

Withdraw of Consent

A Government of Fraud & Deception

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS DEDICATED TO THE FUTURE OF MAN.

HOW DOES CONGRESS “LEGALLY” GET AWAY WITH ALL THEIR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIVITY?

- *The Federal Reserve? - The Patriot Act? - The Healthcare Bill? - Cap and Trade? – Federal Income Taxes?*

What follows is fact - not fiction. It is NOT conspiracy theory or Patriot myth. It is all 100% documented. The TRUTH is that the UNITED STATES you believe to be a country is nothing more than a private/ for profit business operated by an unlawful Congress for the benefit of a handful of International Bankers and controlled by the Vatican. America is a corporate “slave” plantation.

On February 21st in 1871, the “nobility” of Congress officially created a PRIVATE / FOR PROFIT municipal corporation that they could “legally” control under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the organic Constitution - and then proceeded to give it all the power and authority "not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States." See: Congressional Record/ Organic Act of 1871. What did Congress name their NEW private business enterprise? They named their new company...THE UNITED STATES.

Let me be very clear about this important issue by restating it:

In 1871, “Congress” created a PRIVATE company called the UNITED STATES over which THEY had complete “legal” control, and gave it powers - “NOT INCONSISTENT with the Constitution and Laws of the United States.”

The District of Columbia (aka The State of New Columbia) is unlike ANY other municipal corporation on the planet. For within the ten mile square known as the “District of Columbia” is a PRIVATELY HELD corporation legally named “THE UNITED STATES” with all the power of the organic Constitution for the united States of America. Any participation “within” this PRIVATE / FOR PROFIT commercial entity is “presumed” to be a legally binding contract, based on OUR CONSENT, to be “adjudicated” by THEM, in THEIR PRIVATE commercial courts. Amazingly, most Americans still believe a legitimate government and system of Law exists and they live in a FREE society. Sadly, nothing can be farther from the truth. Truth be told, the American people are nothing more than FEUDAL SERFS (slaves) within a system of “Public Policy” that captures ALL corporate U.S. citizen “persons” (assets) through a deceptive - but voluntary - 14th Amendment U.S. citizenship. The fact is, every single “courtroom” currently operating “within” one of their “STATE OF” franchises, is a non-Article III legislative tribunal acting as collection agent for Congress’s PRIVATE / FOR PROFIT commercial business (you) – and administrator of FDR’s corporate U.S. bankruptcy of 1933. Every Department of Justice “court” across America is a private commercial Law Merchant court operating ONLY for the generation of corporate PROFITS.

To be clear, there is NEVER a lawful non-fictional non-commercial “cause of action” in THEIR PRIVATE COURT SYSTEM. Never should a sane man or woman walk into one of their PRIVATE / FOR PROFIT commercial courtrooms and expect the Constitution to magically appear or the Common Law to be recognized, upheld, or enforced. The sooner WE ALL accept that - WE HAVE NO LAW - and - WE HAVE NO GOVERNMENT - the sooner we can take back what has been fraudulently stolen by the Crown controlled thieves in Washington D.C. its private central banking system – the Federal Reserve. Only then can we start rebuilding what is left of America. Only then will we have a monetary system based on real value. Only then will we, “the American people,” truly regain our freedom, liberty, and God given unalienable Rights.

- *There has been no true freedom or “lawful” government since the creation of the UNITED STATES Constitution.*
- *We have been under Military Rule since dictator Abraham Lincoln issued Executive Order #1, April 15, 1861.*
- *No American claiming U.S. “citizenship” has a “vote” or any representation in their private “Congress.”*

We must educate OURSELVES on the U.S. ASSET / 14th Amendment “citizenship” that holds us in Bondage!

The Declaration of Independence states: Governments are instituted... by the CONSENT of the governed.

NOW IS THE TIME TO... WITHDRAW OUR CONSENT

Contact Kurt Kallenbach at: IAMTHEPEOPLE.US@gmail.com/ or Listen Every Tuesday Night 8PM Central at: <http://libertyandfreedomradio.net/>

Table of Contents

<i>Grateful Slave - by Paine's Torch</i>	6
<i>The Constitution Con</i>	11
<i>The United States Isn't a Country – It's a Corporation by Lisa Guliani</i>	41
<i>The District of Columbia "Voting" Rights</i>	46
<i>U.S. economic history that Ron Paul wants every American to know: Pt. I - by Geoff Linsley</i>	48
<i>U.S. economic history that Ron Paul wants every American to know: Pt. II - by Geoff Linsley</i>	53
<i>U.S. economic history that Ron Paul wants every American to know: Pt. III - by Geoff Linsley</i>	60
<i>What Do YOU Really Know? – by Nichole Terry</i>	66
<i>The United States is a British Colony – by James Montgomery</i>	71
<i>The New World Order</i>	89
<i>The Executive Order</i>	91
<i>The Lieber Code / General Orders 100</i>	97
<i>No Treason I - by Lysander Spooner</i>	112
<i>No Treason II – The Constitution - by Lysander Spooner</i>	120
<i>The Ten Causes of the War Between the States – by James W. King and LtCol Thomas M. Nelson</i>	129
<i>The History of the Office of the Illinois Attorney General – by Atty Shawn W. Denney</i>	134
<i>The Crown Temple</i>	144
<i>Congress's "SEASON OF TREASON" 1861-1871</i>	159
<i>An Act of Congress to Re-Define "Person" in America - Excerpt by Richard Mark Voudren</i>	161
<i>An Act of Congress to Re-Define "State" in America - Excerpt by Richard Mark Voudren</i>	162
<i>The 14th Amendment – July 28, 1868</i>	163
<i>The Organic Act of 1871</i>	164
<i>The "Other" Side of the Constitutional Fence – Drawing</i>	166
<i>United States vs UNITED STATES vs united States of America</i>	167
<i>Are You a Union state Citizen or Federal U.S. citizen?</i>	172
<i>The Fictitious Legal Entity Called "a Person" - by Paul Verge</i>	180

<i>Terms not Words – by The Informer</i>	183
<i>“The Official State Office Known As "PERSON"”</i>	191
<i>Do You Own Yourself? - by Butler Shaffer</i>	199
<i>The Un-Constitutionality of the 14th Amendment – by Judge L.H. Perez</i>	203
<i>The Non-Ratification of the 14th Amendment – by Judge A.H. Ellett</i>	215
<i>Law vs. Legal – by Brother Gregory</i>	276
<i>The Two United States and the Law – by Howard Freeman</i>	286
<i>U.S. Law is Private Merchant Law</i>	291
<i>The American Illusion</i>	298
<i>The History of How We Were Put Into the “Commerce Game”</i>	305
<i>The United States is a Fraud</i>	309
<i>Who Says We Need A License?</i>	312
<i>Hiding Behind the Bar</i>	322
<i>Are Cops Constitutional – by Roger Roots</i>	327
<i>Admiralty on Land! – by James Montgomery / Traficant speech on U.S. Bankruptcy</i>	386
<i>Who is Running America? – Barefoots World</i>	397
<i>Secrets of the Federal Reserve – by Eustace Mullins</i>	418
<i>FEDERAL REGIONALISM – The Buck Act – Map of Standard Federal Regions</i>	542
<i>Executive Order Establishing Council of Governors</i>	551
<i>The Constitution for the Newstates of America</i>	569
<i>The Most Powerful Man in the World? - by Rick Martin</i>	577
<i>The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion</i>	650
<i>The Mind Conspirators – by Nelson Hultburg</i>	696
<i>John B. Nelson “Letter to the American People” February 2, 1992</i>	705
<i>“CREATOR” Flow Chart</i>	717
<i>The unanimous Declaration of Independence</i>	718
<i>A Public Declaration and Privat Notice of Immediate “Withdraw of Consent”</i>	723

Grateful Slave

By Paine's Torch

I am a grateful slave.

My master is a good man.

He gives me food, shelter, work and other things.

All he requires in return is that I obey him.

I am told he has the power to control my life.

I look up to him, and wish that I were so powerful.

My master must understand the world better than I,

because he was chosen by many others for his respected position.

I sometimes complain, but fear I cannot live without his help.

He is a good man.

My master protects my money from theft, before and after he takes half of it.

Before taking his half, he says only he can protect my money.

After taking it, he says it is still mine.

When he spends my money, he says I own the things he has bought.

I don't understand this, but I believe him.

He is a good man.

I need my master for protection, because others would hurt me.

Or, they would take my money and use it for themselves. My master is better than them:

When my master takes my money, I still own it. The things he buys are mine.

I cannot sell them, or decide how they are used, but they are mine.

My master tells me so,

And I believe him.

He is a good man.

My master provides free education for my children.

He teaches them to respect and obey him and all future masters they will have.

He says they are being taught well; learning things they will need to know in the future.

I believe him.

He is a good man.

My master cares about other masters, who don't have good slaves.

He makes me contribute to their support.

I don't understand why slaves must work for more than one master,

But my master says it is necessary.

I believe him.

He is a good man.

Other slaves ask my master for some of my money.

Since he is good to them as he is to me, he agrees.

This means he must take more of my money; but he says this is good for me.

I ask my master why it would not be better to let each of us keep our own money.

He says it is because he knows what is best for each of us.

We believe him.

He is a good man.

*My master tells me: Evil masters in other places are not as good as he;
They threaten our comfortable lifestyle and peace.
So, he sends my children to fight the slaves of evil masters.
I mourn their deaths, but my master says it is necessary.
He gives me medals for their sacrifice, and I believe him.
He is a good man.*

Good masters sometimes have to kill evil masters, and their slaves.

This is necessary to preserve our way of life; to show others that our version of slavery is the best.

I asked my master: Why do evil masters' slaves have to be killed, along with their evil master?

He said: "Because they carry out his evil deeds."

"Besides, they could never learn our system;

They have been indoctrinated to believe that only their master is good."

My master knows what is best.

He protects me and my children.

He is a good man.

My master lets me vote for a new master, every few years.

I cannot vote to have no master, but he generously lets me choose between two candidates he has selected.

I eagerly wait until Election Day, since voting allows me to forget that I am a slave.

Until then, my current master tells me what to do.

I accept this.

It has always been so, and I would not change tradition.

My master is a good man.

At the last election, about half the slaves were allowed to vote.

The other half had broken rules set by the master, or were not thought by him to be fit.

Those who break the rules should know better than to disobey!

Those not considered fit should gratefully accept the master chosen for them by others.

It is right, because we have always done it this way.

My master is a good man.

There were two candidates.

One received a majority of the vote - about one-fourth of the slave population.

I asked why the new master can rule over all the slaves, if he only received votes from one-fourth of them.

My master said: "Because some wise masters long ago did it that way."

"Besides, you are the slaves; and we are the master."

I did not understand his answer, but I believed him.

My master knows what is best for me.

He is a good man.

Some slaves have evil masters.

They take more than half of their slaves' money and are chosen by only one-tenth,

rather than one-fourth, of their slaves.

My master says they are different from him.

I believe him.

He is a good man.

I asked if I could ever become a master, instead of a slave. My master said, "Yes, anything is possible."

*"But first you must pledge allegiance to your present master,
and promise not to abandon the system that made you a slave."*

I am encouraged by this possibility.

My master is a good man.

He tells me slaves are the real masters, because they can vote for their masters.

I do not understand this, but I believe him.

He is a good man; who lives for no other purpose than to make his slaves happy.

I asked if I could be neither a master nor a slave.

My master said, "No, you must be one or the other."

"There are not other choices."

I believe him. He knows best.

He is a good man.

I asked my master how our system is different, from those evil masters.

He said: "In our system, masters work for the slaves." No longer confused, I am beginning to accept his logic.

Now I see it! Slaves are in control of their masters, because they can choose new masters every few years.

When the masters appear to control the slaves in between elections, it is all a grand delusion!

In reality, they are carrying out the slaves' desires.

For if this was not so, they would not have been chosen in the last election.


How clear it is to me now!

I shall never doubt the system again.

My master is a good man.

The Constitution Con

The first function of the founders of nations, after the founding itself, is to devise a set of true falsehoods about origins – a mythology – that will make it desirable for nationals to continue to live under common authority, and, indeed, make it impossible for them to entertain contrary thoughts - Forrest McDonald (E Pluribus Unum)



Slavery by word and parchment idolatry.

The US Constitution was created on September 17, 1787, and was ratified behind closed doors on June 21, 1788. Thirty nine of the fifty five delegates who attended the Philadelphia Convention signed the document. Their con job is evident from the very first line penned. Legally, the "People" allegedly mentioned, are not sovereign. They are merely *willing* slaves who have been granted the *illusion* of freedom.

From an occult point of view, the Constitution was ratified on an Atonist festival day. It is a patently Solar Cult document. This is because the date of ratification was June 21st, the day when the sun ascends to its highest point in the zodiac.

Benjamin Franklin, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, were three of the men who framed the infernal Constitution and pushed for its ratification. Their document served the American aristocracy, not the people. In fact, the document was never put before the people for ratification. This is because it was openly opposed by the majority of men and women in the original thirteen states.

The Constitutionlists were guileful traitors whose attendance at the Philadelphia Convention was kept secret for an entire generation. Their document served to leave the "door" of America unlocked and ajar, so that the country's foreign enemies could surreptitiously re-enter in the days and years following the supposed War of Independence.



Benjamin Franklin

James Madison

Alexander Hamilton

The hypocrisy and duplicity of the Federalists is responsible for modern neo-imperialism and advent of the so-called New World Order. In our opinion, these men were little more than British agents, because King George himself - the man who declared *eternal* war on America - could not have done as much damage to America as their actions have wrought.

Such a tyrannical future where property rights would be ignored, where a massive standing army would lurk unchallengeable, where Congressmen would hold office for life, where ruinous treaties would be commonplace, where Presidential powers would make Nero jealous, where gold and silver would vanish from circulation to be replaced by the worthless "notes" of a private banking conglomeration, where the States would be reduced to mere administrative departments of the feds, and where the grasp of taxation would actually reach into the common laborer's paycheck - all this was too fantastic to be even theoretically contemplated during the ratification debates - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)

When the duplicitous Hamilton was questioned as to why he helped draft the Constitution, he guardedly replied:

My motives must remain in the depository of my own breast.

He was but one member of the Philadelphia Convention who secretly resented the independence of America. One perceptive dissenter realized this, and wrote:

The Continental convention...was composed of some men of excellent characters; of others who were more remarkable for their ambition and cunning, than their patriotism; and of some who have been opponents to the independence of the United States - (Dissenting Address of the Pennsylvanian Convention, 18 December 1787)

James Madison is considered the "father" of the US Constitution. He was heavily influenced, as were many American politicians, by the philosophy of French aristocrat Baron de Montesquieu, who believed in rule by monarchs. Madison was also influenced by the writings of the British empiricist philosopher John Locke, who was himself "a major investor in the English slave-trade through the Royal Africa Company." Madison was vehemently opposed to state independence and pushed the Constitution to keep power well and truly out of the hands of ordinary Americans. He openly advocated an anti-republican ideology, and explained how the illiterate masses should be divided and controlled:

Where a majority are united by a common sentiment, and have an opportunity, the rights of the minor party become insecure. In a republican government the majority, if united, have always an opportunity. The only remedy is to enlarge the sphere and thereby divide the community into so great a number of interests and parties that, in the first place, a majority will not be likely, at the same moment, to have a common interest separate from that of the whole, or of the minority; and, in the second place, that, in case they should have such an interest, they may not be so apt to unite in the pursuit of it - (Elliot's Debates, Vol. 5)

Madison was the only delegate to keep records of proceedings at the Convention. However, his notes were not made public until four years *after* his death. Prior to their public release, the notes had been thoroughly edited.

The con is evident from the Constitution's Preamble, as we said. In fact the "People" referred to are *not* the citizens of America, No! They are the elites who rule from within the quite separate precinct known as the District of Columbia. This district is under federal control, and the government operating from within it is, legally speaking, a *foreign* institution. "We the People" denotes this separate ruling elite. It refers to the imperious overlords who have *granted* the Constitution to the masses within the "United States of America," the *non-sovereign* nation under *their* control. Therefore, the entity mentioned in the first line of the Preamble is *not* the same entity mentioned in the last line. Let's read it and uncover the cunning artifice of its authors:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

This is what the Preamble subtextually infers:

WE THE RULING ARISTOCRACY, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution FOR THE SLAVES WITHOUT RIGHTS, UNDER OUR FEDERAL CONTROL.

Because "People" is capitalized it is a proper noun referring to a specific body of people - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)

These facts explain why the word "for" is to be found in the last line, and not the word "of." Legally, there is a big difference between:

...do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

and:

...do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.

The first rendering implies that the Constitution has been *granted* to one body by another. Ergo, the Constitution is nothing more than a totalitarian document, ratifying aristocratic control over the "United States of America" and its inhabitants. The elites are literally saying; "This document and its articles are *for* you." The point being, that it is not *of* you, meaning, it is not yours by natural right. The word "for" indicates that the matter of the document is *bestowed* by another. And of course, when a person gives someone something, they presumably want something in return. This was certainly the case for the Federalists who conceived the Constitution.

Suggestively, the word "of" does appear in a meaningful legal declaration. It appears in the text of the Presidential Oath:

I solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

In this instance, the word "of" designates the President as a member of the aristocratic elite. He is, therefore, a ruler *separate* from the citizens in the states, and of the nation. The "for" does not apply to the President because, unlike the masses, he is not an outsider. He is part of the inner sovereign circle referenced by the word "of." The Constitution is "of" the ruling elite, but is "for" the masses. In effect, the Constitution is a schizophrenic document. There are *two* constitutions; one for the mass servant class, and one for the oligarchs ruling from within the District of Columbia. This is why the Preamble contains two *different* terms: the "United States" (denoting the oligarchy and their authority), and "United States of America" (denoting the non-sovereign masses on the receiving end).

If the Presidential Oath read as follows, there would be less cause for concern:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States of America, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.

But then again, pigs might fly. Alarmingly, before it was dropped, the President's original title was "His Excellency."

Many critics and authors have pointed out these disturbing facts and rightly insist that the so-called "United States" is not the same thing as the so-called "United States of America." Nevertheless, due to deliberate misinformation and conditioning, most people do believe that the terms refer to one and the same entity. They are certainly not inclined to

think of the "United States" (the U.S.) as a foreign *corporation*. Furthermore, the drafters of the Constitution intentionally saw to it that the term "United States" had more than one meaning. Specifically, they knew the term did not refer to citizens of a state. Once-upon-a-time, in America, you could have been a citizen of a state without being a citizen of the nation. This political idiosyncrasy did not suit the Federalists who have ingeniously manipulated the words and terms we have become familiar with. It is a old trick that serves the cause of totalitarians no end.


...not only were the poly meanings of "United States" intentionally and expressly used within the Constitution, but often in ways as to actually invite confusion. For such brilliant men to explain three jurisdictional concepts would, on its face, pose a great mystery -
Kenneth W. Royce (*Hologram of Liberty*)

When members of the police or military swear to serve, uphold, and protect the Constitution, and the "United States," they probably imagine that their oath is sworn to the American people. Nothing could be further from the truth. They are, in fact, swearing to give their labor, and possibly their very lives, for the diabolical corporate executives of Washington D.C.



Oaths of allegiance are fine, as long as you know who or what your swearing them to.





Hologram of Liberty,
by K. W. Royce.
Probably the best
book dealing with
the con of the
Constitution.

In short, the U.S. and the U.S.A., are not the same thing. The alleged "People" are not, therefore, free and sovereign members of a country, as they would have been under the Articles of Confederation drawn up after the War of Independence. No, they were, and still are, merely employees of a privately run corporation. They do not have rights, they have provisionally granted privileges. They have liberty, but do not have permanent and inviolable sovereignty or freedom.

The Constitution, as currently interpreted, now resembles what the Founding Lawyers truly desired in their aristocratic heart of hearts. Two centuries of history have lifted the veil from that picture of Dorian Gray, leaving us with the Hag of Hegemony - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)

The State...both in its genesis and by its primary intention, is purely anti-social. It is not based on the idea of natural rights, but on the idea that the individual has no rights except those that the State may provisionally grant him - Albert Jay Nock (Our Enemy, the State)

The duplicity served to strengthen Federal power. Because of the Constitution, the populace have been intentionally stripped of their sovereign rights. It is also because of this particular chicanery that Americans presently find themselves politically and economically compromised. The Federalist plan was nothing less than an act of war. It was the plan of agent provocateurs and fifth columnists. Only a very few authors have stated this in so many words. However, we are convinced that the early Federalists were ministers of the Crown. They accomplished with their pens what armed legions failed to do by open war. We believe that after the Constitution was ratified, Americans became, in effect, subjects of the aristocracy. The king who hated America, did not resend his army to attack with force of arms. He knew the country could be conquered and brought under British control by other means:

The phrase "direct and immediate allegiance" is something right out of feudal law...Americans who became "U.S. citizens" have transposed themselves from one system into another fundamentally different from the first...Americans have unknowingly joined a modern feudal system in which they must render a percentage of their toil to their federal master - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)

The non-federal state Citizenship became virtually unknown as millions of state Americans were tricked out of their sovereignty and into federal citizenship - and thus into federal jurisdiction. Today, the states have been all but replaced by corporate, federal overlays...There's probably not enough left of the original states for Americans to resume state Citizenship - ibid

These facts show that the Constitution was not a progressive document. On the contrary, its cunning drafters concocted it knowing that it would help to usher in the kind of Merchant State system that flourished earlier in America, before the War of Independence, and shortly after the first settlers arrived, with their *British* system of law. As Albert Jay Nock explains:


The fundamental fact to be observed in any survey of the American State's initial development is the one whose importance was first remarked, I believe, by Mr. Beard; that the trading-company - the commercial corporation for colonization - was actually an autonomous State. "Like the State," says Mr. Beard, "it had a constitution, a charter issued by the Crown...it had a territorial basis, a grant of land often greater in area than a score of European principalities...every essential element long afterward found in the government of the American State appeared in the chartered corporation that started English civilization in America" - (Our Enemy, the State)

Nock goes on to emphasize the connections between the "Old World" system of control, and the so-called "New World" system:

...the system of civil order established in America was the State-system of the "mother countries" ...the only thing that distinguished it was that the exploited and dependant class was situated at an unusual distance from the owning and exploiting class. The headquarters of the autonomous State were on one side of the Atlantic, and its subjects on the other.

The elites of Britain and Europe knew that remote control was only feasible for a short time. They knew they had to have their agents on site in order for the engines of exploitation to work efficiently. Consequently, in 1628, during the reign of Charles I, the oligarchs established the Massachusetts Bay Company in America. Many of the Constitution's most illustrious signers became wealthy from their memberships of corporations such as the Massachusetts Bay Company, which overflowed with agents of the British Crown. Business the American way is, it seems, business the *British* way.

While it is not surprising that America's Founding Fathers were mostly slave owners, a legal activity, it may be surprising to discover that they were often smugglers as well. Profits from drug running, smuggling, slave trading, and even piracy are directly responsible for the founding of several of the country's most important banks, which are still in operation today. New England's staunch insurance business was born and prospered through profits earned from insuring opium and slave ships. The large railroad system that was built throughout the continental United States in the nineteenth century was funded with profits from illegal drug smuggling. And one of the greatest opium fortunes would provide seed money for the telephone and communications industry - Steven Sora (Secret Societies of America's Elite)



Flag of the British East India Company



Flag of the "United States" Corporation

Of course, there were clever men who knew what was going on. Even before the Constitution - the document of servitude - was signed and ratified, the warnings went out:

That investigation into the nature and construction of the new constitution, which the conspirators have so long and zealously struggled against, has, notwithstanding their partial success, so far taken place as to ascertain the enormity of their criminality. That system which was pompously displayed as the perfection of government, proves upon examination to be the most odious system of tyranny that was ever projected, a many headed hydra of despotism, whose complicated and various evils would be infinitely more oppressive and afflictive than the scourge of any tyrant - "Centinel" (Essay 12, 23 January 1788)

The anonymous author of this diatribe would not be in the least bit surprised to see the present state of decay, and neither would Thomas Paine, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, or Andrew Jackson. They would simply know that their worst fears were justified.

The rise of imperialist fascism in America is, as we said, the direct result of the door of America being deliberately left ajar. The enemies of America could creep in at any time. And creep in they did. They were confident that the country would eventually fall into their hands. They knew their agents were well ensconced within the country, and that they would use their positions of authority within government and big business to gradually undermine the Articles of Confederation, that did guarantee each and every American, regardless of class, the rights they deserved. They knew they simply had to continue employing the "divide and rule" tactic to further their nationalist interests.



The Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, was America's true Constitution before it was cunningly derided and overruled by self-serving traitors known, in today's parlance, as Globalists or Internationalists.

The lunatic tyrant King George III had adamantly proclaimed his utter hatred for the American rebels. He openly declared "eternal" war on America, and his word was law to his industrious lieutenants. True to form, agents of the British Crown have been waging eternal war on the country ever since their despicable master's day.

The men who undermined the Articles of the Confederation, and who hustled the Constitution, have had statues and portraits raised in their honor. Volumes have been written about their deeds, but rarely has the truth been told. Throughout America and the world, the traitors are still lauded as great revolutionaries, thinkers, and humanitarians. Their ideological descendants now openly and unashamedly work hand in hand with British and European oligarchs. They still use fear and panic to further their agendas, and still work to erode what is left of the privileges once bestowed upon their slaves.

We have "federal sheriffs" beyond imagination. There are forty six civilian agencies of the Federal Government whose agents carry guns and have the power to make arrests. These "great insults on the people" have been allowed because there is little we can do about them, short of armed rebellion. And by the way, no laws authorizing "civil forfeiture" or other related measures of tyranny have been struck down by the federal courts - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)

We have plenty of rights in this country, provided you don't get caught exercising them - Terry Mitchell (Editor of The Revolutionary Toker)

Patrick Henry was one patriot who understood what was going on. He did not attend the Convention in Philadelphia, and said: "I smell a rat." He was dead right. But there was more than one stinking *human* rat running loose at the Convention. The traitors referred to themselves as Federalists because they knew the people would tend to think of them as servants of America. And they were right. Their smokescreen worked wonderfully. Today, the misuse of words and terms continues. George Bush's "Patriot Acts," dupe the uninformed masses and give them the impression that it is patriotic to give up hard won rights in turn for government (or State) protection.

For centuries, pillage by invading armies was a normal part of warfare...Nowadays, at least in more civilized countries, we do not let armies rampage for booty. We leave the pillaging to men in suits, and we don't call it pillaging anymore. We call it economic development - Brian Whitaker (The Guardian)

The Bushes did as their predecessors had done two hundred years ago. The Federalist traitors hurried the ratification process along, and gave the Convention delegates and American people little time to scrutinize the Constitution's articles.

George W. Bush did likewise when it came to his scurrilous Patriot Acts. Moreover, he personally saw to it that the investigation into the causes of the September Eleventh tragedy was hampered and limited:

President Bush personally asked Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle...to limit the Congressional investigation into the events of September 11, Congressional and White House sources told CNN...The request was made at a private meeting with Congressional leaders - Gore Vidal (Dreaming War)

George W. Bush's lack of regard for the Constitution is not unique. He is a Globalist, and does not serve America. He is one of many men who have used the Constitution as a stepping stone toward what might be described as an United World Super State. Nowadays the conspirators who have labored toward this utopian chimera, appear to be less inclined to conceal the reasons for their intrigue. As George W. Bush put it:

It is the sacred principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter to which the American people will henceforth pledge their allegiance - (Address to the UN General Assembly, February 1 1992)

The world can therefore seize the opportunity (the Persian Gulf crisis) to fulfill the long held promise of a New World Order where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind - (State of the Union Address, January 29 1991)

Author Forrest MacDonald clarified the issue concerning the undermining of the Articles of Confederation. In his book entitled *Alexander Hamilton: A Biography*, he wrote:

What did determine the outcome were the rules of the contest, which Hamilton played an important part in formulating. The convention decided to disregard the amendment procedures prescribed in the Articles of Confederation and instead provided that each state should hold a special election for delegates to a ratifying convention...Had the rules of the Articles of Confederation been adhered to, the Constitution would never have been adopted.

The dissenters knew what lay in store, and they were very worried. Their warnings went largely unheard, and the ratification of the Constitution hurriedly commenced, regardless of the warnings of many perceptive critics:

It is insisted, indeed, that this constitution must be received, be it ever so imperfect. But remember, when the people once part with power, they can seldom or never resume it again by by force. Many instances can be produced in which the people have voluntarily increased the powers of their rulers; but few, if any, in which rulers have willingly abridged their authority - "Brutus" (Essay 1, 18 October 1787)

Consider what you are about to do before your part with this Government. Take longer time in reckoning things: Revolutions like this have happened in almost every country in Europe: Similar examples are...ancient Greece and ancient Rome: Instances of the people losing their liberty by their own carelessness and the ambition of a few - Patrick Henry (Speech of 5 June 1778)

Does it not insult your judgment to tell you, Adopt first, and then amend?...Is your rage for novelty so great, that you are first to sign and seal, and then retract?...agree to bind yourself hand and foot - for the sake of what? of being unbound?...to go into a dungeon - for what? To get out? Is there no danger, when you go in, that the bolts of federal authority shall shut you in? - Patrick Henry (Speech to the Virginia ratifying assembly 1788)

I look upon the Constitution as the most fatal plan that could be possibly be conceived to enslave a free people - ibid

No sooner was the Constitution ratified, than the oligarchs began acting tyrannically toward the American people. British agent, President George Washington (who presided over the signing of the Constitution and who was a member of the Ohio Company of Virginia, the Mississippi Company, and the Potomac Company) sent thirteen thousand armed troops to violently stamp out the so-called Whiskey Rebellion of 1794. This rebellion was against heavy taxation.



The victims of government oppression soon discovered that they could not use the Constitution to receive justice. It contained little provision for the under-classes. It gave complete suzerainty to the courts and judges, not to the people or the states. To all intents and purposes, it was as if the War of Independence had never been fought.

The Constitution merely made it possible for agents of the British Crown to operate as if they served the citizens of America. In this regard, nothing has changed.

The facts about the American Revolution show that in the early days, in the mid 1770's, the colonialists suffered a series of defeats. Strategic secrets were being passed to the British. The facts also show that an American army general, Benedict Arnold, was a traitor who plotted to surrender the fort at West Point to the British and turn the tide of war against his own side. The facts link Washington with Arnold when it comes to Freemasonry and the facts show that the day the plot was discovered, Washington was due to meet Arnold at West Point...Washington has been working with Arnold and passing secrets to the British - Robert Cooper (Interview on Dan Brown's The Lost Symbol)

The tyranny continued in 1798, with the Alien and Sedition Acts, which made criticism of federal officials a punishable offence. The Constitution served to strengthen the powers of the wealthy aristocratic class in America. It possessed few benefits for the average citizen, and ultimately legalized widespread acts of confiscation and extortion. As Thomas Jefferson once remarked: "The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." The point is emphasized by Constitutional scholar and author Kenneth W. Royce:

If analyzed in contrast to history since 1787, it appears that the Constitution was purposely laden with several components designed to nearly guarantee the gradual expansion of the Federal Government - at the expense of the States and the people - (Hologram of Liberty)



Patrick Henry is known for his "Give me Liberty, or give me Death!" speech. Along with Samuel Adams and Thomas Paine, he is remembered as one of the most influential and radical advocates of the American Revolution and of republicanism, especially in his denunciations of corruption in government officials - (Wikipedia Online Encyclopedia)

The Founding Fathers may have referred to themselves as Federalists. But this was, as we said, yet one more cunning play on words. Master propagandists, such as Vladimir Lenin, probably learned tactics from America's faux Federalists.

The *original* Federalists demanded a government of limited powers, and were for state power. Their needs were ably met by the Articles of Confederation, ratified in 1781. After the War of Independence (1775 to 1783), Americans had the Constitution forced upon them. Ever since then Americans have been duped about the prestige of the document. The people and representatives of the original thirteen states were not allowed enough time to decide whether the document was sound or not. Patrick Henry questioned the haste, and warned of the consequences of accepting the Constitution without due consideration and debate. He knew that state representatives needed at least a year to mull over the articles of the Constitution. He spoke out and said:

Why then tell us of dangers to terrify us into an adoption of this new Government? And yet who knows the dangers that this new system may produce; they are out of sight of the common people: They cannot foresee latent consequences: I dread the operation of it on the middling and lower class of people: It is for them I fear the adoption of this system...I see jeopardy in this new Government. I see none from our present one.

As we said, the Constitution's articles scandalously allowed the Supreme Court to possess almost unlimited legal powers:

No country has given its courts such extraordinary power. Not Britain, where an act of Parliament binds the courts. Not India...Not even West Germany or Ireland, where the power of judicial review is established but exercised on a narrower scale. The President is elected. State legislators and Governors are elected. Supreme Court Justices are not elected: they are appointed for life - Archibald Cox (The Court and the Constitution)

Despite widespread resistance, and a spirit of animosity toward the Constitution's articles, its cheerleaders Madison, Hamilton, Franklin and Washington relentlessly pressed on. They ensured that resistance to their will was summarily suppressed.

Most troublesome to the framers of the Constitution was the increasing insurgent spirit evidenced among the people. Fearing the popular takeover of state governments, the wealthy class looked to a national government as a means of protecting their interests. Even in states where they were inclined to avoid strong federation, the rich, once faced with the threat of popular rule and realizing that a political alliance with conservatives from other states would be a safeguard if the radicals could capture the state government...gave up 'state rights' for 'nationalism' without hesitation - Michael Parenti (Democracy for the Few)

Within a month after the 17 September signing, a torrent of anti-constitution essays appeared in the newspapers, pleading for prudent wisdom. This horrified three particular federalists, who quickly went on the editorial offensive in what was to be a staggering 85 essays totaling some 175,000 words. The Federalist Papers were written by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay to defend the proposed Constitution...Hamilton, Madison, and Jay hid for years behind the pseudonym "Publius"...to conceal from the public their true identities, and Convention attendance - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)



George Washington addressing the delegates during the signing of the US Constitution. Benjamin Franklin (a member of the English Hell Fire Club) is shown in the center of the canvas. His design for the Seal of the United States depicted Moses leading the Children of Israel across the Red Sea. Franklin's nickname among his elite secret society chums was "Moses." Like his many Masonic associates in America, England, and France, he was an Atonist or, in conventional parlance, a Luciferian. His backers were powerful royal figures such as Charles de Lorraine and the Duke d'Orleans. The last thing on his mind was freedom for the American people. He was a wealthy speculator in land, and a member of the Vandalia Company, whose land grant happened (coincidentally of course) to have been awarded by the British Crown. (Click pic for full scene.)

The secretiveness of the proceedings at the Convention reinforced the suspicions of many critics of the Constitution. Kenneth W. Royce tell us:

Little wonder why the Constitution operated under such extraordinary secrecy. Held on the second floor, windows shut, with sentries posted below, the delegates were sworn to strict silence. Not until 32 years later (a generation, you see) were the proceeding's Journals published. Madison's notes (thoroughly edited) weren't published until 53 years later, in 1840.

Royce also comments on the measures taken by the Federalists to conceal the infighting that took place among delegates at the Convention:

Great propaganda measures were employed to conceal the Convention's true atmosphere of acrimonious dissent.

The state of affairs was noted by a journalist, who wrote:

So great is the unanimity, we hear, that prevails in the Convention, upon all great federal subjects, that it has been proposed to call the room in which they assemble - Unanimity Hall - (Pennsylvania Packet and Daily Advertiser, 19 July 1787)

Fifty five delegates attended the Philadelphia Convention - forty one politicians and thirty four lawyers. Not a single person from the working class was present. Those men who attempted to delay proceedings, by boycotting the Convention, were sought out by troops and forcibly dragged to the Convention hall.

Electing the respected General George Washington as Convention president, with the added presence of Benjamin Franklin, was responsible for much of the public's "false confidences." Of the 55 delegates, 41 were politicians and 34 were lawyers...According to delegate James McHenry, at least 21 of the 55 delegates favored some form of monarchy - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)

Prime mover in the conspiracy to undermine the Articles of Confederation was the traitor Alexander Hamilton. In a book entitled *The Federalist Papers*, author Douglas Adair comments on Hamilton's dilemma:

Hamilton's disillusion with the workings of the Confederation and his fear of democracy, especially after Shay's Rebellion, had convinced him that it would be almost impossible to set up a stable republic in a country as large as the United States. As he informed the Convention, any society in which political power was vested in the hands of all the people would be continually torn by the class struggles of the rich and poor. Hamilton's remedy for this class war the Hobbesian expedient of setting up a leviathan state to impose order upon the American People from above, Hamilton was sure that the only alternative to social anarchy was the establishment of a consolidated government capable of maintaining itself independently of the people's will.

Hamilton's tactics worked. He knew the mindset of the men he represented. He knew that all he had to do was instill enough fear into the delegates to achieve the desired result. Federalists and Globalists continue to employ this type of ruse to further their agendas. It is little more than conflict control.

That was the genius of the Constitution: To 1. utterly transform political reality without the people understanding it; 2. destroy the States without sound or smoke and 3. foist a government destined to become, over the distant horizon, fully national in scope and authority. By the time the States and the people would realize they'd been trumped, it would be too late - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)

Hamilton, Madison, and their Federalist gang of conspirators, were ecstatic over the success of their "divide and rule" tactics. After the damage was done, Madison bragged about the debacle he had deliberately helped foment:

One anti-federalist opinion tell us that the proposed constitution ought to be rejected because it is not a confederation of the States, but a government over individuals. Another admits that it ought to be a government over individuals to a certain extent but by no means to extent proposed. A third does not object to a government over individuals but to the want of a bill of rights. A fourth concurs in the absolute necessity of a bill of rights but contends that it ought to be declaratory, not for the personal rights of individuals, but of the rights reserved to the States in their political capacity. A fifth is of the opinion that a bill of rights of any sort would be superfluous and misplaced and that the plan would be unexceptional except for the fatal power of regulating the times and place of elections.

Thomas Jefferson (principle author of the Declaration of Independence) was appalled at the liberties taken by Hamilton, and by those he continued taking in the years following the Constitution's ratification. He noticed that Hamilton was contemptuous of the Constitution that he himself had cheered, and that he was ambitiously attempting to obtain even broader powers for central government. Hamilton soon proposed changes that were well outside the scope of the Constitution's rules. Obviously, the Constitution was merely one means to many ends, for Hamilton and his self-serving aristocratic cronies. Incensed by Hamilton's scheming, Jefferson wrote:

I will not suffer...the slanders of Hamilton whose history, from the moment at which history can stoop to notice him, is a tissue of machinations against the liberty of the country which has not only received and given him bread, but heaped honors on his head - (Jefferson to Washington, 1792)

Eventually, even Hamilton's colleague James Madison, began to chafe at his obvious disdain for the people and the Constitutional provisos:

As Madison watched Hamilton's program develop, he became disillusioned and bitter. In the Convention he had fought to create a Constitution under which 'the interests and rights of every class of citizen should be duly represented and understood.' Now he saw the machinery of his new government being used to exploit the mass of the people in the interest of a small minority - Douglas Adair (The Federalist Papers)

Among Hamilton's most insidious programs was the creation of the first private bank. Hamilton pushed for the establishment of this scurrilously extortionist organization. His co-conspirator was the arch-traitor Robert Morris, who was undoubtedly an agent of European aristocracy.

Financial genius Robert Morris organized the first bank. He and his associates believed that the bank should be modeled after the Bank of England...Secret investors put up \$400,000 to start this bank. This attempt failed after two short years...Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton, submitted a proposal to Congress in 1790 for a central bank. Interestingly enough, Hamilton had been an aide of Robert Morris in the initial experience of central banking in North America - Bill Hughes (*The Secret Terrorists*)



Financier Nicholas Biddle, was president of the Second National Bank of the United States, established in 1817. He was a servant of the Jesuits, and may have been in contact with the Rothschilds or their predecessors, the Hahns.



Jewish financier Haym Solomon. A precursor to the Rothschilds, he was a close colleague of Robert Morris. The intrigue of affluent Jewish financier families has been tracked and delineated by several authors.



The insidious pirate, slave-trader, and arch-traitor Robert Morris, was the buddy of Alexander Hamilton and Haym Solomon. In 1791 he was appointed U.S. Superintendent of Finance.



The arch-traitor Aaron Burr. Unknown to most Americans, he was a prime mover within the cabal that worked to undermine American sovereignty. This truly insidious character's plotting is revealed in Anton Chaitkin's masterly work entitled *Treason in America*.

Norman Dodd, Research Director of the 1950s Reese Commission (that investigated America's tax-exempt foundations), finally uncovered the dirt on Morris, and wrote:

Robert Morris (signer of the Declaration of Independence) was the personality in this country who used his fortune to finance the Continental army and at the end of the revolution, Mr. Morris found himself diluted of his fortune. So after the revolution was over he then turned his attention to, as an individual, of rebuilding a fortune and his area of activity was in land speculation. At that time he was contacted by an agent of wealth lodged abroad and this wealth was represented by an entity which is historically referred to as the "House of Orange." However, we did know the agent of the House of Orange who contacted Robert Morris after he began to rebuild his fortune, and that personality was a man by the name of Haym Saloman, and he was an agent of the House of Orange in this country, and it was through him that Mr. Morris was offered considerable financial accommodation, which would enable him to, working capital, you might say, to rebuild his fortune.

Haym Soloman was, of course, a servant of the Jewish Kahal and Jesuit Order. Like the Rothschilds, who rose to power shortly after his time, Solomon was a lackey of European royalty - the Hanoverians, Hapsburgs, Stuarts, and their related houses. King George III (America's arch-enemy) was a senior member of the Dutch House of Orange, or Hanover.



The royals maintain control over their disposable lieutenants by way of Masonic societies such as the Skull and Bones, and Bohemian Club. The double-headed eagle (emblem of Scottish Rite Masonry) is *identical* to the royal arms of European dynasties such as the Hapsburgs.

These royal dynasties own corporations and businesses all over the world, and have the power and skill to purchase and use men as easily as they do companies. Of course, they do not openly display their colors. They are very discreet and prefer to exercise control by way of devious but disposable agents, faceless companies, and shadowy banking houses. One of the most important aristocratically controlled engines is the Société Générale de Belgique (Society General of Belgium). From 1840 to 1870 (before the Rothschilds were handed the wheel), this financial consortium was directly controlled by Belgium's King Leopold II, grandson of Queen Victoria, and member of the powerful Saxe-Coburg-Gotha dynasty. The Society was actually founded in 1822, by non other than King William I, of the House of Orange. America's number one enemy, King George III, was of the same royal line as William I. Their ancestor, Duchess Sophia of Hanover, was heir to the English throne. Her son became King George I of Great Britain. His grandson was the infamous King George III. These monarchs were members of the so-called "Black Nobility" of Venice and Holland. By way of their financial consortiums they, and their family members, maintained control *remotely* over their colonies, and that includes America.

The corporate name that is assigned to that entity, as the 18th turned into the 19th century, is called Societie Genearale de Belgique, which is the largest accumulation of privately controlled tangible wealth in the world - Andrew Power (Ireland: Land of the Pharaohs)

William of Orange it was...who established the original SGDB which was to finance the growth of a great part of Belgian industry and which today remains by far the most important single force in the country's economic life. La Generale list the Belgian royal family as well as the Vatican among its shareholders in addition to that all-powerful family alliance behind Belgian finances - the Solvays, the Boels and the Janssens...In 1838 the rival Banque de Belgique succumbed to the general crisis in Europe and closed its doors but the SGDB, supported by the Rothschilds, remained open, paying out coin against the notes issued by its competitor - ibid

Prince Bernhard is known to be an influential member of the SGDB, a mysterious organization that seems to be an association of large corporate interests from many countries. American firms associated with this society are said to be among the large corporations whose officers are members of the Council on Foreign Relations and related organizations – Dan Smoot (The Invisible Government)

Because of the intervention of men such as Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the Federalist program to socially and economically undermine America temporarily failed. But time was on the side of the conspiring Nationalists. The second Federal Bank was finally established six years later, in 1816. President Monroe appointed the Jesuit agent Nicholas Biddle as its first president.

Nicholas Biddle, another one of their agents, carried out phase two of the Jesuit attack. Biddle was a brilliant financier, having graduated from the University of Pennsylvania at the age of thirteen. He was a master of the science of money. By the time that Jackson had come to the Presidency in 1828, Biddle was in full control of the Federal government's central bank. This was not the first time that a central bank had been established. Twice before, first under Robert Morris, and then under Alexander Hamilton, had a central bank been tried, but in both cases it had failed because of fraudulent actions on the part of the bankers who were in control. After the war of 1812, a central bank was tried again, and it was in this third attempt that we find Mr. Biddle - Bill Hughes (The Secret Terrorists)



Wilhelm IX, Elector of Hesse-Kassel. He employed Mayer Amschel Rothschild. We must inquire why such a royal would employ and promote a Jewish ghetto-dweller.

The scandalous intrigue of affluent and influential Jewish financier families, such as Rothschild, Oppenheimer, Lazard, Warburg, Schiff, Kuhn, Loeb, Goldman, Sachs, and so on, has been tracked and delineated by several authors. The evidence clearly shows that these families were no friends of America. The Rothschilds, in particular, have received prestigious awards from America's deadliest enemies. For services rendered, leading members of the Rothschild family have been accoladed and endowed with elite status by royals and popes. Amschel Mayer Rothschild, for example, was a Knight of Malta.

The Holy Roman Emperors from the House of Habsburg kept a considerable number of court Jews. Among those of Emperor Ferdinand II are mentioned the following: Solomon and Ber Mayer...Joseph Pincherle of Görz; Moses and Joseph Marburger (Morpurgo) of Gradisca; Ventura Pariente of Trieste; the physician Elijah Chalfon of Vienna; Samuel zum Drachen, Samuel zum Straussen, and Samuel zum Weissen Drachen of Frankfort-on-the-Main; and Mordecai Meisel, of Prague. A specially favored court Jew was Jacob Bassevi, the first Jew to be ennobled, with the title "von Treuenberg" - (Wikipedia Online Encyclopedia. Entry on Court Jews)

Undoubtedly, the Rothschild brothers financially backed the Federalists, in a similar manner as they backed the Duke of Wellington, Cecil Rhodes, Vladimir Lenin, Leon Trotsky, Adolf Hitler, and many other fascists and megalomaniacs. But they were not the first to do so. Agents of the Jesuit Order and Jewish Kahal, such as Haym Solomon, had clearly been active in Federalist circles *before* the Rothschild dynasty were given the reins of financial control. In any case, the Rothschilds and their agents, the Schiffs and Warburgs, were unquestionably instrumental in formulating the so-called Jekyll Island Agreement, which was the basis for the creation of the private Federal Reserve Bank. The Federal Reserve Act was passed on December 22, 1913. Interestingly, this is the time of the Winter Solstice, which is an important day in the Luciferian calendar.

In 1781, Congress established the Office of Finance to save the United States from fiscal ruin. Salomon allied himself with Superintendent of Finance William Morris and became one of the most effective brokers of bills of exchange to meet federal

government expenses. Salomon also personally advanced funds to members of the Continental Congress and other federal officers, charging interest and commissions well below the market rates - Michael Feldberg (*Haym Salomon: The Rest of the Story*)

James Madison confessed that "I have for some time...been a pensioner on the favor of Haym Salomon, a Jew broker" - *ibid*

Solomon supposedly wrote the first draft of the United States Constitution according to some historians. Some claim that he designed the Great Seal of the United States, which is why it has what some believe resembles a Jewish Star above the eagle's head design, and it is also on the back of every American one dollar bill. He believed the United States would become a world power - (Hyam Solomon Bio, Indopedia.org)

The blunt reality is that the Rothschild banking dynasty in Europe was the dominant force, both financially and politically, in the formation of the Bank of the United States - G. Edward Griffin (*The Creature from Jekyll Island*)

The Rothschilds were Jesuits who used their Jewish background as a façade to cover their sinister activities. The Jesuits, working through Rothschild and Biddle, sought to gain control of the banking system of the United States – Bill Hughes (*The Secret Terrorists*)

Over the years since N. M. Rothschild...had been, for a time, the official European banker for the U.S., government and was a pledged supporter of the Bank of the United States - Derek Wilson (*Rothschild: The Wealth and Power of a Dynasty*)

He was lord and master of the money-market of the world, and of course virtually lord and master of everything else...He literally held the revenues of Southern Italy in pawn, and monarchs and ministers of all countries courted his advice and were guided by his suggestions – Benjamin Disraeli (Prime Minister of England writing on Lord Rothschild)

Aware that the Rothschilds are an important Jewish family, I looked them up in *Encyclopedia Judaica* and discovered that they bear the title "Guardians of the Vatican Treasury"...The appointment of Rothschild gave the black papacy absolute financial power and secrecy. Who would ever search a family of orthodox Jews for the key to the wealth of the Roman Catholic Church? - F. Tupper Saussy (*Rulers of Evil*)

The Hofjuden (Court Jews)



Amschel Mayer Rothschild fathered five sons who jointly formed one of the most powerful banking families in history. Amschel died in 1812, which means he may have actively conspired with the Federalists who attempted to found the first US federal bank in 1791. By 1789, Amschel was assisting the House of Hesse and British Crown with their attempts to undermine Napoleon.



Mayer Amschel Rothschild, took over the reigns from his father. He was a Knight of Malta. Elite Masonic Jews had long worked as money men and advisors to the Turks, Huns, and Church of Rome. Mayer died in 1855, which means he was in a position to involve himself in the conspiracy to open the second US Federal bank.



Nathan Mayer Rothschild was in charge of the London branch of his family's banking cartel. He was already working in the Stock Exchange from 1804. He established his London bank in 1811. He died in 1836. Of course, long before Nathan's time, Jewish financiers had been active in England. For example, during the Civil War (1642–1651), Manasseh Ben Israel, funded the tyrant Oliver Cromwell.



James Mayer Rothschild was advisor to two French kings. Highly decorated, he and his four brothers were bestowed the hereditary title of Baron by Austria's Francis II (the Holy Roman Emperor). James was also appointed consul-general of the Austrian Empire and, in 1823, he was awarded the French Legion of Honor. The predecessors of the Rothschilds were the Hahn family. The Rothschilds are related to the Bauers, Oppenheims, Warburgs, and Schiffs. These Khazarian families were able lieutenants of royalty, but not the architects of control, as many misinformed authors believe. They exercise enormous influence over the American government by way of Masonic lodges and Federal orgs such as the Federal Reserve Banks.

The facts show, beyond doubt, that traitorous Nationalists (or should we say *Internationalists*), such as Hamilton, Morris, Solomon, Burr, and Biddle, did not have the best interests of ordinary Americans at heart. On the contrary, by way of their Constitution, and later by way of their banks and credit houses, they sought to subjugate and impoverish the citizens of America. In his excellent books entitled *The Secret Terrorists* and *Enemy Unmasked*, author Bill Hughes details the strong arm methods used by Biddle to force wary President Andrew Jackson into commissioning the founding of the Federal Bank:

Biddle responded to Jackson refusing to allow him to re-establish the central bank by shrinking the nation's money supply. He did this by refusing to make loans. By so doing, he upended the economy and money disappeared. Unemployment ran high. Companies went bankrupt because they could not pay their loans...So confident was he that he publicly boasted that he had caused the economic wars in America.

Is there no danger to our liberty and independence in a bank that in its nature has so little to bind it to our country? Is there not cause to tremble for the purity of our elections in peace and for the independence of our country in war? Controlling our currency, receiving our public monies, and holding themselves in dependence, it would be more formidable and dangerous than a naval and military power of the enemy – President Andrew Jackson

Because Andrew Jackson persistently resisted the threats and devices of the bankers, he was the victim of an attempted assassination. The gunman was a certain Richard Lawrence. G. Edward Griffin wrote:

...Lawrence...boasted to friends that he had been in touch with powerful people in Europe who had promised to protect him from punishment should he be caught – (The Creature from Jekyll Island)

The Federal bankers caused the Depression of 1929, and saw to it that thousands of American businesses were ruined. They funded Adolf Hitler, and financed Lenin's murderous Bolsheviks. Avaricious financial organizations that plague the planet, such as the World Bank and IMF (International Monetary Fund), are merely tentacles of the Federal System of the Globalists.

Immense sums belonging to our national depositors have been given to Germany on no collateral security whatsoever...Billions upon billions of our money has been pumped into Germany by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Banks - H. S. Kenan (The Federal Reserve Bank)

Sir Joseph Stamp was a director of the Bank of England from 1928 to 1941. He openly addressed the colossal power of the Bankers:

The modern banking system manufactures money out of nothing. The process is perhaps the most astounding piece of sleight of hand that was ever invented. Banking was conceived in iniquity and born in sin. Bankers own the Earth. Take it away from them, but leave them the power to create money, and with the flick of a pen they will create enough money to buy it back again...Take this great power away from them and all great fortunes like mine will disappear, and they ought to disappear, for then this would be a better and happier world to live in. But if you want to continue to be slaves of the banks and pay the cost of your own slavery, then let the bankers continue to create money and control credit.

President Thomas Jefferson was not a Freemason, and was not the least bit interested in amassing personal wealth. He had no love for the Federal bank and made his position clear:

I believe that banking institutions are the most dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a moneyed aristocracy that has set the government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people to whom it properly belongs.

A private central bank issuing the public currency is a greater menace to the liberties of the people than a standing army... We must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around the banks will deprive the people of all property until their children wake-up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered.

Nevertheless, Jefferson's reputation is marred on several accounts, not least by his appointment of British agent Albert Gallatin as Secretary of the Treasury in 1801. In the same year, Gallatin was also appointed Vice President. Regrettably, a statue of the duplicitous Geneva-born Gallatin stands to this day outside the United States Treasury building in Washington DC.

It is interesting and suggestive to note that Alexander Hamilton's banking system precisely paralleled that used by British bankers. He favored what is known as the tontine capitalist system:

His tontine scheme, fashioned after the British tontine of 1789, involved a system of rights of annual payments to survivors, the annuities therefrom becoming the means of creating a permanent investment class - Frank Bourgin (The Great Challenge: The Myth of Laissez-Faire in the Early Republic)

Political figures of intelligence and cunning knew the real reason for the War of Independence. They knew it had to do with money and usury, and with nationwide colonization, confiscation, and extortion. They knew the conflict was fomented by British and European banks, eager to establish control over America, as they had throughout the world. This fact is admitted by British agent Benjamin Franklin, whose comment takes us to the heart of the matter:

The inability of the Colonists to get power to issue their own money permanently out of the hands of King George III and the international bankers, was the prime reason for the revolutionary war

The Colonists were not able to free themselves from the clutches of the international bankers and royal overlords. The War of Independence was not a victory for the citizens of America. On the contrary, it was yet one more victory for the aristocracy that has controlled America from the beginning.

As with the real first bank, the government had been the only depositor to put up any real money, with the remainder being raised from loans the investors made to each other, using the magic of fractional reserve banking. When time came for renewal of the charter, the bankers were warning of bad times ahead if they didn't get what they wanted. The charter was not renewed. Five month later Britain had attacked America and started the war of 1812 - (Money as History)

Few people are aware today that the history of the United States, since the Revolution in 1776, has been, in large part, the story of an epic struggle to get free, and stay free, of control by the European international banks. This struggle was finally lost in 1913, when

President Woodrow Wilson signed the into effect the Federal Reserve Act, putting the International Banking Cartel in charge of creating America's money - Paul Grignon (Money as Debt)

Thomas Jefferson mentioned the nefarious power of the bankers directly, saying desperately:

I wish it were possible to obtain a single amendment to our Constitution - taking from the federal government their power of borrowing.



Thomas Jefferson. Along with William Paterson, Thomas Paine, Patrick Henry, and Samuel Adams, he put state's rights before the demands of insatiable Federalists.

After Alexander Hamilton's gang had established the Federal Bank, and the Judiciary with its unlimited power, Jefferson's illusions concerning America's fate were gone. In 1821, five years before he died, he recorded his misgivings and foreboding:

It has long...been my opinion...that the germ of dissolution of our federal judiciary is in the constitution of the federal judiciary; an irresponsible body working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the states, and the government of all be consolidated into one. To this I am opposed, because when all government...shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated.

Our government is now taking so steady a course as to show by what road it will pass to destruction, to wit, by consolidation first, and then corruption, its necessary consequences.

The following year, Jefferson's insight sharpened all the more. His words reveal the accuracy of his foresight:

If ever this vast country is brought under a single government, it will be one of the most extensive corruption...

In fact, Jefferson had misgivings about the state of affairs in America many years before he wrote these words. He had been living in France, as minister to that country, between the years 1784 and 1789. Upon his return to America, he was horrified to see how little effect the grand precepts and provisos of the Declaration of Independence, which he had chiefly formulated, had made. Alfred Jay Knock explains:

On arriving in New York and resuming his place in the social life of the country, he was greatly depressed by the discovery that the principles of the Declaration had gone wholly by the board. No one spoke of natural rights and popular sovereignty, it would seem actually that no one had ever heard of them. On the contrary, everyone was talking about the pressing need of a strong central coercive authority, able to check the incursions which the "democratic spirit" was likely to incite upon "the men of principle and property" ...Clearly, though the Declaration might have been the charter of American independence, it was in no sense the charter of the new American State - (Our Enemy, the State)

Patrick Henry, long time critic of the Constitution's drafters, also clearly foresaw the totalitarianism of the Federalists:

My great objection to this Government is, that it does not leave us the means of defending our rights; or of waging war against tyrants...Have we the means of resisting disciplined armies, when our only defense, the militia, is put into the hands of Congress? - (Speech of 5 June 1788)

Did you ever read of any revolution in any nation, brought about by the punishment of those in power, inflicted by those who had no power at all?...Will your Mace-bearer be a match for a disciplined regiment?...Will the oppressor ever let go of the oppressed? Was there ever an instance? Can the annals of mankind exhibit one single example, where rulers, overcharged with power, willingly let go of the oppressed? - ibid

A standing army we shall have also, to execute the execrable commands of tyranny - ibid

Alfred Jay Nock summarizes the travesty and the tragedy in these words:

Nowhere in the history of the constitutional period do we find the faintest suggestion of the Declaration's doctrine of natural rights, and we find its doctrine of popular sovereignty not only continuing in abeyance, but constitutionally estopped from ever reappearing. Nowhere do we find a trace of the Declaration's theory of government, on the contrary, we find it expressly repudiated. The new political mechanism was a faithful replica of the old disestablished British model, but so far improved and strengthened as to be incomparably more close-working and efficient...presenting more attractive possibilities of capture and control - (Our Enemy, the State)



Note the Masonic colors of Maher's tie.

Nothing that governments do is new. Despots within government operate according to plans that are repeated, in various ways, over generations. Their control is aided and abetted by their co-conspirators in the media. The politicians and media spin doctors are instructed by overlords who control the private banks and "philanthropic" foundations.

Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment nothing can fail. Without it nothing can succeed. He who molds opinion is greater than he who enacts laws - Abraham Lincoln


In many cases, the politicians, media men, and bankers are themselves under the tutelage and direction of British and European aristocracy who have made the "board," so to speak, on which the great geopolitical games are played.

The conspirators who organize the game are cautious. They do not want their true allegiances or diabolical schemes to be publicly exposed. Each group and individual conspirator knows how vulnerable they are. They know the facts about their true allegiances and agendas must never leak out to the masses at large. Their success depends upon human apathy and ignorance.

In "Red Dusk and the Morrow" ...by Sir Paul Dukes, formerly Chief of the British Secret Service in Russia, we read that a Lithuanian asked a prominent Bolshevik how the regime was maintained. The answer was: "Our power is based on three things: first, on Jewish brains; secondly, on Lettish and Chinese bayonets; and thirdly, on the crass stupidity of the Russian people - Denis Fahey (The Rulers of Russia)

The elitist conspirators also know that should civil unrest occur, the masses can be forced back into line by threats to their material and emotional security. The strategy is tried and true, and usually works wonders. As Ernest Hemmingway explained:

The first panacea for a mismanaged nation is inflation of the currency; the second is war. Both bring a temporary prosperity and both bring a permanent ruin. But both are the refuge of political and economic opportunists.



The Trinity of Slavery. The basic diagram shows how the Atonist royals have maintained world control for millennia. By way of theology and politics is the human heart and mind enslaved. Through secret societies, such as Masonry, the royal hierarchy of control is perpetuated and monitored. As French poet Charles Peguy wrote: "Tyranny is always better organized than freedom."

Because of the confessions and evidence provided by intelligent and informed whistle-blowers from *within* religion, politics, royalty, and masonry, we know a great deal about how the engines of world control operate. However, there are also pitfalls when insiders with myopic insight, and inflexible allegiances and prejudices, attempt to instruct the masses as to the intricacies of world control. When it comes to exposing the dirty little secrets, and the dirty big secrets, of those occupying the highest levels of the Atonist power-pyramid, objectivity is essential. Photographs of their hideous visages, taken from a rickety platform constructed by their agents, will be "blurred" and inadequate, to say the least.

The philosopher Ayn Rand frequently warned her readers of the evils of big government. With great lucidity, she wrote:

Instead of being a protector of man's rights, the government is becoming their most dangerous violator; instead of guarding freedom the government is establishing slavery; instead of protecting men from the initiators of physical force, the government is initiating physical force and coercion in any manner and issue it pleases; instead of serving as the instrument of objectivity in human relationships, the government is creating a deadly subterranean reign of uncertainty and fear...instead of protecting men from injury by whim, the government is arrogating to itself the power of unlimited whim – so that we are fast approaching the stage of the ultimate inversion: the stage where the government is free to do anything it pleases, while the citizens may act only by permission; which is the stage of the darkest periods of human history, the stage of rule by brute force.

Rand laid it on the line when addressing the crimes of government:

Criminals are a small minority in any age or community. And the harm they have done to mankind is infinitesimal when compared to the horrors – the bloodshed, the wars, the persecution, the famines, the enslavements, the wholesale destruction – perpetrated by mankind's governments. Potentially, a government is the most dangerous threat to man's rights - When unlimited and unrestricted by individual rights, a government is man's deadliest enemy.

Before her perceptive words were written, the French philosopher Pierre Joseph Proudhon, explained the people versus government problem, as follows:

To be Governed is to be watched, inspected, spied upon, directed, law-driven, numbered, regulated, enrolled, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, checked, estimated, valued, censured, commanded, by creatures who have neither the right nor the wisdom nor the virtue to do so. To be Governed is to be at every operation, at every transaction noted, registered, counted, taxed, stamped, measured, numbered, assessed, licensed, authorized, admonished, prevented, forbidden, reformed, corrected, punished. It is, under pretext of public utility, and in the name of the general interest, to be placed under contribution, drilled, fleeced, exploited, monopolized, extorted from, squeezed, hoaxed, robbed; then, at the slightest resistance, the first word of complaint, to be repressed, fined, vilified, harassed, hunted down, abused, clubbed, disarmed, bound, choked, imprisoned, judged, condemned, shot, deported, sacrificed, sold, betrayed; and to crown all, mocked, ridiculed, derided, outraged, dishonored. That is government; that is its justice; that is its morality - (General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century)

The Victorian philosopher Herbert Spencer queried whether man requires governments at all. He wrote:

What, then, do they (Humans) want a government for? Not to regulate commerce; not to educate the people; not to teach religion; not to administer charity; not to make roads and railways; but simply to defend the natural rights of man - to protect person and property - to prevent the aggressions of the powerful upon the weak - in a word, to administer justice. This is the natural, the original, office of a government. It was not intended to do less: it ought not to be allowed to do more - (The Man Versus the State)

He also wrote:

The great political superstition of the past was the divine right of kings. The great political superstition of the present is the divine right of parliaments.

The father of the Anarchist movement, Mikhail Bakunin, who spent many years imprisoned in dungeons, knew all about government oppression. For him, governments were unnecessary institutions that darkened the world:

The liberty of man consists solely in this, that he obeys the laws of nature, because he has himself recognized them as such, and not because they have been imposed upon him externally by any foreign will whatsoever, human or divine, collective or individual – (God and the State, 1882)

The German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche understood why governments exist, and how they maintain their malignant dominion. He wrote:

...a fullness of state power such as only despotism had enjoyed...surpassed all the past because it strove for the formal annihilation of the individual...Once the earth is brought under all-embracing economic control, then mankind will find it has been reduced to machinery in its service, as a monstrous clockwork system of ever smaller, more finely adjusted wheels.

Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega Y Gasset explained State corruption in these words:

This is the gravest danger that today threatens civilization: State intervention, the absorption of all spontaneous social effort by the State, that is to say, of spontaneous historical action, which in the long-run sustains, nourishes and impels human destinies.

His sentiments were shared by the American critic Henry L. Menken, who said that the State:

...has spread out its powers until they penetrate to every act of the citizen, however secret, it has begun to throw around its operations the high dignity and impeccability of a State religion, its agents become a separate and superior caste, with authority to bind and loose...But it still remains, as it was in the beginning, the common enemy of all well-disposed industrious and decent men.

In his important book on State totalitarianism, entitled *Our Enemy, the State*, author Albert Jay Nock explained the motives of State officials:

It is unfortunately none too well understood that, just as the State has no money of its own, so it has no power of its own. All power it has is what society gives it, plus what it confiscates from time to time on one pretext or another; there is no other source from which State power can be drawn. Therefore every assumption of State power, whether by gift or seizure, leaves society with so much less power; there is never, nor can be, any strengthening of State power without a corresponding and roughly equivalent depletion of social power.

Nock understands that there is not a jot of difference between American Federalists and the diabolical fascists who have plagued the world. He put the matter plainly:

The superficial distinctions of Fascism, Bolshevism, Hitlerism, are the concern of journalists and publicists, the serious student sees in them only one root-idea of a complete conversion of social power to State power...The positive testimony of history is that the State invariably had its origin in conquest and confiscation. No known State known to history originated in any other manner.

The men who profited from the Constitution's acceptance, expertly used fear to further their interests and to goad delegates into compliance with their will. They manipulated the fact that Americans were traumatized and exhausted by war. They stage-managed the Conventions and controlled media reportage of events in Virginia and Philadelphia. Had the people time to relax and educate themselves, if they had paid attention to the warnings of Thomas Paine, Patrick Henry, and the many other critics who suspected what the conspirators were planning, the Constitution would never have been ratified. Instead, the best that the people were able to belatedly receive, after the fact, was the Bill of Rights drafted in 1791. It was expressly created to *protect* people against potential abuses of the ill-received Constitution. It was conceded to the American people by Madison, who by then had secured all that he and his Federalist colleagues had demanded.

A number of states had accepted the Constitution with urgent recommendations for changes. At first, it seemed that Congress would pay no attention to these suggestions. Patrick Henry and other then set up a clamor which had to be heeded, and Congress referred the proposals to a committee - Nevins and Commanger (Pocket History of the U.S.)

The federalists delayed ratification of the Bill of Rights for over two years while they organized the new federal courts and armed the judges with powers to counter individual rights - Kenneth W. Royce (Hologram of Liberty)



Freedom can go to hell, but apparently silly belief systems and prejudices are always welcome to stay.

The Federalists instigated virtual panic, and made sure the people were not able to take enough time to repair and think. Their representatives and delegates were harried into accepting and signing the Constitution. The same methods of "conflict control" have been used over the generations. They are still being put to good use by politicians and parties. In the 1960s, Ex-Communist Jerry Kirk discovered the way the great game is played. He eloquently explained the process in these words:

The idea is to create a situation where the people are so frightened of the chaos all around them, that they will throw their arms up in the air and shout "Federal Government, do something!" And the only choice open will be Martial Law...The Communists, black militants and revolutionaries will never succeed in overthrowing the government of the United States, but unless they are stopped, they will scare the American people into accepting Socialism from Washington, and status rule from the Establishment. This is what it is really all about.

Expert on the British takeover of America, G. Edward Griffin, delineates the phenomena of conflict control, in these words:

...deliberately create problems, and then offer only those solutions which result in the expansion of government. Create conditions so frightful at home and abroad that the abandonment of personal liberties and national sovereignty will appear as a reasonable price for a return to domestic tranquillity and world peace - (The Capitalist Conspiracy)

James S. Kunen, a student revolutionary, also discovered how the upper echelon conspires to foment social unrest, so that the true enemies of freedom can remain undetected. He wrote:

In the evening we went up to the University to check out a strategy meeting. A kid was giving a report on the SDS Convention. He said that...at the Convention men from Business International Roundtables...tried to buy up a few radicals...These men are the world's leading industrialists and they convene to decide how our lives are going to go. These are the guys who wrote the Alliance for Progress. They are the left wing of the ruling class...They offered to finance our demonstrations in Chicago (1968). We were offered Esso (Rockefeller) money. They want us to make a lot of radical commotion so they can look more in the center as they move to the left - (The Strawberry Statement: Notes of a College Revolutionary)

The scrapping of the US Constitution is essential. Americans must revise and update the Articles of Confederation, and subsequently abolish the corrupt Federal (totalitarian) apparatus of control. Americans must wake up from their delirium and find out what kind of conspiracy has been occurring in their land. They must contemplate the words of Bertrand de Jouvenal, who said "A society of sheep must in time beget a government of wolves," and remember that it was mutineers and not conformists who founded America.



People should not be afraid of their governments; governments should be afraid of the people!

The traitors are still with us. Indeed, their treachery is greater than ever. Hiding behind the Constitution and political process, they see to it that America's ports are sold and that schools are swamped and under-funded. Because of their scandalous policies, America's heavy industry operates at a minimum. American businesses are throttled by legality and taxation, while foreign-made products fill the shelves. Companies and jobs are perpetually outsourced, prisons super size while innocent men and women languish behind bars to be raped and tortured. Poisons fall from the sky in the form of chemtrails, and illegal aliens occupy like invading armies, enjoying the "fruits" they did nothing to cultivate or harvest. And it all occurs in a country that came out of World War II richer than it went in. Why is this? What has happened? Why have so few taken so much from so many for so long?

As of 2000, USA Today reports on its front page that 6.6 million adults (three percent of the adult population) are in prison or "correction." No other society as ever done so deadly a thing to its people and on such a scale - Gore Vidal (Imperial America)

We have two million people in jail. Our country doesn't build hospitals, doesn't build schools and doesn't build day-care centers. It builds prisons. This is not the hallmark of a free society, but of a police state - Steven Hager (High Times Editor-in-Chief)

The Oriental countries prosper and rise economically. The Third World is fast becoming the First World, while the First World nose dives into ruin. This was the plan from the start. It is the result of tyranny, not democracy. It is also the result of apathy. No truer words on the subject were stated than these by President Abraham Lincoln:

These United States of America can never be destroyed from forces outside its borders. If America falls, it will fall from within. Brought down by apathy. When good people do nothing, Anarchy reigns - (Letter to Congress, 1854)

Lincoln also emphasized the despotism of the wealthy oligarchs who prosper from the ignorance and apathy of the masses. Their profile and resume was well known to him:

The money power preys upon the nation in times of peace and conspires against it in times of adversity. It is more despotic than a monarchy, more insolent than autocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy.

Robert Maynard Hutchins also commented on the apathetic state brought on by over-stimulation and trauma:

The death of democracy is not likely to be an assassination from ambush. It will be a slow extinction from apathy, indifference, and undernourishment.

George W. Malone, a Senator from Nevada, made the following statement before Congress in 1957:

I believe that if the people of this nation fully understood what Congress has done to them over the last 49 years, they would move on Washington; they would not wait for an election...It adds up to a preconceived plan to destroy the economic and social independence of the United States!

Ironically, during and after the War of Independence, the eyes of the world were on America. The Czar of Russia, Nicholas Romanov II, admired what he saw taking place and, before his brutal assassination, he was ready to emulate the scintillating American experiment. During the War of Independence, he sent ships, money, and troops to assist the American rebels. Russia, and many other countries, would have changed for the better had Americans not been cajoled into adopting the Constitution and, as a result, not fallen under the control of avaricious despots.



The good news is that even the most oppressive tyranny cannot last forever. Once the tyrant and his heinous industry is exposed, the game is up. At that point they can be overthrown, and things can be put aright. It has happened in Ireland and the Congo, in Cuba and Nicaragua, and many other lands. But the enemy knows this only too well. He understands that he is vulnerable, and is aware of how he could be undermined. As a result, he is constantly on guard. He knows that his activities and methods must not be properly scrutinized. Consequently, he makes a point of keeping his subjects in fear for their lives. He prefers them to be limbic creatures unable to reason and discern good from bad and right from wrong. He makes sure their attention is focused elsewhere, and that strange, demented, and frightening "enemies" are always rattling the gates. Through his obedient agents, he funds and controls the supposed enemies, and instructs them how to operate. In this manner is the great game of geopolitics and mass control played. It is simply chess on a global level. Should a pawn fall off the board, or be sacrificed, the kings, queens, and bishops do not turn a hair. The comfortably placed, ruthless misleaders bang the drums of war and send dedicated men and women to fight and die for the "United States" corporation. The U.S. is a *business*, and those who have given their lives for it, died uselessly. Sadly, and tragically, they have been sacrificed at the behest of their country's true enemies. As Count Leo Tolstoy wrote: "Government is an association of men who do violence to the rest of us."

George William Frederick (George III), King of Great Britain and Hanover. He was a member of the Hanover dynasty - the so-called House of Orange. Like numerous royals, he was a demented maniac who suffered from mental disease. According to author George Trevelyan, he vowed "never to acknowledge the independence of the Americans, and to punish their contumacy by the indefinite prolongation of a war which promised to be eternal." He wanted to "keep the rebels harassed, anxious, and poor, until the day when, by a natural and inevitable process, discontent and disappointment were converted into penitence and remorse."

Military men are dumb, stupid animals, to be used as pawns for foreign policy – Henry Kissinger (January-February 2003 edition of *Eagle Newsletter*)

It's not a number I'm terribly interested in – Colin Powell (reply when asked about the Iraqi casualties)

The men who committed this atrocity in New York, on September Eleventh 2001, mass murdered more people than the combined killings of every serial killer in the 228 year history of the United States - Anthony J. Hilder (*The Greatest Lie Ever Sold*)

Our point is simple. We insist that the predators and parasites, who have vampirized America and the world, must be closely studied. Understanding how and why they function as they do provides humankind with the keys of worldly salvation.



President Andrew Jackson suffered terribly at the hands of the brutes of the British Crown. During the war he and his brother were captured, held prisoner, and nearly starved to death. When Andrew refused to clean the boots of a red coat, he was slashed at with a sword which left him with scars on his left hand and head. His brother Robert died from smallpox contracted while under British captivity. Jackson's immediate family died from war-related hardships. As a result of his horrific experiences, Andrew Jackson never forgave the British oppressors.

Moreover, we must understand that the despots of the world are creatures of habit. They enjoy repetition, and their nefarious strategies are tried and true. Additionally, we need to understand that despots bank on one human weakness, that of *forgetfulness*. Historical amnesia hands them the power they covet. As author Milan Kundera so appropriately said: "The struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting."

The answer to humankind's future lies in remembering what has transpired in history. It lies in not repeating past mistakes, and not falling for the same tired political fallacies. Furthermore, we must end our psychological dependence on the fiends who have established despotic forms of government and who benefit from our allegiance. As long as we consciously or unconsciously identify with the predator, we will never see the demise of tyranny, regardless of the political action taken. It will raise its ugly head time and time again. Ultimately, we must judge our misleaders by their *deeds* and not by their words.

We must be on guard against their rhetoric and sophistry, and not hesitate to use existing laws to prevent them doing their worst. We must not be afraid to seek justice when degenerate, self-serving politicians - supposedly acting in our name - seek to lead us astray.

Civil disobedience is not our problem. Our problem is civil obedience. Our problem is that numbers of people all over the world have obeyed the dictates of the leaders of their government and have gone to war, and millions have been killed because of this obedience...Our problem is that people are obedient all over the world in the face of poverty and starvation and stupidity, and war, and cruelty. Our problem is that people are obedient while the jails are full of petty thieves, and all the while the grand thieves are running the country. That's our problem -
Howard Zinn

The Articles of Confederation worked to bring security to all Americans. They restored order after the chaos of the War of Independence. Unlike the US Constitution, the Articles of Confederation honored the rights of individual states. The Articles did not distinguish between rich and poor. They were meant for *Citizens*, not "People." They did not permit an oligarchy to assume totalitarian control. The men who drafted and ratified the US Constitution were hungry for power

over human beings. They adamantly wanted to protect their own prestige and wealth. Despite their megalomania, they knew exactly what they wanted and how to go about getting it. They acted like proverbial wolves in sheep's clothing.



Americans don't care about politics, only about politicians - Anthony Wedgwood Benn

Their Constitution is likewise largely deceptive in form and substance. It allowed for an aristocracy to preside in America. The American-based aristocrats may not wear crowns or sit on thrones, but they are, in many cases, directly connected to the royal dynasties of Britain and Europe. George W. Bush is, for example, a distant cousin of John Kerry, the Presidential nominee who ran against him in 2004. Kerry's parents was not Irish, but Jewish. On the matter of his aristocratic ancestry, we read:

Senator John Kerry has blue blood from all the royal houses of Europe, with even more titled relations than President Bush...Burke's Peerage, which researches the genealogy, said the Democratic presidential candidate traces descent through his mother, Rosemary Forbes, to the royal houses of Albania, England, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Russia, Byzantium, Persia (Iran) and France. Forbes was descended from William Forbes, the Laird of Newe, and extended family that included many baronets...It is via this family that the Democratic candidate is descended from Henry II, the king of England and father of Richard the Lionheart, who was the leader of the third Crusade in 1189...By contrast, Bush is related to Queen Elizabeth II, twenty British dukes and many European princes...President Bush, Princess Diana and Winston Churchill are distantly related - (Union Jack Newspaper; September 2000 Edition)

George H. W. Bush and his wife Barbara are related to the same British oligarchs. George is also:

...closely related to every European monarch on and off the throne – and has kinship with every member of Britain's royal family, the House of Windsor. He is the 13th cousin of Britain's Queen Mother, and of her daughter Queen Elizabeth, and is the 13th cousin once removed of the heir to the throne, Prince Charles. Bush's family tree can be documented as far back as the early 15th century. He has a direct descent from Henry III and from Henry VIII's sister Mary Tudor who was also the wife of Louis XI of France. He is also descended from Charles II of England - David Icke (Alice in Wonderland and the World Trade Center Disaster)

Father George and wife Barbara are both descendants of Godfroi de Bouillon who, in 1099, led European noblemen in the successful Crusade to recapture Jerusalem from the Islamic faith and moved into the King's palace at Temple Mount...Godfroi de Bouillon was the first king of Jerusalem and the Duke of Lower Lorraine, a major region for the Illuminati bloodline - ibid

The time has come for the veils of mystique to be torn away from the so-called "fathers" of the Constitution. They were not champions of a free, sovereign nation, and their legacy is neither auspicious nor grand. They chose to subvert the Articles that guaranteed freedom to every American. They coveted power and wealth, and made themselves fabulously rich by exploiting the gullibility and ignorance of the moral, but illiterate, masses. In our time, their villainous counterparts in government have shifted into overdrive. Their heinous acts of conquest, extortion, and confiscation know no bounds. As long as ignorance of the enemy's nature persists, nothing will change, and the pirates of Capitol Hill will

continue to ply their insidious trade. As King George once demanded, the war against America was to be waged *eternally*. His desire is being fulfilled as every day passes. Unless the Machiavellian intrigues of his biological and ideological descendants are exposed and overcome, America's ruin is certain. The task is, however, impossible without *knowledge* of the adversary. Knowledge is the weapon we must use to eradicate the imperious predators that lurk behind the long grass.

"Conspiracy!" One of the darkest words in the language of man. Yet there is hardly a single page of History that does not partially reveal the deadly eye of Conspiracy at work. It was a conspiracy that led Brutus against Caesar in the Roman senate on the Ides of March...that plotted the betrayal of West Point by Benedict Arnold, during the American Revolution...that led John Wilkes Booth to the assassination of President Lincoln on Good Friday 1865. The past record of man is burdened with accounts of assassinations, secret combines, palace plots and betrayals in war. But in spite of this clear record, an amazing number of people have begun to scoff at the possibility of conspiracy at work today. They dismiss such an idea merely as a conspiratorial view - G. Edward Griffin (The Capitalist Conspiracy)

Knowledge of the enemy is the golden key that opens the gate to a future free of tyranny and slavery. We not only owe our children a better and freer future - we owe it to our forebears. Those who fought and labored to create the elements of civilization that we enjoy, but who were treacherously undermined and robbed, must be remembered and reverently toasted. It is *their* memory we must honor, not that of their destroyers.

Where other men have skimmed the surface, Beard has gone through to the core. He stayed months in Washington to get to the core. In his search for ancient papers and documents in the Treasury Department, he went into vaults that were so filled with dust that it was necessary to excavate the papers with a vacuum cleaner. But when he came back to the surface he had damning evidence against a good many of the "patriot fathers." He then knew why they were so anxious, not only for a new constitution, but for the particular kind of a constitution that was afterward adopted - Allan L. Benson (The Dishonest Constitution)

By Michael Tsarion

◇ ◇ ◇

The United States Isn't a Country – It's a Corporation

By Lisa Guliani

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

— Preamble of the original "organic" Constitution

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

— Excerpted from the Declaration of Independence of the original thirteen united States of America,
July 4, 1776

Fourth of July 2002 has come and gone, and Americans honored the holiday with a renewed patriotic fervor that reminded me of the Bicentennial celebrations of 1976. As is customary, traditional fireworks displays took center stage and scores of people turned out to witness the dazzling show in the summer sky. With mixed feelings, I sat with friends on a crowded Pennsylvania sidewalk beneath a glittering, mesmerizing explosion of color, pondering the keen sense of sadness and betrayal that overwhelmed my spirit. Looking around at the huge crowds gathered for the annual events, I thought silently, "We are not free." In truth, we have not been a free people for a very long time.

We celebrate this day in honor of our "independence". We call ourselves a free people in a land of liberty. Our anthems proudly sing the praises of this nation, and we raise our voices, wave our flags and join in song - but how many Americans realize they are not free? This is a myth perpetuated by the powers-that-be in order to avoid any major civil unrest, and to keep us all living under the thumb of a militaristic corporate Big Brother within the illusions that have been created for us. The truth of the matter is this: what freedom has not been stolen from us, we have surrendered willingly through our silence and ignorance. As Americans, most of us have no idea how our freedoms are maintained — or lost. Apparently, our ancestors didn't have a good grasp of this either. It is sad, but it is also very true.

Don't point to that beloved parchment, the Constitution, as a symbol of your enduring freedom. It is representative of a form of government which seemingly no longer exists in this country today. The Constitution has been thrown out the window, the Republic shoved aside and replaced with a democracy. The

thing is; most people in this country remain unaware that this is so because they simply do not know the truth — what lies beyond the myths. Your so-called government is not going to tell you, either.

To even begin to understand what has happened to the Republic, we must look backward in time to the period following the Civil War. We must go back to the year 1871, which was the beginning of the decline of the Republic. When we examine what happened during that time in our history, we begin to piece together this troubling, perplexing puzzle that is "America" — only then should we answer as to whether we are indeed a "free" people or not.

So, let's roll backward into the past for a moment. It is time we learned what they didn't teach us in school. It is far more interesting than what they DID tell us. I think you'll stay awake for this lesson.

The date is February 21, 1871 and the Forty-First Congress is in session. I refer you to the "Acts of the Forty-First Congress," Section 34, Session III, chapters 61 and 62. On this date in the history of our nation, Congress passed an Act titled: "An Act To Provide A Government for the District of Columbia." This is also known as the "Act of 1871." What does this mean? Well, it means that Congress, under no constitutional authority to do so, created a separate form of government for the District of Columbia, which is a ten mile square parcel of land.

What? How could they do that? Moreover, WHY would they do that? To explain, let's look at the circumstances of those days. The Act of 1871 was passed at a vulnerable time in America. Our nation was essentially bankrupt — weakened and financially depleted in the aftermath of the Civil War. The Civil War itself was nothing more than a calculated "front" for some pretty fancy footwork by corporate backroom players. It was a strategic maneuver by European interests (the international bankers) who were intent upon gaining a stranglehold on the neck (and the coffers) of America.

The Congress realized our country was in dire financial straits, so they cut a deal with the international bankers — (in those days, the **Rothschilds** of London were dipping their fingers into everyone's pie) thereby incurring a DEBT to said bankers. If we think about banks, we know they do not just lend us money out of the goodness of their hearts. A bank will not do anything for you unless it is entirely in their best interest to do so. There has to be some sort of collateral or some string attached which puts you and me (the borrower) into a subservient position. This was true back in 1871 as well. The conniving international bankers were not about to lend our floundering nation any money without some serious stipulations. So, they devised a brilliant way of getting their foot in the door of the United States (a prize they had coveted for some time, but had been unable to grasp thanks to our Founding Fathers, who despised them and held them in check), and thus, the Act of 1871 was passed.

In essence, this Act formed the corporation known as THE UNITED STATES. Note the capitalization, because it is important. This corporation, owned by foreign interests, moved right in and shoved the original "organic" version of the Constitution into a dusty corner. With the "Act of 1871," our Constitution was defaced in the sense that the title was block-capitalized and the word "for" was changed to the word "of" in the title. The original Constitution drafted by the Founding Fathers, was written in this manner:

"The Constitution for the united states of America".

The altered version reads: "THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA". It is the corporate constitution. It is NOT the same document you might think it is. The corporate constitution operates

in an economic capacity and has been used to fool the People into thinking it is the same parchment that governs the Republic. It absolutely is not.

Capitalization - an insignificant change? Not when one is referring to the context of a legal document, it isn't. Such minor alterations have had major impacts on each subsequent generation born in this country. What the Congress did with the passage of the Act of 1871 was create an entirely new document, a constitution for the government of the District of Columbia. The kind of government THEY created was a corporation. The new, altered Constitution serves as the constitution of the corporation, and not that of America. Think about that for a moment.

Incidentally, this corporate constitution does not benefit the Republic. It serves only to benefit the corporation. It does nothing good for you or me - and it operates outside of the original Constitution. Instead of absolute rights guaranteed under the "organic" Constitution, we now have "relative" rights or privileges. One example of this is the Sovereign's right to travel, which has been transformed under corporate government policy into a "privilege" which we must be licensed to engage in. This operates outside of the original Constitution.

So, Congress committed TREASON against the People, who were considered Sovereign under the Declaration of Independence and the organic Constitution. When we consider the word "Sovereign," we must think about what the word means.

According to Webster's Dictionary, "sovereign" is defined as: 1. chief or highest; supreme. 2. Supreme in power, superior in position to all others. 3. Independent of, and unlimited by, any other, possessing or entitled to, original and independent authority or jurisdiction.

In other words, our government was created by and for "sovereigns" - the free citizens who were deemed the highest authority. Only the People can be sovereign - remember that. Government cannot be sovereign. We can also look to the Declaration of Independence, where we read: "government is subject to the CONSENT of the governed" - that's supposed to be us, the sovereigns. Do you feel like a sovereign nowadays? I don't.

It doesn't take a rocket scientist or a constitutional historian to figure out that this is not what is happening in our country today. Government in these times is NOT subject to the CONSENT of the governed. Rather, the governed are subject to the whim and greed of the corporation, which has stretched its tentacles beyond the ten-mile-square parcel of land known as the District of Columbia - encroaching into every state of the Republic. Mind you, the corporation has NO jurisdiction outside of the District of Columbia. THEY just want you to think it does.

You see, you are presumed to know the law. This is ironic because as a people, we are taught basically nothing about the law in school. We are made to memorize obscure factoids and paragraphs here and there, such as the Preamble, and they gloss over the Bill of Rights. But we are not told about the law. Nor do our corporate government schools delve into the Constitution in any great depth. After all, they were put into place to indoctrinate and dumb down the masses — not to teach us anything. We were not told that we were sold-out to foreign interests and made beneficiaries of the debt incurred by Congress to the international bankers. For generations, American citizens have had the bulk of their earnings confiscated to pay on a massive debt that they, as a People, did not incur. There are many, many things the People have not been told. How do you feel about being made a beneficiary of somebody else's massive debt without your knowledge or CONSENT? Are we just going to keep going along with this?

When you hear some individuals say that the Constitution is null and void, think about how our government has transformed over time from a service-oriented entity to a corporate or profit-oriented entity. We are living

under the myth that this is lawful, but it is not. We are being ruled by a "de facto," or unlawful, form of government - the corporate body of the death mongers - The Controllers.

With the passage of the Act of 1871, a series of subtle and overt deceptions were set in motion - all in conjunction and collusion with the Congress, who knowingly and deliberately sold the People down the river. Did they tell you this in government school? I doubt it. They were too busy drumming the fictional version of history into your brain - and mine. By failing to disclose what THEY did to the American People, the people became ignorant of what was happening. Over time, the Republic took it on the chin to the point of a knockdown. With the surrender of their gold in 1933, the People essentially surrendered their law. I don't suppose you were taught THAT in school either. That's because our REAL history is hidden from us. This is the way Roman Civil Law works - and our form of governance today is based upon Roman Civil Law and Admiralty/Maritime Law - better known as the "Divine Right of Kings" and "Law of the Seas", respectively. This explains a lot. Roman Civil Law was fully established in the original colonies even before our nation began and is also known as private international law.

The government which was created for the District of Columbia via the Act of 1871 operates under Private International Law, and not Common Law, which was the law of the Constitutional Republic.

This is very important to note since it impacts all Americans in concrete ways. You must recognize that private international law is only applicable within the District of Columbia and NOT in the other states of the Union. The various arms of the corporation are known as "departments" such as the Judiciary, Justice and Treasury. You recognize those names? Yes, you do! But they are not what you assume them to be. These "departments" all belong to the corporation known as THE UNITED STATES. They do NOT belong to you and me under the corporate constitution and its various amendments that operate outside of the Constitutional Republic.

I refer you to the UNITED STATES CODE (note the capitalization, indicating the corporation, not the Republic) Title 28 3002 (15) (A) (B) (C). **It is stated unequivocally that the UNITED STATES is a corporation. Realize, too, that the corporation is not a separate and distinct entity from the government. It IS the government of YOUR 14th Amendment "citizenship." This is extremely important. I refer to this as the "corporate empire of the UNITED STATES," which operates under Roman Civil Law outside of the Constitution.** How do you like being ruled by a cheesy, sleazy corporation? You'll ask your Congressman about this, you say? HA!!

Congress is fully aware of this deception. **You must be made aware that the members of Congress do NOT work for you and me. Rather, they work for the Corporation known as THE UNITED STATES.** Is this really any surprise to you? This is why we can't get them to do anything on our behalf or to answer to us - as in the case with the illegal income tax - among many other things. Contrary to popular belief, they are NOT our civil servants. They do NOT work for us. They are the servants of the corporate government and carry out its bidding - period.

The great number of committees and sub-committees that the Congress has created all work together like a multi-headed monster to oversee the various corporate "departments" and, you should know that every single one of these that operates outside the District of Columbia is in violation of the law. The corporate government of the UNITED STATES has no jurisdiction or authority in ANY state of the Republic beyond the District of Columbia. Let this sink into your brain for a minute. Ask yourself, "Could this deception REALLY have occurred without the full knowledge and complicity of the Congress?" Do you think it happened by accident? You are deceiving yourself if you do. There are no accidents or coincidences. It is time to confront the truth and awaken from ignorance.

Your legislators will not apprise you of this information. You are presumed to know the law. THEY know you don't know the law, or your history for that matter, because this information has not been taught to you. No concerted effort has been made to inform you. As a Sovereign, you are entitled to full disclosure of the facts.

As a slave, you are entitled to nothing other than what the corporation decides to "give" you - at a price. Be wary of accepting so-called "benefits" of the corporation of the UNITED STATES. Aren't you enslaved enough already?

I said (above) that you are presumed to know the law. Still, it matters not if you don't in the eyes of the corporation. Ignorance of the law is not considered an excuse. It is your responsibility and your obligation as an American to learn about the law and how it applies to you. THEY count on the fact that most people are too uninterested or distracted or lazy to do so. The People have been mentally conditioned to allow the alleged government to do their thinking for them. We need to turn that around if we are to save our Republic before it is too late.

The UNITED STATES government is basically a corporate instrument of the international bankers. This means YOU are owned by the corporation from birth to death. The corporate UNITED STATES also holds ownership of all your assets, your property, YOU, and even your children! Does this sound untrue? Think long and hard about all those bills you pay, all those various taxes and fines and licenses you must pay for. Yes, they've got you by the pockets. Actually, they've had you by the ass for as long as you've been alive. In your heart, you know it's true. Don't believe any of this? Read up on the 14th Amendment. Check out how "free" you really are.

With the Act of 1871 and subsequent legislation such as the purportedly ratified 14th Amendment, our once-great nation of Sovereigns has been subverted from a Republic to a democracy. As is the case under Roman Civil Law, our ignorance of the facts has led to our silence. Our silence has been construed as our **CONSENT** to become beneficiaries of a debt we did not incur. The Sovereign People have been deceived for hundreds of years into thinking they remain free and independent, when in actuality we continue to be slaves and servants of the corporation.

Treason was committed against the People in 1871 by the Congress. This could have been corrected through the decades by some honest men (assuming there were some), but it was not, mainly due to lust for money and power. That's nothing new. Are we to forgive and justify this crime against the People? You have lost more freedom than you may realize due to corporate infiltration of the so-called government. We will lose more unless we turn away from a democracy that is the direct road to disaster - and restore our Constitutional Republic.

I am saddened to think about the brave men and women who were killed in all the wars and conflicts instigated by the Controllers. These courageous souls fought for the preservation of ideals they believed to be true - not for the likes of a corporation. Do you believe that any one of the individuals who have been killed as a result of war would have willingly fought if they knew the full truth? Do you think one person would have laid down his life for a corporation? I think not. If the People had known long ago to what extent their trust had been betrayed, I wonder how long it would have taken for another Revolution. What we need is a Revolution in THOUGHT. We change our thinking and we change our world.

Will we ever restore the Republic? That is a question I cannot answer yet. I hope, and most of all - pray - that WE, the Sovereign People, will work together in a spirit of cooperation to make it happen in OUR lifetime. I know I will give it my best shot - come what may. Our children deserve their rightful legacy - the liberty our ancestors fought so hard to give to us. Will we remain silent telling ourselves we are free, and perpetuate the MYTH? Or, do we stand as One Sovereign People, and take back what has been stolen from the house of our Republic?

Something to think about — it's called freedom.

District of Columbia voting “Rights”

Voting rights of citizens in the District of Columbia differs from those of [United States](#) citizens in each of the fifty states. [District of Columbia](#) residents do not have voting representation in the [United States Senate](#), but D.C. is entitled to three [electoral votes](#) for [President](#). In the [U.S. House of Representatives](#), the District is entitled to a [delegate](#), who is not allowed to vote on the floor of the House, but can vote on procedural matters and in [House committees](#).



The [United States Constitution](#) grants congressional voting representation to the states, **which the District is not**. The District is a federal territory ultimately under the complete [authority of Congress](#). The lack of voting representation in Congress for residents of the U.S. capital has been an issue since the foundation of the federal district. Numerous proposals have been introduced to change this situation including legislation and constitutional amendments to grant D.C. residents voting representation, [returning the District](#) to the state of [Maryland](#) and making the District of Columbia into a [new state](#). All proposals have been met with political or constitutional challenges; therefore, there has been no change in the District's representation in the Congress.

The "District Clause" in [Article I, Section 8, Clause 17](#) of the U.S. Constitution states: [The Congress shall have Power] To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States.

The land on which the District is formed was ceded by the state of Maryland in 1790 following the passage of the [Residence Act](#). The Act specified that the laws of the state from which the area was ceded would apply in the federal district, meaning that [Maryland](#) laws applied on the eastern side of the Potomac while [Virginia](#) laws applied on the western side in the [District of Columbia](#) until the government officially took residence. Upon assuming control of the federal district in 1800, Congress would have full authority over local matters within the District of Columbia.^[9] Since the District of Columbia was no longer part of any state, the District's residents lost voting representation.^[4]

Residents of Washington, D.C. were also originally barred from voting for the [President of the United States](#). This changed after the passage of the [Twenty-third Amendment](#) in 1961, which grants the District three votes in the [Electoral College](#). This right has been exercised by D.C. citizens since the [presidential election of 1964](#).

In 1980, District voters approved the call of a [constitutional convention](#) to draft a proposed [state constitution](#), just as U.S. territories had done prior to their admission as states. The proposed constitution was ratified by District voters in 1982 for a new state to be called "[New Columbia](#)". However, the necessary authorization from the Congress has never been granted.^[4]



The 14th Amendment makes ALL “persons” corporate citizens of the United States (The District of Columbia) where ALL United States citizens are “subject to the jurisdiction thereof” and residents of the “State” (The District of Columbia) and have NO CONGRESSIONAL VOTING REPRESENTATION.

"The few who understand the system, will either be so interested in its profits or so dependent on its favors that there will be no opposition from that class, while on the other hand, the great body of people, mentally incapable of comprehending the tremendous advantages... will bear its burden without complaint, and perhaps without suspecting the system is inimical to their best interests."

- Rothchilds

U.S. economic history that Ron Paul wants every American to know: Pt. I

June 17, 1:46 AM • Grand Rapids Ron Paul Examiner • Geoff Linsley

Before the decorated days when the thirteen colonies emerged into existence, America was but an idea. This idea was the brainchild of European investors: a few very, very rich families and bankers. These investors, who were always in search of new ways to expand their banking empires and family fortunes, banded together for the purpose of creating the grandest investment ever undertaken.

Residents of England and other countries were encouraged to go thrive on the newfound land for the purpose of bringing life to this new investment through their labor. The migrants agreed to this because of their hopes for new, better, American lives. In return for living and working on the land, they were required to pay taxes back to the Bank of England, which acted as the central bank for all of America's investors. America's economic situation was and still is no different than any other creditor/debtor relationship today. If a teenager spends too much on her credit card, she needs to pay the interest and the accumulated debt until the debt is cleared, because she created this obligation to pay when she cosigned the credit card company's contract with her dad. The investors were the creditors and the colonists were the debtors.

In time, the people of the young country decided that they just didn't want to pay their contractual obligation anymore and gave England and its other investors the proverbial finger – an action which was and still is illegal according to international law (commercial law.) One tactic to avoid paying taxes was the introduction of fiat money. There are 3 different types of money: commodity, receipt, and fiat.[1] Commodity money is simply goods, like a cow or a chocolate bar. Before the other types existed, people bartered goods amongst each other and assigned their own values to these goods.

People, however, would've had a difficult time carrying cows around in their pockets; and this difficulty led to the use of *receipt money*. This type of money is a basically intrinsically worthless item that is used as an expected representation of how much of a commodity will be transferred. This worthless item is made unique through a minting or painting process, among other modifications. The birth of representational money gave birth to the potential to exchange a fraction of a commodity, making this type of currency more effective. Receipt money is given value because each monetary denomination is used as a representation of a fraction of the value of real goods existing somewhere else – it is backed by things that have real value. Gold and silver are the preferred backings of receipt money because they have perceived value and are rare enough so there won't be a huge addition of these substances into an economic system, which would significantly alter the value of the existing receipt money, destabilizing an economy.

Many people think that Federal Reserve Notes are a form of receipt money: this is utterly false. Federal Reserve Notes are a form of fiat money.[2] *Fiat money*, what early Americans used to spite the king of England, is money that isn't backed by anything at all – it is simply worthless items that, for no good reason, have perceived value and can be created out of thin air by the controller of the currency for the benefit of this controller. The early Americans simply got tired of being taxed through the king of England's gold-based economic system, so they created their own monetary system out of thin air. Fiat money is merely a promise to pay real goods or services later, a.k.a. an I.O.U.[3]

America's fiat money was uncontrollable by the King; so, in his anger, he passed a law requiring his subjects to pay their taxes in gold only. Americans had very little gold in relation to the king, so this action

instigated a returned anger of the colonies and a plea for legal reform. Being angry, the king didn't hear their plea, which was a major cause for the start of the Revolutionary War.[4] [5]

During this time, America had two obligations. One was to their foreign creditors and one was to the legal stipulations of the king. Although America fended off the king, it didn't and couldn't fend off its creditors from hounding it. The best way to state what the result of the Revolutionary War was is that we made peace with England – words one will hear when one sees any accurate history documentary. America may have stopped fighting, but it didn't get out unscathed. It still had its monetary obligations to the Bank of England; so it, according to commercial law, wasn't truly a free nation. It was a debtor nation – a subservient nation to sovereign, truly free creditors.

The upside to winning the war was that America gained its ability to control its own government. Soon after its victory, the first guidelines for the first American government were formed, called the Articles of Confederation. Little known is that there were presidents before George Washington under the Articles of Confederation, the first of which was Thomas McKean.[6]

Gaining freedom was the primary goal of those who fought for independence, so America's forefathers attempted to keep this dream alive when they ratified the Constitution in 1789. The relevance of the Constitution is a little different than is taught in schools, which also incorrectly teach that its relevance is fading out. The Constitution is a contract of limitations, created in attempt to both keep America's new government from becoming oppressive and preserve the *sovereign* [7] rights of its people.

Being a debtor to foreign investors, America needed to either completely pay off or continually pay interest on its debt. This caused an almost immediate reintroduction of taxes.[8] These taxes deeply affected some Americans, especially farmers, and some decided to do everything they thought they could to save themselves from them. In 1786 Daniel Shays of Massachusetts led a rebellion, which one could call the second Revolutionary War in American history. He, however, did not win his war against the early American government; and taxes have since existed, just as they did before America gained legal independence.

America won the Revolutionary War but its investors were smart enough to know that its Revolutionary War caused its economy to become too unstable to survive in a productive manner. Knowing this, Congress was forced to pass the 1791 Assumption Act – which created America's first national bank (a.k.a. the First Bank of America), chartered by the Bank of England for a term of twenty years – in attempt to stabilize it. On December 12, 1791, this bank, which controlled the American money supply, opened for business in Philadelphia. Regarding the creation of this bank, James Madison said, "History records that the money changers have used every form of abuse, intrigue, deceit, and violent means possible to maintain their control over governments by controlling money and its issuance."

In order to create this bank, America was forced to charter it with the same European investors and bankers that were holding its debts before the war. At first, the bank's capitalization was \$10,000,000 – 80% of which was owned by foreign bankers. In other words, the American government agreed to its creation under the condition that America would only own 20% of it. The bank was authorized to lend up to \$20,000,000, which was a profitable condition for both the government and the investors, since they could lend and collect interest on money that they didn't actually have (a common banking trick.[9]) The bankers, however, led the government – which was more naïve when it came to banking practices and how to handle money – down a spiraling path that would quickly rob it of its share in the ownership. Just five years later, the government *owed* the bank \$6,200,000 and was forced to sell most of its shares to its investors in order to resolve this debt in order to prevent an even worse situation. By 1802, the government was forced to sell all of its shares, leaving America with no stock whatsoever in its own national bank, giving it no control over its own currency and economic well being. The importance of this crisis was well illustrated by Thomas Jefferson:

If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks... will deprive the people of all property until their children wake-up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered.... The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people, to whom it property belongs.[10]

America's first central bank was primarily created because its secured party creditors – its investors overseas – demanded a private bank for holding the securities (assets) of their investment, being America. This bank, holding America's assets, acted as collateral for America's debts and loans. During the creation of this bank, one of the largest private investors, **Amshel Bauer Rothschild, made the famous statement, "Let me issue and control a Nation's money and I care not who writes the laws."**[11]

About two decades later, Napoleon began conquering Europe. When he reached Frankfort, Germany, Prince William left 3 million dollars in the hands of **Amshel Mayer Rothschild** for the purpose of paying off his Hessian troops. After losing the battle of Jena, William fled to his relatives in the North. Instead of giving the money to the troops, Amshel Mayer put the money in the stock market, investing in an inside tip he received from his world revolutionary network. Amshel Mayer's five sons then inflated their family's power by creating five authoritative banks in five major European cities: Amshel, Frankfort; Jacob, Paris; Nathan, London; Karl, Naples; Solomon, Vienna.

The War of 1812

In 1811, the twenty year contract with the Bank of England expired. On February 20, the American government again decided to give England the finger and not renew the charter on the grounds that the Bank was unconstitutional. This led to the withdrawal of \$7,000,000 by European investors, precipitating an economic recession and an English military response.[12] In 1812, England waged the war we now call the War of 1812. On August 24th and 25th, it invaded Washington D.C., burning down the first White House, the first Library of Congress, [13] the President's house, etc. The Brits invaded because America dishonored its contract, and according to International Law, the only remedy left was to come into America on a letter of marque and seize its assets. More accumulated debt as a result of this war reaffirmed the need for a new bank charter: the Second Bank of the United States founded in 1816 and chartered for another term of 20 years.

Four years before this charter was set to expire, England once again came knocking, this time proposing an early charter renewal. Andrew Jackson – a true patriot and very possibly the best American President ever [14] – in his presidency denied this charter renewal. Jackson had the bravery to assert that the Constitution doesn't delegate the government's authority to establish a national bank, but also had the brains to fix the problem. At the time, the States were having trouble deciding if they wanted to collect taxes. For the greater good of America, Jackson sent federal troops into these states and forced them to collect taxes. He then used these taxes to completely pay off the National Debt, eliminating the creditor's rights over its debtor. Jackson stated, "If Congress has the right under the Constitution to issue paper money, it was given to them to use themselves, not to be delegated to individuals or corporations." [15] America went without another national bank for seventy-seven years, until the institution of the Federal Reserve.[16]

What happened to Jackson after doing this? On January 30, 1835, Richard Lawrence, an unemployed house painter, attempted to assassinate Jackson via pistol. The gun, however, malfunctioned, and the bullet didn't discharge. Jackson defended himself with his cane, while a second weapon was used, which also misfired. Jackson believed the attacker was sent by his political enemies, the Whigs, because of his plan to do away with the Second Bank of the United States. This began a sad trend for American presidents: if they try to truly stand up for their country, soon after they tend to get shot at, with varying degrees of success. The ones who don't fight for their people just get shoes thrown at them.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Fractional money is an arguable fourth type. It is the loaning of money that doesn't really exist at all, using existing capital to back it. I believe it is more of a banking trick than a type of money.

[2] In chapter three we will discuss what Federal Reserve notes are in much greater detail.

[3] The downside to using intrinsically worthless fiat money is that its potential to deflate in value is very high, so it isn't the wisest choice of money for a government to use. This deflation occurs by printing additional money, which removes some of the value of the existing money. In theory, if a money supply consists of 100 notes, and 10 more are printed, the total value of all of the money remains the same, but each note in the supply decreases in value by .091% of the total value of the system ($1/100 - 1/110$.)

[4] America once again used fiat money in 1775 during the War, called Continental Currency. The deflation of this fiat money gave rise to the saying "not worth a Continental."

[5] King George III hired rented Hessian soldiers from investors Amshel Mayer Rothschild and Prince William (who used his royal connections in Denmark and England to provoke the war) to fight the American colonists.

[6] Also little known is that Barack Obama was not the first black American president. A black man named John Hanson was once the active President by default (everybody got up and left Congress for a while except him, giving him his short seat as President.)

[7] Sovereignty means the complete independence and self-government of an individual.

[8] A restricted power of the government outlined in the Constitution.

[9] This type of money is called fractional money: money that is lent but doesn't really exist. The Federal Reserve System uses this principle today.

[10] An 1802 letter of the Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin, later published in *The Debate Over the Recharter of the Bank Bill*, 1809.

[11] The Rothschild family has since become the wealthiest family on the planet.

[12] The problem with not renewing the charter wasn't that the central bank wasn't unconstitutional. The problem was that its creditors wished to decide how they will collect their debt and America, the debtor, wasn't abiding by international law.

[13] We will discuss why this was burned in the next chapter.

[14] Interestingly, this former general of the Tennessee militia was the first President not to have been born into wealth.

[15] Veto message regarding the Bank of the United States, July 10, 1832.

[16] Which the government also didn't have the power to establish, but we shall discuss this in great detail in chapter three.

I shall assume that your silence gives consent.

Plato

U.S. economic history that Ron Paul wants every American to know: Pt. II

June 17, 3:49 AM • Grand Rapids Ron Paul Examiner • Geoff Linsley

America had finally become a free country; this is until shortly before the start of the Civil War. Having lost the battle with President Jackson, the foreign investors of the Second National Bank were perturbed. Throughout America's early years, a close business relationship developed between the cotton growers in the South and the cotton manufacturing industry in England. Due to such business ties, the States swarmed with British agents, especially the Southern ones. These British agents carefully planted and nurtured political propaganda between the North and the South, which ultimately led to servile insurrection and the succession of South Carolina on Dec. 26, 1860. In South Carolina's declaration of succession, it stated: "They have encouraged and assisted thousands of our slaves to leave their homes: and those who remain, have been incited by emissaries, books and pictures to servile insurrection."

The political imbalance between the states in the South and the states in the North had more to do with economic policies than any moral issue of slavery. Even in the early 19th Century, the North's economy was primarily driven by factories and the South's economy was primarily driven by slaves on plantations. In 1828 the "Tariff of Abominations" was passed which greatly favored Northern industries over Southern plantations. Tension and arguments lasted for the next 32 years over how to deal with these taxes. Political propaganda eventually enticed South Carolina, who hurt the worst from industry-favoring tariffs, to secede from the Union. Other Southern states soon followed, commonly because they felt the North wasn't respecting the Constitution by denying them their property rights when their slaves were freed. Texas stated during its secession:

In all the non-slaveholding States, in violation of that good faith and comity which should exist between entirely distinct nations, the people have formed themselves into a great sectional party, now strong enough in numbers to control the affairs of each of those States, based upon an unnatural feeling of hostility to these Southern States and their beneficent and patriarchal system of African slavery, proclaiming the debasing doctrine of equality of all men, irrespective of race or color – a doctrine at war with nature, in opposition to the experience of mankind, and in violation of the plainest revelations of Divine Law.

The truth is that the North wasn't doing this for moral reasons, as is taught to school children today. They were simply stealing the blacks, under the guise that they have obtained "freedom," to work for cheaper wages than the whites would during the boom of the Industrial Revolution. The end of slavery was more an incidental result of the War than the reason for fighting it. Slavery, it can be argued, just changed definitions, as one can make a very valid argument that working for dirt cheap is equivalent to slavery.

On March 27, 1861, the event that initiated the movement towards the Civil War occurred, when the representatives for the Southern states walked out of Congress over the aforesaid matters. When these Congressional members walked out of Congress, it adjourned *sine die*, meaning it adjourned without a definite return date. This left less than the constitutionally required amount of Congressional members to perform business as usual for America, making Congress as a whole legally powerless: **Congress ceased to exist as a lawful deliberative body.** Consequently, the only constitutionally lawful American authority that could declare war was no longer lawful, nor present.

Without the proper legal authority to do so, Abraham Lincoln executed Lincoln Executive Order 1, putting the Federal territories (only) under martial law (mob rule) on April 15, 1861. **Congress did eventually assemble again, but did so under the military authority of Mr. Lincoln (no longer the Commander in Chief) and not by the rules of parliamentary law or Constitutional law. This institution of marital law has not changed since.** A 1973 Senate Report illustrated this situation well:

A majority of United States “citizens” have lived under emergency rule.... And, in the United States, actions taken by the Government in times of great crises have – from, at least, the Civil War – in important ways, shaped the present phenomenon of a permanent state of national emergency.[1]

Knowing that his Executive Proclamation was unconstitutional, Mr. Lincoln, on April 24, 1863, commissioned General Orders No. 100[2]: a special code to “govern” his illegal actions while under martial law, giving the illusion that his actions were justified[3]. This code also gave the illusion that the laws of the District of Columbia and the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17-18 were legally extended into the States, seemingly putting them under the same laws of war and private commercial laws as those of federal territories.

With the patriotic South absent, representatives of America’s former investors rushed into Congress, seeing an opportunity to corrupt the nation for their benefit, and helped the North illegally ratify two very important and damaging Constitutional amendments: a new 13th Amendment and the 14th Amendment. Today’s 13th Amendment is the new amendment because it replaced the old 13th Amendment (a.k.a. the Titles of Nobility Act), which was created shortly after the origins of America in order to prevent exactly what had happened after the South left.[4] The old, forgotten 13th Amendment, ratified on December 9, 1812, read: “If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the united States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.”[5] When the South walked out of office, those with titles of nobility poured into Congress, creating the need for these nobles to replace any remembrance of the old 13th Amendment. Government officials still sometimes deny the existence of this old Amendment in order to hide American history from the American people, but it has in fact been found and verified.

The new, two part 13th Amendment was soon illegally ratified by Congress:

Section 1. Neither Slavery nor servitude, except as a punishment for crime where of the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. *Section 2.* Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.[6]

This amendment ended slavery, except for in the instance of crimes, of which were to be decided by the government, itself.

The new 13th Amendment was a stepping block for the 14th Amendment, which is *the most important piece of legislation in terms of what was to come in American law.* Here are the sections that most concern what we are discussing:

Section 1. **All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States** and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. *Section 4.* **The validity of the public debt of the United States,** authorized by

law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, **shall not be questioned.** But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.[7]

American law is a tricky thing to understand. Almost all people don't understand what the 14th Amendment really means, and that is because the words used have legal definitions which typically aren't the definitions found in a normal dictionary. The use of words that have multiple legal meanings fuels the power of the 14th Amendment. For starters, there is a legal difference between the "United States" and the "united States." Legally, the "united States" are the unity of the sovereign States of America. The "United States" is actually referring to a corporation, a.k.a. "The United States of America." The "united States" is the abbreviated form of "united States for America." The "United States of America" is the name used in the Constitution to describe the federal government, not the States that are united. The purpose of the old 13th Amendment was to keep those with titles of nobility – in other words, representatives of Britain – out of the government of the United States of America – being the federal government – by not allowing them to be citizens of the united States, a Constitutional prerequisite for office.

Section 1 of the 14th Amendment was an attempt to tie the sovereign American of the united States to the United States federal government. Doing so required the change in the definition of what a Citizen is: we see the case of "Citizen" was changed to "citizen." The American "Citizen," addressed in earlier parts of the Constitution, was replaced by the 14th amendment title of "citizen." This was a necessary step for controlling the people because before this time, there was no tie between the federal government and the Citizen of a State. States were like countries of their own, only the federal government acted as a mediator between them. The 14th Amendment made people citizens of both their States and the federal government, subjecting them to both entities' laws. The other key element is the use of the word "person" or "persons," which is distinguishable in law from "people." The word "person" has three legal definitions, the third of which being the confusing factor: 3. An entity (such as a corporation) that is recognized by law as having the rights and duties of a human being. In this sense, the term includes partnerships and other associations, whether incorporated or unincorporated."[8] **In short, person can also mean a corporation. So, looking back at the 14th Amendment, one can reword the first line "All corporations born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." A 14th Amendment "citizen," as we shall later see in much greater detail can and commonly does refer to a corporation.**[9]

The 14th Amendment didn't truly rewrite the rights of the "Citizen," it just refers to the rights of the "citizen," which is different altogether. Schools teach that this amendment made everybody equal. Its purpose was to do just this; but this equality didn't come with the condition that everyone is free. It was an attempt to lower everyone's status to a "citizen," which means subservient to the federal government. The popular belief that these two amendments made people free isn't quite accurate. It simply was an attempt to *remove everyone's freedom* from the federal government.

At the time, the Amendment didn't affect people and, partially as a result of this, most people didn't realize the significance of the wording and bought the propaganda that its purpose was to make the slaves equal, as uneducated Americans still do today. The real reason for the implementation of this Amendment was to set in place the first step in a gradual plan being implemented by America's former investors, which wouldn't be fully realized until the New Deal in 1933. The Amendment was a staging point which would set the course for new federal laws to be written, which would eventually end up rewriting all of American law, including the Constitution.

Being an attorney, Mr. Lincoln tended to make presidential moves that weren't fully in the interest of the American people as a whole or respective to the Constitution.[10] When it comes to defying American

interests, it seems that the most historically celebrated presidents are the most culpable. This is because the families that these Presidents did their favors for still have their economic foothold in America today. Mr. Lincoln accepted war loans from the same investors that Jackson patriotically broke away from, putting America back in debt.

He, however, did do one thing that was admirable: at the end of his presidency, he finally stood up to the bankers. After generously loaning both sides of the War, the bankers argued that, due to the present chaos in America, their American beneficiaries of the future couldn't be trusted with the Constitutional powers and the political and monetary system of free enterprise created by their forefathers. They wanted to regain a monetary and political foothold in America, using their powers as creditors to persuade Mr. Lincoln into assisting their plan by manipulating his will to win the War. In 1865, Mr. Lincoln declared his new monetary policy, which he contrived for the purpose of paying off war debts without accruing harmful interest:

“The Government should create, issue, and circulate all the currency and credits needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of consumers. By the adoption of these principles, the taxpayers will be saved immense sums of interest. Money will cease to be master and become the servant of humanity.... The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of government, but it is the government's greatest opportunity.”

Had Lincoln's policy been implemented, America would have found its way out of its war debts. Just five days after General Lee [11] surrendered and Mr. Lincoln won his War, he was shot. Neither Mr. Lincoln nor any future President ever repealed the martial law instituted during the Civil War.

The Private Laws of the District of Columbia

In 1871, three years after the illegal ratification of the 14th Amendment, the government defaulted on its war debts, forcing America into bankruptcy.[12] What resulted is considered the death blow to the united States for America.[13] On February 21st, *England* claimed what was theirs, according to international law, and *incorporated the ten mile square that is Washington D.C.*[14] England also incorporated the American Constitution and names for its new corporation, such as THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, U.S., and USA, as well as other titles, as declared in the District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871.[15] A point of interest in these copyrighted names is the implementation of the article “THE.” Before this time, America was a union of “united States,” not a union of “the united States.” The article “the” doesn't exist when referring to other countries, i.e. Canada and Britain aren't referred to as “the Canada” or “the Britain.” The British-controlled Corporation, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, exclusively uses the article “the” in its name, which is distinct from the “united States” or the “United States.” One other immense change to America simultaneously occurred: being a bankrupt nation, the united States retained only the power to settle civil disputes, not criminal matters, allowing room for the illusion that only Britain's private, ever-changing laws appertain to America's criminal disputes. British law literally attempted to fill the gap created by the bankruptcy without anyone knowing, making it appear that everything was going just as usual. Since this point in history, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA has been governed entirely by foreign, private, corporate law and Washington, D.C. has been under British control.

The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is a corporation, whose jurisdiction is applicable only in the ten-mile-square parcel of land known as the District of Columbia and to whatever properties are legally titled to the UNITED STATES, by its registration in the corporate County, State, and Federal governments that are under military power of the UNITED STATES and its creditors.[16]

Being incorporated, people need permission to use Britain's imposed laws. These people, who use this British legal system for and usually against the American people, are referred to as *attorneys*, as opposed to *lawyers*. Yes, there's a difference. The word "attorney" comes from "attorn," which means to turn over to another; transfer.[17] In old England, the title of attorney meant one who attorned ("attourned" is the old English), which meant to transfer money, goods, etc. to another.[18] Attorneys served the king or queen in handling disputes regarding money/goods with their peasants. In modern times, attorneys transfer things of monetary value through court procedures to both other forms of money/goods and to new owners, being either persons or the government.[19] Attorneys have limited legal power because they are sworn to uphold the British, copyrighted law. A lawyer isn't limited like this. Many believe that one needs to get licensed in order to practice law – this is an utter fiction. One needs to become licensed if one wishes to become an attorney in order to avoid a copyright violation[20], and the way to do this is to pass the BAR exam and register with the American BAR Association. The American BAR Association is an appendage of the BAR Council, which is the BAR association of England. The term BAR is an acronym for British Accreditation Register [21]: the registry for those who have been accredited to use America's British copyrighted law.

Beyond this point in America's legal history, any laws that came about were private laws of Britain. Any sovereign Citizen is exempt from these private laws. Anyone who doesn't dispute being a 14th Amendment "citizen" is subject to these private laws. The 13th Amendment eliminated involuntary servitude, but it said nothing about voluntary servitude. The 14th Amendment was a gateway for voluntary servitude to take place. At this time, simply claiming to be a sovereign Citizen and not a 14th Amendment "citizen" was, legally speaking, enough to avoid being subject to Britain's private laws. How could the Brits get people to agree to be these citizens? The answers they found were implemented into a plan that materialized into the New Deal.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Senate Report 93-549, 93rd Congress, 1st Session, 1973

[2] a.k.a. the Lieber Instructions and the Lieber Code

[3] "It is sometimes argued that the existence of an emergency allows the existence and operation of powers, national or state, which violate the inhibitions of the Federal Constitution. The rule is quite otherwise. No emergency justifies the violation of any of the provisions of the United States Constitution. An emergency, however, while it cannot create power, increase granted power, or remove or diminish the restrictions imposed upon power granted or reserved, may furnish the occasion for the exercise of power already in existence, but not exercised except during an emergency." - *16 AM.Jur.2d, Section 71, National League of Cities vs. Usury, 426 U.S. 833, 49 L.Ed.2d 245*

[4] The creation of the Titles of Nobility Act was an important cause for the War of 1812 and was the direct cause for the burning of the Library of Congress during it.

[5] Notice the capitalization of "United" in the first instance and the conflict with the second instance. We will discuss why this was done soon.

[6] There is also much controversy regarding whether this amendment was ratified by members of Congress who had signed under duress, making their signatures invalid. Notice how the capitalization of "united States" changed from the old 13th Amendment.

[7] It will become apparent why a national debt is included in this package later on in history.

[8] Black's Law Dictionary 1178 8th ed., 2004

[9] The 14th Amendment was never properly ratified because it lacked the proper governing authority to do so. "I cannot believe any court, in full possession of its faculties, could honestly hold that the amendment was properly approved and adopted." (State v. Phillips, Pacific Reporter, 2nd Series, Vol. 540, pp. 941-2, 1975) Also see Utah Supreme Court Cases Dyvett v Turner, (1968) 439 P2d 266, 267 and State v Phillips, (1975) 540 P 2d 936. Also see Coleman v Miller, 307 U.S. 448, 59 S. Ct. 972. Also see 28 *Tulane Law Review*, 22 and 11 *South Carolina Law Quarterly* 484. Also see the *Congressional Record*, June 13, 1967, pp. 15641-15646.

[10] Also, being an attorney, he possessed a title of nobility, which according the still technically valid old 13th Amendment made his reign as president illegal. We'll discuss more about why attorneys aren't in favor of the people soon.

[11] The Commander of the Southern army

[12] A statutory procedure by which a (usually insolvent) debtor obtains financial relief and undergoes a judicially supervised reorganization or liquidation of the debtor's assets for the benefit of creditors. [Black's Law Dictionary 156 (8th ed. 2004)]

[13] This event did not truly destroy the united States for America, it just put in place a corporation that exists simultaneously, causing the people to forget that they are truly Citizens of the united States for America.

[14] 16 Stat. 419 Chapter 62

[15] Title 28 USC Section 3002(5) Chapter 176; 534 FEDERAL SUPPLEMENT 724

[16] Act to Provide a Government for the District of Columbia, Section 34 of the Forty-First Congress of the United States, Session III, Chapters 61 and 62, enacted February 21, 1871

[17] Random House Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2009

[18] Black's Law Dictionary 138 (8th ed. 2004)

[19] In the third part we shall discuss the processes that take place to perform these actions.

[20] Although the owners of the copyright wouldn't likely press charges for the sake of concealing this fact.

[21] a.k.a. British Accreditation Regency

"We shall have world government whether or not we like it. The only question is whether world government will be achieved by conquest or consent."

Feb. 17, 1950, James Paul Warburg, the former president of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), speaking to the U.S. Senate.

U.S. economic history that Ron Paul wants every American to know: Pt. III

June 17, 3:53 AM · Grand Rapids Ron Paul Examiner · Geoff Linsley

“In politics, nothing happens by accident. If it happens, you can bet it was planned that way.” – Franklin Delano Roosevelt

One of the conditions when Britain took over Washington D.C. during its 1871 bankruptcy was that Britain would bail it out of its debt for a while, but not permanently. In 1909 this bailout ended and economic default again returned. America went back to Britain for an extension; and Britain agreed for a term of twenty years, in exchange for an agreement to three big conditions. One, that America creates another national bank, despite Andrew Jackson’s valid reasoning for discontinuing such in 1836. The second and third conditions were that Britain’s 16th and 17th Amendments were ratified.[1] The national bank was the Federal Reserve Bank, which was completed and fully operational by 1913. Also in 1913 came the 16th Amendment. This chapter discusses the little-known, complete nature and relevance of these two big changes to American law and their affect on the American people.

The Great Depression

When economic default loomed again in 1929, something different happened. J.P. Morgan and Kuhn and Loeb illegally sent advanced warning to their insiders of an economic collapse, who all pulled out of the stock market. The problem initiating the crash was created by Warburg’s Federal Reserve when it printed money at a 62% inflation rate and then raised interest rates to 6%. Congressman Louis T. McFadden claimed the crash was created by the international bankers who sought to become rulers of us all. In his famous 1932 Congressional address, he said:

Mr. Chairman, we have in this country one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever known. I refer to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Banks. The Federal Reserve Board, a Government board, has cheated the Government of the United States and the people of the United States out of enough money to pay the national debt. The depredations and iniquities of the Federal Reserve Board has cost this country enough money to pay the national debt several times over. This evil institution has impoverished and ruined the people of the United States, has bankrupted itself, and has practically bankrupted our Government. It has done this through the defects of the law by the Federal Reserve Board, and through the corrupt practices of the moneyed vultures who control it.

Some people think the Federal Reserve banks are United States Government institutions. They are not Government institutions. They are private credit monopolies which prey upon the people of the United States for the benefit of themselves.

Not long after, McFadden died from food poisoning, following a heart attack, which occurred under suspicious circumstances.

Major stockholders, including America’s creditors and their affiliates, pulled out of the market simultaneously, lowering the value of stocks, which caused a nationwide panic. Most everyone decided to pull out, and most naturally did so too late to salvage their family’s earnings. This, just as any economic depression, creates a

large gap between a pauper class and a dominant high class. The most important effect of the Great Depression for America's creditors was that most of the money – cash, certificates, and other constitutionally lawful receipt money – that was backed by lawful coinage (gold and silver) was pulled out of peoples' hands and moved to the banks. Additionally, many of those who still had cash put it into high-interest yielding Treasury Bonds, driven to a higher value because of their high demand. This also exchanged the lawful money for a different form.[2]

At this point, there was no way out for THE UNITED STATES without resorting to help, meaning accepting new bankruptcy conditions. Being the fiscal agent over the monetary policies of THE UNITED STATES, President Herbert Hoover asked the Federal Reserve for a resolution to the dilemma. The Federal Reserve Board responded: "Whereas, in the opinion of the Board of Directors of the Federal Bank of New York, the continued and increasing withdrawal of currency and gold from the banks of the country has now created a national emergency...."[3]

If it was what money was backed by anyway, why would people holding gold create a national emergency? The emergency came to be because most of the gold withdrawn went not in the hands of Americans, but outside of the U.S. economy: this lost gold actually left at the *start* of the Depression. "... [T]hat those spectaculars and insiders were right was plain enough later on. This first contract of the 'moneychangers' with the New Deal netted those who removed their money from a country a profit of up to 60 percent when the dollar was debased."[4]

The banks were left without a sufficient amount of gold for their own protection, thus they denied the public its gold. The Federal Reserve Board's proposal to Hoover was that he release an Executive Order, based on the 1917 Trading with the Enemy Act, which read as follows:

Whereas, it is provided in Section 5(b) of the Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, that "the President may investigate, regulate, or prohibit, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe by means of licensure or otherwise, any transaction in foreign exchange and the export, hoarding, melting, or ear markings of gold or silver coin or bullion currency,"[5]

President Hoover declined to issue the Executive Order because of the negative impact it would have on the American people.

Soon after, a President that *would* play puppet for international interests was purposely sworn in: Franklin Delano Roosevelt. That day, Roosevelt asked Congress for emergency powers to deal with the crisis. The next day he issued Proclamation 2038, asking for a Special Session of Congress to deal with the situation. The first Act of the Special Session began with these words: "Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, that the Congress hereby declares that a serious emergency exists and that it is imperatively necessary to speedily put into effect remedies of uniform national application." The same day, Congress passed this statute:

During time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise investigate, regulate, or prohibit under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe by means of licensure or otherwise, any transaction in foreign exchange, transactions of credit between or payments by banking institutions as defined by the President and export, hoarding, melting, or ear markings of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, by any person within the United States or anyplace subject to the jurisdiction thereof.[6]

Whenever, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, such action is necessary to protect the currency system of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may regulate any or all individuals,

partnerships, associations and corporations to pay and deliver to the Treasurer of the United States any or all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates owned by such individuals, partnerships, associations, and corporations.

... Whoever shall not comply with the provisions of this act shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or if a natural person, in addition to such fine may be imprisoned for a year, not exceeding ten years.[7]

These statutes led to the landmark "Resolution" that was the biggest theft inflicted on the American people ever.

House/Senate Joint Resolution 192[8]

On June 5, 1933, Congress passed House/Senate Joint Resolution (HJR 192). HJR 192 was passed to suspend the gold standard and abrogate the gold clause in the Constitution. As a result of the conditions set forth by HJR 192, no one in America has since been able to lawfully pay a debt. This resolution reads:

To assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States,

Whereas the holding of or dealing in gold affect public interest, and are therefore subject to proper regulation and restriction; and Whereas the existing emergency has disclosed that provisions of obligations which purport to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency of the United States, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, obstruct the power of the Congress to regulate the value of the money of the United States, and are inconsistent with the declared policy of the Congress to maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar, coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts, Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that

(a) every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payments in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy; and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts. Any such provision contained in any law authorizing obligations to be issued by or under authority of the United States, is hereby repealed, but the repeal of any such provision shall not invalidate any other provision or authority contained in such law.

(b) As used in this resolution, the term 'obligation' means any obligation (including every obligation of and to the United States, excepting currency) payable in money of the United States; and the term 'coin or currency' means coin or currency of the United States, including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations.

Sec. 2: The last sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 43 of the Act entitled 'An Act to relieve the existing national economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emergency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and of other purposes;, approved May 12, 1933, is amended to read as follows:

"All coins and currencies of the United States (including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of the Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations) heretofore or hereafter coined or issued, shall be legal tender for all debts, public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues, except that gold coins, when

below the standard weight and limit of tolerance provided by law for the single piece, shall be legal tender only at valuation in proportion to their actual weight.”[9]

An older Federal Reserve note, such as one from the 1950s, establishes the difference between a Federal Reserve note and true legal tender on its face. Where the modern notes read “THIS NOTE IS LEGAL TENDER FOR ALL DEBTS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE,” the old notes additionally read, “AND IS REDEEMABLE IN LAWFUL MONEY AT THE UNITED STATES TREASURY, OR AT ANY FEDERAL RESERVE BANK.” **The ability to redeem this lawful money, however, is illegal, as established by the terms of HJR 192, making this old offer a bluff. In reality, a Federal Reserve note is just an instrument of debt – an I.O.U. – and not a commodity of value. The only “value” in Federal Reserve notes is their perceived value, and the fact that people who carry this perception circulate them throughout America’s economy. If this fundamentally incorrect perception was to fade, people would perceive them to be what they truly are: just pieces of inked paper.**

The New Deal

HJR 192 was the sacrifice for the New Deal. Most believe that Roosevelt – grandson of opium smuggler Warren Delano Junior – was one of the best Presidents ever because he invested lots in jobs, national parks, more roads, etc., and that these investments in due time made the economy boom, as schoolbooks teach. This is a result of what happened, but what changed as a result of the New Deal for the common American “citizen” is avoided in schoolbooks. Deals were being made with the international bankers. The bankers invested in America once again, under new conditions. The first of which was the passing of House/Senate Joint Resolution 192, which further emphasized the country’s necessity for a new national bank – the Federal Reserve. This Resolution commanded people to turn in all of their lawful gold and silver currencies in exchange for Federal Reserve notes. The lawful, gold and silver currencies all went to the bankers, and the Federal Reserve notes [10] acted as debts, merely IOUs in a new, debt-based economic system, completely changing American economics.

Under the new law the money is issued to the banks in return for Government obligations, bills of exchanges, drafts, notes, trade acceptances, and bankers’ acceptances. The money will be worth 100 cents on the dollar, because it is backed by the credit of the nation. *It will represent a mortgage on all the homes and other property of all the people in the nation. The money so issued will not have one penny of gold coverage behind it, because it is really not needed.*[11]

The biggest effect of the New Deal on the people was that it changed who was to pick up the tab of the national debt. *Instead of the United States being the debtor to America’s national debt, the new system’s goal is to make all of the American citizens individually the debtors, foisting the economic responsibility off of the government and on to its people.* Sound atrocious? This plan, however, can’t legally be carried out without the American people agreeing to their “share” of the debt. **No one in their right mind would voluntarily agree to a share of a debt that they themselves didn’t incur, so the U.S. government had to trick its citizens into becoming debt-slaves to foreign creditors.**

To do this, Franklin Delano Roosevelt invoked his Emergency War Powers under Public Law 1. **The enemy of his war was defined as “any person within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.”**[12] The war was an economic war, and the government gave everyone a *nom de guerre* – a war name – for the purpose of tracking and regulating its enemies (of the State) in order to “ensure elevated national security.” This war name is also called a *straw man*: a personal account that the government creates for the purpose of continuing an economic transaction when one party doesn’t necessarily agree to contracting.[13] This is the name found on your driver’s license, social security card, I.R.S. forms, etc. **These straw man accounts have the same name as everyone’s legal names, but they are purposely capitalized. John Doe’s**

straw man account would be called JOHN DOE. These accounts are capitalized because the accounts are considered to be corporations [14] by law. These corporations are also, in law, called persons.[15] By agreeing that your straw man represents you, the sovereign, you are agreeing to be a person and a UNITED STATES citizen, and are contracting with the UNITED STATES to be within the jurisdiction of its private laws.

In 1921 the government started issuing birth certificates, something the UK had been doing since the mid-Nineteenth Century. These certificates confirmed that a child is officially a U.S. citizen. People had no good reason to start obtaining these birth certificates, so the government had to entice them to do so. Expecting mothers were encouraged to sign them on behalf of their babies in return for paid pregnancy leave. Not understanding the contractual implications of the birth certificate, these mothers jumped at the chance for free money with no obvious strings attached.[16] Another condition of the bankers' New Deal was that everyone was to deliver their birth registries – the documentation used before birth certificates were introduced – to the government. These were exchanged for Certificates of Live Birth (birth certificates), which were then filed by the U.S. Department of Commerce into one of its subdivisions, known as the Bureau of Vital Statistics. These titles to people's bodies – their property and future labor – were pledged to the international bankers as security (collateral) for the debt of the United States Corporation.[17]

Later, forms of adhesion contracts arose, making the knot that ties the sovereign people to their straw men corporation names even stronger. Adhesion contracts – contracts that favor one party much more than the other, typically entered unknowingly – are found throughout the government's interactions with its citizens. Registering to vote formally declares one a citizen. After 1935, Social Security benefits enticed people to contract again and receive a social security number. Nowadays, all businesses that blindly follow THE UNITED STATES' economic laws [18] make one virtually unemployable without a number.[19] Driver's licenses are another example of an adhesion contract. Look at your name on your driver's license. You won't actually find it; instead, you'll find your straw name, which you agreed was you when you registered for your license. Legally, only one of these contracts is sufficient to bind the sovereign to the corporate UNITED STATES' laws.

The monetary implications of the New Deal extended all over the globe. Economies all around the world plummeted into depressions; but history books generally don't disclose much about this fact because it raises obvious questions about the purported cause that the common holders in the U.S. stock market were the prime culprit. Rough worldwide conditions allowed for the propagation of repressive political parties, like Hitler's Nazi Party, a modernized Democratic Party and a modernized Republican Party, all of which support diminished rights for the people and the interests of those abroad.

“Since March 9, 1933, the United States has been in a state of declared national emergency.”[20] One result of this national emergency was the introduction of the so-called “alphabet agencies” – i.e. the FBI, the CIA, the DEA, etc. – implemented for the purpose of protecting the government from foreign terrorists, which – because the entity in control of the laws is Britain – is usually considered the American people.

In 1944, the states also lost the remainder of their sovereignty through the Buck Act.[21] This Act improperly gave the States the title of 14th Amendment citizens, putting them under U.S. jurisdiction, which, according to the British private laws, eliminated the possibility that they could usurp the authority of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.[22] The Act was originally passed as an extension of the Public Salary Tax of 1939, which is a municipal law of the District of Columbia allowing it to especially tax all Federal and State governmental employees and those who live in any Federal area. The problem was that the Act wasn't pervasive enough to apply to the States, being sovereign entities themselves. The Buck Act was an attempt to lower their status as sovereign states to allow the money-grubbing governmental hands of taxation to loot the rest of the country, making state governments even less distinguishable from the Federal government. The Public Salary Tax Act

was subsequently renamed the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and was used to fraudulently apply federal income tax to all federal citizens.

Twenty years later, all of the states adopted the Uniform Commercial Code, which organized all of the economic transactions of every state and the feds. This Code also gave the U.S. the ability to use the copyrighted names of every state. Since all the laws of bankrupt America are rooted in economic principles, the UCC became the supreme law of the land, which was supposedly ruled, under the Buck Act, by THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. And thus the current shadow government, of which people unwittingly believe dominates all law-making and national authority, was formed.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The 17th Amendment deals with the ability of the executive power of a State to fill in a Senate seat in the event one were to open up. This limits the power of the people to choose who gets in the Senate, under the disguise that it helps Congress run more smoothly. A situation like this was recently seen when Rob Blagojevich chose Roland Burris to replace the seat made vacant by Barack Obama's transition to presidency. This Amendment allows those who already have power and lots of money to handpick Senators for private interests without the people's consent.

[2] The economic depression was not only felt by America in this time. World War I created towering debts in several European nations, as well as the United States. In 1930 the international bankers declared these nations, and once again America, bankrupt.

[3] From private papers of Herbert Hoover, March 3, 1933

[4] Hoover Policy Paper, written by the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of Agriculture

[5] Herbert Hoover private papers of March 3, 1933

[6] Title 1, Sec. 2, 48 Statute 1, March 9, 1933

[7] Stat. 48, Section 1, Title 1, Subsection N, March 9, 1933

[8] It's not of upmost importance that the details in this subchapter need to be closely read or understood in order to continue. Don't bother taking a long time with it unless it's your prerogative to do so.

[9] House Joint Resolution 192, 73d Congress, Sess. I, Ch. 48, June 5, 1933 (Public Law No. 10; U.S.C.A. 462, 463)

[10] In legal terms, a "note" is a debt. [Black's Law Dictionary 1088 (8th ed. 2004)]

[11] House 73rd Congress, Session I, Chapter I, p. 83; Also see Senate Report 93-549 and Executive Orders 6072, 6102, and 6246

[12] 73rd Congress, Sess. 1, Ch 1, Title 1(b)

[13] Black's Law Dictionary 1461 (8th ed. 2004)

[14] Black's Law Dictionary 365 8th ed., 2004

[15] Black's Law Dictionary 1178 8th ed., 2004

[16] Birth Certificates originated as a result of the 1921 Sheppard-Towner Maternity Act.

[17] Title 28 U.S.C. 3002(15) (A)

[18] Which in reality only apply to THE UNITED STATES itself and its subsidiary corporations, along with the ten mile square that is Washington D.C.

[19] This number itself being virtually no different than a brand on a cow

[20] Senate Report 93-549

[21] Title 4, U.S.C. 104-116

[22] For example, the sovereign State of Michigan became THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, and its abbreviation changed from "Mich." to "MI," denoting the Federal corporation.

What Do YOU Really Know!

By Nichole Terry

- The IRS is not a U.S. Government Agency - it is an Agency of the IMF. (Diversified Metal Products v. IRS et al. CV-93-405E-EJE U.S.D.C.D.I., Public Law 94-564, Senate Report 94-1148 pg. 5967, Reorganization Plan No. 26, Public Law 102-391.)
- The IMF is an Agency of the UN. (Black's Law Dictionary 6th Ed. Pg. 816)
- The U.S. has not had a Treasury since 1921. (41 Stat. Ch.214 pg. 654)
- The U.S. Treasury is now the IMF. (Presidential Documents Volume 29-No.4 pg. 113, 22 U.S.C. 285-288)
- The United States does not have any employees because **there is no longer a United States.** After over 200 years of operating under bankruptcy - it's finally over. No more "reorganizations." (Executive Order 12803) Do not personate one of the creditors or share holders or you will go to Prison. 18 U.S.C. 914
- The FCC, CIA, FBI, NASA, and all of the other alphabet gangs were never part of the United States government - although the "US Government" held shares of stock in the various Agencies. (U.S. v. Strang, 254 US 491, Lewis v. US, 680 F.2d, 1239)
- Social Security Numbers are issued by the UN through the IMF. The Application for a Social Security Number is the SS5 form. The Department of the Treasury (IMF) issues the SS5 not the Social Security Administration. The new SS5 forms do not state who or what publishes them, the earlier SS5 forms state that they are Department of the Treasury forms. You can get a copy of the SS5 you filled out by sending form SSA-L996 to the SS Administration. (20 CFR chapter 111, subpart B 422.103 (b) (2) (2) Read the cites above)

- **There are no judicial courts in America and there has not been any since 1789. Judges do not enforce Statutes and Codes. Executive Administrators enforce Statutes and Codes. (FRC v. GE 281 US 464, Keller v. PE 261 US 428, 1 Stat. 138-178)**
- There have not been any Judges in America since 1789. There have just been Administrators. (FRC v. GE 281 US 464, Keller v. PE 261 US 428 1Stat. 138-178) 10. According to the GATT you must have a Social Security number. House Report (103-826)
- We have One World Government, One World Law and a One World Monetary System.
- The UN is a One World Super Government.
- No one on this planet has ever been free. This entire planet is nothing more than a Slave Colony. There has always been a One World Government. It is just that now it is much better organized and has changed its name as of 1945 to the United Nations.
- New York City is defined in the Federal Regulations as the United Nations. Rudolph Gulliani stated on C-Span that "New York City was the capital of the World" and he was correct. (20 CFR chapter 111, subpart B 422.103 (b) (2) (2))
- Social Security is not insurance or a contract, nor is there a Trust Fund. (Helvering v. Davis 301 US 619, Steward Co. V. Davis 301 US 548.)
- Your Social Security check comes directly from the IMF which is an Agency of the UN. (Look at it if you receive one. It should have written on the top left United States Treasury.)
- You own no property - slaves can't own property. Read the Deed to the property that you think is yours. You are listed as a Tenant. (Senate Document 43, 73rd Congress 1st Session)
- The most powerful court in America is not the United States Supreme Court but, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. (42 Pa.C.S.A. 502)

- The Revolutionary War was a fraud. See (22, 23 and 24) 20. The King of England financially backed both sides of the Revolutionary war. (Treaty at Versailles July 16, 1782, Treaty of Peace 8 Stat 80)
- You cannot use the Constitution to defend yourself because you are not a party to it. (Padelford, Fay, & Co. v. The Mayor and Alderman of The City of Savannah 14 Georgia 438, 520)
- **America is a British Colony. (THE UNITED STATES IS A CORPORATION, NOT A LAND MASS AND IT EXISTED BEFORE THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR AND THE BRITISH TROOPS DID NOT LEAVE UNTIL 1796.) Respublica v. Sweers 1 Dallas 43, Treaty of Commerce 8 Stat 116, The Society for Propagating the Gospel, &c. V. New Haven 8 Wheat 464, Treaty of Peace 8 Stat 80, IRS Publication 6209, Articles of Association October 20, 1774.)**
- Britain is owned by the Vatican. (Treaty of 1213)
- The Pope can abolish any law in the United States. (Elements of Ecclesiastical Law Vol.1 53-54)
- A 1040 form is for tribute paid to Britain. (IRS Publication 6209)
- The Pope claims to own the entire planet through the laws of conquest and discovery. (Papal Bulls of 1455 and 1493)
- The Pope has ordered the genocide and enslavement of millions of people.(Papal Bulls of 1455 and 1493)
- The Popes laws are obligatory on everyone. (Bened. XIV., De Syn. Dioec, lib, ix., c. vii., n. 4. Prati, 1844)(Syllabus, prop 28, 29, 44)

- We are slaves and own absolutely nothing not even what we think are our children.(Tillman v. Roberts 108 So. 62, Van Koten v. Van Koten 154 N.E. 146, Senate Document 43 & 73rd Congress 1st Session, Wynehammer v. People 13 N.Y. REP 378, 481)
- Military Dictator George Washington divided the States (Estates) into Districts. (Messages and papers of the Presidents Vo 1, pg. 99. Webster's 1828 dictionary for definition of Estate.)
- "The People" does not include you and me. (Barron v. Mayor & City Council of Baltimore. 32 U.S. 243)
- The United States Government was not founded upon Christianity. (Treaty of Tripoli 8 Stat 154.)
- It is not the duty of the police to protect you. Their job is to protect the Corporation and arrest code breakers. Sapp v. Tallahasee, 348 So. 2nd. 363, Reiff v. City of Philadelphia, 477 F.Supp. 1262, Lynch v. N.C. Dept of Justice 376 S.E. 2nd. 247.
- Everything in the "United States" is For Sale: roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, water, prisons airports etc. I wonder who bought Klamath lake. Did anyone take the time to check? (Executive Order 12803)
- We are Human capital. (Executive Order 13037)
- The UN has financed the operations of the United States government for over 50 years and now owns every man, women and child in America. The UN also holds all of the Land in America in Fee Simple.
- The good news is we don't have to fulfill "our" fictitious obligations. You can discharge a fictitious obligation with another's fictitious obligation.
- **The depression and World War II were a total farce. The United States and various other companies were making loans to others all over the World during the Depression. The building of Germanys infrastructure in the 1930's including the Railroads was financed by the United States. That way those who call themselves "Kings," "Prime Ministers," and "Furor."etc could sit back and play a game of chess using real people. Think of all of the Americans, Germans etc. who gave**

their lives thinking they were defending their Countries which didn't even exist. The millions of innocent people who died for nothing. Isn't it obvious why Switzerland is never involved in these fiascoes? That is where the "Bank of International Settlements" is located. Wars are manufactured to keep your eye off the ball. You have to have an enemy to keep the illusion of "Government" in place.

- The "United States" did not declare Independence from Great Britain or King George.

The documents listed, plus hundreds more and numerous Essays explaining what has happened to this World are available on Disks for FREE. The documents are not secret. They are all on the Public Record. All of the Cases and Documents listed are on the Disks so you can see them for yourself. Just contact me (Nicole Terry) and I will be glad to send them to you.

Guess who owns the UN?

The disks have many more cites including Hundreds of Documents to verify the 40 statements above and numerous other facts. The Disks also include numerous Essays written by Stephen Ames and several other people that fully explain the 40 above mentioned facts. The Disks will clear up any confusion and answer any questions that you may have. The cites listed above are only the tip of the iceberg. Also included on the Disks are several hundred legal definitions because without them it is next to impossible for the non-lawyer to understand many of the Documents. Simple words such as "person" "citizen" "people" "or" "nation" "crime" "charge" "right" "statute" "preferred" "prefer" "constitutor" "creditor" "debtor" "debit" "discharge" "payment" "law" "United States" etc, do not mean what most of us think because we were never taught the legal definitions (TERMS) of the proceeding words. The illusion is much larger than what is cited above.

- There is no use in asking an Attorney about any of the above because: "His first duty is to the courts...not to the client." U.S.v Franks D.C.N.J. 53F.2d 128. "Clients are also called "wards of the court" in regard to their relationship with their attorneys."Spilker v. Hansin, 158 F.2d 35, 58U.S.App.D.C. 206. Wards of court. Infants and persons of unsound mind. Davis Committee v. Lonny, 290 Ky. 644, 162 S.W.2d 189, 190.

Did you get that? An Attorneys first duty is not to you and when you have an Attorney you are either considered insane or an infant.

By: Nicole Terry PH: 717-497-5231

Email: Nicole@Boxemail.com

What would “the People” do if they knew that they had been lied to by “the Government” their entire lives?

The United States is still a British Colony

By James Montgomery

The trouble with history is that we weren't there when it took place and it can be changed to fit someone's belief and/or traditions, or it can be taught in the public schools to favor a political agenda, and withhold many facts. I know you have been taught that we won the Revolutionary War and defeated the British, but I can prove to the contrary. I want you to read this paper with an open mind, and allow yourself to be instructed with the following verifiable facts. You be the judge and don't let prior conclusions on your part or incorrect teaching, keep you from the truth.

I too was always taught in school and in studying our history books that our freedom came from the Declaration of Independence and was secured by our winning the Revolutionary War. I'm going to discuss a few documents that are included at the end of this paper, in the footnotes. The first document is the first Charter of Virginia in 1606 (footnote #1). In the first paragraph, the king of England granted our fore fathers license to settle and colonize America. The definition for license is as follows.

"In Government Regulation. Authority to do some act or carry on some trade or business, in its nature lawful but prohibited by statute, except with the permission of the civil authority or which would otherwise be unlawful." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914.

Keep in mind those that came to America from England were British subjects. So you can better understand what I'm going to tell you, here are the definitions for subject and citizen.

"In monarchical governments, by subject is meant one who owes permanent allegiance to the monarch." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914.

"Constitutional Law. One that owes allegiance to a sovereign and is governed by his laws. The natives of Great Britain are subjects of the British government. Men in free governments are subjects as well as citizens; as citizens they enjoy rights and franchises; as subjects they are bound to obey the laws. **The term is little used, in this sense, in countries enjoying a republican form of government.**" Swiss Nat. Ins. Co. v. Miller, 267 U.S. 42, 45 S. Ct. 213, 214, 69 L.Ed. 504. Blacks fifth Ed.

I chose to give the definition for subject first, so you could better understand what definition of citizen is really being used in American law. Below is the definition of citizen from Roman law.

"The term citizen was used in Rome to indicate the possession of private civil rights, including those accruing under the Roman family and inheritance law and the Roman contract and property law. All other subjects were peregrines. But in the beginning of the 3d century the distinction was abolished and all subjects were citizens; 1 sel. Essays in Anglo-Amer. L. H. 578." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914.

The king was making a commercial venture when he sent his subjects to America, and used his money and resources to do so. I think you would admit the king had a lawful right to receive gain and prosper from his venture. In the Virginia Charter he declares his sovereignty over the land and his subjects and in paragraph 9 he declares the amount of gold, silver and copper he is to receive if any is found by his subjects. There could have

just as easily been none, or his subjects could have been killed by the Indians. This is why this was a valid right of the king (Jure Coronae, "In right of the crown," Black's forth Ed.), the king expended his resources with the risk of total loss.

If you'll notice in paragraph 9 the king declares that all his heirs and successors were to also receive the same amount of gold, silver and copper that he claimed with this Charter. The gold that remained in the colonies was also the kings. He provided the remainder as a benefit for his subjects, which amounted to further use of his capital. You will see in this paper that not only is this valid, but it is still in effect today. If you will read the rest of the Virginia Charter you will see that the king declared the right and exercised the power to regulate every aspect of commerce in his new colony. A license had to be granted for travel connected with transfer of goods (commerce) right down to the furniture they sat on. A great deal of the king's declared property was ceded to America in the Treaty of 1783. I want you to stay focused on the money and the commerce which was not ceded to America.

This brings us to the Declaration of Independence. Our freedom was declared because the king did not fulfill his end of the covenant between king and subject. The main complaint was taxation without representation, which was reaffirmed in the early 1606 Charter granted by the king. It was not a revolt over being subject to the king of England, most wanted the protection and benefits provided by the king. Because of the king's refusal to hear their demands and grant relief, separation from England became the lesser of two evils. The cry of freedom and self determination became the rallying cry for the colonist. The slogan "Don't Tread On Me" was the standard borne by the militias.

The Revolutionary War was fought and concluded when Cornwallis surrendered to Washington at Yorktown. As Americans we have been taught that we defeated the king and won our freedom. The next document I will use is the Treaty of 1783, which will totally contradict our having won the Revolutionary War. (Footnote 2).

I want you to notice in the first paragraph that the king refers to himself as prince of the Holy Roman Empire and of the United States. You know from this that the United States did not negotiate this Treaty of peace in a position of strength and victory, but it is obvious that Benjamin Franklin, John Jay and John Adams negotiated a Treaty of further granted privileges from the king of England. Keep this in mind as you study these documents. You also need to understand the players of those that negotiated this Treaty. For the Americans it was Benjamin Franklin Esqr., a great patriot and standard bearer of freedom. Or was he? His title includes Esquire.

An Esquire in the above usage was a granted rank and Title of nobility by the king, which is below Knight and above a yeoman, common man. An Esquire is someone that does not do manual labor as signified by this status, see the below definitions.

"Esquires by virtue of their offices; as justices of the peace, and others who bear any office of trust under the crown....for whosoever studieth the laws of the realm, who studieth in the universities, who professteth the liberal sciences, and who can live idly, and without manual labor, and will bear the port, charge, and countenance of a gentleman, he shall be called master, and shall be taken for a gentleman." Blackstone Commentaries p. 561-562

"Esquire - In English Law. A title of dignity next above gentleman, and below knight. Also a title of office given to sheriffs, serjeants, and barristers at law, justices of the peace, and others." Blacks Law Dictionary fourth ed. p. 641

Benjamin Franklin, John Adams and John Jay as you can read in the Treaty were all Esquires and were the signers of this Treaty and the only negotiators of the Treaty. The representative of the king was David Hartley Esqr.

Benjamin Franklin was the main negotiator for the terms of the Treaty; he spent most of the War traveling between England and France. The use of Esquire declared his and the others British subjection and loyalty to the crown.

In the first article of the Treaty most of the king's claims to America are relinquished, except for his claim to continue receiving gold, silver and copper as gain for his business venture. Article 3 gives Americans the right to fish the waters around the United States and its rivers. In article 4 the United States agreed to pay all bona fide debts. If you will read my other papers on money you will understand that the financiers were working with the king. Why else would he protect their interest with this Treaty?

I wonder if you have seen the main and obvious point. This Treaty was signed in 1783; the war was over in 1781. If the United States defeated England, how is the king granting rights to America, when we were now his equal in status? We supposedly defeated him in the Revolutionary War! So why would these supposed patriot Americans sign such a Treaty, when they knew that this would void any sovereignty gained by the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary War? If we had won the Revolutionary War, the king granting us our land would not be necessary; it would have been ours by his loss of the Revolutionary War. To not dictate the terms of a peace treaty in a position of strength after winning a war; means the war was never won. Think of other wars we have won, such as when we defeated Japan. Did MacArthur allow Japan to dictate to him the terms for surrender? No way! All these men did is gain status and privilege granted by the king and insure the subjection of future unaware generations. Worst of all, they sold out those that gave their lives and property for the chance to be free.

When Cornwallis surrendered to Washington he surrendered the battle, not the war. Read the Article of Capitulation signed by Cornwallis at Yorktown (footnote 3)

Jonathan Williams recorded in his book, Legions of Satan, 1781, that **Cornwallis revealed to Washington during his surrender that "a holy war will now begin on America, and when it is ended America will be supposedly the citadel of freedom, but her millions will unknowingly be loyal subjects to the Crown."... "in less than two hundred years the whole nation will be working for divine world government. That government that they believe to be divine will be the British Empire."**

All the Treaty did was remove the United States as a liability and obligation of the king. He no longer had to ship material and money to support his subjects and colonies. At the same time he retained financial subjection through debt owed after the Treaty, which is still being created today; millions of dollars a day. And his heirs and successors are still reaping the benefit of the king's original venture. If you will read the following quote from Title 26, you will see just one situation where the king is still collecting a tax from those that receive a benefit from him, on property which is purchased with the money the king supplies, at almost the same percentage:

-CITE-

26 USC Sec. 1491

HEAD-

Sec. 1491. Imposition of tax

-STATUTE-

There is hereby imposed on the transfer of property by a citizen or resident of the United States, or by a domestic corporation or partnership, or by an estate or trust which is not a foreign estate or trust, to a foreign corporation as paid-in surplus or as a contribution to capital, or to a foreign estate or trust, or to a foreign partnership, an excise tax equal to 35 percent of the excess of -

(1) the fair market value of the property so transferred, over

(2) the sum of -

(A) the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of such property in the hands of the transferor, plus

(B) the amount of the gain recognized to the transferor at the time of the transfer.

-SOURCE-

(Aug. 16, 1954, ch. 736, 68A Stat. 365; Oct. 4, 1976, Pub. L. 94-455, title X, Sec. 1015(a), 90 Stat. 1617; Nov. 6, 1978, Pub. L. 95-600, title VII, Sec. 701(u) (14) (A), 92 Stat. 2919.)

-MISC1-

AMENDMENTS

1978 - Pub. L. 95-600 substituted 'estate or trust' for 'trust' wherever appearing.

1976 - Pub. L. 94-455 substituted in provisions preceding par.

(1) 'property' for 'stocks and securities' and '35 percent' for '27 1/2 percent' and in par.

(1) 'fair market value' for 'value' and 'property' for 'stocks and securities' and in par.

(2) designated existing provisions as subpar. (A) and added subpar. (B).

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1978 AMENDMENT

Section 701(u) (14) (C) of Pub. L. 95-600 provided that: 'The amendments made by this paragraph (amending this section and section 1492 of this title) shall apply to transfers after October 2, 1975.'

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1976 AMENDMENT

Section 1015(d) of Pub. L. 94-455 provided that: 'The amendments made by this section (enacting section 1057 of this title, amending this section and section 1492 of this title, and renumbering former section 1057 as 1058 of this title) shall apply to transfers of property after October 2, 1975.'

A new war was declared when the Treaty was signed. The king wanted his land back and he knew he would be able to regain his property for his heirs with the help of his world financiers. Here is a quote from the king speaking to Parliament after the Revolutionary War had concluded.

(Six weeks after) the capitulation of Yorktown, the king of Great Britain, in his speech to Parliament (Nov. 27, 1781), declared "That he should not answer the trust committed to the sovereign of a free people, if he consented to sacrifice either to his own desire of peace, or to their temporary ease and relief, those essential rights and permanent interests, upon the maintenance and preservation of which the future strength and security of the country must forever depend." The determined language of this speech, pointing to the continuance of the American war, was echoed back by a majority of both Lords and Commons.

In a few days after (Dec. 12), it was moved in the House of Commons that a resolution should be adopted declaring it to be their opinion "That all farther attempts to reduce the Americans to obedience by force would be ineffectual, and injurious to the true interests of Great Britain." The rest of the debate can be found in (footnote 4). What were the true interests of the king? The gold, silver and copper.

The new war was to be fought without Americans being aware that a war was even being waged; it was to be fought by subterfuge and key personnel being placed in key positions. The first two parts of "A Country Defeated In Victory," go into detail about how this was done and exposes some of the main players.

Every time you pay a tax you are transferring your labor to the king, and his heirs and successors are still receiving interest from the original American Charters.

The following is the definition of tribute (tax).

"A contribution which is raised by a prince or sovereign from his subjects to sustain the expenses of the state. A sum of money paid by an inferior sovereign or state to a superior potentate, to secure the friendship or protection of the latter." Blacks Law Dictionary forth ed. p. 1677

As further evidence, not that any is needed, a percentage of taxes that are paid are to enrich the king/queen of England. For those that study Title 26 you will recognize IMF, which means Individual Master File, all tax payers have one. To read one you have to be able to break their codes using file 6209, which is about 467 pages. On your IMF you will find a blocking series, which tells you what type of tax you are paying. You will probably find a 300-399 blocking series, which 6209 says is reserved. You then look up the BMF 300-399, which is the Business Master File in 6209. You would have seen prior to 1991, this was U.S.-U.K. Tax Claims, non-refile DLN. Meaning **everyone is considered a business and involved in commerce** and you are being held liable for a tax via a treaty between the U.S. and the U.K., payable to the U.K. The form that is supposed to be used for this is form 8288, FIRPTA - Foreign Investment Real Property Tax Account, you won't find many people using this form, just the 1040 form. The 8288 form can be found in the Law Enforcement Manual of the IRS, chapter 3. If you will check the OMB's paper - Office of Management and Budget, in the Department of Treasury, List of Active Information Collections, Approved Under Paperwork Reduction Act, you will find this form under OMB number 1545-0902, which says U.S. withholding tax-return for dispositions by foreign persons of U.S. real property interests-statement of withholding on dispositions, by foreign persons, of U.S. Form #8288 #8288a. These codes have since been changed to read as follows; IMF 300-309, Barred Assesment, CP 55 generated valid for MFT-30, which is the code for 1040 form. IMF 310-399 reserved, the BMF 300-309 reads the same as IMF 300-309. BMF 390-399 reads U.S. /U.K. Tax Treaty Claims. The long and short of it is nothing changed, the government just made it plainer, the 1040 is the payment of a foreign tax to the king/queen of England. We have been in financial servitude since the Treaty of 1783.

Another Treaty between England and the United States was Jay's Treaty of 1794 (footnote 5). If you will remember from the Paris Treaty of 1783, John Jay Esqr. was one of the negotiators of the Treaty. In 1794 he negotiated another Treaty with Britain. There was great controversy among the American people about this Treaty.

In Article 2 you will see the king is still on land that was supposed to be ceded to the United States at the Paris Treaty. This is 13 years after America supposedly won the Revolutionary War. I guess someone forgot to tell the king of England. In Article 6, the king is still dictating terms to the United States concerning the collection of debt and damages, the British government and World Bankers claimed we owe. In Article 12 we find the king dictating terms again, this time concerning where and with whom the United States could trade. In Article 18 the United States agrees to a wide variety of material that would be subject to confiscation if Britain found said material going to its enemy's ports. Who won the Revolutionary War?

That's right, we were conned by some of our early fore fathers into believing that we are free and sovereign people, when in fact we had the same status as before the Revolutionary War. I say had, because our status is far worse now than then. I'll explain.

Early on in our history the king was satisfied with the interest made by the Bank of the United States. But when the Bank Charter was canceled in 1811 it was time to gain control of the government, in order to shape government policy and public policy. Have you never asked yourself why the British, after burning the White House and all our early records during the War of 1812, left and did not take over the government? The reason they did, was to remove the greatest barrier to their plans for this country. That barrier was the newly adopted 13th Amendment to the United States Constitution. The purpose for this Amendment was to stop anyone from serving in the government who was receiving a Title of nobility or honor. It was and is obvious that these government employees would be loyal to the granter of the Title of nobility or honor.

The War of 1812 served several purposes. It delayed the passage of the 13th Amendment by Virginia, allowed the British to destroy the evidence of the first 12 states ratification of this Amendment, and it increased the national debt, which would coerce the Congress to reestablish the Bank Charter in 1816 after the Treaty of Ghent was ratified by the Senate in 1815.

Forgotten Amendment

The Articles of Confederation, Article VI states: "nor shall the united States in Congress assembled, or any of them, grant any Title of nobility."

The Constitution for the united States, in Article, I Section 9, clause 8 states: "No Title of nobility shall be granted by the united States; and no Person holding any Office or Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State."

Also, Section 10, clause 1 states, "No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque or Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but Gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto of Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of nobility."

There was however, no measurable penalty for violation of the above Sections; Congress saw this as a great threat to the freedom of Americans, and our Republican form of government. In January 1810 Senator Reed proposed the Thirteenth Amendment, and on April 26, 1810 was passed by the Senate 26 to 1 (1st-2nd session, p. 670) and by the House 87 to 3 on May 1, 1810 (2nd session, p. 2050) and submitted to the seventeen states for ratification. The Amendment reads as follows:

"If any citizen of the United States shall Accept, claim, receive or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office or emolument of any kind

whatever, from any emperor, king, prince or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them."

From An "American Dictionary of the English Language, 1st Edition," Noah Webster, (1828) defines nobility as: "3. The qualities which constitute distinction of rank in civil society, according to the customs or laws of the country; that eminence or dignity which a man derives from birth or title conferred, and which places him in an order above common men."; and, "4. The persons collectively who enjoy rank above commoners; the peerage."

The fore-mentioned Sections in the Constitution for the united States, and the above proposed Thirteenth Amendment sought to prohibit the above definition, which would give any advantage or privilege to some citizens an unequal opportunity to achieve or exercise political power. Thirteen of the seventeen states listed below understood the importance of this Amendment.

Date admitted Date voted for Date voted against to the Union the Amendment the Amendment

1788 Maryland Dec. 25, 1810

1792 Kentucky Jan. 31, 1811

1803 Ohio Jan. 31, 1811

1787 Delaware Feb. 2, 1811

1787 Pennsylvania Feb. 6, 1811

1787 New Jersey Feb. 13, 1811

1791 Vermont Oct. 24, 1811

1796 Tennessee Nov. 21, 1811

1788 Georgia Dec. 13, 1811

1789 North Carolina Dec. 23, 1811

1788 Massachusetts Feb. 27, 1812

1788 New Hampshire Dec. 10, 1812

1788 Virginia March 12, 1819

1788 New York March 12, 1811

1788 Connecticut May 1813

1788 South Carolina December 7, 1813

1790 Rhode Island September 15, 1814

On March 10, 1819, the Virginia legislature passed Act No. 280 (Virginia Archives of Richmond, "misc." file, p. 299 for micro- film):

"Be it enacted by the General Assembly, that there shall be published an edition of the laws of this Commonwealth in which shall be contained the following matters, that is to say: the Constitution of the united States and the amendments thereto..."

The official day of ratification was March 12, 1819; this was the date of re-publication of the Virginia Civil Code. Virginia ordered 4,000 copies, almost triple their usual order. Word of Virginia's 1819 ratification spread throughout the states and both Rhode Island and Kentucky published the new Amendment in 1822. Ohio published the new Amendment in 1824. Maine ordered 10,000 copies of the Constitution with the new Amendment to be printed for use in the public schools, and again in 1831 for their Census Edition. Indiana published the new Amendment in the Indiana Revised Laws, of 1831 on P. 20. The Northwest Territories published the new Amendment in 1833; Ohio published the new Amendment again in 1831 and in 1833. Connecticut, one of the states that voted against the new Amendment published the new Amendment in 1835. Wisconsin Territory published the new Amendment in 1839; Iowa Territory published the new Amendment in 1843; Ohio published the new Amendment again, in 1848; Kansas published the new Amendment in 1855; and Nebraska Territory published the new Amendment six years in a row from 1855 to 1860. Colorado Territory published the new Amendment in 1865 and again 1867, in the 1867 printing, the present Thirteenth Amendment (slavery Amendment) was listed as the Fourteenth Amendment. The repeated reprinting of the Amended united States Constitution is conclusive evidence of its passage.

Also, as evidence of the new Thirteenth Amendments impending passage; on December 2, 1817 John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, wrote to Buck (an attorney) regarding the position Buck had been assigned. The letter reads:

"...if it should be the opinion of this Government that the acceptance on your part of the Commission under which it was granted did not interfere with your citizenship. It is the opinion of the Executive that under the 13th amendment to the constitution by the acceptance of such an appointment from any foreign Government, a citizen of the United States ceases to enjoy that character, and becomes incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under the United States or either of them... J.Q.A.

By virtue of these titles and honors, and special privileges, lawyers have assumed political and economic advantages over the majority of citizens. A majority may vote, but only a minority (lawyers) may run for political office.

After the War of 1812 was concluded the Treaty of Ghent was signed and ratified (footnote 6). In Article 4 of the Treaty, the United States gained what was already given in the Treaty of Paris 1783, namely islands off the U.S. Coast. Also, two men were to be given the power to decide the borders and disagreements, if they could not, the power was to be given to an outside sovereign power and their decision was final and considered conclusive. In Article 9 it is admitted there are citizens and subjects in America. As you have seen, the two terms are interchangeable, synonymous. In Article 10 you will see where the idea for the overthrow of this country came from and on what issue. The issue raised by England was slavery and it was nurtured by the king's emissaries behind the scenes. This would finally lead to the Civil War, even though the Supreme Court had declared the states and their citizens property rights could not be infringed on by the United States government or Congress. This was further declared by the following Presidential quotes, where they declared to violate the states' rights would violate the U.S. Constitution. Also, history shows that slavery would not have existed much longer in the Southern states, public sentiment was changing and slavery was quickly disappearing. **The Civil War was about destroying property rights and the U.S. Constitution which supported these rights.** Read the following quotes of Presidents just before the Civil War:

"I believe that involuntary servitude, as it exists in different States of this Confederacy, is recognized by the Constitution. I believe that it stands like any other admitted right, and that the States where it exists are entitled to efficient remedies to enforce the constitutional provisions." Franklin Pierce Inaugural Address, March 4, 1853 - Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 5.

"The whole Territorial question being thus settled upon the principle of popular sovereignty-a principle as ancient as free government itself-everything of a practical nature has been decided. No other question remains for adjustment, because all agree that under the Constitution slavery in the States is beyond the reach of any human power except that of the respective States themselves wherein it exists." James Buchanan Inaugural Address, March 4, 1857 - Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 5.

"I cordially congratulate you upon the final settlement by the Supreme Court of the United States of the question of slavery in the Territories, which had presented an aspect so truly formidable at the commencement of my Administration. The right has been established of every citizen to take his property of any kind, including slaves, into the common Territories belonging equally to all the States of the Confederacy, and to have it protected there under the Federal Constitution. Neither Congress nor a Territorial legislature nor any human power has any authority to annul or impair this vested right. The supreme judicial tribunal of the country, which is a coordinate branch of the Government, has sanctioned and affirmed these principles of constitutional law, so manifestly just in themselves and so well calculated to promote peace and harmony among the States." James Buchanan, Third Annual Message, December 19, 1859 - Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 5.

So there is no misunderstanding I am not rearguing slavery. Slavery is morally wrong and contrary to God Almighty's Law. In this divisive issue, the true attack was on our natural rights and on the Constitution. The core of the attack was on our right to possess allodial property. Our God given right to own property in allodial was taken away by conquest of the Civil War. If you are free this right cannot be taken away. The opposite of free is slave or subject; we were allowed to believe we were free for about 70 years. Then the king said enough, and had the slavery issue pushed to the front by the northern press, which so formed northern public opinion, that they were willing to send their sons to die in the Civil War.

The southern States were not fighting so much for the slave issue, but for the right to own property, any property. These property rights were granted by the king in the Treaty of 1783, knowing they would soon be forfeited by the American people through ignorance. Do you think you own your house? If you were to stop paying taxes, federal or state, you would soon find out that you were just being allowed to live and pay rent for this house; the rent being the taxes to the king, who supplied the benefit of commerce. A free man not under a monarch, democracy, dictatorship or socialist government, but is under a republican form of government would not and could not have his property taken. Why! The king's tax would not and could not be levied. If the Americans had been paying attention the first 70 years to the subterfuge and corruption of the Constitution and government representatives, instead of chasing the money supplied by the king, the Conquest of this country during the Civil War could have been avoided. George Washington had vision during the Revolutionary War, concerning the Civil War. You need to read it. Footnote

7

Civil War and the Conquest that followed

The government and press propaganda that the War was to free the black people from slavery is ridiculous, once you understand the Civil War Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments. The black people are just as much slaves today as before the Civil War just as the white people are, finding us subjects of the king/queen of England. The only thing that changed for black people is they changed masters and were granted a few rights, which I might add can be taken away anytime the government chooses. Since the 1930's the black people have been paid reparations to buy off their silence, in other words, keep the slaves on the plantation working. I do not

say this to shock or come across as prejudiced, because I'm not. Here's what Russell Means said, for those that don't remember who he is, he was the father in the movie called, "Last of the Mohicans". Russell Means said "until the white man is free we will never be free", the "we" to which he refers, are the Indians. There has never been a truer statement, however the problem is the white people are not aware of their enslavement.

At the risk of being redundant; to set the record straight, because Lord only knows what will be said about what I just said regarding black people, I believe that if you are born in this country you are equal, period. Forget the empty promises of civil rights, what about you unalienable natural rights under God Almighty. All Americans are feudal tenants on the land, allowed to rent the property they live on as long as the king gets his cut. What about self-determination, or being able to own allodial title to property, which means the king cannot take your property for failure to pay a tax. Which means you did not own it to begin with. The king allows you to use the material goods and land. Again this is financial servitude.

"The ultimate ownership of all property is in the state; individual so-called 'ownership' is only by virtue of government, i.e., law, amounting to a mere user; and use must be in accordance with law and subordinate to the necessities of the State." Senate Document No. 43, "Contracts payable in Gold" written in 1933.

The king controlled the government by the time the North won the Civil War, through the use of lawyers that called the shots behind the scenes, just as they do now and well placed subjects in the United States government. This would not have been possible if not for England destroying our documents in 1812 and the covering up of state documents of the original 13th Amendment.

According to International law, what took place when the North conquered the South? First, you have to understand the word "conquest" in international law. When you conquer a state you acquire the land; and those that were subject to the conquered state, then become subject to its conquer. The laws of the conquered state remain in force until the conquering state wishes to change all or part of them. At the time of conquest the laws of the conquered state are subject to change or removal, which means the law no longer lies with the American people through the Constitution, but lies with the new sovereign. The Constitution no longer carries any power of its own, but drives its power from the new sovereign, the conqueror. The reason for this is the Constitution derived its power from the people, when they were defeated, so was the Constitution.

The following is the definition of Conquest: "The acquisition of the sovereignty of a country by force of arms, exercised by an independent power which reduces the vanquished to submission to its empire." "The intention of the conqueror to retain the conquered territory is generally manifested by formal proclamation of annexation, and when this is combined with a recognized ability to retain the conquered territory, the transfer of sovereignty is complete. A treaty of peace based upon the principle of *uti possidetis* (q.v.) is formal recognition of conquest." "The effects of conquest are to confer upon the conquering state the public property of the conquered state, and to invest the former with the rights and obligations of the latter; treaties entered into by the conquered state with other states remain binding upon the annexing state, and the debts of the extinct state must be taken over by it. Conquest likewise invests the conquering state with sovereignty over the subjects of the conquered state. Among subjects of the conquered state are to be included persons domiciled in the conquered territory who remain there after the annexation. The people of the conquered state change their allegiance but not their relations to one another." *Leitensdorfer v. Webb*, 20 How. (U.S.) 176, 15 L. Ed. 891. "After the transfer of political jurisdiction to the conqueror the municipal laws of the territory continue in force until abrogated by the new sovereign." *American Ins. Co. v. Canter*, 1 Pet. (U.S.) 511, 7 L. Ed. 242. Conquest, In international Law. - Bouvier's Law Dictionary

What happened after the Civil War? Did not U.S. troops force the southern states to accept the Fourteenth Amendment? The laws of America, the Constitution were changed by the conquering government. Why? The main part I want you to see, as I said at the beginning of this paper, is who controls the money and commerce. The Fourteenth Amendment says the government debt cannot be questioned. Why?

Because now the king wants all the gold, silver, copper, and the land; which can be easily taken by increasing the government debt and making the American people sureties for the debt. This has all been done by sleight of hand of the lawyers and bankers.

The conquering state is known as a Belligerent. Read the following quotes.

Belligerency, is International Law

"The status of de facto statehood attributed to a body of insurgents, by which their hostilities are legalized. Before they can be recognized as belligerents they must have some sort of political organization and be carrying on what is international law is regarded as legal war. There must be an armed struggle between two political bodies, each of which exercises de facto authority over persons within a determined territory, and commands an army which is prepared to observe the ordinary laws of war. It is not enough that the insurgents have an army; they must have an organized civil authority directing the army." "The exact point at which revolt or insurrection becomes belligerency is often extremely difficult to determine; and belligerents are not usually recognized by nations unless they have some strong reason or necessity for doing so, either because the territory where the belligerency is supposed to exist is contiguous to their own, or because the conflict is in some way affecting their commerce or the rights of their citizens...One of the most serious results of recognizing belligerency is that it frees the parent country from all responsibility for what takes place within the insurgent lined; Dana's Wheaton, note 15, page 35." Bouvier's Law Dictionary

Belligerent - In International Law

"As adj. and noun. Engaged in lawful war; a state so engaged. In plural. A body of insurgents who by reason of their temporary organized government are regarded as conducting lawful hostilities. Also, militia, corps of volunteers, and others, who although not part of the regular army of the state, are regarded as lawful combatants provided they observe the laws of war; 4 H. C. 1907, arts, 1, 2." Bouvier's Law Dictionary

According to the International law no law has been broken. Read the following about military occupation, notice the third paragraph. After the Civil War, title to the "conquered" land had not been completed until sometime after 1933. I will address this in a moment. In the last paragraph, it says the Commander-in-Chief governs the conquered state. The proof that this is the case today is that the U.S. flies the United States flag with a yellow fringe on three sides. According to the United States Code, Title 4, Sec. 1, the U.S. flag does not have a fringe on it. The difference being one is a Constitutional flag, while the other, the fringed flag, is a military flag. The military flag means you are in a military occupation and are governed by the Commander-in-Chief in his executive capacity and not under any Constitutional authority. Read the following.

Military Occupation

"This at most gives the invader certain partial and limited rights of sovereignty. Until conquest, the sovereign rights of the original owner remain intact. Conquest gives the conqueror full rights of sovereignty and, retroactively, legalizes all acts done by him during military occupation. Its only essential is actual and exclusive possession, which must be effective." "A conqueror may exercise governmental authority, but only when in actual possession of the enemy's country; and this will be exercised upon principles of international law; MacLeod v. U.S., 229 U.S. 416, 33 Sup. Ct 955, 57 L. Ed. 1260." "The occupant administers the government and may, strictly speaking, change the municipal law, but it is considered the duty of the occupant to make as few changes in the ordinary administration of the laws as possible, though he may proclaim martial law if necessary. He may occupy public land and buildings; he cannot alienate them so as to pass a good title, but a subsequent conquest would probably complete the title..." "Private lands and houses are usually exempt. Private movable property is exempt, though subject to contributions and requisitions. The former are payments of money, to be levied only by the commander-in-chief...Military necessity may require the destruction of private property, and hostile acts of communities or individuals may be punished in the same way. Property may be liable to seizure as booty on the field of battle, or when a town refuses to capitulate and is carried by assault. When military occupation ceases, the state of things which existed previously is restored under the fiction of

postliminium (q.v.)" "Territory acquired by war must, necessarily, be governed, in the first instance, by military power under the direction of the president, as commander-in-chief. Civil government can only be put in operation by the action of the appropriate political department of the government, at such time and in such degree as it may determine. It must take effect either by the action of the treaty-making power, or by that of congress. So long as congress has not incorporated the territory into the United States, neither military occupation nor cession by treaty makes it domestic territory, in the sense of the revenue laws. Congress may establish a temporary government, which is not subject to all the restrictions of the constitution. Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244, 21 Sup Ct. 770, 45 L. Ed. 1088, per Gray, J., concurring in the opinion of the court." Bouvier's Law Dictionary

Paragraph 1-3 of the definition of Military Occupation describes what took place during and after the Civil War. What took place during the Civil War and Post Civil War has been legal under international law. You should notice in paragraph 3, that at the end of the Civil War, title to the land was not complete, but the subsequent Conquest completed the title. When was the next Conquest? 1933, when the American people were alienated by our being declared enemies of the Conquer and by their declaring war against all Americans. Read the following quotes and also (footnote 8).

The following are excerpts from the Senate Report, 93rd Congress, November 19, 1973, Special Committee On The Termination Of The National Emergency United States Senate.

Since March 9, 1933, the United States has been in a state of declared national emergency.... Under the powers delegated by these statutes, the President may: seize property; organize and control the means of production; seize commodities; assign military forces abroad; institute martial law; seize and control all transportation and communication; regulate the operation of private enterprise; restrict travel; and, in a plethora of particular ways, control the lives of all American citizens. A majority of the people of the United States have lived all of their lives under emergency rule. For 40 years, freedoms and governmental procedures guaranteed by the Constitution have, in varying degrees, been abridged by laws brought into force by states of national emergency....from, at least, the Civil War in important ways shaped the present phenomenon of a permanent state of national emergency.

In Title 12, in section 95b you'll find the following codification of the emergency war powers: The actions, regulations, rules, licenses, orders and proclamations heretofore or hereafter taken, promulgated, made, or issued by the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury since March 4, 1933, pursuant to the authority conferred by subsection (b) of section 5 of the Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (12 USCS, 95a), are hereby approved and confirmed. (March 9, 1933, c. 1, Title 1, 1, 48 Stat. 1)

It is clear that the Bankrupt, defacto government of the united States, which is operating under the War Powers Act and Executive Orders; not the Constitution for the united States, has in effect issued under its Admiralty Law, Letters of Marque (piracy) to its private agencies IRS, ATF, FBI and DEA, with further enforcement by its officers in the Courts, local police and sheriffs, waged war against the American People and has classed Americans as enemy aliens.

The following definition is from BOUVIER'S LAW DICTIONARY (P. 1934) of Letters of Marque says: "A commission granted by the government to a private individual, to take the property of a foreign state, or of the citizens or subjects of such state, as a reparation for an injury committed by such state, its citizens or subjects. The prizes so captured are divided between the owners of the privateer, the captain, and the crew. A vessel to a friendly port, but armed for its own defense in case of attack by an enemy, is also called a letter of marque."

Words and Phrases, Dictionary

By the law of nations, an enemy is defined to be "one with whom a nations at open war." When the sovereign

ruler of a state declares war against another sovereign, it is understood the whole nation declares war against that other nation. All the subjects of one are enemies to all the subjects of the other, and during the existence of the war they continue enemies, in whatever country they may happen to be, "and all persons residing within the territory occupied by the belligerents, although they are in fact foreigners, are liable to be treated as enemies." Grinnan v. Edwards, 21 W.Va. 347, 357, quoting Vatt. Law.Nat.bk. 3, c. 69-71

So we find ourselves enemies in our own country and subjects of a king that has conquered our land, with heavy taxation and no possibility of fair representation.

The government has, through the laws of forfeiture, taken prize and booty for the king; under the Admiralty Law and Executive powers as declared by the Law of the Flag. None of which could have been done with the built in protection contained in the true Thirteenth Amendment, which has been kept from the American People. The fraudulent Amendments and legislation that followed the Civil War, bankrupted the American People and put the privateers (banksters) in power, and enforced by the promise of prize and booty to their partners in crime (government).

The following is the definition of a tyrant.

Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary defines tyrant as follows: "1. an absolute ruler; one who seized sovereignty illegally; a usurper. 2. a cruel oppressive ruler; a despot. 3. one who exercises his authority in an oppressive manner, a cruel master."

"When I see that the right and means of absolute command are conferred on a people or upon a king, upon an aristocracy or a democracy, a monarchy or republic, I recognize the germ of tyranny, and I journey onwards to a land of more helpful institutions." Alexis de Tocqueville, 1 DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA, at 250 [Arlington House (1965)].

So we pick up with paragraph 4, which describes the taxation under Military Occupation and that you are under Executive control and are bound under admiralty law by the contracts we enter, including silent contracts and by Military Occupation.

Notice the last sentence in paragraph 5, Congress may establish a temporary government, which is not subject to all the restrictions of the Constitution. See also Harvard Law Review - the Insular Cases. This means you do not have a Constitutional government; you have a military dictatorship, controlled by the President as Commander-in-Chief. What is another way you can check out what I am telling you? Read the following quotes.

"...[T]he United States may acquire territory by conquest or by treaty, and may govern it through the exercise of the power of Congress conferred by Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution... In exercising this power, Congress is not subject to the same constitutional limitations, as when it is legislating for the United States. ...And in general the guaranties of the Constitution, save as they are limitations upon the exercise of executive and legislative power when exerted for or over our insular possessions, extend to them only as Congress, in the exercise of its legislative power over territory belonging to the United States, has made those guarantees applicable." [Hooven & Allison & Co. vs Evatt, 324 U.S. 652 (1945)]

"The idea prevails with some indeed, it found expression in arguments at the bar that **we have in this country substantially or practically two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument,** by exercising such powers as other nations of the earth are accustomed to exercise. I take leave to say that if the

principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will be the result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism.

It will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of a government outside of the supreme law of the land finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the constitution." [Downes vs Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)]

A Military Flag

And to further confirm and understand the significance of what I have told you, you need to understand the fringe on the United States flag. Read the following.

First the appearance of our flag is defined in Title 4 sec. 1. U.S.C. "The flag of the United States shall be thirteen horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; and the union of the flag shall be forty-eight stars, white in a blue field." (When new states are admitted, new stars are added.)

A foot note was added on page 1113 of the same section which says: "Placing of fringe on the national flag, the dimensions of the flag, and arrangement of the stars are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but within the discretion of the President as commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy." 1925, 34 Op.Atty.Gen. 483.

The president, as military commander, can add a yellow fringe to our flag. When would this be done? During time of war. Why? A flag with a fringe is an ensign, a military flag. Read the following.

"Pursuant to U.S.C. Chapter 1, 2, and 3; Executive Order No. 10834, August 21, 1959, 24 F.R. 6865, a military flag is a flag that resembles the regular flag of the United States, except that it has a YELLOW FRINGE, bordered on three sides. The President of the United states designates this deviation from the regular flag, by executive order, and in his capacity as COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF of the Armed forces."

From the National Encyclopedia, Volume 4:

"Flag, an emblem of a nation; usually made of cloth and flown from a staff. From a military standpoint flags are of two general classes, those flown from stationary masts over army posts, and those carried by troops in formation. The former are referred to by the general name flags. The latter are called colors when carried by dismounted troops. Colors and Standards are more nearly square than flags and are made of silk with a knotted Fringe of Yellow on three sides...use of the flag. The most general and appropriate use of the flag is as a symbol of authority and power."

"...The agency of the master is devolved upon him by the law of the flag. The same law that confers his authority ascertains its limits, and the flag at the mast-head is notice to all the world of the extent of such power to bind the owners or freighters by his act. The foreigner who deals with this agent has notice of that law, and, if he be bound by it, there is not injustice. His notice is the national flag which is hoisted on every sea and under which the master sails into every port, and every circumstance that connects him with the vessel isolates that vessel in the eyes of the world, and demonstrates his relation to the owners and freighters as their agent for a specific purpose and with power well defined under the national maritime law." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914.

Don't be thrown by the fact they are talking about the sea, and that it doesn't apply to land. Admiralty law came on land in 1845 with the Act of 1845 by Congress. Next a court case:

"Pursuant to the "Law of the Flag", a military flag does result in jurisdictional implication when flown. The Plaintiff cites the following: "Under what is called international law, the law of the flag, a ship-owner who sends his vessel into a foreign port gives notice by his flag to all who enter into contracts with the shipmaster that he intends the law of the flag to regulate those contracts with the shipmaster that he either submit to its operation or not contract with him or his agent at all." *Ruhrstrat v. People*, 57 N.E. 41, 45, 185 ILL. 133, 49 LRA 181, 76 AM.

I have had debates with folks that take great issue with what I have said, they dogmatically say the constitution is the law and the government is outside the law. I wish they were right, but they fail to see or understand that the American people have been conquered, unknowingly, but conquered all the same. That is why a judge will tell you not to bring the Constitution into his court, or a law dictionary, because he is the law, not the Constitution. You have only to read the previous Senates report on National Emergency, to understand the Constitution and our Constitutional form of government no longer exists.

Social Security

I fail to understand how the American people could have been so "dumbed down" as to not see that the Social Security system is fraudulent and that it is based on socialism, which is the redistribution of wealth and right out of the communist manifesto. The Social Security system is fraud. It is insolvent and was never intended to be anything but. Its true use is for a national identification number; a requirement to receive benefits from the conquerors (king). The Social Security system is made to look and act like insurance and all insurance is governed by admiralty law, which is the king's way of binding those involved with commerce to him.

"The Social Security system may be accurately described as a form of Social Insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress' power to "spend money in aid of the 'general welfare'," *Helvering vs. Davis* [301 U.S., at 640]

"My judgment accordingly is that policies of insurance are within... the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States." Federal Judge Story, in *DELOVIO VS. BOIT*, 7 Federal Cases, #3776, at page 444 (1815)

You need to know and understand what contribution means in F.I.C.A., Federal Insurance Contribution Act. Read the following definition.

Contribution. Right of one who has discharged a common liability to recover of another also liable, the aliquot portion which he ought to pay or bear. Under principle of "contribution," a tort-feasor against whom a judgment is rendered is entitled to recover proportional shares of judgment from other joint tort-feasor whose negligence contributed to the injury and who were also liable to the plaintiff. (Cite omitted) The share of a loss payable by an insure when contracts with two or more insurers cover the same loss. The insurer's share of a loss under a coinsurance or similar provision. The sharing of a loss or payment is the act of any one or several of a number of co-debtors, co-sureties, etc., reimbursing one of their number who has paid the whole debt or suffered the whole liability, each to the extent of his proportionate share. (Blacks Law Dictionary 6th ed.)

Thereby making you obligated for the national debt. The Social Security system is one of the contractual nexus' between you and the king. Because you are involved in the king's commerce and have asked voluntarily for his protection, you have accomplished the following. You have admitted that you are equally responsible for having caused the national debt and that you are a wrong doer, as defined by the above legal definition. You have admitted to being a Fourteenth Amendment citizen, who only has civil rights granted by the king. By being a Fourteenth Amendment citizen, you have agreed that you do not have standing in court to question the national debt. Keep in mind this is beyond the status of our country and people, which I covered earlier in this paper. We are in this system of law because of the conquest of our country.

Congress has transferred its Constitutional obligation of coining money to the federal reserve, the representatives of the king, this began after the Civil War and the overturning of the U.S. Constitution, as a result of CONQUEST. You have used this fiat money without objection, which is a commercial benefit, supplied by the king's bankers. Fiat money has no real value, other than the faith in it, and you CANNOT pay a debt with fiat money, because it is a debt instrument. A Federal Reserve note is a promise to pay and is only evidence of debt. The benefit you have received is you are allowed to discharge your debt, which means you pass on financial servitude to someone else. That someone else is our children.

When you go to the grocery store and hand the clerk a fifty dollar Federal Reserve note you have stolen the groceries and passed fifty dollars of debt to the seller. Americans try to acquire as much of this fiat money as they can. If Americans were aware of this; it wouldn't matter to them, because they don't care if the merchandise is stolen as long as it is legal. But what happens if the system fails? Those with the most fiat money or real property, which was obtained with fiat money will be forfeited to the king, everything that was obtained with this fiat money reverts back to the king temporary, I will explain in the conclusion of this paper. Because use of his fiat money is a benefit, supplied by the king's bankers; it all transfers back to the king. The king's claim to the increase in this country comes from the original Charter of 1606. But, it is all hidden, black is white and white is black, wealth is actually debt and financial slavery.

For those that do not have a Social Security number or think they have rescinded it, you are no better off. As far as the king is concerned you are subject to him also. Why? Well, just to list a couple of reasons other than conquest. You use his money and as I said before, this is discharging debt, without prosecution. You use the goods and services that were obtained by this fiat money, to enrich your life style and sustain yourself. You drive or travel, which ever definition you want to use, on the king's highways and roads for pleasure and to earn a living; meaning you are involved in the king's commerce. On top of these reasons which are based on received benefits, this country HAS BEEN CONQUERED!

I know a lot of patriots won't like this. Your (our) argument has been that the government has and is operating outside of the law (United States Constitution). Believe me I don't like sounding like the devil's advocate, but as far as international law goes; and the laws that govern War between countries, the king/queen of England rule this country, first by financial servitude and then by actual Conquest and Military Occupation. The Civil War was the beginning of the Conquest, as evidenced by the Fourteenth Amendment. This Amendment did several things, as already mentioned. It created the only citizenship available to the conquered and declared that these citizens had no standing in any court to challenge the monetary policies of the new government. Why? So the king would always receive his gain from his Commercial venture. The Amendment also eliminated your use of natural rights and gave the Conquered civil rights. The Conquered are governed by public policy, instead of Republic of self-government under God Almighty. Your argument that this can't be, is frivolous and without merit, the evidence is conclusive.

Nothing has changed since before the Revolutionary War.

All persons, whose activities in King's Commerce are such that they fall under this marine-like environment, are into an invisible Admiralty Jurisdiction Contract. Admiralty Jurisdiction is the KING'S COMMERCE of the High Seas, and if the King is a party to the sea-based Commerce (such as by the King having financed your ship, or the ship is carrying the King's guns), then that Commerce is properly governed by the special rules applicable to Admiralty Jurisdiction. But as for that slice of Commerce going on out on the High Seas without the King as a party, that Commerce is called Maritime Jurisdiction, and so Maritime is the private Commerce that transpires in a marine environment. At least, that distinction between Admiralty and Maritime is the way things once were, but no more. George Mercier, Invisible Contracts, 1984.

What Lincoln and Jefferson said about the true American danger was very prophetic.

"All the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined could not, by force, take a drink from the Ohio, or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years. At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach, us it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be its author and finisher. Abraham Lincoln

"Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless... the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis is [now] while our rulers are honest, and ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war we shall be going downhill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and their rights disregarded. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money, and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion. Thomas Jefferson

Below are the political platforms of the Democrats and the Republicans, as you can see there is no difference between the two, plain socialism. They are both leading America to a World government, just as Cornwallis said, and that government will be the British Empire or promoted by the British.

"We have built foundations for the security of those who are faced with the hazards of unemployment and old age; for the orphaned, the crippled, and the blind. On the foundation of the Social Security Act we are determined to erect a structure of economic security for all our people, making sure that this benefit shall keep step with the ever increasing capacity of America to provide a high standard of living for all its citizens."
DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORM OF 1936, at page 360, infra.

"Real security will be possible only when our productive capacity is sufficient to furnish a decent standard of living for all American families and to provide a surplus for future needs and contingencies. For the attainment of that ultimate objective, we look to the energy, self-reliance and character of our people, and to our system of free enterprise. "Society has an obligation to promote the security of the people, by affording some measure of protection against involuntary unemployment and dependency in old age. The NEW DEAL policies, while purporting to provide social security, have, in fact, endangered it. "We propose a system of old age security, based upon the following principles:

1. We approve a PAY AS YOU GO policy, which requires of each generation the support of the aged and the determination of what is just and adequate.
2. Every American citizen over 65 should receive a supplemental payment necessary to provide a minimum income sufficient to protect him or her from want.
3. Each state and territory, upon complying with simple and general minimum standards, should receive from the Federal Government a graduated contribution in proportion to its own, up to a fixed maximum.
4. To make this program consistent with sound fiscal policy the Federal revenues for this purpose must be provided from the proceeds of a direct tax widely distributed. All will be benefitted and all should contribute. "We propose to encourage adoption by the states and territories of honest and practical measures for meeting the problems of employment insurance."The unemployment insurance and old age annuity of the present Social Security Act are unworkable and deny benefits to about two-thirds of our adult population, including professional men and women and all engaged in agriculture and domestic service, and the self-employed, while imposing heavy tax burdens upon all."

- REPUBLICAN PARTY PLATFORM OF 1936, at page 366.

Both PLATFORMS appear in NATIONAL PARTY PLATFORMS -- 1840 TO 1972;

Compiled by Ronald Miller [University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois (1973)

CONCLUSION

Jesus gave us the most profound warning and advice of all time, Hosea 4:6 "My people are destroyed by a lack of knowledge." This being our understanding and spiritual development in His Word. When applied to the many facets of life, His Word exposes all of life's pit falls. Jesus Christ's Word covers all aspects of life.

The working class during the 1700's was far more educated than now, but this was still not enough to protect them from the secret subterfuge practiced by the lawyers and bankers. Only with understanding of Jesus Christ's Word, can the evil application of man's law be exposed and understood for what it is. This is why Jesus Christ also warned of the beguilement of the lawyers and the deceit and deception they practice.

Another reason, the working class have been unable to understand their enslavement, is because of the time spent working for a living. At wages supplied by the upper class, sufficient to live and even prosper, but never enough to attain upper class status. This is basic class warfare. This system is protected by the upper class controlling public education, to limit and focus the working class's knowledge, to maintain class separation.

What does this have to do with this paper? Everything! This is the reason our upper class fore fathers submitted to the king in the Treaty of 1783. After this Treaty and up to the Civil War, the working class was busy making this the greatest Country in the history of the world. You see they believed they were free; a freeman will work much harder than a man that is subject or a slave. As a whole, the working class was not paying attention to what the government was doing, including its Treaties and laws. This allowed time for the banking procedures and laws to be put in place over time, while the nation slept, so the nation could be conquered during the Civil War. The only way to regain this county is with the re-education of the working class, so they can make informed decisions and vote the mis-managers of our government out of office. We could then reverse the post Civil War socialist laws and the one world government laws, which have been gradually put in place since the Civil War. **Until the defeat of America is recognized, victory will never be attainable.** Only through reliance by faith on Jesus Christ and the teaching of His Kingdom will we realize our freedom. As I said earlier, just as this Country has been conquered, when Jesus Christ returns he conquers all nations and takes possession of His Kingdom and rules them with a rod of iron (Rev. 11:15-18). His right of ownership is enforced by THE LAW, God Almighty.

"...And to preserve their independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts as that we must be taxed in our meat and in our drink, in our necessaries and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our callings and our creeds, as the people of England are, our people, like them, must come to labor sixteen hours in the twenty-four, and give the earnings of fifteen of these to the government for their debts and daily expenses; and the sixteenth being insufficient to afford us bread, we must live, as they now do, on oatmeal and potatoes; have not time to think, no means of calling the mismanager's to account; but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow sufferers..."

(Thomas Jefferson) THE MAKING OF AMERICA, p. 395

The New World Order

War and Emergency Powers Acts & Executive Orders

"A majority of the people of the United States have lived all of their lives under emergency rule. For 40 years **[now 66 years]**, freedoms and governmental procedures guaranteed by the Constitution have, in varying degrees, been abridged by laws brought into force by states of national emergency. The problem of how a constitutional democracy reacts to great crises, however, far antedates the Great Depression. As a philosophical issue, its origins reach back to the Greek city-states and the Roman Republic. And, in the United States, actions taken by the Government in times of great crises have - from, at least, the Civil War - in important ways, shaped the present phenomenon of a **permanent state of national emergency.**"

"Since March 9, 1933, the United States has been in a state of declared national emergency. In fact, there are now in effect four presidentially proclaimed states of national emergency: In addition to the national emergency declared by President Roosevelt in 1933, there are also the national emergency proclaimed by President Truman on December 16, 1950, during the Korean conflict, and the states of national emergency declared by President Nixon on March 23, 1970, and August 15, 1971.

These proclamations give force to 470 provisions of Federal law **[hundreds more since 1973, particularly in the Clinton administration since Jan 21, 1993]**. These hundreds of statutes delegate to the President extraordinary powers, ordinarily exercised by the Congress, which affect the lives of American citizens in a host of all-encompassing manners. This vast range of powers, taken together, confers enough authority to rule the country without reference to normal Constitutional processes.

Under the powers delegated by these statutes, the President may: seize property; organize and control the means of production; seize commodities; assign military forces abroad; institute martial law; seize and control all transportation and communication; regulate the operation of private enterprise; restrict travel; and, in a plethora of particular ways, control the lives of all American citizens."

When the Southern states walked out of Congress on March 27, 1861, the quorum to conduct business under the Constitution was lost. The only votes that Congress could lawfully take, under Parliamentary Law, were those to set the time to reconvene, take a vote to get a quorum, and vote to adjourn and set a date, time, and place to reconvene at a later time, but instead, Congress abandoned the House and Senate without setting a date to reconvene. Under the parliamentary law of Congress, when this happened, Congress became sine die (pronounced see-na dee-a; literally "without day") and thus when Congress adjourned sine die, **it ceased to exist as a lawful deliberative body, and the only lawful, constitutional power that could declare war was no longer lawful, or in session.**

The Southern states, by virtue of their secession from the Union, also ceased to exist sine die, and some state legislatures in the Northern bloc also adjourned sine die, and thus, all the states which were parties to creating the Constitution ceased to exist. President Lincoln executed the first executive order written by any President on April 15, 1861, **Executive Order 1**, and the nation has been ruled by the President under executive order ever since. When Congress eventually did reconvene, it was reconvened under the military authority of the Commander-in-Chief and not by Rules of Order for Parliamentary bodies or by Constitutional Law; placing the American people under martial rule ever since that national emergency declared by President Lincoln. The Constitution for the United States of America temporarily ceased to be the law of the land, and the President, Congress, and the Courts unlawfully presumed that they were free to remake the nation in their own image, whereas, lawfully, no constitutional provisions were in place which afforded power to any of the actions which were taken which presumed to place the nation under the new form of control.

President Lincoln knew that he had no authority to issue any executive order, and thus he commissioned **General Orders No. 100** (April 24, 1863) as a special field code to govern his actions under martial law and which justified the seizure of power, which extended the laws of the District of Columbia, and which fictionally implemented the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17-18 of the Constitution beyond the boundaries of Washington, D.C. and into the several states. General Orders No. 100, also called the Lieber Instructions and the Lieber Code, extended The Laws of War and International Law onto American soil, and the United States government became the presumed conqueror of the people and the land.

Martial rule was kept secret and has never ended, the nation has been ruled under Military Law by the Commander of Chief of that military; the President, under his assumed executive powers and according to his executive orders. Constitutional law under the original Constitution is enforced only as a matter of keeping the public peace under the provisions of General Orders No. 100 under martial rule. Under Martial Law, title is a mere fiction, since all property belongs to the military except for that property which the Commander-in-Chief may, in his benevolence, exempt from taxation and seizure and upon which he allows the enemy to reside.

President Lincoln was assassinated before he could complete plans for reestablishing constitutional government in the Southern States and end the martial rule by executive order, and **the 14th Article in Amendment to the Constitution created a new citizenship status for the new expanded jurisdiction. New laws for the District of Columbia were established and passed by Congress in 1871, supplanting those established Feb. 27, 1801 and May 3, 1802. The District of Columbia was re-incorporated in 1872, and all states in the Union were reformed as Franchisees of the Federal Corporation** so that a new Union of the United States could be created. The key to when the states became Federal Franchisees is related to the date when such states enacted the Field Code in law. The Field Code was a codification of the common law that was adopted first by New York and then by California in 1872, and shortly afterwards the Lieber Code was used to bring the United States into the 1874 Brussels Conference and into the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907.

In 1917, the Trading with the Enemy Act (Public Law 65-91, 65th Congress, Session I, Chapters 105, 106, October 6, 1917) was passed and which defined, regulated and punished trading with enemies, who were then required by that act to be licensed by the government to do business. The National Banking System Act (Public Law 73-1, 73rd Congress, Session I, Chapter 1, March 9, 1933), Executive Proclamation 2038 (March 6, 1933), Executive Proclamation 2039 (March 9, 1933), and Executive Orders 6073, 6102, 6111 and 6260 prove that in 1933, the United States Government formed under the executive privilege of the original martial rule went bankrupt, and a new state of national emergency was declared under which United States citizens were named as the enemy to the government and the banking system as per the provisions of the Trading with the Enemy Act. The legal system provided for in the Constitution was formally changed in 1938 through the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Erie Railroad Co. v. Tompkins*, 304 US 64, 82 L.Ed. 1188.

On April 25, 1938, the Supreme Court overturned the standing precedents of the prior 150 years concerning "COMMON LAW" in the federal government.

THERE IS NO FEDERAL COMMON LAW, AND CONGRESS HAS NO POWER TO DECLARE SUBSTANTIVE RULES OF COMMON LAW applicable IN A STATE, WHETHER they be LOCAL or GENERAL in their nature, be they COMMERCIAL LAW or a part of LAW OF TORTS." (See: *ERIE RAILROAD CO. vs. THOMPkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 82 L. Ed. 1188)

The significance is that since the Erie Decision, no cases are allowed to be cited that are prior to 1938. There can be no mixing of the old law with the new law. The Common Law is the fountain source of Substantive and Remedial Rights, if not our very Liberties. **In 1945 the United States gave up any remaining national sovereignty when it signed the United Nations Treaty, making all American citizens subject to United Nations jurisdiction.** The "constitution" of the United Nations may be compared to that of the old Soviet Union.

THE EXECUTIVE ORDER:

A Presidential Power not designated by the Constitution

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution is concise in its language, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." When the Constitution was proposed, those opposed to a strong central government, the anti-Federalists, argued that there was no Bill of Rights to protect the people and that a centralized government would become too powerful, usurping the rights of the individual States.

At the time of its formation, the Constitution was created in secrecy and in direct contradiction to the mandate of the Congress, which was to amend the Articles of Confederation that were governing the infant nation since the end of the American Revolution. Under the Articles of Confederation, the President of the United States was known as the President of the United States in Congress Assembled. The one-year Presidency was very limited in its scope, responsibility and authority. The Constitution, in contrast to the Articles of Confederation, established a strong four-year Presidency, but still only providing extremely limited powers to the office.

The greatest fear the founders of this nation had was the establishment of a strong central government and a strong political leader at the center of that government. They no longer wanted kings, potentates or czars; they wanted a loose association of States in which the power emanated from the States and not from the central government.

John Adams advocated that a good government consists of three balancing powers, the legislative, executive and the judicial, that would produce an equilibrium of interests and thereby promote the happiness of the whole community. It was Adams' theory that the only effectual method to secure the rights of the people and promote their welfare was to create an opposition of interests between the members of two distinct bodies (legislative and executive) in the exercise of the powers of government, and balanced by those of a third (judicial).

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

On June 8, 1789, James Madison proposed the Bills of Rights to the new Congress. Its eventual creation was the outcropping of arguments made in the respective State legislatures debating ratification of the new Constitution. Madison had previously been opposed to the establishment of the Bill of Rights, but the treatises of Thomas Jefferson convinced him of the necessity of such Constitutional amendments. The concept was simple, according to Madison, "That all power is originally vested in, and consequently derived from the people. That government is instituted and ought to be exercised for the benefit of the people; which consists in the enjoyment of life and liberty and the right of acquiring property, and generally of pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety. That the people have an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to reform or change their government whenever it be found adverse or inadequate to the purpose of its institution."

He further advocated, "The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship... The people shall not be deprived or abridged of their right to speak, to write, or to publish their sentiments; and the freedom of the press, as one of the great bulwarks of liberty, shall be inviolable. The people shall not be restrained from peaceably assembling and consulting for their common good; nor for applying to the legislature by petitions or remonstrances for redress of their grievances... The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The framework of this nation is embodied in the Bill of Rights, unequalled in its time, and surpassed by none to date. Madison also stated, "The rights of the people to be secured in their persons, their houses, their papers, and their other property from all unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated by warrants issued without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, or not particularly describing the places to be searched, or the persons or things to be seized." He added, "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial to be informed of the cause and nature of the accusation, to be confronted with his accusers and the witnesses against him; to have a compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense."

THE EXECUTIVE ORDER IN TIME OF WAR

Many of the fears of the founding fathers may now be coming to fruition. Today, the executive branch of the government is immensely powerful, much more powerful than the founding fathers had envisioned or wanted. Congressional legislative powers have been usurped. There is no greater example of that usurpation than in the form of the Presidential Executive Order. The process totally by-passes Congressional legislative authority and places in the hands of the President almost unilateral power. The Executive Order governs everything from the Flag Code of the United States to the ability to single-handedly declare Martial Law. Presidents have used the Executive Order in times of emergencies to override the Constitution of the United States and the Congress.

President Andrew Jackson used executive powers to force the law-abiding Cherokee Nation off their ancestral lands. The Cherokee fought the illegal action in the U.S. Supreme Court and won. But Jackson, using the power of the Presidency, continued to order the removal of the Cherokee Nation and defied the Court's ruling. He stated, "Let the Court try to enforce their ruling." The Cherokee lost their land and commenced a series of journeys that would be called The Trail of Tears.

President Abraham Lincoln suspended many fundamental rights guaranteed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights with Executive Order #1 on April 15, 1861. He closed down newspapers opposed to his war-time policies and imprisoned what many historians now call political prisoners. He suspended the right of trial and the right to be confronted by accusers. Lincoln's justification for such drastic actions was said to be the preservation of the Union above all things. After the war and Lincoln's death, Constitutional law was never restored.

April 15, 1861

*BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
A PROCLAMATION.*

Whereas the laws of the United States have been for some time past, and now are opposed, and the execution thereof obstructed, in the States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas, by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the powers vested in the Marshals by law,

Now therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, in virtue of the power in me vested by the Constitution, and the laws, have thought fit to call forth, and hereby do call forth, the militia of the several States of the Union, to the aggregate number of seventy-five thousand, in order to suppress said combinations, and to cause the laws to be duly executed. The details, for this object, will be immediately communicated to the State authorities through the War Department.

I appeal to all loyal citizens to favor, facilitate and aid this effort to maintain the honor, the integrity, and the existence of our National Union, and the perpetuity of popular government; and to redress wrongs already long enough endured.

I deem it proper to say that the first service assigned to the forces hereby called forth will probably be to re-possess the forts, places, and property which have been seized from the Union; and in every event, the utmost care will be observed, consistently with the objects aforesaid, to avoid any devastation, any destruction of, or interference with, property, or any disturbance of peaceful citizens in any part of the country.

And I hereby command the persons composing the combinations aforesaid to disperse, and retire peaceably to their respective abodes within twenty days from this date.

Deeming that the present condition of public affairs presents an extraordinary occasion, I do hereby, in virtue of the power in me vested by the Constitution, convene both Houses of Congress. Senators and Representatives are therefore summoned to assemble at their respective chambers, at 12 o'clock, noon, on Thursday, the fourth day of July, next, then and there to consider and determine, such measures, as, in their wisdom, the public safety, and interest may seem to demand.

In Witness Whereof I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the Seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this fifteenth day of April in the year of our Lord One thousand, Eight hundred and Sixtyone, and of the Independence the United States the Eightyfifth.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD, *Secretary of State.*

In 1917, President Woodrow Wilson could not persuade Congress to arm United States vessels plying hostile German waters before the United States entered World War One. When Congress balked, Wilson invoked the policy through a Presidential Executive Order.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 9066 in December 1941. His order forced 100,000 Japanese residents in the United States to be rounded up and placed in concentration camps. The property of the Japanese was confiscated. Both Lincoln's and Roosevelt's actions were taken during wartime, when the very life of the United States was threatened. Wilson's action was taken on the eve of the United States entering World War One. Whether history judges these actions as just, proper or legal, the decision must be left to time. The dire life struggle associated with these actions provided plausible argumentation favoring their implementation during a time when hysteria ruled an age.

THE NEW DANGERS

A Presidential Executive Order, whether Constitutional or not, becomes law simply by its publication in the Federal Registry. Congress is by-passed. Here are just a few Executive Orders that would suspend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. These Executive Orders have been on record for nearly 30 years and could be enacted by the stroke of a Presidential pen:

- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 10990** allows the government to take over all modes of transportation and control of highways and seaports.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 10995** allows the government to seize and control the communication media.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 10997** allows the government to take over all electrical power, gas, petroleum, fuels and minerals.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 10998** allows the government to take over all food resources and farms.

- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11000** allows the government to mobilize civilians into work brigades under government supervision.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11001** allows the government to take over all health, education and welfare functions.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11002** designates the Postmaster General to operate a national registration of all persons.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11003** allows the government to take over all airports and aircraft, including commercial aircraft.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11004** allows the Housing and Finance Authority to relocate communities, build new housing with public funds, designate areas to be abandoned, and establish new locations for populations.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11005** allows the government to take over railroads, inland waterways and public storage facilities.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11051** specifies the responsibility of the Office of Emergency Planning and gives authorization to put all Executive Orders into effect in times of increased international tensions and economic or financial crisis.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11310** grants authority to the Department of Justice to enforce the plans set out in Executive Orders, to institute industrial support, to establish judicial and legislative liaison, to control all aliens, to operate penal and correctional institutions, and to advise and assist the President.

Without Congressional approval, the President now has the power to transfer whole populations to any part of the country, the power to suspend the Press and to force a national registration of all persons. The President, in essence, has dictatorial powers never provided to him under the Constitution. The President has the power to suspend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights in a real or perceived emergency. Unlike Lincoln and Roosevelt, these powers are not derived from a wartime need, but from any crisis, domestic or foreign, hostile or economic. Roosevelt created extraordinary measures during the Great Depression, but any President faced with a similar, or lesser, economic crisis now has extraordinary powers to assume dictatorial status.

Many of the Executive Orders cited here have been on the books for over a quarter of a century and have not been applied. Therefore, what makes them more dangerous today than yesteryear? There has been a steady, consistent series of new Executive Orders, originating from President Richard Nixon and added to by Presidents Ronald Reagan, Jimmy Carter and George Bush that provide an ominous Orwellian portrait, the portrait of George Orwell's 1984.

THE EROSION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

A series of Executive Orders, internal governmental departmental laws, not passed by Congress, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 and the Violent Crime Control Act of 1991, has whittled down Constitutional law substantially. These new Executive Orders and Congressional Acts allow for the construction of concentration camps, suspension of rights and the ability of the President to declare Martial Law in the event of a drug crisis. Congress will have no power to prevent the Martial Law declaration and can only review the process six months after Martial Law has been declared. The most critical Executive Order was issued on August 1, 1971. Nixon signed both a proclamation and Executive Order 11615. Proclamation No. 4074 states, "I hereby declare a national emergency", thus establishing an economic crisis. That national emergency order has not been rescinded.

The crisis that changed the direction of governmental thinking was the anti-Vietnam protests. Fear that such demonstrations might explode into civil unrest, Executive Orders began to be created to allow extreme measures to be implemented to curtail the demonstrations. The recent Los Angeles riots after the Rodney King jury verdict only reinforced the government's concern about potential civil unrest and the need to have an effective mechanism to curtail such demonstrations.

Here are the later Executive Orders:

- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11049** assigns emergency preparedness function to federal departments and agencies, consolidating 21 operative Executive Orders issued over a fifteen year period.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 11921** allows the Federal Emergency Preparedness Agency to develop plans to establish control over the mechanisms of production and distribution, of energy sources, wages, salaries, credit and the flow of money in U.S. financial institution in any undefined national emergency. It also provides that when a state of emergency is declared by the President, Congress cannot review the action for six months.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 12148** created the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) that is to interface with the Department of Defense for civil defense planning and funding. An "emergency czar" was appointed. FEMA has only spent about 6 percent of its budget on national emergencies; the bulk of their funding has been used for the construction of secret underground facilities to assure continuity of government in case of a major emergency, foreign or domestic.
- **EXECUTIVE ORDER 12656** appointed the National Security Council as the principal body that should consider emergency powers. This allows the government to increase domestic intelligence and surveillance of U.S. citizens and would restrict the freedom of movement within the United States and granted the government the right to isolate large groups of civilians. The National Guard could be federalized to seal all borders and take control of U.S. air space and all ports of entry. Many of the figures in the Iran-Contra scandal were part of this emergency contingent, including Marine Colonel Oliver North.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency has broad powers in every aspect of the nation. General Frank Salzedo, chief of FEMA's Civil Security Division stated in a 1983 conference that he saw FEMA's role as a "new frontier in the protection of individual and governmental leaders from assassination, and of civil and military installations from sabotage and/or attack, as well as prevention of dissident groups from gaining access to U.S. opinion, or a global audience in times of crisis."

The Violent Crime Control Act of 1991 provides additional powers to the President of the United States, allowing the suspension of the Constitution and Constitutional rights of Americans during a "drug crisis". It provides for the construction of detention camps, seizure of property, and military control of populated areas. This, teamed with the Executive Orders of the President, enables Orwellian prophecies to rest on whoever occupies the White House. The power provided by these "laws" allows suspension of the Constitution and the rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights during any civil disturbances, major demonstrations and strikes and allows the military to implement government ordered movements of civilian populations at state and regional levels, the arrest of certain unidentified segments of the population, and the imposition of Martial Law.

When the Constitution of the United States was framed it placed the exclusive legislative authority in the hands of Congress and with the President. Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution is concise in its language, "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." That is no longer true. The Bill of Rights protected Americans against loss of freedoms. That is no longer true. The Constitution provided for a balanced separation of powers. That is no longer applicable.

Perhaps it can be summed up succinctly in the words of arch-conservative activist Howard J. Ruff. **"Since the enactment of Executive Order 11490, the only thing standing between us and dictatorship is the good character of the President, and the lack of a crisis severe enough that the public would stand still for it."**

By Harry V. Martin with research assistance from David Caul

Copyright FreeAmerica and Harry V. Martin, 1995

**No man is good enough to govern
another man without that other's
consent.**

Abraham Lincoln

The Lieber Code of 1863

CORRESPONDENCE, ORDERS, REPORTS, AND RETURNS OF THE UNION AUTHORITIES
FROM JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1863.--#7
O.R.--SERIES III--VOLUME III [S# 124]

GENERAL ORDERS No. 100.

WAR DEPT., *ADJT. GENERAL'S OFFICE*,
Washington, April 24, 1863.

The following "Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field," prepared by Francis Lieber, LL.D., and revised by a board of officers, of which Maj. Gen. E. A. Hitchcock is president, having been approved by the President of the United States, he commands that they be published for the information of all concerned.

By order of the Secretary of War:
E. D. TOWNSEND,
Assistant Adjutant-General.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE
FIELD.

SECTION I.--*Martial law--Military jurisdiction--Military necessity--Retaliation.*

1. A place, district, or country occupied by an enemy stands, in consequence of the occupation, under the martial law of the invading or occupying army, **whether any proclamation declaring martial law, or any public warning to the inhabitants, has been issued or not.** Martial law is the immediate and direct effect and consequence of occupation or conquest.

The presence of a hostile army proclaims its martial law.

2. Martial law does not cease during the hostile occupation, except by special proclamation, ordered by the commander-in-chief, or by special mention in the treaty of peace concluding the war, when the occupation of a place or territory continues beyond the conclusion of peace as one of the conditions of the same.

3. Martial law in a hostile country consists in **the suspension** by the occupying military authority **of the criminal and civil law, and of the domestic administration and government in the occupied place or territory,** and in the substitution of military rule and force for the same, as well as in the dictation of general laws, as far as military necessity requires this suspension, substitution, or dictation. The commander of the forces may proclaim that the administration of all civil and penal law shall continue either wholly or in part, as in times of peace, unless otherwise ordered by the military authority.

4. Martial law is simply military authority exercised in accordance with the laws and usages of war. Military oppression is not martial law; it is the abuse of the power which that law confers. As martial law is executed by military force, it is incumbent upon those who administer it to be strictly guided by the principles of justice, honor, and humanity--virtues adorning a soldier even more than other men, for the very reason that he possesses the power of his arms against the unarmed.

5. Martial law should be less stringent in places and countries fully occupied and fairly conquered. Much greater severity may be exercised in places or regions where actual hostilities exist or are expected and must be prepared for. Its most complete sway is allowed--even in the commander's own country--when face to face with the enemy, because of the absolute necessities of the case, and of the paramount duty to defend the country against invasion.

To save the country is paramount to all other considerations.

6. All civil and penal law shall continue to take its usual course in the enemy's places and territories under martial law, unless interrupted or stopped by order of the occupying military power; but **all the functions of the hostile government--legislative, executive, or administrative--whether of a general, provincial, or local character, cease under martial law,** or continue only with the sanction, or, if deemed necessary, the participation of the occupier or invader.

7. Martial law extends to property, and to persons, whether they are subjects of the enemy or aliens to that government.

8. Consuls, among American and European nations, are not diplomatic agents. Nevertheless, their offices and persons will be subjected to martial law in cases of urgent necessity only; their property and business are not exempted. Any delinquency they commit against the established military rule may be punished as in the case of any other inhabitant, and such punishment furnishes no reasonable ground for international complaint.

9. The functions of ambassadors, ministers, or other diplomatic agents, accredited by neutral powers to the hostile government, cease, so far as regards the displaced government; but the conquering or occupying power usually recognizes them as temporarily accredited to itself.

10. Martial law affects chiefly the police and collection of public revenue and taxes, whether imposed by the expelled government or by the invader, and refers mainly to the support and efficiency of the Army, its safety, and the safety of its operations.

11. The law of war does not only disclaim all cruelty and bad faith concerning engagements concluded with the enemy during the war, but also the breaking of stipulations solemnly contracted by the belligerents in time of peace, and avowedly intended to remain in force in case of war between the contracting powers.

It disclaims all extortions and other transactions for individual gain; all acts of private revenge, or connivance at such acts.

Offenses to the contrary shall be severely punished, and especially so if committed by officers.

12. Whenever feasible, martial law is carried out in cases of individual offenders by military courts; but sentences of death shall be executed only with the approval of the chief executive, provided the urgency of the case does not require a speedier execution, and then only with the approval of the chief commander.

13. Military jurisdiction is of two kinds: First, that which is conferred and defined by statute; second, that which is derived from the common law of war. Military offenses under the statute law must be tried in the manner therein directed; but military offenses which do not come within the statute must be tried and punished under the common law of war. The character of the courts which exercise these jurisdictions depends upon the local laws of each particular country.

In the armies of the United States the first is exercised by courts-martial; while cases which do not come within the Rules and Articles of War, or the jurisdiction conferred by statute on courts-martial, are tried by military commissions.

14. Military necessity, as understood by modern civilized nations, consists in the necessity of those measures which are indispensable for securing the ends of the war, and which are lawful according to the modern law and usages of war.

15. Military necessity admits of all direct destruction of life or limb of armed enemies, and of other persons whose destruction is incidentally unavoidable in the armed contests of the war; it allows of the capturing of every armed enemy, and every enemy of importance to the hostile government, or of peculiar danger to the captor; it allows of all destruction of property, and obstruction of the ways and channels of traffic, travel, or communication, and of all withholding of sustenance or means of life from the enemy; of the appropriation of whatever an enemy's country affords necessary for the subsistence and safety of the Army, and of such deception as does not involve the breaking of good faith either positively pledged, regarding agreements entered into during the war, or supposed by the modern law of war to exist. Men who take up arms against one another in public war do not cease on this account to be moral beings, responsible to one another and to God.

16. Military necessity does not admit of cruelty--that is, the infliction of suffering for the sake of suffering or for revenge, nor of maiming or wounding except in fight, nor of torture to extort confessions. It does not admit of the use of poison in any way, nor of the wanton devastation of a district. It admits of deception, but disclaims acts of perfidy; and, in general, military necessity does not include any act of hostility which makes the return to peace unnecessarily difficult.

17. War is not carried on by arms alone. It is lawful to starve the hostile belligerent, armed or unarmed, so that it leads to the speedier subjection of the enemy.

18. When a commander of a besieged place expels the non-combatants, in order to lessen the number of those who consume his stock of provisions, it is lawful, though an extreme measure, to drive them back, so as to hasten on the surrender.

19. Commanders, whenever admissible, inform the enemy of their intention to bombard a place, so that the non-combatants, and especially the women and children, may be removed before the bombardment commences. But it is no infraction of the common law of war to omit thus to inform the enemy. Surprise may be a necessity.

20. Public war is a state of armed hostility between sovereign nations or governments. It is a law and requisite of civilized existence that men live in political, continuous societies, forming organized units, called states or nations, whose constituents bear, enjoy, and suffer, advance and retrograde together, in peace and in war.

21. The citizen or native of a hostile country is thus an enemy, as one of the constituents of the hostile state or nation, and as such is subjected to the hardships of the war.

22. Nevertheless, as civilization has advanced during the last centuries, so has likewise steadily advanced, especially in war on land, the distinction between the private individual belonging to a hostile country and the hostile country itself, with its men in arms. The principle has been more and more acknowledged that the unarmed citizen is to be spared in person, property, and honor as much as the exigencies of war will admit.

23. Private citizens are no longer murdered, enslaved, or carried off to distant parts, and the inoffensive individual is as little disturbed in his private relations as the commander of the hostile troops can afford to grant in the overruling demands of a vigorous war.

24. The almost universal rule in remote times was, and continues to be with barbarous armies, that the private individual of the hostile country is destined to suffer every privation of liberty and protection and every disruption of family ties. Protection was, and still is with uncivilized people, the exception.

25. In modern regular wars of the Europeans and their descendants in other portions of the globe, protection of the inoffensive citizen of the hostile country is the rule; privation and disturbance of private relations are the exceptions.

26. Commanding generals may cause the magistrates and civil officers of the hostile country to take the oath of temporary allegiance or an oath of fidelity to their own victorious government or rulers, and they may expel everyone who declines to do so. But whether they do so or not, the people and their civil officers owe strict obedience to them as long as they hold sway over the district or country, at the peril of their lives.

27. The law of war can no more wholly dispense with retaliation than can the law of nations, of which it is a branch. Yet civilized nations acknowledge retaliation as the sternest feature of war. A reckless enemy often leaves to his opponent no other means of securing himself against the repetition of barbarous outrage.

28. Retaliation will therefore never be resorted to as a measure of mere revenge, but only as a means of protective retribution, and moreover cautiously and unavoidably--that is to say, retaliation shall only be resorted to after careful inquiry into the real occurrence and the character of the misdeeds that may demand retribution.

Unjust or inconsiderate retaliation removes the belligerents farther and farther from the mitigating rules of regular war, and by rapid steps leads them nearer to the internecine wars of savages.

29. Modern times are distinguished from earlier ages by the existence at one and the same time of many nations and great governments related to one another in close intercourse.

Peace is their normal condition; war is the exception. The ultimate object of all modern war is a renewed state of peace.

The more vigorously wars are pursued the better it is for humanity. Sharp wars are brief.

30. Ever since the formation and coexistence of modern nations, and ever since wars have become great national wars, war has come to be acknowledged not to be its own end, but the means to obtain great ends of state, or to consist in defense against wrong; and no conventional restriction of the modes adopted to injure the enemy is any longer admitted; but the law of war imposes many limitations and restrictions on principles of justice, faith, and honor.

SECTION II.--Public and private property of the enemy--Protection of persons, and especially of women; of religion, the arts and sciences--Punishment of crimes against the inhabitants of hostile countries.

31. A victorious army appropriates all public money, seizes all public movable property until further direction by its government, and sequesters for its own benefit or of that of its government all the revenues of real property belonging to the hostile government or nation. The title to such real property remains in abeyance during military occupation, and until the conquest is made complete.

32. A victorious army, by the martial power inherent in the same, may suspend, change, or abolish, as far as the martial power extends, the relations which arise from the services due, according to the existing laws of the invaded country, from one citizen, subject, or native of the same to another.

The commander of the army must leave it to the ultimate treaty of peace to settle the permanency of this change.

33. It is no longer considered lawful-- on the contrary, it is held to be a serious breach of the law of war--to force the subjects of the enemy into the service of the victorious government, except the latter should proclaim, after a fair and complete conquest of the hostile country or district, that it is resolved to keep the country, district, or place permanently as its own and make it a portion of its own country.

34. As a general rule, the property belonging to churches, to hospitals, or other establishments of an exclusively charitable character, to establishments of education, or foundations for the promotion of knowledge, whether public schools, universities, academies of learning or observatories, museums of the fine arts, or of a scientific character--such property is not to be considered public property in the sense of paragraph 31; but it may be taxed or used when the public service may require it.

35. Classical works of art, libraries, scientific collections, or precious instruments, such as astronomical telescopes, as well as hospitals, must be secured against all avoidable injury, even when they are contained in fortified places whilst besieged or bombarded.

36. If such works of art, libraries, collections, or instruments belonging to a hostile nation or government, can be removed without injury, the ruler of the conquering state or nation may order them to be seized and removed for the benefit of the said nation. The ultimate ownership is to be settled by the ensuing treaty of peace.

In no case shall they be sold or given away, if captured by the armies of the United States, nor shall they ever be privately appropriated, or wantonly destroyed or injured.

37. The United States acknowledge and protect, in hostile countries occupied by them, religion and morality; strictly private property; the persons of the inhabitants, especially those of women; and the sacredness of domestic relations. Offenses to the contrary shall be rigorously punished.

This rule does not interfere with the right of the victorious invader to tax the people or their property, to levy forced loans, to billet soldiers, or to appropriate property, especially houses, lands, boats or ships, and the churches, for temporary and military uses.

38. Private property, unless forfeited by crimes or by offenses of the owner, can be seized only by way of military necessity, for the support or other benefit of the Army or of the United States.

If the owner has not fled, the commanding officer will cause receipts to be given, which may serve the spoliated owner to obtain indemnity.

39. The salaries of civil officers of the hostile government who remain in the invaded territory, and continue the work of their office, and can continue it according to the circumstances arising out of the war--such as judges, administrative or political officers, officers of city or communal governments--are paid from the public revenue of the invaded territory until the military government has reason wholly or partially to discontinue it. Salaries or incomes connected with purely honorary titles are always stopped.

40. There exists no law or body of authoritative rules of action between hostile armies, except that branch of the law of nature and nations which is called the law and usages of war on land.

41. All municipal law of the ground on which the armies stand, or of the countries to which they belong, is silent and of no effect between armies in the field.

42. Slavery, complicating and confounding the ideas of property (that is, of a thing), and of personality (that is, of humanity), exists according to municipal or local law only. The law of nature and nations has never acknowledged it. The digest of the Roman law enacts the early dictum of the pagan jurist, that "so far as the law of nature is concerned, all men are equal." Fugitives escaping from a country in which they were slaves, villains, or serfs, into another country, have, for centuries past, been held free and acknowledged free by judicial decisions of European countries, even though the municipal law of the country in which the slave had taken refuge acknowledged slavery within its own dominions.

43. Therefore, in a war between the United States and a belligerent which admits of slavery, if a person held in bondage by that belligerent be captured by or come as a fugitive under the protection of the military forces of the United States, such person is immediately entitled to the rights and privileges of a freeman. To return such person into slavery would amount to enslaving a free person, and neither the United States nor any officer under their authority can enslave any human being. Moreover, a person so made free by the law of war is under the shield of the law of nations, and the former owner or State can have, by the law of postliminy, no belligerent lien or claim of service.

44. All wanton violence committed against persons in the invaded country, all destruction of property not commanded by the authorized officer, all robbery, all pillage or sacking, even after taking a place by main force, all rape, wounding, maiming, or killing of such inhabitants, are prohibited under the penalty of death, or such other severe punishment as may seem adequate for the gravity of the offense.

A soldier, officer, or private, in the act of committing such violence, and disobeying a superior ordering him to abstain from it, may be lawfully killed on the spot by such superior.

45. All captures and booty belong, according to the modern law of war, primarily to the government of the captor.

Prize money, whether on sea or land, can now only be claimed under local law.

46. Neither officers nor soldiers are allowed to make use of their position or power in the hostile country for private gain, not even for commercial transactions otherwise legitimate. Offenses to the contrary committed by commissioned officers will be punished with cashiering or such other punishment as the nature of the offense may require; if by soldiers, they shall be punished according to the nature of the offense.

47. Crimes punishable by all penal codes, such as arson, murder, maiming, assaults, highway robbery, theft, burglary, fraud, forgery, and rape, if committed by an American soldier in a hostile country against its inhabitants, are not only punishable as at home, but in all cases in which death is not inflicted the severer punishment shall be preferred.

SECTION III.--*Deserters--Prisoners of war--Hostages--Booty on the battle-field.*

48. Deserters from the American Army, having entered the service of the enemy, suffer death if they fall again into the hands of the United States, whether by capture or being delivered up to the American Army; and if a deserter from the enemy, having taken service in the Army of the United States, is captured by the enemy, and punished by them with death or otherwise, it is not a breach against the law and usages of war, requiring redress or retaliation.

49. A prisoner of war is a public enemy armed or attached to the hostile army for active aid, who has fallen into the hands of the captor, either fighting or wounded, on the field or in the hospital, by individual surrender or by capitulation.

All soldiers, of whatever species of arms; all men who belong to the rising *en masse* of the hostile country; all those who are attached to the Army for its efficiency and promote directly the object of the war, except such as are hereinafter

provided for; all disabled men or officers on the field or elsewhere, if captured; all enemies who have thrown away their arms and ask for quarter, are prisoners of war, and as such exposed to the inconveniences as well as entitled to the privileges of a prisoner of war.

50. Moreover, citizens who accompany an army for whatever purpose, such as sutlers, editors, or reporters of journals, or contractors, if captured, may be made prisoners of war and be detained as such.

The monarch and members of the hostile reigning family, male or female, the chief, and chief officers of the hostile government, its diplomatic agents, and all persons who are of particular and singular use and benefit to the hostile army or its government, are, if captured on belligerent ground, and if not provided with a safe-conduct granted by the captor's government, prisoners of war.

51. If the people of that portion of an invaded country which is not yet occupied by the enemy, or of the whole country, at the approach of a hostile army, rise, under a duly authorized levy, *en masse* to resist the invader, they are now treated as public enemies, and, if captured, are prisoners of war.

52. No belligerent has the right to declare that he will treat every captured man in arms of a levy *en masse* as a brigand or bandit.

If, however, the people of a country, or any portion of the same, already occupied by an army, rise against it, they are violators of the laws of war and are not entitled to their protection.

53. The enemy's chaplains, officers of the medical staff, apothecaries, hospital nurses, and servants, if they fall into the hands of the American Army, are not prisoners of war, unless the commander has reasons to retain them. In this latter case, or if, at their own desire, they are allowed to remain with their captured companions, they are treated as prisoners of war, and may be exchanged if the commander sees fit.

54. A hostage is a person accepted as a pledge for the fulfillment of an agreement concluded between belligerents during the war, or in consequence of a war. Hostages are rare in the present age.

55. If a hostage is accepted, he is treated like a prisoner of war, according to rank and condition, as circumstances may admit.

56. A prisoner of war is subject to no punishment for being a public enemy, nor is any revenge wreaked upon him by the intentional infliction of any suffering, or disgrace, by cruel imprisonment, want of food, by mutilation, death, or any other barbarity.

57. So soon as a man is armed by a sovereign government and takes the soldier's oath of fidelity he is a belligerent; his killing, wounding, or other warlike acts are no individual crimes or offenses. No belligerent has a right to declare that enemies of a certain class, color, or condition, when properly organized as soldiers, will not be treated by him as public enemies.

58. The law of nations knows of no distinction of color, and if an enemy of the United States should enslave and sell any captured persons of their Army, it would be a case for the severest retaliation, if not redressed upon complaint.

The United States cannot retaliate by enslavement; therefore death must be the retaliation for this crime against the law of nations.

59. A prisoner of war remains answerable for his crimes committed against the captor's army or people, committed before he was captured, and for which he has not been punished by his own authorities.

All prisoners of war are liable to the infliction of retaliatory measures.

60. It is against the usage of modern war to resolve, in hatred and revenge, to give no quarter. No body of troops has the right to declare that it will not give, and therefore will not expect, quarter; but a commander is permitted to direct his troops to give no quarter, in great straits, when his own salvation makes it impossible to cumber himself with prisoners.
61. Troops that give no quarter have no right to kill enemies already disabled on the ground, or prisoners captured by other troops.
62. All troops of the enemy known or discovered to give no quarter in general, or to any portion of the Army, receive none.
63. Troops who fight in the uniform of their enemies, without any plain, striking, and uniform mark of distinction of their own, can expect no quarter.
64. If American troops capture a train containing uniforms of the enemy, and the commander considers it advisable to distribute them for use among his men, some striking mark or sign must be adopted to distinguish the American soldier from the enemy.
65. The use of the enemy's national standard, flag, or other emblem of nationality, for the purpose of deceiving the enemy in battle, is an act of perfidy by which they lose all claim to the protection of the laws of war.
66. Quarter having been given to an enemy by American troops, under a misapprehension of his true character, he may, nevertheless, be ordered to suffer death if, within three days after the battle, it be discovered that he belongs to a corps which gives no quarter.
67. The law of nations allows every sovereign government to make war upon another sovereign State, and, therefore, admits of no rules or laws different from those of regular warfare, regarding the treatment of prisoners of war, although they may belong to the army of a government which the captor may consider as a wanton and unjust assailant.
68. Modern wars are not internecine wars, in which the killing of the enemy is the object. The destruction of the enemy in modern war, and, indeed, modern war itself, are means to obtain that object of the belligerent which lies beyond the war. Unnecessary or revengeful destruction of life is not lawful.
69. Outposts, sentinels, or pickets are not to be fired upon, except to drive them in, or when a positive order, special or general, has been issued to that effect.
70. The use of poison in any manner, be it to poison wells, or food, or arms, is wholly excluded from modern warfare. He that uses it puts himself out of the pale of the law and usages of war.
71. Whoever intentionally inflicts additional wounds on an enemy already wholly disabled, or kills such an enemy, or who orders or encourages soldiers to do so, shall suffer death, if duly convicted, whether he belongs to the Army of the United States, or is an enemy captured after having committed his misdeed.
72. Money and other valuables on the person of a prisoner, such as watches or jewelry, as well as extra clothing, are regarded by the American Army as the private property of the prisoner, and the appropriation of such valuables or money is considered dishonorable, and is prohibited.
- Nevertheless, if large sums are found upon the persons of prisoners, or in their possession, they shall be taken from them, and the surplus, after providing for their own support, appropriated for the use of the Army, under the direction of the commander, unless otherwise ordered by the Government. Nor can prisoners claim, as private property, large sums found and captured in their train, although they have been placed in the private luggage of the prisoners.
73. All officers, when captured, must surrender their side-arms to the captor. They may be restored to the prisoner in marked cases, by the commander, to signalize admiration of his distinguished bravery, or approbation of his humane

treatment of prisoners before his capture. The captured officer to whom they may be restored cannot wear them during captivity.

74. A prisoner of war, being a public enemy, is the prisoner of the Government and not of the captor. No ransom can be paid by a prisoner of war to his individual captor, or to any officer in command. The Government alone releases captives, according to rules prescribed by itself.

75. Prisoners of war are subject to confinement or imprisonment such as may be deemed necessary on account of safety, but they are to be subjected to no other intentional suffering or indignity. The confinement and mode of treating a prisoner may be varied during his captivity according to the demands of safety.

76. Prisoners of war shall be fed upon plain and wholesome food, whenever practicable, and treated with humanity.

They may be required to work for the benefit of the captor's government, according to their rank and condition.

77. A prisoner of war who escapes may be shot, or otherwise killed, in his flight; but neither death nor any other punishment shall be inflicted upon him simply for his attempt to escape, which the law of war does not consider a crime. Stricter means of security shall be used after an unsuccessful attempt at escape.

If, however, a conspiracy is discovered, the purpose of which is a united or general escape, the conspirators may be rigorously punished, even with death; and capital punishment may also be inflicted upon prisoners of war discovered to have plotted rebellion against the authorities of the captors, whether in union with fellow-prisoners or other persons.

78. If prisoners of war, having given no pledge nor made any promise on their honor, forcibly or otherwise escape, and are captured again in battle, after having rejoined their own army, they shall not be punished for their escape, but shall be treated as simple prisoners of war, although they will be subjected to stricter confinement.

79. Every captured wounded enemy shall be medically treated, according to the ability of the medical staff.

80. Honorable men, when captured, will abstain from giving to the enemy information concerning their own army, and the modern law of war permits no longer the use of any violence against prisoners in order to extort the desired information, or to punish them for having given false information.

SECTION IV.--*Partisans--Armed enemies not belonging to the hostile army--Scouts--Armed prowlers-- War-rebels.*

81. Partisans are soldiers armed and wearing the uniform of their army, but belonging to a corps which acts detached from the main body for the purpose of making inroads into the territory occupied by the enemy. If captured they are entitled to all the privileges of the prisoner of war.

82. Men, or squads of men, who commit hostilities, whether by fighting, or inroads for destruction or plunder, or by raids of any kind, without commission, without being part and portion of the organized hostile army, and without sharing continuously in the war, but who do so with intermitting returns to their homes and avocations, or with the occasional assumption of the semblance of peaceful pursuits, divesting themselves of the character or appearance of soldiers--such men, or squads of men, are not public enemies, and therefore, if captured, are not entitled to the privileges of prisoners of war, but shall be treated summarily as highway robbers or pirates.

83. Scouts or single soldiers, if disguised in the dress of the country, or in the uniform of the army hostile to their own, employed in obtaining information, if found within or lurking about the lines of the captor, are treated as spies, and suffer death.

84. Armed prowlers, by whatever names they may be called, or persons of the enemy's territory, who steal within the lines of the hostile army for the purpose of robbing, killing, or of destroying bridges, roads, or canals, or of robbing or destroying the mail, or of cutting the telegraph wires, are not entitled to the privileges of the prisoner of war.

85. War-rebels are persons within an occupied territory who rise in arms against the occupying or conquering army, or against the authorities established by the same. If captured, they may suffer death, whether they rise singly, in small or large bands, and whether called upon to do so by their own, but expelled, government or not. They are not prisoners of war; nor are they if discovered and secured before their conspiracy has matured to an actual rising or to armed violence.

SECTION V.--*Safe-conduct--Spies-- War-traitors-- Captured messengers--Abuse of the flag of truce.*

86. All intercourse between the territories occupied by belligerent armies, whether by traffic, by letter, by travel, or in any other way, ceases. This is the general rule, to be observed without special proclamation.

Exceptions to this rule, whether by safe-conduct or permission to trade on a small or large scale, or by exchanging mails, or by travel from one territory into the other, can take place only according to agreement approved by the Government or by the highest military authority. Contraventions of this rule are highly punishable.

87. Ambassadors, and all other diplomatic agents of neutral powers accredited to the enemy may receive safe-conducts through the territories occupied by the belligerents, unless there are military reasons to the contrary, and unless they may reach the place of their destination conveniently by another route. It implies no international affront if the safe-conduct is declined. Such passes are usually given by the supreme authority of the state and not by subordinate officers.

88. A spy is a person who secretly, in disguise or under false pretense, seeks information with the intention of communicating it to the enemy.

The spy is punishable with death by hanging by the neck, whether or not he succeeds in obtaining the information or in conveying it to the enemy.

89. If a citizen of the United States obtains information in a legitimate manner and betrays it to the enemy, be he a military or civil officer, or a private citizen, he shall suffer death.

90. A traitor under the law of war, or a war-traitor, is a person in a place or district under martial law who, unauthorized by the military commander, gives information of any kind to the enemy, or holds intercourse with him.

91. The war-traitor is always severely punished. If his offense consists in betraying to the enemy anything concerning the condition, safety, operations, or plans of the troops holding or occupying the place or district, his punishment is death.

92. If the citizen or subject of a country or place invaded or conquered gives information to his own government, from which he is separated by the hostile army, or to the army of his government, he is a war-traitor, and death is the penalty of his offense.

93. All armies in the field stand in need of guides, and impress them if they cannot obtain them otherwise.

94. No person having been forced by the enemy to serve as guide is punishable for having done so.

95. If a citizen of a hostile and invaded district voluntarily serves as a guide to the enemy, or offers to do so, he is deemed a war-traitor and shall suffer death.

96. A citizen serving voluntarily as a guide against his own country commits treason, and will be dealt with according to the law of his country.

97. Guides, when it is clearly proved that they have misled intentionally, may be put to death.

98. All unauthorized or secret communication with the enemy is considered treasonable by the law of war.

Foreign residents in an invaded or occupied territory or foreign visitors in the same can claim no immunity from this law. They may communicate with foreign parts or with the inhabitants of the hostile country, so far as the military authority permits, but no further. Instant expulsion from the occupied territory would be the very least punishment for the infraction of this rule.

99. A messenger carrying written dispatches or verbal messages from one portion of the army or from a besieged place to another portion of the same army or its government, if armed, and in the uniform of his army, and if captured while doing so in the territory occupied by the enemy, is treated by the captor as a prisoner of war. If not in uniform nor a soldier, the circumstances connected with his capture must determine the disposition that shall be made of him.

100. A messenger or agent who attempts to steal through the territory occupied by the enemy to further in any manner the interests of the enemy, if captured, is not entitled to the privileges of the prisoner of war, and may be dealt with according to the circumstances of the case.

101. While deception in war is admitted as a just and necessary means of hostility, and is consistent with honorable warfare, the common law of war allows even capital punishment for clandestine or treacherous attempts to injure an enemy, because they are so dangerous, and it is so difficult to guard against them.

102. The law of war, like the criminal law regarding other offenses, makes no difference on account of the difference of sexes, concerning the spy, the war-traitor, or the war-rebel.

103. Spies, war-traitors, and war-rebels are not exchanged according to the common law of war. The exchange of such persons would require a special cartel, authorized by the Government, or, at a great distance from it, by the chief commander of the army in the field.

104. A successful spy or war-traitor, safely returned to his own army, and afterward captured as an enemy, is not subject to punishment for his acts as a spy or war-traitor, but he may be held in closer custody as a person individually dangerous.

SECTION VI.--*Exchange of prisoners--Flags of truce--Flags of protection.*

105. Exchanges of prisoners take place--number for number--rank for rank--wounded for wounded--with added condition for added condition--such, for instance, as not to serve for a certain period.

106. In exchanging prisoners of war, such numbers of persons of inferior rank may be substituted as an equivalent for one of superior rank as may be agreed upon by cartel, which requires the sanction of the Government, or of the commander of the army in the field.

107. A prisoner of war is in honor bound truly to state to the captor his rank; and he is not to assume a lower rank than belongs to him, in order to cause a more advantageous exchange, nor a higher rank, for the purpose of obtaining better treatment.

Offenses to the contrary have been justly punished by the commanders of released prisoners, and may be good cause for refusing to release such prisoners.

108. The surplus number of prisoners of war remaining after an exchange has taken place is sometimes released either for the payment of a stipulated sum of money, or, in urgent cases, of provision, clothing, or other necessaries.

Such arrangement, however, requires the sanction of the highest authority.

109. The exchange of prisoners of war is an act of convenience to both belligerents. If no general cartel has been concluded, it cannot be demanded by either of them. No belligerent is obliged to exchange prisoners of war.

A cartel is voidable as soon as either party has violated it.

110. No exchange of prisoners shall be made except after complete capture, and after an accurate account of them, and a list of the captured officers, has been taken.

111. The bearer of a flag of truce cannot insist upon being admitted. He must always be admitted with great caution. Unnecessary frequency is carefully to be avoided.

112. If the bearer of a flag of truce offer himself during an engagement, he can be admitted as a very rare exception only. It is no breach of good faith to retain such flag of truce, if admitted during the engagement. Firing is not required to cease on the appearance of a flag of truce in battle.

113. If the bearer of a flag of truce, presenting himself during an engagement, is killed or wounded, it furnishes no ground of complaint whatever.

114. If it be discovered, and fairly proved, that a flag of truce has been abused for surreptitiously obtaining military knowledge, the bearer of the flag thus abusing his sacred character is deemed a spy.

So sacred is the character of a flag of truce, and so necessary is its sacredness, that while its abuse is an especially heinous offense, great caution is requisite, on the other hand, in convicting the bearer of a flag of truce as a spy.

115. It is customary to designate by certain flags (usually yellow) the hospitals in places which are shelled, so that the besieging enemy may avoid firing on them. The same has been done in battles when hospitals are situated within the field of the engagement.

116. Honorable belligerents often request that the hospitals within the territory of the enemy may be designated, so that they may be spared.

An honorable belligerent allows himself to be guided by flags or signals of protection as much as the contingencies and the necessities of the fight will permit.

117. It is justly considered an act of bad faith, of infamy or fiendishness, to deceive the enemy by flags of protection. Such act of bad faith may be good cause for refusing to respect such flags.

118. The besieging belligerent has sometimes requested the besieged to designate the buildings containing collections of works of art, scientific museums, astronomical observatories, or precious libraries, so that their destruction may be avoided as much as possible.

SECTION VII.--*The parole.*

119. Prisoners of war may be released from captivity by exchange, and, under certain circumstances, also by parole.

120. The term parole designates the pledge of individual good faith and honor to do, or to omit doing, certain acts after he who gives his parole shall have been dismissed, wholly or partially, from the power of the captor.

121. The pledge of the parole is always an individual, but not a private act.

122. The parole applies chiefly to prisoners of war whom the captor allows to return to their country, or to live in greater freedom within the captor's country or territory, on conditions stated in the parole.

123. Release of prisoners of war by exchange is the general rule; release by parole is the exception.

124. Breaking the parole is punished with death when the person breaking the parole is captured again.

Accurate lists, therefore, of the paroled persons must be kept by the belligerents.

125. When paroles are given and received there must be an exchange of two written documents, in which the name and rank of the paroled individuals are accurately and truthfully stated.

126. Commissioned officers only are allowed to give their parole, and they can give it only with the permission of their superior, as long as a superior in rank is within reach.

127. No non-commissioned officer or private can give his parole except through an officer. Individual paroles not given through an officer are not only void, but subject the individuals giving them to the punishment of death as deserters. The only admissible exception is where individuals, properly separated from their commands, have suffered long confinement without the possibility of being paroled through an officer.

128. No paroling on the battle-field; no paroling of entire bodies of troops after a battle; and no dismissal of large numbers of prisoners, with a general declaration that they are paroled, is permitted, or of any value.

129. In capitulations for the surrender of strong places or fortified camps the commanding officer, in cases of urgent necessity, may agree that the troops under his command shall not fight again during the war unless exchanged.

130. The usual pledge given in the parole is not to serve during the existing war unless exchanged.

This pledge refers only to the active service in the field against the paroling belligerent or his allies actively engaged in the same war. These cases of breaking the parole are patent acts, and can be visited with the punishment of death; but the pledge does not refer to internal service, such as recruiting or drilling the recruits, fortifying places not besieged, quelling civil commotions, fighting against belligerents unconnected with the paroling belligerents, or to civil or diplomatic service for which the paroled officer may be employed.

131. If the government does not approve of the parole, the paroled officer must return into captivity, and should the enemy refuse to receive him he is free of his parole.

132. A belligerent government may declare, by a general order, whether it will allow paroling and on what conditions it will allow it. Such order is communicated to the enemy.

133. No prisoner of war can be forced by the hostile government to parole himself, and no government is obliged to parole prisoners of war or to parole all captured officers, if it paroles any. As the pledging of the parole is an individual act, so is paroling, on the other hand, an act of choice on the part of the belligerent.

134. The commander of an occupying army may require of the civil officers of the enemy, and of its citizens, any pledge he may consider necessary for the safety or security of his army, and upon their failure to give it he may arrest, confine, or detain them.

SECTION VIII.--*Armistice--Capitulation.*

135. An armistice is the cessation of active hostilities for a period agreed between belligerents. It must be agreed upon in writing and duly ratified by the highest authorities of the contending parties.

136. If an armistice be declared without conditions it extends no further than to require a total cessation of hostilities along the front of both belligerents.

If conditions be agreed upon, they should be clearly expressed, and must be rigidly adhered to by both parties. If either party violates any express condition, the armistice may be declared null and void by the other.

137. An armistice may be general, and valid for all points and lines of the belligerents; or special--that is, referring to certain troops or certain localities only. An armistice may be concluded for a definite time; or for an indefinite time, during which either belligerent may resume hostilities on giving the notice agreed upon to the other.

138. The motives which induce the one or the other belligerent to conclude an armistice, whether it be expected to be preliminary to a treaty of peace, or to prepare during the armistice for a more vigorous prosecution of the war, does in no way affect the character of the armistice itself.

139. An armistice is binding upon the belligerents from the day of the agreed commencement; but the officers of the armies are responsible from the day only when they receive official information of its existence.

140. Commanding officers have the right to conclude armistices binding on the district over which their command extends, but such armistice is subject to the ratification of the superior authority, and ceases so soon as it is made known to the enemy that the armistice is not ratified, even if a certain time for the elapsing between giving notice of cessation and the resumption of hostilities should have been stipulated for.

141. It is incumbent upon the contracting parties of an armistice to stipulate what intercourse of persons or traffic between the inhabitants of the territories occupied by the hostile armies shall be allowed, if any.

If nothing is stipulated the intercourse remains suspended, as during actual hostilities.

142. An armistice is not a partial or a temporary peace; it is only the suspension of military operations to the extent agreed upon by the parties.

143. When an armistice is concluded between a fortified place and the army besieging it, it is agreed by all the authorities on this subject that the besieger must cease all extension, perfection, or advance of his attacking works as much so as from attacks by main force.

But as there is a difference of opinion among martial jurists whether the besieged have a right to repair breaches or to erect new works of defense within the place during an armistice, this point should be determined by express agreement between the parties.

144. So soon as a capitulation is signed the capitulator has no right to demolish, destroy, or injure the works, arms, stores, or ammunition in his possession, during the time which elapses between the signing and the execution of the capitulation, unless otherwise stipulated in the same.

145. When an armistice is clearly broken by one of the parties the other party is released from all obligation to observe it.

146. Prisoners taken in the act of breaking an armistice must be treated as prisoners of war, the officer alone being responsible who gives the order for such a violation of an armistice. The highest authority of the belligerent aggrieved may demand redress for the infraction of an armistice.

147. Belligerents sometimes conclude an armistice while their plenipotentiaries are met to discuss the conditions of a treaty of peace; but plenipotentiaries may meet without a preliminary armistice; in the latter case the war is carried on without any abatement.

SECTION IX.--*Assassination.*

148. The law of war does not allow proclaiming either an individual belonging to the hostile army, or a citizen, or a subject of the hostile government an outlaw, who may be slain without trial by any captor, any more than the modern law of peace allows such international outlawry; on the contrary, it abhors such outrage. The sternest retaliation should follow the murder committed in consequence of such proclamation, made by whatever authority. Civilized nations look with horror upon offers of rewards for the assassination of enemies as relapses into barbarism.

SECTION X.--*Insurrection-- Civil war--Rebellion.*

149. Insurrection is the rising of people in arms against their government, or portion of it, or against one or more of its laws, or against an officer or officers of the government. It may be confined to mere armed resistance, or it may have greater ends in view.

150. Civil war is war between two or more portions of a country or state, each contending for the mastery of the whole, and each claiming to be the legitimate government. The term is also sometimes applied to war of rebellion, when the rebellious provinces or portions of the state are contiguous to those containing the seat of government.

151. The term rebellion is applied to an insurrection of large extent, and is usually a war between the legitimate government of a country and portions of provinces of the same who seek to throw off their allegiance to it and set up a government of their own.

152. When humanity induces the adoption of the rules of regular war toward rebels, whether the adoption is partial or entire, it does in no way whatever imply a partial or complete acknowledgment of their government, if they have set up one, or of them, as an independent or sovereign power. Neutrals have no right to make the adoption of the rules of war by the assailed government toward rebels the ground of their own acknowledgment of the revolted people as an independent power.

153. Treating captured rebels as prisoners of war, exchanging them, concluding of cartels, capitulations, or other warlike agreements with them; addressing officers of a rebel army by the rank they may have in the same; accepting flags of truce; or, on the other hand, proclaiming martial law in their territory, or levying war taxes or forced loans, or doing any other act sanctioned or demanded by the law and usages of public war between sovereign belligerents, neither proves nor establishes an acknowledgment of the rebellious people, or of the government which they may have erected, as a public or sovereign power. Nor does the adoption of the rules of war toward rebels imply an engagement with them extending beyond the limits of these rules. It is victory in the field that ends the strife and settles the future relations between the contending parties.

154. Treating in the field the rebellious enemy according to the law and usages of war has never prevented the legitimate government from trying the leaders of the rebellion or chief rebels for high treason, and from treating them accordingly, unless they are included in a general amnesty.

155. All enemies in regular war are divided into two general classes--that is to say, into combatants and non-combatants, or unarmed citizens of the hostile government.

The military commander of the legitimate government, in a war of rebellion, distinguishes between the loyal citizen in the revolted portion of the country and the disloyal citizen. The disloyal citizens may further be classified into those citizens known to sympathize with the rebellion without positively aiding it, and those who, without taking up arms, give positive aid and comfort to the rebellious enemy without being bodily forced thereto.

156. Common justice and plain expediency require that the military commander protect the manifestly loyal citizens in revolted territories against the hardships of the war as much as the common misfortune of all war admits.

The commander will throw the burden of the war, as much as lies within his power, on the disloyal citizens, of the revolted portion or province, subjecting them to a stricter police than the non-combatant enemies have to suffer in regular war; and if he deems it appropriate, or if his government demands of him that every citizen shall, by an oath of allegiance, or by some other manifest act, declare his fidelity to the legitimate government, he may expel, transfer, imprison, or fine the revolted citizens who refuse to pledge themselves anew as citizens obedient to the law and loyal to the government. Whether it is expedient to do so, and whether reliance can be placed upon such oaths, the commander or his government have the right to decide.

157. Armed or unarmed resistance by citizens of the United States against the lawful movements of their troops is levying war against the United States, and is therefore treason.

NO TREASON

No. 1.

BY LYSANDER SPOONER

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR,
No. 14 Bromfield Street.
1867.

Entered according to Act of congress, in the year 1867,

By LYSANDER SPOONER,

in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States, for the District
of Massachusetts.

INTRODUCTORY

The question of treason is distinct from that of slavery; and is the same that it would have been, if free States, instead of slave States, had seceded.

On the part of the North, the war was carried on, not to liberate slaves, but by a government that had always perverted and violated the Constitution, to keep the slaves in bondage; and was still willing to do so, if the slaveholders could be thereby induced to stay in the Union.

The principle, on which the war was waged by the North, was simply this: That men may rightfully be compelled to submit to, and support, a government that they do not want; and that resistance, on their part, makes them traitors and criminals.

*No principle, that is possible to be named, can be more self-evidently false than this; or more self-evidently fatal to all political freedom. Yet it triumphed in the field, and is now assumed to be established. If it really be established, the number of slaves, instead of having been diminished by the war, has been greatly increased; for a man, thus subjected to a government that he does not want, is a slave. And there is no difference, in principle -- but only in degree --- between political and chattel slavery. The former, no less than the latter, denies a man's ownership of himself and the products of his labor; and [*iv] asserts that other men may own him, and dispose of him and his property, for their uses, and at their pleasure.*

Previous to the war, there were some grounds for saying that --- in theory, at least, if not in practice --- our government was a free one; that it rested on consent. But nothing of that kind can be said now, if the principle on which the war was carried on by the North, is irrevocably established.

If that principle be not the principle of the Constitution, the fact should be known. If it be the principle of the Constitution, the Constitution itself should be at once overthrown.

[*5]

NO TREASON

No. 1.

I.

Notwithstanding all the proclamations we have made to mankind, within the last ninety years that our government rests on consent, and that that was the rightful basis on which any government could rest, the late war has practically demonstrated that our government rests upon force --- as much so as any government that ever existed.

The North has thus virtually said to the world: It was all very well to prate of consent, so long as the objects to be accomplished were to liberate ourselves from our connection with England, and also to coax a scattered and jealous people into a great national union; but now that those purposes have been accomplished, and the power of the North has become consolidated, it is sufficient for us --- as for all governments --- simply to say: Our power is our right.

In proportion to her wealth and population, the North has probably expended more money and blood to maintain her power over an unwilling people than any other government ever did. And in her estimation, it is apparently the chief glory of her success and an adequate compensation for all her own losses and an ample justification for all her devastation and carnage of the South, that all pretence of any necessity for consent to the perpetuity or power of government, is (as she thinks) forever expunged from the minds of the people. In short, the North [*6] exults beyond measure in the proof she has given, that a government professedly resting on consent, will expend more life and treasure in crushing dissent, than any government openly founded on force has ever done.

And she claims that she has done all this in behalf of liberty! In behalf of free government! In behalf of the principle that government should rest on consent!

If the successors of Roger Williams, within a hundred years after their State had been founded upon the principle of free religious toleration, and when the Baptists had become strong on the credit of that principle, had taken to burning heretics with a fury never seen before among men; and had they finally gloried in having thus suppressed all question of the truth of the State religion; and had they further claimed to have done all this in behalf of freedom of conscience, the inconsistency between profession and conduct would scarcely have been greater than that of the North in carrying on such a war as she has done, to compel men to live under and support a government that they did not want; and in then claiming that she did it in behalf of the of the principle that government should rest on consent.

This astonishing absurdity and self-contradiction are to be accounted for only by supposing either that the lusts of fame and power and money have made her utterly blind to, or utterly reckless of, the inconsistency and enormity of her conduct; or that she has never even understood what was implied in a government's resting on consent. Perhaps this last explanation is the true one. In charity to human nature, it is to be hoped that it is.

II.

What, then, is implied in a government's resting on consent?

If it be said that the consent of the strongest party, in a nation, is all that is necessary to justify the establishment of a government that shall have authority over the weaker party, it [*7] may be answered that the most despotic governments in the world rest upon that very principle, viz: the consent of the strongest party. These governments are formed simply by the consent or agreement of the strongest party; that they will act in concert in subjecting the weaker party to their dominion. And the despotism, and tyranny, and injustice of these governments consist in that very fact. Or at least that is the first step in their tyranny; a necessary preliminary to all the oppressions that are to follow.

If it be said that the consent of the most numerous party in a nation is sufficient to justify the establishment of their power over the less numerous party, it may be answered:

First - That two men have no more natural right to exercise any kind of authority over one, than one has to exercise the same authority over two. A man's natural rights are his own, against the whole world; and any infringement of them is equally a crime whether committed by one man or by millions; whether committed by one man, calling himself a robber, (or by any other name indicating his true character,) or by millions, calling themselves a government.

Second - It would be absurd for the most numerous party to talk of establishing a government over the less numerous party, unless the former were also the strongest, as well as the most numerous; for it is not to be supposed that the strongest party would ever submit to the rule of the weaker party merely because the latter were the most numerous. And as a matter of fact, it is perhaps never that governments are established by the most numerous party. They are usually, if not always, established by the less numerous party; their superior strength consisting of their superior wealth, intelligence, and ability to act in concert.

Third - Our Constitution does not profess to have been established simply by the majority; but by "the people;" the minority, as much as the majority. [*8]

Fourth - If our founding fathers in 1776 had acknowledged the principle that a majority had the right to rule the minority, we should never have become a nation; for they were in a small minority, as compared with those who claimed the right to rule over them.

Fifth - Majorities, as such, afford no guarantees for justice. They are men of the same nature as minorities. They have the same passions for fame, power, and money, as minorities; and are liable and likely to be equally --- perhaps more than equally, because more boldly --- rapacious, tyrannical and unprincipled, if intrusted with power. There is no more reason, then, why a man should either sustain, or submit to, the rule of the majority, than of a minority. Majorities and minorities cannot rightfully be taken at all into account in deciding questions of justice. And all talk about them in matters of government is mere absurdity. Men are dunces for uniting to sustain any government or any laws except those in which they are all agreed. And nothing but force and fraud compel men to sustain any other. To say that majorities, as such,

have a right to rule minorities, is equivalent to saying that minorities have, and ought to have, no rights except such as majorities please to allow them.

Sixth - It is not improbable that many or most of the worst of governments --- although established by force, and by a few, in the first place --- come, in time, to be supported by a majority. But if they do, this majority is composed, in large part, of the most ignorant, superstitious, timid, dependent, servile, and corrupt portions of the people; of those who have been over-awed by the power, intelligence, wealth, and arrogance; of those who have been deceived by the frauds; and of those who have been corrupted by the inducements, of the few who really constitute the government. Such majorities, very likely, could be found in half, perhaps nine-tenths, of all the countries on the globe. What do they prove? Nothing but the tyranny and corruption of the very governments that have reduced so large portions of [*9] the people to their present ignorance, servility, degradation, and corruption; an ignorance, servility, degradation, and corruption that are best illustrated in the simple fact that they do sustain governments that have so oppressed, degraded, and corrupted them. They do nothing towards proving that the governments themselves are legitimate; or that they ought to be sustained, or even endured, by those who understand their true character. The mere fact, therefore, that a government chances to be sustained by a majority, of itself proves nothing that is necessary to be proved, in order to know whether such government should be sustained, or not.

Seventh - The principle that the majority have a right to rule the minority practically resolves all government into a mere contest between two bodies of men, as to which of them shall be masters, and which of them slaves; a contest, that --- however bloody --- can, in the nature of things, never be finally closed, so long as man refuses to be a slave.

III.

But to say that the consent of either the strongest party, or the most numerous party, in a nation, is sufficient justification for the establishment or maintenance of a government that shall control the whole nation, does not obviate the difficulty. The question still remains, how comes such a thing as "a nation" to exist? How do millions of men, scattered over an extensive territory --- each gifted by nature with individual freedom; required by the law of nature to call no man, or body of men, his masters; authorized by that law to seek his own happiness in his own way, to do what he will with himself and his property, so long as he does not trespass upon the equal liberty of others; authorized also, by that law, to defend his own rights, and redress his own wrongs; and to go to the assistance and defence of any [*10] of his fellow men who may be suffering any kind of injustice --- how do millions of such men come to be a nation, in the first place? How is it that each of them comes to be stripped of his natural, God-given rights, and to be incorporated, compressed, compacted, and consolidated into a mass with other men, whom he never saw; with whom he has no contract; and towards many of whom he has no sentiments but fear, hatred, or contempt? How does he become subjected to the control of men like himself, who, by nature, had no authority over him; but who command him to do this, and forbid him to do that, as if they were his sovereigns, and he their subject; and as if their wills and their interests were the only standards of his duties and his rights; and who compel him to submission under peril of confiscation, imprisonment, and death?

Clearly all this is the work of force, or fraud, or both.

By what right, then, did we become "a nation?" By what right do we continue to be "a nation?" And by what right do either the strongest, or the most numerous, party, now existing within the territorial limits, called "The United States," claim that there really is such "a nation" as the United States? Certainly they are bound to show the rightful existence of "a nation," before they can claim, on that ground, that they themselves have a right to control it; to seize, for their purposes, so much of every man's property within it, as they may choose; and, at their discretion, to compel any man to risk his own life, or take the lives of other men, for the maintenance of their power.

To speak of either their numbers, or their strength, is not to the purpose. The question is by what right does the nation exist? And by what right are so many atrocities committed by its authority? or for its preservation?

The answer to this question must certainly be, that at least such a nation exists by no right whatever.

We are, therefore, driven to the acknowledgment that nations and governments, if they can rightfully exist at all, can exist only by consent. [*11]

IV.

The question, then, returns, what is implied in a government's resting on consent?

Manifestly this one thing (to say nothing of the others) is necessarily implied in the idea of a government's resting on consent, viz: the separate, individual consent of every man who is required to contribute, either by taxation or personal service, to the support of the government. All this, or nothing, is necessarily implied, because one man's consent is just as necessary as any other man's. If, for example, A claims that his consent is necessary to the establishment or maintenance of government, he thereby necessarily admits that B's and every other man's are equally necessary; because B's and every other man's right are just as good as his own. On the other hand, if he denies that B's or any other particular man's consent is necessary, he thereby necessarily admits that neither his own, nor any other man's is necessary; and that government need to be founded on consent at all.

There is, therefore, no alternative but to say, either that the separate, individual consent of every man who is required to aid in any way in supporting the government is necessary, or that the consent of no one is necessary.

Clearly this individual consent is indispensable to the idea of treason; for if a man has never consented or agreed to support a government, he breaks no faith in refusing to support it. And if he makes war upon it, he does so as an open enemy, and not as a traitor that is, as a betrayer, or treacherous friend.

All this, or nothing, was necessarily implied in the Declaration made in 1776. If the necessity for consent, then announced, was a sound principle in favor of three millions of men, it was an equally sound one in favor of three men, or

of one man. If the principle was a sound one in behalf of men living on a separate continent, it was an equally sound one in behalf of a man living on a separate farm, or in a separate house. [*12]

Moreover, it was only as separate individuals, each acting for himself and not as members of organized governments, that the three millions declared their consent to be necessary to their support of a government; and, at the same time, declared their dissent to the support of the British Crown. The governments then existing in the Colonies had no constitutional power, as governments, to declare the separation between England and America. On the contrary, those governments, as governments, were organized under charters from, and acknowledged allegiance to, the British Crown. Of course the British king never made it one of the chartered or constitutional powers of those governments, as governments, to absolve the people from their allegiance to himself. So far, therefore, as the Colonial Legislatures acted as revolutionists, they acted only as so many individual revolutionists and not as constitutional legislatures. And their representatives at Philadelphia who first declared Independence, were, in the eye of the constitutional law of that day, simply a committee of Revolutionists and in no sense constitutional authorities or the representatives of constitutional authorities.

It was also, in the eye of the law, only as separate individuals, each acting for himself, and exercising simply his natural rights as an individual, that the people at large assented to, and ratified the Declaration.

It was also only as so many individuals, each acting for himself, and exercising simply his natural rights, that they revolutionized the constitutional character of their local governments, (so as to exclude the idea of allegiance to Great Britain); changing their forms only as and when their convenience dictated.

The whole Revolution, therefore, as a Revolution, was declared and accomplished by the people, acting separately as individuals, and exercising each his natural rights, and not by their governments in the exercise of their constitutional powers.

It was, therefore, as individuals, and only as individuals, each acting for himself alone, that they declared that their consent that is, their individual consent for each one could consent only [*13] for himself --- was necessary to the creation or perpetuity of any government that they could rightfully be called on to support.

In the same way each declared, for himself, that his own will, pleasure, and discretion were the only authorities he had any occasion to consult in determining whether he would any longer support the government under which he had always lived. And if this action of each individual were valid and rightful when he had so many other individuals to keep him company, it would have been, in the view of natural justice and right, equally valid and rightful if he had taken the same step alone. He had the same natural right to take up arms alone to defend his own property against a single tax-gatherer that he had to take up arms in company with three millions of others to defend the property of all against an army of tax-gatherers.

Thus the whole Revolution turned upon, asserted, and, in theory, established the right of each and every man at his discretion to release himself from the support of the government under which he had lived. And this principle was

asserted, not as a right peculiar to themselves, or to that time, or as applicable only to the government then existing; but as a universal right of all men, at all times, and under all circumstances.

George the Third called our ancestors traitors for what they did at that time. But they were not traitors in fact, whatever he or his laws may have called them. They were not traitors in fact, because they betrayed nobody, and broke faith with nobody. They were his equals, owing him no allegiance, obedience, nor any other duty, except such as they owed to mankind at large. Their political relations with him had been purely voluntary. They had never pledged their faith to him that they would continue these relations any longer than it should please them to do so; and therefore they broke no faith in parting with him. They simply exercised their natural right of saying to him and to the English people, that they were under no obligation to continue their political connection with them, and that, for reasons of their own, they chose to dissolve it. [*14]

What was true of our ancestors, is true of revolutionists in general. The monarchs and governments from whom they choose to separate attempt to stigmatize them as traitors. But they are not traitors in fact; in-much they betray, and break faith with, no one. Having pledged no faith, they break none. They are simply men, who, for reasons of their own --- whether good or bad, wise or unwise, is immaterial --- choose to exercise their natural right of dissolving their connection with the governments under which they have lived. In doing this, they no more commit the crime of treason --- which necessarily implies treachery, deceit, breach of faith --- than a man commits treason when he chooses to leave a church, or any other voluntary association, with which he has been connected.

This principle was a true one in 1776. It is a true one now. It is the only one on which any rightful government can rest. It is the one on which the Constitution itself professes to rest. If it does not really rest on that basis, it has no right to exist; and it is the duty of every man to raise his hand against it.

If the men of the Revolution designed to incorporate in the Constitution the absurd ideas of allegiance and treason, which they had once repudiated, against which they had fought, and by which the world had been enslaved, they thereby established for themselves an indisputable claim to the disgust and detestation of all mankind.

In subsequent numbers, the author hopes to show that, under the principle of individual consent, the little government that mankind need, is not only practicable, but natural and easy; and that the Constitution of the United States authorizes no government, except one depending wholly on voluntary support.

NO TREASON

No. II

The Constitution.

BY LYSANDER SPOONER

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR,
No. 14 Bromfield Street.
1867.

Entered according to Act of congress, in the year 1867,

By LYSANDER SPOONER,

in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States, for the District
of Massachusetts.

[*3]

NO TREASON

NO. II

I.

The Constitution says:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The meaning of this is simply We, the people of the United States, acting freely and voluntarily as individuals, consent and agree that we will cooperate with each other in sustaining such a government as is provided for in this Constitution.

The necessity for the consent of "the people" is implied in this declaration. The whole authority of the Constitution rests upon it. If they did not consent, it was of no validity. Of course it had no validity, except as between those who actually consented. No one's consent could be presumed against him, without his actual consent being given, any more than in the case of any other contract to pay money, or render service. And to make it binding upon any one, his signature, or other positive evidence of consent, was as necessary as in the case of any other-contract. If the instrument meant to say that any of "the people of the United States" would be bound by it, who [*4] did not consent, it was a usurpation and a lie. The most that can be inferred from the form, "We, the people," is, that the instrument offered membership to all "the people of the United States;" leaving it for them to accept or refuse it, at their pleasure.

The agreement is a simple one, like any other agreement. It is the same as one that should say: We, the people of the town of A----, agree to sustain a church, a school, a hospital, or a theatre, for ourselves and our children.

Such an agreement clearly could have no validity, except as between those who actually consented to it. If a portion only of "the people of the town of A----," should assent to this contract, and should then proceed to compel contributions of money or service from those who had not consented, they would be mere robbers; and would deserve to be treated as such.

Neither the conduct nor the rights of these signers would be improved at all by their saying to the dissenters: We offer you equal rights with ourselves, in the benefits of the church, school, hospital, or theatre, which we propose to establish, and equal voice in the control of it. It would be a sufficient answer for the others to say: We want no share in the benefits, and no voice in the control of your institution; and will do nothing to support it.

The number who actually consented to the Constitution of the United States, at the first, was very small. Considered as the act of the whole people, the adoption of the Constitution was the merest farce and imposture, binding upon nobody.

The women, children, and blacks, of course, were not asked to give their consent. In addition to this, there were, in nearly or quite all the States, property qualifications that excluded probable one half, two thirds, or perhaps even three fourths, of the white male adults from the right of suffrage. And of those who were allowed that right, we know not how many exercised it.

Furthermore, those who originally agreed to the Constitution, could thereby bind nobody that should come after them. They could contract for nobody but themselves. They had no more [*5] natural right or power to make political contracts, binding upon succeeding generations, than they had to make marriage or business contracts binding upon them.

Still further - Even those who actually voted for the adoption of the Constitution, did not pledge their faith for any specific time; since no specific time was named in the Constitution, during which the association should continue. It was, therefore, merely an association during pleasure; even as between the original parties to it. Still less, if possible, has it been anything more than a merely voluntary association, during pleasure, between the succeeding generations, who have never gone through, as their fathers did, with so much even as any outward formality of adopting it, or of pledging their faith to support it. Such portions of them as pleased, and as the States permitted to vote, have only done enough, by voting and paying taxes, (and unlawfully and tyrannically extorting taxes from others,) to keep the government in operation for the time being. And this, in the view of the Constitution, they have done voluntarily, and because it was for their interest, or pleasure, and not because they were under any pledge or obligation to do it. Any one man, or any number of men, have had a perfect right, at any time, to refuse his or their further support; and nobody could rightfully object to his or their withdrawal.

There is no escape from these conclusions, if we say that the adoption of the Constitution was the act of the people, as individuals, and not of the States, as States. On the other hand, if we say that the adoption was the act of the States, as States, it necessarily follows that they had the right to secede at pleasure, inasmuch as they engaged for no specific time.

The consent, therefore, that has been given, whether by individuals, or by the States, has been, at most, only a consent for the time being; not an engagement for the future. In truth, in the case of individuals, their actual voting is not to be taken as proof of consent, even for the time being. On the contrary, it is to be considered that, without his consent having ever been asked, a [*6] man finds himself environed by a government that he cannot resist; a government that forces him to pay money, render service, and forego the exercise of many of his natural rights, under peril of weighty punishments. He sees, too, that other men practice this tyranny over him by the use of the ballot. He sees further that, if he will but use the ballot himself, he has some chance of relieving himself from this tyranny of others, by subjecting them to his own. In short, he finds himself, without his consent, so situated that, if he use the ballot, he may become a master; if he does not use it, he must become a slave. And he has no other alternative than these two. In self-defense, he attempts the former. His case is analogous to that of a man who has been forced into battle, where he must either kill others, or be killed himself. Because, to save his own life in battle, a man attempts to take the lives of his opponents, it is not to be inferred that the battle is one of his own choosing. Neither in contests with the ballot --- which is a mere substitute for a bullet --- because, as his only chance of self-preservation, a man uses a ballot, is it to be inferred that the contest is one into which

he voluntarily entered; that he voluntarily set up all his own natural rights, as a stake against those of others, to be lost or won by the mere power of numbers. On the contrary, it is to be considered that, in an exigency, into which he had been forced by others, and in which no other means of self-defense offered, he, as a matter of necessity, used the only one that was left to him.

Doubtless the most miserable of men, under the most oppressive government in the world, if allowed the ballot, would use it, if they could see any chance of thereby ameliorating their condition. But it would not therefore be a legitimate inference that the government itself that crushes them, was one which they had voluntarily set up, or ever consented to.

Therefore a man's voting under the Constitution of the United States, is not to be taken as evidence that he ever freely assented to the Constitution, even for the time being. Consequently we have no proof that any very large portion, even of the actual [*7] voters of the United States, ever really and voluntarily consented to the Constitution, even for the time being. Nor can we ever have such proof, until every man is left perfectly free to consent, or not, without thereby subjecting himself or his property to injury or trespass from others.

II.

The Constitution says:

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

This is the only definition of treason given by the Constitution, and it is to be interpreted, like all other criminal laws, in the sense most favorable to liberty and justice. Consequently the treason here spoken of, must be held to be treason in fact, and not merely something that may have been falsely called by that name.

To determine, then, what is treason in fact, we are not to look to the codes of Kings, and Czars, and Kaisers, who maintain their power by force and fraud; who contemptuously call mankind their "subjects;" who claim to have a special license from heaven to rule on earth; who teach that it is a religious duty of mankind to obey them; who bribe a servile and corrupt priest-hood to impress these ideas upon the ignorant and superstitious; who spurn the idea that their authority is derived from, or dependent at all upon, the consent of their people; and who attempt to defame, by the false epithet of traitors, all who assert their own rights, and the rights of their fellow men, against such usurpations.

Instead of regarding this false and calumnious meaning of the word treason, we are to look at its true and legitimate meaning in our mother tongue; at its use in common life; and at what would necessarily be its true meaning in any other contracts, or articles [*8] of association, which men might voluntarily enter into with each other.

The true and legitimate meaning of the word treason, then, necessarily implies treachery, deceit, breach of faith. Without these, there can be no treason. A traitor is a betrayer --- one who practices injury, while professing friendship. Benedict Arnold was a traitor, solely because, while professing friendship for the American cause, he attempted to injure it. An open enemy, however criminal in other respects, is no traitor.

Neither does a man, who has once been my friend, become a traitor by becoming an enemy, if before doing me an injury, he gives me fair warning that he has become an enemy; and if he makes no unfair use of any advantage which my confidence, in the time of our friendship, had placed in his power.

For example, our founding fathers --- even if we were to admit them to have been wrong in other respects --- certainly were not traitors in fact, after the fourth of July, 1776; since on that day they gave notice to the King of Great Britain that they repudiated his authority, and should wage war against him. And they made no unfair use of any advantages which his confidence had previously placed in their power.

It cannot be denied that, in the late war, the Southern people proved themselves to be open and avowed enemies, and not treacherous friends. It cannot be denied that they gave us fair warning that they would no longer be our political associates, but would, if need were, fight for a separation. It cannot be alleged that they made any unfair use of advantages which our confidence, in the time of our friendship, had placed in their power. Therefore they were not traitors in fact: and consequently not traitors within the meaning of the Constitution.

Furthermore, men are not traitors in fact, who take up arms against the government, without having disavowed allegiance to it, provided they do it, either to resist the usurpations of the government, or to resist what they sincerely believe to be such usurpations. [*9]

It is a maxim of law that there can be no crime without a criminal intent. And this maxim is as applicable to treason as to any other crime. For example, our fathers were not traitors in fact, for resisting the British Crown, before the fourth of July, 1776 --- that is, before they had thrown off allegiance to him --- provided they honestly believed that they were simply defending their rights against his usurpations. Even if they were mistaken in their law, that mistake, if an innocent one, could not make them traitors in fact.

For the same reason, the Southern people, if they sincerely believed --- as it has been extensively, if not generally, conceded, at the North, that they did --- in the so-called constitutional theory of "State Rights," did not become traitors in fact, by acting upon it; and consequently not traitors within the meaning of the Constitution.

III.

The Constitution does not say who will become traitors, by "levying war against the United States, or adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

It is, therefore, only by inference, or reasoning, that we can know who will become traitors by these acts.

Certainly if Englishmen, Frenchmen, Austrians, or Italians, making no professions of support or friendship to the United States, levy war against them, or adhere to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort, they do not thereby make themselves traitors, within the meaning of the Constitution; and why? Solely because they would not be traitors in fact. Making no professions of support or friendship, they would practice no treachery, deceit, or breach of faith. But if they should voluntarily enter either the civil or military service of the United States, and pledge fidelity to them, (without being

naturalized,) and should then betray the trusts reposed in them, either by turning their guns against the United States, or by giving aid [*10] and comfort to their enemies, they would be traitors in fact; and therefore traitors within the meaning of the Constitution; and could be lawfully punished as such.

There is not, in the Constitution, a syllable that implies that persons, born within the territorial limits of the United States, have allegiance imposed upon them on account of their birth in the country, or that they will be judged by any different rule, on the subject of treason, than persons of foreign birth. And there is no power, in Congress, to add to, or alter, the language of the Constitution, on this point, so as to make it more comprehensive than it now is. Therefore treason in fact -- that is, actual treachery, deceit, or breach of faith --- must be shown in the case of a native of the United States, equally as in the case of a foreigner, before he can be said to be a traitor.

Congress have seen that the language of the Constitution was insufficient, of itself to make a man a traitor --- on the ground of birth in this country --- who levies war against the United States, but practices no treachery, deceit, or breach of faith. They have, therefore --- although they had no constitutional power to do so --- apparently attempted to enlarge the language of the Constitution on this point. And they have enacted:

"That if any person or persons, owing allegiance to the United States of America, shall levy war against them, or shall adhere to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort, * * * such person or persons shall be adjudged guilty of treason against the United States, and shall suffer death." --- Statute, April 30, 1790, Section 1.

It would be a sufficient answer to this enactment to say that it is utterly unconstitutional, if its effect would be to make any man a traitor, who would not have been one under the language of the Constitution alone.

The whole pith of the act lies in the words, "persons owing allegiance to the United States." But this language really leaves the question where it was before, for it does not attempt to [*11] show or declare who does "owe allegiance to the United States;" although those who passed the act, no doubt thought, or wished others to think, that allegiance was to be presumed (as is done under other governments) against all born in this country, (unless possibly slaves).

The Constitution itself, uses no such word as "allegiance," "sovereignty," "loyalty," "subject," or any other term, such as is used by other governments, to signify the services, fidelity, obedience, or other duty, which the people are assumed to owe to their government, regardless of their own will in the matter. As the Constitution professes to rest wholly on consent, no one can owe allegiance, service, obedience, or any other duty to it, or to the government created by it, except with his own consent.

The word allegiance comes from the Latin words ad and ligo, signifying to bind to. Thus a man under allegiance to a government is a man bound to it; or bound to yield it support and fidelity. And governments, founded otherwise than on consent, hold that all persons born under them, are under allegiance to them; that is, are bound to render them support, fidelity, and obedience; and are traitors if they resist them.

But it is obvious that, in truth and in fact, no one but himself can bind any one to support any government. And our Constitution admits this fact when it concedes that it derives its authority wholly from the consent of the people. And the word treason is to be understood in accordance with that idea.

It is conceded that a person of foreign birth comes under allegiance to our government only by special voluntary contract. If a native has allegiance imposed upon him, against his will, he is in a worse condition than the foreigner; for the latter can do as he pleases about assuming that obligation. The accepted interpretation of the Constitution, therefore, makes the foreigner a free person, on this point, while it makes the native a slave.

The only difference --- if there be any --- between natives and foreigners, in respect of allegiance, is, that a native has a right --- offered to him by the Constitution --- to come under allegiance to [*12] the government, if he so please; and thus entitle himself to membership in the body politic. His allegiance cannot be refused. Whereas a foreigner's allegiance can be refused, if the government so please.

IV.

The Constitution certainly supposes that the crime of treason can be committed only by man, as an individual. It would be very curious to see a man indicted, convicted, or hanged, otherwise than as an individual; or accused of having committed his treason otherwise than as an individual. And yet it is clearly impossible that anyone can be personally guilty of treason, can be a traitor in fact, unless he, as an individual, has in some way voluntarily pledged his faith and fidelity to the government. Certainly no man, or body of men, could pledge it for him, without his consent; and no man, or body of men, have any right to presume it against him, when he has not pledged it, himself.

V.

It is plain, therefore, that if, when the Constitution says treason, it means treason --- treason in fact, and nothing else --- there is no ground at all for pretending that the Southern people have committed that crime. But if, on the other hand, when the Constitution says treason, it means what the Czar and the Kaiser mean by treason, then our government is, in principle, no better than theirs; and has no claim whatever to be considered a free government.

VI.

One essential of a free government is that it rest wholly on voluntary support. And one certain proof that a government is not free, is that it coerces more or less persons to support it, against their will. All governments, the worst on earth, and the [*13] most tyrannical on earth, are free governments to that portion of the people who voluntarily support them. And all governments though the best on earth in other respects --- are nevertheless tyrannies to that portion of the people --- whether few or many --- who are compelled to support them against their will. A government is like a church, or any other institution, in these respects. There is no other criterion whatever, by which to determine whether a government is a free one, or not, than the single one of its depending, or not depending, solely on voluntary support.

VII.

No middle ground is possible on this subject. Either "taxation without consent is robbery," or it is not. If it is not, then any number of men, who choose, may at any time associate; call themselves a government; assume absolute authority over all weaker than themselves; plunder them at will; and kill them if they resist. If, on the other hand, taxation without consent is robbery, it necessarily follows that every man who has not consented to be taxed, has the same natural right to defend his property against a tax gatherer than he has to defend it against a highwayman.

VIII.

It is perhaps unnecessary to say that the principles of this argument are as applicable to the State governments, as to the national one.

The opinions of the South, on the subjects of allegiance and treason, have been equally erroneous with those of the North. The only difference between them, has been, that the South has had that a man was (primarily) under involuntary allegiance to the State government; while the North held that he was (primarily) under a similar allegiance to the United States government; whereas, in truth, he was under no involuntary allegiance to either. [*14]

IX.

Obviously there can be no law of treason more stringent than has now been stated, consistently with political liberty. In the very nature of things there can never be any liberty for the weaker party, on any other principle; and political liberty always means liberty for the weaker party. It is only the weaker party that is ever oppressed. The strong are always free by virtue of their superior strength. So long as government is a mere contest as to which of two parties shall rule the other, the weaker must always succumb. And whether the contest is carried on with ballots or bullets, the principle is the same; for under the theory of government now prevailing, the ballot either signifies a bullet, or it signifies nothing. And no one can consistently use a ballot, unless he intends to use a bullet, if the latter should be needed to insure submission to the former.

X.

The practical difficulty with our government has been, that most of those who have administered it, have taken it for granted that the Constitution, as it is written, was a thing of no importance; that it neither said what it meant, nor meant what it said; that it was gotten up by swindlers, (as many of its authors doubtless were,) who said a great many good things, which they did not mean, and meant a great many bad things, which they dared not say; that these men, under the false pretence of a government resting on the consent of the whole people, designed to entrap them into a government of a part; who should be powerful and fraudulent enough to cheat the weaker portion out of all the good things that were said, but not meant, and subject them to all the bad things that were meant, but not said. And most of those who have administered the government, have assumed that all these swindling intentions were to be carried into effect, in the place of the written Constitution. Of all these swindles, the [*15] treason swindle is the most flagitious. It is the most flagitious, because it is equally flagitious, in principle, with any; and it includes all the others. It is the instrumentality by

which all the others are made effective. A government that can at pleasure accuse, shoot, and hang men, as traitors, for the one general offence of refusing to surrender themselves and their property unreservedly to its arbitrary will, can practice any and all special and particular oppressions it pleases.

The result --- and a natural one --- has been that we have had governments, State and national, devoted to nearly every grade and species of crime that governments have ever practiced upon their victims; and these crimes have culminated in a war that has cost a million of lives; a war carried on, upon one side, for chattel slavery, and on the other for political slavery; upon neither for liberty, justice, or truth. And these crimes have been committed, and this war waged, by men, and the descendants of men, who, less than a hundred years ago, said that all men were equal, and could owe neither service to individuals, nor allegiance to governments, except with their own consent.

XI.

No attempt or pretence, that was ever carried into practical operation amongst civilized men --- unless possibly the pretence of a "Divine Right," on the part of some, to govern and enslave others embodied so much of shameless absurdity, falsehood, impudence, robbery, usurpation, tyranny, and villainy of every kind, as the attempt or pretence of establishing a government by consent, and getting the actual consent of only so many as may be necessary to keep the rest in subjection by force. Such a government is a mere conspiracy of the strong against the weak. It no more rests on consent than does the worst government on earth.

What substitute for their consent is offered to the weaker party, whose rights are thus annihilated, struck out of existence, [*16] by the stronger? Only this: Their consent is presumed! That is, these usurpers condescendingly and graciously presume that those whom they enslave, consent to surrender their all of life, liberty, and property into the hands of those who thus usurp dominion over them! And it is pretended that this presumption of their consent --- when no actual consent has been given --- is sufficient to save the rights of the victims, and to justify the usurpers! As well might the highwayman pretend to justify himself by presuming that the traveler consents to part with his money. As well might the assassin justify himself by simply presuming that his victim consents to part with his life. As well the holder of chattel slaves to himself, by presuming that they consent to his authority, and to the whips and the robbery which he practices upon them. The presumption is simply a presumption that the weaker party consent to be slaves.


Such is the presumption on which alone our government relies to justify the power it maintains over its unwilling subjects. And it was to establish that presumption as the inexorable and perpetual law of this country, that so much money and blood have been expended.

The Ten Causes of the War Between The States

By James W. King and LtCol Thomas M. Nelson

Historians have long debated the causes of the war and the Southern perspective differs greatly from the Northern perspective. Based upon the study of original documents of the War Between The States (Civil War) era and facts and information published by Confederate Veterans, Confederate Chaplains, Southern writers and Southern Historians before, during, and after the war, I present the facts, opinions, and conclusions stated in the following article.

Technically the 10 causes listed are reasons for Southern secession. The only cause of the war was that the South was invaded and responded to Northern aggression.



I respectfully disagree with those who claim that the War Between the States was fought over slavery or that the abolition of slavery in the Revolutionary Era or early Federal period would have prevented war. It is my opinion that war was inevitable between the North and South due to complex political and cultural differences. The famous Englishman Winston Churchill stated that the war between the North and South was one of the most unpreventable wars in history. The Cause that the Confederate States of America fought for (1861-1865) was Southern Independence from the United States of America. Many parallels exist between the War for American Independence (1775-1783) and the War for Southern Independence.

There were 10 political causes of the war (causes of Southern Secession) ---one of which was slavery--- which was a scapegoat for all the differences that existed between the North and South. The Northern industrialists had wanted a war since about 1830 to get the South's resources (land-cotton-coal-timber-minerals) for pennies on the dollar. All wars are economic and are always between centralists and decentralists. The North would have found an excuse to invade the South even if slavery had never existed.

A war almost occurred during 1828-1832 over the tariff when South Carolina passed nullification laws. The U.S. congress had increased the tariff rate on imported products to 40% (known as the tariff of abominations in Southern States). This crisis had nothing to do with slavery. If slavery had never existed --period--or had been eliminated at the time the Declaration of Independence was written in 1776 or any time prior to 1860 it is my opinion that there would still have been a war sooner or later.

On a human level there were 5 causes of the war--New England Greed--New England Radicals--New England Fanatics--New England Zealots--and New England Hypocrites. During "So Called Reconstruction" (1865-1877) the New England Industrialists got what they had really wanted for 40 years--THE SOUTH'S RESOURCES

FOR PENNIES ON THE DOLLAR. It was a political coalition between the New England economic interests and the New England fanatics and zealots that caused Southern secession to be necessary for economic survival and safety of the population.

1. TARIFF

Prior to the war about 75% of the money to operate the Federal Government was derived from the Southern States via an unfair sectional tariff on imported goods and 50% of the total 75% was from just 4 Southern states--Virginia-North Carolina--South Carolina and Georgia. Only 10%--20% of this tax money was being returned to the South. The Southern states were being treated as an agricultural colony of the North and bled dry. John Randolph of Virginia's remarks in opposition to the tariff of 1820 demonstrates that fact. The North claimed that they fought the war to preserve the Union but the New England Industrialists who were in control of the North were actually supporting preservation of the Union to maintain and increase revenue from the tariff. The industrialists wanted the South to pay for the industrialization of America at no expense to them. Revenue bills introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives prior to the War Between the States were biased, unfair and inflammatory to the South. Abraham Lincoln had promised the Northern industrialists that he would increase the tariff rate if he was elected president of the United States. Lincoln increased the rate to a level that exceeded even the "Tariff of Abominations" 40% rate that had so infuriated the South during the 1828-1832 eras (between 50 and 51% on iron goods). The election of a president that was Anti-Southern on all issues and politically associated with the New England industrialists, fanatics, and zealots brought about the Southern secession movement.

2. CENTRALIZATION VERSUS STATES RIGHTS

The United States of America was founded as a Constitutional Federal Republic in 1789 composed of a Limited Federal Government and Sovereign States. The North wanted to and did alter the form of Government this nation was founded upon. The Confederate States of America fought to preserve Constitutional Limited Federal Government as established by America's founding fathers who were primarily Southern Gentlemen from Virginia. Thus Confederate soldiers were fighting for rights that had been paid for in blood by their forefathers upon the battlefields of the American Revolution. Abraham Lincoln had a blatant disregard for The Constitution of the United States of America. His War of aggression Against the South changed America from a Constitutional Federal Republic to a Democracy (with Socialist leanings) and broke the original Constitution. The infamous Socialist Karl Marx sent Lincoln a letter of congratulations after his reelection in 1864. A considerable number of European Socialists came to America and fought for the Union (North).

3. CHRISTIANITY VERSUS SECULAR HUMANISM

The South believed in basic Christianity as presented in the Holy Bible. The North had many Secular Humanists (atheists, transcendentalists and non-Christians). Southerners were afraid of what kind of country America might become if the North had its way. Secular Humanism is the belief that there is no God and that man, science and government can solve all problems. This philosophy advocates human rather than religious values. Reference: Frank Conner's book "The South under Siege 1830-2000."

4. CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

Southerners and Northerners were of different Genetic Lineage's. Southerners were primarily of Western English (original Britons), Scottish, and Irish lineage (Celtic) whereas Northerners tended to be of Anglo-Saxon and Danish (Viking) extraction. The two cultures had been at war and at odds for over 1000 years before they arrived in America. Our ancient ancestors in Western England under King Arthur humbled the Saxon princes at

the battle of Baden Hill (circa 497 AD --516 AD). The cultural differences that contributed to the War Between the States (1861-1865) had existed for 1500 years or more.

5. CONTROL OF WESTERN TERRITORIES

The North wanted to control Western States and Territories such as Kansas and Nebraska. New England formed Immigrant Aid Societies and sent settlers to these areas that were politically attached to the North. They passed laws against slavery that Southerners considered punitive. These political actions told Southerners they were not welcome in the new states and territories. It was all about control--slavery was a scapegoat.

6. NORTHERN INDUSTRIALISTS WANTED THE SOUTH'S RESOURCES

The Northern Industrialists wanted a war to use as an excuse to get the South's resources for pennies on the dollar. They began a campaign about 1830 that would influence the common people of the North and create enmity that would allow them to go to war against the South. These Northern Industrialists brought up a morality claim against the South alleging the evils of slavery. The Northern Hypocrites conveniently neglected to publicize the fact that 5 New England States (Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and New York) were primarily responsible for the importation of most of the slaves from Africa to America. These states had both private and state owned fleets of ships.

7. SLANDER OF THE SOUTH BY NORTHERN NEWSPAPERS

This political cause ties in to the above listed efforts by New England Industrialists. Beginning about 1830 the Northern Newspapers began to slander the South. The Industrialists used this tool to indoctrinate the common people of the North. They used slavery as a scapegoat and brought the morality claim up to a feverish pitch. Southerners became tired of reading in the Northern Newspapers about what bad and evil people they were just because their neighbor down the road had a few slaves. This propaganda campaign created hostility between the ordinary citizens of the two regions and created the animosity necessary for war. The Northern Industrialists worked poor whites in the factories of the North under terrible conditions for 18 hours a day (including children). When the workers became old and infirm they were fired. It is a historical fact that during this era there were thousands of old people living homeless on the streets in the cities of the North. In the South a slave was cared for from birth to death. Also the diet and living conditions of Southern slaves was superior to that of most white Northern factory workers. Southerners deeply resented this New England hypocrisy and slander.

8. NEW ENGLANDERS ATTEMPTED TO INSTIGATE MASSIVE SLAVE REBELLIONS IN THE SOUTH

Abolitionists were a small but vocal and militant group in New England who demanded instant abolition of slavery in the South. These fanatics and zealots were calling for massive slave uprisings that would result in the murder of Southern men, women and children. Southerners were aware that such an uprising had occurred in Santa Domingo in the 1790 era and that the French (white) population had been massacred. The abolitionists published a terrorist manifesto and tried to smuggle 100,000 copies into the South showing slaves how to murder their masters at night. Then when John Brown raided Harpers Ferry, Virginia in 1859 the political situation became inflammatory. Prior to this event there had been more abolition societies in the South than in the North. Lincoln and most of the Republican Party (64 members of congress) had adopted a political platform in support of terrorist acts against the South. Some (allegedly including Lincoln) had contributed monetarily as supporters of John Brown's terrorist activities. Again slavery was used as a scapegoat for all differences that existed between the North and South.

9. SLAVERY

Indirectly slavery was a cause of the war. Most Southerners did not own slaves and would not have fought for the protection of slavery. However they believed that the North had no Constitutional right to free slaves held by citizens of Sovereign Southern States. Prior to the war there were five times as many abolition societies in the South as in the North. Virtually all educated Southerners were in favor of gradual emancipation of slaves. Gradual emancipation would have allowed the economy and labor system of the South to gradually adjust to a free paid labor system without economic collapse. Furthermore, since the New England States were responsible for the development of slavery in America, Southerners saw the morality claims by the North as blatant hypocrisy. The first state to legalize slavery had been Massachusetts in 1641 and this law was directed primarily at Indians. In colonial times the economic infrastructure of the port cities of the North was dependent upon the slave trade. The first slave ship in America, "THE DESIRE", was fitted out in Marblehead, Massachusetts. Further proof that Southerners were not fighting to preserve slavery is found in the diary of an officer in the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia. He stated that "he had never met a man in the Army of Northern Virginia that claimed he was fighting to preserve slavery". If the war had been over slavery, the composition of the politicians, officers, enlisted men, and even African Americans would have been different. Confederate General Robert E. Lee had freed his slaves (Custis Washington estate) prior to 1863 whereas Union General Grant's wife Julia did not free her slaves until after the war when forced to do so by the 13th amendment to the constitution. Grant even stated that if the abolitionists claimed he was fighting to free slaves that he would offer his services to the South. Mildred Lewis Rutherford (1852-1928) was for many years the historian for the United Daughters Of The Confederacy (UDC). In her book Truths Of History she stated that there were more slaveholders in the Union Army (315,000) than the Confederate Army (200,000). Statistics and estimates also show that about 300,000 blacks supported the Confederacy versus about 200,000 for the Union. Clearly the war would have been fought along different lines if it had been fought over slavery. The famous English author Charles Dickens stated "the Northern onslaught upon Southern slavery is a specious piece of humbug designed to mask their desire for the economic control of the Southern states."

10. NORTHERN AGGRESSION AGAINST SOUTHERN STATES

Proof that Abraham Lincoln wanted war may be found in the manner he handled the Fort Sumter incident. Original correspondence between Lincoln and Naval Captain G.V.Fox shows proof that Lincoln acted with deceit and willfully provoked South Carolina into firing on the fort (A TARIFF COLLECTION FACILITY). It was politically important that the South be provoked into firing the first shot so that Lincoln could claim the Confederacy started the war. Additional proof that Lincoln wanted war is the fact that Lincoln refused to meet with a Confederate peace delegation. They remained in Washington for 30 days and returned to Richmond only after it became apparent that Lincoln wanted war and refused to meet and discuss a peace agreement. After setting up the Fort Sumter incident for the purpose of starting a war, Lincoln called for 75,000 troops to put down what he called a rebellion. He intended to march Union troops across Virginia and North Carolina to attack South Carolina. Virginia and North Carolina were not going to allow such an unconstitutional and criminal act of aggression against a sovereign sister Southern State. Lincoln's act of aggression caused the secession of the upper Southern States.

On April 17th 1861, Governor Letcher of Virginia sent this message to Washington DC: "I have only to say that the militia of Virginia will not be furnished to the powers of Washington for any such use or purpose as they have in view. Your object is to subjugate the Southern states and the requisition made upon me for such an object in my judgement not within the purview of the constitution or the act of 1795, will not be complied with. You have chosen to inaugurate civil war; having done so we will meet you in a spirit as determined as the administration has exhibited toward the South."

The WAR BETWEEN THE STATES 1861-1865 occurred due to many complex causes and factors as enumerated above. Those who make claims that "the war was over slavery" or that if slavery had been abolished in 1776 when the Declaration of Independence was signed or in 1789 when The Constitution of the United

States of America was signed, that war would not have occurred between North and South are being very simplistic in their views and opinions.

The following conversation between English ship Captain Hillyar and Capt. Raphael Semmes-Confederate Ship CSS Sumter (and after 1862 CSS Alabama) occurred during the war on August 5th, 1861. It is a summary from a well-educated Southerner who is stating his reasons for fighting. Captain Hillyar expressed surprised at Captain Semme's contention that the people of the South were "defending ourselves against robbers with knives at our throats", and asked for further clarification as to how this was so, the exchange below occurred. I especially was impressed with Semmes' assessment of Yankee motives - the creation of "Empire"!

Semmes: "Simply that the machinery of the Federal Government, under which we have lived, and which was designed for the common benefit, has been made the means of despoiling the South, to enrich the North", and I explained to him the workings of the iniquitous tariffs, under the operation of which the South had, in effect, been reduced to a dependent colonial condition, almost as abject as that of the Roman provinces, under their proconsuls; the only difference being, that smooth-faced hypocrisy had been added to robbery, inasmuch as we had been plundered under the forms of law"

Captain Hillyar: "All this is new to me", replied the captain. "I thought that your war had arisen out of the slavery question".

Semmes: "That is the common mistake of foreigners. The enemy has taken pains to impress foreign nations with this false view of the case. With the exception of a few honest zealots, the canting hypocritical Yankee cares as little for our slaves as he does for our draught animals. The war which he has been making upon slavery for the last 40 years is only an interlude, or by-play, to help on the main action of the drama, which is Empire; and it is a curious coincidence that it was commenced about the time the North began to rob the South by means of its tariffs. When a burglar designs to enter a dwelling for the purpose of robbery, he provides himself with the necessary implements. The slavery question was one of the implements employed to help on the robbery of the South. It strengthened the Northern party, and enabled them to get their tariffs through Congress; and when at length, the South, driven to the wall, turned, as even the crushed worm will turn, it was cunningly perceived by the Northern men that 'No slavery' would be a popular war-cry, and hence, they used it.

It is true that we are defending our slave property, but we are defending it no more than any other species of our property - it is all endangered, under a general system of robbery. We are in fact, fighting for independence. The Union victory in 1865 destroyed the right of secession in America, which had been so cherished by America's founding fathers as the principle of their revolution. British historian and political philosopher Lord Acton, one of the most intellectual figures in Victorian England, understood the deeper meaning of Southern defeat. In a letter to former Confederate General Robert E. Lee dated November 4, 1866, Lord Acton wrote "I saw in States Rights the only available check upon the absolutism of the sovereign will, and secession filled me with hope, not as the destruction but as the redemption of Democracy. I deemed you were fighting the battles of our liberty, our progress, and our civilization and I mourn for that which was lost at Richmond more deeply than I rejoice over that which was saved at Waterloo (defeat of Napoleon). As Illinois Governor Richard Yates stated in a message to his state assembly on January 2, 1865, the war had "tended, more than any other event in the history of the country, to militate against the Jeffersonian Ideal (Thomas Jefferson) that the best government is that which governs least.

Years after the war former Confederate president Jefferson Davis stated "I Am saddened to Hear Southerners Apologize For Fighting To Preserve Our Inheritance". Some years later former U.S. president Theodore Roosevelt stated "Those Who Will Not Fight For The Graves Of Their Ancestors Are Beyond Redemption".

History of the Office of the Illinois Attorney General

By: Shawn W. Denney, Former Senior Counsel to the Attorney General

As the chief legal officer of the State, the Attorney General has the constitutional duty of acting as legal adviser to and legal representative of State agencies. He or she has the prerogative of conducting legal affairs for the State. The effect of this grant of power to the Attorney General is that Illinois is served by a centralized legal advisory system. *EPA v. PCB* (1977), 69 Ill. 2d 394.

The Office of Attorney General first came into existence at the admission of the State of Illinois to the Union on December 3, 1818. Adapted constitutionally and legislatively over the years to meet the needs of a growing State, the office has increased in size and importance and its powers have been greatly expanded since the early days of Illinois State government. This history traces the constitutional and statutory development of the Office of Attorney General from an office filled at the option of and by the General Assembly to an independent office, responsible to the electorate, with broad powers not subject to diminishment or transfer.

The Constitution of 1818, adopted on August 26, 1818, by a Constitutional Convention held in Kaskaskia, authorized the General Assembly to appoint an Attorney General and to regulate his duties by law. (Ill. Const. 1818, Schedule, §10.) Illinois' first Attorney General was Daniel Pope Cook, who served for 11 days beginning on March 5, 1819. Attorney General Cook went on to represent Illinois in the U.S. Congress; and Cook County, created in 1831, was named in his honor. Though none served such a short term, most other holders of the office during its first three decades served for relatively short periods of time, generally one to two years. No fixed term was provided for the office until a two-year term was established by law in 1831. (Laws 1831, pp. 17-18.)

The General Assembly defined the Attorney General's duties as well as provided for the appointment of circuit attorneys in "An Act for the appointment of Circuit Attorneys, and defining their duties, and the duties of the Attorney General," approved March 23, 1819. (Laws 1819, p. 204.) Section 8 of the Act established powers specific to the Attorney General, including the duty to "prosecute on behalf of the state, all suits which may be commenced by and on behalf of the said state, and all matters relating to the revenue thereof, and all impeachments * * *." In addition, section 8 required the Attorney General to give his opinion in writing on all questions of law "relating to the public concerns of this state" to the Governor, the Auditor of Public Accounts and the State Treasurer.

The Attorney General also functioned as a circuit attorney in the circuit that he was to designate under section 7 of the 1819 Act. [In the event of a vacancy, a successor Attorney General was to reside and prosecute in the circuit of his predecessor to avoid interference with existing circuit attorney appointments.] Circuit attorneys in the remaining three circuits of the state were appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. Unlike the Office of Attorney General, the office of circuit attorney was not specifically provided for in the 1818 Constitution, but was created in the 1819 Act. Circuit attorneys were charged in section 3 of the Act with prosecuting "all matters and things, pleas, actions, and suits, wherein the state is a party." Under section 3 of the Act, the circuit attorneys and the Attorney General were to be commissioned by the Governor "to continue in office during good behavior."

In the provisions of "An Act supplemental to an Act entitled 'An Act for the appointment of Circuit Attorneys and defining their Duties, and the Duties of the Attorney General,' approved March 23, 1819," approved January 18, 1825 (Laws 1825, p. 178), the Attorney General was assigned the duties of a circuit attorney in the first judicial circuit, which included the counties of Peoria, Fulton, Schuyler, Adams, Pike, Calhoun, Greene, Morgan, and Sangamon. (Laws 1824, p. 119.) The remaining circuits, now numbering four, were to continue to be served by circuit attorneys appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The provisions of the 1819 and 1825 Acts were repealed by "An Act relating to the Attorney General and State's Attorneys," approved February 17, 1827, and effective February 19, 1827. (Revised Code 1827, p. 79.) In addition to continuing the responsibilities of the Attorney General as set forth in the 1819 and 1825 Acts, including the responsibility to function as circuit attorney for the first circuit, the 1827 Act, in section 2, specifically directed the Attorney General to "attend each of the terms of the supreme court, and there commence, prosecute or defend every case that the people of this state, the auditor of public accounts, the state bank or any county of this state shall in any wise be a party to, or interested in the result." The Attorney General's duty to give opinions was expanded to encompass, in addition to the Governor, the Auditor of Public Accounts, and the State Treasurer, the county commissioners' courts and justices of the peace within his circuit, the Secretary of State, and the General Assembly, or either branch thereof. In section 6, the Attorney General was given the right to call upon the State's Attorneys to assist in "the prosecution, or in the defence of any suit in the supreme court, or the trial of any impeachment which it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to attend to." [Note: The terms "State's Attorney," "circuit attorney," and "prosecuting attorney" were used interchangeably in statutes enacted prior to the adoption of the 1870 Constitution to refer to attorneys appointed or elected on the circuit level to exercise prescribed representational responsibilities. Likewise, this history, in using any of these terms, refers to the same office.]

In 1831, in section 5 of "An Act to provide for the election of auditor of public accounts, and further defining his duties," approved and effective February 14, 1831 (Laws 1831, pp. 17-18), the General Assembly spoke for the first time concerning the manner of election and term of office of the Attorney General. [This provision was reenacted in "An Act to consolidate the acts relative to the Auditor and Treasurer and election of the Attorney General," approved March 2, 1833, and effective July 3, 1833 (Revised Laws 1833, p. 103).] In that section, it was provided that the General Assembly, by joint vote of both branches, was to elect the Attorney General "whose duties shall be such as are or may be defined by law." Such election was to be made during the session of the General Assembly "commencing on the first Monday in December, 1834, and every two years thereafter."

Under the provisions of "An Act to amend an Act relative to the duties of the office of Attorney General of this state," approved and effective February 5, 1833 (Revised Laws 1833, p. 99), the Attorney General was required to "reside at the seat of government," and to "prosecute in the circuit in which the seat of government may be situate." The seat of government at the time was Vandalia, located in Fayette County, which was in the second circuit. In addition to Fayette, the second circuit included the counties of Madison, St. Clair, Monroe, Randolph, Washington, Clinton, Bond, Montgomery, and Shelby. (Revised Statutes 1829, p. 48.)

"An Act to amend an act, entitled 'An Act relating to the Attorney General and State's Attorneys,'" effective February 7, 1835 (Laws 1835, p. 44), provided for the appointment of the State's Attorneys by the General Assembly rather than by the Governor. The manner of selection chosen paralleled that used for appointing the Attorney General. This Act was passed over the objections of the Council of Revision, consisting of the Governor and the judges of the supreme court, which had power under article III, section 19 of the 1818 Constitution to return a bill with objections to its house of origin for reconsideration.

In "An Act further defining the duties of the Attorney General, and for other purposes," approved and effective February 26, 1841 (Laws 1841, p. 35), the Attorney General was given the duty to "enforce the penalties of the criminal code against all persons who have or may embezzle the public money, or who may be liable for

prosecution for any delinquency or default pertaining to the public revenue in his district." Further, the Attorney General was given the duty "to give information, and directions, and instructions to the prosecuting attorneys of the State, of any such offenses * * * in other parts of this State out of his district, so that prosecutions may be instituted against such offenders." This statute is as close as the Attorney General has ever come to having supervisory responsibility over State's Attorneys.

The provisions of the prior laws were codified in chapter 12 of the Revised Statutes of 1845, approved on March 3, 1845 (Revised Statutes 1845, p. 75). The General Assembly continued to appoint the Attorney General and the circuit attorneys for two year terms. The Attorney General, who was required to reside at the seat of government, continued to function ex officio as the circuit attorney for the circuit including the seat of government within its territory. The circuit attorneys appointed pursuant to this Act generally continued to be known as State's Attorneys, as they had previously been titled. (See, Revised Code 1827, p. 79; Laws 1835, p. 44.) Under the 1845 statute, the Attorney General retained the duties set forth in the 1827 statute.

The 1848 Constitution, effective April 1, 1848, made no provision for the selection of an Attorney General. During the Constitutional Convention, which met in Springfield from June 7 until August 31, 1847, language which would have created an elected constitutional office of Attorney General had been suggested by the select committee on the Judiciary for inclusion in the Judicial Article. That language provided as follows:

" * * *

Sec. 20. There shall be elected, by the qualified electors of this state, one attorney general, who shall hold his office for the term of four years, and until his successor shall be commissioned and qualified. He shall perform such duties and receive such compensation as may be prescribed by law.

* * * "

(Cole, Arthur Charles, ed., The Constitutional Debates of 1847 (Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield (1919)), p. 793.)

Charles H. Constable, an influential Whig leader, State senator and lawyer, moved to strike the section on the following grounds.

" * * *

* * * The office, said he, under the judicial system adopted by the Convention, was unnecessary. Under that system the circuit attorney for the state in that district where the seat of government may be, can be appointed the constitutional adviser of the Governor, and the state's prosecuting attorneys in the several circuits might be required, by the Legislature, to follow their cases up to the supreme court in their districts.

* * * "

(Cole, Arthur Charles, ed., The Constitutional Debates of 1847 (Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield (1919)), p. 793.)

The motion prevailed and the proposed section was stricken. The office was mentioned only in section 29 of article III, which continued a prohibition contained in article III, section 25 of the 1818 Constitution against the "attorney general" or an "attorney for the state," inter alia, holding a seat in the General Assembly.

Section 28 of article V of the 1848 Constitution provided for the election, "by the qualified electors thereof," of one State's Attorney [the prosecuting attorney alluded to by Mr. Constable] in each of the [initially nine] judicial circuits of this State, such State's Attorney to serve a four-year term and to perform such duties "as may be prescribed by law." Section 28 also authorized the establishment of a system of county attorneys to function in lieu of the State's Attorneys provided for in the section, but no legislation establishing such a system was ever enacted by the General Assembly.

Under the 1845 statute, which incorporated prior laws, the circuit attorneys, of whom the Attorney General was one, ex officio, had exercised powers similar to those of the Attorney General, including the authority to "commence and prosecute [in the Circuit Courts] actions, suits, process, indictments and prosecutions, civil and criminal, in which the people of this State * * * may be concerned." (Revised Statutes 1845, p. 76 (Section 4).) Appearance before the supreme court was the prerogative of the Attorney General, who, as was previously noted, could call upon any of the circuit attorneys for assistance "in the prosecution, or in the defence of any suit in the Supreme Court." (Revised Statutes 1845, p. 77 (Section 7).)

When the Office of Attorney General ceased to exist, his representational duties, as anticipated by Delegate Constable, were assumed by the State's Attorneys, and those duties continued to be exercised by them until the recreation of the Office of Attorney General by statute in 1867. Under the provisions of an "Act to enable the auditor of public accounts to prosecute claims in favor of the state," effective January 5, 1850 (Laws 1849 (2nd Sess.), p.6), authority to conduct the State's business in the supreme court was given to the prosecuting attorney for each circuit in which a supreme court grand division was held. [Article V, section 3 of the 1848 Constitution provided for the division of the State into three "grand divisions," with supreme court terms for the first being held at Mount Vernon, the second being held at Springfield, and the third being held at Ottawa. (Ill. Const. 1848, art. V, sec. 31.) Section 6 of the same article (Ill. Const. 1848, art. V, sec. 6) provided that the supreme court "shall hold one term annually in each of the aforesaid grand divisions."] In section 4 of the aforementioned Act, the appropriate "prosecuting attorney" was directed to "attend in that supreme court to all business therein in which the state * * * may be interested." For these services, he was paid an additional \$100 per annum out of the State treasury. There was, however, no statutory enactment assigning the Attorney General's advisory functions to another officer.

In 1867, the General Assembly recreated the Office of Attorney General by statute. Under the provisions of "An Act to create the office of the attorney general, and prescribing his duties," effective February 27, 1867 (Laws 1867, p. 46), the General Assembly provided for an interim appointment of the Attorney General by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, until the following election for Governor, at which time the Attorney General was to be elected by the qualified electors of the State to a four year term. (See, section 2 of the 1867 Act and Ill. Const. 1848, art. IV, sec. 2.) Robert G. Ingersoll, of Peoria, was appointed Attorney General by Governor Richard J. Oglesby on February 38, 1867. The first popularly elected Attorney General, Washington Bushnell, of LaSalle County, took office on January 11, 1869. Among the duties given to the Attorney General in the 1867 Act were the giving of opinions to the Governor, executive officers, State's Attorneys, the houses and committees of the General Assembly, the institution and prosecution of all actions, suits and complaints in favor of or for the use of the State, and representation before the supreme court in all cases of appeal.

The 1870 Constitution, effective August 8, 1870, reestablished the Office of Attorney General as a constitutional office. Article V, section 1 of that Constitution provided as follows:

"The executive department shall consist of a Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Auditor of Public Accounts, Treasurer, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Attorney General, who shall each hold office for a term of four years from the second Monday of January next after his election and until his successor is elected and qualified.

* * * "

(Emphasis added.)

Along with the other executive officers, the Attorney General was directed in section 1 to "perform such duties as may be prescribed by law." (Emphasis added.) The first Attorney General under the 1870 Constitution, James K. Edsall, of Lee County, was elected in November 1872, and took office on January 13, 1873.

The statutory powers of the Attorney General were restated in "An Act in regard to Attorneys General and State's Attorneys," approved March 22, 1872, and effective July 1, 1872 (Laws 1871-2, p. 169). Section 2 of this Act expanded on the five paragraphs contained in the 1867 Act, setting forth 12 paragraphs defining the Attorney General's duties. Section 4 of the current Attorney General Act (15 ILCS 205/4) is, in substance, largely based upon this enactment. The duties set forth in the 1872 Act included:

" * * *

First - - To appear for and represent the people of the state before the supreme court, in each of the grand divisions, in all cases in which the state or the people of the state are interested.

Second - - To institute and prosecute all actions and proceedings in favor of or for the use of the state, which may be necessary in the execution of the duties of any state officer.

Third - - To defend all actions and proceedings against any state officer, in his official capacity, in any of the courts of this state or the United States.

Fourth - - To consult with and advise the several state's attorneys in matters relating to the duties of their office; and when, in his judgment, the interest of the people of the state requires it, he shall attend the trial of any party accused of crime, and assist in the prosecution.

Fifth - - To consult with and advise the governor and other state officers, and give, when requested, written opinions upon all legal or constitutional questions relating to the duties of such officers, respectively.

Sixth - - To prepare, when necessary, proper drafts for contracts and other writings, relating to subjects in which the state is interested.

Seventh - - To give written opinions, when requested by either branch of the general assembly, or any committee thereof, upon constitutional or legal questions.

Eighth - - To enforce the proper application of funds appropriated to the public institutions of the state, prosecute breaches of trust in the administration of such funds, and, when necessary, prosecute corporations for failure or refusal to make the reports required by law.

Ninth - - To keep, in proper books, a register of all cases prosecuted or defended by him, in behalf of the state or its officers, and of all proceedings had in relation thereto, and to deliver the same to his successor in office.

Tenth - - To keep in his office a book, in which he shall record all the official opinions given by him during his term of office, which book shall be by him delivered to his successor in office.

Eleventh - - To pay into the state treasury all moneys received by him for the use of the state.

Twelfth - - To attend to and perform any other duty which may, from time to time, be required of him by law. " (Laws 1871-2, p. 170.)

This Act was reenacted verbatim, effective July 1, 1874, as part of the comprehensive revision of Illinois statutory law that resulted in the Illinois Revised Statutes. (See, Ill. Rev. Stat. 1874, ch. 14, par. 4.)

The effect of the establishment of the Office of Attorney General under the 1870 Constitution, not fully recognized for several decades, was the creation of an office with broad powers to represent and safeguard the interests of the People of this State. The Attorney General has been determined, in decisions of the supreme court, to have not just those duties and powers that might be specifically prescribed in statutory enactments, but to have all those duties that appertain to the Office of Attorney General as it was known at common law. The phrase "prescribed by law" was rejected as a limitation on the Attorney General's powers to those specified by statute. The supreme court stated in *Fergus v. Russel* (1915), 270 Ill. 304, discussed below, that "[t]he common law is as much a part of the law of this State as the statutes and is included in the meaning of this phrase." (See, 5 ILCS 50/1.)

In considering the powers of the Attorney General, the supreme court, in *Fergus v. Russel*, noted:

" * * *

* * * Under our form of government all of the prerogatives which pertain to the crown in England under the common law are here vested in the people, and if the Attorney General is vested by the constitution with all the common law powers of that officer and it devolves upon him to perform all the common law duties which were imposed upon that officer, then he becomes the law officer of the people, as represented in the State government, and its only legal representative in the courts, unless by the constitution itself or by some constitutional statute he has been divested of some of these powers and duties.

* * * "

(*Fergus*, at 337.)

The court went on to state:

" * * *

* * * By our Constitution we created this office by the common law designation of Attorney General and thus impressed it with all its common law powers and duties. As the Office of the Attorney General is the only office at common law [exercising legal functions] which is thus created by our Constitution, the Attorney General is the chief law officer of the State, and the only officer empowered to represent the people in any suit or proceeding in which the State is the real party in interest * * *.

* * * "

(*Fergus*, at 342.)

The court noted that it is the Attorney General's duty "to conduct the law business of the State, both in and out of the courts." *Fergus*, at 342.

With these pronouncements, the court in *Fergus* clearly established the Office of Attorney General as one with expansive powers which the General Assembly lacked the power to diminish. While it has frequently been

argued that much of the language in Fergus broadly describing the Attorney General's role is obiter dicta, it is clear that Fergus stands for "the principle that the Attorney General is the sole officer who may conduct litigation in which **the People of the State** are the real party in interest." *People ex rel. Scott v. Briceland* (1976), 65 Ill. 2d 485, 495. Under Fergus and its progeny, any attempt to authorize any other officer to conduct litigation in which the State is the real party in interest would be an impermissible interference with the Attorney General's constitutional powers and an appropriation to another agency to be used directly for such purposes would be unconstitutional and void.

The powers generally understood to belong to the Attorney General at common law have been summarized as follows:

" * * *

* * * 1st. To prosecute all actions, necessary for the protection and defense of the property and revenues of **the crown**. 2d. By information, to bring certain classes of persons accused of crimes and misdemeanors to trial. [3rd.] By scire facias, to revoke and annul grants made by **the crown** improperly, or when forfeited by the grantee thereof. 4th. By information, to recover money or other chattels, or damages for wrongs committed on the land, or other possessions of **the crown**. 5th. By writ of quo warranto, to determine the right of him who claims or usurps any office, franchise or liberty, and to vacate the charter, or annul the existence of a corporation, for violations of its charter, or for omitting to exercise its corporate powers. 6th. By writ of mandamus, to compel the admission of an officer duly chosen to his office, and to compel his restoration when illegally ousted. 7th. By information in chancery, to enforce trusts, and to prevent public nuisances, and the abuse of trust powers. 8th. By proceedings in rem, to recover property to which the crown may be entitled, by forfeiture for treason, and property, for which there is no other legal owner, such as wrecks, treasure trove, &c. (3 Black. Com., 256-7, 260 to 266; id., 427 and 428; 4 id., 308, 312.) 9th. And in certain cases, by information in chancery, for the protection of the rights of lunatics, and others, who are under the protection of **the crown**. (Mitford's Pl., 24-30, Adams' Equity, 301-2.)

* * * "

1919-20 Ill. Att'y Gen. Op. 618, 629-30, quoting from *People v. Miner*, 3 Lansing (NY) 396 (1868).

While many of these powers now have a statutory basis, the significance of the common law powers still must be understood from the perspective of the interests represented. **Representation of the Crown is translated in our system to representation of the People** thus, serving the public interest is established as the paramount obligation of the Attorney General. Further, these powers fix the core of the powers to be exercised by the Attorney General. While they may be expanded upon, nothing in this basic core can be transferred or exercised by any other officer.

At the same time that the Constitution created the Office of Attorney General in what has remained its form to this day, it changed the Office of State's Attorney from the form in which it had been previously known to its present form. The Constitution provided that at the 1872 election there would "be elected a state's attorney in and for each county in lieu of the [circuit] state's attorneys now provided by law." (Ill. Const. 1870, art. VI, sec. 22.) The incorporation of prior statutory language in legislation pertaining to the new offices as known under the 1870 Constitution left the responsibilities somewhat blurred, or at least closely interrelated. One can find to this day provisions for the commencement of actions in which the people of the State may be concerned (55 ILCS 5/9005(a)(1)) and for representation of State officers by State's Attorneys within their counties. (55 ILCS 5/3-9005(a)(4).) As in the 1827 and 1845 Acts, the current law allows the Attorney General to call on State's Attorneys for assistance in matters before the supreme court. (55 ILCS 5/3-9005(a)(8).) There is also a sharing of responsibilities in the area of criminal prosecution. (See, 15 ILCS 205/4.)

The Illinois Constitution of 1970, generally effective on July 1, 1971, continued the Office of Attorney General as it had been established under the 1870 Constitution. The Office of Attorney General is created in article V, section 1, and is described specifically in section 15 of article V, which provides as follows: "The Attorney General shall be the legal officer of the State and shall have the duties and powers that may be prescribed by law." While there was some discussion in the course of the Constitutional Convention concerning a possible limitation on the powers of the Attorney General, given the clear understanding from *Fergus v. Russel* that the prescription of powers by law was inclusive of the broad powers enjoyed by the Attorney General under the common law, the Convention included language that did not differ in import or effect from that in the 1870 Constitution. [Note: In their book *The Illinois Constitution: An Annotated and Comparative Analysis* (Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, Urbana (1969)), prepared for the Illinois Constitution Study Commission, George D. Braden and Rubin G. Cohn suggested, at p. 360, that reversion to the language of the 1818 Constitution ["regulated" versus "prescribed" by law] would "introduce adequate flexibility in allocating legal work within the Executive Department." The Convention did not opt for this suggested alteration.]

In *People ex rel. Scott v. Briceland* (1976), 65 Ill. 2d 485, it was the view of the Illinois Supreme Court that *Fergus* had been "incorporated into article V, section 15, of the present Constitution." **The court went on to reaffirm that "the Attorney General is the sole officer authorized to represent the people of this State in any litigation in which the People of this State are the real party in interest * * *."** In a subsequent case, *EPA v. PCB* (1977), 69 Ill. 2d 394, the court reaffirmed the Attorney General's "prerogative of conducting legal affairs for the State" and noted that the "Attorney General's responsibility is not limited to serving or representing the particular interests of State agencies, including opposing State agencies, but embraces serving or representing the broader interests of the State."

Because of the peculiar role carved out for the Attorney General, he or she stands, as a lawyer, in a position different from most other lawyers. His or her client is ultimately the People, and while he or she may represent officers and agencies that are parties to litigation within his purview, his or her relationship to those "clients" differs from a customary attorney/client relationship. (See *EPA v. PCB*, at 401-2.) When the Attorney General undertakes representation in his or her constitutional role, it is the Attorney General and not the officer or agency who controls the course of the representation. (See *Newberg, Inc. v. The Illinois State Toll Highway Authority* (1983), 98 Ill. 2d 58.) The Attorney General is fully empowered to control the State's litigation in the public interest. Under the applicable case law, one must come to the conclusion that the Attorney General has the power to make all decisions on the State's behalf in litigation he is handling, including those on strategy, the course of the litigation, and to make determinations on settlement and appeal.

Serving and representing the broader interests of the State takes the Attorney General into a wide range of areas, some of which were unknown at the time the common law powers were developed but which nevertheless can be addressed through the use of those powers. The State's day to day legal business has been joined by functions relating to the protection of the environment (developing from the common law power to prevent public nuisance), the combating of consumer fraud, the protection of the citizens' interests in public utility rate and service matters, and, most recently, in the obtainment of health care.

While the Attorney General has prosecutorial powers under the common law, he generally lacks the power to take exclusive charge of the prosecution of cases over which a State's Attorney shares authority, unless exclusive or independent authority is given by statute. (See, *People v. Massarella* (1978), 73 Ill. 2d 531, and *People v. Buffalo Confectionery Co.* (1980), 78 Ill. 2d 447.) The powers of the Attorney General provide that he is to assist State's Attorneys in prosecutions "when, in his judgment, the interest of the people of the State requires it." (15 ILCS 205/ 4.) Prosecution assistance has been a major function, particularly necessary when serious cases have arisen in smaller counties with limited resources. Criminal activity on a multicounty basis has led to statutory power to convene a statewide grand jury with powers crossing jurisdictional lines for investigation of specified drug and streetgang related offenses. (725 ILCS 215/1 et seq.) In specialized areas,

and particularly in areas pertaining to environmental protection, the General Assembly has given the Attorney General independent power to prosecute. As was provided in the office's earliest days, the Attorney General retains the prerogative to "appear for and represent the people of the state before the supreme court in all cases [civil or criminal] in which the state or the people of the state are interested." (15 ILCS 205/4.) Thus, most serious criminal matters, and particularly capital cases, eventually fall within the Attorney General's purview.

In the 180 year history of this State, the Office of the Attorney General has developed and has become an indispensable participant in this State's governance. The fact that the common law places the Attorney General in a position of being an advocate for the broader interests of the State, as attorney for the People as a whole, postures him or her to look beyond what can sometimes be the parochial interests of State agencies and governmental units to what is the greater good and the more significant interest.

Attorneys General of Illinois

Daniel Pope Cook	1819
William Mears	1819-1821
Samuel D. Lockwood	1821-1823
James Turney	1823-1829
George Forquer	1829-1832
James Semple	1833-1834
Ninian W. Edwards	1834-1835
Jesse B. Thomas, Jr.	1835-1836
Walter B. Scates	1836-1837
Usher F. Linder	1837-1838
George W. Olney	1838-1839
Wickliffe Kitchell	1839-1840
Josiah Lamborn	1840-1843
James A. McDougall	1843-1846
David B. Campbell	1846-1848
Robert G. Ingersoll	1867-1869
Washington Bushnell	1869-1873
James K. Edsall	1873-1881
James McCartney	1881-1885
George Hunt	1885-1893

Maurice T. Moloney	1893-1897
Edward C. Akin	1897-1901
Howland J. Hamlin	1901-1905
William H. Stead	1905-1913
Patrick J. Lucey	1912-1917
Edward J. Brundage	1917-1925
Oscar E. Carlstrom	1925-1933
Otto Kerner	1933-1938
John Edward A. Cassidy	1938-1941
George F. Barrett	1941-1949
Ivan A. Elliott	1949-1953
Latham Castle	1953-1959
Grenville Beardsley	1959-1960
William L. Guild	1960-1961
William G. Clark	1961-1969
William J. Scott	1969-1980
Tyrone C. Fahner	1980-1983
Neil F. Hartigan	1983-1991
Roland W. Burris	1991-1995
Jim Ryan	1995-2003
Lisa Madigan	2003-Present

The Crown Temple

By Michael Edward of the Ecclesiastic Commonwealth Community (ECC)

The Templars of the Crown

The governmental and judicial systems within the United States of America, at both federal and local state levels, is owned by the Crown, which is a private foreign power. Before jumping to conclusions about the Queen of England or the Royal Families of Britain owning the U.S.A., this is a different Crown and is fully exposed and explained below. We are specifically referencing the established Templar Church, known for centuries by the world as the Crown. From this point on, we will also refer to the Crown as the Crown Temple or Crown Templar, all three being synonymous.

First, a little historical background. The Temple Church was built by the Knights Templar in two parts: the Round and the Chancel. The Round Church was consecrated in 1185 and modeled after the circular Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The Chancel was built in 1240. The Temple Church serves both the Inner and Middle Temples (see below) and is located between Fleet Street and Victoria Embankment at the Thames River. Its grounds also house the Crown Offices at Crown Office Row. This Temple Church is outside any Canonical jurisdiction. The Master of the Temple is appointed and takes his place by sealed (non-public) patent, without induction or institution.

All licensed Bar Attorneys - Attorners (see definitions below) in the U.S. owe their allegiance and give their solemn oath in pledge to the Crown Temple, realizing this or not. This is simply due to the fact that all Bar Associations throughout the world are signatories and franchises to the International Bar Association located at the Inns of Court at Crown Temple, which are physically located at Chancery Lane behind Fleet Street in London. Although they vehemently deny it, all Bar Associations in the U.S., such as the American Bar Association, the Florida Bar, or California Bar Association, are franchises to the Crown.

The Inns of Court (see below, The Four Inns of Court) to the Crown Temple use the Banking and Judicial system of the City of London - a sovereign and independent territory which is not a part of Great Britain (just as Washington City, as DC was called in the 1800's, is not a part of the north American states, nor is it a state) to defraud, coerce, and manipulate the American people. These Fleet Street bankers and lawyers are committing crimes in America under the guise and color of law (see definitions for legal and lawful below). They are known collectively as the Crown. Their lawyers are actually Templar Bar Attornies, not lawyers.

The present Queen of England is not the Crown, as we have all been led to believe. Rather, it is the Bankers and Attornies (Attorneys) who are the actual Crown or Crown Temple. The Monarch aristocrats of England have not been ruling sovereigns since the reign of King John, circa 1215. All royal sovereignty of the old British Crown since that time has passed to the Crown Temple in Chancery.

The U.S.A. is not the free and sovereign nation that our federal government tells us it is. If this were true, we would not be dictated to by the Crown Temple through its bankers and attorneys. The U.S.A. is controlled and manipulated by this private foreign power and our unlawful Federal U.S. Government is their pawn broker. The bankers and Bar Attorneys in the U.S.A. are a franchise in oath and allegiance to the Crown at Chancery - the Crown Temple Church and its Chancel located at Chancery Lane – a manipulative body of elite bankers and attorneys from the independent City of London who violate the law in America by imposing fraudulent legal - but totally unlawful - contracts on the American people. The banks Rule the Temple Church and the Attorneys carry out their Orders by controlling their victim's judiciary.

Since the first Chancel of the Temple Church was built by the Knights Templar, this is not a new ruling system by any means. The Chancel, or Chancery, of the Crown Inner Temple Court was where King John was, in January 1215, when the English barons demanded that he confirm the rights enshrined in the Magna Carta. This City of London Temple was the headquarters of the Templar Knights in Great Britain where Order and Rule were first made, which became known as Code. Remember all these terms, such as Crown, Temple, Templar, Knight, Chancel, Chancery, Court, Code, Order and Rule as we tie together their origins with the present American Temple Bar system of thievery by equity (chancery) contracts.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. -Matthew 23:27

By what authority has the Crown usurped the natural sovereignty of the American people? Is it acceptable that the U.S. Supreme Court decides constitutional issues in the U.S.A? How can it be considered in any manner as being constitutional when this same Supreme Court is appointed by (not elected) and paid by the Federal U.S. Government? As you will soon see, the land called North America belongs to the Crown Temple.

The legal system (judiciary) of the U.S.A. is controlled by the Crown Temple from the independent and sovereign City of London. The private Federal Reserve System, which issues fiat U.S. Federal Reserve Notes, is financially owned and controlled by the Crown from Switzerland, the home and legal origin for the charters of the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and most importantly, the Bank of International Settlements. Even Hitler respected his Crown bankers by not bombing Switzerland. The Bank of International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland controls all the central banks of the G7 nations. He who controls the gold rules the world.

Definitions you never knew:

ATTORN [e-'tern] Anglo-French aturner to transfer (allegiance of a tenant to another lord), from Old French atornier to turn (to), arrange, from a- to + torner to turn: to agree to be the tenant of a new landlord or owner of the same property. Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law 1996.

ATTORN, v.i. [L. ad and torno.] In the feudal law, to turn, or transfer homage and service from one lord to another. This is the act of feudatories, vassels or tenants, upon the alienation of the estate. Websters - 1828 Dictionary.

ESQUIRE, n [L. scutum, a shield; Gr. a hide, of which shields were anciently made.], a shield-bearer or armor-bearer, scutifer; an attendant on a knight. Hence in modern times, a title of dignity next in degree below a knight. In England, this title is given to the younger sons of noblemen, to officers of the king's courts and of the household, to counselors at law, justices of the peace, while in commission, sheriffs, and other gentlemen. In the United States, the title is given to public officers of all degrees, from governors down to justices and attorneys. Websters - 1828 Dictionary.

RULE, n. [L. regula, from rego, to govern, that is, to stretch, strain or make straight.] 1. Government; sway; empire; control; supreme command or authority. 6. In monasteries, corporations or societies, a law or regulation to be observed by the society and its particular members. Websters - 1828 Dictionary

RULE n. 1 [C] a statement about what must or should be done, (syn.) a regulation.

REGULATION n. 1 [C] a rule, statement about what can be done and what cannot. 2 [U] the general condition of controlling any part of human life. -Newbury House Dictionary - 1999.

CODE n. 1 [C; U] a way of hiding the true meaning of communications from all except those people who have the keys to understand it. 2 [C] a written set of rules of behavior. 3 [C] a formal group of principles or laws. -v. coded, coding, codes to put into code, (syn.) to encode. ENCODE v. 1 to change written material into secret symbols. - Newbury House Dictionary - 1999.

CURTAIN n. [OE. cortin, curtin, fr. OF. cortine, curtine, F. courtine, LL. cortina, also, small court, small inclosure surrounded by walls, from cortis court. See Court.] 4 A flag; an ensign; -- in contempt. [Obs.] Shak. Behind the curtain, in concealment; in secret. -1913 Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary.

COURT, n. 3. A palace; the place of residence of a king or sovereign prince. 5. Persons who compose the retinue or council of a king or emperor. 9. The tabernacle had one court; the temple, three. Webster's 1828 Dictionary.

COURT n. 2 the place where a king or queen lives or meets others. -The Newbury House Dictionary - 1999.

TEMPLAR, n. [from the Temple, a house near the Thames, which originally belonged to the knights Templars. The latter took their denomination from an apartment of the palace of Baldwin II in Jerusalem, near the temple.] 1. A student of the law. -Webster's 1828 Dictionary.

TEMPLE, n. [L. templum.] 1. A public edifice erected in honor of some deity. Among pagans, a building erected to some pretended deity, and in which the people assembled to worship. Originally, temples were open places, as the Stonehenge in England. 4. In England, the Temples are two inns of court, thus called because anciently the dwellings of the knights Templars. They are called the Inner and the Middle Temple. -Webster's 1828 Dictionary.

CAPITOL, n. 1. The temple of Jupiter in Rome, and a fort or castle, on the Mons Capitolinus. In this, the Senate of Rome anciently assembled; and on the same place, is still the city hall or town-house, where the conservators of the Romans hold their meetings. The same name was given to the principal temples of the Romans in their colonies.

INN, n. [Hebrew, To dwell or to pitch a tent.] 2. In England, a college of municipal or common law professors and students; formerly, the town-house of a nobleman, bishop or other distinguished personage, in which he

resided when he attended the court. Inns of court, colleges in which students of law reside and are instructed. The principal are the Inner Temple, the Middle Temple, Lincoln's Inn, and Gray's Inn. Inns of chancery, colleges in which young students formerly began their law studies. These are now occupied chiefly by attorneys, solicitors, etc.

INNER, a. [from in.] Interior; farther inward than something else, as an inner chamber; the inner court of a temple or palace. –Webster's 1828 Dictionary.

CROWN, n. 4. Imperial or regal power or dominion; sovereignty. There is a power behind the crown greater than the crown itself. Junius. 19. A coin stamped with the image of a crown; hence, a denomination of money; as, the English crown. -- Crown land, land belonging to the crown, that is, to the sovereign. -- Crown law, the law which governs criminal prosecutions. – Crown lawyer, one employed by the crown, as in criminal cases. v.t. 1. To cover, decorate, or invest with a crown; hence, to invest with royal dignity and power. -1913 Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary.

COLONY, n. 1. A company [i.e. legal corporation] or body of people transplanted from their mother country to a remote province or country to cultivate and inhabit it, and remaining subject to the jurisdiction of the parent state; as the British colonies in America or the Indies; the Spanish colonies in South America. –Webster's 1828 Dictionary.

STATE, n. [L., to stand, to be fixed.] 1. Condition; the circumstances of a being or thing at any given time. These circumstances may be internal, constitutional or peculiar to the being, or they may have relation to other beings. 4. Estate; possession. [See Estate.] –Webster's 1828 Dictionary.

ESTATE, n. [L. status, from sto, to stand. The roots stb, std and stg, have nearly the same signification, to set, to fix. It is probable that the L. sto is contracted from stad, as it forms steti.] 1. In a general sense, fixedness; a fixed condition; 5. Fortune; possessions; property in general. 6. The general business or interest of government; hence, a political body; a commonwealth; a republic. But in this sense, we now use State. ESTATE, v.t. To settle as a fortune. 1. To establish. –Webster's 1828 Dictionary.

PATENT, a. [L. patens, from pateo, to open.] 3. Appropriated by letters patent. 4. Apparent; conspicuous. PATENT, n. A writing given by the proper authority and duly authenticated, granting a privilege to some person or persons. By patent, or letters patent, that is, open letters, the king of Great Britain grants lands, honors and franchises.

PATENT, v.t. To grant by patent. 1. To secure the exclusive right of a thing to a person.

LAWFUL. In accordance with the law of the land; according to the law; permitted, sanctioned, or justified by law. "Lawful" properly implies a thing conformable to or enjoined by law; "Legal", a thing in the form or after the manner of law or binding by law. A writ or warrant issuing from any court, under color of law, is a "legal" process however defective. A Dictionary of Law 1893.

LEGAL. Latin legalis. Pertaining to the understanding, the exposition, the administration, the science and the practice of law: as, the legal profession, legal advice; legal blanks, newspaper. Implied or imputed in law. Opposed to actual. "Legal" looks more to the letter, and "Lawful" to the spirit, of the law. "Legal" is more appropriate for conformity to positive rules of law; "Lawful" for accord with ethical principle. "Legal" imports

rather that the forms of law are observed, that the proceeding is correct in method, that rules prescribed have been obeyed;

"Lawful" that the right is actful in substance, that moral quality is secured. "Legal" is the antithesis of "equitable", and the equivalent of "constructive". – 2 Abbott's Law Dict. 24; A Dictionary of Law (1893).

STATUS IN QUO, STATUS QUO. [L., state in which.] The state in which anything is already. The phrase is also used retrospectively, as when, on a treaty of peace, matters return to the status quo ante bellum, or are left in statu quo ante bellum, i.e., the state (or, in the state) before the war. -1913 Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary

The Four Inns of Court to the unholy Temple

Globally, all the legalistic scams promoted by the exclusive monopoly of the Temple Bar and their Bar Association franchises come from four Inns or Temples of Court: the Inner Temple, the Middle Temple, Lincoln's Inn, and Gray's Inn. These Inns/Temples are exclusive and private country clubs; secret societies of world power in commerce. They are well established, some having been founded in the early 1200's. The Queen and Queen Mother of England are current members of both the Inner Temple and Middle Temple. Gray's Inn specializes in Taxation legalities by Rule and Code for the Crown. Lincoln's Inn received its name from the Third Earl of Lincoln (circa 1300).

Just like all U.S. based franchise Bar Associations, none of the Four Inns of the Temple are incorporated - for a definite and purposeful reason: You can't make claim against a non-entity and a non-being. They are private societies without charters or statutes, and their so-called constitutions are based solely on custom and self-regulation. In other words, they exist as secret societies without a public front door unless you're a private member called to their Bar.

While the Inner Temple holds the legal system franchise by license to steal from Canada and Great Britain, it is the Middle Temple that has legal license to steal from America. This comes about directly via their Bar Association franchises to the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple through the Crown Temple.

From THE HISTORY OF THE INN, Later Centuries, [p.6], written by the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, we can see a direct tie to the Bar Association franchises and its Crown signatories in America:

Call to the Bar or keeping terms in one of the four Inns a pre-requisite to Call at King's Inns until late in the 19th century. In the 17th and 18th centuries, students came from the American colonies and from many of the West Indian islands. The Inn's records would lead one to suppose that for a time there was hardly a young gentleman in Charleston who had not studied here. Five of the signatories to the Declaration of Independence were Middle Templars, and notwithstanding it and its consequences, Americans continued to come here until the War of 1812.

All Bar Association licensed Attorneys must keep the terms of their oath to the Crown Temple in order to be accepted or called to Bar at any of the King's Inns. Their oath, pledge, and terms of allegiance are made to the Crown Temple.

It's a real eye opener to know that the Middle Inn of the Crown Temple has publicly acknowledged there were at least five Templar Bar Attornies, under solemn oath only to the Crown, who signed what was alleged to be an American Declaration of Independence. This simply means that both parties to the Declaration agreement were of the same origin, the Crown Temple. In case you don't understand the importance of this, there is no international agreement or treaty that will ever be honored, or will ever have lawful effect, when the same party signs as both the first and second parties. It's merely a worthless piece of paper with no lawful authority when both sides to any agreement are actually the same. In reality, the American Declaration of Independence was nothing more than an internal memo of the Crown Temple made among its private members.

By example, Alexander Hamilton was one of those numerous Crown Templars who was called to their Bar. In 1774, he entered King's College in New York City, which was funded by members of the London King's Inns, now named Columbia University. In 1777, he became a personal aide and private secretary to George Washington during the American Revolution.

In May of 1782, Hamilton began studying law in Albany, New York, and within six months had completed a three year course of studies, passed his examinations, and was admitted to the New York Bar. Of course, the New York Bar Association was/is a franchise of the Crown Temple through the Middle Inn. After a year's service in Congress during the 1782-1783 session, he settled down to legal practice in New York City as Alexander Hamilton, Esqr. In February of 1784, he wrote the charter for, and became a founding member of, the Bank of New York, the State's first bank.

He secured a place on the New York delegation to the Federal Convention of 1787 at Philadelphia. In a five hour speech on June 18th, he stated an Executive for life will be an elective Monarch. When all his anti-Federalist New York colleagues withdrew from the Convention in protest, he alone signed the Constitution for the United States of America representing New York State, one of the legal Crown States (Colonies).

One should particularly notice that a lawful state is made up of the people, but a State is a legal entity of the Crown - a Crown Colony. This is an example of the deceptive ways the Crown Temple - Middle Templars - have taken control of America since the beginning of our settlements.

Later, as President Washington's U.S. Treasury Secretary, Hamilton alone laid the foundation of the first Federal U.S. Central Bank, secured credit loans through Crown banks in France and the Netherlands, and increased the power of the Federal Government over the hoodwinked nation-states of the Union. Hamilton had never made a secret of the fact that he admired the government and fiscal policies of Great Britain.

Americans were fooled into believing that the legal Crown Colonies comprising New England were independent nation states, but they never were nor are today. They were and still are Colonies of the Crown Temple, through letters patent and charters, who have no legal authority to be independent from the Rule and Order of the Crown Temple. A legal State is a Crown Temple Colony.

Neither the American people nor the Queen of Britain own America. The Crown Temple owns America through the deception of those who have sworn their allegiance by oath to the Middle Templar Bar. The Crown Bankers and their Middle Templar Attornies Rule America through unlawful contracts, unlawful taxes, and contract documents of false equity through debt deceit, all strictly enforced by their completely unlawful, but legal, Orders, Rules and Codes of the Crown Temple Courts, our so-called judiciary in America. This is because the Crown Temple holds the land titles and estate deeds to all of North America.

The biggest lie is what the Crown and its agents refer to as the rule of law. In reality, it is not about law at all, but solely about the Crown Rule of all nations. For example, just read what President Bush stated on November 13, 2001, regarding the rule of law:

Our countries are embarked on a new relationship for the 21st century, founded on a commitment to the values of democracy, the free market, and the rule of law. - Joint Statement by President George W. Bush and President Vladimir V. Putin on 11/13/01, spoken from the White House, Washington D.C.

What happened in 1776?

"Whoever owns the soil, owns all the way to the heavens and to the depths of the earth." - Old Latin maxim and Roman expression.

1776 is the year that will truly live in infamy for all Americans. It is the year that the Crown Colonies became legal Crown States. The Declaration of Independence was a legal, not lawful, document. It was signed on both sides by representatives of the Crown Temple. Legally, it announced the status quo of the Crown Colonies to that of the new legal name called States as direct possessive estates of the Crown (see the definitions above to understand the legal trickery that was done).

The American people were hoodwinked into thinking they were declaring lawful independence from the Crown. Proof that the Colonies are still in Crown possession is the use of the word State to signify a legal estate of possession. Had this been a document of and by the people, both the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution would have been written using the word states. By the use of State, the significance of a government of estate possession was legally established. All of the North American States are Crown Templar possessions through their legal document, signed by their representation of both parties to the contract, known as the Constitution of the United States of America.

All Constitutional Rights in America are simply those dictated by the Crown Temple and enforced by the Middle Inn Templars (Bar Attorneys) through their franchise and corporate government entity, the federal United States Government. When a State Citizen attempts to invoke his constitutional, natural, or common law rights in Chancery (equity courts), he is told they don't apply. Why? Simply because a State citizen has no rights outside of the Rule and Codes of Crown law. Only a state citizen has natural and common law rights by the paramount authority of God's Law.

The people who comprise the citizenry of a state are recognized only within natural and common law as is already established by God's Law. Only a State Citizen can be a party to an action within a State Court. A common state citizen cannot be recognized in that court because he doesn't legally exist in Crown Chancery Courts. In order to be recognized in their State Courts, the common man must be converted to that of a corporate or legal entity (a legal fiction).

Now you know why they create such an entity using all capital letters within Birth Certificates issued by the State. They convert the common lawful man of God into a fictional legal entity subject to Administration by State Rules, Orders and Codes (there is no law within any Rule or Code). Of course, Rules, Codes, etc. do not apply to the lawful common man of the Lord of lords, so the man with inherent Godly law and rights must be converted into a legal Person of fictional status (another legal term) in order for their legal - but completely unlawful State Judiciary (Chancery Courts) to have authority over him.

Chancery Courts are tribunal courts where the decisions of justice are decided by 3 judges. This is a direct result of the Crown Temple having invoked their Rule and Code over all judicial courts. It is held to be a settled Rule, that our courts cannot take notice of any title to land not derived from the State or Colonial government, and duly verified by patent. -4 Johns. Rep. 163. Jackson v. Waters, 12 Johns. Rep. 365. S.P.

The Crown Temple was granted Letters Patent (see definition above) and Charters (definition below) for all the land (Colonies) of New England by the King of England, a sworn member of the Middle Temple (as the Queen is now). Since the people were giving the patent/charter corporations and Colonial Governours such a hard time, especially concerning Crown taxation, a scheme was devised to allow the Americans to believe they were being granted independence. Remember, the Crown Templars represented both parties to the 1776 Declaration of Independence; and, as we are about to see, the latter 1787 U.S. Constitution.

To have this Declaration recognized by international treaty law, and in order to establish the new legal Crown entity of the incorporated United States, Middle Templar King George III agreed to the Treaty of Paris on September 3, 1783, between the Crown of Great Britain and the said United States. The Crown of Great Britain legally was, then and now, the Crown Temple. This formally gave international recognition to the corporate United States, the new Crown Temple States (Colonies). Most important is to know who the actual signatories to the Treaty of Paris were. Take particular note to the abbreviation Esqr. Following their names (see above definition for ESQUIRE) as this legally signifies Officers of the King's Courts, which we now know were Templar Courts or Crown Courts. This is the same Crown Templar Title given to Alexander Hamilton (see above).

The Crown was represented in signature by David Hartley, Esqr., a Middle Templar of the King's Court. Representing the United States (a Crown franchise) by signature was John Adams, Esqr, Benjamin Franklin, Esqr. and John Jay, Esqr. The signatories for the United States were also Middle Templars of the King's Court through Bar Association membership. What is plainly written in history proves, once again, that the Crown Temple was representing both parties to the agreement. What a perfect and elaborate scam the people of North America had pulled on them!

It becomes even more obvious when you read Article 5, which states in part, to provide for the Restitution of all Estates, Rights, and Properties which have been confiscated, belonging to real British Subjects.

The Crown Colonies were granted to persons and corporations of the Crown Temple through Letters Patent and Charters, and the North American Colonial land was owned by the Crown.

Now, here's a real catch-all in Article 4:

It is agreed that creditors on either side shall meet with no lawful impediment to the recovery of the full value in sterling money of all bona fide debts heretofore contracted. Since the Crown and its Templars represented both the United States, as the debtors, and the Crown, as the creditors, then they became the creditor of the American people by owning all debts of the former Colonies, now called the legal Crown States. This sounds too good to be true, but these are the facts. The words SCAM and HOODWINKED can't begin to describe what had taken place.

So then, what debts were owed to the Crown Temple and their banks as of 1883? In the Contract Between the King and the Thirteen United States of North America, signed at Versailles July 16, 1782, Article I states, It is agreed and certified that the sums advanced by His Majesty to the Congress of the United States under the title

of a loan, in the years 1778, 1779, 1780, 1781, and the present 1782, amount to the sum of eighteen million of livres, money of France, according to the following twenty-one receipts of the above-mentioned underwritten Minister of Congress, given in virtue of his full powers, to wit:

That amount equals about \$18 million dollars, plus interest, that Hamilton's U.S. Central Bank owed the Crown through Crown Bank loans in France. This was signed, on behalf of the United States, by an already familiar Middle Templar, Benjamin Franklin, Esquire.

An additional \$6 million dollars (six million livres) was loaned to the United States at 5% interest by the same parties in a similar Contract signed on February 25, 1783. The Crown Bankers in the Netherlands and France were calling in their debts for payment by future generations of Americans.

The Fiscal Agents of Mystery Babylon

Since its beginnings, the Temple Church at the City of London has been a Knight Templar secret society. It was built and established by the same Temple Knights who were given their Rule and Order by the Roman Pope. It's very important to know how the British Royal Crown was placed into the hands of the Knights Templars, and how the Crown Templars became the fiscal and military agents for the Pope of the Roman Church.

This all becomes very clear through the Concession Of England To The Pope on May 15, 1213. The charter was sworn in fealty by England's King John to Pope Innocent and the Roman Church. It was witnessed before the Crown Templars, as King John stated upon sealing the same, I myself bearing witness in the house of the Knights Templars.

Pay particular attention to the words being used that we have defined below, especially charter, fealty, demur, and concession:

We wish it to be known to all of you, through this our charter, furnished with our seal not induced by force or compelled by fear, but of our own good and spontaneous will and by the common counsel of our barons, do offer and freely concede to God and His holy apostles Peter and Paul and to our mother the holy Roman church, and to our lord pope Innocent and to his Catholic successors, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom Ireland, with all their rights and appurtenances we perform and swear fealty for them to him our aforesaid lord pope Innocent, and his catholic successors and the Roman church binding our successors and our heirs by our wife forever, in similar manner to perform fealty and show homage to him who shall be chief pontiff at that time, and to the Roman church without demur. As a sign we will and establish perpetual obligation and concession from the proper and especial revenues of our aforesaid kingdoms the Roman church shall receive yearly a thousand marks sterling saving to us and to our heirs our rights, liberties and regalia; all of which things, as they have been described above, we wish to have perpetually valid and firm; and we bind ourselves and our successors not to act counter to them. And if we or any one of our successors shall presume to attempt this, whoever he be, unless being duly warned he come to his kingdom, and this senses, he shall lose his right to the kingdom, and this charter of our obligation and concession shall always remain firm.

Most who have commented on this charter only emphasize the payments due the Pope and the Roman Church. What should be emphasized is the fact that King John broke the terms of this charter by signing the Magna Carta on June 15, 1215. Remember; the penalty for breaking the 1213 agreement was the loss of the Crown (right to the kingdom) to the Pope and his Roman Church. It says so quite plainly. To formally and lawfully take the Crown from the royal monarchs of England by an act of declaration, on August 24, 1215, Pope Innocent III annulled the Magna Carta; later in the year, he placed an Interdict (prohibition) on the entire British Empire. From that time until today, the English monarchy and the entire British Crown belonged to the Pope.

The following definitions are all taken from Webster's 1828 Dictionary since the meanings have not been perverted for nearly 200 years:

FEALTY, n. [L. fidelis.] Fidelity to a lord; faithful adherence of a tenant or vassal to the superior of whom he holds his lands; loyalty. Under the feudal system of tenures, every vassal or tenant was bound to be true and faithful to his lord, and to defend him against all his enemies. This obligation was called his fidelity or fealty, and an oath of fealty was required to be taken by all tenants to their landlords. The tenant was called a liege man; the land, a liege fee; and the superior, liege lord.

FEE, n. [In English, is loan. This word, fee, inland, or an estate in trust, originated among the descendants of the northern conquerors of Italy, but it originated in the south of Europe. See Feud.] Primarily, a loan of land, an estate in trust, granted by a prince or lord, to be held by the grantee on condition of personal service, or other condition; and if the grantee or tenant failed to perform the conditions, the land reverted to the lord or donor, called the landlord, or lend-lord, the lord of the loan. A fee then is any land or tenement held of a superior on certain conditions. It is synonymous with fief and feud. In the United States, an estate in fee or fee simple is what is called in English law an allodial estate, an estate held by a person in his own right and descendible to the heirs in general.

FEUD, n. [L. fides; Eng. loan.] A fief; a fee; a right to lands or hereditaments held in trust, or on the terms of performing certain conditions; the right which a vassal or tenant has to the lands or other immovable thing of his lord, to use the same and take the profits thereof hereditarily, rendering to his superior such duties and services as belong to military tenure, &c., the property of the soil always remaining in the lord or superior.

By swearing to the 1213 Charter in fealty, King John declared that the British-English Crown and its possessions at that time, including all future possessions, estates, trusts, charters, letters patent, and land, were forever bound to the Pope and the Roman Church, the landlord. Some five hundred years later, the New England Colonies in America became a part of the Crown as a possession and trust named the United States.

ATTORNING, ppr. Acknowledging a new lord, or transferring homage and fealty to the purchaser of an estate. Bar Attorneys have been attorning ever since they were founded at the Temple Church, by acknowledging that the Crown and he who holds the Crown is the new lord of the land.

CHARTER, n. 1. A written instrument, executed with usual forms, given as evidence of a grant, contract, or whatever is done between man and man. In its more usual sense, it is the instrument of a grant conferring powers, rights and privileges, either from a king or other sovereign power, or from a private person, as a charter of exemption, that no person shall be empanelled on a jury, a charter of pardon, &c. The charters under which most of the colonies in America were settled, were given by the king of England, and incorporated certain

persons, with powers to hold the lands granted, to establish a government, and make laws for their own regulation. These were called charter-governments.

By agreeing to the Magna Carta, King John had broken the agreement terms of his fealty with Rome and the Pope. The Pope and his Roman Church control the Crown Temple because his Knights established it under his Orders. He who controls the gold controls the world.

The Crown Temple Today

The workings of the Crown Temple in this day and age is more so obvious, yet somewhat hidden. The Crown Templars have many names and many symbols to signify their private and unholy Temple. Take a close look at the (alleged) one dollar \$1 private Federal Reserve System (a Crown banking franchise) Debt Note.

Notice in the base of the pyramid the Roman date MDCCLXXVI which is written in Roman numerals for the year 1776. The words ANNUIT COEPTIS NOVUS ORDO SECLORUM are Roman Latin for ANNOUNCING THE BIRTH OF THE NEW ORDER OF THE WORLD. Go back to the definitions above and pay particular attention to the words CAPITOL, CROWN and TEMPLE. 1776 signifies the birth of the New World Order under the Crown Temple. That's when their American Crown Colonies became the chartered government called the United States, thanks to the Declaration of Independence. Since that date, the United Nations (another legal Crown Temple by charter) rose up and refers to every nation as a State member.

The Wizard of Oz = the Crown Temple

This is not a mere child's story written by L. Frank Baum. What symbol does Oz stand for? Ounces? Gold? What is the yellow brick road? Bricks or ingot bars of gold?

The character known as the Straw Man represents that fictitious ALL CAPS legal fiction - a PERSON – the Federal U.S. Government created with the same spelling as your Christian birth name. Remember what the StrawMan wanted from the Wizard of Oz? A brain! No legal fiction has a brain because they have no breath of life! What did he get in place of a brain? A Certificate. A Birth Certificate for a new legal creation. He was proud of his new legal status, plus all the other legalisms he was granted. Now he becomes the true epitome of the brainless sack of straw who was given a Certificate in place of a brain of common sense.

What about the Tin Man? Does Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) mean anything to you? The poor TIN Man just stood there mindlessly doing his work until his body literally froze up and stopped functioning. He worked himself to death because he had no heart or soul. He's the heartless and emotionless creature robotically carrying out his daily task as if he was already dead. He's the ox pulling the plow and the mule toiling under the yoke. His masters keep him cold on the outside and heartless on the inside in order to control any emotions or heart he may get a hold of.

The pitiful Cowardly Lion was always too frightened to stand up for himself. Of course, he was a bully and a big mouth when it came to picking on those smaller than he was. They act as if they have great courage, but they really have none at all. All roar with no teeth of authority to back them up. When push came to shove, the Cowardly Lion always buckled under and whimpered when anyone of any size or stature challenged him. He wanted courage from the Grand Wizard, so he was awarded a medal of official recognition. Now, regardless of how much of a coward he still was, his official status made him a bully with officially recognized authority. He's just like the Attorneys who hide behind the Middle Courts of the Temple Bar.

What about the trip through the field of poppies? They weren't real people, so drugs had no effect on them. The Wizard of Oz was written at the turn of the century, so how could the author have known America was going to be drugged? The Crown has been playing the drug cartel game for centuries. Just look up the history of Hong Kong and the Opium Wars. The Crown already had valuable experience conquering all of China with drugs, so why not the rest of the world?

Who finally exposed the Wizard for what he really was? Toto, the ugly (or cute, depending on your perspective) and somewhat annoying little dog. Toto means in total, all together; Latin in toto. Notice how Toto was not scared of the Great Wizard's theatrics, yet he was so small in size compared to the Wizard, no-one seemed to notice him. The smoke, flames and hologram images were designed to frighten people into doing as the Great Wizard of Oz commanded. Toto simply went over, looked behind the curtain - the court - (see the definition for curtain above), saw it was a scam, and started barking until others paid attention to him and came to see what all the barking was about. Just an ordinary person controlling the levers that created the illusions of the Great Wizard's power and authority. The veil hiding the corporate legal fiction and its false courts was removed. The Wizard's game was up. It's too bad that people don't realize how loud a bark from a little dog is.

How about your bark? Do you just remain silent and wait to be given whatever food and recognition, if any, your legal master gives you?

Let's not forget those pesky flying monkeys. What a perfect mythical creature to symbolize the Bar Association Attorneys who attack and control all the little people for the Great Crown Wizard, the powerful and grand Bankers of Oz - Gold.

What is it going to take to expose the Wizard and tear down the court veil for what they really are? Each of us needs only a brain, a heart and soul, and courage. Then, and most importantly, we all need to learn how to work together. Only in toto, working together as one Body of the King of Kings, can we ever be free or have the freedom given under God's Law.

Mystery Babylon Revealed

There is no mystery behind the current abomination of Babylon for those who discern His Truth:

And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. -Revelation 17:5

God has reserved His judgment for the great idolatress, Rome, the chief seat of all idolatry, that rules over many nations with whom the kings have committed to the worship of her idols (see Revelation 17:1-4). The Pope and His purported Church; sitting on the Temple throne at the Vatican; ruling the nations of the earth through the Crown Temple of ungodly deities are the Rule and Order of Babylon; the Crown of godlessness and the Code of commerce.

One may call the Rule of the world today by many names: The New World Order (a Bush family favorite), the Third Way (spoken by Tony Blair and Bill Clinton), the Illuminati, Triad, Triangle, Trinity, Masonry, the United Nations, the EU, the US, or many dozens of other names. However, they all point to one origin and one beginning. We have traced this in history to the Crown Temple, the Temple Church circa 1200. Because the Pope created the Order of the Temple Knights (the Grand Wizards of deception) and established their mighty Temple Church in the sovereign City of London, it is the Pope and his Roman Capitols who control the world.

And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication? -Revelation 17:4

This verse appears to be an accurate description of the Pope and His Bishops for the past 1,700 years. He idolatries of commerce in the world: all the gold and silver; the iron and soft metals; the money and coins and riches of the world: All of these are under the control of the Crown Temple; the Roman King and his false Church; the throne of Babylon; attended to by his Templar Knights, the Wizards of abomination and idolatry.

The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman [mother of harlots] sitteth - Revelation 17:9

The only mention of seven mountains within our present-day Bible is at Revelation 17:9, so it's no wonder this has been a mystery to the current Body of Christ. The 1611 King James (who was a Crown Templar) Bible is not the entire canon of the early church (church in Latin ecclesia; in Greek ekklesia). This in itself is no mystery as history records the existence and destruction of these early church writings; just as history has now proven their genuine authenticity with the appearance of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the coptic library at Nag Hamedi in Egypt, among many other recent Greek language discoveries within the past 100 years.

The current Holy Bible quotes the Book of Enoch numerous times:

By faith Enoch was taken away so that he did not see death, "and was not found, because God had taken him"; for before he was taken he had this testimony, that he pleased God. - Hebrews 11:5

Now Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied about these men also, saying, "Behold, the Lord comes with ten thousands of His saints, to execute judgment on all, to convict all who are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have committed in an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him." - Jude 1:14-15

The Book of Enoch was considered scripture by most early Christians. The earliest literature of the so-called "Church Fathers" is filled with references to this mysterious book. The second century Epistle of Barnabus makes much use of the Book of Enoch. Second and Third Century "Church Fathers," such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origin and Clement of Alexandria, all make use of the Book of Enoch "Holy Scripture".

The Ethiopic Church included the Book of Enoch to its official canon. It was widely known and read the first three centuries after Christ. However, this and many other books became discredited after the Roman Council

of Laodicea. Being under ban of the Roman Papal authorities, afterwards they gradually passed out of circulation.

At about the time of the Protestant Reformation, there was a renewed interest in the Book of Enoch, which had long since been lost to the modern world. By the late 1400's, rumors began to spread that a copy of the long lost Book of Enoch might still exist. During this time, many books arose claiming to be the lost book but were later found to be forgeries.

The return of the Book of Enoch to the modern western world is credited to the famous explorer James Bruce, who in 1773 returned from six years in Abyssinia with three Ethiopic copies of the lost book. In 1821, Richard Laurence published the first English translation. The now famous R.H. Charles edition was first published by Oxford Press in 1912. In the following years, several portions of the Greek text also surfaced. Then, with the discovery of cave number four of the Dead Sea Scrolls, seven fragmentary copies of the Aramaic text were discovered.

Within the Book of Enoch is revealed one of the mysteries of Babylon concerning the seven mountains she sits upon (underlining has been added):

[CHAPTER 52] 2 There mine eyes saw all the secret things of heaven that shall be; a mountain of iron, a mountain of copper, a mountain of silver, a mountain of gold, a mountain of soft metal, and a mountain of lead.

6) These [6] mountains which thine eyes have seen: The mountain of iron, the mountain of copper, the mountain of silver, the mountain of gold, the mountain of soft metal, and the mountain of lead. All these shall be in the presence of the Elect One as wax: Before the fire, like the water which streams down from above upon those mountains, and they shall become powerless before his feet. 7) It shall come to pass in those days that none shall be saved, either by gold or by silver, and none be able to escape. 8) There shall be no iron for war, nor shall one clothe oneself with a breastplate. Bronze shall be of no service, tin shall be of no service and shall not be esteemed, and lead shall not be desired. 9) All these things shall be denied and destroyed from the surface of the earth when the Elect One shall appear before the face of the Lord of Spirits.

[CHAPTER 24] 3 The seventh mountain was in the midst of these, and it excelled them in height, resembling the seat of a throne; and fragrant trees encircled the throne.

[CHAPTER 25] 3) And he answered saying: This high mountain which thou hast seen, whose summit is like the throne of God, is His throne, where the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King, will sit, when He shall come down to visit the earth with goodness. 4) As for this fragrant tree, no mortal is permitted to touch it until the great judgement when He shall take vengeance on all and bring (everything) to its consummation fore ver. 5) It shall then be given to the righteous and Holy. Its fruit shall be for food to the elect: It shall be transplanted to the Holy place, to the temple of the Lord, the Eternal King. 6) Then shall they rejoice with joy and be glad, and into the Holy place shall they enter; its fragrance shall be in their bones and they shall live a long life on earth, such as thy fathers lived: In their days shall no sorrow, or plague, or torment, or calamity touch them.

The present wealth and power of all the worlds gold, silver, tin, bronze, pearls, diamonds, gemstones, iron, and copper belonging the Babylon whore, and held in the treasuries of her Crown Templar banks and deep stony vaults, will not be able to save them at the time of the Lord's judgment.

But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in [yourselves], neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Matthew 23:13

Where do we go from here?

Now that their false Temple has been exposed, how does this apply to the Kingdom of Heaven? To reach the end, you must know the beginning. For everything ordained of God, there is an imitation ordained of evil that looks like the genuine thing. There is the knowledge of good and the knowledge of evil. The problem is, most believe they have the knowledge of God when what they really have is knowledge of world deceptions operating as gods. The only way to discern and begin to understand the Kingdom of Heaven is to seek the Knowledge that comes only from God, not the knowledge of men who take their legal claim as earthly rulers and gods.

The false Crown Temple and its Grand Wizard Knights have led the world to believe that they are of the Lord God and hold the knowledge and keys to His Kingdom. What they hold within their Temples are the opposite. They claim to be the Holy Church, but which holy church? The real one or the false one? Are the Pope and his Roman Church the Temple of God, or is this the unholy Temple of Babylon sitting upon the seven mountains?

They use the same words, but alter them to show the true meaning they have applied: The State is not a state; a Certificate is not a certification. The Roman Church is not the church (ekklesia). There is the Crown of the Lord; and a Crown of that which is not of the Lord. All imitations appear to be the genuine article, but they are fakes. Those who are truly seeking the genuine Kingdom of God must allow the Lord to show them the discernment between the genuine and the imitation. Without this discernment by the Holy Spirit, all will remain fooled by the illusions of false deity emanating from the unholy spirits of the Wizards.

Neither shall they say, Lo here! Or, lo there! For behold, the kingdom of God is within you. - Luke 17:21

Jesus said, "If your leaders say to you, 'Look, the (Father's) kingdom is in the sky,' then the birds of the sky will precede you. If they say to you, 'It is in the sea,' then the fish will precede you. Rather, the FATHER'S kingdom is within you and it is outside you." - Gospel of Thomas 3

Don't you know that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God lives in you? 1 Corinthians 3:16

Jesus said, "Know what is in front of your face, and what is hidden from you will be disclosed to you. For there is nothing hidden that will not be revealed. [And there is nothing buried that will not be raised.]" - - Gospel of Thomas 5

Congress's

Season

Of

Treason

1861 - 1871

1.

July 1, 1862 - “An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government and to pay Interest on the Public Debt.”

“And be it further enacted, that on and after the first day of August, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, every individual, partnership, firm, association, or corporation, (and any word or words in this act indicating or referring to person or persons shall be taken to mean and include partnerships, firms, associations, or corporations, when not otherwise designated or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof,)” Thirty-Seventh Congress. Sess. II. Chap. CXIX. Page 432. Sec. 68. (p. 459

2.

June 30, 1864 - “An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government, to pay Interest on the Public Debt, and for other Purposes.”

Sec. 182. And be it further enacted, that wherever the word state [jurisdiction] is used in this act, it shall be construed to include the [jurisdictions of the] territories and the District of Columbia, where such construction is necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.” Public Acts of the Thirty- Eighth Congress of the United States. Sess.1. Ch. 173, 174. 1864. (13 Stat. 223).

3.

July 28, 1868 - Article XIV - Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

4.

February 21, 1871 – The Organic Act of 1871 - CHAP. LXII. – An Act to provide a Government for the District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all that part of the territory of the United States included within the limits of the District of Columbia be, and the same is hereby, created into a government by the name of District of Columbia, by which name it is hereby constituted a body corporate for municipal purposes, and may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, have a seal, and exercise all other powers of a municipal corporation not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States and the provisions of this act.

An Act of Congress to Re-Define “Person” in America*

On July 1, 1862, when 11 southern states were not represented in Congress due to its Civil War, the remaining members of Congress passed “An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government and to pay Interest on the Public Debt.” Therein Congress assigned an artificial meaning to the word “person” as follows.

“And be it further enacted, that on and after the first day of August, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, every individual, partnership, firm, association, or corporation, (and any word or words in this act indicating or referring to person or persons shall be taken to mean and include partnerships, firms, associations, or corporations, when not otherwise designated or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof,)” Thirty-Seventh Congress. Sess. II. Chap. CXIX. Page 432. Sec. 68. (p. 459.)

Four years later the 1868 fourteenth amendment was allegedly ratified. The Supreme Court’s anti-constitutional interpretation of the “person” therein will be forthcoming. And a mere five years later Congress once again assigned an artificial meaning to “person” in, once again, an Internal Revenue act, the relevant portion quoted below.

“And where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof, the word, “person,” as used in this title, shall be construed to mean and include a partnership, association, company, or corporation, as well as a natural person.” Forty-Third Congress (1873), Session I, Volume 18, Part 1 - Title XXXV. Internal Revenue. Chapter One. Page 601, Section 3140.

The above-cited 1862 and 1873 Internal Revenue acts effectively demonstrate the intent of Congress to assign an artificial meaning to “person” just before and after the fourteenth amendment, an important fact when considering the possible grounds for the Supreme Court’s corresponding interpretation of the “person” of that amendment.

Furthermore, by not specifically identifying corporations and the like as “artificial persons” as they have been historically known, Congress opened the door for future laws to be written without clarity of meaning or application – “person” meaning a human being or “artificial person” meaning a legal entity.

Consequently, such laws necessarily would be vague, and therefore a violation of due process as explained by the Supreme Court in *Connally v. General Construction Co.*, 269 U.S. 385 (1926) previously cited. This open door also allowed for the courts to expand the meaning for “person” far beyond its normal and ordinary meaning.

An Act of Congress to Re-Define “State” in America*

Prior to the fourteenth amendment the Government of the United States existed as a limited Representative government created by the several states united, possessing only those enumerated powers granted to it by the states. All other powers not expressly delegated to the United States by the Constitution were reserved to the States, or to the People respectively pursuant to Amendments IX and X.

However, beginning with the second unofficial re-construction act revealed herein, whereby Congress re-constructed the meaning for “state”, coupled with the 1867 Reconstruction Acts, designed “to change the entire structure and character of the State governments . . . by force” according to President Johnson, and culminating in the fourteenth amendment, that republican form of government/¹⁶ was destroyed.

As a consequence, the several states united were reduced in status to mere territorial districts called “states”, and made completely subject to Congress...

In 1864, when the so-called Civil War was near its end, Congress passed “An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government and to pay Interest on the Public Debt, and for other Purposes.” Therein Congress re-constructed the word “state” as follows, with words in brackets having been added for the purpose of clarifying how this anti-constitutional legislation should be properly read and interpreted –in a jurisdictional sense.

*Chap. CLXXIII. –“An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government, to pay Interest on the Public Debt, and for other Purposes. Sec. 182. And be it further enacted, that wherever **the word state [jurisdiction] is used in this act, it shall be construed to include the [jurisdictions of the] territories and the District of Columbia,** where such construction is necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.” Public Acts of the Thirty- Eighth Congress of the United States. Sess.1. Ch. 173, 174. 1864. (13 Stat. 223).*

Four years later the fourteenth amendment was allegedly ratified. In 1873, merely five years after the ostensible ratification of that amendment, Congress once again re-constructed the word “state” in Title 35 Internal Revenue, the relevant portion quoted below. Once again, words in brackets have been added for the purpose of clarifying how this second duplicitous legislation should be properly read and interpreted –in a jurisdictional sense.

***“The word ‘State,’ [jurisdiction] when used in this Title, shall be construed to include the [jurisdictions of the] Territories and the District of Columbia,** where such construction is necessary to carry out its provisions. Forty-Third Congress - Statutes at Large (1873), Sess. I. Vol. 18, Part 1 - Title XXXV. Internal Revenue. Chapter One. Sec. 3140. Page 601.*

Therefore, it is plainly apparent that Congress expressed its legislative intent when it seditiously re-constructed the word “state” just before and after the fourteenth amendment in the same way that it did the word “person”, making special note that the re-construction of both words is found in the same 1873 Title XXXV Internal Revenue Code.

**Excerpt from “Sins of the State” by Richard Mark Voudren*

The 14th Amendment – July 28, 1868

Section 1.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 2.

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

Section 3.

No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Section 4.

The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.

Section 5.

The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Organic Act of 1871

An Act to provide a Government for the District of Columbia

In 1871, three years after the illegal ratification of the 14th Amendment, the government defaulted on its war debts, forcing America into bankruptcy.[12] What resulted is considered the death blow to the united States for America.[13] On February 21st, *England* claimed what was theirs, according to international law, and *incorporated the ten mile square that is Washington D.C.*[14] England also incorporated the American Constitution and names for its new corporation, such as THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, U.S., and USA, as well as other titles, as declared in the **District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871.**[15] A point of interest in these copyrighted names is the implementation of the article "THE." Before this time, America was a union of "united States," not a union of "the united States." The article "the" doesn't exist when referring to other countries, i.e. Canada and Britain aren't referred to as "the Canada" or "the Britain." The British-controlled Corporation, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, exclusively uses the article "the" in its name, which is distinct from the "united States" or the "United States." One other immense change to America simultaneously occurred: being a bankrupt nation, the united States retained only the power to settle civil disputes, not criminal matters, allowing room for the illusion that only Britain's private, ever-changing laws appertain to America's criminal disputes. British law literally attempted to fill the gap created by the bankruptcy without anyone knowing, making it appear that everything was going just as usual. Since this point in history, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA has been governed entirely by foreign, private, corporate law and Washington, D.C. has been under British control.

The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is a corporation, whose jurisdiction is applicable only in the ten-mile-square parcel of land known as the District of Columbia and to whatever properties are legally titled to the UNITED STATES, by its registration in the corporate County, State, and Federal governments that are under military power of the UNITED STATES and its creditors.[16]

Being incorporated, people need permission to use Britain's imposed laws. These people, who use this British legal system for and usually against the American people, are referred to as *attorneys*, as opposed to *lawyers*. Yes, there's a difference. The word "attorney" comes from "attorn," which means to turn over to another; transfer.[17] In old England, the title of attorney meant one who attorned ("attorned" is the old English), which meant to transfer money, goods, etc. to another.[18] Attorneys served the king or queen in handling disputes regarding money/goods with their peasants. In modern times, attorneys transfer things of monetary value through court procedures to both other forms of money/goods and to new owners, being either persons or the government.[19] Attorneys have limited legal power because they are sworn to uphold the British, copyrighted law. A lawyer isn't limited like this. Many believe that one needs to get licensed in order to practice law – this is an utter fiction. One needs to become licensed if one wishes to become an attorney in order to avoid a copyright violation[20], and the way to do this is to pass the BAR exam and register with the American BAR Association. The American BAR Association is an appendage of the BAR Council, which is the BAR association of England. The term BAR is an acronym for British Accreditation Register [21]: the registry for those who have been accredited to use America's British copyrighted law.

Beyond this point in America's legal history, any laws that came about were private laws of Britain. Any sovereign Citizen is exempt from these private laws. Anyone who doesn't dispute being a 14th Amendment "citizen" is subject to these private laws. The 13th Amendment eliminated involuntary servitude, but it said nothing about voluntary servitude. The 14th Amendment was a gateway for voluntary servitude to take place. At this time, simply claiming to be a sovereign Citizen and not a 14th Amendment "citizen" was, legally speaking, enough to avoid being subject to Britain's private laws. How could the Brits get people to agree to be these citizens? The answers they found were implemented into a plan that materialized into the New Deal.

So now let us recap exactly what happened to OUR unalienable Rights during this “Season of Treason”


- *On February 21, 1871 - under the guise of creating the seat of OUR government with “The Organic Act of 1871,” the Legislative branch - through Article I, Section 8, clause 17 creates a fully private and for-profit corporation that THEY control - and name it – believe it or not - THE UNITED STATES.*
- *Just prior to creating that private for-profit corporation, THEY, the Legislative branch, put in place through military threat, the totally unlawful and never ratified 14th Amendment of July 28th, 1868, that just happens to place every U.S. citizen squarely within the jurisdiction of THEIR new company.*
- *A few years earlier, June 30th, 1864, this same unlawful Congress re-defined the word “state” through an Internal Revenue Act to mean the very same geographic area over which THEY had complete control AND Constitutional authority – The District of Columbia.*
- *And finally, to make sure “the people” were thoroughly confused, THEY, the very same unlawful and un- Constitutional Legislature through an earlier Internal Revenue Act, redefine the word “person” to mean a non-living “fictional” entity thus creating an artificial “person” under THEIR control.*

In less than a decade, with the Civil War being nothing more than a smoke screen, our Freedom and Liberty was replaced with “civil rights” by OUR “presumed” CONSENT to a misleading U.S. citizenship.

"THIS CONSTITUTION"

ARTICLE VI CLAUSE 2

ARTICLE IV STATE CITIZENS



United States vs. UNITED STATES vs. united States of America

Few Americans realize that there are three definitions for the "United States." Most have been misled to believe that the term "United States" has a single meaning and is a generic term referring to the country as a whole. This is not always so. The legal standing of each individual American, to any one of the three, varies depending on his status or lack of status in law. If you are a citizen of the District of Columbia (the Democracy) you have privileges granted by Congress. If you are a Citizen of the Union (the Republic) you are endowed with the unalienable Rights mentioned in the Declaration of Independence. All licenses are privileges; whereas "Rights" are gifts from God.

Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition. "UNITED STATES". This term has several meanings. (1) It may merely be the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations. (2) It may designate territory over which sovereignty of the United States extends; or, (3) it may be the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution." Hooven & Allison Co. vs. Evatt, 65 S.Ct. 870, 880, 324 U.S. 652, 89 L. Ed. 1252."

The first (1) "United States" is as a sovereign among the nations of the World under International Law (a nation amongst nations). It consists of (1) the Union States and (2) the federal zone (District of Columbia, U.S. territories and possessions, forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings), and is represented collectively in the international arena by the U.S. Consuls abroad as one and the same entity. The flag that properly represents it in the world arena is "Old Glory".

The second (2) "United States in Hooven, supra, was created by the Constitution in Art. I, Section 8, Clauses 17 & 18. This second "United States" received further authority when under Art. IV, Section 3, Clause 1 & 2, "to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the territory or other Property belonging to this United States" but it gave no authority to Congress to extend its municipal authority into the Union States. The latter gave Congress power to extend its jurisdiction (law making powers) beyond the limits of the District of Columbia over which Congress was to exercise "exclusive Legislation" to include the former territories such as the Northwest territory, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands, and currently, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and other territories, possessions, areas and enclaves. Its flag is the Stars and Stripes with the yellow fringe representing a plenary Martial Law jurisdiction. The geographical area known as the "United States" (DC) has its own citizens (United States vs. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 588) who are generally referred to as United States citizens. The yellow-fringed flag signifying this jurisdiction is not for decorative purposes. It signifies the jurisdiction of the District, also known as the Corporate U.S. Federal that has been extended into the Union states by the 14th Amendment. This is the flag of the Democracy. It should be obvious to everyone who observes the flag next to his Senator or Representative from Washington D.C. that he represents the Districts interest in the area of his constituency and not the other way around. When the function of the Circuit Courts of the United States of America was changed to appellate status by another layer of courts, these courts were labeled United States District Courts-- the courts of the District. Where are the courts of the United States America sitting today? They do not exist.

The third (3rd) "United States" (of America) described in Hooven, supra, are the 50 Union states united by and under the Constitution. This "3rd united States" (of America) is known as the Republic. Its flag is "Old Glory." In the Constitutional Courts, the civil authority of the Constitution is signified by the Stars and Stripes hung vertically behind the bench, just as it hangs behind the Speaker's Chair in the House of Representatives. Why, one might logically ask, is such a flag not found in our courtrooms today? Because they are not Constitutional.

The Republic has Citizens of its own called American Nationals. Those are the Sovereign Citizens who qualify as such by being Members of the Posterity referred to in the Preamble and can only be the Natural Born or Naturalized White Inhabitants of each state whose forefathers delegated by solemn agreement certain powers to the Congress of the "United States" (D.C.), which powers are limited to those delegated in Art. I, Section 8, Clauses 1-16 and Art. IV, Section 3, Clause. 2, though today unlawfully expanded far beyond Constitutional limits by (1)usurpation, and (2) deception of benefits (by contract) which American Nationals unwittingly and unknowingly enter on the other hand.

When legislating for the third "(3rd) united States" (of America) all powers not enumerated in Art. 1, Section 8, Clauses 1-16, are reserved for those sovereign States, and the Citizens of those Republics, by the 9th and 10th Amendments to the Constitution of these united States of America (In Union). The Founding Citizens of the Republic gave very limited powers to the Congress of the United States to legislate for the geographical area known above as the "3 Union States", described in the Hooven case, supra. These legislative powers are limited to being exclusive within the area of its jurisdiction as is that power possessed by any one of the legislatures of the 50 states of the Union when legislating for its responsive geographical area. However, when legislating for the 50 Union states collectively as a nation, Congress is bound by the chains of the Constitution and must remain inside the jurisdictional boundaries of Art. 1, Clause 8, Cls. 1-16, "and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State" [18 U.S.C. Clause 7 (1), (5), & (7), see particularly Clause 7 (3)].

Constitutional Law.

Territories, power of the United States over, as plenary[full, entire, complete, absolute] In exercising its constitutional power to make all needful regulations respecting the territory belonging to the (2nd) United States, Congress is not subject to the same Constitutional limitations as when it is legislating for the 3rd states of the Union.

Hooven & Allison Co. vs Evatt, supra; Downes vs. Bidwell 182 U.S. 244

Constitutional Guaranties as extended to territories.

"In general the guarantees of the Constitution, save as they are limitations upon the exercise of excessive legislative power, when exerted for or over the insular possessions of the United States, extend to them only as Congress, in the exercise of its legislative power over territories belonging to the United States, has made those guarantees applicable." Hooven & Allison Co. vs. Evatt, supra. i.e., The Court states that the rights of those within Congress's sphere at exclusive jurisdiction are mere "privileges" extended them at the whim of Congress. Those who live in the District of Columbia, its enclaves, territories, or possessions, and those who live in the ceded areas of the several states (called "federal areas or enclaves") are known as #2 United States citizens. They are true federal citizens. From the standpoint of Constitutional law Congress has 100% control over the lives of All #2 United States citizens whenever they reside in the several states, or elsewhere, and their rights are subject to Congress's exclusive legislative authority. Such rights are called "civil rights". This type of

government is a "Legislative Democracy", the object of which, since passage of the 14th Amendment, has been to rob Natural Born Citizens of their birthright and bring all Americans into the Democracy under the legislative authority of Congress as a single group under authoritarian rule --contrary to the intent of the Organic Constitution. In contrast, white people living in the Union States (the Republic) are not under the Congress's legislative authority and are known as American Nationals. They are citizens of the (3rd) united States of America. The reason that the federal government prefers that everyone submit to its authority "voluntary" under the 14th Amendment through participation in Social Security is that the IRS can lawfully tax only federal #2 United States citizens, its employees and those others who willingly contract with it and not #3 American Nationals who chose not to. Its authority does not lawfully extend to the latter unless they "voluntarily" place themselves under the "private commercial law" of CORPORATE U.S. FEDERAL by contracting with it by such a simple and subtle means as merely using Federal Reserve Notes and associated commercial paper instruments. Included in this latter group are those Whites who elected to be 14th Amendment citizens by "voluntarily" entering into unilateral contracts with the federal government by contracting for Social Security Old Age Insurance, obtaining licenses, privileges, etc, and by "voluntarily" making W-4 and 1040 contracts annually. This is what is meant by their claim that the federal income tax is "voluntary". In this way, those who "volunteer" themselves into federal contracts place themselves under the authority of Congress's powers to regulate commerce under Art. 1, Clause 8, Cl.3, subjecting themselves to the federal income tax. Thus the federal government ultimately obtains legal title to all of our property and total control over our lives leaving us with only the equitable interest so long as we perform the terms of our contracts. A serious breach of the contract means the loss of our equity; i.e., the government will take our property. The 1st clause of the 14th Amendment created a subject matter enclave jurisdiction to "artificially" create citizens not circumscribed by the Organic Law (Negroes, corporations, licensees, etc.) and placed them directly under municipal authority of Congress so that wherever they might "reside" in any one of the several states, territories, or possessions, they are within the scope of Congress's legislative authority as their existence is a federal state created privilege.

Since the nations bankruptcy in 1933-- and the subsequent overthrow of the Constitution in 1933--though our government will not "openly and officially" admit it-- its position is that all Natural Born Citizens are also "subjects" with jurisdiction acquired by our "voluntary" contractual participation in Worldwide Social Insurance. Accordingly, all races are considered joined together as 14th Amendment (D.C.) citizens, "subjects" since being "enrolled" into Commerce by their "birth certificate", and by subsequently confirming their consent, when "applying for" such Unilateral Contracts as the Drivers and Marriage Licenses, Social Security Application, Selective Service and Voters' Registration, Bank Accounts, Credit Applications, W-4, and 1040 Income Tax Contracts, etc. for those who would chose to follow Satan, God provided flaws in the Constitution - - Art. 1 Clause 8, Cls 3, 17, & 18, and Art. 1, Clause 10, Cl. 1- - for the International Bankers to discover , to humble Christian Americans who would turn their backs on their God to worship the strange gods of greed, power, prestige, sex, the sports world, etc.- - their idols of materialism - - all violations of the First Commandment. When a Natural Born Citizen with a SS# refuses to sign a 1040 contract the federal courts will rule that he has " a know legal duty" which compels him to contract with government without ever requiring the government to produce the laws that make him liable for the tax and require the affirmative act of filing. Such quasi- coerced and compelled "commercial agreements"- - though entered out of fear - - need only be entered voluntarily and intentionally to have validity. The fact that he did not enter the agreement knowingly is immaterial. Ignorance of the law is no excuse.

It has taken concerned American Nationals 62 years to figure out why our Constitutional protections have been legislated away since 1913 by a Congress initially ordained with no such powers. Under the Common Law, violations require an injured party (a Corpus Delicti), and contracts must be entered Knowingly, Willingly, and with full knowledge of informed consent (intentionally). Having done so unknowingly or unwillingly could not have resulted in any forfeiture of unalienable Rights that would bring about a loss of property (labor) or liberty (held in captivity) as has been the case resulting from alleged Internal Revenue Code violations by American Nationals. Such an insidious plot perpetrated against American Nationals could only have been conceived and

hatched in the mind of Satan. How did this system of Commercial Law develop? It developed as a result of the use of the introduction and use of Federal Reserve Notes (Commercial Paper). In pursuance of our use of this "Commercial Paper" the courts in our country are proceeding under the old Negotiable Instruments Law which has been codified into the Uniform Commercial Code and subsequently adopted by all the states. A Federal Reserve Note dollar is a fictional instrument a "colorable" dollar, and not the lawful dollar described in Clause 9 of the Coinage Act of 1792, (371-1/4 grains of .999 silver.) Common Law and Equity use gold and silver; Admiralty use gold only. All systems of law described in the Constitution are based on substance. No system of law that uses paper can be genuine - - -therefore it is a "colorable" system of law. So the Banksters and the Bar Association invented this new "colorable" jurisdiction to support this colorable law called "statutory law" which operates not according to "Public Law" but according to "Public Policy". For many years Patriots thought that because this statutory jurisdiction followed Admiralty rules it was an Admiralty jurisdiction. Not so! The only reason the Banksters did not enforce the Bankruptcy of 1933 by 1938 and foreclose on this and other bankrupt nations is that they did not have control of the guns. So you see why it is today that gun control is our government's paramount objective through deception of anti-terrorism legislation?

Our servants of the Public Trust have long ignored the meaning of the 9th and 10th Amendments and the Concept of "unalienable Rights" so eruditely stated by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence for the benefit of the People of this nation and their Posterity. Our Natural and Unalienable Rights run much deeper than those so called "civil rights" regulated by Congress through the 14th Amendment, [Proof of this among others is the duplicate due process clause provided therein for its citizen "subjects"] If we expect to claim our Rights it is our individual responsibility to see that the Bill of Rights is enforced and that those violating our Rights are tried for Treason.] Truly, we are engaged in a spiritual battle. The situation that presently exists in the 50 Union States is the very reason the 2nd Amendment was written - - so that the contract called the Constitution could be enforced by the People (i.e. the state 3 Citizens).

Why all the confusion over the simple term "United States"?

Obviously, to extend the taxing powers beyond their constitutionally authorized limits. Everybody knows that: "The District of Columbia is not a state within meaning of the Constitution" [U.S. vs. Virginia (1805)] like the 50 states of the Union, and yet it is referred to in all the (2) United States Codes as a "State", meaning the corporate and statutory venue of the Union. The District of Columbia is a corporation which is also known as the "1 & 2 United States." It must have its own definition for "state" since it 1 & 2 and the territorial States were not formed as Union States (3) by and under the Constitution. It is the primary entity owning Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, etc., which are federal States. Nevertheless, the federal courts are unconstitutionally enforcing the jurisdiction of CORPORATE U.S. FEDERAL (2) entity upon the entire geographical area of the Union states (3) as if they were under Congress' exclusive legislative authority (see 18 U.S.C. Clause 3231, with its Cross References referring the reader to 18 U.S.C. Clause 7, @ (3). The law is clear on this point, but the courts won't enforce it. Here are the facts concerning the term "United States" when used in the federal tax code (Title 26) which has its own peculiar definitions (called terms of art) written by the craftiest of legal minds, and paid by our tax dollars to defraud us, the American People, of our labor property.

1. "United States" does not mean the fifty states of the Union except in two extremely limited areas which deal with excise taxes on articles and goods.

2. "United States" means "federal areas" within the fifty states of the Union which are ceded to the "United States" and under the municipal authority of the Congress seated in Washington, D.C., but it does not include the entire geographical areas of the several states of the Union.

3. "United States" means the possessions of the District of Columbia which are its States - - -Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. It does not mean the 50 Union States.

4. The numbers 2 and 3 above are called "States" but are not to be confused with the states of the Union, such as Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky. The "Internal Revenue Code" is purposely written to mislead and is purposefully misconstrued by the courts in the interest of promoting "Public Policy".

5. "United States" are: Congress assembled at home (the seat of government), the District of Columbia and its territories (termed States in the IRS Code) and its possessions (ceded areas, military posts, navy yards, etc.) called federal enclaves.

6. "United States Citizen" does not mean a Natural Born Citizen who is an American National. State Inhabitants who live in the Common Law venue and jurisdiction of one of the 50 Union States are not "subject to" the income tax laws unless they either work for the federal government [see 26 U.S.C. Clause 6331(?)] and thus are compelled to pay a Kickback for the contractual privilege received. Or they are those who produce alcohol, or tobacco under Title 27, the Stamp Tax Act. The District of Columbia is referred to as a "State" in the Income tax laws and Social Security laws, as well as in all other codes of the "United States" to purposely leave the law open to interpretation so the courts can "mold" it in the interest of "Public Policy" under the Colorable Law of the Uniform Commercial Code. Federal Law Distinguishes How our government complies with the law while promulgating the fraud...

Do they know the difference? You bet they do! And the following law proves it. From the Code of Civil Procedure.28 United States Code: Section 1746 Unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury. "Wherever, under law of the United States, or any rule, regulation, order, or requirement made pursuant to law, any matter is required or permitted to be supported by him, as true under penalty of perjury, and dated in substantially the following form.

(1) If executed without the United States: "I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date).
(Signature)"

(2) If executed within the United States, its territories, possessions, or commonwealths: "I declare (or certify, verily, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date) (Signature) [emphasis mine] The writers of the Code of Civil Procedure in (1) above are referring to the Common Law venue and jurisdiction (that of the Republic), and in (2) above, the statutory venue and jurisdiction of the District Of Columbia (that of the Democracy) -- not just whether one is inside or outside of the country -- but whether one is legally situated inside or outside the Republic, through your ignorance in this instance will never be challenged. Please also note that when government employees and agents sign documents they are only required to swear that the information is true, correct and NOT "Complete" as is required of those United States citizens/"subjects" who submit 1040 contracts because of their so-called "voluntary" relationships with the District. That should incline one to inquire just who considers whom the master and whom the servant in this relationship. A word to the wise....

Copyrighted at Common Law (rev. February 27, 1998)

Bob Jungles

Reprinted with permission.

Are YOU a Union state Citizen or Federal U.S. "citizen"?

ARTICLE #2 - Fourteenth Amendment Citizenship

If you look through the copy of the United States constitution found in the 1990 edition of Black's Law Dictionary, you'll notice something very interesting. The word "Citizen" is always capitalized until you get to the fourteenth amendment, which was adopted in 1868. After that, it's no longer capitalized. This isn't an isolated occurrence either. In the definition of "Dred Scott Case," a supreme court case decided before the fourteenth amendment, they capitalize "Citizen," but everywhere else in the dictionary, where it refers to the laws of today, the word isn't capitalized. As you shall see, this is just one small indicator of many that the fourteenth amendment created a new class of citizen.

This is certainly no secret to the legal community. In fact, under the definition of "Fourteenth Amendment" it says, "The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States... creates... a citizenship of the United States as distinct from that of the states..." This class of "citizen of the United States" was new; it was unknown to the constitution prior to 1868. This wasn't the status of our forefathers. In the first sentence of the definition of "United States" found in Black's, it says, "This term has several meanings." Pursuing this further, we find that one of the definitions is the "collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution." This is what the framers of the constitution meant by "Citizen of the United States" - that is, the Citizen of one state is to be considered and treated as a Citizen of every other state in the union. Used in another sense, though, the term is simply the name of the federal government. This is what is meant by "citizen of the United States in the fourteenth amendment":

Privileges and immunities clause of Fourteenth Amendment protects only those rights peculiar to being citizen of federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship.

Jones v. Temmer, Federal Supplement, Vol. 829, Page 1227 (1993)

From the authorities above, we can see that the fourteenth amendment created citizenship of the federal government. This status is a privilege granted by the government:

Citizenship is a political status, and may be defined and privilege limited by Congress.

Ex Parte (NG) Fung Sing, Federal Reporter, 2nd Series, Vol. 6, Page 670 (1925)

It goes without saying that the federal government can regulate the privileges it creates. By definition, "citizenship" is the basis of a person's relationship with the government. In the legal sense, everything else is built upon it. Therefore, since fourteenth amendment citizenship is a privilege, every aspect of the citizen's life could potentially be regulated. Worst of all, this new class of citizen does not have the right to invoke the protections of the Bill of Rights, as explained in the following supreme court case:

We have cited these cases for the purpose of showing that the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States do not necessarily include all the rights protected by the first eight amendments to the Federal Constitution against the powers of the Federal government. They were decided subsequently to the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment...

Maxwell v. Dow, 176 US 598 (1900)

This isn't an idea peculiar to the turn of the century either. Going back to the 'Jones' case, which was decided in 1993, we find the courts of today saying, "The privileges and immunities clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects very few rights because it neither incorporates any of the Bill of Rights nor protects all rights of individual citizens." Although fourteenth amendment citizens have no guaranteed access to the Bill of Rights, the amendment itself does state that they have certain "privileges and immunities." Here's what the Supreme Court has decided they are:

Privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, on the other hand, are only such as arise out of the nature and essential character of the national government, or are specifically granted or secured to all citizens or persons by the Constitution of the United States. *Slaughter-House Cases*, supra, p.79; *Re Kemmler*, 136 U.S. 436, 448, 34 L.ed. 519, 524, 10 Sup. Ct.Rep. 930; *Duncan v. Missouri*, 152 U.S. 377, 382, 38 L.ed. 485, 487, 14 Sup.Ct.Rep. 570. Thus, among the rights and privileges of national citizenship recognized by this court are the right to pass freely from state to state (*Crandall v. Nevada*, 6 Wall. 35, 18 L.ed. 75); the right to petition Congress for a redress of grievances (*United States v. Cruikshank*, supra); the right to vote for national officers (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U.S. 651, 28 L.ed. 274, 4 Sup.Ct.Rep. 152; *Wiley v. Sinkler*, 179 U.S. 58, 45 L.ed. 84, 21 Sup.Ct. Rep. 17); the right to be protected against violence while in the lawful custody of a United States marshal (*Logan v. United States*, 144 U.S. 263, 36 L.ed. 429, 12 Sup.Ct. Rep. 617); and the right to inform the United States authorities of violation of its laws (*Re Quark*, 158 U.S. 532, 39 L.ed. 1080, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 959).

Twining v. New Jersey, 211 US 78 (1908)

As discussed in the last article, Sovereign Citizens created government to guarantee them their rights. In contrast, it would seem from the above that the federal government created fourteenth amendment citizenship to guarantee its power.

As a side note, this amendment has always been controversial. Many people over the years have questioned the amount of power it vests in the federal government. Some have even questioned its validity. On one occasion Judge Ellett of the Utah Supreme Court remarked:

I cannot believe that any court, in full possession of its faculties, could honestly hold that the amendment was properly approved and adopted.

State v. Phillips, Pacific Reporter, 2nd Series, Vol. 540, Page 941, 942 (1975)

However, the most important fact about this amendment is that, although it created a new class of citizen, it did not have any effect on Sovereign Citizens. Both classes still exist:

When the Constitution was adopted the people of the United States were the citizens of the several States for whom and for whose posterity the government was established. Each of them was a citizen of the United States at the adoption of the Constitution, and all free persons thereafter born within one of the several States became by birth citizens of the State and of the United States. (Mr. Calhoun in his published work upon the Constitution denied that there was any citizenship of the United States in any other sense than as being connected with the government through the States.)

The first attempt by Congress to define citizenship was in 1866 in the passage of the Civil Rights Act (Revised Statutes section 1992, 8 United States Code Annotated section 1). The act provided that:

"All persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power are declared to be citizens of the United States."

And this in turn was followed in 1868 by the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, United States Code Annotated Amendment 14, declaring:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

Perkins v. Elg, Federal Reporter, 2nd Series, Vol. 99, Page 410 (1938), affirmed by supreme court at 307 US 325 (1939)

Both classes of citizen still exist. It's your right to be a Sovereign Citizen, while it's a privilege to be a fourteenth amendment citizen, and most importantly, it's up to you to determine which one you are, and which one you want to be.

The following is a reprint from the Free Enterprise Society's newsletter, May 1989. It is authored by former Arizona State Senator Wayne Stump:

"As my interest in constitutional law has expanded over the past years and the word of my interest spread, I have happily become the recipient of Patriot papers, circulars and letters from all over this great land.

Many folks involved in the research and use of the principles involved in our "Republican" form of government have become personal friends. These friendships have enabled a great deal of activity, from diverse sources, to develop together for comparison and evaluation.

I have, from time to time, endeavored to pass information, on a limited basis, from one source to another for enlightenment of individuals on general issues.

This time, however, it would appear that the emerging principles are so fundamental to our form of government, and of such magnitude as to encompass every man, woman and child in our united Republics, that one wonders how they could have ever become obscured.

The principles to which I refer are those heralded in the Preamble of the Constitution, which being: "We, the People...." and continues "....secure the blessings of Liberty to Ourselves and our Posterity." These words, without question, were used to represent the interests of the signers of the Constitutional contract. That is to say, "The Founding Fathers and their Posterity."

When one reflects on this meaning of "We the People" it would seem to mean that the Preamble People were a class of people who, with the aid of God, originally secured their Liberty with the protections they constructed into the Organic Constitution and the first ten Amendments thereto. This, being the case, tends to bring the import of the 14th Amendment into focus.

The 13th and 14th Amendments, as we have been taught, were fashioned to give freedom to slaves and to secure for them privileges of citizenship.

Our Educators, however, neglected to explain that the 14th Amendment creation was that of a new "class" of citizenship. It becomes clear when one studies the wording of the Organic Constitution, that the original people cited in the "Preamble" could not lose the "Blessings" secured thereby as long as the Constitution was intact, because our Constitution is perpetual.

The 14th Amendment, then had to create another "position" for those persons for whom it was created. Scrutiny of the 14th Amendment reveals that persons encompassed thereby were "subject" to jurisdiction thereof and may not "question" the validity of the public debt.

Big "C" -- Little "c"

When this Nation was founded each of the individual States of this union had their own Citizens (spelled with a capital "C"). Today, we have a second class of citizen (note the small "c"), the 14th Amendment citizen.

In law, every letter in a word is important. A word capitalized may mean one specific thing, while the same word without capitalization may mean something entirely different. In the case of Citizenship (or citizenship), this is more certainly true.

There is a clear distinction between national and State citizenship, U.S. citizenship does not entitle citizen of the privileges and Immunities of the Citizen of the State. *K. Tashiro v. Jordan*, 256 P 545, affirmed 49 S Ct 47, 278 US 123.

Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, agrees with the distinction between these different classes of (C)itizenship:

There are two Privileges and Immunities Clauses in the federal Constitution and Amendments, the first being found in Art. IV, and the second in the 14th Amendment. Section 1, second sentence, clause 1. The provision in Art. IV states that "The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States, while the 14th Amendment provides that "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

Note the lack of capitalization in the wording used in the 14th Amendment, this specifically means that the words "citizens, privileges, immunities" are not the same as in Article IV.

The State of California was admitted into the Union of the United States in 1849; 9 Statutes at Large 452. It was admitted on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever.

The State of California was required to have its own Citizens, who were first State Citizens, then as a consequence of State Citizenship were American Citizens, known as Citizens of the United States. There was no specific class as this, but for traveling and protection by the United States government while out of the country, they were generally called Citizens of the United States.

The Constitution for the United States of America (1787) used the term "Citizen of the United States" in Article I, Section 2, (capital "C"), and numerous other sections. This referred to the Sovereign Political Body of State Citizens, this Citizen is entitled to all the Privileges and Immunities of the Citizens of the several States under Article IV.

Congress utilized the same term "citizen of the United States" qualifying it with a small "c" to distinguish "federal citizen" in the so-called 14th Amendment. These "citizens" have only statutory rights granted by Congress.

Thus, Congress and most of the Judiciary, without distinction being properly brought forth have made rulings based upon the federal "citizens" who are resident in a State, not State Citizens domiciled within their own State.

The statement by Chief Justice Taney in *Dred Scott v. Stanford*, 19 How. 393, 422, in defining the term "persons" the Judge stated:

...persons who are not recognized as Citizens." See also *American and Ocean Ins. Co. v. Canter*, 1 Pet. 511, which also distinguishes "persons" and "Citizens." These were the persons that were the object of the 14th Amendment, to give to this class of native born "persons" who were "resident" in the union of the United States citizenship, and authority to place other than the white race within the special category of "citizen of the United States."

To overcome the statement in *Dred Scott*, supra, that only white people were Citizens, and all other persons were only "residents" without citizenship of the United States, Congress then passed the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat 27.

The Act of Congress called the Civil Rights Act, 14 U.S. Stats. At Large, pg.

27, which was the forerunner of the 14th Amendment, amply shows the intent of Congress:

All persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States, and such citizens of every race and color... shall have the same right in every state and territory of the United States... to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property as is enjoyed by white citizens,...

(Again, note the lack of capitalization)

This was the intent of Congress; not to infringe upon the Constitution or the state of the de jure Citizens of the several states. It was never the intent of the 14th Amendment to subvert the States' authority or that of the Constitution as it relates to the status of the de jure State Citizens. *People v. Washington*, 36 C 658, 661 (1869) over ruled on other grounds; *French v. Barber*, 181 US 324; *MacKenzie v. Hare*, 60 L Ed 297

At this point, I anticipate a lot of folks reading this article are going into shock as they grab for the Constitution to check out the phrase and "question" of the validity of the public debt. Let me help you by reference to section 4 of the 14th Amendment and caution you to hold onto your chair.

It would seem then, from the foregoing, that there are two "classes" of citizens in this country:

1. Preamble Citizen: persons born or naturalized within the meaning of the Organic Constitution and inhabiting one of the several Republics of the United States who enjoy full citizenship of the Organic Constitution as Citizens of the Republic which they inhabit.
2. Citizen "subject": persons enfranchised by the 14th Amendment who are born or naturalized in the United States within the meaning of the 14th Amendment and are residing therein as a United States citizen and are enjoying the privileges and immunities of "limited" citizenship.

It is not my intention, in this article, to become technically involved in citations for the information introduced here, but only to outline an overview for those folks who claim "Constitutional Rights" and then wonder why the legislatures, courts and police don't respond in "kind" to these claims.

When one separates the classes among their appropriate dividing lines, it appears that:

1. Preamble Citizens:

a. Have direct personal access to a God inspired, original Constitution and it's restraints on government for the protection of life, liberty and property.

b. Have direct personal access to the Article III courts known as "justice courts" which deal with law.

2. Citizen "subjects":

a. Have representative access to the first eight amendments as purviewed by the 14th Amendment.

b. Have representative access to Article 1 courts, provided by legislature, that are known as "legislative courts" which deal with statutes and are served by bar members, or officers of the court, known as lawyers.

My concern here, stems from my observation that folks involved with the preservation of our beloved Constitution are unaware of the "limited" citizenship created by the 14th Amendment. Additionally, these folks don't realize that they are, or have voluntarily become, citizen subjects because of their acceptance of the "benefits" of limited citizenship.

The main "benefit" that I will mention here is Social Security. There are many other "benefits" such as the benefit of "regulation by licensing" that give control of your children to the State by making them "wards of the State" and subject to the "regulation" of the "legislative courts" by statute, etc.

The intention of this article is to point out the apparent difference in the classes of citizenship and the difference in the courts in serving these classes.

I have noticed that, in many publications, and also personal conversations, people convey their feelings of alarm or despair in finding that "the court" or "government" is in violation of the Constitution without realizing that the court they are addressing is a legislative court and does not hear cases based on justice, but rather, cases based only on statute law.

The reality of the following example of statute law is that the statute specifies a speed limit to be held at 30 m.p.h. The only question that can be entertained by the court is that of whether the accused did in fact go faster than the limit. That is a yes or no question. The accused cannot try to tell the court that it was a six lane highway on a clear day with no traffic in sight and that his speed of 60 m.p.h. did not injure anyone. The court is not obligated to hear that argument as it is not a justice court.

The final question then would seem to be "where is the article III "justice" court and who can use it? I am very aware that many of the folks reading this article are not going to be able to use the justice courts, as they have natural or acquired deficiencies that will not allow them Preamble Citizenship,

but for the people endowed with the proper qualifications, it appears that the straight line approach of barring jurisdiction of legislative courts (tribunals) through rescission of contracts and declaration of Article IV, Section 2 status is essential, as it appears that only Preamble People can exercise the offices as set forth in the Organic Constitution. Additionally, it seems that this same class (Preamble People) is the only class that may claim the protection of the first ten Amendments as written.

As the truth of our personal status, and the responsibilities connected therewith unfolds, it becomes clear that the Article III "justice" court must be accessed individually by the person claiming the right. At present it is being done by common law filing of actions "in law" with the County Recorders who have been found to be "ex officio" clerks of the County courts. The authority for the exercise of the "justice" office is found in the 9th Article of Amendment and I believe all State Constitutions have similar provisions for the Preamble Citizens (also known as de jure Citizens).

I will not go farther with an attempt toward instruction but will leave this in the hands of the many patriots engaged in the research of these developments. My mission in presenting this information in a general sense is to help the unfortunate individuals who repeatedly bash themselves against the rocks of misinformation or ignorance in vain, though laudable, effort to protect our beloved Constitution. I hope I have achieved this end."

It would appear that this former Arizona State Senator was a right-wing, anti-government wacko! However, he knows more about the subject matter than 95% of the people in this country. Why is that do you suppose? The reason is, the people in this country have been programed (dumbed down) in the government indoctrination centers (public [fool] school system).


**Remember this the next time you show up in one of their private
"STATE OF" franchise courtrooms:**

- **The United States "citizen" has ONLY privileges granted by the authority of the Federal Government. You have NO "lawful" RIGHTS or CONSTITUTIONAL protections.**

The Fictitious Legal Entity Called "a Person"

February 14, 2010

by Paul Verge



(Col. House, left, puppeteer of Presidents)

A quote, famously attributed to Rothschild agent Col. Edward House, but rarely understood except by "one man in a million" envisages people as collateral on the national debt:

"[Very] soon, every American will be required to register their biological property in a National system designed to keep track of the people and that will operate under the ancient system of pledging.

By such methodology, we can compel people to submit to our agenda, which will affect our security as a chargeback for our fiat paper currency. Every American will be forced to register or suffer not being able to work and earn a living.

They will be our chattel, and we will hold the security interest over them forever, by operation of the law merchant under the scheme of secured transactions. Americans, by unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of lading to us will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent, forever to remain economic slaves through taxation, secured by their pledges.

They will be stripped of their rights and given a commercial value designed to make us a profit and they will be none the wiser, for not one man in a million could ever figure our plans and, if by accident one or two would figure it out, we have in our arsenal plausible deniability.

After all, this is the only logical way to fund government, by floating liens and debt to the registrants in the form of benefits and privileges. This will inevitably reap to us huge profits beyond our wildest expectations and leave every American a contributor to this fraud which we will call "Social Insurance."

*Without realizing it, every American will insure us for any loss we may incur and in this manner; **every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly.** The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and, **we will employ the high office of the President of our dummy corporation to foment this plot against America.**"*

If you can decipher what this means, you will truly understand a massive piece of the Global Agenda.

Essentially, House's quote illuminates the multiple "need" for imposing Legal Person's status upon us by the Satanic (Ego Worshipping) Elite.

The '**Strawman**', also known as the **Legal Person** or **Natural Person** is the idea that a **Fictitious Legal Entity**, called a **PERSON**, exists for purposes of Law and Commerce.

This **PERSON** is similar to a Company or Corporation in that it exists as a construct of the imagination - it has no real body, and no soul to save, but for legal purposes, carries similar rights and attributes to that of a Human Man or Woman.

These rights include Ownership of Property, Lobbying the Government, Voting, and other activities related to money. The **PERSON** allows us to function with Limited Liability (read: Less Responsibility)

Our primary Legal **Person**, or "ID Card" consists of Birth Date, Eye color, Hair colour, Height, Weight, and now Fingerprints and Retina-scans, as if that's all we are. Nowhere on an ID Card are your Soul, or your **Personality**, or your Hopes, Dreams or Capacity to Love ever mentioned...

The emotional insecurities we have about our Bodies are magnified & exploited through constant propaganda and advertising, while our media hammers away at our psyche, "reminding" us that we are only Bodies, that bodies can only be sexy or ugly, and that Bodies and their Parts must be regarded as Possessions or Objects to be Owned.

In addition, by Registering (signing over to the state) your Biological Property (your body and the bodies of your children), creating a Birth Certificate (*a Financial Security Instrument representing proof of parental consent in signing over the child*) you are thus **Consenting** to the State's Ownership of You and Your Children.

The State then creates a child's very first Legal **PERSON**, with the parental signing of the Birth Certificate, which is given a "commercial value". If you have an older-style Birth Certificate, look on the Reverse side of it, to see 3 points of interest.

- 1) A 6-10 digit Number that you have never used in your life.
- 2) The words "Revenue Receipt" on the left side of this number.
- 3) The words "For Treasury Purposes Only" on the right side of the number.

Incidentally, before the 1900's, people USED to write the evidence of a birth in their Family Bible.

This first Legal Person attached to you, is known as a "NATIONAL CITIZEN" which later becomes synonymous with being a "Government Employee", when you SUBMIT (give in) an APPLICATION (to beg) for REGISTRATION (to sign over your rights) to become a SINner (by signing up for the Fraud called Social Insurance or Social Security).

You then receive your Employee ID # (also known as a SIN #) which creates another **Person** called a "**TAXPAYER**". This means you **consent** to the Income Tax Act, and now makes you liable for the Income Tax, in exchange for the "Benefits" of being a Government Employee.

The Strawman/Legal **Person** is thus the Evidence of your Signature (an oath) and **Consent** to Obey a set of Acts or Statutes, usually located on paper contract, or in a card form with your signature.

For example: You sign for a "Drivers License" to create a Legal Person called a "DRIVER", and have **consented** to follow the Traffic Safety/Motor Vehicle Acts of your state or province.

You sign up for a "Bank Account" to create a Legal **Person** called an "ACCOUNT HOLDER", usually providing your SIN # as part of your "Identification" which **consents** to allowing access to your bank account by court order to pay your Income Taxes by force!

You sign up for "Voter Registration" to create Legal **Person** called a "VOTER", which gets to vote for new Employee's and Presidents/Prime Ministers **for the Corporation your PERSON resides in**, and thus **consent** to the actions of your representative and their party, even if it means going to war against an innocent foreign country, or proroguing their own Parliament illegally!

There are literally dozens, if not hundreds of different **PERSONS** you can be holding, but none of them are YOU.

PERSONS must **RESIDE** within another Legal Entity, they cannot "Live" anywhere - that is why you are asked if you are a **Resident** of CANADA or the UNITED STATES. Authorities are not asking you, the Living Man or Woman if you Live in the Country, they are asking if your Legal **Person** RESIDES (has the right to do business/work) **within their Corporation**.

We have to know what words mean when people claiming authority try to use Legal words to control us. Legal dictionaries are different than regular dictionaries, because Legal words carry Weight in Law, and are often defined completely differently within various Acts, Statutes, and Legal dictionaries. It is literally another language, which is why they call it Legalese.

SOLUTIONS

Only by realizing and discerning WHO we really are: Powerful spiritual beings with unlimited creative potential created by God, can we break the first invisible chain keeping us from freedom.

"You can declare your Rights and stand upon them as a Sovereign Man or Woman by filing "Notices of Understanding and Intent" and "Claims of Right", example of both available on the Web. You must tailor your own Notices and Claims to your own situation. It is not a simple cookie-cutter process.

Standing upon your Sovereignty in court and winning is FACTUAL, but you must not fall for their NAME GAME, where they try to get you to accept your LEGAL NAME, which puts you in their jurisdiction. Doing that, in the eyes of the court, turns you from a Living Human with Human Rights, into a Soulless Corporate Entity with No Rights whatsoever.

The best solution to win against the crooked and corrupt courts is to never go to court and play their fixed game at all. If someone tries to use a Court Order against you, make sure it is SIGNED by a JUDGE or it is INVALID. Most Court Orders aren't actually signed, and officials use unsigned Court Order's as a confidence trick to gain your **consent!**

There is no silver bullet. There is no lazy way to learn about your rights. You must Research and do your homework to REALLY learn what you are doing. Ignorantly walking into court is like playing carelessly with a loaded handgun."

You are not a **PERSON**. You are a Living Soul of Flesh and Blood. A **PERSON** has Privileges that can be revoked while a Living Man or Woman has Rights that are Inalienable!

Knowing THIS, is the first step to stopping the War Against Consciousness.

TERMS not WORDS

The Informer - Jan 2002

This article will go into the IRS use of meanings in their code. In fact, any agency of government or the legislature of a state, or Congress that uses the word "TERM" in its statutes is totally different from when the "TERM" is not used. WORDS and TERMS are entirely two separate and distinct conveyances of ideas. A TERM is used in a definition that signifies a special meaning to the words that follow. For it is the man's idea alone, who is the proponent of the idea, who is to define the meaning of that specific term "means" in his mind. It can be a totally different definition than what you are accustomed to using even when using the exact same "word." As we move along you will see it is really not that hard to grasp the differences between a "word" and a "term."

The following is from **Black's Law 4th Ed.**

TERM. A word or phrase; an expression; particularly one which possesses a fixed or known meaning in some science, art, or profession.

WORDS. Symbols indicating idea and subject to contraction and expansion to meet the idea sought to be expressed. * * * As used in law, this term generally signifies the technical terms and phrases appropriate to particular instruments, or aptly fitted to the expression of a particular intention in legal instruments. See the subtitles following.

WORDS OF ART. The vocabulary or terminology of a particular art or science, and especially those expressions which are idiomatic or peculiar to it. See *Cargill v Thompson*, 57, Minn. 534, 59 N.W. 638

The following from **Webster's American Dictionary of the English Language 1828.** Term consists of two columns so only the pertinent parts are cited. However, read the entire definition in that book so you cannot say I am picking and choosing. However, that's exactly what the enemy (the government) does.

TERM. 1. A limit; a bound or boundary; the extremity of anything; that which limits its extent.

7. In *grammar*, a word or expression; that which fixes or determines ideas.

14. In *contracts*, *terms* in the plural, are conditions; propositions stated or promises made, which when assented to or accepted by another, settle the contract and bind the parties.

WORD. 1. An articulate or vocal sound or a combination of articulate or vocal sounds, uttered by the human voice, and by custom expressing an idea or ideas; a single component of human speech or language.

Notice that "term" is defined in both dictionaries quite similarly. Term pinpoints the idea exactly and must be specific and cannot be expanded or contracted upon. However, "word" is quite differently defined in the standard dictionary of common words we all use. When we converse on the street, in the home, in the store we use common words which are not terms. Term is limiting to a specific idea. Only "words" can be expanded or contracted upon whereas terms cannot. Now refer to Black's above and note that they used "TERM" and not

"word" in the definition of WORD. Most people would never catch it unless shown. This is how closely you have to read the past masters of deceit who are lawyers.

What is white to you is black to them in the words employed in their "Words of Art." This is never more evident than in the definitions in the IR Code. Please note that every definition (7701) starts with "The TERM---". Once you understand TERM is a clue to words of art employed after the word term, you have half the battle won. That means throw out the standard dictionary definition we are all use to seeing and go by what they, the writers of the law, mean. They never say "The WORD" when they start the definition in any 7701 (a) part, now do they? Or for that matter anywhere else in the code definitions. It has to be term in order to make words work against you and *for* them, as they write the definitions, not us.

I suggest everyone take a look at **IRC 7701(a) (28) OTHER TERMS**. -- Any term used in this subtitle with respect to the application of, or in connection with, the provisions of **any other subtitle of this title shall have the same meaning as in such provisions**.

The case of the TERM, not word, "Resident" it is legally defined in United States v. Penelope, 27 Fed. Case No. 16024, which states:

"But admitting that the **common acceptance** of the word and its **legal technical** meaning are **different**, we must presume that Congress meant to adopt **the latter**." page 487.

"But this is a highly penal act, and must have **strict construction**. * * * The question seems to be whether they inserted 'resident' without the legal meaning generally affixed to it. If they have omitted to express their meaning, we cannot supply it.", page 489.

No one asks what words are in the code because we blindly use the common accepted use of that word that we all use in every day speech. This gives the IRS an edge because the idea written is specifically technical as stated by the court in the case above. So IRS moves by presumption, against the man by calling him a "**person**" that is defined in the code at section 7343, but the man assumes he is a person in common words and not terms of the law writer. Now this is where the use of the word "including" by IRS, means restricted to that specific meaning and cannot be expanded upon. The use of the word TERM quite clearly states it is not a "WORD" that can be expanded or contracted upon when reading the definition in the above dictionaries. Therefore, including cannot be expanded upon to mean any more than what is described by the "TERM." If it could be expanded the definition would look like this, **Person. Person shall be construed to mean and include * * ***. Or it could look like this **Person. The word person shall be construed to mean and include * * *** In either case the word can be expanded or contracted while the use of TERM cannot.

"**Person**" is a TERM and is a word of art that does not pertain to Man. Man is never referenced in any tax code; a "**person**" is a Man that has taken on the artificial character of a legal entity and is subject to the tax. That Man is an artificial "**person**" and to define him as such they use the term of art "natural **person**" in order to separate him from a paper corporation such as IBM who could never be a "natural **person**," just a "**person**" as defined in the 7701(a) definition. So, now the man who is not a taxpayer, in the sense we know, actually makes the IRS presumption stick when declaring he is a "natural **person**." Remember, in law, and nowhere else, the word "**person**" means a legal entity of artificial character. So you state you are a "natural" artificial (**person**) compared to a fictional corporation (**person**).

For instance in 7701 (a) 10, State is a TERM and not a WORD. Therefore, it is defined exactly like the words employed and no more. State is exactly what is written, that is the District of Columbia. It does NOT include any of the states of the Union as it cannot be expanded upon as it is not a WORD but a "TERM" already defined as the idea of the law writer. In 7701 (a) (9) the United States is only the district of Columbia and only the states

that the United States owns such as those described in 26 U.S.C. 3121 (e) (1) and (2). Notice the word "TERM" in the beginning of the definition to alert you that it is a technical specific closed meaning to those words employed in that section. Therefore, in all the entire code, that meaning stands unless altered specifically. Now where that might be?

Turn to 26 U.S.C. 6103 (b) (5). Note after the word TERM is used it includes the word MEANS. Nowhere else but one or two other places will you see the word "means" used. Now they are telling you that for that section and that section only the definition is expanded upon to include all the states in the Union as it names them as such. You do not see this definition in 3121 (e) (1) and (2). Because to do so, as stated in 7701 (a) it would be "manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof."

Be not so fast to look at what the word "means" means. Just like Clinton argued the word "is." Yes, words are used to kill you by IRS and this government. From the 1828 American Dictionary this is very revealing as to why they had to use "means" in 6103. The words of study are in bold.

MEAN. Pronounced *ment*. To mean, to intend, **also to relate**, to recite or tell, also to *moan*, to lament; **The primary sense is to set or thrust forward, to reach, stretch or extend.**

So the use of the word "means" to describe a different meaning to the United States and State is required to make an expansion to the TERM United States and State as found throughout the IR Code. If you will please note the use of the word include is not to be found in 6103, whereas in all the other definitions "include" appears. We all know that includes is argued back and forth that it can be expansive. Well this proves includes is restrictive when the word TERMS is employed, which in itself is a special "technical" restrictive meaning. We all know that "includes" is defined as to shut up, confine within and so forth. Now go and read 3121 (e) (1) and (2) and you will see "The term "State" includes" and "The term United States when used in a Geographical sense." Geographical is explained in my book *Which One Are You*, as it is another WORD OF ART.

Now when you look at 7701 (a) (4) and (5) you can see the fraud by the use of TERMS rather than words to define domestic and foreign. Remember, the entire set of laws Titles 1 to 50 are designed to apply strictly to the United States and NOT to the States in Union. It is to apply to government people and not to the people in the States. It is to apply to "Domestic corporations" and NOT to the "Foreign corporations" located in the States of the Union. Can the statutes of Texas, Ohio, Florida or California apply to any other State or to the United States? The answer is obviously not. Can the laws of the United States apply to one living in the foreign states just mentioned? Obviously not when the Case of John Barron was decided and since then all the other cases where the Supreme Court stated the Bill of Rights was never to extend to the people in the states as it was a Bill for ONLY the United States. That means none of the laws or Constitution FOR the United States apply to the people of the States.

Have fun in reading the use of the words of art following the use of the TERM in any definition in the Code or for that matter any other Title of the United States code. You might want to see how your state uses the word TERM in its definition. This is one reason why the kids of today starting in about 1974 have gone downhill so they could never begin to understand what was employed by use of words that have an entirely different meaning than what they think they mean in law. Always remember, there is a common use of a word and there is a "legal technical" use of the word as stated by the Supreme Court above. Now at the back of the U.S. Supreme Court Rule book at Rule 47 it says,

"The **term** "State Court," when used in these Rules, includes the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. See 28 U.S.C. Sections 1257 and 1258. References in

these Rules to the common law and Statutes of a State include the common law and statutes of the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." This is a prime example of deceit because "includes" is restrictive to the terms defined which is State Court. Had this been properly designed to mean in the very beginning the state courts of each of the 50 states it would say so but it does not. It would have to be written this way if the word TERM was not used. **A "State Court" when used in these Rules means the 50 State courts of the Union and includes the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.** The original wording is stating that besides the U.S. Supreme Court being the State Court so are the other two. It does not mean any of the 50 State of The Union courts.

I cannot harp on this enough but by definition we people in the states are non resident aliens and are not subject to the income tax unless falling under sections 871 to 877. See 26 U.S.C. Section 2 (d). No one or very few people heeded my words on this in, *Which One Are You*, published over 12 years ago. People called me crazy, but I knew the words employed and they refused to pick up a dictionary to understand. The IRS gets you on words of common meaning when saying you are not a non resident alien because they ask, "don't you live and work in the United States?" to which the man says "yes," not realizing the IRS agent just stepped outside the legal technical" definition of United States and applied it in common language. Read 871 to 874 and 7701 (b) (1) (B) and ask this. If I am a non resident alien and I make money or carry on a trade or business within the United States am I subject to an income tax? The answer is yes? Why? What United States are you referring to that you work and receive income from? That's about all I can say; the rest is up to educating yourself in the fine line of "Words of Art." But I will include part of a Chapter from *Which One Are You* to digest.

Chapter IV

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Let's follow the Code of Federal Regulations trail to see where it leads. You have to remember, Nonresident Alien is an American, not a United States citizen, not in the **state of the forum**, per term. This is for self-employment income in 26 CFR, but applies equally to an American working for a corporation not chartered by Congress.

26 CFR § 1.1402 (b)-1 (a) In general. Except for the exclusions in paragraph (b) and (c) of this section and the **exception in paragraph (d) of this section**, the term "self employment income" means the net earnings from self employment derived by an individual during a taxable year.

Let's see what **paragraph (d)** says.

26 CFR § 1.1402 (b)-3 (d) Nonresident Alien. "A nonresident alien individual **never** has self-employment income. While a nonresident alien individual who derives income from a **trade or business** carried on **within the United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa...** may be subject to the applicable income tax provisions on such income, such nonresident alien individual will not be subject to the tax on self employment income, since any net earnings which he may have from self employment do not constitute self-employment income. For the purposes of the tax on self-employment income, an individual who is not a citizen of the United States but who is a resident of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands or for taxable years beginning after 1960, of Guam or American Samoa **is not** considered to be a nonresident alien individual."

Explanation; I like "**never**", don't you? Just what is this term **trade or business**? But remember the phrase **is not**, for I will get to that. Again look at the context of the statute. They are using the term nonresident in its geographical/citizen form.

26 CFR § 1.1402 (c) 1 Trade or Business. "In order for an individual to have net earnings from self employment, he must carry on a **trade or business**, either as an individual or as a member of a partnership. Except for the exclusions discussed in §§ 1.1402 (c) (2) to 1.1402 (c) (7), inclusive, the term **'trade or business'**, for the purpose for the tax on **self-employment income**, shall have the same meaning as when used in section **162**."

I am adding here, which comes from the book as to what section 162 says so you have a better understanding since you do not have the book to refer.

Here comes the Section 911 I have been referring to. There are people who say that, if you are a United States citizen, you can use § 911 of 26 USC, to avoid the tax because you are in one of the foreign 50 states, making foreign earned income which then cannot be taxed. True you are in a foreign state, they got that right but they still don't understand the term United States citizen. The U.S. citizen has to be a **"qualified individual"** 26 USC § 911 (d) (1), who has a **"tax home"** identified in 26 USC § 911 (d) (3), which is an individual listed in 26 USC § 162 (a) (2). That individual has earned income as defined in 26 USC § 911 (d) (2) (A) & (B), and is a **CONGRESSMAN**. It also talks about 'State Legislators' at 26 USC § 162 (h) (1) thru (4), which, when the term State is understood, means the District of Colombia and the 5 federal States. Now go back and read 26 USC § 864 again.

(B) NONRESIDENT. --- The term "nonresident" means any person other than a United States resident.

Are you an individual listed in **911 (d) (3)**?

911 (d) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES. -- For purposes of this section--

(3) TAX HOME,-- The term "tax home" means, with respect to any individual, such individual's home for purposes of section **162 (a) (2)** (relating to traveling expenses while away from home). An individual shall not be treated as having a tax home in a foreign country for any period for which his abode is within the United States.

So now they have established that to be a **United States resident** in the **United States**, you must have a **tax home** as relates to **traveling expenses** in section **162 (a) (2)**. So we go to § 162 (a) (2) to see if you are the taxpayer for "internal revenue." Remember what "United States" we are talking about.

26 USC § 162. TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES.

(a) In general.-- There shall be allowed as a deduction all the ordinary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business, including—

(1) a reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered;

(2) traveling expenses (including amounts expended for meals and lodging other than amounts which are lavish or extravagant under the circumstances) while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business; and

(3) rentals or other payments required to be made as a condition to the continued use or possession, for purposes of the trade or business, of property to which the taxpayer has not taken or is not taking title or in which he has no equity. [that was one sentence]

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the place of residence of a MEMBER OF CONGRESS (including any Delegate and Resident Commissioner) within the State, congressional district, or possession which he represents in Congress shall be considered his home for amounts expended by such Members within each taxable year for living expenses will not be deductible for income tax purposes in excess of \$3,000.

There you have it folks; are you a Congressman who is effectively connected with a **trade or business**, getting money from the public treasury, which is a privilege to which you are to return a portion of **internal revenue**? You thought they were talking about you in the beginning, right? Now read 26 CFR § 1.1402 (c) 2 (b) Meaning of Public Office, as this relates to,

26 USC 7701 (a) 26, which defines "Trade or Business" as "**the performance of the functions of a public office.**"

Bear this in mind when we look at 26 USC § 911 infra.

When comparing what is stated in the Social Security Handbook of 1982, Chapter 11 § 1101, pg. 176, it really helps you understand the private capacity of the laws that apply only to the United States and its agents, to wit:

"A 'TRADE OR BUSINESS' for Social Security purposes means the same as when used in **section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954**, relating to income taxes.

First let's see to whom the exclusions apply at 1.1402 above. It applies to government employees and foreign government employees. Who are these foreign government employees? Why the foreign sister state governments of the Union employees while performing in the United States as defined in section 3121 (e) (2) of 26 USC. Ever here of the Public Salary Tax Act? No mention of Congress in these 1.1402 sections, so we have to go back to section 162 where they are mentioned. Are you a member of Congress to be taxed?

Now remember the resident of the islands, in 1.1402 (b) (3) (d) (remember **is not**), cannot be considered nonresident alien because he resides within the term United States. Could you, an American who is not a United States citizen, and not residing within D.C. or the islands be a resident of those areas? NO, then you are a nonresident and alien to those areas, while those residing in the islands are residents and are not alien since they live on United States soil. Now the term nonresident takes on a geographical meaning, doesn't it?

Why isn't a resident of the islands considered nonresident of the **U.S.**? Here is a case from **U.S.** tax court that should prove to you who are still skeptical because Johnson was a **resident** of the Island.

87-1 USTC 9362 Johnson v Quinn,

"As stated in Revenue Ruling 73-315, 1973-2 C.B. 225, [T]he United States and Virgin Islands are separate and distinct taxing jurisdictions although their income tax laws arise from an identical statute applicable to each."

"In construing the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as in effect in the Virgin Islands, in addition to other modifications **when necessary and appropriate**, it will be necessary **in some sections**

of the law to **substitute** the words `Virgin Islands' for the words `United States' in order to give the law proper effect in those islands." **Emphasis theirs.**

The court also stated;

"Petitioners, having been taxed by **A STATE OF THE UNITED STATES**, contend that they are entitled to a foreign tax credit for taxes paid to that **STATE.**"

You can now see that petitioners did not understand that they were in a **state** belonging to that entity called the **U.S.**; they thought they were in a foreign country.

You already have a taste for how colorable the "law" is in using the term nonresident. Here is another example how **colorable** the tax law is. The Virgin Islands can be called a foreign country when Congress so declares:

26 USC § 3455. Other definitions and special rules.

(a) DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this subchapter

(4) FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.

The term "foreign government" means a foreign government, a political subdivision of a foreign government, and any wholly owned agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing.

[Only Congress could come up with this utterly stupid definition to deceive the functional illiterate. This is like defining a quart of milk by saying, a quart of milk is a quart of milk or part of a quart of milk. They haven't defined milk or a quart, have they?]

Continuing,

§ 2014 at (g) states; "**Possessions of United States Deemed a FOREIGN COUNTRY.--** For purposes of the credits authorized by this section, **each possession** of the United States shall be deemed to be a **FOREIGN COUNTRY.**"

The rest of 26 CFR § 1.1402 (b) doesn't apply unless you decide to work for a government corporation or are "effectively connected with" a "trade or business" **within** the United States. If you do, then follow 26 CFR § 1.6012 (b) -1. Read this very carefully and compare with;

26 CFR § 1.6015 (i)-1. Nonresident Alien Individuals. (a) Exception from requirement from making a declaration. No declaration of estimated income is required to be made under section 6015 (a) and § 1.6015 (a)-1 by a nonresident alien individual **unless--** (1) Such individual has **wages**, as defined in section 3401 (a), and the regulations thereunder, upon which tax is required to be withheld under section 3402.

See how nicely the government slides around to the term "wages?" Only Congressmen and Government employees have wages. Now we have to go back to wages in 26 CFR § 1.1402 (b) (3). Now as a nonresident alien working for government you do have wages, so follow 26 CFR § 1.1402 (c) -3 (a) & (d). This is where the 1040 NR comes in and possibly the Form 8233 for withholding. Now wait a minute, you say you don't work for government but a corporation chartered by a State of the Union? Fine then go to;

26 CFR 31.3401 (a) (6) -1 (b). Remuneration for services performed outside the United States.

Remuneration paid to a nonresident alien individual... for services performed outside the United States is **excepted** from **wages** and hence is **NOT SUBJECT TO WITHHOLDING**.

This is NOT the **unless category** found in 26 CFR § 1.6015 (i) -1 (1), is it? See how they slide around to **wages** like for self-employed. Isn't this in agreement with;

26 USC § 3401 (a) Wages. For purposes of this chapter, the **term** "wages" means all remuneration... for services performed by an employee for his employer, including the cash value of all remuneration... paid in any medium other than cash; **except** that such **term** SHALL NOT INCLUDE remuneration paid--(6) for such services performed by a nonresident alien individual, as may be designated by regulations prescribed by the Secretary;.

The State chartered company may refer you to 26 CFR § 31.3402 (f) (6) (1), but this is wrong for you are not the employee described in 26 USC § 3401 (c), working for the employer 26 USC § 3401 (d), which corresponds to 26 CFR § 1.1402 (c) 3 (d) and (c) 2 (b). This indicates you are not the "person" described in 26 USC 7343, because you are not to be treated as a resident working for the foreign (State) government's instrumentality **within the United States**. Therefore, the company is not defined as a government employer. How does the following read in your mind **The Federal Register, Tuesday, September 7, 1943 Page 12267 section 404.104 EMPLOYEE;**

"... x ... The term 'employee' ... **SPECIFICALLY INCLUDES** officers and employees whether elected or appointed, of the United States, a state ["Federal states" remember] Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing."

Note the use of the word "TERM" and it is a specific restricted meaning correct?

On page 12266 Section 404.102 of the Federal Register, Congress states:

"(g) Compensation paid to nonresident alien individual. ...remuneration for services performed by nonresident alien individuals **does not constitute wages subject to withholding** under section 1622..."

This means you are not in a "Covered group" which requires a Social Security Number. This is stated in Title 42 USC Chapter 7 section 418 (b) (5), as you would be performing a Proprietary function, which is described in CFR Title 26 pages 6001 and 6002 section 29.22 (b)-1, as being exempt from gross income, which is, **"under the Constitution, not taxable by the Federal government."**

The Official State Office Known As "PERSON"

Liberty means responsibility. That is why most men dread it.
George Barnard Shaw

This is the single most important lesson that you MUST learn. If you spend an hour to learn this material you will be rewarded for the rest of your life.

The word "person" in legal terminology is perceived as a general word which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than men and women. See e. g. 1 U. S. C. sec 1. Church of Scientology v. U. S. Dept. of Justice (1979) 612 F. 2d 417, 425.

One of the very first of your STATE statutes will have a section listed entitled "Definitions." Carefully study this section of the statutes and you will find a portion that reads similar to this excerpt.

In construing these statutes and each and every word, phrase, or part hereof, where the context will permit:

- (1) The singular includes the plural and vice versa.
- (2) Gender-specific language includes the other gender and neuter.
- (3) The word "person" includes individuals, children, firms, associations, joint adventures, partnerships, estates, trusts, business trusts, syndicates, fiduciaries, corporations, and all other groups or combinations.

Please note however that the definitions Statute does not list man or woman -- **THEREFORE THEY ARE EXCLUDED FROM ALL THE STATUTES!**

Under the rule of construction "expressio unius est exclusio alterius," where a statute or Constitution enumerates the things on which it is to operate or forbids certain things, it is ordinarily to be construed as excluding from its operation all those not expressly mentioned.

Generally words in a statute should be given their plain and ordinary meaning. When a statute does not specifically define words, such words should be construed in their common or ordinary sense to the effect that the rules used in construing statutes are also applicable in the construction of the Constitution. It is a fundamental rule of statutory construction that words of common usage when used in a statute should be construed in their plain and ordinary sense.

If you carefully read the statute laws enacted by your STATE legislature you will also notice that they are all written with phrases similar to these five examples:

1. A person commits the offense of failure to carry a license if the person...
2. A person commits the offense of failure to register a vehicle if the person...
3. A person commits the offense of driving uninsured if the person...
4. A person commits the offense of fishing if the person...
5. A person commits the offense of breathing if the person...

Notice that only "persons" can commit these STATE created, legislative crimes. A crime is by definition an offense committed against the "STATE." If you commit an offense against a man or woman, it is called a tort. Examples of torts would be any personal injury, slander, or defamation of character.

So how does someone become a "person" and subject to regulation by STATE statutes and laws?

There is only one way – **by Contract!** You must ask the STATE for permission to volunteer to become a STATE person. **You must volunteer because the U. S. Constitution forbids the STATE from compelling you into slavery.** This is found in the 13th and 14th Amendments.

13th Amendment

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United STATES, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

14th Amendment:

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the STATE wherein they reside. No STATE shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any STATE deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

You become a STATE created statutory "person" by taking up residency with the STATE and stepping into the office of "person." You must hold an "office" within the STATE government in order for that STATE government to regulate and control you. First comes the legislatively created office, and then comes their control. If you do not have an office in STATE government, the legislature's control over you would also be prohibited by the Declaration of Rights section, usually found to be either Section I or II, of the STATE Constitution.

The most common office held in a STATE is therefore the office known as "person." Your STATE legislature created this office as a way to control people. It is an office most people occupy without even knowing that they are doing so.

The legislature cannot lawfully control you because you are a flesh and blood human being. God alone created you and by Right of Creation, He alone can control you. It is the nature of Law, that what One creates, One controls. This natural Law is the force that binds a creature to its creator. God created us and we are, therefore, subject to His Laws, whether or not we acknowledge Him as our Creator.

The way the STATE gets around God's Law and thereby controls the People is by creating only an office, and not a real human. This office is titled as "person" and then the legislature claims that you are filling that office. Legislators erroneously now think that they can make laws that also control men. They create entire bodies of law - motor vehicle codes, building codes, compulsory education laws, and so on ad nauseum. They still cannot control men or women, but they can now control the office they created. And look who is sitting in that office -- YOU.

Then they create government departments to administer regulations to these offices. Within these administrative departments of STATE government are hundreds of other STATE created offices. There is everything from the office of janitor to the office of governor. But these administrative departments cannot function properly unless they have subjects to regulate.

The legislature obtains these subjects by creating an office that nobody even realizes to be an official STATE office.

They have created the office of "person."

The STATE creates many other offices such as police officer, prosecutor, judge etc. and everyone understands this concept. However, what most people fail to recognize and understand is the most common STATE office of all, the office of "person." Anyone filling one of these STATE offices is subject to regulation by their creator, the STATE legislature. Through the STATE created office of "person," the STATE gains its authority to regulate, control and judge you, the real man or woman. What they have done is apply the natural law principle, "what one creates, one controls."

A look in Webster's dictionary reveals the origin of the word "person." It literally means "the mask an actor wears."

The legislature creates the office of "person" which is a mask. They cannot create real people, only God can do that. But they can create the "office" of "person," which is merely a mask, and then they persuade a flesh and blood human being to put on that mask by offering a fictitious privilege, such as a drivers license. Now the legislature has gained complete control over both the mask and the actor behind the mask.

A resident is another STATE office holder.

All STATE residents hold an office in the STATE government.

But not everyone who is a resident also holds the office of "person."

Some residents hold the office of judge and they are not persons.

Some residents hold the office of prosecutors and they are not persons.

Some residents hold the office of police officer (rs) and they are not persons.

Some residents hold the office of legislators and they are not persons.

Some residents are administrators and bureaucrats and they also are not persons.

Some residents are attorneys and they also are not persons.

An attorney is a STATE officer of the court and is firmly part of the judicial branch. The attorneys will all tell you that they are "licensed" to practice law by the STATE Supreme Court. Therefore, it is unlawful for any attorney to hold any position or office outside of the judicial branch. There can be no attorney legislators - no attorney mayors - no attorneys as police - no attorneys as governor. Yes, I know it happens all the time, however, this practice of multiple office holding by attorneys is prohibited by the individual State and U.S. Constitutions and is a felony in most STATES.

If you read farther into your STATE constitution you will find a clause stating this, the Separation of Powers, which will essentially read as follows:

Branches of government -- The powers of the STATE government shall be divided into legislative, executive and judicial branches. No person belonging to one branch shall exercise any powers appertaining to either of the other branches unless expressly provided herein.

Therefore, a police officer cannot arrest a prosecutor, a prosecutor cannot prosecute a sitting judge, and a judge cannot order the legislature to perform and so on.

Because these "offices" are not persons, the STATE will not, and cannot prosecute them; therefore they enjoy almost complete protection by the STATE in the performance of their daily duties. This is why it is impossible to sue or file

charges against most government employees. If their crimes should rise to the level where they "shock the community" and cause alarm in the people, then they will be terminated from STATE employment and lose their absolute protection. If you carefully pay attention to the news, you will notice that these government employees are always terminated from their office or STATE employment and then are they arrested, now as a common person, and charged for their crimes. Simply put, the STATE will not eat its own.

The reason all STATE residents hold an office is so the STATE can control everything. It wants to create every single office so that all areas of your life are under the complete control of the STATE. Each office has prescribed duties and responsibilities and all these offices are regulated and governed by the STATE. If you read the fine print when you apply for a STATE license or privilege you will see that you must sign a declaration that you are in fact a "resident" of that STATE.

"Person" is a subset of resident. Judge is a subset of resident. Legislator and police officer are subsets of resident. If you hold any office in the STATE, you are a resident and subject to all legislative decrees in the form of statutes.

They will always say that we are free men. But they will never tell you that the legislatively created offices that you are occupying are not free.

They will say, "All men are free," because that is a true statement.

What they do not say is that holding any STATE office binds free men into slavery for the STATE. They are ever ready to trick you into accepting the STATE office of "person," and once you are filling that office, you cease to be free men. You become regulated creatures, called persons, totally created by the legislature. You will hear "free men" mentioned all the time, but you will never hear about "free persons."

If you build your life in an office created by the legislature, it will be built on shifting sands. The office can be changed and manipulated at any time to conform to the whims of the legislature. When you hold the office of "person" created by the legislature, your office isn't fixed. Your duties and responsibilities are ever changing. Each legislative session binds a "person" to ever more burdens and requirements in the form of more rules, laws and statutes.

Most STATE constitutions have a section that declares the fundamental power of the People:
Political power -- All political power is inherent in the People. The enunciation herein of certain Rights shall not be construed to deny or impair others retained by the People.

Notice that this says "people" it does not say persons. This statement declares beyond any doubt that the People are Sovereign over their created government. This is natural law of creation and the natural flow of delegated power.

A Sovereign is a private, non-resident, non-domestic, non-person, non-individual, NOT SUBJECT to any real or imaginary statutory regulations or quasi laws enacted by any STATE legislature which was created by the People.

When you are pulled over by the police, roll down your window and say, "You are speaking to a Sovereign political power holder. I do not **CONSENT** to you detaining me. Why are you detaining me against my will?"

Now the STATE office of policeman knows that "IT" is talking to a flesh and blood Sovereign. The police officer cannot cite a Sovereign because the STATE legislature can only regulate what they create. And the STATE does not create Sovereign political power holders. It is very important to lay the proper foundation right from the beginning. Let the police officer know that you are a Sovereign. Remain in your proper office of Sovereign political power holder. Do not leave it. Do not be persuaded by police pressure or tricks to put on the mask of a STATE "person."

Why aren't Sovereigns subject to the STATE's charges? It is because of the concept of office. The STATE is attempting to prosecute only a particular office known as "person." If you are not in that STATE created office of "person," the STATE statutes simply do not apply to you. This is common sense, for example, if you are not in the STATE of Texas, then Texas

laws do not apply to you. For the STATE to control someone, they have to first create the office. Then they must coerce a warm-blooded creature to come fill that office. They want you to fill that office.

Here is the often expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court, that **"in common usage, the term "person" does not include the Sovereign, statutes employing the word person are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign."** *Wilson v. Omaha Tribe*, 442 U. S. 653, 667 (1979) (quoting *United States v. Cooper Corp.*, 312 U. S. 600, 604 (1941)). See also *United States v. Mine Workers*, 330 U. S. 258, 275 (1947).

The idea that the word "person" ordinarily excludes the Sovereign can also be traced to the **"familiar principle that the King is not bound by any act of Parliament unless he be named therein by special and particular words."** *Dollar Savings Bank v. United States*, 19 Wall. 227, 239 (1874).

As this passage suggests, however, this interpretive principle applies only to "the enacting Sovereign." *United States v. California*, 297 U. S. 175, 186 (1936). See also *Jefferson County Pharmaceutical Assn., Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories*, 460 U. S. 150, 161, n. 21 (1983).

Furthermore, as explained in *United States v. Herron*, 20 Wall. 251, 255 (1874), even the principle as applied to the enacting Sovereign is not without limitations: **"Where an act of Parliament is made for the public good, as for the advancement of religion and justice or to prevent injury and wrong, the king is bound by such act, though not particularly named therein; but where a statute is general, and thereby any prerogative, Right, title, or interest is divested or taken from the king, in such case the king is not bound, unless the statute is made to extend to him by express words."**

U. S. Supreme Court Justice Holmes explained:

"A Sovereign is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal Right as against the authority that makes the law on which the Right depends." *Kawananakoa v. Polyblank*, 205 U. S. 349, 353, 27 S. Ct. 526, 527, 51 L. Ed. 834 (1907).

The majority of American STATES fully embrace the Sovereign immunity theory as well as the federal government. See *Restatement (Second) of Torts* 895B, comment at 400 (1979).

The following U. S. Supreme Court case makes clear all these principals.

I shall have occasion incidentally to evince, how true it is, that STATES and governments were made for man; and at the same time how true it is, that his creatures and servants have first deceived, next vilified, and at last oppressed their master and maker.

... A STATE, useful and valuable as the contrivance is, is the inferior contrivance of man; and from his native dignity derives all its acquired importance. ...

Let a STATE be considered as subordinate to the people: But let everything else be subordinate to the STATE. The latter part of this position is equally necessary with the former. For in the practice, and even at length, in the science of politics there has very frequently been a strong current against the natural order of things, and an inconsiderate or an interested disposition to sacrifice the end to the means. As the STATE has claimed precedence of the people; so, in the same inverted course of things, the government has often claimed precedence of the STATE; and to this perversion in the second degree, many of the volumes of confusion concerning Sovereignty owe their existence. The ministers, dignified very properly by the appellation of the magistrates, have wished, and have succeeded in their wish, to be considered as the Sovereigns of the STATE. This second degree of perversion is confined to the old world, and begins to diminish even there: but the first degree is still too prevalent even in the several STATES, of which our union is composed. By a STATE I mean, a complete body of free persons united together for their common benefit, to enjoy

peaceably what is their own, and to do justice to others. It is an artificial person. It has its affairs and its interests: It has its rules: It has its Rights: and it has its obligations. It may acquire property distinct from that of its members. It may incur debts to be discharged out of the public stock, not out of the private fortunes of individuals. It may be bound by **contracts**; and for damages arising from the breach of those **contracts**. In all our contemplations, however, concerning this feigned and artificial person, we should never forget, that, in truth and nature, those who think and speak and act, are men. Is the foregoing description of a STATE a true description? It will not be questioned, but it is. See Our Enemy The State

It will be sufficient to observe briefly, that the Sovereignities in Europe, and particularly in England, exist on feudal principles. That system considers the prince as the Sovereign, and the people as his subjects; it regards his person as the object of allegiance, and excludes the idea of his being on an equal footing with a subject, either in a court of justice or elsewhere. That system contemplates him as being the fountain of honor and authority; and from his grace and grant derives all franchise, immunities and privileges; it is easy to perceive that such a Sovereign could not be amenable to a court of justice, or subjected to judicial control and actual constraint. It was of necessity, therefore, that suability became incompatible with such Sovereignty. Besides, the prince having all the executive powers, the judgment of the courts would, in fact, be only monitory, not mandatory to him, and a capacity to be advised, is a distinct thing from a capacity to be sued. The same feudal ideas run through all their jurisprudence, and constantly remind us of the distinction between the prince and the subject.

"No such ideas obtain here (speaking of America): at the revolution, the Sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the Sovereigns of the country, but they are Sovereigns without subjects (unless the African slaves among us may be so called) and have none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the Sovereignty." Chisholm v. Georgia (February Term, 1793) 2 U. S. 419, 2 Dall. 419, 1 L. Ed 440.

There are many ways you can give up your Sovereign power and accept the role of "person." One is by receiving STATE benefits. Another is by asking permission in the form of a license or permit from the STATE.

One of the subtlest ways of accepting the role of "person," is to answer the questions of bureaucrats. When a STATE bureaucrat knocks on your door and wants to know why your children aren't registered in school, or a police officer pulls you over and starts asking questions, you immediately fill the office of "person" if you start answering their questions.

It is for this reason that you should ignore or refuse to "answer" their questions and instead act like a true Sovereign, a King or Queen, and ask only your own questions of them.

You are not a "person" subject to their laws.

If they persist and haul you into their court unlawfully, your response to the judge is simple and direct, you the Sovereign, must tell him:

I have no need to answer you in this matter.

It is none of your business whether I understand my Rights or whether I understand your fictitious charges.

It is none of your business whether I want counsel.

The reason it is none of your business is because I am not a person regulated by the STATE. I do not hold any position or office where I am subject to the legislature. The STATE legislature does not dictate what I do.

I am a free Sovereign "Man"(or woman) and I am a political power holder as lawfully decreed in the STATE Constitution at article I (or II) and that constitution is controlling over you.

You must NEVER retain or hire an attorney, a STATE officer of the court, to speak or file written documents for you. Use an attorney (if you must) only for counsel and advice about their "legal" system. If you retain an attorney to represent you (your strawman) and speak in your place, you become "NON COMPOS MENTIS", not mentally competent, and you are then considered a ward of the court. You LOSE all your Rights, and you will not be permitted to do anything herein.

The judge knows that as long as he remains in his office, he is backed by the awesome power of the STATE, its lawyers, police, and prisons. The judge will try to force you to abandon your Sovereign sanctuary by threatening you with jail. No matter what happens, if you remain faithful to your Sovereignty, The judge and the STATE may not lawfully move against you.

The STATE did not create the office of Sovereign political power holder. Therefore, they do not regulate and control those in the office of Sovereign. They cannot ascribe penalties for breach of that particular office. The reason they have no authority over the office of the Sovereign is because they did not create it and the Sovereign people did not delegate to them any such power.

When challenged, simply remind them that they do not regulate any office of the Sovereign and that their statutes only apply to those STATE employees in legislative created offices.

This Sovereign individual paradigm is explained by the following U. S. Supreme Court case: "The individual may stand upon his constitutional Rights as a Citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no such duty [to submit his books and papers for an examination] to the STATE, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. His Rights are such as existed by the law of the land [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the STATE, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his Rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their Rights." Hale v. Henkel, 201 U. S. 43 at 47 (1905).

Let us analyze this case. It says, "The individual may stand upon his constitutional Rights." It does not say, "Sit on his Rights." It DOES NOT say, "understand," which means to stand under. There is a principle here: "If you don't use 'em you lose 'em." You have to assert your Rights, demand them, and then "stand upon" them.

Next it says, "He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way." It says "private business" - you have a Right to operate a private business. Then it says "in his own way." It doesn't say "in the government's way."

Then it says, "His power to contract is unlimited." As a Sovereign individual, your power to contract is unlimited. In common law there are certain criteria that determine the validity of contracts. They are not important here, except that any contract that would harm others or violate their Rights would be invalid. For example, a "contract" to kill someone is not a valid contract. Apart from this obvious qualification, your power to contract is unlimited.

Next it says, "He owes no such duty [to submit his books and papers for an examination] to the STATE, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property." The court case contrasted the duty of the corporation (an entity created by government permission - feudal paradigm) to the duty of the Sovereign individual. The Sovereign individual doesn't need and didn't receive permission from the government, hence has no duty to the government.

Then it says, "His Rights are such as existed by the law of the land [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the STATE." This is very important. The Supreme Court recognized that humans have inherent Rights. The U. S. Constitution (including the Bill of Rights) does not grant us Rights. We have fundamental Rights, irrespective of what the Constitution says. The Constitution acknowledges some of our Rights. And Amendment IX STATES, "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain Rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." The important point is that our Rights antecede (come before, are senior to) the organization of the STATE.

Next the Supreme Court says, "And [his Rights] can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution." Does it say the government can take away your Rights? No. Your Rights can only be taken away "by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution." "Due process of law" involves procedures and safeguards such as trial by jury. "Trial By Jury" means, inter alia, the jury judges both law and fact.

Then the case says, "Among his Rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law." These are some of the Rights of a Sovereign individual. Sovereign individuals need not report anything about themselves or their businesses to anyone.

Finally, the Supreme Court says, "He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their Rights." The Sovereign individual does not have to pay taxes.

If you should discuss Hale v. Henkel with a run-of-the-mill attorney, he or she will tell you that the case is "old" and that it has been "overturned." If you ask that attorney for a citation of the case or cases that overturned Hale v. Henkel, there will not be a meaningful response. We have researched Hale v. Henkel and here is what we have found:

"We know that Hale v. Henkel was decided in 1905 in the U. S. Supreme Court.

Since it was the Supreme Court, the case is binding on all courts of the land, until another Supreme Court case says it isn't. Has another Supreme Court case overturned Hale v. Henkel? The answer is NO. As a matter of fact, since 1905, the Supreme Court has cited Hale v. Henkel a total of 144 times. A fact more astounding is that since 1905, Hale v. Henkel has been cited by all of the federal and STATE appellate court systems a total of over 1600 times. None of the various issues of this case has ever been overruled.

So if the STATE through the office of the judge continues to threaten or does imprison you, they are trying to force you into the STATE created office of "person." As long as you continue to claim your Rightful office of Sovereign, the STATE lacks all jurisdiction over you. The STATE needs someone filling the office of "person" in order to continue prosecuting a case in their courts.

A few weeks in jail puts intense pressure upon most "persons." Jail means the loss of job opportunities, separation from loved ones, and the piling up of debts. Judges will apply this pressure when they attempt to arraign you. When brought in chains before a crowded courtroom the issue of counsel will quickly come up and you can tell the court you are In Propria Persona or simply "PRO PER", as yourself and you need no other.

Do not sign their papers or cooperate with them because most things about your life are private and are not the STATE's business to evaluate. Here is the Sovereign People's command in the constitution that the STATE respect their privacy:

Right of privacy -- Every man or woman has the Right to be let alone and free from governmental intrusion into their private life except as otherwise provided herein. This section shall not be construed to limit the public's Right of access to public records and meetings as provided by law. See U.S. Constitution, Ninth Amendment

If the judge is stupid enough to actually follow through with his threats and send you to jail, you will soon be released without even being arraigned and all charges will be dropped. You will then have documented prima facie grounds for false arrest and false imprisonment charges against him personally.

Now that you know the hidden evil in the word "person", try to stop using it in everyday conversation. Simply use the correct term, MAN or WOMAN. Train yourself, your family and your friends to never use the derogatory word "person" ever again.

This can be your first step in the journey to get yourself free from all STATE control.

Do You Own Yourself?

by Butler Shaffer

One of my favorite quotations comes from Thomas Pynchon: "If they can get you asking the wrong questions, they don't have to worry about answers." Our world is in the mess it is in today because most of us have internalized the fine art of asking the wrong questions.

Contrary to the thinking that would have us believe that the conflict, violence, tyranny, and destructiveness that permeates modern society is the result of "bad" or "hateful" people, disparities in wealth, or lack of education, all of our social problems are the direct consequence of a general failure to respect the inviolability of one another's property interests!

I begin my Property classes with the question: "do you own yourself?" Most of my students eagerly nod their heads in the affirmative, until I warn them that, by the time we finish examining this question at the end of the year, they will find their answer most troubling, whatever it may be today. If you do own yourself, then why do you allow the state to control your life and other property interests? And if you answer that you do not own yourself, then what possible objection can you raise to anything that the state may do to you?" We then proceed to an examination of the case of *Dred Scott v. Sandford*.

The question of whether *Dred Scott* was a self-owning individual, or the property of another, is the same question at the core of the debate on abortion. Is the fetus a self-owning person, or an extension of the property boundaries of the mother? The same property analysis can be used to distinguish "victimizing" from "victimless" crimes: murder, rape, arson, burglary, battery, theft, and the like, are victimizing crimes because someone's property boundaries were violated. In a victimless crime, by contrast, no trespass to a property interest occurs. If one pursues the substance of the "issues" that make up political and legal debates today, one always finds a property question at stake: is person "x" entitled to make decisions over what is his, or will the state restrain his decision-making in some way? Regulating what people can and cannot put into their bodies, or how they are to conduct their business or social activities, or how they are to educate their children, are all centered upon questions of property.

"Property" is not simply some social invention, like Emily Post's guide to etiquette, but a way of describing conditions that are essential to all living things. Every living thing must occupy space and consume energy from outside itself if it is to survive, and it must do so to the exclusion of all other living things on the planet. I didn't dream this up. My thinking was not consulted before the life system developed. The world was operating on the property principle when I arrived and, like the rest of us, I had to work out my answers to that most fundamental, pragmatic of all social questions: who gets to make decisions about what? The essence of "ownership" is to be found in control: who gets to be the ultimate decision maker about people and "things" in the world?

Observe the rest of nature: trees, birds, fish, plants, other mammals, bacteria, all stakes out claims to space and sources of energy in the world, and will defend such claims against intruders, particularly members of their own species. This is not because they are mean-spirited or uncooperative: quite the contrary, many of us have discovered that cooperation is a great way of increasing the availability of the energy we need to live well. We have found out that, if we will respect the property claims of one another and work together, each of us can

enjoy more property in our lives than if we try to function independently of one another. Such a discovery has permitted us to create economic systems.

There is no way that I could have produced, by myself, the computer upon which I am writing this article. Had I devoted my entire life to the undertaking, I would have been unable even to have conceived of its technology. Many other men and women, equally unable to have undertaken the task by themselves, cooperated without even knowing one another in its creation. Lest you think that my writing would have to have been accomplished through the use of a pencil, think again: I would also have been unable to produce a pencil on my own, as Leonard Read once illustrated in a wonderful, brief essay.

Such cooperative undertakings have been possible because of a truth acknowledged by students of marketplace economic systems, particularly the Austrians about human nature: each of us acts only in anticipation of being better off afterwards as a result of our actions. Toward whatever ends we choose to act, and such ends are constantly rearranging their priorities within us, their satisfaction is always expressed in terms inextricably tied to decision making over something one owns (or seeks to own). Whether I wish to acquire some item of wealth, or to give it away; whether I choose to write some great novel or paint some wondrous work of art; or whether I just wish to lie around and look at flowers, each such act is premised on the fact that we cannot act in the world without doing so through property interests. It is in anticipation of being able to more fully express our sense of what is important to us, both materially and spiritually, that we cooperate with one another.

"Property" also provides a means for maximizing both individual liberty and peace in society. For once we identify who the owner of some item of property is; that person's will is inviolate as to such property interest. He or she can do what they choose with respect to what is theirs. If I own a barn, I can set fire to it should I so choose. If I must first get another's permission, such other person is the owner. Individual liberty means that my decision making is immune from the coercion of others, and coercion is always expressed in terms of property trespasses.

At the same time, the property principle limits the scope of my decision making by confining it to that which is mine to control. This is why problems such as industrial "pollution" are usually misconceived, reflecting the truth of Pynchon's earlier quote. A factory owner, who fails to confine the unwanted byproducts of his activities to his own land, is not behaving as a property owner, but as a trespasser. Economists have an apt phrase for this: socializing the costs. He is behaving like any other collectivist, choosing to extend his decision making over the property of others!

But not all of us choose to pursue our self-interests through cooperation with others. Cooperation can exist only when our relationships with others are on a voluntary (**CONSENT**) basis which, in turn, requires a mutual respect for the inviolability of one another's property boundaries. Those who seek to advance their interests in non-cooperative ways, create another system: politics. If you can manage to drag your mind away from the drivel placed there by your high school civics class teacher, and look at political systems in terms of what they in fact do, you will discover this: every such system is founded upon a lack of respect for privately owned property! All political systems are collectivist in nature, for each presumes a rightful authority to violate the will, including confiscation, of property owners. One can no more conceive of "politics" without "theft" than of "war" without "violence."

Every political system is defined in terms of how property is to be controlled in a given society. In communist systems, the state confiscates all the means of production. In less-ambitious socialist systems, the state

confiscates the more important means of production (e.g., railroads, communications, steel mills, etc.). Under fascism, "title" to property remains in private hands, but "control" over such property is exercised by the state. Thus, fascism has given us state regulatory systems, in which property owners, be they farmers, homeowners, or businesses, have the illusion of owning what they believe to be "theirs," while the state increasingly exercises the real ownership authority (i.e., control). In welfare state systems, the state confiscates part of the income of individuals and redistributes it to others.

As stated earlier, property is an existential fact. Whatever the society in which we live, someone will make determinations as to who will live where, what resources can be consumed by whom (and when), and how such property will be controlled. Such decisions can either be made by individual property owners, over what is theirs to control, or by the state presuming the authority to control the lives of each of us. When such decisions are made by the state, it is claiming ownership over our lives.

It is at this point that I let the students in on the secret the political establishment would prefer not to have revealed: the 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution did not end slavery, but only nationalized it! That most Americans acquiesce in such political arrangements, and take great offense should anyone dare to explain their implications, has led me to the conclusion that America may be the last of the collectivist societies to wither away. Most Americans, sad to say, seem unprepared to deny the state's authority to direct their lives and property as political officials see fit. The reason for this, as my first-day question to students is designed to elicit, is that most of us refuse to insist upon self-ownership.

We may, of course, choose to accept our role as state-owned chattels, particularly if we are well-treated by our masters. We may be so conditioned in our obeisance that, like cattle entering the slaughterhouse, we may pause to lick the hand of the butcher out of gratitude for having been well cared for. On the other hand, we may decide to reclaim our self-ownership by taking back the control over our lives that we have long since abandoned.

Perhaps the insanity of our social destructiveness, including the UNITED STATES (under Bush) deranged declaration of a permanent war against the rest of the world, will bring about an examination of alternative ways of living together in conditions of peace and liberty. Our political systems cannot bring about such harmonious and life-sustaining ways because they are premised on a rejection of the principle of self-ownership. In a society of self-owning people, there would be no place for politicians, bureaucrats, and other state functionaries. Like the rest of us, they would have to confine their lives to minding their own business, and deriving whatever benefit they could from those who chose to cooperate with them.

There is only one man or woman who can restore you to a state of self-ownership, however, and that man or woman is you. To do so, you need only assert your claim, not as some empty gesture, but in full understanding of the existential meaning of such a claim, including the willingness to take full control of and responsibility for your life. While your claim will likely evoke cries of contempt from many, you may also find yourself energized by a life force that permeates all of nature; an élan vital that reminds us that life manifests itself only through individuals, and not as collective monstrosities; that life belongs to the living, not to the state or any other abstraction.

February 25, 2002

The strongest and most effective force in guaranteeing the long-term maintenance of power is not violence in all the forms deployed by the dominant to control the dominated, but consent in all the forms in which the dominated acquiesce in their own domination.

Robert Frost

In 1868, the "Fourteenth Amendment" was declared ratified by Secretary of State William Seward and was adjoined to the United States Constitution. This "Amendment," which Black's Law Dictionary acknowledges as having created "for the first time citizenship of the United States," has since been used to enslave millions of Americans to the voluminous statutes of the Abraham Lincoln's de facto "new nation," particularly the Internal Revenue Code. In this treatise, Judge Perez of Louisiana presented irrefutable evidence that the socialist democracy which has usurped our Christian Republic is founded squarely upon a sham.

The Unconstitutionality of the 14th Amendment

**How the Southern States Were Illegally Excluded
From Congress During Reconstruction**

by Judge L.H. Perez

Introduction

The purported Fourteenth Amendment to the *U.S. Constitution* is and should be held to be ineffective, invalid, null, void, and unconstitutional for the following reasons:

1. The Joint Resolution proposing said Amendment was not submitted to or adopted by a Constitutional Congress as required by Article 1, Section 3, and Article V of the *U.S. Constitution*.
2. The Joint Resolution was not submitted to the President for his approval as required by Article 1, Section 5 of the *U.S. Constitution*.
3. The proposed Fourteenth Amendment was rejected by more than one fourth of all the states in the Union, and it was never ratified by three fourths of all the states in the Union as required by Article V, Section 1 of the *U.S. Constitution*.

Eleven States Unlawfully Excluded From Congress

The *U.S. Constitution* provides:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State....

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The fact that twenty-three Senators had been unlawfully excluded from the U.S. Senate in order to secure a two thirds vote for the adoption of the Joint Resolution proposing the Fourteenth Amendment is shown by Resolutions of protest adopted by the following state Legislatures. The New Jersey Legislature by Resolution on March 27, 1868, protested as follows:

The said proposed amendment not having yet received the assent of three fourths of the states, which is necessary to make it valid, the natural and constitutional right of this state to withdraw its assent is undeniable....

That it being necessary by the *Constitution* that every amendment to the same should be proposed by two thirds of both houses of Congress, the authors of said proposition, for the purpose of securing the assent of the requisite majority, determined to, and did, exclude from the said two houses eighty representatives from eleven states of the Union, upon the pretense that there were no such states in the Union; but, finding that two thirds of the remainder of the said houses could not be brought to assent to the said proposition, they deliberately formed and carried out the design of mutilating the integrity of the United States Senate, and without any pretext or justification, other than the possession of the power, without the right, and in the palpable violation of the *Constitution*, ejected a member of their own body, representing this state, and thus practically denied to New Jersey its equal suffrage in the Senate, and thereby nominally secured the vote of two thirds of the said house.

The Alabama Legislature protested against being deprived of representation in the Senate of the U.S. Congress.

The Texas Legislature, by Resolution on October 15, 1866, protested as follows:

The Amendment to the *Constitution* proposed by this joint resolution as Article XIV is presented to the Legislature of Texas for its action thereon, under Article V of that *Constitution*. This Article V, providing the mode of making amendments to that instrument, contemplates the participation by all the States through their representatives in Congress, in proposing amendments. As representatives from nearly one third of the States were excluded from the Congress proposing the amendments, the constitutional requirement was not complied with; it was violated in letter

and in spirit; and the proposing of these amendments to States which were excluded from all participation in their initiation in Congress, is a nullity.

The Arkansas Legislature, by Resolution on December 17, 1866, protested as follows:

The *Constitution* authorized two thirds of both houses of Congress to propose amendments; and, as eleven States were excluded from deliberation and decision upon the one now submitted, the conclusion is inevitable that it is not proposed by legal authority, but in palpable violation of the *Constitution*.

The Georgia Legislature, by Resolution on November 9, 1866, protested as follows:

Since the reorganization of the State government, Georgia has elected Senators and Representatives. So has every other State. They have been arbitrarily refused admission to their seats, not on the ground that the qualifications of the members elected did not conform to the fourth paragraph, second section, first Article of the *Constitution*, but because their right of representation was denied by a portion of the States having equal but not greater rights than themselves. They have in fact been forcibly excluded; and, inasmuch as all legislative power granted by the States to the Congress is defined, and this power of exclusion is not among the powers expressly or by implication defined, the assemblage, at the capital, of representatives from a portion of the States, to the exclusion of the representatives of another portion, cannot be a constitutional Congress, when the representation of each State forms an integral part of the whole.

This amendment is tendered to Georgia for ratification, under that power in the *Constitution* which authorizes two thirds of the Congress to propose amendments. We have endeavored to establish that Georgia had a right, in the first place, as a part of the Congress, to act upon the question, "Shall these amendments be proposed?" Every other excluded State had the same right. The first constitutional privilege has been arbitrarily denied. Had these amendments been submitted to a constitutional Congress, they would never have been proposed to the States. Two thirds of the whole Congress never would have proposed to eleven States voluntarily to reduce their political power in the Union, and at the same time, disfranchise the larger portion of the intellect, integrity, and patriotism of eleven co-equal States.

The Florida Legislature, by Resolution on December 5, 1866, protested as follows:

Let this alteration be made in the organic system and some new and more startling demands may or may not be required by the predominant party previous to allowing the ten States now unlawfully and unconstitutionally deprived of their right of representation is guaranteed by the *Constitution* of this country and there is no act, not even that of rebellion, can deprive them.

The South Carolina Legislature, by Resolution on November 27, 1866, protested as follows:

Eleven of the Southern States, including South Carolina, are deprived of their representation in Congress. Although their Senators and Representatives have been duly elected and have presented themselves for the purpose of taking their seats, their credentials have, in most instances, been laid upon the table without being read, or have been referred to a committee, who have failed to make any report on the subject. In short, Congress has refused to exercise its Constitutional functions, and decide either upon the election, the return, or the qualification of these selected by the States and people to represent us. Some of the Senators and Representatives from the Southern States were prepared to take the test oath, but even these have been persistently ignored, and kept out of the seats to which they were entitled under the *Constitution* and laws.

Hence this amendment has not been proposed by "two thirds of both Houses" of a legally constituted Congress, and is not, Constitutionally or legitimately, before a single Legislature for ratification.

The North Carolina Legislature, by Resolution on December 6, 1866, protested as follows:

The Federal *Constitution* declares in substance, that Congress shall consist of a House of Representatives, composed of members apportioned among the respective States in the ratio of their population and of a Senate, composed of two members from each State. And in the Article which concerns Amendments, it is expressly provided that "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." The contemplated Amendment was not proposed to the States by a Congress thus constituted. At the time of its adoption, the eleven seceding States were deprived of representation both in the Senate and House, although they all, except the State of Texas, had Senators and Representatives duly elected and claiming their privileges under the *Constitution*. In consequence of this, these States had no voice on the important question of proposing the Amendment. Had they been allowed to give their votes, the proposition would doubtless have failed to command the required two thirds majority....

If the votes of these States are necessary to a valid ratification of the Amendment, they were equally necessary on the question of proposing it to the States; for it would be difficult, in the opinion of the Committee, to show by what process in logic, men of intelligence, could arrive at a different conclusion.

⁴ Article I, Section 7 of the *United States Constitution* provides that not only every bill have been passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States Congress, but that:

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.

The Joint Resolution proposing the Fourteenth Amendment was never presented to the President of the United States for his approval, as President Andrew Johnson stated in his message on June 22, 1866. Therefore the Joint Resolution did not take effect.

Amendment Not Ratified by Three Fourths of the States

Pretermitted the ineffectiveness of said Resolution, as demonstrated above, fifteen states out of the then thirty-seven states of the Union rejected the proposed Fourteenth Amendment between the date of its submission to the states by the Secretary of State on June 16, 1866, and March 24, 1868, thereby further nullifying said Resolution and making it impossible for its ratification by the constitutionally required three fourths of such states, as shown by the rejections thereof by the Legislatures of the following states:

Texas rejected the Fourteenth Amendment on October 27, 1866.

Georgia rejected it on November 9, 1866.

Florida rejected it on December 6, 1866.

Alabama rejected it on December 7, 1866.

Arkansas rejected it on December 17, 1866.

North Carolina rejected it on December 17, 1866.

South Carolina rejected it on December 20, 1866.

Kentucky rejected it on January 8, 1867.

Virginia rejected it on January 9, 1867.

Louisiana rejected it on February 6, 1867.

Delaware rejected it on February 7, 1867.

Maryland rejected it on March 23, 1867.

Mississippi rejected it on January 31, 1868.

Ohio rejected it on January 15, 1868.

New Jersey rejected it on March 24, 1868.

There is no question that all of the Southern states which rejected the Fourteenth Amendment had legally constituted governments, were fully recognized by the Federal government, and were functioning as member states of the Union at the time of their rejection. President Andrew Johnson in his veto message of March 2, 1867, pointed out:

It is not denied that the States in question have each of them an actual government with all the powers, executive, judicial, and legislative, which properly belong to a free State. They are organized like the other States of the Union, and, like them, they make, administer, and execute the laws which concern their domestic affairs.

If further proof were needed that these states were operating under legally constituted governments as member states of the Union, the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment on December 8, 1865 undoubtedly supplies this official proof. If the Southern states were not member states of the Union, the Thirteenth Amendment would not have been submitted to their Legislatures for ratification.

The Thirteenth Amendment to the *United States Constitution* was proposed by Joint Resolution of Congress and was approved February 1, 1865 by President Abraham Lincoln, as required by Article I, Section 7 of the *United States Constitution*. The President's signature is affixed to the Resolution. The Thirteenth Amendment was ratified by twenty-seven states of the then thirty-six states of the Union, including the Southern states of Virginia, Louisiana, Arkansas, South Carolina, North Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia. This is shown by the Proclamation of the Secretary of State on December 18, 1865. Without the votes of these seven Southern state Legislatures the Thirteenth Amendment would have failed. There can be no doubt but that the ratification by these seven Southern states of the Thirteenth Amendment again established the fact that their Legislatures and state governments were duly and lawfully constituted and functioning as such under their state constitutions.

Furthermore, on April 2, 1866, President Andrew Johnson issued a proclamation that stated:

The insurrection which heretofore existed in the States of Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Florida is at an end, and is henceforth to be so regarded.

On August 20, 1866, President Johnson issued another proclamation pointing out the fact that the Senate and House of Representatives had adopted identical Resolutions on July 22 and July 25, 1861, that the Civil War forced by disunionists of the Southern states, was not waged for the purpose of conquest or to overthrow the rights and established institutions of those states, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the *Constitution* and to preserve the Union with all the equality and rights of the several states unimpaired, and that as soon as these objects were accomplished, the war ought to cease. The President's proclamation on April 2, 1866 declared that the insurrection in the other Southern states, except Texas, no longer existed. On August 20, 1866, the President proclaimed that the insurrection in the state of Texas had been completely ended. He continued:

And I do further proclaim that the said insurrection is at an end, and that peace, order, tranquility, and civil authority now exist, in and throughout the whole of the United States of America.

The state of Louisiana rejected the Fourteenth Amendment on February 6, 1867, making it the tenth state to have rejected the same, or more than one fourth of the total number of thirty-six states of the Union as of that date. Because this left less than three fourths of the states to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment, it failed of ratification in fact and in law, and it could not have been revived except by a new Joint Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives in accordance with the constitutional requirement.

Congress Passes the Reconstruction Acts

Faced with the positive failure of ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, both Houses of Congress passed over the veto of the President three Acts, known as the Reconstruction Acts, between the dates of March 2 and July 19, 1867. The third of said Acts was designed to illegally remove with "Military force" the lawfully constituted state Legislatures of

the ten Southern states of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. In President Andrew Johnson's veto message on the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, he pointed out these unconstitutionals:

If ever the American citizen should be left to the free exercise of his own judgment, it is when he is engaged in the work of forming the fundamental law under which he is to live. That work is his work, and it cannot be properly taken out of his hands. All this legislation proceeds upon the contrary assumption that the people of these States shall have no constitution, except such as may be arbitrarily dictated by Congress, and formed under the restraint of military rule. A plain statement of facts makes this evident.

In all these States there are existing constitutions, framed in the accustomed way by the people. Congress, however, declares that these constitutions are not "loyal and republican" and requires the people to form them anew. What, then, in the opinion of Congress, is necessary to make the constitution of a State "loyal and republican"? The original act answers this question: "It is universal negro suffrage" -- a question which the federal Constitution leaves exclusively to the States themselves. All this legislative machinery of martial law, military coercion, and political disfranchisement is avowedly for that purpose and none other. The existing constitutions of the ten States, conform to the acknowledged standards of loyalty and republicanism. Indeed, if there are degrees in republican forms of government, their constitutions are more republican now, than when these States -- four of which were members of the original thirteen -- first became members of the Union.

In President Johnson's veto message regarding the Reconstruction Act of July 19, 1867, he pointed out various unconstitutionals as follows:

The veto of the original bill of the 2d of March was based on two distinct grounds -- the interference of Congress in matters strictly appertaining to the reserved powers of the States, and the establishment of military tribunals for the trial of citizens in time of peace....

A singular contradiction is apparent here. Congress declares these local State governments to be illegal governments, and then provides that these illegal governments shall be carried on by federal officers, who are to perform the very duties on its own officers by this illegal State authority. It certainly would be a novel spectacle if Congress should attempt to carry on a legal State government by the agency of its own officers. It is yet more strange that Congress attempts to sustain and carry on an illegal State government by the same federal agency....

It is now too late to say that these ten political communities are not States of this Union. Declarations to the contrary made in these three acts are contradicted again and again by repeated acts of legislation enacted by Congress from the year 1861 to the year 1867.

During that period, while these States were in actual rebellion, and after that rebellion was brought to a close, they have been again and again recognized as States of the Union. Representation has been apportioned to them as States. They have been divided into judicial districts for the holding of district and circuit courts of the United States, as States of the Union only can be distracted. The last act on this subject was passed July 23, 1866, by which every one of these ten States was arranged into districts and circuits.

They have been called upon by Congress to act through their legislatures upon at least two amendments to the Constitution of the United States. As States they have ratified one amendment, which required the vote of twenty-seven States of the thirty-six then composing the Union. When the requisite twenty-seven votes were given in favor of that amendment, it was proclaimed to be a part of the Constitution of the United States, and slavery was declared no longer to exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction. If these seven States were not legal States of the Union, it follows as an inevitable consequence that in some of the States slavery yet exists. It does not exist in these seven States, for they have abolished it also in their State constitutions; but Kentucky not having done so, it would still remain in that State. But, in truth, if this assumption that these States have no legal State governments be true, then the abolition of slavery by these illegal governments binds no one, for Congress now denies to these States the power to

abolish slavery by denying them the power to elect a legal State legislature, or to frame a constitution for any purpose, even for such a purpose as the abolition of slavery.

As to the other constitutional amendment having reference to suffrage, it happens that these States have not accepted it. The consequence is, that it has never been proclaimed or understood, even by Congress, to be a part of the *Constitution of the United States*. The Senate of the United States has repeatedly given its sanction to the appointment of judges, district attorneys, and marshals for every one of these States; yet, if they are not legal States, not one of these judges is authorized to hold a court. So, too, both houses of Congress have passed appropriation bills to pay all these judges, attorneys, and officers of the United States for exercising their functions in these States. Again, in the machinery of the internal revenue laws, all these States are distracted, not as "Territories," but as "States."

So much for continuous legislative recognition. The instances cited, however, fall far short of all that might be enumerated. Executive recognition, as is well known, has been frequent and unwavering. The same may be said as to judicial recognition through the Supreme Court of the United States.

To me these considerations are conclusive of the unconstitutionality of this part of the bill before me, and I earnestly comment their consideration to the deliberate judgment of Congress.

(And now to the Court.) Within a period of less than a year, the legislation of Congress has attempted to strip the executive department of the government of its essential powers. The *Constitution*, and the oath provided in it, devolve upon the President the power and duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed. The *Constitution*, in order to carry out this power, gives him the choice of the agents, and makes them subject to his control and supervision. But in the execution of these laws the constitutional obligation upon the President remains, but the powers to exercise that constitutional duty is effectually taken away. The military commander is, as to the power of appointment, made to take the place of its President, and the General of the Army the place of the Senate; and any attempt on the part of the President to assert his own constitutional power may, under pretense of law, be met by official insubordination. It is to be feared that these military officers, looking to the authority given by these laws rather than to the letter of the *Constitution*, will recognize no authority but the commander of the district and the General of the Army.

If there were no other objection than this to this proposed legislation, it would be sufficient.

Some States Protest Against Reconstruction

No one can contend that the Reconstruction Acts were ever upheld as being valid and constitutional. They were brought into question, but the courts either avoided decision or were prevented by Congress from finally adjudicating upon their constitutionality.

In *Mississippi v. President Andrew Johnson*, where the suit sought to enjoin the President of the United States from enforcing provisions of the Reconstruction Acts, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the President could not be enjoined because for the Judicial Department of the government to attempt to enforce the performance of the duties of the President might be justly characterized, in the language of Chief Justice Marshall, as "an absurd and excessive extravagance." The Court further said that if it granted the injunction against the enforcement of the Reconstruction Acts, and if the President refused obedience, it was needless to observe that the Court was without power to enforce its process.

In a joint action, the states of Georgia and Mississippi brought suit against the President and the Secretary of War. The Court said:

The bill then sets forth that the intent and design of the Acts of Congress, as apparent on their face and by their terms, are to overthrow and annul this existing state government, and to erect another and different government in its place, unauthorized by the *Constitution* and in defiance of its guaranties; and that, in furtherance of this intent and design, the

defendants, the Secretary of War, the General of the Army, and Major General Pope, acting under orders of the President, are about setting in motion a portion of the army to take military possession of the state, and threaten to subvert her government and subject her people to military rule; that the state is holding inadequate means to resist the power and force of the Executive Department of the United States; and she therefore insists that such protection can, and ought to be afforded by a decree or order of this court in the premises.

The applications for injunction by these two states to prohibit the Executive Department from carrying out the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts directed to the overthrow of their government, including this dissolution of their state Legislatures, were denied on the grounds that the organization of the government into three great departments -- the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial -- carried limitations of the powers of each by the *Constitution*. This case went the same way as the previous case of Mississippi against President Johnson and was dismissed without adjudicating upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts.

In another case, *ex parte William H. McCradle*, a petition for the *writ of habeas corpus* for unlawful restraint by military force of a Citizen not in the military service of the United States was before the United States Supreme Court. After the case was argued and taken under advisement, and before conference in regarding the decision to be made, Congress passed an emergency act, vetoed by the President and repassed over his veto, repealing the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court in such case. Accordingly, the Supreme Court dismissed the appeal without passing upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts, under which the non-military Citizen was held without benefit of *writ of habeas corpus*, in violation of Article I, Section 9 of the *U.S. Constitution*. That Act of Congress placed the Reconstruction Acts beyond judicial recourse and avoided tests of constitutionality.

It is recorded that one of the Supreme Court Justices, Grier, protested against the action of the Court as follows:

This case was fully argued in the beginning of this month. It is a case which involves the liberty and rights, not only of the appellant, but of millions of our fellow citizens. The country and the parties had a right to expect that it would receive the immediate and solemn attention of the court. By the postponement of this case we shall subject ourselves, whether justly or unjustly, to the imputation that we have evaded the performance of a duty imposed on us by the *Constitution*, and waited for Legislative interposition to suppress our action, and relieve us from responsibility. I am not willing to be a partaker of the eulogy or opprobrium that may follow. I can only say... I am ashamed that such opprobrium should be cast upon the court and that it cannot be refuted.

The ten states were organized into Military Districts under the unconstitutional *Reconstruction Acts*, their lawfully constituted Legislatures were illegally removed by "military force," and were replaced by rump, so-called Legislatures, seven of which carried out military orders and pretended to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment as follows:

Arkansas on April 6, 1868.

North Carolina on July 2, 1868.

Florida on June 9, 1868.

Louisiana on July 9, 1868.

South Carolina on July 9, 1868.

Alabama on July 13, 1868.

Georgia on July 21, 1868.

Of the above seven states whose Legislatures were removed and replaced by rump, so-called Legislatures, six Legislatures of the states of Louisiana, Arkansas, South Carolina, Alabama, North Carolina, and Georgia had ratified the Thirteenth Amendment as shown by the Secretary of State's Proclamation of December 18, 1865, without which ratifications, the Thirteenth Amendment could not and would not have been ratified because said six states made a total of twenty-seven out of thirty-six states, or exactly three fourths of the number required by Article V of the *Constitution* for ratification.

Furthermore, governments of the states of Louisiana and Arkansas had been re-established under a Proclamation issued by President Abraham Lincoln dated December 8, 1863. The government of North Carolina had been re-established under a Proclamation issued by President Andrew Johnson dated May 29, 1865. The government of Georgia had been re-established under a Proclamation issued by President Johnson dated June 17, 1865. The government of Alabama had been re-established under a Proclamation issued by President Johnson dated June 21, 1865. The government of South Carolina had been re-established under a Proclamation issued by President Johnson dated June 30, 1865.

These three *Reconstruction Acts*, under which the above state Legislatures were illegally removed and unlawful rump, or so-called Legislatures were substituted in a mock effort to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment, were unconstitutional, null and void, *ab initio*, and all acts done thereunder were also null and void, including the purported ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment by said six Southern puppet Legislatures of Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia.

Those *Reconstruction Acts* of Congress and all acts and things unlawfully done thereunder were in violation of Article IV, Section 4 of the *United States Constitution*, which required the United States to guarantee a republican form of government. They violated Article 1, Section 3, and Article V of the *Constitution* which entitled every state in the Union to two Senators because under provisions of these unlawful Acts of Congress, ten states were deprived of having two Senators, or equal suffrage in the Senate.

The Secretary of State expressed doubt as to whether three fourths of the required states had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment, as shown by his Proclamation of July 20, 1868. Promptly on July 21, 1868, a Joint Resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives declaring that three fourths of the several states of the Union had indeed ratified the Fourteenth Amendment. That Resolution, however, included the purported ratifications by the unlawful puppet Legislatures of five states -- Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Alabama -- which had previously rejected the Fourteenth Amendment by action of their lawfully constituted Legislatures, as shown above. This Joint Resolution assumed to perform the function of the Secretary of State in whom Congress, by Act of April 20, 1818, had vested the function of issuing such Proclamation declaring the ratification of Constitutional Amendments.

The Secretary of State bowed to the action of Congress and issued his Proclamation of July 28, 1868, in which he stated that he was acting under authority of the Act of April 20, 1818, but pursuant to said Resolution of July 21, 1868. He listed three fourths or so of the then thirty-seven states as having ratified the Fourteenth Amendment, including the purported ratification by the unlawful puppet Legislatures of the states of Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Alabama. Without said five purported ratifications there would have been only twenty-five states left to ratify out of thirty-seven when a minimum of twenty-eight states was required by three fourths of the states of the Union.

The Joint Resolution of Congress and the resulting Proclamation of the Secretary of State also included purported ratifications by the states of Ohio and New Jersey, although the Proclamation recognized the fact that the Legislatures of said states, several months previously, had withdrawn their ratifications and effectively rejected the Fourteenth Amendment in January, 1868 and April, 1868. Therefore, deducting these two states from the purported ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, only twenty-three state ratifications at most could be claimed- five less than the required number required to ratify the Amendment.

From all of the above documented historic facts, it is inescapable that the Fourteenth Amendment was never validly adopted as an article of the *Constitution*, that it has no legal effect, and it should be declared by the Courts to be unconstitutional, and therefore, null, void, and of no effect.

The Constitution Strikes the Amendment With Nullity

The defenders of the Fourteenth Amendment contend that the U.S. Supreme Court has decided finally upon its validity. In what is considered the leading case, *Coleman v. Miller*, the U.S. Supreme Court did not uphold the validity of the Fourteenth Amendment. In that case, the Court brushed aside constitutional questions as though they did not exist. For instance, the Court made the following statement:

The legislatures of Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina had rejected the amendment in November and December, 1866. New governments were erected in those States (and in others) under the direction of Congress. The new legislatures ratified the amendment, that of North Carolina on July 4, 1868, that of South Carolina on July 9, 1868, and that of Georgia on July 21, 1868.

The Court gave no consideration to the fact that Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina were three of the original states of the Union with valid and existing constitutions on an equal footing with the other original states and those later admitted into the Union. Congress certainly did not have the right to remove those state governments and their Legislatures under unlawful military power set up by the unconstitutional Reconstruction Acts, which had for their purpose the destruction and removal of legal state governments and the nullification of the *Constitution*.

The fact that these three states and seven other Southern states had existing constitutions, were recognized as states of the Union, again and again, had been divided into judicial districts for holding their district and circuit courts of the United States, had been called by Congress to act through their Legislatures upon two Amendments -- the Thirteenth and the Fourteenth -- and by their ratifications had actually made possible the adoption of the Thirteenth, as well as their state governments having been re-established under Presidential Proclamations, as shown by President Johnson's veto message and proclamations, were all brushed aside by the Court in *Coleman v. Miller* by the statement, "New governments were erected in those States (and in others) under the direction of Congress," and that these new legislatures ratified the Amendment.

The U.S. Supreme Court overlooked that it previously had held that at no time were these Southern states out of the Union. In *Coleman v. Miller*, the Court did not adjudicate upon the invalidity of the Acts of Congress which set aside those state constitutions and abolished their state Legislatures. The Court simply referred to the fact that their legally constituted Legislatures had rejected the Fourteenth Amendment and that the "new legislatures" had ratified it. The Court further overlooked the fact that the state of Virginia was also one of the original states with its constitution and Legislature in full operation under its civil government at the time.

In addition, the Court also ignored the fact that the other six Southern states, which were given the same treatment by Congress under the unconstitutional Reconstruction Acts, all had legal constitutions and a republican form of government in each state, as was recognized by Congress by its admission of those states into the Union. The Court certainly must take judicial cognizance of the fact that before a new state is admitted by Congress into the Union, Congress enacts an Enabling Act to enable the inhabitants of the territory to adopt a constitution to set up a republican form of government as a condition precedent to the admission of the state into the Union, and upon approval of such constitution, Congress then passes the Act of Admission of such state. All this was ignored and brushed aside by the Supreme Court in the *Coleman v. Miller* case. However, the Court inadvertently stated:

Whenever official notice is received at the Department of State that any amendment to the *Constitution of the United States* has been adopted, according to the provisions of the Constitution, the Secretary of State shall forthwith cause the amendment to be published, with his certificate, specifying the States by which the same may have been adopted, and that the same has become valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of the *Constitution of the United States*.

In *Hawke v. Smith*, the U.S. Supreme Court unmistakably held:

The fifth article is a grant of authority by the people to Congress. The determination of the method of ratification is the exercise of a national power specifically granted by the *Constitution*; that power is conferred upon Congress, and is limited to two methods, by action of the Legislatures of three fourths of the states. *Dodge v. Woolsey*, 18 How. 331, 15 L.Ed. 401. The framers of the *Constitution* might have adopted a different method. Ratification might have been left to a vote of the people, or to some authority of government other than that selected. The language of the article is plain, and admits of no doubt in its interpretation. It is not the function of courts or legislative bodies, national or state, to alter the method which the *Constitution* has fixed.

We submit that in none of the cases in which the Court avoided the constitutional issues involved, did it pass upon the constitutionality of that Congress which purported to adopt the Joint Resolution for the Fourteenth Amendment, with eighty Representatives and twenty-three Senators forcibly ejected or denied their seats and their votes on said Resolution, in order to pass the same by a two thirds vote, as pointed out in the New Jersey Legislature Resolution of March 27, 1868.

Such a fragmentary Congress also violated the constitutional requirements of Article V that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. There is no such thing as giving life to an Amendment illegally proposed or never legally ratified by three fourths of the states. There is no such thing as Amendment by laches, no such thing as Amendment by waiver, no such thing as Amendment by acquiescence, and no such thing as Amendment by any other means whatsoever except the means specified in Article V of the *Constitution* itself. It does not suffice to say that there have been hundreds of cases decided under the Fourteenth Amendment to offset the constitutional deficiencies in its proposal or ratification as required by Article V. If hundreds of litigants did not question the validity of the Fourteenth Amendment, or question the same perfunctorily without submitting documentary proof of the facts of record which made its purported adoption unconstitutional, their failure cannot change the *Constitution* for the millions in America.

The same thing is true of laches; the same thing is true of acquiescence; the same thing is true of ill-considered court decisions. To ascribe constitutional life to an alleged Amendment which never came into being according to the specified methods laid down in Article V cannot be done without doing violence to Article V itself. This is true, because the only question open to the courts is whether the alleged Fourteenth Amendment became a part of the *Constitution* through a method required by Article V. Anything beyond that which a court is called upon to hold in order to validate an Amendment, would be equivalent to writing into Article V another mode of the Amendment process which has never been authorized by the people of the United States of America.

On this point, therefore, the question is: Was the Fourteenth Amendment proposed and ratified in accordance with Article V? In answering this question, it is of no real moment that decisions have been rendered in which the parties did not contest or submit proper evidence, or the Court assumed that there was a Fourteenth Amendment. If a statute never in fact passed in Congress, through some error of administration and printing got in the published reports of the statutes, and if under such supposed statute courts had levied punishment upon a number of persons charged under it, and if the error in the published volume was discovered and the fact became known that no such statute had ever passed in Congress, it is unthinkable that the courts would continue to administer punishment in similar cases, on a non-existent statute because prior decisions had done so. If that be true as to a statute we need only realize the greater truth when the principle is applied to the solemn question of the contents of the *Constitution*. While the defects in the method of proposing and the subsequent method of computing "ratification" has been brief above, it should be noted that the failure to comply with Article V began with the first action by Congress. The very Congress which proposed the alleged Fourteenth Amendment under the first part of Article V was itself, at that very time, violating the last part as well as the first part of Article V of the *Constitution*.

There is one, and only one, provision of the *Constitution of the United States* which is forever immutable, which can never be changed or expunged. The courts cannot alter it, the executives cannot question it, the Congress cannot change it, and the states themselves, though they act in perfect concert, cannot amend it in any manner whatsoever, whether they act through conventions called for the purpose or through their Legislatures. Not even the unanimous vote of every voter in the United States of America could amend this provision. It is a perpetual fixture in the

Constitution, so perpetual and so fixed that if the people of the United States of America desired to change or exclude it, they would be compelled to abolish the *Constitution* and start afresh.

The unalterable provision is this: "No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." A state, by its own consent, may waive this right of equal suffrage, but that is the only legal method by which a failure to accord this immutable right of equal suffrage in the Senate can be justified. Certainly not by forcible ejection and denial by a majority in Congress, as was done for the adoption of the Joint Resolution for the Fourteenth Amendment. Statements by the Court in the *Coleman v. Miller* case that Congress was left in complete control of the mandatory process, and therefore it was a political affair for Congress to decide if an Amendment had been ratified, does not square with Article V of the *Constitution* which shows no intention to leave Congress in charge of deciding such matters. Even a constitutionally recognized Congress is given but one volition in Article V, and that is to vote whether to propose an Amendment on its own initiative. The remaining steps by Congress are mandatory. Congress shall propose Amendments; if the Legislatures of two thirds of the states make application, Congress shall call a convention. For the Court to give Congress any power beyond that which is found in Article V is to write new material into Article V. It would be inconceivable that the Congress of the United States could propose, compel submission to, and then give life to an invalid Amendment by resolving that its effort had succeeded regardless of compliance with the positive provisions of Article V. It should need no further citation to sustain the proposition that neither the Joint Resolution proposing the Fourteenth Amendment nor its ratification by the required three fourths of the states in the Union were in compliance with the requirements of Article V of the *Constitution*.

When the mandatory provisions of the *Constitution* are violated, the *Constitution* itself strikes with nullity the Act that did violence to its provisions. Thus, the *Constitution* strikes with nullity the purported Fourteenth Amendment.

Conclusion

The courts, bound by oath to support the *Constitution*, should review all of the evidence herein submitted and measure the facts proving violations of the mandatory provisions of Article V of the *Constitution*, and finally render judgment declaring said purported Amendment never to have been adopted as required by the *Constitution*.

The *Constitution* makes it the sworn duty of the judges to uphold the *Constitution* which strikes with nullity the Fourteenth Amendment. As Chief Justice Marshall pointed out for a unanimous Supreme Court in *Marbury v. Madison*:

The framers of the constitution contemplated the instrument as a rule for the government of courts, as well as of the legislature....

Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the constitution of the United States, if that constitution forms no rule for his government?...

If such be the real state of things, that is worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe, or to take this oath, becomes equally a crime....

Thus, the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions.... that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.

The Federal courts actually refuse to hear argument on the invalidity of the Fourteenth Amendment, even when the evidence above is presented squarely by the pleadings. Only an aroused public sentiment in favor of preserving the *Constitution* and our institutions and freedoms under constitutional government, and the future security of our country, will break the political barrier which now prevents judicial consideration of the unconstitutionality of the Fourteenth Amendment.

**IN THE SUPREME COURT FOR THE
STATE OF UTAH**

(Dyett v. Turner, 439 P2d 266 @ 269, 20 U2d 403 [1968])

**THE NON-RATIFICATION OF THE
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT**

(Judge A.H. Ellett)

The method of amending the U.S. Constitution is provided for in Article V of the original document. No other method will accomplish this purpose. That *Article* provides as follows:

'The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress;'

The Civil war had to be fought to determine whether the Union indissoluble and whether any State could secede or withdraw there from. The issue was settled first on the field of battle by force of arms, and second by the pronouncement of the highest court of the land. In the case of State of Texas v. White, / it was claimed that Texas having seceded from the Union and severed her relationship with a majority of the States of the Union, and having by her *Ordinance of Secession* attempted to throw off her allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, had thus disabled herself

from prosecuting a suit in the Federal Courts. In speaking on this point the Court at page 726, 19L.Ed.227 held:

'When, therefore, Texas became one of the United States, she entered into an indissoluble relation. All the obligations of perpetual union, and all the guarantees of republican government in the Union, attached at once to the State. The act which consummated her admission into the Union was something more than a compact; it was the incorporation of a new member into the political body. And it was final. The union between Texas and the other States was as complete, as perpetual, and as indissoluble as the union between the original States. There was no place for reconsideration, or revocation, except through revolution, or through consent of the States.

'Considered therefore as transactions under the Constitution, the ordinance of secession, adopted by the convention and ratified by a majority of the citizens of Texas, and all the acts of her legislature intended to give effect to that ordinance, were absolutely null. They were utterly without operation in law. The obligations of the State, as a member of the Union, and of every citizen of the State, as a citizen of the United States, remained perfect and unimpaired. It certainly follows that the State did not cease to be a State, nor her citizens to be citizens of the Union. If this were otherwise, the State must have become foreign, and her citizens foreigners. The war must have ceased to be a war for the suppression of rebellion, and must have become a war for conquest of subjugation.

'Our conclusion therefore is, that Texas continued to be a State, and a State of the Union, notwithstanding the transactions to which we have referred. And this conclusion, in our judgment, is not in conflict with any act or declaration of any department of the National government, but entirely in accordance with the whole series of such acts and declarations since the first outbreak of the rebellion.'

It is necessary to review the historical background to understand how the Fourteenth Amendment came to be a part of our U.S. Constitution.

General Lee had surrendered his Army on April 9, 1865, and General Johnston surrendered his 17 days later. Within a period of less than six weeks thereafter, not one Confederate soldier was bearing arms. By June 30, 1865, the Confederate States were all restored by *Presidential Proclamation* to their proper positions as States in an indissoluble Union, / and practically all Citizens thereof. /

A few Citizens were excepted from the Amnesty Proclamation, such, for example, as Civil or Diplomatic Officers of the late Confederate government and all of the seceding States; United States Judges, members of Congress and commissioned Officers of the United States Army and Navy who left their posts to aid the rebellion: Officers in the Confederate military forces above the rank of Colonel in the Army and Lieutenant in the Navy; all who resigned commissions in the Army or Navy of the United States to assist the rebellion; and all Officers of the military forces of the Confederacy who had been educated at the military or naval academy of the United States, etc., etc., had been granted amnesty. Immediately thereafter, each of the seceding States functioned as regular States in the Union with both State and Federal Courts in full operation.

President Lincoln had declared the freedom of the slaves as a war measure, but when the war ended, the effect of the Proclamation was ended, and so it was necessary to propose and to ratify the Thirteenth Amendment in order to insure the freedom of the slaves.

The 11 southern States, having taken their rightful and necessary place in the indestructible Union, proceeded to determine whether to ratify or reject the proposed Thirteenth Amendment.

In order for the Thirteenth Amendment to become a part of the Constitution, it was necessary that the proposed Amendment be ratified by 27 of the 36 States. Among those 27 States ratifying the Thirteenth Amendment were 10 from the South, to wit, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas, South Carolina, Alabama, North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Florida, and Texas.

When the 39th Congress assembled on December 5, 1865, the Senators and Representatives from the 25 northern States voted to deny seats in both Houses of Congress to anyone elected from the 11 southern States. The full complement of Senators from the 36 States of the Union was 72, and the full membership in the House was 240. Since it requires only a majority vote / to refuse a seat in Congress, only the 50 Senators and 182 Congressmen from the North were seated. All of the 22 Senators and 58 Representatives from the southern States were denied seats.

Joint Resolution No. 48, proposing the Fourteenth Amendment, was a matter of great concern to the Congress and to the people of the Nation. In order to have this proposed Amendment submitted to the 36 States for ratification, it was necessary that two thirds of each House concur. A count of noses showed that only 33 Senators were favorable to the measure, and 33 was a far cry from two thirds of 72 and lacked one of being two thirds of the 50 seated Senators.

While it requires only a majority of votes to refuse a seat to a Senator, it requires a two thirds majority to unseat a member once he is seated. /

One John P. Stockton was seated on December 5, 1865, as one of the Senators from New Jersey. He was outspoken in his opposition to Joint Resolution No. 48 proposing the Fourteenth Amendment. The leadership in the Senate, not having control of two thirds of the seated Senators, voted to refuse to seat Mr. Stockton upon the ground that he had received only a plurality and not a majority of the votes of the New Jersey legislature. It was the law of New Jersey, and several other States, that a plurality vote was sufficient for election. Besides, the Senator had already been seated. Nevertheless, his seat was *-refused-* and the 33 favorable votes thus became the required two thirds of the 49 members of the Senate.

In the House of Representatives, it would require 122 votes to be two thirds of the 182 members seated. Only 120 voted for the proposed Amendment, but because there were 30 abstentions, it was declared to have been passed by a two thirds vote of the House.

Whether it requires two thirds of the full membership of both Houses to propose an Amendment to the Constitution or only two thirds of those seated or two thirds of those voting is a question which it would seem could only be determined by the United States Supreme Court. However, it is perhaps not so important for the reason that the Amendment is only *-proposed-* by Congress. It must be *-ratified-* by three fourths of the States in the Union before it becomes a part of the Constitution. The method of securing the passage through Congress is set out above, as it throws some light on the means used to obtain ratification by the States thereafter.

Nebraska had been admitted to the Union and so the Secretary of State, in transmitting the proposed Amendment, announced that ratification by 28 States would be needed before the Amendment would become part of the Constitution since there were at the time 37 States in the Union. A rejection by 10 States would thus defeat the proposal.

By March 17, 1867; the proposed Amendment had been ratified by 17 States and rejected by 10 with California voting to take no action thereon which was equivalent to rejection, thus the proposal was defeated.

One of the ratifying States, *Oregon*; had ratified by a membership wherein two legislators were subsequently held not to be duly elected, and after the contest, the duly elected members of the legislature of Oregon rejected the proposed Amendment. However, this rejection came after the Amendment was declared passed.

Despite the fact that the southern States had been functioning peacefully for two years and had been counted to secure ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment, Congress passed the Reconstruction Act [March 2, 1867], which provided for

the military occupation of 10 of the 11 southern States. It excluded Tennessee from military occupation and one must suspect it was because Tennessee had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment on July 7, 1866.

The "Act" further disfranchised practically all white voters and provided that no Senator or Congressman from the occupied States could be seated in Congress until a new Constitution was adopted by each State which would be approved by Congress. The "Act" further provided that each of the 10 States was required to ratify the proposed Fourteenth Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment must become a part of the Constitution of the United States before the military occupancy would cease and the States be allowed to have seats in Congress.

By the time the Reconstruction Act had been declared to be the law; three more States had ratified the proposed Fourteenth Amendment and two States, Louisiana and Delaware, had rejected it. Maryland then withdrew its prior ratification and rejected the proposed Fourteenth Amendment. Ohio followed suit and withdrew its prior ratification, as also did New Jersey and California, (*which earlier had voted not to pass upon the proposal*), now voted to reject the Amendment. Thus 16 of the 37 States had rejected the proposed Amendment.

By spurious, non-representative governments; seven of the southern States, (*which had theretofore rejected the proposed Amendment under the duress of military occupation and of being denied representation in Congress*), did attempt to ratify the proposed Fourteenth Amendment. The Secretary of State, (*of July 20, 1868*), issued his Proclamation wherein he stated that it was his duty under the law to cause Amendments to be published and certified as a part of the Constitution when he received official notice that they had been adopted pursuant to the Constitution. Thereafter his certificate contained the following language:

And whereas neither the Act just quoted from, nor any other law, expressly or by conclusive implication, authorizes the Secretary of State to determine and decide doubtful questions as to the authenticity of the organization of State legislatures, or as to the power of any State legislature to recall a previous act or resolution of ratification of any amendment proposed to the Constitution;

And whereas it appears from official documents on file in this Department that the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed as aforesaid, has been ratified by the legislatures of the States of [naming 23, including New Jersey, Ohio, and Oregon];

And whereas it further appears from documents on file in this Department that the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed as aforesaid, has also been ratified by newly constituted and newly established bodies avowing themselves to be and acting as the legislatures, respectively, of the States of Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Alabama;

And whereas it further appears from official documents on file in this Department that the legislatures of two of the States first above enumerated, to wit, Ohio and New Jersey, have since passed resolutions respectively withdrawing the consent of each of said States to the aforesaid amendment; and whereas it is deemed a matter of doubt and uncertainty whether such resolutions are not irregular, invalid, and therefore ineffectual for withdrawing the consent of the said two States, or of either of them, to the aforesaid amendment;

And whereas the whole number of States in the United States is thirty-seven, to wit: [naming them];

And whereas the twenty-three States first hereinbefore named, whose legislatures have ratified the said proposed amendment, and the six States next there after named, as having ratified the said proposed amendment by newly constituted and established legislative bodies, together constitute three fourths of the whole number of States in the United States;

Now, therefore, be it known that I, WILLIAM H. SEWARD, Secretary of State of the United States, by virtue and in pursuant of the second section of the act of Congress, approved the twentieth of April, eighteen hundred and eighteen, hereinbefore cited, do hereby certify that if the resolutions of the legislatures of Ohio and New Jersey ratifying the aforesaid amendment are to be deemed as remaining of full force and effect, notwithstanding the subsequent resolutions of the legislatures of those States, which purport to withdraw the consent of said States from such ratification, then the aforesaid amendment had been ratified in the manner hereinbefore mentioned, and so has become valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of the Constitution of the United States." * * * /

Congress was not satisfied with the Proclamation as issued and on the next day passed a Concurrent Resolution wherein it was resolved:

`That said Fourteenth Article is hereby declared to be a part of the Constitution of the United States, and it shall be duly promulgated as such by the Secretary of State.'

Resolution set forth in

Proclamation of Secretary of State,

(15Stat.709[1868]).

See also U.S.C.A., Amends. 1 to 5, Constitution, p. 11.

Thereupon; William H. Seward, the Secretary of State (*after setting forth the Concurrent Resolution of both Houses of Congress*) then certified that the Amendment:

`Has become valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States.' /

The Constitution of the United States is silent as to who should decide whether a proposed Amendment has or has not been passed according to formal provisions of Article V of the Constitution. The Supreme Court of the United States is the ultimate authority on the meaning of the Constitution and has never hesitated in a proper case to declare an `Act' of Congress "*unconstitutional*" - except when the `Act' purported to amend the Constitution.

In the case of Leser v. Garnett, / the question was before the Supreme Court as to whether or not the Nineteenth Amendment had been ratified pursuant to the Constitution. In the last paragraph of the decision the Supreme Court said:

`As the legislatures of Tennessee and of West Virginia had power to adopt the resolutions of ratification, official notice to the Secretary, duly authenticated, that they had done so, was conclusive upon him, and, being certified to by his proclamation, is conclusive upon the courts.'

The duty of the Secretary of State was ministerial, to wit, to count and determine when threefourths of the States had ratified the proposed Amendment. He could not determine that a State, once having rejected a proposed Amendment, could thereafter approve it; nor could he determine that a State, once having ratified that proposal, could thereafter reject it. The Supreme Court, and not Congress, should determine whether the Amendment process be final or would not be final, whether the first vote was for ratification or rejection.

In order to have 27 States ratify the Fourteenth Amendment, it was necessary to count those States which had first rejected and then under the duress of military occupation had ratified, and then also to count those States which initially ratified but subsequently rejected the proposal.

To leave such dishonest counting to a fractional part of Congress is dangerous in the extreme. What is to prevent any political party having control of both Houses of Congress from refusing to seat the opposition and then passing a Joint Resolution to the effect that the Constitution is amended and that it is the duty of the Administrator of the General Services Administration [now the Archivist of the United States] to proclaim the adoption? Would the Supreme Court of the United States still say the problem was political and refuse to determine whether constitutional standards had been met? [Yes- Epperly et. al. v. United States /].

How can it be conceived in the minds of anyone that a combination of powerful States can by force of arms deny another State a right to have representation in Congress until it has ratified an Amendment which its people oppose? [And by what authority does any States (or combination thereof) claim to declare a sister State to have an invalid government?] The Fourteenth Amendment was adopted by means almost as bad as that suggested above.

"For a more detailed account of how the Fourteenth Amendment was forced upon the Nation, see Articles in 11 S.C.L.Q. 484 and 28 Tul.L.Rev. 22."

The Reconstruction Acts

Introduction

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution for the United States was questioned before the Courts of the United States in the case of Gordon Epperly et. al. v. United States / wherein each of those Courts ruled within un-published Opinions/Judgments that the questions raised were "political questions" to the Courts (citing Coleman v. Miller/ and United States v. Stahl /).

Prior to 1939, the Supreme Court for the United States had taken cognizance of a number of diverse objections to the validity of specific amendments. Apart from holding that official notice of ratification by the several States was conclusive upon the courts, / it had treated these questions as justiciable, although it had uniformly rejected them on the merits. In that year, however, the whole subject was thrown into confusion by the inconclusive decision of Coleman v. Miller. / This case came up on a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Kansas to review the denial of a writ of mandamus to compel the Secretary of the Kansas Senate to erase an endorsement on a Resolution ratifying the proposed child labor Amendment to the Constitution of the effect that it had been adopted by the Kansas Senate.

Four opinions were written in the U.S. Supreme Court, no one of which commanded the support of more than four members of the Court. The majority ruled that the Plaintiffs, members of the Kansas State Senate, had a sufficient interest in the controversy to give the federal courts jurisdiction to review the case. Without agreement with regard to the grounds for their decision, a different majority affirmed the judgment of the Kansas court denying the relief sought. Four members who concurred in the result had voted to dismiss the writ on the ground that the amending process "is 'political' in its entirety, from submission until an amendment becomes part of the Constitution, and is not subject to judicial guidance, control or interference at any point." / In an opinion reported as "the opinion of the Court," but in which it appears that only two Justices joined Chief Justice Hughes who wrote it, it was declared that the writ of mandamus was properly denied, because the question whether a reasonable time had elapsed since submission of the proposal was a nonjusticiable political question, the kinds of considerations entering into deciding being fit for Congress to evaluate, and the question of the effect of a previous rejection upon a ratification was similarly nonjusticiable, because the 1868 Fourteenth Amendment precedent of congressional determination "has been accepted." / But with respect to the contention that the lieutenant governor should not have been permitted to cast the deciding vote in favor of ratification, the Court found itself evenly divided, thus accepting the judgment of the Kansas Supreme Court that the state officer had acted validly. / However, the unexplained decision by Chief Justice Hughes and his two concurring Justices that the issue of the lieutenant governor's vote was justiciable indicates at the least that their position was in disagreement with the view of the other four Justices in the majority that all questions surrounding Constitutional Amendments are nonjusticiable. /

However, Coleman does stand as authority for the proposition that at least some decisions with respect to the proposal and ratification of Constitutional Amendments are exclusively within the purview of Congress or the States, either because they are textually committed or because the Courts lack adequate criteria of determination to pass on them. / But to what extent the political question doctrine encompasses the amendment process and what the standards may be to resolve that particular issue remain elusive of answers.

We can conclude from the cases of Epperly et. al. v. United States (supra.) that the United States Supreme Court has made a determination that any constitutional questions regarding the amending of the U.S. Constitution are "political questions" for the Congress or the States to address.

Historical Background

The historical facts relating to the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment have been addressed by the Supreme Court for the State of Utah in the case of Dyett v. Turner; (supra.) / State v. Phillips; / and the legal brief of Judge Lander H. Perez of Louisiana as published in the Congressional Record. /

It should be noted that the U.S. Supreme Court declared within the case of State of Texas v. White, / that a State cannot secede from the Union after being admitted into the Union. The Supreme Court further ruled that the southern States were States of the Union before the Civil War, the southern States were States of the Union during the Civil War and the southern States were States of the Union after the Civil War.

Your attention is also called that at the time the Civil War was declared to be at an end, the southern States were operating under proper civil governments when the present day Thirteenth Amendment was submitted to those States for ratification.

The Problem

For the purpose of discussion, we will concentrate on the HouseJointResolution that proposed the Fourteenth Amendment, the ReconstructionActs of 1867 and the Proclamations of Ratification by Secretary of State, WilliamH.Seward.

Note:

In regard to the FourteenthAmendment; the Record of the "CongressionalGlobe" refers to the "JointResolution" proposing the Amendment as being H.J.R.127. The copy of the "JointResolution" that was submitted to the States for Ratification was referred to as H.J.R.48. Hereinafter, we will refer to the "JointResolution" as H.J.R.48.

First:

Premitting the ineffectiveness of "H.J.R. 48;" seventeen (17) States (*four(4)votes are questionable*) out of the then thirty-seven (37) States of the Union rejected the proposed FourteenthAmendment between the date of its submission to the States by the Secretary of State on June 16, 1866 and March24,1868 thereby further nullifying said Resolution and making it impossible for its ratification by the constitutionally required three-fourths of such States as shown by the rejections thereof by the legislatures of the followingStates:

- Texas rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on October 27, 1866 (HouseJournal1866, pgs. 577-584 - Senate Journal 1866, p.471.).
- Georgia rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on November9,1866 (HouseJournal1866, pgs. 61-69 - SenateJournal 1866, pgs.65-72.).
- Florida rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on December6, 1866 (HouseJournal1866, pgs. 75-80, 138, 144, 149-150 - SenateJournal1866, pgs.101-103, 111, 114, 133.).
- Alabama rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on December 7, 1866 (HouseJournal1866. pgs. 208-213 - Senate Journal 1866, pgs. 182-183.).
- North Carolina rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on December14,1866 (HouseJournal 1866 - 1867. pgs. 182-185- SenateJournal 1866-67, pgs.91-139).
- Arkansas rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on December 17, 1866 (HouseJournal 1866, pp. 288-291 - Senate Journal 1866, p. 262.).
- South Carolina rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on December20,1866 (HouseJournal 1866, p. 284 - Senate Journal 1866, p. 230.).
- Kentucky rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on January 8, 1867 (HouseJournal1867, pgs. 60-65 - Senate Journal 1867, pgs. 62-65.).
- Virginia rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on January 9, 1867 (HouseJournal1866-67, p. 108 - Senate Journal 1866-67, pgs. 101-103.).
- Louisiana rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on February 9, 1867 (JointResolution as recorded on page 9 of the Acts of the GeneralAssembly, Second Session, January 28, 1867) (McPherson, "Reconstruction," p. 194; "Annual Encyclopedia," p. 452.).
- Delaware rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on February 7, 1867 (HouseJournal1867, pgs. 223-226 - Senate Journal 1867, pgs.169, 175-176,208.).

- Maryland rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on March 23, 1867 (HouseJournal1867, pgs. 1139-1141 - Senate Journal 1867, p. 808.).
- Mississippi rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** on January 31, 1867 (Laws of Mississippi, 1866-1877, p. 734; House Journal 1867, pgs.201-202- SenateJournal 1866, p 195-196) (McPherson, "*Reconstruction*," p. 194.).
- Ohio rescinded its **Fourteenth Amendment** ratification vote on January 15, 1868 (House Journal 1868, pgs. 44-51 - Senate Journal 1868, pgs.33-39.).
- New Jersey rescinded its **Fourteenth Amendment** ratification vote on March 24, 1868 (Minutes of the Assembly 1868, p. 743 - SenateJournal1868, p.356.).
- California on March 3rd, 1868, the Assembly, with the Senate concurring, rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** (Journal of the Assembly 1867-68, p.601).
- Oregon rejected the **Fourteenth Amendment** by the Senate on October 6, 1868 and by the House on October 15, 1868 proclaiming the legislature that ratified the Amendment to have been a "*de facto*" legislature (U.S. House of Representatives, 40th Congress, 3rd session, Mis. Doc. No 12).

There is no question that all of the southern States [*which rejected the Fourteenth Amendment*] had legal constituted governments; were fully recognized by the federal government and were functioning as member States of the Union at the time of their rejection.

Where a proposed Amendment to the Federal Constitution has been rejected by more than one-fourth of the States, and rejections have been duly certified, a State which has rejected the proposed Amendment may not change its position, even if it might change its position while the Amendment is still before the people. /

Second:

Several "*Reconstruction Acts*" were passed by Congress after the Civil War was proclaimed by the President of the United States to be at an end. / The "*Reconstruction Acts*" that will be addressed are those that were enacted on March 2, 1867, / June 25, 1868, / July 19, 1867, / March 30, 1870. / It is obvious that these "*Reconstruction Acts*" were enacted into law over the *veto* of the President for the purpose of coercing the southern States into rescinding their vote of rejection of the Fourteenth Amendment:

- **Reconstruction Act** of March 2, 1867: /

"... and when said State, by a vote of its legislature elected under said constitution (state) , **shall have adopted the amendment to the Constitution of the United States**, proposed by the Thirty-ninth Congress, and **known as article fourteen, and when said article shall have become a part of the Constitution of the United States, said State shall be declared entitled to representation in Congress,...**"

- The **Act** of June 25, 1868 / to admit the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, to representation in Congress at **Section I**:

"That each of the States of (*naming them*) shall be entitled and admitted to representation in Congress as a State of the Union **when the legislature of such State shall have duly ratified the amendment to the Constitution of the United States** proposed by the Thirty-ninth Congress, and **known as the article fourteen, . . .**"

- The **Act** of March 30, 1870 / admitting the State of Texas to Representation in the Congress of the United States [**Preamble**]:

"Whereas the people of Texas has framed and adopted a constitution of State government which is republican; and whereas the legislature of Texas elected under said constitution **has ratified the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States; and whereas the performance of these several acts in good faith is a condition precedent to the representation of the State in Congress: . . .**"

From these three Acts of Congress, the questions must be asked: "*By what authority did the Congress rely upon to **compel** a State to reverse its negative ratification vote?*" And: "*By what authority did the Congress rely upon to **compel** a State to ratify an Amendment to the Constitution for the United States?*"

Third:

The **Thirty-ninth Congress** declared at Section 1 of the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867 / that:

". . . That said rebel States shall be divided into military districts and made subject to the military authority of the United States. . ."

and at Section 6 of the same Act:

". . . any civil governments which may exist therein shall be deemed provisional only, and in all respects subject to the paramount authority of the United States . . ."

and at Section 10 of the Reconstruction Act of July 19, 1867: /

"That the commander of any district named in said act (March 2, 1867) shall have power . . . to suspend or remove from office, or from the performance of official duties and the exercise of official powers, any officer or person holding or exercising, or professing to hold or exercise, any civil or military office or duty in such district under any power, election, appointment or authority derived from, or granted by, or claimed under, any so-called State or the government thereof, or any municipal or other division thereof. . ."

and at Section 10 of that Act:

"That no district commander . . . or any of the officers or appointees acting under them, shall be bound in his action by any opinion of any civil officer of the United States."

The above Sections of the Reconstruction Acts of March 2, 1867 and July 19, 1867 makes it very clear that the southern States were under military law and were without republican form of governments. The question must be asked: "*By what authority did the **Thirty-ninth Congress** rely upon to impose military law upon those southern States after those States were declared by "**Presidential Proclamation**" of April 2, 1868 and "**Presidential Proclamation**" of August 20, 1866 that the insurrection was at an end, and that peace, order, tranquillity and civil authority existed in and throughout the whole of the United States of America?*" Keep in mind that the military was originally sent into those States by "**Presidential Proclamation**" to suppress rebellion within those States, **not by any Act of Congress.**

Fourth:

As Section 1 of the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, / declares that the southern States had no legal governments:

"Whereas no legal State governments or adequate protection for life or property **now exists in the rebel States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Florida, Texas, and Arkansas; . . ."**

the question must be asked: "*When did the southern States have legal governments?*" The Congress answered the question within: - "An Act to provide for the more efficient Government of the Rebel States" / and within the: - "Act to admit the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Louisiana, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, to Representation in Congress" / and within the: - "Act to admit the State of Texas to Representation in the

*Congress of the United States"/ wherein the Congress declared that the southernStates were not to be recognized as "States" with lawful civilgovernments until said States ratified the Fourteenth Amendment. By the mouth of Congress; the purported votes cast for the ratification of the FourteenthAmendment under the Reconstruction Acts were cast by unlawful governments of those southernStates [*militarydistricts*].*

Fifth:

If the southern States had no legal governments, as declared by Congress; additional questions must be asked:

- *Why did the Congress submit the Resolution proposing the ThirteenthAmendment to the United States Constitution to the southernStates for ratification?*
- *Why did the Congress accept the southern States "ratification votes" on the Thirteenth Amendment?*
- *Why did the Congress submit the Resolution proposing the FourteenthAmendment to the southernStates for ratification?*
- *As both Houses of Congress passed Resolutions/ declaring that the Civil War was not waged in the spirit of oppression nor for purpose of overthrowing or **INTERFERING WITH THE RIGHTS OF ESTABLISHED INSTITUTIONS OF THOSE STATES**, why did Congress wait until those southern States cast a "negative" ratification vote on the Fourteenth Amendment before declaring the civilgovernments of those States as being unlawful?*
- *Did the southern States have lawful governments before the enactment of the "Reconstruction Acts?"*
- *When a freely associated compact State of the united States ofAmerica is declared to have an unlawful civil government by Congress and is placed under "Military Law" - *isthat State a "State" as that term is used in U.S. Const., V:1:1*?*
- *When a freely associated compact State of the united States ofAmerica is placed under "Military Law" by the Congress - *do those States have a Republican form of government as they are to be guaranteed under U.S.Const., IV:4:1*?*
- *Does Congress have the authority to substitute the Republicanform of government of a freely associated compact State of the united States ofAmerica with another form of government for the purpose of compelling ratification of an Amendment to theConstitution for the United States?*
- *If Congress has the "textually demonstrable commitment" and thus has the exclusive and plenary powers to declare the southern States to have unlawful civil governments - why did Congress find the need to submit the "Reconstruction Acts" to the President of the UnitedStates for his signature, a procedure that is governed by U.S.Const.,I:7:2?*

Sixth:

With the United States Supreme Court's *Dred Scott v. Sanford*,/ ruling that a Negro had no rights under the Constitution for the United States to either obtain rights of citizenship or rights of suffrage; the "Reconstruction Acts" of 1867 fails on the following grounds:

- *The "Reconstruction Acts" granted the Negroes of the southernStates the rights of holding public office of Legislator and thus the U.S. Congress granted the Negro population the status of "citizen" **BEFORE** the Fourteenth Amendment was proclaimed to be an Amendment to the United States Constitution./*
- *The "Reconstruction Acts" granted the Negroes of the southernStates the rights of "suffrage" **BEFORE** the FifteenthAmendment was proclaimed to be an Amendment to the United States Constitution. /*

- [*The **Fifteenth Amendment** is a formal declaration by the Congress of the United States that the suffrage provisions within the **Reconstruction Acts** of 1867 are unconstitutional*].

Seventh:

The "Reconstruction Acts" also fails on the following grounds:

- The Congress of the United States granted authority to "*Military Districts*" of the United States to ratify Amendments to the United States Constitution in violation of **U.S. Const., Article V**./
- Denied the southern States representation in Congress in violation of **Paragraph Two** of **Article V** of the **Articles of Confederation**./
- Denied the people of the southern States the privilege of holding an "*Office of Trust*" if they were excluded under the provisions of the **Fourteenth Amendment** BEFORE the **Fourteenth Amendment** was proclaimed to be an Amendment to the United States Constitution./
- Denied the people of the southern States the rights of "*suffrage*" unless they were qualified under the *Third Article* of the **Fourteenth Amendment** BEFORE the **Fourteenth Amendment** was proclaimed to be an Amendment to the United States Constitution./
- The "**Reconstruction Acts**" fails as Congress had no Constitutional authority to create governments within a freely associated compact State of the United States of America that consisted of "*Aliens*."/

Eighth:

William H. Seward, as Secretary of State, expressed doubt as to whether three-fourths of the required States had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment (as shown by his *Proclamation of July 20, 1868*.) Promptly; on July 21, 1868, a Concurrent Resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives declaring that three-fourths of the several States of the Union had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment. That Concurrent Resolution; however, was not submitted to the President of the United States for his approval as required by U.S. Const., I:7:3 and it included purported ratifications by the unlawful puppet legislatures of five (5) States (Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Alabama) which had previously rejected the Fourteenth Amendment./

This Concurrent Resolution assumed to perform the function of the Secretary of State in whom Congress (by *Act of April 20, 1818*) had vested the function of issuing such Proclamation declaring the ratification of Constitutional Amendments.

The Secretary of State bowed to the action of Congress and issued his Proclamation on July 28, 1868/ in which he stated that he was acting under the mandate of the Congressional Act of July 21, 1868:

"Now, therefore, be it known that I, William H. Seward, Secretary of State of the United States, in execution of the aforesaid act, (*April 20, 1818*) and of the afore-said concurrent resolution of the 21st of July, 1868, and in conformance thereto, do hereby direct the said proposed amendment (Fourteenth Amendment) to the Constitution of the United States to be published in the newspapers authorized to promulgate the laws of the United States, and I do hereby certify that the said proposed amendment **has been adopted in the manner hereinbefore mentioned** by the States *specified in the said concurrent resolution*, namely [*naming them*]; the States thus specified being more than three fourths of the States of the United States. . . ."

- In regard to the Concurrent Resolution of July 21, 1868 - *By what authority did the Congress rely upon to make a determination as to what States ratified the Fourteenth Amendment?*
- As the power to ratify Amendments to the Constitution for the United States is with the several States of the Union, *by what authority did the Secretary of State, William H. Seward, rely upon to declare that the Concurrent Resolution of July 21, 1868 was an "Official Notice" of ratification?*

- In regard to the **Concurrent Resolution** of July 21, 1868 - *By what authority did the Congress rely upon to perform the function of the Secretary of State in whom Congress (by Act of April 20, 1818) had vested the function of issuing **Proclamations** declaring the ratification of Constitutional Amendments?*
- In regard to the **Concurrent Resolution** of July 21, 1868 - *By what authority did the Congress rely upon to declare that the Secretary of State shall issue forth the **Proclamation of Ratification** of July 28, 1868/ **when the Concurrent Resolution of July 21, 1868 was never submitted to the President of the United States for his approbation as required by the U.S. Constitution?***
- Within the **Proclamation of Ratification** of July 20, 1868 / - U.S. Secretary of State, William H. Seward, expressed reservations as to the legitimacy of the governments of those southern States that were under the military government of the United States and what were his responsibilities in making legal determinations regarding the ratification votes of those States. The question must be asked: *"Who has the authority to make legal determinations regarding the ratification of Amendments to the Constitution for the United States?"*

The questions presented needs to be answered and without answers, the declared ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment must be found "*ultra vires*" and void "*ab initio*."

The federal Courts of *Coleman v. United States*, *United States v. Stahl* / and *Epperly et. al. v. United States* / **have declared that all issues pertaining to amending of the U.S. Constitution are "*political questions*" for Congress or the States to address.** As the Congress of the United States of America on several occasions over the past 100 years -*refused*- to address the questions presented, the Congress has taken the position that under Article V / of the Constitution for the United States of America and Article X / of the Bill of Rights, the legislatures of the States have the "*textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issues.*" It is the **PEOPLE IN A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OR THE LEGISLATURES OF THE SEVERAL STATES THAT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE IF AN AMENDMENT HAS BEEN ADOPTED IN ACCORDANCE TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION.**

United States Constitution

And The

Fourteenth Amendment

[FICTION OR FACT]

The validity, or should we say invalidity, of the Civil War Amendments is very important to reinstating the inalienable rights of free white Citizens in the United States of America. At every juncture where the government of the United States of America and/or the governments of the several States attempt to usurp inalienable rights, the Civil War Amendments are ultimately claimed to be the authority for such deprivations of rights.

To determine whether the Fourteenth Amendment is fiction or fact, we will proceed to dissect each Section of the Fourteenth Amendment, sentence by sentence. Please remember that the following Authorities reflects the understanding of the Founding Fathers at the time the Constitution for the United States was adopted, and although they may not be "*politically*" correct today, the Authorities represents the law at the time the Fourteenth Amendment was (*purportedly*) adopted.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT - SECTION ONE

We begin with Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment which reads:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, United States Constitution

The first sentence of Section One provides:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, ..."

Fourteenth Amendment, Section One

Notice there is no relation to race and there is no definition of person, other than the "p" in person is not capitalized, indicating the word would not mean a "*Natural Person*," but a "*juristic person*" or "*artificial person*." As the courts have said, the "*due process*" and "*equal protection*" Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment apply to Corporations which are juristic(*artificial*) persons.

Compare this with Article II, Section 1, Clause 4 of the Constitution for the United States of America:

"No Person except a natural born Citizen, ..."

Notice the "N" in "no", the "P" in "Person" and the "C" in "Citizen." All of the capitalization is on the object to be distinguished as to who is a Natural Person. This is further clarified in Amy v. Smith: /

"Free negroes and mulattoes are, almost everywhere, considered and treated as a degraded race of people; insomuch so, that, under the constitution and laws of the United States, they can not become citizens of the United States."

Amy v. Smith, 1 Litt. Ky. R. 334.

In light of this, no person would be considered as a United States Citizen or a citizen of the United States; as the Constitution was framed to incorporate the common law, in opposition to international law.

- common law - one race governs;
- international law - all races govern.

The capitalization of the words "*Person*" and "*Citizen*" could mean only one thing, the denoting of only those of one race in compliance with the common law.

"The American colonies brought with them the common, and not the civil law; and each state at the revolution, adopted either more or less of it, and not one of them exploded the principle, that place of birth conferred citizenship."

Amy v. Smith, 1 Litt. Ky. R. 337-38.

Under the common-law (*and under American Constitutions*), "*Citizenship*" was dependent upon right of inheritance which can only be passed by lineage (*race*). This is in accord with the Preamble (Constitution for the United States of America), which states that the Constitution was adopted for the protection of "*We The People*" and "*their posterity*," - posterity - being a racial term.

The "p" in "*persons*" of the Fourteenth Amendment is not referring to those referred to in Article IV, Section 2, Constitution for the United States of America.

"... and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, ..."

Notice the word: "*subject*." Those that were not of the white race (*when the Fourteenth Amendment was proposed*) were natural born "*subjects*."

"Blacks, whether born or in bondage, if born under the jurisdiction and allegiance of the United States, are natives, and not aliens. They are what the common law terms natural-born subjects ... The better opinion, I should think, was, that Negroes or other slaves, born within and under the allegiance of the United States, are natural-born subjects, but not citizens. Citizens, under our constitution and laws, mean free inhabitants, born within the United States, or naturalized under the law of Congress ..."

Commentaries of American Law, James Kent,
7th Ed., Vol. II, at 275-78.

Thus, we find the meaning and application of the terms: "*subject to the jurisdiction*."

A United States "*Citizen*" (*that is a common-law Citizen in one of the several States at the adoption of the Constitution for the United States of America*) was considered "*within*" the jurisdiction of the United States. "*Citizens*" were never subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Instead, the United States was subject to the jurisdiction of the Citizen, that is, under the common law. [See the tenth Article in Amendment, Constitution for the United States of America].

According to the common law principle (*upon which our Constitution was founded*), only the race (*family*) of people forming the sovereignty to adopt the Constitution (*We the People*) are considered "*Citizens*." All others born inside the Country and owing allegiance to "*We the People*" are natural born "*Subjects*." Under principles of International Law, that is, inter-racial law (*See definition in Webster's Dictionary, [1828]*), these "*Subjects*" (*who, by special privilege, are licensed to become something or do something normally illegal under the common-law*), are said to be "*citizens*" and "*persons*."

"But in considering the question before us, it must be borne in mind that there is no law of nations standing between the people of the United States and their Government, and interfering with their relation to each other. The powers of the government, and the rights of the citizens under it, are positive and practical regulations plainly written down. The people of the United States have delegated to it certain enumerated powers, and forbidden it to exercise others."

Dred Scott v. Sandford, (1856-1857)
19 How. (60 U.S.) 393,
452, 15 L.Ed. 691.

It is clear that the Fourteenth Amendment could not be referring to the "*Citizens*" that are known of the white race, but must be referring to those artificial "*citizens*" of the non-white races

"... are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside ..."

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1.

This sentence is interesting, as it not only declares that these "*persons*" (small "*p*") are "*citizens*" (small "*c*") of the United States, but also of the State they choose to reside in:

"No white person born within the limits of the United States, ... or born without those limits, and subsequently naturalized under their laws, owes the status of citizenship to the recent Amendments to the Federal Constitution."
Van Valkenburg v. Brown, (1872) 43 Cal 43, 47.

"Prior to the adoption of this amendment, strictly speaking, there were no citizens of the United States, but only some one of them. Congress had the power '*to establish an uniform rule of naturalization*,' but not the power to make a naturalized alien a citizen of any state. But the states generally provided that such persons might, on sufficient residence therein, become citizens thereof, and then the courts held, *ab convenienti*, rather than otherwise, that they became ipso facto citizens of the United States."

Sharon v. Hill, (1885) 26 F 337, 343.

Notice the words: "*some one of them.*" This refers to citizenship of "*some one*" of the States. The national government had no power to make citizens of its own and force them upon the States. The States could make anyone they chose to be a citizen of their State, but only those of the whiterace could be recognized as national citizens under the Preamble to the Constitution for the United States of America and be treated as "*Citizens*" in any State they entered.

Thus, only white State citizens held the privileges and immunities known to Article IV, Section 2, among the several States, and no State could confer that Constitutional protection on any other race. In consequence thereof, the "*also*" could not authorize a "non-white" to be an "*Officer*" of the United States government. These elements were what was referred to as "*national citizenship*" (prior to the Fourteenth Amendment) to avoid one State (or the States collectively at the national level) from interfering in another State's sovereignty, or the sovereignty "*We the People*".

The Fourteenth Amendment attempts to reverse this natural common-law order of things by making State citizenship dependent upon national citizenship.

"... By the original constitution, citizenship in the United States was a consequence of citizenship in a state. By this clause [Am 14, Sec 1] this order of things is reversed. Citizenship in the United States is defined; it is made independent of citizenship in a state, and citizenship in a state is a result of citizenship in the United States. So that a person born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to its jurisdiction, is, without reference to state constitutions or laws, entitled to all privileges and immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States to citizen thereof."

U.S. v. Hall, (1871) 26 Fed. Case 79, 81.

"Prior to the adoption of this amendment, strictly speaking, there were no citizens of the United States, but only some one of them. Congress had the power "*to establish an uniform rule of naturalization,*" but not the power to make a naturalized alien a citizen of any state. But the states generally provided that such persons might, on sufficient residence therein, become citizens thereof, and then the courts held, *ab convenienti*, rather than otherwise, that they became ipso facto citizens of the United States."

Sharon v. Hill, (1885) 26 F 337, 343.

Notice the words "*ab convenienti*," which means after the event. This means after the Constitutional Convention. And the words "*ipso facto*," which interprets as after the sovereignty was established, (*composed only of members of the white race [family]*).

The choice of words here is interesting, as they did not use the words: "*nunc protunc*," which means to do what should have been done in the beginning. In other words, they are not saying they made a mistake by not including other races when the Constitution was framed. They are only claiming to have changed the order of things, regardless of the correctness of the original circumstance.

This Section of the Fourteenth Amendment totally dissolves the State's (*people of the State*) right to declare its own sovereign body. It is in violation of "*State Sovereignty*" and completely violates Article IV, Sections 2 and 4, and the Ninth and Tenth Articles in Amendment.

"The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.

"A person charged in any State with Treason, Felony, or other Crime, who shall flee from Justice, and be found in another State, shall, on demand of the executive Authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having Jurisdiction of the Crime.

"No Person held to Service or Labour in one State, under the Law thereof, escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labour, but shall be delivered up on Claim of the Party to whom such Service or Labour may be due."

Constitution for the United States of America, Article IV, Section 2.

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Ninth Article in Amendment to the

Constitution for the United States of America.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Tenth Article in Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America.

To understand that not only Article IV, but all other Articles (I through VII) were written only for the government of and for the white race (*thereby barring those not of the white race from coming under their protection*), you are referred to the case of Crandall v. Connecticut: /

"The first Congress after the constitution was adopted, was composed of many of those distinguished patriots, who framed the constitution, and from that circumstance would be supposed to know what its spirit was. Some of the earliest work they performed for the country, was to establish by law a uniform rule of naturalization. The first law was by Congress in 1790, and in its precise and technical language is used: '*Any alien, being a free white person, may become a citizen, by complying with the requirements hereinafter named.*' In the year 1795, a further regulation was made by law, when the same language was used: '*Any free white person may become a citizen,*' &c. In 1798-1802-1813, and 1824, similar laws were passed, on the same subject, and in each of those laws, the same technical language is used. These laws were carrying into effect the constitution itself; and if the constitution in any part of it embraced coloured persons as citizens, then Congress mistook its duty, and early departed from its provisions. Congress have also marked this distinction of colour in the post-office laws '*No person of colour can be engaged in the post-office, or in the transportation of mail.*' This is a right open to all but persons of colour."

Crandall v. Connecticut, (1834) 10 Conn 358.

"To my mind, it would be a perversion of terms, and the well known rule of construction, to say, that slaves, free blacks, or Indians, were citizens, within the meaning of that term, as used in the constitution. God forbid that I should add to the degradation of this race of men; but I am bound, by my duty, to say, they are not citizens. I have thus shown you that this law is not contrary to the 2d section of the 4th art. of the constitution of the United States; for that embraces only citizens."

Ibid, at 347.

Note the word "*citizen*" as it used in Crandall. For the definition of the word "*citizen*", we refer you to Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 8th Ed., (1859):

"CITIZEN, persons. 3. All natives are not citizens of the United States; the descendants of the aborigines, and those of African origin, are not entitled to the rights of citizens. Anterior to the adoption of the constitution of the United States, each State had the right to make citizens of such persons as it pleased. That constitution does not authorize any but white persons to become citizens of the United States; and it must therefore be presumed that no one is a citizen who is not white."

Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 8th Ed. (1859), Title "Citizen," p.231.

"CITIZEN, persons. 2. Citizens are either native born or naturalized. Native citizens may fill any office; naturalized citizens may be elected or appointed to any office under the constitution of the United States, except the office of president and vice-president. The constitution provides, that '*the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.*' "

Ibid, at p. 231.

This leaves no doubt who (*under the organic law of this Nation*) are solely defined as "*Citizens*" (*Persons*), or what race is the sovereign body. No one else is included. The Fourteenth Amendment is an attempt to unseat the organic law and we should question any and all government Officials who would condone this type of deception.

Notice in government reprints of the Constitution for the United States of America, Article I, Section 2, Clause 3:

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons."

Constitution for the United States of America,
Article I, Section 2, Clause 3.

Upon checking the Constitution for the Confederate States of America, the people of the Confederacy (*who knew and understood the organic law of this Nation*) re-worded the Preamble and Article I, Section 2, Clause 3, as follows:

"We, the people of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character, in order to form a permanent federal government, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity -- invoking the favor and guidance of Almighty God -- do ordain and establish this Constitution for the Confederate States of America."

Preamble to the Constitution for the Confederate States of America.

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, which may be included within this Confederacy, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined, by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all slaves."

Constitution for the Confederate States of America,
Article I, Section 2, Clause 3.

Notice "*We, the people*" and "*to ourselves and our posterity*" were preserved. Also, notice the substitution of the word: "*Persons*" for that of the word: "*slaves*."

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; ..."

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1.

This sentence of the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1, makes all State Constitutions which set their sovereign body as the white race only (*such as Oregon's Constitution*) null and void.

"In all elections not otherwise provided for by this constitution, every white male citizen of the United States, ..."
Oregon Constitution, (1859) Article II, Section 2.

and others, such as:

"The electors or members of the general assembly shall be free white male citizens of the State, ..."
Georgia Constitution, (1865) Article V, Section 1.

"Every free white man at the age of twenty-one years being a native or naturalized citizen of the United States, ..."
North Carolina Constitution, (1856) Article I, Section 3, Clause 2.

"Every white male citizen of the commonwealth, resident therein, aged twenty-one years and upwards, being qualified to exercise the right of suffrage ..."

Virginia Constitution, (1830) Article III, Section 14.

"That every white male citizen of this State, above twenty-one years of age, and neither, having resided twelve months within the State, and six months in the county, ..."

Maryland Constitution, (1810) Article 14.

"All elections of governor, senators, and representatives shall be by ballot. And in such elections every white free man of the age of twenty-one years, ..."

Delaware Constitution, (1792) Article IV, Section 1.

See Neal v. Delaware, / as to nullification of State Constitutions under the Fourteenth Amendment.

All of these provisions of the Constitutions for the States are now "*null and void*" if the Fourteenth Amendment is considered as a valid Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America (*which it certainly is not*). No State legislature could change the governing class which put the legislature into being and which class was set in their own State Constitution.

Here we must also note the difference between the Fourteenth Amendment's "*privileges and immunities*" Clause and the "*privileges and immunities*" Clause of Article IV, Section 2. (See Maxwell v. Dow, /).

"... nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1.

Notice how close the wording of this sentence of the Fourteenth Amendment is to the wording of the fifth Article in Amendment:

"... nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."
Fifth Article in Amendment,
Constitution for the United States of America.

Notice the Fourteenth Amendment deviates from the fifth Article in Amendment on the issue of compensation. The Fourteenth Amendment says, "*equal protection*," where the fifth Article in Amendment says, "*nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation*."

The problem (*it appears*) in this change of wording is to give *martial law properties* to the fifth Article in Amendment, thereby converting the common-law remedial effect of the fifth Article in Amendment, to a martial law remedy. This could be why the courts use the word "*purview*" when referencing the Articles in Amendment (*Articles One through Eight*) in relation to the Fourteenth Amendment.

"Purview. Enacting part of a statute, in contradistinction to the preamble. The part of a statute commencing with the words '*Be it enacted*,' and continuing as far as the repealing clause; and hence, the design, contemplation, purpose, or scope of the act."
Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Ed. (1979).

It appears that when the Judges speak of any common-law remedy, principle, or maxim, as being within "*purview*" of the Fourteenth Amendment, they are converting a common-law remedy, principle, or maxim, to a martial law remedy, principle, or maxim of law. In such cases, the common-law remedy, principle, or maxim is eliminated and, of course, the unalienable rights of the Citizen are also eliminated (*in favor of martial law rule*).

This conversion of the common law to properties of martial law nature is obvious. The Fourteenth Amendment (*with military force to enforce it*) allows all races to govern. A maxim which violates the common-law with the power (*force*) of martial law.

According to these principles, we must take another look at this portion of the Fourteenth Amendment. *What is "due process" under the Fourteenth Amendment?* Amazingly enough, "*due process*" is completely defined within the Amendment by the integral words that follow those very terms, "*equal protection of the laws*."

Nothing more than "*equal protection of the law*" is required to satisfy the *Due Process Clause* of the Fourteenth Amendment. Thus, equal tyranny and deprivation of common-law rights to all meets the equal protection principle. *So, what protection is given?* **Answer:** *As much as the national government wishes to give, and no more.* Congressional protection can be enlarged and contracted as much as Congress and Administrative Agencies wish, provided only that these changes affect all equally. If everyone is chained to a post for their own protection, then they have "*equal protection of the law*" under the law martial.

To see the clear and inherent weakness of the "*Due Process Clause*" of the Fourteenth Amendment, we look below to find that the common-law principles clearly known to the Bill of Rights do not apply to the Fourteenth Amendment and "*Due Process*."

"The right of trial by jury in civil cases, guaranteed by the Seventh Amendment (*Walker v. Sauvinet, 92 US 90*), and the right to bear arms guaranteed by the Second Amendment (*Presser v. Illinois, 116 US 252*), have been distinctly held not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment against abridgement by the States, and in effect the same decision was made in respect of the guarantee against prosecution, except by indictment by grand jury, contained in the Fifth Amendment (*Hurtado v. California, 110 US 516*), and in respect of the right to be confronted with witnesses, contained in the Sixth Amendment. (*West v. Louisiana, 194 US 258*). In *Maxwell v. Dow*, supra, where the plaintiff in error had been convicted in a state court of a felony upon information and by a jury of eight persons, it was held that the indictment, made indispensable by the Fifth Amendment, and the trial by jury guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment, were not privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, as those words were used in the Fourteenth Amendment... the decision rested upon the ground that this clause of the Fourteenth Amendment did not forbid the States to abridge the personal rights enumerated in the first eight Amendments, because these rights were not within the meaning of the clause '*privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.*' ... We conclude, therefore, that the exemption from compulsory self-incrimination is not a privilege or immunity of National citizenship guaranteed by this clause of the Fourteenth Amendment against abridgement by the States... "... it is possible that some of the personal rights safeguarded by the first eight Amendments against National action may also be safeguarded against State action, because a denial of them would be a denial of due process of law ... If this is so, it is not because those rights are enumerated in the first eight Amendments, but because they are of such a nature that they are included in the conception of due process of law." Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 78, 98-99, 29 S.Ct. 14, 53 L.Ed. 97.

Therefore, any reference to Amendments One through Eight, (*when applied to the State, or through purview of the Fourteenth Amendment in any way*) replaces the common law thereof with martial law. This is pure theft of our God given common law birthright. The first Section of the Fourteenth Amendment's purpose is to:

1. Convert common-law Citizens to statutory citizens and statutory persons under martial law rule; and,
2. Convert common-law remedies, principles, and maxims in Articles One through Ten in Amendment to martial law remedies, principles, and maxims through the Fourteenth Amendment; and,
3. Convert common-law rights ownership of property to martial law confiscation of property, in which a private citizen is not capable of protecting his property under the common-law; and,
4. Completely remove the common-law jurisdiction from the original people and their Posterity and convert them to Statutory Persons who can be brought within purview of the Fourteenth Amendment under national, international, martial law rule; and,
5. Completely destroy the restrictions on those not of the white race to enter our Nation and dislodge the people mention in the Preamble as the governing body of this white Nation; and,
6. Completely destroy the ability of the said people to govern by allowing those not of our race to hold elected Office, both State and National.

All this is done with the intention of breaking down State sovereignty by an increased power of the national side of the United States government with a corresponding loss of power for States sovereignty on the federal side of the United States. This leaves the existence of the United States government less dependent (*or not dependent at all*) upon the existence of the several States.

The Fourteenth Amendment set the stage for the destruction of "*white rule*" under Christian doctrine in the United States of America.

Ultimately, they will not succeed, as God has designated this land for the regathering of the twelve tribes of Israel to become a mighty Nation again, and so it will be as God has proclaimed.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT - SECTION TWO

The next Section of the Fourteenth Amendment reads:

"Sec. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-president of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the Executive and Judicial Officers of a State, or the members of the Legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis for representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 2.

The purpose of the initial sentence of section Two is clear by its own terms: "*Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, . . .*" The intention is to give those persons (*previously known as "chattels"*) a "*whole*" character and to give that character representation as a "*citizen*;" accordingly, allowing the States to claim those persons for purposes of representation in the United States government. [Elk v. Wilkins /].

What does the original Constitution say on the subject?

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons."
Article I, Section 2, Clause 3,
Constitution for the United States of America.

Under Article I, Section 2, Clause 3, we can see that the Framers understood that they would not allow the direct taxation of property in the several States (*by the United States*) by excluding those persons held in servitude as "*property*" from apportionment for direct taxes. The only exception made was that of counting those persons at three-fifths of their actual enumeration and adding that to the whole number of free persons.

At the time of adoption of the Constitution for the United States of America, the southern States feared that they would be powerless in the new government due to low population of free persons in those States. A compromise was struck which allowed additional representation for the populace held as slaves with a corresponding increase in taxation for the additional representation. This carried two benefits with the new government:

1. More revenue would be generated by the United States from these States; and,
2. These States would be more likely to ratify the Constitution, having more equal authority in the central government. But even here, representation and direct taxes were not considered on the same level. [See: 8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 195 (1906)].

The first sentence of Section Two of the Fourteenth Amendment is wholly in conflict with, and in contradiction to, Article I, Section 2, Clause 3, as well as the Preamble. The only reason these persons (*Slaves*) were even given a three-fifths character in the United States Census was for the purpose of taxation (*which incidentally, prevented the slave States from suffering a lack of sufficient representation in the United States House of Representatives*). By no means was this three-fifths character to imply any direct representation of the persons to whom it related. [See: 8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 107 (1906)].

Under the Fourteenth Amendment, if any State refuses to give this class "*suffrage*" in State elections (*by the terms of Section Two [14th Am.]*), a disability is imposed. When this disability is imposed, the State subjected to the disability loses the three-fifths representation it had based upon the number of such "*persons*" and for that reason is repugnant to the organic law.

Rather than returning a State to its original standing or representation under Article I (*by counting non-whites as three-fifths for purposes of taxation and incidental representation*), the uncooperative State is forced into the very condition the Framers of the Constitution intended to prevent by the compromise struck at the Constitutional Convention. And since Section Two of the Fourteenth Amendment makes no mention of taxation, it is presumable that the State would still be taxed according to at least three-fifths apportionment for the number of those persons inhabiting the State, an unequal taxation never intended. [See *The Federalist, No. 34*].

Moreover, without the three-fifths disability place upon non-whites, the people mentioned in the Preamble to the Constitution for the United States of America, (*or rather, their "Posterity"*) no longer can maintain their superior character over their own governmental affairs as the founders and sovereignty of the government. This amounts to no less than allowance of a foreign invasion into the several States of the Union, sanctioned by Congressional (*State and Federal*) legislation against the people of the States in violation of their respective sovereignties.

One thing that must be noted: Although this disability would be imposed upon the States that were uncooperative, they could still deny "*suffrage*" to the "*Subjects*" of the United States.

In Section Two of the Fourteenth Amendment, "*Indians not taxed*" were still excluded as they are in Article I, Section 2, Clause 3. The reason "*Indians not taxed*" (*taken*) were still excluded is because of their allegiance to, and membership in, a separate racial sovereignty, that is, the Indian Nations. [See, *9 Fed. Stat. Anno. 626*].

The court of Elk v. Wilkins, / later determined that holding Indians outside the consideration for representation was wholly inconsistent with destruction of racial distinction proposed by the Fourteenth Amendment. It is speculated that this decision was made because to decide otherwise, would reveal the racial sovereignty principles of the U.S. Constitution in Article I, Section 2, Clause 3 and the Preamble. The purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment was to destroy the common-law ideal that each race (*enlarged family*) constituted a separate sovereignty in their own governments. It should be noted that this principle (*destruction of racial recognition*) has now been extended to all races, including artificial juristic persons (*corporations etc.*) even though the Fourteenth Amendment initially was put into existence on the proposition that it was only intended to benefit the African race.

"The Fourteenth Amendment is to be liberally construed to carry out the purpose of its framers, but it is not to be restricted in its application because designed originally to rectify an existing wrong. The amendment was adopted soon after the close of the civil war, and undoubtedly had its origin in a purpose to secure the newly made citizens in the full enjoyment of their freedom. But it is in no respect limited in its operation to them. It is universal in its application, extending its protective force over all men, of every race and color, within the jurisdiction of the States throughout the broad domain of the Republic."

8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 256;

See also, authorities cited therein.

It is no wonder that this Amendment has been held to apply to artificial (*juristic*) persons since its purpose was to artificially (*by operation or fiction of law*) confer citizenship on classes never recognized as "*Citizens*" under common-law principles that are based upon the natural law.

/////

/////

/////

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT - SECTION THREE

Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment reads:

"Sec. 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having

previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability."
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 3.

This provision, at first glance, was obviously intended to punish the active southern participants in the Civil War. But this Section (like the rest of the Fourteenth Amendment) later proved to deprive the rights of Citizens in the (so-called) northern States as well. For instance, under this Section, Congress enacted legislation requiring Citizens to take an "Oath of Allegiance" before being allowed to vote (thus interfering with their right of suffrage and exercise of sovereignty and before obtaining judgments in the courts of the United States [thus interfering with the Citizens right to obtain remedy]).

The "Oath" spoken of was created during the Civil War and continued thereafter under the martial law of this Section of the Fourteenth Amendment. It was created with the intent to circumvent any exercise of State sovereignty, either by *Conventions of the People of the State* or by "Acts" of their legislature which could interfere with the unauthorized superiority exercised by the United States government through the force of martial law.

"... it shall be the duty of the heads of the several departments to cause to be administered to each and every officer, clerk, or employee, now in their respective departments, or in any way connected therewith, or who shall hereafter in any way become connected therewith, to following oath, viz.: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm, as the case may be) that I will support, protect, and defend the Constitution and Government of the United States against all enemies, whether domestic or foreign, and that I will bear true faith, allegiance, and loyalty to the same, any ordinance, resolution, or law of any State Convention or Legislature to the contrary notwithstanding; and, further, that I do this with a full determination, pledge, and purpose, without any mental reservation or evasion whatsoever; and, further, that I will well and faithfully perform all the duties which may be required of me by law. So help me God."

"And that each and every such civil officer and employee, in the departments aforesaid, or in any way connected therewith, in the service or employment of the United States, who shall refuse to take the oath or affirmation herein provided, shall be immediately dismissed and discharged from such service or employment."

"An Act requiring an Oath of Allegiance, and to support the Constitution of the United States, to be administered to certain Persons in the Civil Service of the United States."

Approved August 6, 1861,
Ch. 64, Section 1, 12 Stat. 326.

Also see the "Oath" prescribed for West Point Cadets in "An Act providing for the better Organization of the Military Establishment." Approved August 3, 1861 /

The "Oath of Allegiance" was also used in many other relations. To obtain a "Judgment" in the courts of the United States (and to raise claims in its departments and bureaus, for instance), Congress enacted:

". . . the commanders of all American vessels sailing from ports in the United States to foreign ports, during the continuance of the present rebellion, and all persons prosecuting claims either as attorney or on his own account, before any of the departments or bureaus of the United States, shall be require to take the oath of allegiance, and to support the Constitution of the United States (or affirm, as the case maybe,) as required of persons in the civil service of the United States, by the provisions of the act of Congress approved August Sixth, eighteen hundred and sixtyone. . . ."

"An Act requiring the Commanders of American Vessels sailing to foreign ports and Persons prosecuting Claims, to take the Oath of Allegiance."

Approved July 17, 1862,
Ch. 205, Sect. 1,
12 Stat. 610.

". . . . Provided, however, That in order to authorize the said court to render a judgment in favor of any claimant, if a citizen of the United States, it shall be set forth in the petition that the claimant, and the original and every prior owner thereof where the claim has been assigned, has at all times borne true allegiance to the Government of the United States, and whether a citizen or not, that he has not in any way voluntarily aided, abetted, or given

encouragement to rebellion against the said Government, which allegations may be traversed by the Government, and if on the trial such issue shall be decided against the claimant, his petition shall be dismissed. *An Act to amend. "An Act to establish for Investigation of Claims against the United States,"* approved February twenty-fourth, eighteen hundred and fifty-five.

Approved March 3, 1863,

Ch. 152, Sect. 12,

12 Stat. 765, 767.

"... Whenever it shall be material in any suit or claim before any court to ascertain whether any person or party asserting the loyalty of any such person to the United States during such rebellion, shall be required to prove affirmatively that such person did, during said rebellion, consistently adhere to the United States and did give no aid or comfort to persons engaged in said rebellion; and the voluntary residence of any such person in any place where, at any time during such residence, the rebel force or organization held sway, shall be prima facie evidence that such person did give aid and comfort to said rebellion and to the persons engaged therein."

"An Act to provide for Appeals from the Court of Claims, and for other Purposes."

Approved June 25, 1868,

Ch. 71, Sec. 3, 15 Stat. 75.

Also see: *"An Act making Appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial Expenses of the Government for the Year ending the thirteenth of June, eighteen hundred and seventy-one."* Approved July 12, 1870 /

All of these "Acts" of martial law that require an "Oath of Allegiance" from the people who are already "Citizens" within the original meaning of the Constitution, are given a continuing affect through Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment. Under these "Acts" created under Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment, Citizens are (or could be) treated as being "guilty" of insurrection or rebellion until they prove themselves innocent. This is again a reversal of the common-law maxim that one is innocent until proven guilty and contrary to the intent of the fifth Article in Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America.

For those who may take offense to the use of the terms "Civil War" (as opposed to "the war between the States"), we will continue to use those terms for a reason. The cause of this War was the attempt of the national government to interfere in the sovereignty of the several States through National Civil Law; thus, the actual controversy ("political" as well as "military") is known as the "Civil War."

This was a War over the intrusion of Civil Law upon the Common Law. The court of Diamond v. Harris, / calls the Civil Law (statutory law) "superior equity":

"It is difficult to see how the courts of this State are to ignore the common law as a rule of decision, when it is made so by statute, and adopt the civil law, even though it have the merit of superior equity."

Diamond v. Harris, (1830) 33 Tex 634, 638.

In the meantime, "Civil Law" was the form of law imposed in the Roman Empire which was largely (if not wholly) governed by martial law rule.

"Equity" has always been understood to follow the law; to have "superior equity," is to turn things on their head. This is exactly what happens when martial law is imposed. If "equity" is the law, then it follows its own course rather than following the common law, thereby destroying the common law and leaving what is called "equity" in its place. We can't even begin to count the number of times Judges, Lawyers, and Statesmen have said:

"There isn't any common law anymore. It has been replaced by Statutes."

They would be more truthful if they said:

"There isn't any common-law any more, it has been replaced by martial law."

The 1789 Judiciary Act, Section 16 / prevented the courts of the United States from entertaining a suit in equity where there was an adequate remedy at law.

"Sec. 16. And be it further enacted, That suits in equity shall not be sustained in either of the courts of the United States, in any case where plain, adequate and complete remedy may be had at law."

"An Act to establish the Judicial Courts of the United States,"

Approved September 24, 1789,

Ch. 20, Section 16, 1 Stat. 73, 82.

This *statute* was taken from a principle well known to the common law and was made by men who participated in the creation of our Constitution. The *Civil Law* that followed the Civil War is found to be this so-called "*Superior Equity*" instituted under the police power created in the Fourteenth and related Amendments. This so-called "*superior equity*" can only be imposed under conditions of "*martial law rule*" where the law is in suspension.

If the judiciary has no right to proceed in equity when the law provides adequate remedy, how does the Congress propose to statute the principles of equity, and then claim to have made law? It would seem that such a practice is wholly unlawful (in light of legal principles known to the Constitution and to the several States at the time of its adoption).

As well, it must be noted that "*martial law*" is known (*for the most part*) to follow the course set by men rather than the course set by law (*its jurisdiction being based on "force" and coerced consent*). Even where concerned, it must be justified by those imposing it or they eventually will be held liable for damages caused by its imposition.

"What is called '*proclaiming martial law*' is no law at all; but merely for the sake of public safety, in circumstances of great emergency, setting aside all law, and acting under military power; a proceeding which requires to be followed by an act of indemnity when the disturbances are at an end."

8 Atty. Gen. Op. 365, 367, February 3, 1857.

The Framers understood Common-Law to be superior law in all areas where it could be given effect. In fact, the Constitution for the United States of America incorporates the Common-Law in many of its provisions by using Common-Law terms which only the Common-Law can define.

It should not be forgotten, that the first laws of the United States carry great weight in construction of the powers given in the Constitution for the United States of America, (*as well as the lawful manner of instituting those powers* /).

"To all this mass of proof we have still to add, that Congress has repeatedly legislated upon the same construction of the Constitution that we have given. Three laws, two of which were passed almost immediately after the Government went into operation, will be abundantly sufficient to show this. The two first are particularly worthy of notice, because many of the men who assisted in framing the Constitution, and took an active part in procuring its adoption, were then in the halls of legislation, and certainly understood what they meant when they used the words '*people of the United States*' and '*citizen*' in that well considered instrument."

Dred Scott v. Sandford. (1856 - 1857).

19 How. (60 U.S.) 393, 419, 15 L.Ed. 691.

While the distinction between "*law*" and "*equity*" are now claimed to be abolished by Rule 1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the combining of both jurisdictions under a singular procedure could only be done outside the judicial power under martial law rule. Some courts still seem to recognize some distinctions in law and equity (*possibly to avoid explaining the damage done to the judicial power by this combination*).

Getting back to the point, from Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment we can see that the southern States would be disabled from recovering their sovereignty by propositions of this Section (*because all that were sympathetic to their cause would be [and were] refused "Office" in the United States government*). This was necessary for the northern Revolutionaries to maintain the results of their usurpation of the Preamble to the Constitution and their imposition of "*martial law*."

According to McKee v. Young, / all that is necessary to constitute: "*Aid and comfort*" (as known in Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment) is giving the enemy words of encouragement or expression of favorable opinion while occupying an influential position. / From this it is obvious that southern Public Officials were targeted for punishment for their attempts to maintain the power of the Preamble to the Constitution for the United States of America (as well as the principles of the Federal government known to and required by that instrument).

NOTE: Secession of the southern States is not condoned, but a recognition that the south seceded due to the usurpatious Acts pursued by the national government is intended. The several States did have the right to withdraw their Senators from the national government to suspend its operation until such time as it conformed itself to the requirements of the Constitution. It appears that secession was used by the northern Revolutionaries as justification for the acts of a usurpatious national government. This mistake should never be repeated.

It has been said that the Thirteenth Amendment (and subsequent Amendments to the U.S. Constitution) bear the same authority as other provisions of the Constitution (being Amendments thereto) rather than bearing the inferior quality of "*statutes*" which may be considered "*void*" when made without authority of the Constitution as adopted.

Not only are these Amendments contrary to the original intent of the Framers, (which recognized only a white sovereignty [We the people]), but even Congress has treated the Fourteenth Amendment as a mere statute. It is well known that the Constitution for the United States of America may not be amended by statute. [Article V, Constitution for the United States of America]. It is presumable that Congress fully understands this fact. "*An Act of Congress*" Approved June 6, 1898, / provides:

" . . . that the disability imposed by Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution heretofore incurred is hereby removed."

According to Marbury v. Madison, / either the Constitution is the supreme and paramount law, unchangeable by mere legislative enactment, or it is a futile attempt by the people to control their government. Either the Fourteenth Amendment has no more standing than a statute or it violates the principles of government proposed by the original Constitution by allowing Congress to change its provisions by its own legislative authority. [See Rogers v. Bellei / (*Dissenting Opinion*), as to Congress changing the intent of the Fourteenth Amendment by mere legislation]. This being the case, the Fourteenth Amendment must be something less than organic law.

Ironically enough, Madison (the Defendant in Marbury v. Madison [supra.]) in the Constitutional Convention (while moving for the ratification of the Constitution by the people rather than the State legislatures) agreed that a legislature could not amend the organic law that put it into existence.

William M. Meigs of the Philadelphia Bar, in "*The Growth of the Constitution*," [See: Vol. 8, Fed. Stat. Anno. reports Madison's views]:

"Madison thought the legislatures clearly incompetent (to ratify the United States Constitution) for the very changes proposed would make essential inroads on the State Constitution, and a legislature cannot change the Constitution under which it exists."
8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 243.

On this (and other basis), the Constitution for the United States of America was ratified by "*Conventions of the People*" of the States rather than the State legislatures. This raises another important question: "*Were (or are) the State legislatures competent to ratify Amendments to the Constitution (such as the Fourteenth Amendment) which effectually changed the State Constitution by the inroads made into it?*"

Obviously the Constitutional Convention thought that the State legislatures are incompetent to ratify any organic law that adversely affected (changed) their State Constitutions. Therefore, this would appear to give further validity to the proposition that the State legislatures may only amend the Constitution for the United States of America according to Article V, thereof, when the purpose of the Amendment is to hold the United States government to the limits of its original powers. Ratification of any Amendment (which expands power of the United States government beyond its original

limits) must therefore (by any theory) be ratified by "Conventions of the People" of the class mentioned in the Preamble in their respective States.

NOTE: The Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments were not ratified by Conventions of the people and thus those Amendments undermined the States' Constitutions by depriving both the governments of the several States and the sovereign people of a great deal of their powers (by purporting to transfer power to the national government).

It must also be noted:

"There is no sounder rule of interpretation (of the Constitution) than that which requires us (the court) to look at the whole of an instrument, before we (the court) determine a question of construction of any particular part..."
U.S. v. Morris, (1851) 26 Fed. Cas. No. 15,815;
See also Madison in The Federalist, No. 41
and 8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 253.

Could this be why there are great efforts being put forth to call a "Constitutional Convention" for the purpose of giving final validity to these usurpatious "Acts" of American legislators?

Regardless of this fact, it is obvious that the northern usurpation of the Constitution for the United States of America favoring international [*interracial*] law was to be protected from southern resistance by martial law. By Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Congress would be allowed to decide when the principles of the Preamble were dead and when those who maintained those principles were also dead (or when they were no longer a threat to these usurpatious "Acts" against our Constitution).

Considering the weight of the evidence that the Fourteenth Amendment is of martial law jurisdiction, we can begin to understand why it was thought that Congress might repeal the disabilities of Section Three without a Constitutional Amendment (outside of the scope of Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Constitution for the United States of America).

Over the years, the people have had a great deal of trouble accessing the judicial power of the courts. Since martial law suspends the judicial power (along with other regular powers of government), this is quite understandable. Congress' power is (practically speaking) "unlimited" where the regulation of courts subjected to martial law rule are concerned. Therefore, why would Congress think that their power over the martial law measures (in general), is limited to the Constitution (especially since Congress claimed power under martial law with the power Clauses of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments)? /

A known maxim to the Common Law is that it supersedes the military power. The framers of our national Constitution understood this principle when they limited Congressional power to make military appropriations to a maximum term of two years. / Many Constitutions of the several States also make this clear by requiring the military power to "bear arms" to remain subordinate to the civil power.

For example:

"The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence (sic) of themselves, and the State, but the Military power shall be kept in strict subordination of the civil power."
Oregon Constitution, (1859) Article I, Section 27.

The second Article in Amendment also makes the subordination of the military power to the will of the people clear.

Some say we did not adopt the whole of the common law of England. This is true to a certain extent. We did not adopt the monarchy and the feudal law of England. We did adopt so much of the common law as was intended by the Framers of the Constitution and those who ratified it. By the ninth Article in Amendment, it is clear that all rights known to Englishmen were adopted and were to be retained by the people. In addition, "the people" also assumed unto themselves

the powers of sovereignty (*and the rights related thereto*) as clearly indicated by the tenth Article in Amendment to the Federal Constitution. This is the American common-law.

In the Declaration of Rights and Resolves [1774] (*as well as the Declaration of Independence* [1776]), some of the men who framed the Constitution complained of the force uses by the King of England that resulted in the loss of trial by jury and violation of other many rights now known to be protected by the Bill of Rights. At that time of American history, the King of England was already using military force (*martial law*) to govern the Colonies to deprive Americans of their rights.

Therefore, it cannot be presumed that Congress never had the power to use *martial law* of any form to govern within the several States.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT - SECTION FOUR

Next is Section 4 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

"The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any state shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void."

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 4, United States Constitution.

As previously in this exposé, we will continue to dissect the Fourteenth Amendment with a view to its legal effects, sentence by sentence, continuing with the remaining portion of Section Four and going on through Section Five.

The first sentence of Section Four provides:

"The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned."

Fourteenth Amendment, Section Four.

For years, several individuals have been questioning the issue and the use of paper money by the national government. Of course, we know that the main medium which plagues us is the Federal Reserve Note, but in our zeal to uphold the original intent and purpose of our Constitution, these individuals have made a fatal error - they have ignored this provision of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The arguments that have been used against these "Bills of Credit" have always focused on Article I, Section 8, Constitution for the United States of America. For instance, we know that Congress is empowered to Coin money, not print it.

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5, Const. for the U.S. of A.

Under this Clause, the Congress fixed the unit of measure for money coined by the United States at 416 grains of standard Silver (Legal Tender Cases /), calling the unit of measure a "*dollar*." This made the dollar's Silver a standard by which all other money ("*foreign*" as well as "*domestic*") would be measured. As a result, there is no such thing as a gold standard in the United States. Congress has the power to change the weight of a gold dollar without affecting the standard in Silver. In fact, the Congress is duty bound to change the gold coin when it no longer reflects a true comparative value to the standard (*a dollar's Silver*).

Consequently, legislation can be found (*prior to the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment*) changing the amount of gold contained in a gold dollar. Don't forget that the term: "*dollar*" reflects a unit of Silver. When the term: "*dollar*" is used

with respect to gold, it becomes a comparative term between the value of Gold and Silver (*with Silver being the constant and Gold [in a sense] being given a respective value according to true economic conditions*).

The only way that one could avoid being compelled to accept a gold dollar of lesser weight for the completion of contracts was to make specific reference to the weight of Gold to be transferred for payment, thus treating the Gold as a "commodity" rather than a monetary unit for purposes of the specific Contract. [Legal Tender Cases, /].

Although Congress had this power (*concerning gold currency*), Congress cannot be deemed to have power to pass legislation which intended to reflect other than the parity between the standard of measure (*dollars silver*) and the gold dollar. To do so, would be to deprive those contracting in gold dollars of property without due process of law in that they could not recover the true intrinsic value of their Contracts. This would violate the fourth Article in Amendment by seizing property without warrant or probable cause upon *Oath* or *Affirmation*, and would violate the fifth Article in Amendment by either taking private property for public use without just compensation or by depriving property without due process of law.

The question is: "*Can the Congress issue paper and declare it to have an unrelated value in gold or silver, or can it issue the same without redemption and force these "Bills of Credit" to circulate among private Citizens by operation of law?"* There is sufficient authority in the original Constitution to show that Congress was never intended to exercise such a power, or at least, not to exercise its power in such a way.

In the Constitutional Convention, Sherman (in relation to Article I, Section 10, [*Const. for the U.S. of A.*]) said that: "*He thought this was a favorable moment for crushing paper money.*" / This was an extension of the Convention's "*determination to prevent the evils of paper money, already manifested by striking out from the powers of Congress the power to 'emit bills on the credit of the United States'.*" /

It should be noted that only the States were directly prohibited from interfering in the *Obligation of Contracts*. During the House and Senate debates on H.J.R. 192 of June 5, 1933, this prohibition was brought into view and it was answered that the prohibition did not apply to the federal government. While this may be true, the fourth and fifth Articles in Amendment of the Bill of Rights accomplish the same thing by prohibiting the seizure of property without warrant or the deprivation of property without due process of law. A man has property in his Contracts and if the "*Obligations of Contract*" are interfered with, then that property is deprived of the parties to the Contract. If this deprivation takes place without proper judicial proceedings conducted within the limitations of the Bill of Rights, the taking of property is without authority of law.

When the question of "*Bills of Credit*" (in relation to the powers of Congress) was raised in the Convention, the power was offered with the Clause: "*to borrow money on the credit of the United States.*" Governor Morris moved to strike out the words "*and emit bills on the credit of the United States.*" Madison thought it would be enough to prohibit them from being made a tender. Ellsworth thought this a favorable moment to bar the door against paper money. Read that the words (*if not struck out*) would be "*as alarming as the mark of the beast in Revelation.*" On this basis, the words were struck out by nine States to two. /

It is obvious from the Convention (*as well as the powers granted to Congress concerning coinage of money and borrowing of money on the credit of the United States*) that no direct or implied power was given to Congress to force circulation of its evidences of debt as a currency. While Congress has the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, the Congress has no power to force any one to lend to the government (*much less the power to spend "debt" into circulation*) without the intention of repayment whatsoever (*as in the case of Federal Reserve Notes ["Promises to pay" are not "payment"]*).

As a result of the money (*credit*) question (*raised by the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment*), we find it necessary to review the Legal Tender Cases. For the most part, those cases were decided during and after the Civil War Reconstruction period when martial law was in full bloom in the United States. By looking at these cases in this new light, much can be gained in the way of understanding the money issue (*as well as the Constitution in general*).

From the Legal Tender Cases, we first see that the supreme court of the United States initially declared the legal tender statutes of February 25th, 1862, July 11th, 1862, and March 3rd, 1863, to be upheld as: "*War measures, exceptional in*

their character, not authorized by any express grant of the power to Congress contained in the Constitution, but as not prohibited by its terms, and as justified in view of the great public exigencies which required their adoption." / In other words, paper money was declared legitimate as "*martial law money*" (*an emergency war measure*).

The supreme court in Thorington v. Smith, / (*in an Opinion dealing with Judgments of the Confederate courts* [relating to property in dispute in that case]) made a statement that is applicable to this early decision favoring legal tender laws made during the hostilities of the Civil War. The court said in Thorington:

"But such a judgment, in such a time, has little authority."

Although this was said in relation to Confederate Judgments, the principle still applies. In times of war (*during imposition of martial law*), the will to win and martial law may override all true logic (*even down to the principles of the organic law*).

It appears that the supreme court held to this principle in the case of Hepburn v. Griswald, / In Hepburn (*supra.*), the supreme court reasoned that the exigency which allowed the legal tender character to be accorded to the Civil War "*Greenbacks*" was over, thus the conditions which implied the power (*to make them legal tender*) had ended. Thus the law could no longer be held "*constitutional*" as in the past.

The dissenting Opinion of the Chief Justice in a later legal tender case reports the holding of the Hepburn court:

"The majority of the court as then constituted, five judges to eight, felt obliged to conclude that an act making mere promises to pay dollars a legal tender in payments of debts previously contracted is not a means appropriate, plainly adapted, really calculated to carry into effect any express power vested in Congress, is inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution, and is prohibited by the Constitution."

Legal Tender Case, (1870) 12 Wall. 571, (*supra.*)

The Opinion of Hepburn was ordered to be published on January 29th, 1870, and was decided in Conference on November 27th, 1870.

"The action of Congress in passage of the first Legal Tender Act was . . . placed distinctly upon the ground of the existing imperative need of government, and the legal tender clause was urged and adopted as a war measure."
[*martial law*].

Julliard v. Greenman, (1884) 110 U.S. 421;
425, 4 S.Ct. 122; 28 L.Ed. 204.

As many of us know, this is not the first time that the government has claimed certain implied powers as an expedient of war or some other emergency. *Martial law measures* have consistently been imposed under the guise of "*emergencies*" of all kinds (*Roosevelt being the greatest offender since Lincoln*). The Hepburn court (*without directly overruling its previous judgment upholding the Legal Tender Acts*) merely declared that the exigency no longer existed and that continued enforcement of the statute must be declared unconstitutional.

After the Hepburn ruling, the United States Attorney General in the cases of Knox v. Lee, and Parker v. Davis, / moved to be heard on the Hepburn question (Julliard v. Greenman, [*supra.*]/). These cases were heard almost a year after the Hepburn case, with the court reconstituted. Congress had passed an "Act" allowing for an additional Justice and one of the Justices concurring in the Hepburn case had retired. These are the conditions under which the question was reheard.

Although the Concurring Justices in the Hepburn case had not changed their Opinion, the legal tender Clauses were upheld (*five Justices to four*) thus overturning Hepburn v. Griswald directly. Many have said this was a packed court, and this may be true. But the court wasn't packed merely to overturn Hepburn, rather, it was packed to assure that the recent (*and most controversial*) Fourteenth Amendment would be upheld in its entirety. The legal tender question (*as we will see*) was merely an incident of the Fourteenth Amendment because of the words of Section Four.

In 1870 (*December*), the reconstituted court (*for the most part*) claimed to base its ruling overturning Hepburn on the grounds laid out in the *Dissenting Opinion* of the Hepburn case. The only real difference in the Opinions of the Hepburn court and this later legal tender case (*Knox and Parker*) was that the *Dissenting Opinion* of Hepburn became the *Concurring Opinion* of Knox and Parker, and the *Concurring Opinion* of Hepburn became the *Dissenting Opinion* of Knox and Parker.

It was noted by the *Dissenting Opinion* of Justice Field (*12 Wall. 634*), that the court failed to give any reason for overturning Hepburn. The question arises, with the turmoil and flat disloyalty and usurpations involved in adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment still remaining vivid in 1870: "*Did the court dare go to the 4th Section of the Fourteenth Amendment for the additional law it needed to justify such an upset in the supreme court?*" (*Note: the Fourteenth Amendment was never touted as an Amendment that would allow Congress a legal tender power to force paper money on American Citizens*). Justice Field begins his dissent:

"Nothing has been heard from counsel in these cases, and nothing from the present majority of the court, which has created a doubt in the mind of the correctness of the judgment rendered in the case of Hepburn v. Griswold, or of the conclusions expressed in the opinion of the majority of the court as then constituted. That judgment was reached only after repeated arguments were heard from able and eminent counsel, and after every point raised on either side had been the subject of extended deliberation."

Legal Tender Cases, 12 Wall. 634.

Obviously, no one had the courage to directly raise the Fourteenth Amendment in defense of the legal tender statutes. And in fact, you will not find any direct reference to it in the *Arguments of Counsel* or the *Majority Opinion* of Knox and Parker, (*supra.*). Had the case turned on this point, there may have been another Civil War spilling more blood than the last.

While we do not wish to go into great detail about the "*Concurring*" and "*Dissenting Opinions*" in these cases, the court did say some things that we will find important to this discussion.

A study of the history of the Fourteenth Amendment clearly reveals the injustice done by the Amendment (*as well as the injustice done to obtain assent of the States to adopt it*).

The court in Knox and Parker admits that Congress, (*by its legal tender laws, if declared unconstitutional*) has done a disastrous thing:

"Indeed, legal tender treasury notes have become the universal measure of values. If now, by our decision, it be established that these debts and obligations can be discharged only by gold coin; it, contrary to the expectations of the parties to these contracts, legal tender notes are rendered unavailable, the government has become an instrument of the grossest injustice."

Legal Tender Cases, 12 Wall. 530.

By the legal tender law, itself, the government had become the instrument of gross injustice to the rights of parties who had contracted for specie payments, now the court is worried that the injustice really done will be revealed. Congress also was worried about this, and that is why we have a provision in the Fourteenth Amendment disallowing any question of the "*validity of the public debt*," that is, the validity of Congress' action. If no one can question this action, then how can the injustice be revealed?

It is further said by the court:

"It is incumbent upon those who affirm the unconstitutionality of an act of Congress to show clearly that it is in violation of the provisions of the Constitution."

Legal Tender Cases 12 Wall. 531.

It must be noted that the litigants against paper money never addressed the validity of the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment. No one contested the constitutionality of the Fourth Section, and while the court alluded to its principles, direct reference to it is avoided like the plague.

Throughout all the legal tender cases, the Justices in opposition to legal tender present a most compelling legal argument (*as well as historical facts and motives of the framers and the people of the States as references to show that Congress had no power to enact a legal tender law making paper acceptable as money* [as ruled in Hepburn v. Griswald]).

If looking only at the original organic law (*as the Hepburn court did*), these arguments are absolutely valid. But we must remember that we are not dealing only with the original organic law (*and neither was the supreme court after the unconstitutional adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment*). The Fourteenth Amendment is claimed to be a part of the organic law, no matter how false or erroneous that assumption may be. Also, in reviewing these legal tender decisions, don't forget that the supreme court is always "*on notice*" of the Constitution in its entirety, whether they mention any of its specific provisions or not in their Opinions.

If four supreme court Justices won't be heeded when relating the true history and meaning of our original Constitution, where can we expect to prove our point merely on the same grounds they raised, without dissuading the effect of subsequent (*so-called*) Amendments. This is exactly what we have done, but not as well as Justice Field and his fellow dissenting Justices. It seems like a very futile attempt. All that could be said in the supreme court (*about the original Constitution*) in relation to paper money has been said by its own Justices, with one exception; the relationship that the Fourteenth Amendment bears to the subject and the fact that the Fourteenth Amendment is a mere fiction, not a part of the Constitution. This question has not been raised. We must answer the question posed by Justice Field: *What allowed Hepburn to be overturned?*

Let us look at some of the things said by the litigants and the court in upholding the legal tender law. If we are right about the implications of the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment, then some reference must have been made to it, even if only indirectly.

You might say that the validity of the public debt has nothing to do with paper currency, or currency in general. The Attorney General of the United States (*in arguing for paper money*) disagrees:

"There is a kinship between the borrowing of money and the issuing of a currency made valuable by being invested with all the facilities of money, in evidence of that borrowing."
Legal Tender Cases, 12 Wall. 526.

Interestingly enough, no reference is made to the Fourteenth Amendment by the Attorney General when this statement was made (*while the language relates directly to provisions of the Fourth Section*).

"A decent respect for a co-ordinate branch of government demands that the judiciary should presume, until the contrary is clearly shown, that there has been no transgression of power of Congress . . ."
Legal Tender Cases, 12 Wall 531.

Remember, new power was conferred upon Congress, more plenary in its character than ever before, with exception of the Thirteenth Amendment (*as you will see in our discussion of the Fifth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment, [infra.]*).

In speaking of the powers of Congress:

"It is allowable to group together any number of them and infer from them all that the power claimed has been conferred."
Legal Tender Cases, 12 Wall. 534.

What about the new power of the Fourteenth Amendment? The court admits that the Bill of Rights was intended to curtail those questionable powers of Congress that may be implied, "*these Amendments are denials of power*" (Legal Tender Cases /); and refers to the Preamble of the Bill of Rights as setting that standard. This will be further discussed with

reference to who is competent to amend the Constitution and under what conditions. But right after the court says this (*for the most part*) the Bill of Rights is disregarded. Why does the Fourteenth Amendment supersede the Bill of Rights where the power exercised is a direct power conferred after their adoption? Answer: "*The limitations of the Bill of Rights are common-law principles, while the Fourteenth Amendment is martial law.*" When "martial law" is put into effect, it is used to suspend the common law, rightfully or otherwise, and therefore supersedes it.

From the standpoint of constitutional construction:

"If there be any conflict between an Amendment and a provision of the original Constitution, the provision found in the Amendment must control, under the rule that the last expression of the will of the lawmaker prevails over an earlier one"

9 Fed. Stat. Anno. 255.

This also raises the question: "*Who is the lawmaker if there is to be a change in the members of the sovereign body?*" Is it not the sovereign body itself, rather than their creations (*State legislatures or Congress*)?

It is said that the Congress has power to borrow on the credit of the United States, and the power to emit "*bills of credit*" is incident to that power. But the court relates that when the legal tender laws were passed, it was the fact that the credit of the United States had run out which caused the exigency (*emergency*) requiring a legal tender law.

"Meanwhile the public treasury was nearly empty, and the credit of the government, if not stretched to its utmost tension, had become nearly exhausted . . ."

Legal Tender Cases, 12 Wall. 541 (Concurring Opinion)

If the credit is exhausted, where is their power to borrow on the credit or any implied power under it? But, this is not true if the validity of the debt cannot be questioned (*Fourteenth Amendment, Section Four*).

The basic reasoning of the concurring court in Knox and Parker / was that Congress has the power to declare war and repel insurrection (*powers of martial law*); from this power is the implied power to make war or the power to execute such war (*implied powers of martial law*); coupled with the war powers (*martial law powers*) is the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States; when the credit of the United States runs out or is short, an emergency exists (*an excuse for imposition of martial law measures*) and, under the war powers, loans may be forced. Under this implied power to enforce loans, the government may issue "*bills of credit*" evidencing the debt and force their acceptance by declaring them "*legal tender*." Here we see an implication of power not directly given (*in its fourth generation of implication*) all justified under the power of "*martial law*." This is stretching things to say the least, and we have already discussed the borrowing power being extinguished when the credit of the United States becomes none existent. The consequence of a marriage between the war powers and emergency borrowing when there is no credit to borrow against is legal tender paper money, which would be better called "*martial law money*."

Basically, the power exercised in legal tender was a military power (*martial law power*) and when we go back to the Hepburn case, we see that to be true according to the supreme court. Now with the war over, wherein could the implied martial law powers rest? They had no basis, this was the decision of Hepburn.

It becomes obvious that Congress needed a new direct grant of power to enforce the legal tender laws. Thus the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment was purposed to maintain the validity of the public debt, leaving the *Bills of Credit* issued as evidence of that debt valid (*under an implied power derived from a new source*). Therefore, the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment was intended to imply the power to make them (*Greenbacks*) a legal tender to maintain the validity of the debt from another source. Nonetheless, the martial law nature and origin of the debt and its currency (*legal tender*) cannot be doubted. It is clearly stated in the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment, Congress claims a new direct power as a basis for implied powers that could not lawfully be used except by necessity of military exigency. The Fourteenth Amendment is an extension of the Congress' military (*martial law*) power over the entire United States, not confined by any of the Clauses of the original Constitution for the United States of America (*if the Fourteenth Amendment is fact instead of fiction*).

Look at what is alleged to have started the Civil War. Allegedly, a shot was fired on Fort Sumpter. Congress has full power under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 to govern Forts, and it could truly be said that an insurrection had been done against not one of the United States, but against the property under control of the Congress of the United States. Congress (*claiming its martial law "power to declare war," "suppress insurrections" and "repel invasions"*) imposed martial law on the United States and never discontinued it. The result was an extension of military and municipal jurisdiction of Congress. But where is the evidence of this? Look at the Thirteenth Amendment, the Civil Rights Acts, the Legal Tender Laws, the Fourteenth Amendment, etc., etc., etc..

The fact that Congress did not merely extend its coinage power over currency is clearly admitted by the court:

" . . . nor do we assert that Congress may make anything which has no value money."
Legal Tender Cases, 12 Wall. 553. (*Concurring Opinion*)

Paper "money" isn't issued under the money powers of Congress, but under the military power (*in conjunction with the borrowing power*) and this power is not the original power under the original Constitution, but a new and different power of *martial law rule* under the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The original borrowing power is only solvent when the credit of the United States is intact. Section 4 of the Fourteenth Amendment confers authority beyond that known to the borrowing power of Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 which is obvious since it also relates to the validity of the public debt and consequently borrowing to create that debt.

In reference to the federal and national characters of the U.S. Government, Justice Bradley says "*it is a national power that prevents the States from seceding from the Union.*" (*Ibid. at 555*). When this power is exercised in prevention of insurrection (as in the Civil War), it is a national power, and any powers implied by its exigencies are also national powers. In this case, we are clearly talking about the national power of *martial law*.

The Fourteenth Amendment is an extension of national military powers presently used in a municipal character and enforced by municipal laws, stretched far beyond their original limitations and enforced in Article I Tribunals. See the discussion of Section Five of the Fourteenth, (*infra.*) concerning Article I Tribunals.

The court even had the nerve to go to the taxing power of Congress to draw certain implications about Congress' power. We know the lawful bounds of the taxing power originally conferred are "*uniformity*" and "*apportionment.*" Ben Franklin referred to paper money as imposing "*a kind of imperceptible tax*". (See "*Concurring Opinion*" of Justice Bradley, Legal Tender Cases /). *Without the Fourteenth Amendment, how would such taxation be lawful?* Don't forget the Fourteenth Amendment is considered the last word on the subjects with which it deals.

In 1884, the case of Julliard v. Greenman / again raised the legal tender issue. Up to this point, no one mentioned the Fourteenth Amendment in legal tender litigation (*at least as far as we have found*). Twenty-six years after the Fourteenth Amendment, the *Plaintiff in Error* in Julliard v. Greenman finally makes reference to it:

"The forced loans of 1862 and 1863, in the form of legal tender notes, were vital forces in the struggle for national supremacy. They formed a part of the public debt of the United States, the validity of which is solemnly established by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution."
Julliard v. Greenman, 110 US 432.

The Fourteenth Amendment was further alluded to by the *Plaintiff in Error*:

"The question of the constitutionality of an act of Congress, as well as the question of its construction, must be considered in the light of the history of the time when it was enacted."
Julliard v. Greenman, 110 US 430.

Is this also not true of an Amendment to the Constitution?

"And whenever the power sought to be exercised depends, or must be predicated, upon a given state of facts, the existence of the power is a judicial question to be determined upon the facts."

Ibid.

And, after alluding to cases which support this principle in development of the martial law jurisdiction (*wherein the law of the Fourteenth Amendment lies*); he goes on to say:

"The same doctrine is maintained in the Slaughter-House Cases. / "

Ibid.

The Slaughter-House cases are adjudications of civil rights protected by the Fourteenth Amendment, and are consistent with the other cases cited by the *Plaintiff in Error*.

Then at the end of the page 430, the truth really comes out:

"The exercise of jurisdiction by a court or a legislature assumes the existence of the jurisdiction in the tribunal or body exercising it."

Ibid.

What is really being said here? The Fourteenth Amendment has been here, and the Congress has been allowed to exercise jurisdiction under it for some 26 years, therefore, it must be assumed to exist. Even the court upheld this jurisdiction in the Slaughter-House cases, there is no inconsistency here.

It appears that the *Plaintiff in Error* in Julliard understood exactly what he was talking about, especially when he says the Fourteenth Amendment makes the public debt unquestionable in the same argument.

Of course, the Julliard court again gives the same arguments in favor of legal tender notes, (*as had been given in the past*). Again, this argument seems to be lacking in something to give it validity. A close look at the *Opinion* again reveals the court alluding to the principles of the Fourteenth Amendment to uphold its position and Justice Field "*Dissents*" with the same argument as he, and his like minded Associates had used in the past, still failing to convince the majority of the court.

These, the arguments of Justice Field (*and many more arguments*) have been offered against paper money. Consistently, these arguments have met with little success even when they are valid arguments under the original Constitution of the United States.

The problem is that Congress has claimed a new power through the Fourteenth Amendment. We have been missing the point all along. Our attention has been focused upon the original Constitution and away from those Amendments that are designed to destroy our original concept of government. By Amendment, it is said: "*The validity of the public debt . . . shall not be questioned*". If no one is allowed to question the public debt, then how can anyone question the "*Notes*" representing that debt or the enactments of the legislature forcing us to accept it. We can not even question Congress' adoption of the immoral principle of "*I'd rather owe you than cheat you out of it*".

From this we see that the only reason for this Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment was to (*ex post facto*) give validity to "*Martial Law Acts*" (*not authorized by the Constitution*) and to prevent the people from contesting those unauthorized "*Acts*" of martial law.

Why have we not been able to prevent the increase of the national debt? Because, we have no right to question the validity of the debt in court as long as the Fourteenth Amendment is considered to be a valid Amendment to the Constitution, (*which it isn't*). First, we must attack the Fourteenth Amendment as "*unconstitutional*" before any of the otherwise valid arguments against paper money will have any effect. We have not been making the wrong arguments, we just haven't directed them against the perversions of our organic law.

Why do we have the *Federal Reserve Corporation*? If the Congress is claiming a power to create an unquestionable public debt, then they will also claim the right to exercise that power through any agent they wish, especially when that agent simplifies the process of imposing the debt and increasing it. Congress may claim this power under guise of the "necessary and proper" Clause of Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, but all of us will know that the power actually lies under the Fourteenth Amendment, Section Five, "*the power to enforce this Amendment by appropriate legislation.*"

The Civil War Congress not only wanted to protect the "Greenbacks" in circulation after the Civil War, but it wanted to make provision for a new and increasing debt. Notice the words: "*including debts incurred . . . in suppressing insurrection and rebellion...*". Had Congress only intended to protect the "Greenbacks" of the Civil War, these would have been the only debts protected. Instead, the Congress also included the public debt (*in general*) allowing the inclusion of any debt enacted by Congress. If you wish to study the Legal Tender Cases further, here are some authorities:

Houston v. Moore, (1820) 18 U.S. (5 Wheat.) 1, 49; 5 L.Ed. 19.

Briscoe v. Bank of Commonwealth of Kentucky, (1837)

36 U.S (11 Pet.) 257, 9 L.Ed. 709.

Lick v. Faulkner, (1864) 25 Cal. 405.

Thorington v. Smith, (1868) 8 Wall. 1 (supra.).

Veazie Bank v. Fenno, (1869) 75 U.S. (8 Wall.) 533; 19 L.Ed. 482.

Legal Tender Cases, (1870) 12 Wall. 457, (supra.).

Legal Tender Case, (1884) 110 U.S. 421, (supra.).

It is clear from these cases that the Fourteenth Amendment is a continuation of military power (*martial law*) exercised by Congress during the Civil War and that paper money (*legal tender*) is martial law money.

As previously stated in this exposé, we will continue to dissect the Fourteenth Amendment, with a view to its legal effects, sentence by sentence, continuing with the remaining portion of Section Four and going on through Section Five.

Let us go to the next portion of the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment and see what relation it has to the first portion and the money issues we have faced.

"But neither the United States nor any state shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States. . ."

One of the obvious intentions of these words, was to prevent the southern States from paying (*and their creditors from collecting*) debts incurred through participation in the Civil War. Thus, all those persons who had become the creditors to the southern States were deprived of property without due process of law. Such a deprivation of property by "*Legislative Act*" constitutes a "*Bill of Attainder*" and in its lesser form, a "*Bill of Pains and Penalties.*" Congress, as well as the States, are prohibited from passing such "*Acts*" in Article I, Sections 9 and 10 of the United States Constitution. Further more, the "*Act*" is an "*ex post facto law*" punishing the act committed with a law enacted after commission of the act.

This being true, *how could power be claimed by Congress to amend the Constitution in this manner? And how could the State legislatures claim the power to ratify such an Amendment?*

This portion of the Fourth Section of the Fourteenth Amendment also acts as an "*Indemnification Act*" for the United States by making it impossible for any one to lay claims for the destruction committed by the armies of the United States while enforcing *martial law* upon the southern States.

The final portion of the Fourth Section casts light on the money issue previously discussed as well as the issues of the aforementioned paragraph.

"But neither the United States nor any state shall assume or pay . . . any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void."

The enactment of Congress forcing the emancipation of the slaves, was a great loss of property to those who held them in subjection. The first emancipation of slaves was ordered by Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln, President, acting as Commander-in-Chief of the military forces of the United States (*and was later claimed to be made perpetual by the Thirteenth Amendment*). By operation of these enactments, property was taken and no compensation was offered and military force was used to enforce this deprivation of property. "Emancipation" was born out of martial law and survives under the power of martial law today.

The fourth Article in Amendment makes such an unreasonable seizure of property (*seizure of property without warrant issued upon "Oath" or "Affirmation"*) unconstitutional and prohibits Congress from legislating to this end. Similarly, the Constitutions of the States disable the State legislatures in the same respect. Neither the Congress nor the State legislatures had power to pass such legislation, whether in the form of an Amendment or a Statute.

In addition, the fifth Article in Amendment prohibits the taking of property for public use without compensation and further prohibits the taking of property without due process of law. "Due process of law" requires a trial by jury in civil cases at common-law (*seventh Article in Amendment*) and an indictment and speedy public trial by an impartial jury of the State and District wherein the crime shall have been committed, and etc., with the right to subpoena witnesses and face your accusers in criminal cases (*sixth Article in Amendment*). Clearly, the members of Congress knew that they could not prevent claims "for the loss or emancipation of any slaves" from being successful in southern Courts. Also, the members of Congress clearly knew that southern Juries would uphold claims against the United States as well as the Confederate States for debts incurred and damages done by the Civil War. Instead of facing this fact, the members of Congress chose to usurp the law that would be enforced by Juries, that is, the *Common-Law*.

Moreover, the States are prohibited from passing any law violating the "*Obligation of Contracts*" (Article I, Section 10, Constitution for the United States of America). Everyman who holds property lawfully acquired usually has a "*Bill of Sale*" evidencing the transfer of ownership rights. The "*Bill of Sale*" is an executed Contract, and as such, is one of the few Contracts that has real standing at law.

The courts of equity may "void" a Contract for "fraud" and other similar conditions; but no one has any power or right to interfere with valid Contracts and the property rights acquired under them. If the State can pass no such law, and the Constitution and its Amendments are law; from whence did the power come for the State legislatures to ratify such an Amendment? *Martial Law* is the only answer.

As a result of this Section of the Fourteenth Amendment, litigation arose concerning confederate currency. The adjudication of these cases is of importance to our understanding of the issues concerning paper money. The confederate currency bears similarities to the Federal Reserve Note of today that cannot be ignored.

Many have said that the use of Federal Reserve Notes gives rise to jurisdiction over the transaction for which they were used. The confederate currency (*being designed by the southern States for all transactions therein* [although never made a legal tender]) was considered to be: ". . . a currency imposed upon the community by irresistible force." [Branch v. Haas /]. In Thorington v. Smith / the supreme court said:

"They have no necessary relations to the hostile government, whether invading or insurgent. They are transactions in the ordinary course of civil society, and though they may indirectly and remotely promote the ends of the unlawful government, are without blame, except when proved to have been entered into with actual intent to further invasion or insurrection."

This is also true of *Federal Reserve Notes* which are imposed by irresistible force on the normal course of life and business. Even more so, since the *Federal Reserve Notes* were declared "legal tender" from June 5, 1933 (*as were their predecessors, the "Greenbacks"*).

In the same case, the court said:

"We cannot doubt that such contracts should be enforced in the courts of the United States after restoration of peace, to the extent of their just obligation."

Ibid.

See also, 9 Fed. Stat. Anno. 237.

Many have contested the obligations of private contracts on the basis of unlawful issuance of credit or the medium of exchange designated in the Contract. We have (*through such Contracts*) obtained "substance" with the credit issued (*which indicates that a just obligation arose out of them*). We will find ourselves hard pressed to abrogate such Contracts merely on the basis of currency designated:

"Transaction between individuals, which would be legal and binding under ordinary circumstances, cannot be pronounced illegal and of no obligation because done in conformity with laws enacted or directions given by the usurping power. Between these extremes of lawful and unlawful there is a large variety of transactions to which it is difficult to apply strictly any general rule; but it may be safely said that transactions of the usurping authority, prejudicial to the interests of citizens of other states excluded by the insurrection and by the policy of the national government from the care and oversight of their own interests within the states in rebellion cannot be upheld in the courts of that government."

So, only those transactions which are specifically intended to support the usurping power would be considered to have any connection with the usurpation. In the meantime, those transactions (*private in nature*) only made according to irresistible forces imposed upon the parties are without blame of the parties and binding to their just value.

The bottom line is - the money issue is a very weak, if not a non-existent argument in relation to private Contracts. The Constitution applies to governments interaction with the citizen, but not to citizens interaction with one another. The use of the *Federal Reserve Notes* (*imposed upon us by irresistible force*) does not give rise to blame or attachment to the usurping authority.

Although there may be one exception in the case of "Contracts" adjudicated in State courts. Under Article I, Section 10, Constitution for the United States of America, "*no state shall make any Thing but gold and silver a tender in payment of debt*" and therefore, it is doubtful that the State courts would have jurisdiction to enforce the Contracts (*in the case were "Contracts" make something other than "gold" or "silver" a tender in payment in debt*). Consequently, the State court could adjudicate the Obligation of the Contract for *Federal Reserve Notes*, but could not make a Judgment in that medium. This situation creates an interesting paradox when you demand that a State court define the medium of exchange in a Judgment on a (*so-called*) private Contract written in terms of legal tender.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT - SECTION FIVE

The final section of the Fourteenth Amendment (*as reported in the reprints of the United States Constitution*) claims to authorize:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5,

United States Constitution.

From the words: "*of this article*" it would appear to have little meaning. But an understanding of this Section will lead us to a greater understanding of this Amendment's repugnance to the original United States Constitution. We will also see its repugnance to the Constitutions of the several States and the incompetence of the legislative bodies which claimed authority to ratify it.

We know that this provision is identical to Section Two of the Thirteenth Amendment (*which is also of martial law origin*). The import of Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment, while being similar to Section Two of the Thirteenth Amendment in some respects, is much different in other respects. The reason is that the power Clause of each Amendment (*while conducive to the same end*) put different powers into force, and when put into force, they apply to different objects.

The Thirteenth Amendment was specially designed to operate directly against the Citizen holding Negroes in subjection. It directly removed property, or property rights, from the hands of the Citizen mentioned in the Preamble to the United States Constitution. As a result, the Thirteenth Amendment is construed to operate against individuals (*in general*) as is legislation made in pursuance thereof. This is not the case with the Fourteenth Amendment.

"We must not forget that the province and scope of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments are different; the former simply abolished slavery; the latter prohibited the status from abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; from depriving them of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and from denying to any the equal protection of the laws. The amendments are different, and the powers of Congress under them are different. What Congress has power to do under one, it may not have power to do under the other. Under the Thirteenth Amendment, it has only to do with slavery and its incidents. Under the Fourteenth Amendment, it has power to counteract and render nugatory all state laws and proceedings which have the effect to abridge any of the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, or to deprive them of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny any of them the equal protection of the laws. Under the Thirteenth Amendment, the legislature, so far as necessary or proper to eradicate all forms and incidents of slavery and involuntary servitude, may be direct and primary, operating upon the acts of individuals, whether sanctioned by state legislation or not; under the Fourteenth, as we have already shown, it must necessarily be, and can only be, corrective in its character, addressed to counteract and afford relief against state regulations or proceedings." Civil Rights Cases, (1883) 109 U.S. 3, 23; 3 S.Ct. 18; 27 L.Ed. 835.

The Fourteenth Amendment operates against the States as a whole, that is, either against the different branches of state government, or the people (*sovereign body*) of each State, as a whole, when acting in their sovereign or legislative political capacity to create or enforce State law.

Considering that Congress' powers are enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Constitution for the United States of America, it is reasonable to assume that Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment is intended to give Congress new powers or to extend some existing power beyond the limits established by the original Constitution. In reference to the Fourteenth Amendment, the supreme court said:

". . . It is the power of Congress which has been enlarged. . . ." Ex Parte, Virginia, (1879) 100 US 339, 344; 25 L.Ed. 676; 9 Fed. Stat. Anno. 634.

Not only did the supreme court say that Congress' power was enlarged, the supreme court also made it clear that it was only Congress' power that was enlarged and not that of the general government.

"All of the amendments derive much of their force from this latter provision. It is not said that the judicial power of the general government shall extend to enforce the prohibitions and to protecting the rights and immunities guaranteed." Ex Parte, Virginia, (1879) 100 US 339, 344; 25 L.Ed. 676; Stat. Anno. 634.

This raises a peculiar question in relation to this claimed expansion of power on the part of Congress. *If the judicial power is not expanded by this provision, then, is a court (upon whom Congress confers jurisdiction) exercising "judicial power" or the power of the Congress when adjudicating Civil Rights cases? Any "so-called" court that enforces legislation under an Amendment with this (or a similar power Clause) is proceeding as an Article I legislative Tribunal of Congress, not as an Article III Judicial Court of the Constitution.*

We know from the Internal Revenue Code, Sec. 7441 that the U.S. Tax Court is what is known as an Article I (*legislative*) Court (*tribunal*).

"There is hereby established, under Article I of the Constitution of the United States, a court of record to be known as the United States Tax Court. The members of the Tax Court shall be the chief judge and the judges of the Tax Court."

26 U.S.C. 7441

We also know that an Article III court, that is, a court that actually exercises the judicial powers vested by Article III, can be created by Congress and vested with purely judicial power.

Here we see that Congress exercises the power to create two different kinds of courts, however, only one is vested with the judicial powers known to Article III of the U.S. Constitution. *How do these courts differ? And what power does an Article I Court depend upon or exercise?*

Once Congress has created an Article III court (*and vested it with specific jurisdiction*), it becomes independent of Congress. Its judges have perpetual term of office as long as they are in good behavior (Article III, Section 1) and its Judges may only be removed from office by impeachment (Article II, Section 4). The Judges of an Article III court may not have their compensation diminished during their term of office (Article III, Section 1). It is only the courts with these attributes which actually can exercise the judicial power of Article III of the U.S. Constitution and it is only these courts which can truly operate within the doctrine of separation of powers, a doctrine indispensable to our republican form of government. [Northern Pipe v. Marathon Pipe].

Since the Officers of an Article III court may act without retribution for their actions, the court has both the power and the duty to lay statutory law next to the Constitution and see if the latter squares with the former, and if the statutory law does not conform to the Constitution it must be declared "null" and "void." [Marbury v. Madison]. This being the attributes of an Article III court, the same must have been created by the power granted in Article III.

"The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in ... such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

Article III, Section 1, Const. for U.S. of A.

The words of this Clause give the courts thereunder the attribute of permanence by the words "*ordained and established*", that is, these courts have a fixed character and they are as perpetual as the Union itself.

How does an Article I court differ in character when compared to an Article III court? And does an Article I court exercise the lawful judicial power of the United States?

Article I contains another reference to Congress' power concerning what appear to be courts:

"The Congress shall have power . . . to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9, Const. for U.S. of A.

Notice the difference in wording between the Clause of Article I and the Clause of Article III. The latter makes reference to "*courts*" (inferior) to the "*supreme court*" while the former refers to "*Tribunals*" inferior to the "*Supreme Court*." Article III lays certain requirements on tenure of office, etc., while Article I lays no such requirements. So, in Article I we see the raw power of Congress (*without respect to the limitations the Constitution*) places upon the Article III judicial powers. When that power (*judicial power*) is exercised within the confines of Article III, it is said that the court created is a judicial body exercising a power separate from the legislature (*which is the judicial power conferred and limited by Article III*). It should be noted that as Article I makes reference to "*Tribunals*" inferior to the Supreme Court, the "*Supreme Court*" of Article I must also be a "*Tribunal*" and thus is not the same "*supreme court*" of that in Article III.

It is interesting to note that the Federal Statutes Annotated, Volume 8, p. 633 (*indiscussing Article I, Section 8, Clause 9*) only makes mention of Congress' power under Article I being used within the confines of Article III, that is, up to 1864.

Yet, today, we have Tribunals known as Article I courts. It would seem logical then to deduce that in 1864 (*or some time thereafter*) Congress' power was extended in such a manner as to allow Tribunals to be created by the raw power of Congress without Article III limitations (*and without the necessity of Article III altogether*). The Fourteenth Amendment was allegedly ratified on July 9, 1868. In 1879, the Supreme Court ruled that only Congress' power was extended by the Amendment (14th).

In relation to the Tax Court, Congress was allegedly vested with extended power in the area of taxation (Sixteenth Amendment), and consequently we have an Article I court with relation to the tax imposed under that Amendment.

Another point must be looked at in reference to these questions. Congress has exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia:

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may ... become the Seat of the Government of the United States . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, Const. for U.S. of A.

But this is not the power that is exercised by Congress under *Martial Law Rule* of the Civil War Amendments

Congress also claims the power to legislate, in certain cases, by implication of powers specifically granted:

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper in Execution of the foregoing power, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Const. for U.S. of A.

This also is not the power exercised by Congress under the *martial law rule* of the Civil War Amendments. This Clause requires legislation to be both "*necessary*" and "*proper*." The wording of Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (*requiring Congress legislation to be "proper"*) leaves it in the hands of the judicial power to determine whether Congress action is "*constitutional*." On the other hand, the wording of the power Clauses of the Civil War Amendments (*requiring "appropriate" legislation to enforce the Amendments*) leaves it in the hands of Congress to determine what legislation is "*appropriate*" as a political consideration. Consequently, the courts of judicial power are prevented from determining the constitutionality of Congress' action under these power Clauses because judicial Courts have always claimed they cannot decide political questions without violating the separation of powers. Therefore, without challenging validity of the entire Amendment, we cannot challenge the Constitutional validity of any "*Act*" of Congress under the Amendment having this type of power Clause.

Taking all this into consideration (*along with the alleged extension of solely Congressional power authorized by Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment*) it could only be deduced that an Article I court, (*created under this power*) exercises legislative rather than judicial power. Remember, the power of the judiciary was not extended by Section Five.

If an Article I court exercises only legislative power, then these courts apparently do not have the power (*as does the Article III court*) to lay a legislative enactment next to the Constitution and declare its validity or invalidity. This is the design of the Civil War Amendments and any other Amendment with a similar power Clause. Being in exercise of merely legislative power, the Article I court (*tribunal*) must follow the dictates of the legislature (*Congress*) and no other, because it is merely an extension of the legislature.

How many times have you heard of Tax Court cases when the Tax Court has said either, *the Constitution is inapplicable*, or that a *claim of Constitutional limitations is frivolous*? This alone supports the aforementioned proposition.

This indicates, in the area of the Thirteenth (*and subsequent Amendments*), that all power exercised under them is "*legislative*" and any body that exercises powers similar to those of Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment, are merely extensions of the legislature.

Now we see why the supreme court refers to the power Clause as an enlargement of power rather than a creation of new power. It is an enlargement because the extension of *martialpower* is used in conjunction with previous powers initially conferred upon Congress.

Going back to Congress' power under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; look at what the government's own Publication says in relation to the judiciary in the District of Columbia.

"In the District of Columbia there is no division of powers between the general and local government. Congress has the entire control over the District for every purpose of government, and in organizing a judicial department, all judicial power necessary for the purpose of the government may be vested in the courts of justice of the District."

8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 659.

All judicial power? This conveys the fact the Congress may create courts in the District of Columbia under authority of Article I without reference to Article III (*or any other provision of the original Constitution*). So called Article I courts are "*Tribunals*."

Congress has followed a similar scheme in the case of national Article I Tribunals and in the case of vesting Article III courts with the power of Article I Tribunals. This is why there has been some confusion. Some people believe the Congress has expanded its jurisdiction over the District of Columbia and its territories beyond the limitations of the Constitution into the several States. But this is in error. Congress has expanded its jurisdiction through the power of *Martial Law* and created a whole new venue, a regional venue. This is what "*regionalism*" is all about:

"The general restrictions of the Constitution which govern the exercise of jurisdiction by the courts of the United States within the several states of the Union have no operation in the District of Columbia, and the conditions of jurisdiction existing in the District make the provisions of section 1 of the Act of 1887, defining the jurisdiction of the circuit courts in districts within the several states, plainly inapplicable. General provisions of an Act of Congress not locally applicable are controlling under the provisions of Sec. 93, Rev. Stat. D.C."

Gilford Granite Co. v. Harrison Granite Co.,
23 App. Cas. (DC) 22 (1903).

Under the authority of Congress to make "*municipal law*" for the District of Columbia, Congress need not hold to the Constitution (*as it must with respect to the several States*) nor (*it appears*) even to the doctrine of "*separation of powers*" (*which is inapplicable in the District of Columbia*). A similar scheme is followed in the case of *Martial Law* "*regionalism*" (*again creating the aforesaid confusion*), the difference being that judicial courts are prevented from questioning the "*Acts*" of Congress under *Martial Rule* while in the District of Columbia (*the judicial courts had the power to determine whether Congress had exceeded the limits of authority related to the District of Columbia*).

We know that the Fourteenth Amendment interferes with the sovereignty the several States retained prior to its alleged ratification. If this was a mere expansion of municipal power of the District of Columbia, the judicial courts would be able to adjudicate the constitutionality of the expansion of venue and jurisdiction. But this is not the case. The Fourteenth Amendment places prohibitions upon the States that never existed before (*without reference to the District of Columbia or other territory of the United States*) which said prohibitions encroach upon State sovereignty:

"The prohibitions of the Fourteenth Amendment are directed to the states and they are to a degree restrictions of state power."

9 Fed. Stat. Anno. 631.

Congress' power allegedly was extended into State sovereignty. *Was Congress' municipal authority over the District of Columbia extended into these several States to create Article I courts in the States to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment?* The power exercised is purely "*legislative*," not judicial, but it is not the power over the District of Columbia, it is national *martial law* power, (*not limited by Constitutional provisions related to the District of Columbia or other territory appertaining to the United States*).

It's unquestionable that Congress conferred jurisdiction on the courts of the United States to hear Civil Rights cases. The power exercised (*being purely Congressional*) by any court which exercises jurisdiction pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment, acts as an Article I Tribunal. You might say: "*But Article III courts were vested with this (civil rights) jurisdiction.*" That may be true, but when an Article III court exercises "*legislative power*," it must act as a legislative Tribunal and is reduced to an Article I Tribunal for the adjudication of such cases.

Either the Tribunal exercises the power of the legislature or it exercises the power of the judiciary as a court. The body (*tribunal or court*) cannot exercise both "*legislative*" and "*judicial powers*" simultaneously under the original Constitution and since only the power of Congress is allegedly enlarged by Section Five of the Fourteenth Amendment, a "*Tribunal*" cannot exercise both powers under this Clause either.

Who can claim these Fourteenth Amendment protections and through whom is this national martial law power of Congress extended into the several States?

"Until some state law has been passed, or some state action through its officers or agents has been taken, adverse to the rights of citizens sought to be protected by the Fourteenth Amendment, no legislation of the United States under said amendment, nor any proceeding under such legislation, can be called into activity;... the amendment was intended to provide against ... state laws or state action of some kind, adverse to the rights of the citizen secured by the amendment."

Civil Rights Cases, (1883) 109 U.S. 3, 13,
3 S.Ct. 18, 27 L.Ed. 835;
9 Fed. Stat. Anno. 631.

"*Non-whites*" are protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. Therefore, Congress found these "*persons*" a fit instrument for spreading their *Martial Law* jurisdiction throughout the several States. The unfortunate part of this "*for persons of color*" is that they have been led to believe they are allowed to access the judicial power of the United States when the truth is that they have only been allowed to access the arbitrary power of Congress under the Civil War Amendments. This is why "*persons of color*" in the United States continue to feel that they have no rights, because they have no independent judicial power to protect them.

Thus, Congress legislates between two or more races. A nation is a race or viceversa (**Title: "Nation"**, Webster's Dictionary [1828]). Congress' legislation then is based on principles of "*international law*," and therefore is a form of international law for all intents and purposes. "*Martial law*" and "*international law*" work well together for Congressional purposes because they do not respect the authority of the Common-Law.

The exercise of *Martial Law* jurisdiction within the several States, is the usurpation of the Common Law and subjects the sovereign body (*white Citizenry*) to a jurisdiction that has no right to exist within the States.

Furthermore, since the Amendment (14th) only can invoke Congress' power (*when involving those intended to be protected thereby, such as the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments*), white Citizens have no rights to sue under this Amendment.

There is, of course, one exception to this rule. If a white Citizen acquires the same legal status (*artificial character*) as those protected by the Amendment (*through the operation of some statutory law of Congress*), then said white Citizen may be brought within the venue of the Amendment as a statutory (*juristic*) person. By this means, white Citizens' birthrights become of no effect and their rights are reduced to the inferior character of statutory Civil Rights (*mere legislative privileges*).

It must be remembered that the white Citizen obtaining this status will also be "*subjecto the jurisdiction thereof*" (*of the United States Congress*) and can legally be regulated by the laws Congress passed under its *Martial Law* authority. Here the extension of municipal laws of Congress outside the boundaries set by the U.S. Constitution is complete. By this contrivance (*and others emanating from the Fourteenth Amendment*), the States have been reduced to mere administrative arms and provisional appendages of Congress and Congress' power has been extended to include the entirety of the United States.

The difference between the white man holding citizenship intact according to the Preamble of the United States Constitution (and all others who claim protection under the Fourteenth Amendment), is the difference between a natural birthright known to the Common-Law (or privilege, or immunity, guaranteed by the original Constitution) and a "so called" right, privilege, or immunity, created by the Constitution and Statute (a privilege or immunity that never before existed for the party upon whom it was conferred by statute). The supreme court has recognized that Congress may protect both:

"A right or an immunity, whether created by the Constitution or only guaranteed by it, even without an express delegation of power, may be protected by Congress."

Strauder v. West Virginia, (1879) 100 US 303, 310, 25 L.Ed. 664
reversing State v. Strauder, (1877) 11 W.Va. 745.

But we would venture to say that a Citizen will find more protection in a "natural right" than a "privilege" conferred by Congress. The institution of government was inherently for the protection of natural rights (Preamble - U.S. Const.), while the granting of a privilege is merely at the tolerance of the sovereign body that created government and at the tolerance of the government the sovereign body created. The main point is, the courts have recognized that there are both "natural rights" and those "so called" rights artificially created by law (privileges).

In fact, State common law (natural rights) seem to receive no protection. It should also be noted that where a State government has agreed to usurp its sovereign body (freewhite State Citizens) and show itself disloyal to them by passing legislation in conformance with the Fourteenth Amendment, Congress' power is extinguished. In this relation, the U.S. supreme court said:

"When the state has been guilty of no violation of its provisions; when it has not made or enforced any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; when no one of its departments has deprived any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or denied to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws; when on the contrary, the laws of the state, are enacted by its legislative, and construed by its judicial, and administered by its executive departments recognize and protect the rights of all persons, the amendment imposes no duty and confers no power upon Congress."

U.S. v. Harris, (1882) 106 U.S. 629, 632,
1 S.Ct. 601, 27 L.Ed. 290.

In other words, when State *martial law* is imposed within the State to enforce National *martial law*, Congress has no reason to exercise its *martial law* powers.

If a State has conformed to the new *Order*, there is no need for Congress to intervene. And if a white Citizen has not obtained the standing of a former slave by petitioning Congress for admittance to venue and jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment (i.e. *statutory character of "person"*), then Congress has no power over that individual under this Clause (Amend. 14, Sec. 5). /

With all that has been said about the Fourteenth Amendment in this exposé, the ultimate question remains: "*Is the Fourteenth Amendment a part of the United States?*" Or, rather, "*Is it constitutionally a part of our organic law?*"

The original Resolution which proposed the Fourteenth Amendment to the several States legislatures for ratification contained a Clause which does not appear in the reprints of the United States Constitution:

"Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two thirds of both Houses concurring). That the following Article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as a part of the Constitution, namely: - Article XIV . . ."

14 Stat. 358 (1866).

In looking into the Constitutionality of this Amendment (14th), we must look to see who proposed it; who ratified it; and if the power was actually vested in those bodies by the people of the United States of America in national Constitution to lawfully do so.

From the foregoing Preamble to the Resolution proposing the Fourteenth Amendment, we can see that Congress proposed it, and it was intended that the several States legislatures would ratify it.

There is a great deal of recorded history that shows the unscrupulous way in which the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment was achieved. The basic disloyalties, the *martial law*, and political usurpations that took place after the Civil War are revealed by history to be:

- Military occupation of the several southern States under declaration by Congress, that the southern State governments were not valid, even though they had just been allowed to ratify the Thirteenth Amendment;
- Franchisement of non-citizens (*basically Negroes*) into the body politic;
- Disfranchisement of white Citizens (*members of the sovereignty*) from the body politic;
- Institution, through a military government, of predominantly Negro legislatures (*while Negroes were not citizens*); and
- The ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment by these non-citizen legislatures in the southern States, after the lawful legislatures (*which existed prior to military occupation*) had rejected this same Amendment.

There are no doubts that these are the historical facts. Let us now take a look at the legal side of the question.

We know several things about the Fourteenth Amendment in relation to Congress and the prohibitions laid against Congress by the original Constitution for the United States of America, (*including the Bill of Rights*). We know what the Amendment was designed to do and that it does the following things:

- It violates the Preamble, which defines the whole intent of all powers granted to Congress, by introducing a foreign member into the sovereign body.
- It is an "*ex post facto law*" punishing *Southerners* in many ways for acts not necessarily illegal at the time of their commission.
- It is a "*bill of attainder*" (*in its lesser form of a "bill of pains and penalties"*) depriving all southern slave holders of property without trial.
- It deprived *Southerners* of property by unreasonable seizure and without just compensation, bringing Congress beyond limitations set out by the Fourth and Fifth Articles in Amendment (Bill of Rights).
- It lays prohibitions upon the States beyond those known to the original Constitution of the United States and makes inroads upon the Constitutions of the several States, encroaching upon sovereignty belonging to the people of the several States which is prohibited by the Tenth Article in Amendment (Bill of Rights).
- It created purely legislative "*Tribunals*" without respect to the separation of powers.
- It extended Congress' "*martial law power*" allowing the emission of "*bill of credit*" and etc..
- The list is too long to completely enumerate. (*Refer back within this exposé to list more Constitutional violations*)

We know that the United States government is one of enumerated powers only, and that specific prohibitions were placed on those powers by Article I, Section 9 and the Articles of the Bill of Rights (as well as other provisions of the United States Constitution).

Of course, the main points we are interested in are the prohibitions laid on Congress. Congress has no power to pass any "bill of attainder" or "ex post facto law" to make law which unreasonably deprives a Citizen of "property" or deprives the Citizen of "security in his person or effects;" to encroach upon a State's sovereignty retained at the adoption of the United States Constitution, or to make any law taking property for public use without just compensation.

The fact is, Congress exceeded the powers granted to it and violated prohibitions laid against it (in several areas) and had absolutely no right, power, or authority to propose such legislation and could only claim an exception through a similarly unlawful Act, the Second Section of the Thirteenth Amendment. Thus we find that we will have to show the Thirteenth Amendment to be invalid and unconstitutional, and in fact, not a part of the Constitution in order to judicially destroy the Fourteenth Amendment (at least with respect to the power of Congress as regards the proposing the Fourteenth Amendment).

But now let us take into consideration who actually claimed the power to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment, the State legislatures. We know everyone in government claims the Fourteenth Amendment is a part of the Constitution because it was ratified according to the provisions of Article V of the original U.S. Constitution which says that three fourths of the legislatures may ratify an Amendment to the Constitution and thus make the Amendment part of the organic law, *but can the legislatures of the several States constitutionally make ratifications in all instances?*

According to the principles upon which our form of government is founded and considering who originally ratified the Constitution, the answer to this question must be in the "negative" as a matter of law. We start to see the evidence in the law immediately with Article V of the Constitution for the United States of America.

". . . Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner effect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate."

Article V, Const. for U.S. of A..

Here we see two specific exceptions to the law of Amendment contained in Article V. Many times, the courts have ruled that when specific exemption is provided in the Constitution, that none other exists. In this case, that construction will not properly apply, especially since those exceptions applied both to the State legislature and Conventions of People of the several States.

When the construction of the Constitution is doubtful or the language ambiguous, resort may be made to other portions of the Constitution and finally to the "Convention Notes" and the "Federalist Papers." Article V contains two methods of amending the Constitution;

". . . by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress: . . ."

Article V, Const. for U.S. of A.

Why were the two modes of ratification provided for? Is it possible that cases might arise where it was absolutely necessary for Conventions of the several States to ratify an Amendment instead of the several State legislatures? And if an Amendment required ratification by Conventions of the people of the several States, could Congress expect a lawful and constitutional ratification from the legislatures of the several States? Furthermore, even if Congress could recommend either mode of ratification, could the State legislatures lawfully and constitutionally make this ratification when it affected the Constitution of the State which created them? These are valid and important questions which must be answered as a matter of, and according to law, (in relation to Article V and the two modes of ratification). These questions consequently leave the language of Article V in somewhat of an ambiguous state.

To find the answer to these important questions, we will start at the beginning, the creation of our government. Justice Taney in Dred Scott v. Sandford / relates the history of the beginning of our government and the meaning of the Preamble to the United States Constitution. Therein we find (*as we do in the words of the Preamble*) that the sovereign people ("*WethePeople*") adopted [*ratified*] the Constitution and it was on their authority (*as the sovereign bodies, in their respective States*) that the General Government was formed (*and that it was formed for their protection, as well as the protection of their posterity*).

Some might say that the Constitution for the United States of America could as easily have been ratified by the legislatures of the several States; but if this is true, why does history (*as well as the Constitution*) reflect that it was ratified by the people in Conventions of the several States instead? The fact is, the legislatures of the several States had no lawful authority to ratify the United States Constitution. The Convention related the legal reason why the Constitution had to be ratified by the people instead of the legislatures. The following remarks were made with reference to Article VII, Constitution for the United States of America.

"... Madison thought them essential and remarked that otherwise in cases of conflicts between laws of the States and of Congress, the courts of the former might decide in favor of their own laws; and he remarked further that it might be asserted that the Union was a mere treaty among independent States, and therefore a breach of any one article absolved the other parties from the whole obligation,"
8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 243.

Here, Madison thought the people's ratification necessary to the supremacy Clause of Article VI. Knowing this, (*contrary to the ruling of the supreme court of the United States in Neal v. Delaware /*), the supremacy Clause of the national Constitution could not be applied the Amendments which made inroads into the Constitutions of the several States (*and which were only ratified by State legislatures*).

Question: "*Is this why the several States have been coerced to amend their own Constitutions consistent with national martial law Amendments?*"

Question: "*Is this why the provisional States, such as the provisional State of Washington, were induced into placing a provision in the (so-called) State Constitution making the United States Constitution the Supreme Law of the Land?*" [*Washington Constitution (1889), Article I, Section 2.*]

If the State Constitutions declare the national Constitution "*supreme*," then the supremacy Clause of the national Constitution will not come into play in adjudication's concerning the Civil War Amendments (*and like Amendments*).

If the State Constitutions adopt the provisions that are consistent with the Civil War Amendments (*and like Amendments*) then, again, the application of supremacy Clause of the national Constitution will not be questioned concerning conflicts of law between the States and the United States, because there will be no conflict of law. Later in the Convention:

"Governour Morris argued that, as no alteration could be made under the Confederation without unanimous consent, and change in the proposed Constitution not made in accordance with this provision, must be held void by the judges as unconstitutional, if the reference would be made to the legislatures; while, if the reference should be made to the people of the United States, the federal compact may be altered by a majority of them."
8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 243.

Morris understood that the people were sovereign above the several State legislatures. Finally, Madison made the most important legal argument showing that the States legislatures were incompetent to ratify the Constitution for the United States of America and this argument still applies today.

"Madison thought the legislatures clearly incompetent, for the very changes proposed would make essential inroads on the State Constitutions, and a legislature cannot change the Constitution under which it exists. The difference between a system founded on the legislature only and one founded on the people is, he said, that between a league or treaty and a Constitution."
8 Fed. Stat. Anno. 243, 244.

While all the other Conventioneers arguments related to the Articles of Confederation, Madison was capable of showing the absolute legal incompetence of the State legislatures to ratify the national Constitution. If a State legislature allows inroads to be made upon the Constitution under which it exists (*by ratification of a national Constitution, much less an Amendment thereto*), it is Constitutionally incompetent to pass upon the legislation. This is consistent with the principles of a Constitutional Republic where the institutions of government cannot change the organic law of the people under which the government legally exists. Only the sovereign body (*the people*) can act upon such legislation because it is "*organic law*" (*extraordinary legislation*), not mere ordinary legislation.

We have seen the inroads that the Fourteenth Amendment made on the Constitutions of the several States, whether they were southern or northern. With the possible exception of one or two States, this Amendment (14th) made inroads into all State Constitutions under which the State legislatures existed when they ratified the Fourteenth Amendment. Here, the reason for two methods of ratification comes to light in the first instance:

It may be said that the "*Notes*" on the Convention are not a reliable source of construction of the Constitution. And in certain cases, this may be true. But not here! The supreme court (as in Dred Scott v. Sandford, / [*supra.*]) has said that legislation most recent to the adoption of the Constitution lays closest to the foundation of the organic law and must be accorded the necessary respect due according to the era of their enactment. Obviously, this is true (*considering that such legislation is contemporary to the organic law*), that is, it is contemporary to a time when the original intent was foremost in the minds of the Officials of government, both State and Federal.

Article V had at least one primary purpose in the Constitution. In the Convention it was agreed that a provision should be made in the Constitution so that the several States might add a Bill of Rights to the U.S. Constitution as a condition of its adoption.

Pursuant to this proposition of the Convention (*and with the understanding that a Bill of Rights could be added*), Conventions of the People of the several States ratified the Constitution and proceeded to propose Articles of the Bill of Rights to be added accordingly.

In the Preamble to the Bill of Rights (*seldom found reprinted in any Constitution, whether printed by the federal government or private parties*), we find the first impression of the several States, as to the purpose of Article V, Constitution for the United States of America.

The Bill of Rights was ratified by the legislatures of the several States; and of this there is no doubt. Obviously, both Congress and the several States legislatures believed they had the power to make the ratification. When we look at the Preamble to the Bill of Rights, we see under what circumstance the power was believed to exist:

"THE Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declarative and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution.

"RESOLVED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, two thirds of the Houses, that the following Articles be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States as Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, all or any of which Articles when ratified by three fourths of the said Legislatures, to be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the said Constitution. vis!

"ARTICLES in addition to, and Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the Legislatures of the several States, pursuant to the fifth Article of the original Constitution."

Preamble to the Bill of Rights, U.S. Constitution.

So the Bill of Rights (*as ratified by the State legislatures*) was ratified with the intention of limiting the federal government to the power granted to it, for the preservation of the powers of these several States and the individual Citizen's natural rights. Here, the legislatures of the several States did not attempt to expand the powers of Congress (*by inroads into their own respective Constitutions*), but, instead, ratified the added assurance that Congress would not usurp

its powers in deprivation of the powers of the several States or the people of the several States respectively. [Articles Nine and Ten in Amendment].

If we read Hans v. Louisiana, / we find that the State legislatures again ratified an Amendment of the United States Constitution with the same purpose, that is the Eleventh Amendment. Not until the Thirteenth Amendment were the powers of Congress so

widely expanded, or for that matter, expanded at all by an alleged Amendment to the Constitution. Going back to the assertions of Madison in the Convention; "*Where did the legislatures of the several States derive power to ratify any Amendment which made inroads into the Constitution under which they existed?*" The power, in itself, would be "*nugatory*."

Obviously, Article V provides for ratification of an Amendment by Conventions of the People of the several States for occasions such as this. In fact, the principles upon which the federal Constitution was founded absolutely demand that such Amendments be ratified by the people rather than the State legislatures. No legislative body has the power to change the organic law and its relation to the sovereign body (*Nation*) that created it. Only the sovereign people, themselves, have the power to add to its members a new class of persons.

As a result, we see that no competent body purposed nor ratified the Fourteenth Amendment (*or any like Amendment affecting the sovereign body*), that said Amendment is not a part of the Constitution for the United States of America, and that the Amendment (*and like Amendments*) are absolutely unconstitutional in this respect. They are not Amendments of our Constitution.

Not only do the Amendments discussed herein (*such as the Fourteenth Amendment*) make inroads into State Constitutions (*especially where the States have a Bill of Rights similar to that of the Constitution for the United States of America*), but the several State legislatures are also prohibited by "*the people*" in the Constitution for the United States of America, itself, from enacting (*ratifying*) such legislation into law.

Article I, Section 10, Constitution for the United States of America, lays prohibitions on the several States (*similar to those laid against the United States government in Article I, Section 9, Constitution for the United States of America*) without further prohibition; the several States have no power to violate the "*Obligations of Contract*" by laws enacted in the State. As we previously discussed, many "*bills of sale*" (*executed Contracts*) that were violated by the Thirteenth Amendment were sanctioned to be violated by adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Not only are the State legislatures prohibited by their own respective State Constitutions from passing such legislation, but they are also prohibited by the Constitution for the United States of America from passing such legislation into law, Organic or otherwise. We find no repeal of those original prohibitions at any time before or after the alleged adoption of the Thirteenth or Fourteenth Amendments.

The bottom line is that the State legislatures were, and are, incompetent to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment for no power of ratification having existed in the bodies to whom it was presented.

Another point to address is the 14th Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America is not an "*Amendment*," it is a "*Revision*."

Case law is evidently unanimous in support of the view that there is a distinction of substance between the concept of "*Amendment*" and "*Revision*" and that some proposed constitutional changes can only be accomplished by revision. / The line between changes which are permissible as "*Amendments*" and those which must necessarily be "*Revisions*" cannot be drawn with precision. In general, changes which are "*few and simple and independent*" can be considered Amendments, whereas "*sweeping change*" requires the Revision process. / The case of McFadden is instructive on the distinction between "*Amendment*" and "*Revision*." Quoting from an earlier case, the McFadden court discussed revisions made by a Convention in which "*the entire sovereignty of the people is represented . . .*" Id. at 789.

"The character and extent of a constitution that may be framed by that body is freed from an limitations other than those contained in the constitution of theUnitedStates. . . the very term 'constitution' implies an instrument of a permanent and abiding nature, and the provisions contained therein for its revision indicated the will of the people that the underlying principles upon which it rests, as well as the substantial entirety of the instrument, shall be of a like permanent and abiding nature. On the other hand, thesignificance of the term 'amendment' implies such an addition or change within the lines of the original instrument as will effect an improvement, or better carry out the purpose for which it was framed." /

McFadden v. Jordan, 196 P.2d 787, 789

The court held that the measure in question was so "*far reaching and multifarious*" that it was revisory rather than amendatory in nature. / The court listed numerous sections of the Constitution which the measure in question would affect. / This review demonstrated:

". . . the wide and diverse range of subject matters proposed to be voted upon, and the revisional effect which it would necessarily have on our basic plan of government. The proposal is offered as a single amendment but it obviously is multifarious. It does not give the people an opportunity to express approval or disapproval severally as to each major change suggested. . . ."

McFadden v. Jordan, 196 P.2d 787, 796-97

In Adams v. Gunter, / the court opined that amendment as distinct from revision authority "*includes only the power to amend any section in such a manner that such Amendment, if approved, would be complete within itself, relate to one subject and not substantially affect any other section of Articles of the Constitution or require further Amendments to the Constitution to accomplish its purpose.*" /

The above authorities quoted merely suggest factors that should be considered in determining whether a proposed constitutional change is "*amendatory*" or "*revisory*." The 14th Amendment addresses multifarious issues ranging from status of citizenship, disqualification of representatives,

taxes, apportionment of representatives, and the debt of the United States. And taking into consideration what we have studied, the 14th Amendment has altered more than one Article of the Constitution for the United States of America.

The bottom line is that Congress was and is incompetent to make "*Revisions*" to the Constitution for the United States of America, that the 14th Amendment is absolutely unconstitutional and therefore "*null and void*" ab initio for no power of "*Revision*" exist in the Congress.

We cannot emphasize enough that, as a matter of law, there is no Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution for the United States and that even if there were, it would have absolutely no lawful application to the individual free white Citizens of the several States.

The Law Martial

Introduction

In this exposé, we have briefed the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution for the United States of America and the powers acquired by Congress thereunder to impose Law Martial upon the States. What most people don't realize is that they have been under Martial Law Rule for over 60 years. /

The case of Ex parte Milligan, / is where our study of the *Law-Martial* begins wherein the United States supreme court lists and explains three forms of Martial-Law. Like it or not, we have to deal with these three forms:

1. Full Martial Law.

2. Martial Law Proper.

3. Martial Law Rule.

Full Martial Law is when a Declaration of Martial Law is issued, and military troops are put in the streets to control a region or district with military force. The federal armed forces with the National Guard are on every street corner enforcing military jurisdiction on every Citizen of the Nation. This form is only supposed to be used when the Nation is at War, a declared War by Congress, and should only be used on foreign soil unless the country is actually invaded by some foreign power or to put down an armed rebellion too large to be dealt with by the civil authorities or powers of our constitutional government.

The first indication of imposition of Full Martial Law (with the exception of the troops actually in the streets wielding their military power), is the suspension of the constitutional civil judicial power to enforce the rights of liberty with the privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus. This is clear from the American Constitutions (both State and federal) which generally provide that this great bulwark of liberty may not be suspended except upon declaration of the legislature that the public safety require it due to rebellion or invasion. [For example, Const. for U.S. of A., Article 1, Section 9, Clause 2.] The cause that allows suspension of the privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus is the only cause for imposition of Full Martial Law.

Martial Law Proper is the law governing the internal operation of the armed forces. It is this law that is followed to control military command of armed forces. For example, it is the law used to enforce an "Order" of a Sergeant upon a Private. It is the law that is enforced by Courts Martial.

Martial-Law Rule is the law of necessity and emergency. This form allows a domestic use of martial law powers, but only for as long as the necessity or emergency exist. The most dangerous thing about this form of Martial Law is that this form of Martial Law is used during times of peace.

Called by some writers on the subject (and termed such by a few Constitutions)-the "Law Martial," this jurisdiction has existed since the United States Constitution was first established. The Congress and the President of the United States have argued since the beginning on how far the Law-Martial power can be exercised by both branches of the government. The United States Constitution and the State Constitutions authorize the power to exist, but they do not necessarily define its proper or legitimate use. Should the Law Martial power be abused by the Executive and/or the Legislative Branches (when the Judicial Branch will not check the abuse of the Law Martial powers), the people (being confused) become alarmed and begin to disobey the Statutes authorized under the powers of the Law Martial.

Any one of the three forms (used strictly for the purpose they were structured for) would be (according to the United States supreme Court) constitutional. It appears that it is the third form of the Law Martial [Martial Law Rule] that could be and is used to destroy the letter and spirit of the original United States Constitution. It is also the third form [Martial Law Rule] that can be administered as to lead the people to believe that the Government is administering constitutional law when in fact, the Government is administering Martial-Law Rule under the appearance of constitutional law.

Try as the government may, the people smell a rat. The "Federal Tax Laws" is the first line of disobedience by the people. The people for the last fifty years have in large numbers disobeyed the tax laws (particularly the "Personal Federal Income Tax") which is claimed by these people to be "un-Constitutional." Many have come forth with their claims to the un-Constitutionality of the tax laws and have failed. Have they failed because they have not understood that the "Federal Personal Income Tax" is within a military venue and is enforced under a Martial Law Jurisdiction? The Government seizes their property without "Court Orders." The Government seizes their bank accounts without "Court Orders" and the Government seizes their wages without "Court Orders." The people just can't seem to grasp the source of power that the Government is exercising. If they read General Order No. 100 by Abraham Lincoln, they will discover the source of their problem.

=====

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE FIELD

The following material is part of *Instructions For The Government of Armies of the United States in the Field*, prepared by Francis Lieber, promulgated as *General Orders No. 100* by President Lincoln, (24 April 1863). *General Orders No. 100* can be found published in the book *The Law of Armed Conflicts, Third Ed.*, Edited by Dietrich Schindler and Jiri Toman, wherein its inclusion was explained as follows:

The Lieber Instructions represent the first attempt to codify the laws of war. They were prepared during the American Civil War by Francis Lieber, then a professor of Columbia College in New York, revised by a board of officers and promulgated by President Lincoln. Although they were binding only on the forces of the United States, they correspond to a great extent to the laws and customs of war existing at that time. The Lieber Instructions strongly influenced the further codification of the laws of war and the adoption of similar regulations by other states. They formed the origin of the project of an international convention on the laws of war presented to the Brussels Conference in 1874 (No. 2) and stimulated the adoption of the Hague Conventions on land warfare of 1899 and 1907 (No's. 7 and 8). - [*The Law of Armed Conflicts*, p. 3].

The Law of Armed Conflicts also lists as sources of the published text in English as follows:

Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field, prepared by Francis Lieber, LL.D., Originally Issued as General Orders No. 100, Adjutant General's Office 1863, Washington 1898, Government Printing Office; Francis Lieber, Contributions to Political Science, Including Lectures on the Constitution of the United States and Other Papers, Miscellaneous Writings, Vol. II, 1881, p. 245; Wilson - Tucker pp. VI-XXXVI; Friedman. pp. 158-186.

For the purpose of this exposé, we will quote only those Articles of the Lieber Instructions (*with comments*) that affect us on a day to day basis.

=====

SECTION I

Martial Law - Military jurisdiction - Military necessity - Retaliation

Art. 1. A place, district, or country occupied by an enemy stands, in consequence of the occupation, under the Martial Law of the invading or occupying army, whether any proclamation declaring Martial Law, or any public warning to the inhabitants, has been issued or not. Martial Law is the immediate and direct effect and consequence of occupation or conquest. The presence of a hostile army proclaims its Martial Law.

NOTE: Is there a hostile army presence in every State in the Union, enforcing Martial-Law jurisdiction on the Citizens of the several States? Has America been taken by conquest? According to the United States Supreme Court in Texas v. White, (1868) 7 Wall. (U.S.) 721, the court ruled the Civil War was not a war of conquest. If the civil war was not a war of conquest, then we are under one of the forms of the Law Martial. We must be under occupation. The above Article does not say the Nation has to be under occupation by a foreign nation's army. In and after the Civil War, Citizens of this Nation were under the *Law-Martial* and occupation of the Union Army. The fact is, we must prove today that the several States are under occupation by a domestic army to prove that the Citizens are under the *Law Martial* Jurisdiction.

Citizens see this domestic Army of Occupation every day, but don't recognize them as the Military Police. This domestic Army is on every street of every State in this Union. Citizens don't recognize this Army because the Army hides behind a Vail of secrecy, what appears to be a civilian uniform. To unveil this Army, the people need to look up the State Statutes on the term: "*Peace Officer*." Every State in the Union has a Statute establishing "*Peace Officers*." The term: "*Peace Officer*" in these Statutes means: *the Military Police of the State*. The "*Military Police of the State*" is not the *State Militia*.

Examine your State, County, and City Police. All of the civil police officers are statutorily defined as a single form of "*Officer*," a "*Peace Officer*." Do local police units have military ranks such as "*Sergeants*," "*Captains*," "*Lieutenants*," and "*Quartermasters*?" Have you ever heard the police refer to people as "*civilians*?" What National flag and/or State Flag is displayed at your local police department? The County Sheriff Deputies in

Oregon wear the yellow fringe National Flag patch on their uniforms. Are you beginning to recognize the troops of occupation on every street of this Union? Are you under occupation? When a local policeman enforces a curfew (*as they are across this Nation today*), is the policeman enforcing the curfew as a Sheriff's Deputy, State Policeman, or City Policeman, or are all three enforcing the curfew as "Peace Officers" i.e. "State Military Police?" The answer falls in the Statute or Ordinance they are enforcing. "Curfew" is strictly under a *Martial Law* jurisdiction. How many other State Statutes, or County/City Ordinances have been enacted by the State Legislators, County Commissioners, and City Councils, under *Martial Law* Jurisdiction?

One more point. The "Military Police" must have a "Military Venue" to perform as the "State Military Police." The State Regional Areas under Metro-Government provide the Military Venue for the Peace Officers to enforce *Martial Law* Jurisdiction. Now, can you understand that the Nation is under occupation?

Art. 2. *Martial Law* does not cease during the hostile occupation, except by special proclamation, ordered by the commander in chief; or by special mention in the treaty of peace concluding the war, when the occupation of a place or territory continues beyond the conclusion of peace as one of the conditions of the same.

NOTE: There is no treaty of peace between the Union and the several States that is know of and the end of full martial law was finally declared by withdrawal of troops in the streets, but repeal of all forms of the law martial has never been declared.

Art. 3. *Martial Law* in a hostile country consists in the suspension, by the occupying military authority, of the criminal and civil law, and of the domestic administration and government in the occupied place or territory, and in the substitution of military rule and force for the same, as well as in the dictation of general laws, as far as military necessity requires this suspension, substitution, or dictation.

The commander of the forces may proclaim that the administration of all civil and penal law shall continue either wholly or in part, as in times of peace, unless otherwise ordered by the military authority.

NOTE: Under the Law-Martial, only the criminal jurisdiction of a *Military Court* is the recognized law. But as Article Three says, "*the civil courts can continue wholly or in part as long as the civil jurisdiction does not violate the Military orders laid down by the Commander in Chief or one of his Commanders.*" By this means; a military venue, jurisdiction, and authority are imposed upon the occupied populace under disguise of the ordinary civil courts and officers of the occupied district or region, because the so-called civil authorities in an occupied district, or region, only act at the pleasure of a military authority.

It should also be noted here that the several State Legislatures, County Boards of Commissioners, and City Councils, are constantly legislating to please the edicts of the federal government (*the occupying force*) and that their legislation, in this sense, is not an exercise of States sovereignty, but instead, a compliance with edicts of the military force which occupies the several States and consequently are edicts of *Martial Law Rule*.

Art. 4. *Martial Law* is simply military authority exercised in accordance with the laws and usage's of war. Military oppression is not *Martial Law*: It is the abuse of the power which that law confers. As *Martial Law* is executed by military force, it is incumbent upon those who administer it to be strictly guided by the principles of justice, honor, and humanity - virtues adorning a soldier even more than other men, for the very reason that he possesses the power of his arms against the unarmed.

NOTE: What is being said is abuse of the *Martial Law* power is not considered *Martial Law*. We agree. It's called **TREASON**. (See Article III, Sec. 3, U.S. Const.). Meanwhile (under this principle), the Officers operating under *Martial Law Rule* are required to act in strict accordance with Statutes and Regulations under which *Martial Law Rule* is imposed. That is why "Statutory Tribunals" (courts) will declare the acts of "Peace Officers" statutorily defective in some cases, but at the same time, refuse to impose constitutional limitations. Basically, when a *Tribunal* declares that a "Peace Officer" failed to follow the requirements of a Statute, what that *Tribunal* has done is declared that the "Peace Officer" failed to follow the *Rules of War* while exercising a *Martial Law* power and therefore, was not justified in his acts.

Art. 5. Martial Law should be less stringent in places and countries fully occupied and fairly conquered. Much greater severity may be exercised in places or regions where actual hostilities exist, or are expected and must be prepared for. Its most complete sway is allowed - even in the commander's own country - when face to face with the enemy, because of the absolute necessities of the case, and of the paramount duty to defend the country against invasion. To save the country is paramount to all other considerations.

NOTE: The above Article Five can also be understood to save a *Martial-Law system* as paramount to all other considerations. As long as the system survives without armed hostility against it, *Martial Law* is imposed in the milder form of *Martial Law Rule*, but the minute any armed hostility is raised or threatened against the occupying force, full *Martial Law* is again imposed with troops in the streets to enforce *Martial Law* authority. Do the Los Angeles and Chicago riots ring a bell? How about Waco and Ruby Ridge?

Art. 6. All civil and penal law shall continue to take its usual course in the enemy's places and territories under Martial Law, unless interrupted or stopped by order of the occupying military power; but all the functions of the hostile government - legislative executive, or administrative - whether of a general, provincial, or local character, cease under Martial Law, or continue only with the sanction, or, if deemed necessary, the participation of the occupier or invader.

NOTE: Thus, it appears that the State Legislatures and local governmental units in the several States are still operating under a Constitutional authority, when in fact, they are operating at the pleasure of, or with the sanction of, the *Commander in Chief* of the occupying force. Take a look at the legislation and court decisions in your State and you will find that more than not, the legislation and court decisions are designed to please the edict of the federal government in matters such as the Civil War Amendments.

Art. 7. Martial Law extends to property, and to persons, whether they are subjects of the enemy or aliens to that government.

NOTE: All the "*non-resident alien*" pleaders can trash their argument. Under any of the three forms of the *Law-Martial*, it just doesn't matter.

Art. 8. Consuls, among American and European nations, are not diplomatic agents. Nevertheless, their offices and persons will be subjected to Martial Law in cases of urgent necessity only: their property and business are not exempted. Any delinquency they commit against the established military rule may be punished as in the case of any other inhabitant, and such punishment furnishes no reasonable ground for international complaint.

NOTE: All the "*Ambassadors of God*" pleaders just got trashed by Article Eight.

Art. 9. The functions of Ambassadors, Ministers, or other diplomatic agents accredited by neutral powers to the hostile government, cease, so far as regards the displaced government; but the conquering or occupying power usually recognizes them as temporarily accredited to itself.

Art. 10. Martial Law affects chiefly the police and collection of public revenue and taxes, whether imposed by the expelled government or by the invader, and refers mainly to the support and efficiency of the army, its safety, and the safety of its operations.

NOTE: As we have said, the *Federal Personal Income Tax* is collected under a *Military Venue* within a *Martial-Law* jurisdiction. *Federal Reserve Notes* are *Military Scrip* circulated within a *Military Venue*. The problem is the people don't understand how the entire United States is covered by a *Military Venue*. The first *Military Venue* covering the entire United States was brought into existence through the Social Security Act. Under the Social Security Act, there was brought into existence Ten Federal Regional Areas. These ten federal regional areas are the same as a military base. It is not unconstitutional to circulate "*military scrip*" on a military base as the base is considered to be a military venue. "*Military scrip*" cannot circulate in the civil jurisdiction of the several States. To get around this Constitutional bar, the Congress (*via the Social Security Act*), created *Ten Military Venues*, called "*Federal Regional Areas*." The problem the Congress realized was, while Congress could restructure the Government Agencies into these *Federal Regional Areas*, the people could not be identified to be within this

MilitaryVenue by their own consent. The solution was to create another MilitaryVenue which would trick the people to voluntarily accept recognition that they are within a MilitaryVenue. Congress solved this problem by creating the ZIP CODE.

The "zip code" divides the United States into Ten Military Venues called "NationalAreas." When a Citizen receives mail from an agency of the federal government (*such as the I.R.S.*), in the return address of the federal agency is the district within the regional area the letter is sent from, and on the address of the "Citizen" it was sent to is the national area [ZIP] in which he received the correspondence from the I.R.S.. In other words, the correspondence was sent from one of the federal regional areas [*militaryvenue*] to one of the National Areas [*anothermilitary venue*]. "Taxing Districts" are established within one of the FederalRegional Areas, which places the collection of taxes under amartiallawjurisdiction.

Military commanders can set up "taxing districts" in an occupied region. In the United States, the President (*who is the Commander in Chief of the Military*) has been authorized to set up Internal Revenue Taxing Districts, ever since the Civil War. [*see 26 U.S.C. § 7621*].

Art. 11. The law of war does not only disclaim all cruelty and bad faith concerning engagements concluded with the enemy during the war, but also the breaking of stipulations solemnly contracted by the belligerents in time of peace, and avowedly intended to remain in force in case of war between the contracting powers.

It disclaims all extortion's and other transactions for individual gain; all acts of private revenge, or connivance at such acts.

Offenses to the contrary shall be severely punished, and especially so if committed by officers.

NOTE: Here is the basis for Title 42 suits (Title 42, United States Code), and the reason why 99% of Title 42 suits fail. The Title 42 guru's never get the point. They are trying to sue what they call "Executive Officers" (*assuming these Officers are in the civil jurisdiction of a State or the civil jurisdiction of the United States* [who, in reality, are "Military Officers" (Peace Officers) protected from liability for Constitutional violations as they are not bound to the Articles of the Constitutions (*State or Federal*) but rather, are bound to the Rules of War]). As an example, President Clinton says he can't be forced to court by a woman who is suing him as he is protected in his capacity as Commander in Chief. Of course, the Articles of the Federal Constitution or the Articles of the State Constitutions, (*and their Bill of Rights*) do not apply to Officers within a Military Venue. These Officers (*appearing as "Executive Officers" of the States or Federal Government*) are "Peace Officers" and can only be charged if they violate Article 6 of these Orders, (*or any other Articles under this Order regulating their duties*). Under Military Rules, Title 42 suitors have no Constitutional charges to bring against a Military Officer under the Rules of Occupation.

Art. 13. Military jurisdiction is of two kinds: First, that which is conferred and defined by statute; second, that which is derived from the common law of war. Military offenses under the statute law must be tried in the manner therein directed; but military offenses which do not come within the statute must be tried and punished under the common law of war. The character of the courts which exercise these jurisdictions depends upon the local laws of each particular country.

In the armies of the United States, the first is exercised by courts-martial, while cases which do not come within the "Rules and Articles of War," or the jurisdiction conferred by statute on courts-martial, are tried by military commissions.

NOTE: As you can see, some regulations are by Acts of Congress and some regulations are the acts of the Commander in Chief (*or one of his Commanders*). The most interesting part of this Article is the reference to the "common law of war." Is this the "federal common law" the federal courts are referring to?

Art. 15. Military necessity admits of all direct destruction of life or limb of armed enemies, and of other persons whose destruction is incidentally unavoidable in the armed contests of the war; it allows of the capturing of every armed enemy, and every enemy of importance to the hostile government, or of peculiar danger to the captor; it allows of all destruction of property, and obstruction of the ways and channels of traffic, travel, or communication, and of all withholding of sustenance or means of life from the enemy; of the appropriation of whatever an enemy's country affords necessary for the subsistence and safety of the army, and of such deception as does not involve the breaking of good faith either

positively pledged, regarding agreements entered into during the war, or supposed by the modern law of war to exist. Men who take up arms against one another in public, war do not cease on this account to be moral beings, responsible to one another and to God.

NOTE: Article 15 sounds like the creed of the I.R.S.. Under this Article, would the I.R.S. be exercising "*Federal Common Law*?"

Art. 16. Military necessity does not admit of cruelty - that is, the infliction of suffering for the sake of suffering or for revenge, nor of maiming or wounding except in fight, nor of torture to extort confessions. It does not admit of the use of poison in any way, nor of the wanton devastation of a district. It admits of deception, but disclaims acts of perfidy; and, in general, military necessity does not include any act of hostility which makes the return to peace unnecessarily difficult.

NOTE: *GRANT*, *Sherman*, and bloody *Butler* must have missed reading Article 16.

This Article admits that it is perfectly fine to deceive the occupied populace into believing they are governed by their own civil government, while in reality, they are being governed behind the scenes by a military force. Such deception provides the greatest opportunity for military occupation without hostility (*under the pretense that no occupation or hostility exists*). Simply put, if you can control people's minds, you don't have to control their bodies. One who doesn't believe he lost his liberty will never break out in open hostility to restore it. Such deception provides the maximum amount of control of the occupied region with the minimum expenditure of resources, and is geared to avoid "*any act of hostility which makes the return to peace (or the appearance of peace) unnecessarily difficult*."

Art. 17. War is not carried on by arms alone. It is lawful to starve the hostile belligerent, armed or unarmed, so that it leads to the speedier subjection of the enemy.

NOTE: Is Article 17 justification for the depression of 1929? Justification for leading people to believe they cannot work or survive without being a member of *Social Security*? Justification for leading the people to believe that they cannot function without permission of government officials at every turn? Justification for depriving any aspect of Life, Liberty, or Property (*pursuit of happiness*), without the due process of law required by constitutional limitations, both State and federal?

Art. 18. When a commander of a besieged place expels the noncombatants, in order to lessen the number of those who consume his stock of provisions, it is lawful, though an extreme measure, to drive them back, so as to hasten on the surrender.

NOTE: Is this authority to regulate the farmers to bring about their surrender?

Art. 22. Nevertheless, as civilization has advanced during the last centuries, so has likewise steadily advanced, especially in war on land, the distinction between the private individual belonging to a hostile country and the hostile country itself, with its men in arms. The principle has been more and more acknowledged that the unarmed citizen is to be spared in person, property, and honor as much as the exigencies of war will admit.

NOTE: Article 22 must have been written for the cowards who live in fear of the occupiers and the people.

Art. 26. Commanding generals may cause the magistrates and civil officers of the hostile country to take the oath of temporary allegiance or an oath of fidelity to their own victorious government or rulers, and they may expel everyone who declines to do so. But whether they do so or not, the people and their civil officers owe strict obedience to them as long as they hold sway over the district or country, at the peril of their lives.

NOTE: Article 26 is a mouth full. The "*Order*" that the State Officials is take an Oath to uphold the Fourteenth Amendment, or be expelled from office, come to mind. Isn't strict obedience of the *State Officials* what the United States Supreme Court demands today? Today, we don't have *State Officials* with the guts to stand up to the federal power, but there was a man in the 1800's who did stand up:

Toombs, Robert Augustus (1810-1885), served in the United States Congress before the Civil War and then became Confederate Secretary of State. Toombs refused to swear allegiance to the government of the United States after the war and lost his citizenship.

There are still a few men today who place "*Honor*" above personal safety as Mr. Toombs did.

To whom, or to what have the Officials in your State sworn allegiance to in order to enter office? Your first clue should come from the fact that they executed a voter registration card, (*regulated under authority of the United States*) to enter into a (*so-called*) State Office.

SECTION II

Public and private property of the enemy - Protection of persons, and especially of women, of religion, the arts and sciences - Punishment of crimes against the inhabitants of hostile countries.

Art. 31. A victorious army appropriates all public money, seizes all public movable property until further direction by its government, and sequesters for its own benefit or of that of its government all the revenues of real property belonging to the hostile government or nation. The title to such real property remains in abeyance during military occupation, and until the conquest is made complete.

NOTE: All movable property, real property, public money. Sounds like the I.R.S. confiscating all the Citizens' property for their master, the Congress of the United States.

Art. 34. As a general rule, the property belonging to churches, to hospitals, or other establishments of an exclusively charitable character, to establishments of education, or foundations for the promotion of knowledge, whether public schools, universities, academies of learning or observatories, museums of the fine arts, or of a scientific character such property is not to be considered public property in the sense of paragraph 31; but it may be taxed or used when the public service may require it.

NOTE: Look at the Churches, Schools, etc, of today. If they don't preach or teach government doctrine, are they not harassed and face confiscation of their property? And are they not put up to the public as less than true Americans?

Art. 37. The United States acknowledge and protect, in hostile countries occupied by them, religion and morality; strictly private property; the persons of the inhabitants, especially those of women: and the sacredness of domestic relations. Offenses to the contrary shall be rigorously punished.

This rule does not interfere with the right of the victorious invader to tax the people or their property, to levy forced loans, to billet soldiers, or to appropriate property, especially houses, lands, boats or ships, and churches, for temporary and military uses.

NOTE: The FBI sure didn't read this article when they killed men, women, and children at Waco and Ruby Ridge.

Notice that a part of the martial law is to levy taxes (*for which taxing districts may be set up*), and to levy forced loans (*for which instruments of debt may be issued and circulated*).

The President has been setting up taxing districts called "*internal revenue districts*" starting with the Civil War and continuing to date (26 U.S.C. § 7621). The establishment of revenue districts by the president (*presumably as commander-in-chief*) was initially enacted to administer the first "*income taxes*" in the United States, to provide revenue to execute the Civil War. The "*Act*" to provide the increased revenue from imports to pay interest on the public debt, and for other purposes, was approved August 5, 1861, Ch. 45, §§ 49, 50, 51, 12 Stat. 292, 309-310. Paper money was also issued as a war measure in the Civil War to force loans upon the American populace through legal tender laws. Those forced loans continue to be imposed under the Federal Reserve Act and the legal tender statutes requiring their acceptance. The Fourteenth Amendment in the Fourth Section further protects the inviolability of these forced loans and the Federal Reserve Notes by declaring that the public debt incurred by the Civil War (*or by law*) may not be questioned.

Art. 39. The salaries of civil officers of the hostile government who remain in the invaded territory, and continue the work of their office, and can continue it according to the circumstances arising out of the war such as judges, administrative or police officers, officers of city or communal governments - are paid from the public revenue of the invaded territory, until the military government has reason wholly or partially to discontinue it. Salaries or incomes connected with purely honorary titles are always stopped.

NOTE: Under occupation, the judges, police, etc., can get paid for committing treason by adhering to the occupying force and imposing martial law measures.

Art. 42. Slavery, complicating and confounding the ideas of property (*that is of a thing*), and of personality (*that is of humanity*), exists according to municipal or local law only. The law of nature and nations has never acknowledged it. The digest of the Roman law enacts the early dictum of the pagan jurist, that "*so far as the law of nature is concerned, all men are equal.*" Fugitives escaping from a country in which they were slaves, villains, or serfs, into another country, have, for centuries past, been held free and acknowledged free by judicial decisions of European countries, even though the municipal law of the country in which the slave had taken refuge acknowledged slavery within its own dominions.

Art. 43. Therefore, in a war between the United States and a belligerent which admits of slavery, if a person held in bondage by that belligerent be captured by or come as a fugitive under the protection of the military forces of the United States, such person is immediately entitled to the rights and privileges of a freeman. To return such person into slavery would amount to enslaving a free person, and neither the United States nor any officer under their authority can enslave any human being. Moreover, a person so made free by the law of war is under the shield of the law of nations, and the former owner or State can have, by the law of postliminy, no belligerent lien or claim of service.

NOTE: Now you know why Lincoln had to start the Civil-War. **WITHOUT THE MARTIAL LAW JURISDICTION, HE COULD NOT FREE THE-SLAVES!**

Articles 42 and 43, clearly serve as military grounds for Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, and Congress's subsequent enactments (*with the help of so-called State legislatures*) of the Civil War Amendments as additional military measures. The Civil Rights Acts enacted by Congress under the "Power Clauses" of these martial law Amendments, are also military measures. This explains why "*the people*" were never asked to ratify the Civil War Amendments. They would be imposed by irresistible military force and their consultation was neither sought nor allowed. All of these measures (*governed by the rules of war [martial law]*) remain in effect in the United States.

Art. 44. All wanton violence committed against persons in the invaded country, all destruction of property not commanded by the authorized officer, all robbery, all pillage or sacking, even after taking a place by main force, all rape, wounding, maiming, or killing of such inhabitants, are prohibited under the penalty of death, or such other severe punishment as may seem adequate for the gravity of the offense.

A soldier, officer or private, in the act of committing such violence, and disobeying a superior ordering him to abstain from it, may be lawfully killed on the spot by such superior.

NOTE: Sounds good, but what if the commander forgets to tell the troops to abstain from rape, killing, or maiming?

This is the kind of military rule that administrative regulation is made of. If the Officer acts under Orders, he may act against the populace under such Orders so long as he acts in the manner specified. The only complaint that will be heard of a person affected, is a Complaint that the Officer did not act according to his Orders (*administrative regulations*), but constitutional considerations are treated as "*irrelevant*" under military rule of the occupying force.

Art. 46. Neither officers nor soldiers are allowed to make use of their position or power in the hostile country for private gain, not even for commercial transactions otherwise legitimate. Offenses to the contrary committed by commissioned officers will be punished with cashiering or such other punishment as the nature of the offense may require; if by soldiers, they shall be punished according to the nature of the offense.

NOTE: Congress needs to read this. Are they not considered "*Officers*" under martial-law jurisdiction?

Art. 47. Crimes punishable by all penal codes, such as arson, murder, maiming, assaults, highway robbery, theft, burglary, fraud, forgery, and rape, if committed by an American soldier in a hostile country against its inhabitants, are not only punishable as at home, but in all cases in which death is not inflicted, the severer punishment shall be preferred.

NOTE: This rule confuses the occupied populace into believing they still have control of their government under their own local law by leaving it in effect so far as the occupying force allows it. Consequently, a populace that has been governed by *martial law* for decades can lose sight of the fact that they are being governed by *martial law*.

SECTION III

Deserters - Prisoners of war - Hostages - Booty on the battlefield

Art. 49. A prisoner of war is a public enemy armed or attached to the hostile army for active aid, who has fallen into the hands of the captor, either fighting or wounded, on the field or in the hospital, by individual surrender or by capitulation.

All soldiers, of whatever species of arms; all men who belong to the rising en masse of the hostile country; all those who are attached to the army for its efficiency and promote directly the object of the war, except such as are hereinafter provided for; all disabled men or officers on the field or elsewhere, if captured; all enemies who have thrown away their arms and ask for quarter, are prisoners of war, and as such exposed to the inconveniences as well as entitled to the privileges of a prisoner of war.

Art. 50. Moreover, citizens who accompany an army for whatever purpose, such as sutlers, editors, or reporters of journals, or contractors, if captured, may be made prisoners of war, and be detained as such.

The monarch and members of the hostile reigning family, male or female, the chief, and chief officers of the hostile government, its diplomatic agents, and all persons who are of particular and singular use and benefit to the hostile army or its government, are, if captured on belligerent ground, and if unprovided with a safe conduct granted by the captor's government, prisoners of war.

NOTE: Are not the Americans in the several States being treated as prisoners of war since the Civil War under an occupying force of the federal government? And are not "*licenses*" and other privileges created by statute a letter of safe conduct to such prisoners granted by the captor's government?

Art. 75. Prisoners of war are subject to confinement or imprisonment such as may be deemed necessary on account of safety, but they are to be subjected to no other intentional suffering or indignity. The confinement and mode of treating a prisoner may be varied during his captivity according to the demands of safety.

NOTE: Sounds like statutory civil rights of prisoners defined under the Civil War Amendments and numerous Civil Rights Acts.

SECTION V

Safe-conduct - Spies - War-traitors - Captured messengers - Abuse of the flag of truce

Art. 86. All intercourse between the territories occupied by belligerent armies, whether by traffic, by letter, by travel, or in any other way, ceases. This is the general rule, to be observed without special proclamation.

Exceptions to this rule, whether by safe-conduct, or permission to trade on a small or large scale, or by exchanging mails, or by travel from one territory into the other, can take place only according to agreement approved by the government, or by the highest military authority.

Contraventions of this rule are highly punishable.

NOTE: Is this what regulation of interstate commerce has become? A regulation of commerce under a rule of war? Is this why "licenses" to travel upon highways are purported to be required? Why "licenses" are purported to be required to do business at all?

=====

SECTION VIII

Armistice - Capitulation

Art. 135. An armistice is the cessation of active hostilities for a period agreed between belligerents. It must be agreed upon in writing, and duly ratified by the highest authorities of the contending parties.

Art. 136. If an armistice be declared, without conditions, it extends no further than to require a total cessation of hostilities along the front of both belligerents.

If conditions be agreed upon, they should be clearly expressed, and must be rigidly adhered to by both parties. If either party violates any express condition, the armistice may be declared null and void by the other.

Art. 137. An armistice may be general, and valid for all points and lines of the belligerents, or special, that is, referring to certain troops or certain localities only.

An armistice may be concluded for a definite time; or for an indefinite time, during which either belligerent may resume hostilities on giving the notice agreed upon to the other.

Art. 138. The motives which induce the one or the other belligerent to conclude an armistice, whether it be expected to be preliminary to a treaty of peace, or to prepare during the armistice for a more vigorous prosecution of the war, does in no way affect the character of the armistice itself.

Art. 139. An armistice is binding upon the belligerents from the day of the agreed commencement; but the officers of the armies are responsible from the day only when they receive official information of its existence.

Art. 140. Commanding officers have the right to conclude armistices binding on the district over which their command extends, but such armistice is subject to the ratification of the superior authority, and ceases so soon as it is made known to the enemy that the armistice is not ratified, even if a certain time for the elapsing between giving notice of cessation and the resumption of hostilities should have been stipulated for.

Art. 141. It is incumbent upon the contracting parties of an armistice to stipulate what intercourse of persons or traffic between the inhabitants of the territories occupied by the hostile armies shall be allowed, if any.

If nothing is stipulated the intercourse remains suspended, as during actual hostilities.

Art. 142. An armistice is not a partial or a temporary peace; it is only the suspension of military operations to the extent agreed upon by the parties.

Art. 143. When an armistice is concluded between a fortified place and the army besieging it, it is agreed by all the authorities on this subject that the besieger must cease all extension, perfection, or advance of his attacking works as much so as from attacks by main force.

But as there is a difference of opinion among martial jurists, whether the besieged have the right to repair breaches or to erect new works of defense within the place during an armistice, this point should be determined by express agreement between the parties.

Art. 144. So soon as a capitulation is signed, the capitulator has no right to demolish, destroy, or injure the works, arms, stores, or ammunition, in his possession, during the time which elapses between the signing and the execution of the capitulation, unless otherwise stipulated in the same.

Art. 145. When an armistice is clearly broken by one of the parties, the other party is released from all obligation to observe it.

Art. 146. Prisoners taken in the act of breaking an armistice must be treated as prisoners of war, the officer alone being responsible who gives the order for such a violation of an armistice. The highest authority of the belligerent aggrieved may demand redress for the infraction of an armistice.

Art. 147. Belligerents sometimes conclude an armistice while their plenipotentiaries are met to discuss the conditions of a treaty of peace; but plenipotentiaries may meet without a preliminary armistice; in the latter case, the war is carried on without any abatement.

NOTE: Read Articles 135 through 147 again. Is the ***BUCK ACT***, / providing for concurrent jurisdiction of (so-called) State officials and federal officers within the boundaries of State - an "Armistice" providing for federal control within a State? Are regional metropolitan service districts the result of a local *Armistice* between cities and/or counties and the federal government under Article 140 to govern a specific district? Are not all the *Statutes* and *Agreements* between State legislators and the federal government (*to obtain federal funds and to administer federal regulations*) written in the form of an *Armistice* that allow activities within the State subject to federal restrictions not otherwise authorized by the Constitution?

State legislators have no power to waive the sovereignty of the State (*never having been vested with that power by the people of the State*). But have they capitulated to a captor in an *Armistice of Peace* with out telling the populace they remain under siege of a captor (*the Federal Government*) save for the *Armistice*? And when a State says "no" to the 13th and later Amendments, and says "no" to the income tax, and says "no" to the Federal Reserve, and says "no" to federal Officials entering the State to impose martial law measures, will the Congress or the President (*as commander in chief*) "Order" invasion of the State by federal military forces for a breach of *Armistice*? Is this why Sheriffs, State Judges, City and County Boards and Commissions and the State legislature consistently refuse to tell the "feds" to take a hike, and tell the people that they are required do what they are told to do by the feds? Do they fear military retaliation from the occupying central government? Do they fear personal retribution in the way of civil and criminal charges (*and imprisonment if they fail to impose the will of their captor upon the populace within the State*)? Even if they refuse to take action, they could at least tell the truth and let the people of the State know that they remain "occupied" by an invading force imposing martial law. Or, would this justify a "death penalty" upon them as a "war traitor" for giving information to their government (*the enemy*) while inhabiting occupied belligerent territory under Articles 90 / & 91, / (*being separated from their own government*)?

You need to study the full text of the Lieber codified rules of war. Therein you will find the implementation of these rules for the government of the United States in every aspect of law and of your life.

Conclusion

Under our form of government, every American (*individually or by representation*) is the high and supreme sovereign authority. The authority of each of the three departments of government is defined and established.

It is entirely fitting and proper to observe that in all instances between the States and the United States, and the People, there is no such thing as the idea of a compact between the People on one side and the Government on the other. The compact is that of the people with each other to produce and constitute a government.

To suggest that any government can be a party to a compact with the whole people is supposing it to have an existence before it can have a right to exist.

The only instance in which a compact can take place between the people and those who exercise the government, is that the people shall pay while they choose to employ them.

A Constitution is the property of the Nation and more specifically of the Individual, and not those who exercise the government. All the Constitutions of America are declared to be established in the authority of the People.

The authority of the Constitution is grounded upon the absolute, God-given free agency of each Individual, and this is the basis of all powers granted, reserved or withheld in the authorization of every word, phrase, clause or paragraph of the Constitution. Any attempt by Congress, the President or the Courts to limit, change or enlarge even the most claimed insignificant provision is therefore *ultra vires* and void ab initio.

No one applying the Constitution to any situation has any business, right or duty to look in any direction for sovereignty but toward the people. Any attempt or inclination to do so is a violation of one's Oath and continuing duty to uphold, maintain and support the Constitution of the United States of America.

As the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution are found to have been brought into effect outside the mandates of Article V of the United States Constitution, these three Amendments (*as a franchise to the United States*) must be forfeited as a case of perversion./ An Amendment to the United States Constitution is not brought into effect through usage, by Acts of Congress, or by Opinions of Courts.

The federal Courts of the United States have found that questions of ratification of an Amendment to the United States Constitution are "*political questions*" to which the Courts will not address. According to the federal Courts, either the Congress of the United States or the States

have the "*textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issues*" to determine the validity of the ratification votes cast on an Amendment.

The authority to determine the validity of the votes cast in ratification of an Amendment are with the States and more specific, with the Convention of the States, as the U.S. Constitution at Article V declares that it shall be the power of the legislatures of the States to ratify proposed Amendments and to call for Constitutional Conventions. The people have declared within Article IX of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution for the United States that those powers not delegated to the United States are reserved to the States.

As the federal Courts and the Congress of the United States have refused to determine the legitimacy of the ratification votes cast on the Civil War Amendments, it is proper and necessary for the legislatures of the States to question the Amendments. It appears from case law, the proper procedure would be for the legislatures of the several States to call for a "*Constitutional Convention*" for the purpose of making an investigation into the Amendments to determine if they were proposed and ratified in accordance to the provisions of the Constitution for the United States of America. It appears that only the "*Convention*" has the authority and power to act on questions with respect to matters of fraud, irregularity, or illegal practices in the conduct of Congress or the Legislatures. /

End of Exposé

Law vs. LEGAL

To investigate is the way to know what things are really lawful.¹

“Because of what appears to be a lawful command on the surface, many citizens, because of their respect for what only appears to be a law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance.”²

In the above statement, the Supreme Court talks of “what only appears to be law” “on the surface.” Of what are we so ignorant that we would mistake something for law that is not law? We have grown up hearing phrases like, “The law is the law,” and “Ignorance of the law is no excuse.” What is law and what makes something law?

Since, “The origin of a thing ought to be inquired into,”³ then it would follow that we should look into the origin of the word “law” to give us some idea of its meaning today.

Unlike many of the terms used in the legal system of the United States, the word “law” does not come from the Latin, but from the Anglo-Saxon word *lagu* and the Middle English *lawe*, *laghe* meaning “just, right and fair”. In Latin, “law” would be translated *jus (juris)*, from which we take the word “justice”. The Romans had another word, *lex (legis)*, from which we get the word “legal”, meaning “statute, bill, principle, rule; contract, condition...” **What is legal (connected by contract) becomes lawful (just) by consent.**

A legal system based upon freedom has no lawful power to “command” until an individual binds himself to it “for lex (law) is derived from ligare (to bind), because it binds one to act.”⁴

“All government without the consent of the governed is the very definition of slavery!”⁵

If the Romans, from whom we take much of the principles upon which the present legal system relies, saw fit and necessary to use two separate and distinct words, one *lex* and the other *jus*, then why do we often use them interchangeably. It is in the distinction between these two words that much of our honest confusion lies.

While, “The law (*jus*) is the rule of right; and whatever is contrary to the rule of right is an injury,”⁶ we find that “human laws (*lex*, *leges*) are born, live, and die.”⁷ “That which bars those who have contracted will bar their successors also.”⁸ Therefore, “The contract makes the law”⁹ for our children, as well as for ourselves.

“We shall have world government whether or not we like it. The question is, whether world government will be achieved by conquest or consent.”¹⁰

In the maxim “Consent makes the law,” it is evident that it is our authorization that makes a man-made rule, such as a statute, into a law. It is not the arbitrary proclamation of a remote group of men, be it parliament or congress, that binds men to obedience and subjection. Could this mean that a person can simply disregard all legislation against which he himself arbitrarily disagrees for one reason or another? No, can only be the answer, or else all government would be anarchy.

“A contract is law between the parties having received their consent.”¹¹

How does government receive consent? When does an act of consent truly become binding? “In every contract, whether nominate or innominate, there is implied an exchange, i.e. a consideration.”¹² Nodding the head, raising your right hand, or signing a piece of paper are all evidences that you have given consent, but the taking of “sufficient consideration” is an act that adds force and authority to consent; for either you have consented to an exchange of consideration or you are a thief. A contract is “an agreement, upon sufficient consideration, to do or not to do a particular thing.”¹³ What is a benefit but consideration?

“Nothing is so contrary to consent as force and fear.”¹⁴

There are countless ways in which the state works its craft of expanding its power and presence in the world, and one way is by consent. **It should be realized that, even though coercion through force and fear are often used, the only real binding and lawful consent is voluntary.**

“What is mine cannot be taken away without consent.”¹⁵

If it is consent that makes the legal system a lawful system, then it is at the point of our consent that we become bound to obey a legal rule. It does not matter that those legal rules are changed regularly, as long as those rules are changed in accordance with the system that was set down at the origin of the legal system and the individual’s assent. All this, despite the fact that consent maybe acquired by appealing to the slothful greed and coveting selfishness of the individual.

***“The hand of the diligent shall bear rule: but the slothful shall be under tribute.” (Pr
12:24)***

“The laws of England are threefold: common law, customs, and decrees of parliament.”¹⁶ There was law in England long before a parliament was convened. Then, “new states of facts arising out of changed economic and social conditions” brought the desire for, if not a need for, a strong central government.

If “Pacta sunt servanda.”¹⁷ then “Non Pacta, non servanda”

“Before the Norman conquest of England in 1066 the people were the fountainhead of justice. The Anglo-Saxon courts of those days were composed of large numbers of freemen and the law which they administered, was that which had been handed down by oral tradition from generation to generation. In competition with these non professional courts the Norman king, who insisted that he was the fountainhead of justice, set up his own tribunals. The judges who presided over these royal courts were agents or representatives of the king, not of the people; but they were professional lawyers who devoted most of their time and energy to the administration of justice, and the courts over which they presided were so efficient that they gradually all but displaced the popular, nonprofessional courts.”¹⁸

“But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto the LORD.” (1 Samuel 8:6)

William of Normandy came to England to collect a disputed debt owed to him by Harold. He did not conquer and seize all of England, but only Harold and his properties, duties, and obligations (and those hereditaments of the freemen

who had fought along side Harold in his attempt to avoid payment to William). Also, from his assumed position, William “insisted that he was the fountainhead of justice” and began to consolidate and expand his position and authority by waging war against all who opposed his claim to Harold’s limited kingly dominion.¹⁹ Many changes were brought about as a result of William's strong presence. He opened the door to customs and forms of law that had no foothold in the land of the Anglos since the fall of the Roman Empire. He instituted a survey of all the land that fell under his sword by right of trial by conquest. This was done for the purpose of collecting an excise or tribute tax on the land of those defeated landowners who were then forced to take an oath of fealty and bind their allegiance and lands to William. The people of England called the book that included these subject lands the “Doomsday Book” and it is still called that to this day.

“Wherefore say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Ye eat with the blood, and lift up your eyes toward your idols, and shed blood: and shall ye possess the land?” (Ezekiel 33:25)

With this growing loss of freehold titles in land, the “large numbers of freemen”, who were so necessary for the administration of the Common Law of Land, were no longer available.

Ye stand upon your sword, ye work abomination, and ye defile every one his neighbour’s wife: and shall ye possess the land? (Ezekiel 33:26)

A legal title is not a freehold, lawful, or a fee simple title. Were the remaining freehold titles in land lost by conquest or by other means?

“Towns and boroughs act as if persons.”²⁰

Many followed William, establishing the concepts of towns and cities, which had been traditionally shunned by the Anglos, along with other customs of business, and a loyalty to their homeland that opened a freer avenue for the establishment of commerce.

“...they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top [may reach] unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. (Ge. 11:4)

And as for the people, he removed them to cities from [one] end of the borders of Egypt even to the end thereof.” (Ge. 47:21)

The law of the Anglo-Saxons still remained intact, but not for those who fell subject to William and his successors. The two systems lived side by side in a manner similar to the two jurisdictional systems of law used in the Roman Empire following their own Roman civil war.

The “common law” is “distinguished from law created by the enactment of legislatures,” and it “comprises the body of those principles and rules of action, relating to the government and security of persons and property, which derive their authority solely from usages and customs of immemorial antiquity...” And “as concerns its force and authority in the United States, the phrase designates that portion of the common law of England which had been adopted and was in force here at the time of the Revolution”²¹

“Liberi. In Saxon Law - Freeman; the possessors of allodial lands.”²²

The common law is dependent upon “large numbers of freemen” who can decide both fact and law, as distinguished from the jurors of the United States today, who have lost their allodial land through neglect and ignorance. Today’s jurors as U.S. citizens are subject to the *administration of government*. They are almost always sworn to abide by the decrees of the legislature before they take to their seat as jurors, which allows them to judge only the facts of a case, leaving the determination of law in the hands of the legislature and the administering professional judges. Is this the way it was in the beginning?

“Liber homo. A free man; a freeman lawfully competent to act as juror.”²³ An allodial proprietor, as distinguished from a vassal or feudatory.”²⁴

The original settlers and founders of this republic called the Americas, had come here fleeing the *king's justice* saying, 'Farewell, Rome. Farewell, Babylon'. Here, the individual had access to a free-dominion by the relinquishment, in charter, of the right of the king to make law without consent. In the case of the American colonies, which were republics and were guaranteed by contract with the king that no law could be made "except by the consent of the freeman," there was a clear consideration, as there was with Harold, the last Anglo-Saxon king in England. The king of England was to give the colonies the benefit of his protection from "foreign invasion" and, in exchange, he could impose only excise (*use*) taxes and tariffs (*taxes on foreign trade*), as well as regulate the equitable practice of business, for which there were no remedies at the common law.

The extent of the legal authority of the king of Britain in the Americas was limited. It was his usurpation (*seizing a use*) of rights that were not his that led to the Declaration of Independence, whereby the colonial governments became totally independent states at any dissolution of the charter. As history tells, a dissolution was caused by the king's breaking of the contract and violating the terms of the agreement. The limited authority and responsibility of the king was then assumed by the colonial governments, who eventually bound themselves together by Articles of Confederation, and later by a constitution which created a legal society with certain limited obligations and privileges to the general populus of the republics.

***"The real destroyers of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations and benefits."*²⁵**

The United States Federal government, which exists within the given jurisdiction of the original republics, is a limited jurisdiction within itself. It grew, not by decree, but by government offers and individual acceptance. In other words, the limited authority of government grew by expanding the offer of benefits and obligations to the individual citizens in the republic, including membership in the government itself. The more desired, the more offered, and the more that was accepted, all the more was required. A guarantee of an entitlement grants a reciprocating entitlement to the Benefactor.

"The desire of the slothful killeth him; for his hands refuse to labour." (Proverbs 21:25)

These benefits were not part of the original obligations of the state governments or the United States Federal Government. The average citizen cannot in justice accept them without offering at least some seemingly equal consideration.

"My son, if sinners entice thee, consent not." (Proverbs 1, 10)

Each time we accept or apply for new bounties, donations, and benefits, we are consenting by deed or word to the legal authority of that government or body politic. We grant power.

"Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with [his] hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." (Ephesians 4:28)

To take what is not a gift and is not owed, with no intention of returning equal consideration, is the essence of stealing. To accept without consenting to pay the price is the essence of theft. Ignorance of this fundamental principle is the "ignorance of law". That the law does not excuse.

"I went by the field of the slothful, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding; ... I looked upon [it, and] received instruction. Then I saw, [and] considered [it] well: I looked upon [it, and] received instruction. [Yet] a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep: So shall thy poverty come [as] one that travelleth; and thy want as an armed man." (Pr. 24:30, 34)

"In respect to the ground of the authority of law, it is divided as natural law, or the law of nature or of God, and positive law." Positive Law is, "Law actually ordained or established, under human sanctions, as

distinguished from the law of nature or natural law, which comprises those considerations of justice, right, and universal expediency that are announced by the voice of reason or of revelation...²⁶

“Law governs men and reason the law.”²⁷

The Law of Nature or Natural Law is, “The divine will, or the dictate of right reason, showing the moral deformity or moral necessity that there is in any act, according to its suitableness or unsuitableness to a reasonable nature. Sometimes used of the law of human reason, in contradistinction to the revealed law, and sometimes of both, in contradistinction to positive law.”²⁸

The Natural Law is divine will; not merely the will of men, who, by their own reason, have determined it. If the reason is not *right reason*, then the law or rule is not truly Natural Law. Natural law, as a term, may have several uses and should be clarified whenever it is used.

“They [natural laws] are independent of any artificial connections, and differ from mere presumptions of law in this essential respect, that the latter depend on and are a branch of the peculiar system of jurisprudence to which they belong; but mere natural presumptions are derived wholly by means of the common experience of mankind, without the aid or control of any particular rule of law, but simply from the course of nature and the habits of society. These presumptions fall within the exclusive province of the jury, who are to pass upon the facts.”²⁹

Jury Nullification “... jury shall be judges of the law and the facts.”³⁰

The natural law being “divine will” and “right reason” are not connected to mere “presumptions of law”. Presumptions of law are dependent upon “peculiar systems of jurisprudence”.

Jurisprudence “is but the philosophy of law or the science which treats of the principles of positive law and legal relationships”.³¹ The term, jurisprudence, “is wrongly applied to actual systems of law”.³² To say that these presumptions fall within the exclusive province of the jury, who are to pass upon the facts, does not mean that the jury is to pass upon the facts of the case and not the law. It means that a jury is to decide upon the presumption of law based on their own common experience and God-given conscience.

“Nothing against reason is lawful.”³³

The word legal itself is defined in Black’s 3rd as:

1. *Conforming to law; according to law; required or permitted by law...*
2. *Proper or sufficient to be recognized by law; cognizable in the courts...*
3. *Cognizable in courts of law, as distinguished from courts of equity; construed or governed by the rules and principles of law...*
4. *Posited [assumed] by courts as the inference or imputation of the law, as a matter of construction, rather than established by actual proof.*
5. *Created by law.*

Legal systems may “conform to law”, they may be “permitted by law”, they may even be created by law, but they are not law in themselves. They may become law by consent and constructions of law. What is legal is “cognizable in courts of law; as distinguished from courts of equity” which are not “governed by rules of law”.

It should be clear that any legal system is subject to the prior and essential principles of law. Law that is basic, fundamental, and well-established over thousands of years of recorded history. It must be understood that it is consent that

makes what is only legally proclaimed to be lawfully established. Also, it should be apparent that binding oneself to a legal system that is constantly under the process of change is at least dangerous, if not inevitably disastrous.

“And if the question relate to any point of public liberty, or if it be one of those in which the judges may be suspected of bias, the jury undertake to decide both law and fact.”³⁴

“He was a mighty provider before the LORD: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty provider before the LORD.” (Genesis 10:9)

“The jurisdiction of equity court, gradually developed by the chancellor, was limited only by the chancellor himself. There were two important limitations, both adopted to avoid any clash with the common-law courts. One was that equity would not interfere where there was an adequate remedy at common law; the other was that equity would act merely against the person of the common law plaintiff or defendant and therefore affect the legal right only in that indirect fashion.”³⁵ Equity was dealing with legal rights of a person, not lawful rights of an individual freeman. Equity’s courts administered the king’s justice in the king’s dominion.

“A person is a man considered in reference to a certain status.”³⁶

So, when the term “common law” is used, there is the common law of the individual freeman and the common law of the legislature. The courts of equity were used to fulfill a need for remedies, but, for which the common law, by tradition and custom, did not provide, such as acts outside the realm of its reasoning jurisdiction, as in the case of “trusts and uses.”

“Law, as distinguished from equity, denotes the doctrine and the procedure of the common law of England and America, from which equity is a departure.”³⁷

Equity is a “body of rules existing by the side of the original civil law, founded on distinct principles, and claiming incidentally to supersede the civil law in virtue of a superior sanctity inherent in those principles.”³⁸

First, “equity” is not law in itself, but it only exists “by the side of” the law, and the civil law, at that. The “Civil Law,” ‘Roman Law’ and ‘Roman Civil Law’ are convertible phrases, meaning the same system of jurisprudence.”³⁹ Second, it should be noted that it only claims to supersede the civil law.

“As old rules become too narrow, or are felt to be out of harmony with advancing civilization, a machinery is needed for their gradual enlargement and adaptation to new views of society. One mode of accomplishing this object on a large scale, without appearing to disregard existing law, is the introduction, by the prerogative of some high functionary, of a more perfect body of rules, discoverable in his judicial conscience, which is to stand side by side with the law of the land, overriding it in case of conflict, as on some title of inherent superiority, but not purporting to repeal it. Such a body of rules has been called **Equity**.”⁴⁰

America was settled by men who came to this new land to escape the arbitrary bonds of civil and equitable systems, which were often no more than the will of despotic tyrants, and sought to be, at least in principle, ruled by Divine Will.

“The jury has the Right to judge both the law and the facts.”⁴¹

Even the United States Government, in establishing its own legal system, was forced by custom and reason “that suits in equity shall not be sustained in either of the courts of the United States, in any case where plain, adequate, and complete remedy may be had at law.”⁴²

Equity is not law either in the sense of the common law or the civil legal system. Equity is designed and used to enlarge the system of laws without appearing to disregard the laws themselves; overriding them, but not repealing them. It

is that “part of the law which, having power to enforce discovery, (1) administers trusts, mortgages, and other fiduciary obligations; (2) administers and adjusts common-law rights where the courts of common law have no machinery; (3) supplies a specific and preventive remedy for common law wrongs where courts of common law only give subsequent damages.”⁴³

Equity is important because, in a civil society such as the one created by the Constitution, it is the instrument used to remedy conflicts that arise from certain relations, where plain, adequate, and complete remedy may not be had at law. Equity is used to administer trusts and uses.

The phrase “legal tender” is found on the paper currencies of the world, including those used by the United States. Blue-sealed certificates, red-sealed United States notes, or green-sealed Federal Reserve notes all state that they are “legal tender for all debts public and private.” For decades, these notes also stated that they were “redeemable in lawful money.” If they were redeemable in lawful money then it should be clear that they are not lawful money. Gold and silver are lawful money, which is used as “payment of debt.”⁴⁴ Legal tender is a legal offer in place of payment of debt and does not lawfully pay a debt. Although it may legally discharge debt, the tender or offer does not pay the debt at law. “There is a distinction between a debt discharged and one paid. When discharged the debt still exists, though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the operation of the discharge. Something of the original vitality of the debt continues to exist...”⁴⁵

Where does this debt continue?

It goes on to say, “...which may be transferred, even though the transferee takes it subject to its disability incident to the discharge. The fact that it carries something which may be a consideration for a new promise to pay, so as to make an otherwise worthless promise a legal obligation, makes it the subject of transfer by assignment.”⁴⁶

“The first farmer was the first man, and all historic nobility rests on possession and use of land.” - Emerson.

A “legal title” is “one cognizable... in a court of law.”⁴⁷ “Judicial cognizance” being “judicial notice, or knowledge upon which a judge is bound to act without having it proved in evidence.”⁴⁸ Even more importantly, a legal title is “one which is complete and perfect so far as regards the apparent right of ownership and possession, but which carries no beneficial interest in the property, another person being equitably entitled thereto; in either case, the antithesis of ‘equitable title.’”⁴⁹

“And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you.” (II Pe. 2, 2-3.)

First, we see that a legal title, although it may appear to be a “right of ownership”, “carries no beneficial interest.” If a legal title does not include a right to the beneficial interest, then it does not include a right to the “profit, benefit, or advantage resulting from a contract,” nor does it include “the ownership of an estate.” After all, a beneficial interest is “distinct from the legal ownership.”⁵⁰ In the simplest of terms, a legal title only appears to be a right to ownership, but it is not the “ownership of an estate.”

“Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee.” (Exodus 34, 12.)

By definition, a legal title is the opposite, or at least the antithesis, of an “equitable title.” An equitable title, as opposed to a legal title, “is a right in the party”, rather than only appearing to be a right. It is “the beneficial interest of one person whom equity regards as the real owner, although the legal title is vested in another.”⁵¹

Even though you may discharge a debt and obtain legal titles, you still do not have clear and good titles, which “are synonymous; ‘clear title’ meaning that the land is free from incumbrances, ‘good title’ being one free from litigation, palpable defects, and grave doubts, comprising both legal and equitable titles and fairly deducible of record.”⁵²

“Whoso causeth the righteous to go astray in an evil way, he shall fall himself into his own pit: but the upright shall have good [things] in possession.” (Proverbs 28:10)

This division of true title into a legal title on one hand versus an equitable title on the other is called equitable conversion. Equitable conversion is a “Constructive conversion.”

CONVERSION is an, "alteration, interchange, metamorphosis, passage, reconstruction..."⁵³

BENEFICIAL INTEREST is the, "Profit, benefit, or advantage resulting from a contract, or the ownership of an estate as distinct from the legal ownership or control."⁵⁴

BENEFICIAL USE is, "the right to use and enjoy property according to one's own liking or so as to derive a profit or benefit from it..."⁵⁵

Is it any wonder that you are required to get a permit to build on what you think is your land? You have to get permission, i.e., a license, to operate what you believe is your car. If you do not pay the use, tribute, or excise tax on your land, auto, or labor, you will lose them all. Haven't you lost them already if you do not own them or, at the very least, own the use of them? If you lack the right to the benefit or profit of a thing can you say you own it at all? Does anyone have a lawful title? And who has the true title and for what purpose do they have it?

You have a legal right to work, only if you have applied for and obtained an employee identification number and then are you allowed to labor for an employer who has an employer identification number.

The word "legal" originates in the idea of being connected to a legal system by contract. The connection is most often created by consent and acceptance. What is to be legal becomes law by that consent and one of the essential ingredient of that consent is mutual consideration, whether by application or indulgence.

As we saw in the first chapter in a British voting rights case at the turn of the century, "The statutory word 'person' did not in these circumstances include women." This is the same reason that before the 14th Amendment, "In the eyes of the law... the slave is not a person."⁵⁶ But afterwards he is brought under a new master.

At one time "An Indian [was] not a person within the meaning of the Constitution."⁵⁷ Not being a "person" may exclude an individual from legal protection, but because an extended protection includes aspects of subjection, a non person may be considered free of the protector.

The status of "person" may reduce an individual to little more than a "human resource" because as we will see on *entering into society individuals will give up a share of liberty whether cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance* or because we apply for benefits from benefactors who exercise authority.

*"The word 'person,' as used in the 14th Amendment, does not include the unborn."*⁵⁸

Therefore, upon entering into a legal society, a person waives certain rights naturally inherent in an individual and becomes obligated to abide by the administration of the legally established laws and rules of that civil society. Those rules can include such systems as Equity, as well as general constructions of law. In Equity, the extent of contractual participation may vary.

It is by an indulging consent that these mere constructions of law divide a clear and good title into a legal title on one hand and the equitable title on the other.

A legal title may appear to be a right of ownership, but it is not. Legal title provides no beneficial interest and, therefore, no right to the profit, benefit, or advantage in the property. If you do not pay the legally prescribed use tax, they, the administrators of the trust holding the equitable title, may summarily take the property away from you. Somewhere, someone or something holding the equitable title is the actual owner, in the eyes of the Natural law, of your land, your home, your car, your cattle, your legal right to work and much, much more. You have no rights since your conversion, alteration, or rebirth. You have no right to the profit, benefit, or advantage of such things, but only an apparent legal ownership.

If things have been equitably converted, can they be equitably reconverted? Can things be turned around from what they have become? Can you make a legal title a lawful, good, and complete title again?⁵⁹

Can you now apply this idea that someone else may hold the true and lawful title to everything that you only appear to own, but do not? Has it been kept a secret, a mystery, how everything that the LORD God has given you is owned by another, who the law considers the *true owner* of the property?

"Standing afar off for the fear of her torment, saying, Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come. And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more: The merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, ... and wheat, and beasts ... and slaves, and souls of men." (Revelation 18:10, 13)

Have you been seduced with vain offers and the seduction of a covetous heart or is it through ignorance and lack of knowledge that you have been sold into slavery, yoked with unbelievers and entangled by contractual relationships?

“For when they speak great swelling [words] of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, [through much] wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For if after they have escaped the pollution’s of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known [it], to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog [is] turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.” (2 Peter 2:18, 22)

If we have followed the ways of men can we return to the ways of the LORD? Who has deceived us? Who has devised this plan of confusion and deceit?

“Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.” (Lu 11:52)

“Who shall we seek to know the truth? Who shall we cry out to, man or the LORD God? The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity. For the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he [is] the messenger of the LORD of hosts. But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the LORD of hosts. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law. Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?” (Malachi 2:6, 10)

Footnotes:

1Quærere dat sapere quæ sunt legitima verè. Littleton,§443.

2US vs. Minker. 350 US, 179 p187.

3Origin rei inspici debet. 1Coke, 99.

4Summa Theologica 1st of 2nd Part Treaties on Law Ques. 90 of the Essence of Law. Thomas Aquinas.

5Jonathon Swift

6Jus est norma recti; et quicquid est contra normam recti est injuria. 3 Bulstr.313.

7Leges humanæ nascuntur, vivunt et moriuntur.

8Quod ipsis, qui cotraxerunt, abstat; et successoribus eorum obstat. Di.50.17.29.

9Legem enim contractus dat. 22 Wend. N.Y. 215,223.

10James Warburg to U.S. Senate, February 17, 1950.

11Consensus facit legem. Consent makes the law... Branch. Prine. Black’s.

12In omnibus contractivus, sive nominatis sive innominatis sive, permutatio continetur.

13Blacks 3rd “contract” p421.

14Nihil consensui tam contrarium est quam vis atque metus. Dig. 50. 17.116.

15Quod meum est sine me auferrè non potest. Jenk. Cent. Cas. 251.

16Leges Angliæ sunt tripartitæ: Jus commune, consuetudines, ac decreta comitiiorum.

17“agreements must be kept.”. General Principles of International Commercial Law, Jus Gentium.

18Clark’s Summary of American Law. p 530.

19See: The History of the Common Law of England by Matthew Hale 1713

- 20 Personæ vice fungitur municipium et decuria. Warner v. Beers, 23 Wend. N.Y. 103,144.
- 21 Black's Law Dict. (3rd ed.)
- 22 Black's Law Dict. (3rd Ed.) p.1106.
- 23 Ld. Raym. 417; Kebl. 563.
- 24 Black's 3rd Ed. page 1105.
- 25 Plutarch.
- 26 Bouvier's.
- 27 Fuller
- 28 1.3 Bouvier, Inst. n. 3064; Greanleaf, Ev. É 44.
- 29 3 Bouvier, Inst. n. 3064;
- 30 See Art. 1, Sec. 1 of Georgia's. Art. 1, Sec. 19, of Indiana's and Tennessee, Constitution Alabama (Article I, Sec. 12); Colorado (Article II, Sec. 10); Connecticut (Article First, Sec. 6); Delaware (Article I, Sec. 5); Kentucky (Bill of Rights, Sec. 9); Maine (Article I, Sec. 4); Maryland (Art. XXIII); Mississippi (Article 3, Sec. 13); Missouri (Article I, Sec. 8); Montana (Article II, Sec. 7); New Jersey (Article I, Sec. 6); New York (Article I, Sec. 8); North Dakota (Article I, Sec. 4); Oregon (Art. I, sec. 16), Pennsylvania (Article I, Sec. 7); South Carolina (Article I, Sec. 16); South Dakota (Article VI, Sec. 5); Texas (Article 1, Sec. 8); Utah (Article I, Sec. 15); Wisconsin (Article I, Sec. 3); Wyoming (Article I, Sec. 20)
- 31 Blacks Law Dict. 3rd p1039
- 32 Blacks Law Dict. 3rd
- 33 Nihil quod est contra rationem edt licitum. Coke, litt. 97.
- 34 Thomas Jefferson: Notes on Va., 1782. Q.XIV
- 35 Clark's Summary of American Law. Equity, p 233.
- 36 Persona est homo cum statu quandom cosideratus. Heinecc.Elem. 1.1, tit.3, §75.
- 37 Bouvier's.
- 38 Maine, Anc. Law, 27.
- 39 Black's 3rd p 332.
- 40 Holl. Jur. 59.
- 41 1804, Samuel Chase, Supreme Court Justice and signer of the Declaration of Independence
- 42 Judiciary Act of 1789 "an architectonic act still in force."
- 43 Chutes, Eq. 4.
- 44 Black's 3rd p 1079.
- 45 Stanek v. White. 172 Minn. 390, 215 N. W. 784.
- 46 Stanek v. White, 172 Minn. 390, 215 N. W. 784.
- 47 Black's 3rd p 1734.
- 48 Black's 3rd "cognizance" p 346.
- 49 Black's 3rd "legal title" p 1734.
- 50 Black's 3rd "beneficial Interest" p 206.
- 51 Black's 3rd "Equitable Title" p 1734.
- 52 Black's 3rd "clear title" p 1733.
- 53 LEGAL THESAURUS by William C. Burton second edition
- 54 Black's 3rd p 206
- 55 Black's 3rd p 206
- 56 Virginia Supreme Court decision, 1858
- 57 George Canfield, Am. Law Rev., 1881
- 58 U.S. Supreme Court decision, 1973.
- 59 Conversion vs. Reconversion. Money vs. Mammon. Trust vs. Faith.

"The Two United States and the Law"

By Howard Freeman

Our forefathers, weary of the oppressive measures that King George III's government forced upon them, in common declared their independence from England in 1776. They were not expected to be successful in that resistance. The moneyed people had backed England for two major reasons. First, our forefathers wanted a rigid, written Constitution "set in concrete." They were familiar with the so-called Constitution of England which consisted largely of customs, precedents, traditions, and understandings, often vague and always flexible. They wanted the principle of English common law, that an act done by any official person or law-making body beyond his or its legal competence was simply void. Second, the thirteen little colonies desired to base their union on substance (gold and silver) -- real money. They well knew how the despotic governments of Europe were mortgaged to the hilt -- lock, stock, and barrel, the land, the people, everything -- to certain wealthy men who controlled the banks, the currency, and all credit, who lent credit but did not loan gold and silver!

The United States of America was made up of a union of what is now fifty sovereign States, a three-branch (legislative, executive, and judicial) Republic known as The United States of America, or as termed in this article, the Continental United States. Its citizenry live in one of the fifty States, and its laws are based on the Constitution, which is based on Common Law.

Less than one hundred years after we became a nation, a loophole was discovered in the Constitution by cunning lawyers in league with the international bankers. They realized that a separate nation existed, by the same name, that Congress had created in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. This "United States" is a Legislative Democracy within the Constitutional Republic, and is known as the Federal United States. It has exclusive, unlimited rule over its citizenry, the residents of the District of Columbia, the territories and enclaves (Guam, Midway Islands, Wake Island, Puerto Rico, etc.), and anyone who is a citizen by way of the 14th Amendment (naturalized citizens).

Both United States have the same Congress that rules in both nations. One "United States," the Republic of fifty States, has the "stars and stripes" as its flag, but without any fringe on it. The Federal United States' flag is the stars and stripes with a yellow fringe, seen in all the courts. The abbreviations of the States of the Continental United States are, with or without the zip codes, Ala., Alas., Ariz., Ark., Cal., etc. The abbreviations of the States under the jurisdiction of the Federal United States, the Legislative Democracy, are AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, etc. (without any periods).

Under the Constitution, based on Common Law, the Republic of the Continental United States provides for legal cases (1) at Law, (2) in Equity, and (3) in Admiralty:

(1) Law is the collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense. It is the will of the majority, the organization of the natural right of lawful defense. It is the substitution of a common force for individual forces, to do only what the individual forces have a natural and lawful right to do: to protect persons, liberties, and properties; to maintain the right of each, and to cause justice to reign over us all. Since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty, or property of another individual, then the common force -- for the same reason -- cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups. Law allows you to do anything you want to, as long as you don't infringe upon the life, liberty or property of anyone else. Law does not compel performance. Today's so-called laws (ordinances, statutes, acts, regulations, orders, precepts, etc.) are often erroneously perceived as law, but just because something is called a "law" does not necessarily make it a law. [There is a difference between "legal" and "lawful." Anything the government does

is legal, but it may not be lawful.]

(2) Equity is the jurisdiction of compelled performance (for any **contract** you are a party to) and is based on what is fair in a particular situation. The term "equity" denotes the spirit and habit of fairness, justness, and right dealing which would regulate the intercourse of men with men. You have no rights other than what is specified in your **contract**. Equity has no criminal aspects to it.

(3) Admiralty is compelled performance plus a criminal penalty, a civil **contract** with a criminal penalty.

By 1938 the gradual merger procedurally between law and equity actions (i.e., the same court has jurisdiction over legal, equitable, and admiralty matters) was recognized. The nation was bankrupt and was owned by its creditors (the international bankers) who now owned everything -- the Congress, the Executive, the courts, all the States and their legislatures and executives, all the land, and all the people. Everything was mortgaged in the national debt. We had gone from being sovereigns over government to subjects under government, through the use of negotiable instruments to discharge our debts with limited liability, instead of paying our debts at common law with gold or silver coin.

The remainder of this article explains how this happened, where we are today, and what remedy we have to protect ourselves from this system.

Our Present Commercial System of "Law" and the REMEDY Provided for Our Protection

The present commercial system of "law" has replaced the old and familiar Common Law upon which our nation was founded. The following is the legal thread which brought us from sovereigns over government to subjects under government, through the use of negotiable instruments (Federal Reserve Notes) to discharge our debts with limited liability instead of paying our debts at common law with gold or silver coin.

The change in our system of law from public law to private commercial law was recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Erie Railroad vs. Thompkins case of 1938, after which case, in the same year, the procedures of Law were officially blended with the procedures of Equity. Prior to 1938, all U.S. Supreme Court decisions were based upon public law -- or that system of law that was controlled by Constitutional limitation. **Since 1938, all U.S. Supreme Court decisions are based upon what is termed public policy.**

Public policy concerns commercial transactions made under the Negotiable Instrument's Law, which is a branch of the international Law Merchant. This has been codified into what is now known as the Uniform Commercial Code, which system of law was made uniform throughout the fifty States through the cunning of the Congress of the United States (**which "United States" has its origin in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution, as distinguished from the "United States," which is the Union of the fifty States).**

In offering grants of negotiable paper (Federal Reserve Notes) which the Congress gave to the fifty States of the Union for education, highways, health, and other purposes, Congress bound all the States of the Union into a commercial agreement with the Federal United States (as distinguished from the Continental United States). The fifty States accepted the "benefits" offered by the Federal United States as the consideration of a commercial agreement between the Federal United States and each of the corporate States. The corporate States were then obligated to obey the Congress of the Federal United States and also to assume their portion of the equitable debts of the Federal United States to the international banking houses, for the credit loaned. The credit which each State received, in the form of federal grants, was predicated upon equitable paper.

This system of negotiable paper binds all corporate entities of government together in a vast system of

commercial agreements and is what has altered our court system from one under the Common Law to a Legislative Article I Court, or Tribunal, system of commercial law. Those **persons** brought before this court are held to the letter of every statute of government on the federal, state, county, or municipal levels unless they have exercised the REMEDY provided for them within that system of Commercial Law whereby, when forced to use a so-called "benefit" offered, or available, to them, from government, they may reserve their former right, under the Common Law guarantee of same, not to be bound by any **contract**, or commercial agreement, that they did not enter knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally.

This is exactly how the corporate entities of state, county, and municipal governments got entangled with the Legislative Democracy, **created by Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution**, and called here The Federal United States, to distinguish it from the Continental United States, whose origin was in the Union of the Sovereign States.

The same national Congress rules the Continental United States pursuant to Constitutional limits upon its authority, while it enjoys exclusive rule, **with no Constitutional limitations**, as it legislates for the Federal United States.

With the above information, we may ask: "How did we, the free Preamble citizenry of the Sovereign States, lose our guaranteed unalienable rights and be forced into acceptance of the equitable debt obligations of the Federal United States, and also become subject to that entity of government, and divorced from our Sovereign States in the Republic, which we call here the Continental United States?" We do not reside, work, or have income from any territory subject to the direct jurisdiction of the Federal United States. These are questions that have troubled sincere, patriotic Americans for many years. Our lack of knowledge concerning the cunning of the legal profession is the cause of that divorce, but a knowledge of the truth concerning the legal thread, which caught us in its net, will restore our former status as a free Preamble citizen of the Republic. The answer follows:

Our national Congress works for two nations foreign to each other, and by legal cunning both are called The United States. One is the Union of Sovereign States, under the Constitution, termed in this article the Continental United States. The other is a Legislative Democracy which has its origin in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution, here termed the Federal United States. Very few people, when they see some "law" passed by Congress, ask themselves, "Which nation was Congress working for when it passed this or that so-called law?" Or, few ask, "Does this particular law apply to the Continental citizenry of the Republic, or does this particular law apply only to residents of the District of Columbia and other named enclaves, or territories, of the Democracy called the Federal United States?"

Since these questions are seldom asked by the uninformed citizenry of the Republic, it was an open invitation for "cunning" political leadership to seek more power and authority over the entire citizenry of the Republic through the medium of "legalese." Congress deliberately failed in its duty to provide a medium of exchange for the citizenry of the Republic, in harmony with its Constitutional mandate. Instead, it created an abundance of commercial credit money for the Legislative Democracy, where it was not bound by Constitutional limitations. Then, after having created an emergency situation, and a tremendous depression in the Republic, Congress used its emergency authority to remove the remaining substance (gold and silver) from the medium of exchange belonging to the Republic, and made the negotiable instrument paper of the Legislative Democracy (Federal United States) a legal tender for Continental United States citizenry to use in the discharge of debts.

At the same time, Congress granted the entire citizenry of the two nations the "benefit" of limited liability in the discharge of all debts by telling the citizenry that the gold and silver coins of the Republic were out of date and cumbersome. The citizens were told that gold and silver (substance) was no longer needed to pay their debts, that they were now "privileged" to discharge debt with this more "convenient" currency, issued by the Federal

United States. Consequently, everyone was forced to "go modern," and to turn in their gold as a patriotic gesture. The entire news media complex went along with the scam and declared it to be a forward step for our democracy, no longer referring to America as a Republic.

From that time on, it was a falling light for the Republic of 1776, and a rising light for Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal Democracy, which overcame the depression, which was caused by a created shortage of real money. There was created an abundance of debt paper money, so-called, in the form of interest-bearing negotiable instrument paper called Federal Reserve Notes, and other forms of paperwork credit instruments.

Since all **contracts** since Roosevelt's time have the colorable consideration of Federal Reserve Notes, instead of a genuine consideration of silver and gold coin, all **contracts** are colorable contracts, and not genuine **contracts**. [According to Black's Law Dictionary (1990), colorable means "That which is in appearance only, and not in reality, what it purports to be, hence counterfeit, feigned, having the appearance of truth."]

Consequently, a new colorable jurisdiction, called a statutory jurisdiction, had to be created to enforce the **contracts**. Soon the term colorable contract was changed to the term commercial agreement to fit circumstances of the new statutory jurisdiction, which is legislative, rather than judicial, in nature. This jurisdiction enforces commercial agreements upon implied **CONSENT**, rather than full knowledge, as it is with the enforcement of **contracts** under the Common Law.

All of our courts today sit as legislative Tribunals, and the so-called "statutes" of legislative bodies being enforced in these Legislative Tribunals are not "statutes" passed by the legislative branch of our three-branch Republic, but as "commercial obligations" to the Federal United States for anyone in the Federal United States or in the Continental United States who has used the equitable currency of the Federal United States and who has accepted the "benefit," or "privilege," of discharging his debts with the limited liability "benefit" offered to him by the Federal United States - EXCEPT - those who availed themselves of the remedy within this commercial system of law, which remedy is today found in Book 1 of the Uniform Commercial Code at Section 207.

When used in conjunction with one's signature, a stamp stating "Without Prejudice U.C.C. 1-207" is sufficient to indicate to the magistrate of any of our present Legislative Tribunals (called "courts") that the signer of the document has reserved his Common Law right. He is not to be bound to the statute, or commercial obligation, of any commercial agreement that he did not enter knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally, as would be the case in any Common Law contract.

Furthermore, pursuant to U.C.C. 1-103, the statute, being enforced as a commercial obligation of a commercial agreement, must now be construed in harmony with the old Common Law of America, where the tribunal/court must rule that the statute does not apply to the individual who is wise enough and informed enough to exercise the remedy provided in this new system of law. He retains his former status in the Republic and fully enjoys his unalienable rights, guaranteed to him by the Constitution of the Republic, while those about him "curse the darkness" of Commercial Law government, lacking the truth needed to free themselves from a slave status under the Federal United States, even while inhabiting territory foreign to its territorial venue.

ADDENDUM

U.C.C. 1-207; Sufficiency of reservation.

Any expression indicating any intention to preserve rights is sufficient, such as "without prejudice," "under protest," "under reservation," or "with reservation of all our rights."

The Code states an "explicit" reservation must be made. "Explicit" undoubtedly is used in place of "express" to indicate that the reservation must not only be "express" but it must also be "clear" that such a reservation was intended.

The term "explicit" as used in U.C.C. 1-207 means "that which is so clearly stated or distinctively set forth that there is no doubt as to its meaning." ...

U.C.C. 1-207:7 Effect of reservation of rights.

The making of a valid reservation of rights preserves whatever rights the person then possesses and prevents the loss of such right by application of concepts of waiver or estoppel....

U.C.C. 1-207:9 Failure to make reservation.

When a waivable right or claim is involved, the failure to make a reservation thereof causes a loss of the right and bars its assertion at a later date

U.C.C. 1-103:6 Common law.

The Code is "Complementary" to the common law which remains in force except where displaced by the Code....

A statute should be construed in harmony with the common law unless there is a clear legislative intent to abrogate the common law. ... "The Code cannot be read to preclude a common law action."

"Beware the leader who bangs the drums of war in order to whip the citizenry into a patriotic fervor, for patriotism is indeed a double-edged sword. It both emboldens the blood, just as it narrows the mind. And when the drums of war have reached a fever pitch and the blood boils with hate and the mind has closed, the leader will have no need in seizing the rights of the citizenry. Rather, the citizenry, infused with fear and blinded by patriotism, will offer up all of their rights unto the leader and gladly so. How do I know? For this is what I have done. And I am Caesar." (Julius Caesar)

U.S. Law is Private Merchant Law

“Leaving the people as Surety and Debtor on the Bankruptcy”

Law is contract, universally and in the U.S., so we must follow the progression of contractual agreements which constitute the underlying U.S. Law. (We cannot address all individual laws and cases or you would not have time in a life to review it, even though ignorance of the millions of laws, statutes, codes, etc. is no excuse in Private Admiralty Jurisdictions.)

In basically chronological order, the following progression of contracts, and our interpretation of them follows:

The USA, a corporation of the English Crown, is bankrupt, and has been since at least 1788. The Articles of Confederation states in Article 12: "All bills of credit emitted, monies borrowed, and debts contracted by, or under the authority of Congress, before the assembling of the United States, in pursuance of the present confederation, shall be deemed as considered a charge against the United States, for payment and satisfaction whereof the said United States, and the public faith are hereby solemnly pledged." The "Founding Fathers," as constitutors, acknowledged and reorganized the debt in the US Constitution 1787, Article VI, hence "constitution." Bankruptcy occurred on January 1, 1788 based on 21 loans that the United States of America received from the King of England dating from February 28, 1778 through July 5, 1782, the repayment of which had been ratified by Congress on January 22, 1783. The United States Bank, created in 1791, was a private bank, with 18,000 of 25,000 shares owned by England.

No de jure, constitutional Congress has existed since March 27, 1861 when seven (7) Southern States walked out of Congress leaving Congress without a quorum for adjourning and therefore ending sine die. That which is called "Congress" today assembles and acts under the authority of the President acting in capacity of being Commander-In-Chief of the Armed Forces, under emergency war-powers rule, i.e. "law of necessity," i.e. no law (see 12 Stat 319, which has never been repealed and exists in Title 50 USC §§ 212, 213, 215, Appendix 16, 26 CFR Chapter 1 § 303.1-6(a), and 31 CFR Chapter 5 § 500.701 Penalties).

Since the above-referenced date, March 27, 1861, Americans have been under Fascist rule via presidential executive order under the aforementioned Emergency War Powers, 12 USC 95 a, b. Every "citizen of the United States" is now "legally" established as an "enemy" via the Amendatory Act of March 9, 1933, 48 Stat. 1, amending Trading With Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, H.R. 4960, Public Law No. 91.

December 6th, 1865, the 14th Amendment was proclaimed as ratified (even though it never properly was, see below). The 14th Amendment, which is private Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical Trust Law, constitutes a constructive, cestui que trust, a public charitable

trust, "PCT," that was expressly designed to bring every corporate franchise artificial person called a "citizen of the United States" into an inseparable merging with the government until the two are united (with the power inhering in the government, not the people). A cestui que trust is fundamentally different from a regular trust, which is express in nature and consists of a contractual indenture involving three (3) parties: Grantor (Creator or

Trustor), Trustee, and Beneficiaries. In an express trust, legal ownership is transferred by written contract between Grantor and Trustee in which the Grantor surrenders ownership of property to the legal person, the Trust, to be managed by the Trustee on behalf of those who are to benefit from the arrangement, the Beneficiaries. A cestui que trust, on the other hand, differs from an express trust in several crucial ways:

a.) It is not formed by express contract, i.e. overt agreement expressed in writing, but by legal construction, i.e. fiat.

b.) A cestui que trust has no Grantor, but, being a constructive trust created by operation of law, i.e. by make-believe, has only co-trustees and co-beneficiaries. The co-trustees are the parties with the duties for managing property for the "public good," i.e. for the benefit of those designated as co-beneficiaries.

The Legislative Act of February 21, 1871, Forty-first Congress, Session III, Chapter 62, page 419, chartered a Federal company entitled "United States," a/k/a "US Inc.," a "Commercial Agency" originally designated as "Washington, D.C.," in accordance with the so-called 14th Amendment, which the record indicates was never ratified (see Utah Supreme Court Cases, Dyett v Turner, (1968) 439 P2d 266, 267; State v Phillips, (1975) 540 P 2d 936; as well as Coleman v. Miller, 307 U.S. 448, 59 S. Ct. 972; 28 Tulane Law Review, 22; 11 South Carolina Law Quarterly 484; Congressional Record, June 13, 1967, pp. 15641-15646). A "citizen of the United States" is a civilly dead entity operating as a co-trustee and co-beneficiary of the PCT, the constructive, cestui que trust of US Inc. under the 14th Amendment, which upholds the debt of the USA and US Inc. in Section 4.

In conformity with the above-referenced creation of United States (1871) and the 14th Amendment, the Legislature of each State created a limited-liability corporation, chartered in a private, military, international, commercial, admiralty/maritime jurisdiction, entitled "STATE OF." e.g. "STATE OF CALIFORNIA," as evidenced by, inter alia, the change in the seal and the creation of a new constitution, e.g. Constitution of the State of California (1879), concerning which, re California:

- A general partnership agreement, hereinafter "General Partnership," exists between the California Republic (1849), and STATE OF CALIFORNIA (1879), with STATE OF CALIFORNIA acting as governmental controller.
- STATE OF CALIFORNIA now acts as an agent/instrumentality of United States, collecting whole life insurance premiums, known as "taxes," for the International Monetary Fund, based, inter alia, upon the Limited Liability Act of 1851 and the bankruptcy of United States of 1933, see House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933;

Public Law 73-10; Perry v. U.S. (1935), 294 U.S. 330-381, 79 L Ed 912; 31 USC 5112, 5119.

Inasmuch as all law is contract, the contract involved in a constructive trust is an implied contract. An implied contract can be ratified by two (2) means:

a. Acquiescence by silence, i.e. the "government" asserts its intentions concerning your life, rights, and property and you assent, don't rebut, and compliantly go along with what they claim. In 1871 the Government changed the nature of its contract with the people from law as defined by the original Constitution of 1787 that recognizes law (common law), admiralty (on the sea only), and equity

(functioning by voluntary contract between all participating parties), and began relating to people as if they were "citizens of the United States" within/under the private, commercial, international, military jurisdiction of the new de facto corporation, i.e. US Inc. They offered people a "new deal," and almost everyone bought it (based on naïve and foolish trust and assuming that everything was OK). The people were thereby denied access to law and placed on the ship of state of US Inc. where the captain's word is law and no one has any rights. As Jefferson phrased the matter, "As government grows, liberty recedes."

b. You expressly accept "benefits" offered by the government, and thereby finalize the contract by deed. This is similar to finalizing a contract with a restaurant by sitting down at a table, reading a menu, and then ordering and consuming a meal. By your deeds you affirm to the restaurant that you will pay for the meal in accordance with the price stated on the menu. No written contract is signed, but a contract is formed nevertheless.

By the above two (2) means people give implied assent (**CONSENT**) that they are bound by an alleged contract with US Inc. in accordance with the terms and conditions that inhere in being treated as a "citizen of the United States" under the 14th Amendment, and are therefore placed into permanent legal status as a Debtor and Surety for U.S. Inc. In such a position people leave the ground of sovereignty and all capacity for asserting their unalienable rights in favor of being presumed as having exercised their sovereignty and free-will autonomy for the purpose of going along with the government's assertion that they sacrifice everything for the "public good," i.e. the PCT. By so doing people lose their standing in law, i.e. they "die a civil death in the law." They are placed in the legal position of mortmain (i.e. as if deceased) and are shorn of capacity for asserting their rights, since the presumption is that they have already exercised those rights for the purpose of being placed in the position they are in, i.e. property of the government with a lien against you and everything your life labor could ever create, including your children. The private being (the real individual) is sacrificed for the good of the public (the imaginary collective).

When people die such a civil death in the law they are like ghosts, and thereby incapable of managing their own affairs and enjoying their unalienable rights. Like the estate of a decedent, they are then managed by the executors/administrators of the estate, in probate. Such is the condition of every "citizen of the United States" today in law, managed by the government agencies acting as executors/administrators of their estates in bankruptcy, legal incapacity, and civil death as assets of the bankrupt US. The US is property of the private Real Parties of Interest, the Creditors in bankruptcy.

The 14th Amendment was allegedly established for the purpose of creating a citizenship for the liberated blacks, and other disenfranchised people, who otherwise had no citizenship because they could not comply with the requirements for state citizenship. What actually happened was that the blacks were taken off of the Southern slave plantations and placed into the slave plantation of US Inc., a far worse lot. The government then gradually absorbed everyone else-including state citizens-into the same condition.

1871-1913. Officers of the actual government held office in dual capacity, i.e. in both USA and US Inc. status.

1912. Bonds issued by US Inc. came due but US Inc. did not have the resources for paying their creditors (the seven families that founded the Federal Reserve Bank), so US Inc.'s owner (the actual government) was required to pay the balance. The national government was also without sufficient funds to meet US Inc.'s

obligations, so the creditors settled for all of the assets of both US Inc. and the national government instead of foreclosure on and liquidation of the entire country. By so doing they expropriated the nation-both USA and US Inc. Sic transit America.

1912. US Inc. forms an agreement with the Federal Reserve Bank (It is important to note that both of these entities are private corporations which removes the general allegations of treason or fraud from this relationship). Through this agreement US Inc. must function in debt, even though they have neither funds nor resources for financing their operation.

1912. The first corporate only Senators are seated in the next election year by popular vote of the US Inc. registered voters. The original-jurisdiction national Senators of the States did not assume office that year and at least one third of the nation's Senators seats were lawfully and voluntarily vacant.

February 3rd, 1913. US Inc. passes its 16th Amendment and Congress orders the Secretary of State to enter it as ratified even though the States had not ratified it according to Law. The Secretary complied. It should be noted that this would not have been lawful if it were a national Constitution amendment; however it was perfectly legal within the colorable, de facto corporation. It should also be noted that where the national Constitution already had a 16th amendment and where the Supreme Court says that the new 16th Amendment did not do anything, this corporate amendment must simply be a space filler entered such that US Inc.'s Constitution (1871) would have the same number of amendments as that of the national Constitution (1787).

April 8th, 1913. US Inc. passes its 17th amendment and Congress orders it to be entered as ratified in the exact same manner as they did with US Inc.'s 16th Amendment. This amendment changes where US Inc.'s Senators are elected. This amendment is not even lawfully possible as a national Constitution amendment for several reasons, not the least of which is that the amendment would have required that Congress first pass an amendment that stated that they had the power to say where Senators are elected before they could even deliberate on such a subject matter, after which they would then have to have competent ratifications performed on such amendments in accord with constitutional limits, not as was done with US Inc.'s 16th Amendment.

December 23, 1913. The Congress, late at night with only a small cadre of supporters present, passed the Federal Reserve Act, surrendering the creation and management of the nation's currency into the hands of a cartel of private-and mostly foreign-bankers. Currency is the single most essential and critical commodity in the world, embodying more law and principles of commerce than any other. Since all interactions are "commerce," and the medium of doing business in commerce is currency, money is in a very significant sense the measure of all things. By abandoning control and management of the money supply the nation surrendered all capacity for claiming sovereignty. The government lost its independent treasury (one of the requirements in law for national sovereignty). The United States Government became a mere fiefdom, or administrative arm, of the bankers, who now owned the store.

Passage of the Federal Reserve Act was a major milestone on the "road to serfdom" that this entire progression outlines. The conspiratorial nature of matters is exemplified in comments by one of the major actors in the triumph of the Federal Reserve, Edward Mandell House, who had this to say in a private meeting with President Woodrow Wilson:

"[Very] soon, every American will be required to register their biological property in a

national system designed to keep track of the people and that will operate under the ancient system of pledging. By such methodology, we can compel people to submit to our agenda, which will affect our security as a chargeback for our fiat paper currency. Every American will be forced to register or suffer being unable to work and earn a living. They will be our chattel, and we will hold the security interest over them forever, by operation of the law merchant under the scheme of secured transactions.

Americans, by unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of lading to us will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent, forever to remain economic slaves through taxation, secured by their pledges. They will be stripped of their rights and given a commercial value designed to make us a profit and they will be none the wiser, for not one man in a million could ever figure our plans and, if by accident one or two should figure it out, we have in our arsenal plausible deniability. After all, this is the only logical way to fund government, by floating liens and debt to the registrants in the form of benefits and privileges. This will inevitably reap to us huge profits beyond our wildest expectations and leave every American a contributor to this fraud which we will call "Social Insurance." Without realizing it, every American will insure us for any loss we may incur and in this manner; every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly. The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and, we will employ the high office of the President of our dummy corporation to foment this plot against America."

1917. Corporate-only Senators begin participating in all matters with those Senators who still had original jurisdiction government capacity, as a result of which all activities of the government were performed in corporate capacity only.

1917. President Wilson was re-elected by the Electoral College, but only US Inc.'s Senate performed the Senate confirmation necessary for seating the national President. There was no national government Senate confirmation; no national seats were seated and all remained vacant. Note: the national President is also the Military's Commander in Chief, and under the nation's status of being ruled by the private, commercial, martial-law rule of the Bankers and English Crown, the business needs of the nation have remained under US Inc. control since 1871, i.e. ever since US Inc. was incorporated and made operational over such matters.

1917-1944. All national government seats are and remain vacant, and US Inc. continues maintaining the business needs of the government under martial-law rule.

June 5, 1933. US Inc. declares bankruptcy under House Joint Resolution, "HJR," 192.

1935. The Social Security Act is passed.

On application, the new Social Security Administration (hereinafter "SSA") creates a private Trust with a trust name that sounds like the name of the applicant except the Trust's name is spelled with all capital letters. SSA makes the applicant a co-trustee of the namesake Trust, designates the SSA General Trust Fund as the Beneficiary of the namesake trust, and assigns the Trust a Social Security General Trust Fund Account number re the applicant for accounting and identification purposes.

1938. In Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, 1938, 304 U.S. 64-92, the U.S. Supreme Court sets the presumption re the status and capacity of an individual as that of General Capacity/General Partnership relationship with the namesake Trust, as if the two (2) entities-individual and namesake Trust-were one-in-the-same person.

1944. In the Bretton Woods Agreement US Inc. is quit-claimed into the newly formed International Monetary Fund (hereinafter "IMF") in exchange for the power allowing US Inc.'s President the right of naming (seating and controlling) the governors and general managers of the International Monetary Fund, The World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the Inter-American Bank also formed in that agreement (codified at United States Code Title 22 § 286). It must be noted that this act created an unlawful conflict of interest between US Inc. (with its new foreign owner) and its purpose of carrying out the business needs of the national government. This is the cause of our use of the term "original-jurisdiction" government. With the new foreign owner of US Inc. a conflict of interest is created between the national government and US Inc., even though the contracted purpose of US Inc. has not changed on its face.

1962. At the National Governor's Conference in Lexington, Kentucky, US Inc. informs the governors, under the guise of "public necessity", that they must all form, or reform existing, private corporations under US Inc. (in their state's interest), so that the people will not discover what the state governments are doing with the people's money (dabbling in foreign notes, i.e. Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs), bonds, and evidences of debt), which activity is forbidden from State governments by their own State Constitutions, which information would likely cause a people's revolt ending in the State official's being at worst killed and at least replaced. The proposed incorporation deadline was 1968.

1970. By this time each State revised its constitution and statutes and formed private corporate entities of the name "STATE OF (X)" (where "(X)" is representative of the common State name), and then vacated their original jurisdiction government seats in favor of foreign ownership and control under the mandate of US Inc.

It appears that this was all done so a General Partnership could be presumed as existing between "The State" (of the national Union of States) and "STATE OF (X)", a private corporation. Said STATE OF (X), as General Partner, then assumes the role of governmental operator/controller. This scenario is further proven by the fact that these corporate entities cannot handle gold and silver coin of the United States of America in commercial transactions without violating the Par Value Modifications Act and the Foreign Currency Exchange Act.

April 19th, 1994. Federal agents attack, burn, and raze a private compound, killing approximately 100 of the members of the sect, without any lawful cause for the action.

50 USC 1520 et seq. demonstrates that there exists an agenda for using Americans (Sovereign and otherwise) as biological test subjects. This is a fundamental breach of an alleged Constitutional contract.

President Clinton pushes for a mandatory health care bill for the purpose of placing the physical bodies of all Americans under control of US Inc., with international identification attached, for the purpose of tagging the populace. The computer that would handle the tracking is identified with the acronym: B.E.A.S.T.

What the above progression depicts is the systematic growth of the power, scope, and pervasive control of Government exercised against the American people by foreign, criminal, and hostile powers. This same dreary gestalt constitutes the nature of man's history on this planet as far back as the eye can see.

Civilizations rise, fall, and disappear, replaced by new ones that-based upon being founded on, and functioning in accordance with, wrong principles-are foredoomed for extinction, as were all of their predecessors and as all future civilizations will be until mankind finally learns and ceases "beating a dead horse" by structuring law, commerce, religion, and social organization in general on principles that are existentially impossible.

The above progression has proceeded in America by implementing such strategy as:

- 1) Relentlessly instilling in people the foundational idea that governments in general are absolutely essential in the society of man and that the Government in America is the people's friend and servant, i.e. a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." These premises are untrue-self-serving cons by those who want the power.
- 2) Creating governmentally owned corporate franchises, such as a "citizen of the United States" and one's all-capital-letter name, with which people are deceived into identifying.
- 3) **Regarding every citizen of the United States as contractually being:**
 - a.) **A corporate citizen, i.e. a corporate franchise;**
 - b.) **A co-trustee (with duties) and co-beneficiary (with privileges) of the 14th Amendment Public Charitable cestui que Trust;**
 - c.) **Pledged as an asset in the bankruptcy of US Inc., and therefore a co-surety for the debts of US Inc.;**
 - d.) **An enemy of the Creditors;**
 - e.) **Chattel property of the Bankers and Power Elite;**
 - f.) **A slave with no capacity for asserting any rights, no standing in law, and no capacity for contracting.**
- 4) Functioning on the presumption that the individual being, with autonomy and free will, knowingly, intentionally, and voluntarily contracted into the situation of being united-like heads and tails of a coin-with a corporate entity created and owned by the Government.

As per the established maxim of law, "As a thing is bound, so it is unbound," the way out of the problem is within and through the problem. This is accomplished by understanding what the problem is, i.e. its structure and character, just as solving the problem of a plugged drain is accomplished by realizing that the problem is the plugged drain, whereby the solution consists of unplugging the drain. "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free.

The United States Library of Congress now has between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 books on law. Any law library is a daunting place, possessing row after row of shelves with books full of fine print. Making knowledge of such "law" even more unattainable is not only that what passes for law today perpetually changes, altered by every new court case/opinion, legislative enactment, and all of the ever-changing policies, rules, and regulations of administrative agencies, but an immense amount of the world's law today, as actually implemented, is unwritten and inaccessible.

This is not only because judges operate in general equity in which the ultimate arbiter of a matter is the "conscience of the court" (i.e. how the judge feels about something that day), but because almost all of the world's law is the private Law Merchant of the Creditors in bankruptcy of the world's nations, essentially all of which are insolvent and in receivership to the Bankers.[3] This private Law Merchant is of ancient origin, and is implemented today by men whose identities are unknown to the mass of mankind.

The American Illusion

Background and Framework

The Roman Civil Law Republican government founded by the original Constitution, 1787, is claimed no longer operational. Instead, what is called the “Government of the United States” is a bankrupt, private corporation, owned, underwritten, and functioning in commerce as a front for the international bankers and the Powers-That-Be with which said bankers are allied. The entire institution, i.e., “US Inc.,” is private (not free) enterprise administering the ongoing business and political ends of the actual owners. In this current scenario, every action of US Inc. is a commercial transaction by and between fictitious entities all transpiring for the purpose of furthering the economic and political objectives of the alleged creditors.

This situation arose from the borrowing by USA from European central banks and owing the unpaid indebtedness to the Crown from the original joint-venture agreement between the Colonies (which are corporations of the Crown) and the Crown per se. It appears as though USA has been bankrupt from inception, i.e., from 1788, and the Constitution was drafted to “re-constitute” the unpaid debt and structure an organization for functioning in bankruptcy.

The Civil War was staged and financed by the bankers and the Crown to conquer the nation by engaging in the timeless strategy of “divide and conquer.” Pitting North against South resulted in the dissolution of the de jure Federal government of the organic Constitution. The States were drawn into the Central Government, as were—progressively—the people directly, with the whole conglomerate operating through the new Federal Government in the Emergency War Powers of 12 Stat. 319, 1861, under the “law of necessity.”

Thus, the “Government” functions under mere “color (appearance only) of government” with the President as acting dictator on behalf of the bankers under the President’s capacity as Commander in Chief of the Military. I.e., when the seven (7) Southern States walked out of Congress on March 27, 1861, Congress—and, indeed, the entire de jure Government of USA under the original Constitution—dissolved based on absence of a Congressional quorum to adjourn and re-convene. The result is that the actual winner of the Civil War was neither the North nor the South, but the bankers who owned the new Federal Government that defeated both North and South and absorbed and subserved the States into itself.

In accordance, inter alia, with the Limited Liability Act of 1851, the Emergency War Powers, 12 Stat. 319, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, and the constitutional provision allowing Congress authority to pass any law Congress wishes within the ten-mile square territory of Washington, DC, Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, the 14th Amendment was proclaimed ratified in 1868. Within that framework, on February 21st, 1871, Congress passed the District of Columbia Organic Act, Forty-first Congress, Session III, Chapter 62, page 419, 16 Stat. 419, “An Act to provide a Government for the District of Columbia,” which act was revised in 1874 and reorganized June 8, 1878, 20 Stat. 102, Chap 180, 45th Congress, 2nd Session, “An Act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia.” This “government” is a private corporation now known and copyrighted by such names as “The United States Government,” “United States,” “U.S.,” “U.S.A.,” etc., all referenced herein as “US Inc.”

It is important to understand that US Inc. is not a country, but a corporation—and indeed a bankrupt corporation operating under color of government as the front and device for administering the conquest in law and commerce of the United States of America. The 14th Amendment and US Inc. are all private international law in the admiralty-maritime/Law Merchant of Roman Civil Law.

The 14th Amendment states: “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside.” This amendment allows US Inc. to have complete jurisdiction over “citizens,” i.e., corporate subsets of US Inc., which the de jure federal government did not and could not possess. The 14th Amendment also states (section 4): “The validity of the public debt of the United States authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion [per 12 Stat. 319], shall not be questioned.” \

The 14th Amendment established the framework for complete conquest and absorption of the country, rendering the people permanent debtors, indentured servants in involuntary servitude, peonage, and also enemies of the government as a result, in accordance with 12 State 319, any aspect of US Inc. may summarily confiscate property in rem without necessity for judicial process whenever any citizen asserts a challenge to the laws of the United States, i.e., US Inc.

Remnants of the de jure Government remained after the 14th Amendment, however, based on such things as the continuing circulation of gold and silver coin (the money of sovereigns) and the fact that Senators were still elected to the Senate by Electors of the States rather than by direct, popular vote. Senators became elected by direct vote of the people with the passage of the 17th Amendment. The Civil War had forced each sovereign State to pledge its assets as collateral and become surety and a cosigner for the defaulted Federal Government’s debt to the bankers. This procedure was repeated in the 1933 bankruptcy, at which time gold and silver coin (substance) were outlawed as money for citizens of the United States (fictions). Inability to use gold and silver as money solidified the bankruptcy of US Inc. and foreclosed every such citizen from accessing real money for use in payment of debts, thereby denying access to sovereignty. US Inc. is completely devoid of rights, substance, standing in law, and sovereign character, as is every citizen of the United States.

The creation and nature of the “Strawman”

Because additional pledging of assets was required to enable the now-bankrupt corporation to continue to operate when civilly dead, the governors of all the States met to discuss the “emergency” declared by Franklin D. Roosevelt, i.e., the bankruptcy, and how to reorganize US Inc. to continue functioning when bankrupt by means of insurance underwriting by the creditors.

The governors of the States made a “pledge” to US Inc. to underwrite the bankruptcy through a grand scheme of limited-liability insurance. The people, through their “Certificates of Live Birth,” a/k/a “newborn identification,” were registered in the office of the county recorder by “registered agents” of the government such as the “registered doctor” and “registered nurse,” and were thereby established as property of the State. Remember “register” derives from “regis,” meaning “king,” whereby everything “registered” is there to record and keep track of the king’s property.

The newborn identification is identified with, and attaches to, the flesh-and-blood being by taking a drop of blood and the print (usually footprint) of the baby and applying them to the newborn identification. Once that certificate is registered, it is recorded as a “certificate of title,” as it were, to the real being. Since the point is to be able to enslave the child and render him a surety for the debt of the bankrupt US Inc., it makes no difference

who or what the baby is. Everyone becomes classified as “fungible goods,” like interchangeable bales of cotton.

The parents did not understand what was happening, so the process was thereby fraud based on deceit and non-disclosure. Obviously, with full disclosure of the terms and conditions involved in the alleged contract, no one would agree to go along with it. The agents of the government perpetrate a fraudulent transfer by registering the name, blood, and footprint of beings that is birthed by the living woman and not the corporate state (which can generate only more legal fictions, not real beings). This process amounts to theft of the real being by filing a piece of paper. The State did not create the name from which the all-caps strawman was derived, only colored the name into a form they could use. The name in upper- and lower-case letters pertains to the real being, while the all-caps strawman is a legal fiction used as credit against which to borrow at the expense of the life-force of the living being to which the name and registered newborn identification allegedly relates.

When the Governors of the States, at the Conference of Governors of March 6, 1933, pledged as State-registered assets the newborn identifications of those born in the State to the federal bankruptcy, the people’s energy was established as the collateral for backing the whole operation—the entire national debt. Since the States, being fictitious, commercial entities with no capacity to recognize real beings, could not pledge private, living people or their property, a “bridge” was needed between the living people and the bankruptcy of the federal US Inc.

To accomplish this result the Department of Commerce in Washington, DC, in order to function as a shell to operate out front publicly in place of the people, created the strawman. The scheme had to be so clever that the people would agree to operate as surety for the debts, charges, and obligations of the strawman without knowing what was happening to them, who did it, what they were agreeing to, or how the whole process worked.

The birth certificate with the all-caps name created by the U.S. Department of Commerce is a certificate of equity interest, akin to a “pink slip” pertaining to a vehicle, and possibly a bill of lading, a document of bailment, which ships the cargo (new and original birth certificate) into the special maritime jurisdiction of the creditors to operate as collateral to back the bankruptcy reorganization of US Inc. via the Governor’s pledge. The all-caps strawman is thereby “birthed”—like a vessel—into the private, international-law special maritime jurisdiction of the bankers, et al, as a “citizen of the United States born [birthed] or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof.”

By this scheme the living people assumed the roll of guarantor, accommodation party, and surety for the legal fiction that functions for the benefit and enrichment of the creditors. In this scenario it is the strawman, not the living being, that operates throughout the entirety of today’s law and commerce. One need only look at the Social Security Card, School Records, Passports, Driver’s Licenses, credit cards, utility bills, etc., all of which are always in all-capital letters—just as are gravestones of dead people all over the world and the parties to a dispute on the caption of a court brief—to see the ubiquitous use of the strawman in today’s commercial and legal world.

A “surety” is defined as “the one who is responsible to pay.” The real man is the surety and liable by contract to pay for the debts and obligations of the strawman, even though the real man is not, nor does he own, nor does he receive title to, anything purchased or accomplished by use of the strawman. The strawman is owned by US Inc. and the banks that purchased bonds issued by the Treasury against the strawman (as credit).

As stated, US Inc. is bankrupt, and has been since 1933. US Inc. has no gold or silver to pay any debts and is civilly dead. Having neither possession, nor right of possession, nor legal capacity to use gold and silver, i.e., “lawful money,” the only asset left to finance the continued operation of the bankrupt US Inc., i.e., the “government,” was the people, who were hypothecated as the credit/collateral to finance the bankruptcy. US Inc. uses the substance and labor of the people to finance its entire operation. reorganization and insurance underwriting.

The scenario is extremely sophisticated, resulting in the operation of a vast and pervasive administration of legalized peonage, slavery, permanent indentured servitude, and collectivism (communism) wherein the people have forfeited all standing in law and are “dead to rights.” The Powers-That-Be borrow against your life, rights, and labor to finance their administration of the system they use to exploit, plunder, and dominate you, all under the pretext/presumption that they are acting as your agents to fulfill your own requests. In this scheme one is punished when one fails to pay or obey.

The sequence of steps involved in creating the existing system, in accordance with the best research to date (resulting from the efforts of many devoted people), is as follows in the United States:

1. A living, flesh-and-blood baby is born from its mother’s womb.
2. The legal/commercial system, existing and functioning entirely in the abstract realm of words, contracts, legal persons, corporate entities, laws, symbols, ideas, commerce, private international law, etc., (which constitutes the “matrix”) cannot see, recognize, or deal directly with the real world, including real people. The system itself is imaginary, while the real world is genuine and substantive. Consequently, the system deals only with documents and matters in the abstract realm that form, by presumption, ratified implied contract attached to the real world by “operation of law” and the tacit consent of the people.
3. Just after birth, the involved doctors and hospitals have the mother sign a “birth certificate,” i.e., a “certificate of live birth,” without telling the mother (and undoubtedly without themselves knowing the truth) that by so doing she and the doctor are criminally informing on her newborn baby as an enemy of the state in accordance with the War Powers and turning the baby over to the bankers as chattel property and slave, pledging the baby’s life-energy and labor in perpetuity as the collateral for borrowing into existence all “currency” (debt-paper) that passes as “money” today.
4. The original birth certificate, a “Certificate of Live Birth,” constitutes, as it were, a “certificate of title” to the real being, and is in essence the equivalent of a “manufacturer’s statement (or certificate) of origin,” i.e., “MSO” or “MCO,” which is created upon manufacturing an automobile and constitutes title to the vehicle.
5. Just as in the case of a car, anything being “registered” in the legal system is established on the record as property of the king. The key here is "registered," a word deriving from “regis,” meaning “king,” whereby everything “registered” is recorded as the king’s property.
6. The sequence of steps concerning the birth certificate appears to be as follows:

a. After registration of the Certificate of Live Birth in the office of the county recorder, the county recorder makes a certified, true copy or microfilm, retains it, and sends the original to the Department of Commerce in the State.

b. As in the case of the county recorder, the State Department of Commerce makes a certified, true copy or microfilm, retains it, and sends the original to the Department of Commerce of the Federal Government in Washington, DC.

c. The Department of Commerce in Washington then makes a certified, true copy and, in addition, creates a new document, constituting a “certificate of equity interest,” which is labeled “Birth Certificate.” This birth certificate, however, has the child’s name in all-capital letters, unlike the original birth certificate filed in the county recorder on which the name was in upper- and lower-case letters.

d. The Department of Commerce in Washington, DC then forwards the originals of both documents to the record repository in such locations as The Hague, for holding on behalf of the international banks, e.g., the “World Bank,” the “Bank of International Settlement,” IMF, et al. There the documents remain on deposit as the collateral/asset for hypothecating into existence the credit that finances the underwriting of the world’s bankrupt governments.

7. By this means, the people become the "utility" for the "transmission" of energy from reality into the fictitious, colorable realm of international commerce.

The private, international law that governs the legal/commercial system today is the Uniform Commercial Code, which is established as the law of the land in the United States in Public Laws 88-243 and 88-244. The UCC is private, not public, law, and is copyrighted by Unidroit, an Italian corporation out of the Vatican.

Now the people, via their all-caps names, are classified as “human resources,” and "goods" under the Uniform Commercial Code—see Section 2-105(1) and 9-105(1) in which animals, i.e. humans and their unborn offspring, become "goods" saleable in commerce.

The Department of Treasury issues bonds on the birth certificates, which are sold through securities exchanges and purchased—by extending credit on the bank’s books—by the Federal Reserve Bank, which uses the bonds as “reserves” for creating credit in the fractional reserve system. The people’s labor becomes the collateral for issuing Federal Reserve Notes or some other form of "debt obligation" (see 18 USC §411). The bonds are held in trust for the purchaser, now the “secured party” and holder in due course, at the Resolution Trust Company at 55 Water Street, in New York City, about two blocks down the street from the Federal Reserve. It is a high-rise office building with a sign that reads, "The Tower of Power."

After the New Deal the all-caps name, hereinafter “strawman,” is what the system deals with, since it cannot interface directly with real beings. The real being, however, is presumed to have ratified the deal, agreed to the pledge, by the three (3) means for signifying ratification of implied contracts.

Thereafter, the system functions on the basis of possessing complete authority to do anything it wishes with the strawman, which is the system's own creation and property and does not belong to the living being to whom the strawman purportedly pertains.

This scheme of legal/commercial peonage and slavery is outside the Constitution, which does not apply in any matters concerning the resulting process. The system functions in the realm of private contract, private international law, in international commerce, i.e., the private international law of the private, colorable Law Merchant, not within the direct purview of the Constitution, which merely sanctifies the operational right to contract.

Thereafter, every time the real being signs his name on any legal/commercial document, he is creating more debt-currency into existence, signing as the "surety," or "accommodation party" per the Uniform commercial Code §3-415. He is also placing title to whatever property is involved in the hands of the bond-holder.

In this scenario, the "name," i.e., strawman, is credit and is a constructive trust (trust created by operation of law, i.e., fiat) holding all the real assets, i.e., "sweat-equity," created by the labor of the real being. The right to the use has been separated from the title. The "strawman" holds the title and belongs to the bond-holder, not the real being. The flesh-and-blood man or woman has only naked possession with a limited "right" to use the thing, such as one's body, possessions, or land. Such illusion of ownership and right is essential to maintain the sting on an ongoing basis, keep the people from completely rebelling if their status as slaves was self-evident, and fostering more enthusiasm to work and produce by thinking that they are doing so for their own benefit rather than for the enrichment and power of their owners/masters/rulers.

When the strawman violates some rule or statute, such as is presumed whenever the strawman receives a traffic ticket, the flesh-and-blood being must appear at an arraignment and admit that he is the surety and accommodation party for the strawman, and thereby agree to provide the "energy" necessary for providing whatever fine or penalty is deemed due and payable. The real being has re-confirmed the contract of implied unification of the real being with the strawman by saying "here" when the strawman's name is called in the idem sonans, i.e., "same-sound," tribunal.

This is why it essential for the operation of the system that people "voluntarily give" their names to the court. The "Defendant" in the action is the strawman, not the real being. The real being confirms that he is, or may legally be treated the same as, the Defendant. Through this process one has entered through a door over which is inscribed: "Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

It is now clear that the strawman is:

1. A "nom de guerre," meaning "a name of war," whereby the strawman is regarded as being in a state of "insurrection or rebellion" per Section 4 of the 14th Amendment, 12 Stat. 319, and the Trading With The Enemy Act;
2. A "stramineus homo," or "strawman," the legal and commercial consequences/aspects of which are that it is a permanent debtor in legal incapacity, a dead estate;
3. An artificial entity owned by the secured party who bought into the bond placed on the market by the U.S. Treasury.

It is important to remember that the strawman is not the property of the real being. The living man or woman is merely the surety (sucker) providing the labor, life-energy, and sweat-equity for the fiction owned by US Inc. and the bond-holder. The strawman is the front that enables the secured party to act in legal/commercial dealings without revealing his identity, and to deceive the real being, who signs in all matters as a surety and accommodation party, into thinking that the real being is doing something for himself rather than his owners/masters. Everything the real being signs on behalf of the strawman places title to whatever property is involved into the hands of the United States and the bond owner, i.e., the secured party over the strawman.

Do the American people have a claim on their all-caps strawman? The shortanswer is, “yes,” but only after the American people assert that claim properly. Otherwise, the presumption remains that US Inc. and the owners of the bondholders own the strawman.

The foundation of our claim is that they did not originate the strawman, but merely altered the original name by changing the upper- and lower-case name into a “same sounding” name spelled in all capital letters without full disclosure. That all-caps name is used to finance the system of power and self-enrichment of US Inc. and its owners at the expense of the enslavement of the people. They do not possess any authority to use the name based on the unlawful object of intent to perpetrate the scheme to reduce the people to slavery and peonage by engaging in fraudulent concealment and a mountain of other crimes. In addition, it is the living being to whom the name refers that provides the labor, substance, and life-force that gives value to the strawman, and thereby authorizes the real being to claim superior title to it. Those who expropriate the output of others for their own unjust enrichment, subjugate the populace, and bring about the ruin of those from whom they steal the rights, life force, labor, and wealth, have no legitimate grounds to assert a claim of superior title, either in law, equity, or commerce.

There is a sequence of steps that must be done to become free of the bondage-system that now enslaves mankind and regain lost freedom and independence. The system has not, to say the least, been forthcoming in educating the people concerning the true legal and commercial situation to which virtually everyone in the world is now subject.

A mother having given birth to her baby is not informed that by allowing her child’s birth certificate to be registered she is, for instance:

1. Informing on the baby criminally and declaring her newborn infant to be an enemy of the state with no rights;
2. Consigning the child to permanent slavery, peonage, and indentured servitude;
3. Declaring her baby to be fungible goods and the chattel property of the bankers and world powers.

If full disclosure, good faith, and genuine meeting of the minds prevailed, as is required for any purported contract to be an actual, bona fide contract enforceable at law, and the people knew the truth, the banks and governments of the world would be out of business.

The History of How We Were Put Into the “Commerce Game”

On April 5, 1933, then President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, under Executive Order, issued April 5, 1933, declared: "All persons are required to deliver on or before May 1, 1933 all Gold Coin, Gold Bullion, and Gold Certificates now owned by them to a Federal Reserve Bank, branch or agency, or to any member bank of the Federal Reserve System."

James A. Farley, Postmaster General at that time, required each postmaster in the country to post a copy of the Executive Order in a conspicuous place within each branch of the Post Office. On the bottom of the posting was the following:

Criminal Penalties for Violation of Executive Order

\$10,000 fine or 10 years imprisonment, or both, as provided in Section 9 of the order.

Section 9 of the order reads as follows:

"Whosoever willfully violates any provisions of this Executive Order or of these regulations or of any rule, regulation or license issued there under may be fined not more than \$10,000, or if a natural person, may be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and any officer, director or agency of any corporation who knowingly participates in any such violation may be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both."

NOTE: Stated within a written document received September 17, 1997, from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel, Office of the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Richard L. Shiffin, in response to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), was the following: "A fact that is frequently overlooked is that Executive Orders and proclamations of the President normally have no direct effect upon private persons or their property, and instead, normally constitute only directives or instructions to officers or employees of the Federal Government. The exception is those cases in which the President is expressly authorized or required by laws enacted by the Congress to issue an Executive order or proclamation dealing with the legal rights or obligations of members of the public. Such an issuance of Selective Service Regulations, establishment of boards to investigate certain labor disputes, and establishment of quotas or fees with respect to certain imports into this country."

Note: it seems rather obvious that President Franklin D. Roosevelt was not "expressly authorized or required" to "issue an Executive Order or proclamation" demanding the public (private) to relinquish their privately held gold.

The order (proclamation) issued by Roosevelt was an undisciplined act of treason. Two months after the Executive Order, on June 5, 1933, the Senate and House of Representatives, 73d Congress, 1st session, at 4:30 P.M. approve House Joint Resolution 192 (HJR-192) 192: Joint Resolution to suspend the Gold Standard and apogate the Gold Clause, Joint resolution to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States.

HJR-192 states, in part, that: ***"Every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the oblige a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in any amount of money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy, and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provisions is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any such coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts."***

HJR-192 goes on to state: *"As used in this resolution, the term 'obligation' means an obligation (including every obligation of and to the United States, excepting currency) payable in money of the United States; and the term 'coin or currency' means coin or currency of the United States, including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations."*

HJR-192 superseded Public Law (what passes as law today is only "color of law"), replacing it with public policy. This eliminated our ability to PAY our debts, allowing only for their DISCHARGE. When we use any commercial paper (checks, drafts, warrants, federal reserve notes, etc.), and accept it as money, we simply pass the unpaid debt attached to the paper on to others, by way of our purchases and transactions. This unpaid debt, under public policy, now carries a public liability for its collection. In other words, all debt is now public.

The United States government, in order to provide necessary goods and services, created a commercial bond (promissory note), by pledging the property, labor, life and body of its citizens, as payment for the debt (bankruptcy). This commercial bond made chattel (property) out of every man, woman and child in the United States. We became nothing more than "human resources" and collateral for the debt. This was without our knowledge and/or our **CONSENT**. How? It was done through the filing (registration) of our birth certificates!

The United States government -actually the elected and appointed administrators of government -took (and still do, to this day) certified copies of all our birth certificates and placed them in the United States Department of Commerce ... as registered securities. These securities, each of which carries an estimated \$1,000,000 (one million) dollar value, have been (and still are) circulated around the world as collateral for loans, entries on the asset side of ledgers, etc., just like any other security. There's just one problem, we didn't authorize it.

The United States is a District of Columbia corporation. In Volume 20: Corpus Juris Sec. § 1785 we find "The United States government is a foreign corporation with respect to a State" (see: NY re: Merriam 36 N.E. 505 1441 S. 0.1973, 14 L. Ed. 287). Since a corporation is a fictitious "**person**" (it cannot speak, see, touch, smell, etc.), it cannot, by itself, function in the real world. It needs a conduit, a transmitting utility, a liaison of some sort to "connect" the fictional **person** and fictional world in which it exists, to the real world.

LIVING people exist in a real world - not a fictional, virtual world. But government does exist in a fictional world, and can only deal directly with other fictional or virtual persons, agencies, states, etc. In order for a fictional **person** to deal with real people there must be a connection, a liaison, and a go-between. This can be something as simple as a **contract**. When both "**persons**," the real and the fictional, agree to the terms of a contract, there is a connection, intercourse, dealings, there is a communication, an exchange, an understanding. There is business!

But there is another way for fictional government to deal with the real man and woman: through the use of a representative, a liaison, and the go-between. Who is this go-between, this liaison that connects fictional government to real men and women? It's a government created shadow, a fictional character with the exact same name as ours.

This **PERSON** was created by using our birth certificates as the Manufacturer's Certificate of Origin (MCO) and the state in which we were born as the "port of entry". This gave fictional government a fictional **PERSON** with whom to deal directly. This **PERSON** is called a STRAWMAN.

STRAMINEUS HOMO - Latin: A man of straw, one of no substance, put forward as bail or surety.

This definition comes from Black's Law Dictionary, 6th. Edition, page 1421. Following the definition of STRAMINEUS HOMO in Black's we find the next word; STRAWMAN: A front, a third party who is put up in name only to take part in a transaction. Nominal party to a transaction; one who acts as an agent for another for the purposes of taking title to real property and executing whatever documents and instruments the principal may direct. **Person** who purchases property for another to conceal identity of real purchaser or to accomplish some purpose otherwise not allowed. Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary defines the term "STRAWMAN" as: 1.) a weak or imaginary opposition set up only to be easily confuted. 2.) **Person** set up to serve as a cover for a usually questionable transaction. The STRAWMAN can be

summed up as an imaginary, passive stand-in for the real participant; a front; a blind; a person regarded as a nonentity. The STRAWMAN is a "shadow", a go-between.

For quite some time, a rather large number of people in this country have known that a man or woman's name, written in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS or last name first, does not identify real, living people. Taking this one step further, the rules of grammar for the English language have no provisions for the abbreviation of people's names, i.e. initials are not to be used. As an example; John Adam Smith is correct. ANYTHING else is not correct. Not Smith, John Adam or Smith, John A. or J. Smith or J. A. Smith or JOHN ADAM SMITH or SMITH, JOHN or any other variation. Nothing other than John Adam Smith actually identifies the real, living man and all other appellations identify either a deceased man or a fictitious man such as a corporation. See Black's Law: CAPITIS DIMINUTIO MAXIMA.

Over the years government, through its "public" school system, has managed to pull the wool over our eyes and keep US ignorant of some very important facts. Because all facets of the media (print, radio, television) have an ever-increasing influence in our lives, and because media is controlled (with the issuance of licenses, etc.) by government and its agencies, we have slowly and systematically been led to believe that any form/appellation of our names is, in fact, still us as long as the spelling is correct. WRONG!

We Were Never Told

We were never told, with full and open disclosure, what our government officials were planning to do and why. We were never told that government (the United States) was a corporation, a fictitious "person." We were never told that government had quietly, almost secretly, created a shadow, a STRAWMAN for each and every AMERICAN, so that THEY could not only "control" the people, but also raise an almost unlimited amount of revenue. We were never told that the government ONLY deals with the fictional STRAWMAN and NEVER with real, living, mortal men and women. We were never told, openly and clearly, with full disclosure of all the facts, that since June 5, 1933 we have been unable to pay our debts. We were never told that we had been pledged (and our children, and their children, and their children, and on and on) as collateral, mere chattel, for the debt created by government officials. We were never told that they quietly and cleverly changed the rules, even the game itself, and that the world we perceive is in fact a fictional one created for their benefit. We were never told that the STRAWMAN -a fictional person, a creature of the state -is subject to all the codes, statutes, rules, regulations, ordinances decreed by the corporate government, but that WE, the real mortal men and woman, are not. We were never told we were being treated as property or slaves (albeit comfortably for some) THROUGH OUR CONSENT while having the option of true freedom.

There's something else you should know:


Everything, since June 1933, operates in COMMERCE!

Commerce is based on an agreement or contract and the corporate Government has an implied or presumed agreement or CONSENT via the 14th Amendment U.S citizenship that IS THE STRAWMAN! It is only the STRAWMAN that is subject to government policy or rule. But when we, the mortal flesh and blood men and woman step into their "creation" we become the "surety" or hostage for their fictional character and assume their debts, liabilities and obligations. Additionally, as the STRAWMAN, we relinquish our Article IV Constitutional "standing" and the Common Law. We now only live in the "private" commercial courtrooms of Article I Legislative tribunals under public policy.

Every penny of the unquestionable "public" debt, every liability and every obligation exist only in the fictional commercial world of "book entries" on computers or in paper ledgers. It is a world of "digits" and "notes" devoid of real money, value, or substance. It is the world of the "private" Federal Reserve and its unlawful fiat currency. It is a world where no man or private property can exist. It is a world deception, fraud, and slavery by CONSENT. Everybody and everything in this "private" corporation known as the UNITED STATES is simply collateral for the bonds issued by the U.S. government.

The fictional "person" can only function in a fictional commercial world where there is no real money - only fictional funds. A presentment from a fictional government is nothing but a negative, commercial "claim" against the STRAWMAN. This "claim" takes place in the commercial, fictional world of government. "Digits" move from one side of your STRAWMAN account to the other or to a different account entirely.

This is today's commerce. **YOU ARE TODAY'S COMMERCE!**



THE UNITED STATES IS FRAUD!

The court cases that I include below fortify the fact that U.S. citizens are "resident aliens" within their states of the Union that compose the Republic. I am also convinced that a foreign U.S. citizen of D.C. accepts citizenship in the corporate structure that operates within his state of the Union such as the 1857 "State of Iowa" that operates within the borders of the 1846 state called Iowa.

To lawfully achieve total freedom under common law, U.S. citizens have to wake up to the fact that they are citizens of "a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations" such as Red China and they are definitely not Citizens in the Republic consisting of the United States meaning "the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution." Under English common law you are a citizen of the country in which you were born for life (in my case Iowa) and you can never ever expatriate from your country in which you were born and you have no choice in the matter. Under the government's Roman Civil law you can freely expatriate from your country of Michigan and voluntarily choose to become a citizen of any foreign jurisdiction if that jurisdiction will accept you as its citizen. The common law exists in the states while the Supreme Court has stated in *Erie Railroad v. Thompkins* that there is no federal general common law. The Supreme Court has also opined as follows:

The term "United States" may be used in any one of several senses. It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations. It may designate the territory over which the sovereignty of the United States extends, or it may be the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution. *HOOVEN & ALLISON CO. v. EVATT*, 324 U.S. 652 (1945): and

"The people of the United States resident within any State are subject to two governments: one State, and the other National; The citizen cannot complain, because he has voluntarily submitted himself to such a form of government. He owes allegiance to the two departments, so to speak, and within their respective spheres must pay the penalties which each exacts for disobedience to its laws. "US v. CRUIKSHANK, 92 U.S. 542

This means the U.S. citizen has "voluntarily submitted himself" into being a foreign U.S. citizen and "subject" to two governments under Roman civil law. The Declaration of Independence says "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." U.S. citizens born in the states voluntarily provide consent for their just powers and don't even realize their subject status by their citizenship in D.C.

There is two of nearly everything and this really confuses people. The Iowa Supreme Court has stated that there are no common law crimes within "The State of Iowa". The courts of the corporate "State of Iowa" will give the common law no standing, all while the Iowa Supreme Court has also opined respecting Iowa, to wit:

We have previously acknowledged that although not expressly declared by our statutes or constitution to be part of Iowa law, "the common law has always been . . . in force in Iowa." *Iowa Civil Liberties Union v. Critelli*, 244 N.W.2d 564 (Iowa 1976) In the Supreme Court of Iowa No. 125 / 05-0485 (Certified Question of Law)

This opinion was a certified question of law presented to the Iowa Supreme Court by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa. All of this is why I have formally declared allegiance to my country of Iowa (not the corporate State of Iowa) and I have renounced my U.S. citizenship in the foreign jurisdiction where there are no rights but only privileges the same as if one voluntarily joins the Army.

George Gordon explains that if a person is feeling depressed and goes to the insane asylum and tells the nice lady at the desk about it and checks himself into the institution, and after a couple of weeks on Prozac he's feeling better, he cannot check himself out without the institution's permission. Under federal law, the only way a U.S. citizen can remove himself from the insane asylum after checking himself in is by expatriation in accordance with its codified rules and regulations. You can expatriate from the jurisdiction of United States by declaring allegiance to a foreign country. The United States is a foreign corporation with respect to Iowa and Michigan.

My formal declaration of allegiance to the country of Iowa, with explicit declaration of expatriation from the admiralty jurisdiction of the United States, falls smack under United States Code Section 1481 (a) (2), as the jurisdiction of the United States is foreign to the common law jurisdiction of Iowa. We were born to U.S. citizens and a birth certificate was obtained for us and we were registered as U.S. citizens. We were then the State's child and we could be removed from our parents at any time under equitable proceedings for the best interest of the child. Why were we never taught by State certified teachers that if we wanted to be free as our ancestors we needed to take appropriate action to achieve the status as free men under common law in the Republic when we reached 21 (and now 18 years of age.) If we had taken appropriate action we would be "non-taxpayers" as Citizens of the state of the Union in which we were born and we would be capital [C] Citizens of the (several) United States as designated in the Constitution and not small [c] citizens.

Fifty dollar bills are legal tender in the jurisdiction of the United States and in its 1857 sub-corporation named "The State of Iowa" with its capitol in Des Moines. Fifty dollar gold coins are lawful money under Article I, Section 10 of the federal Constitution within the common law jurisdiction of the 1846 state called Iowa whose capitol is in Iowa City. The capitol in Iowa City sits empty because basically all the free people in the Republic have expatriated to the jurisdiction of the United States and under the Fourteenth Amendment are citizens of its sub division "State of Iowa" and subject to the jurisdiction of its statutes. As subjects most people elect representatives to pass such things as seat belt laws and driver license statutes for their insurance companies that insure them. Free men practice strict liability under the common law, and don't affect any public interest whatsoever. When a free man of the Republic is dragged into court it will be presumed that he is a subject with a social security number thereby affecting a public interest and needs to be regulated under public policy. This presumption needs to be properly destroyed if we want to be free. I believe that the "state of Iowa" was created with its 1846 Constitution and is the Republic while the 1857 "State of Iowa" is a federal State for passing law on U.S. citizens like Puerto Rico is the proper name of a part of the United States. I'm sure a U.S. citizen and a resident of the "State of Iowa" under the Fourteenth Amendment could just move to Puerto Rico and become a Fourteenth Amendment citizen of Puerto Rico with the same U.S. privileges there, and have the same Form 1040 tax obligations there, or vice versa.

U.S. citizens that are residents of the State of Iowa are subject to statutes that are in derogation of the common law while free men in the Republic are not. Statutes in derogation of the common law are advisory with respect to free men. Iowa Code Section 4.2 states: "The rule of the common law, that statutes in derogation thereof are to be strictly construed, has no application to this Code. Its provisions and all proceedings under it shall be liberally construed with a view to promote its objects and assist the parties in obtaining justice." This means that an Iowa statute must bend when dealing with a free man if the free man knows how not to consent to be prosecuted under one of these statutes.

There is definitely a dual system between the states united under the Constitution and the United States that is analogous to a mini-United Nations and headquartered in D.C. The U.S. income tax system is a voluntary system and it is voluntary because it is predicated upon "citizenship."

"The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers and not to non taxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for non-taxpayers and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not

assume to deal, and they are neither the subject nor the object of the revenue laws." *Stewart v. Chinese Chamber of Commerce*, 168 F.2d 709, 712.

Again, you can see the dual system. U.S. citizens residing in the 'State of Michigan' or 'State of Iowa' are 'taxpayers'. This is why in an interview Harry Reid stated that he did not understand the phraseology when talking about the voluntary income tax system and was then asked if he meant that "taxpayers" don't have to pay their income taxes. To most ignorant people Harry Reid looked like a blubbing idiot when he did not come right out and specifically let the cat out of the bag. The Supreme Court has opined that the 16th Amendment added no new taxing powers, but I contend that the Fourteenth Amendment did add new taxing powers for those people within the states and wishing to be "subject to the jurisdiction thereof" so they can receive U.S. socialized security or food stamps or "free" State education for their children.

Being completely free and residing in the Creator who endows men with certain unalienable rights, and not residing in the State for security, is a very scary thing for most people! It wasn't always so scary when neighbors took care of neighbors in need, but with U.S. citizenship everyone thinks the government should pick up the task. And the problem is you can't be partially free in the Democracy that the founding fathers never had a good word for, nor put Democracy in the Constitution. Being partially free is like a woman being partially pregnant. Old Ben Franklyn indicated, "He who would give up liberty for a little security deserves neither.

Because people look back at the freedom our ancestors had while still enjoying constitutionally secured rights in their state, and want to also live in freedom but are now "voluntarily" subject to the jurisdiction that was foreign respecting our ancestors, the United States now has 5 1/2 times the prison rate compared to the next closest sovereignty in the family of nations, [T]he Peoples Republic of China.

A foreign U.S. citizen doing any business within a state is deemed to be in interstate commerce and thereby subject to the commerce clause in the Constitution.

I am convinced that to be free we need to first achieve our status as sovereigns in our states, abstain from interstate commerce over which the United States has delegated authority, and then as free men we have to appropriately break that foreign jurisdiction in its court system that is operating here in lieu of exercising jurisdiction at law. This foreign jurisdiction is the antithesis of the common law of the states. Even if we have the status of free men, judges and magistrates will continue to operate upon presumption that we are subject to their statutory law. The judges operate under this law, to wit: "Whenever the Code creates a "presumption" with respect to a fact, or provides that a fact is "presumed," the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact unless and until evidence is introduced that supports a finding of its nonexistence."

I believe that we, as sovereign free people, need to vey timely and properly challenge the jurisdiction of these courts without ever pleading into their foreign jurisdiction with a "not guilty" plea, nor ever allowing the judge to plead us into his foreign jurisdiction as if we are his subjects, and we need to properly submit evidence to the trier of fact that shows our status as free men to break the presumption that we are subject to his statutes within the jurisdiction under which he operates.

Howard Freeman used to pose the following question to the judges while equity has no cognizance of criminal matters, "This court has two criminal jurisdictions. One is a common law jurisdiction and the other is a condition of contract under the criminal aspects of an admiralty jurisdiction. Under which jurisdiction is this court planning to try this case?"

A soldier in the Army is in admiralty jurisdiction by his enlistment contract and if he doesn't peel potatoes when the sergeant says so, it is criminal.

Who Says We Need A License?

A “LICENSE” IS A SIN [A license is a permit **TO** sin]

A CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR is not what you thought it to be. Oh, in the “combat” sense of the word it may be, but it hits a lot closer to home than that.

Are you “licensed?” Yeah, do you have a license? If so, you’re condemned by your Creator. That statement was thrown in to get you to discover a well-hidden truth. A crafty bargainer has duped you. Read (at least) to the end of “definition” and tell me I’m wrong.

The objection (of a “conscientious objector”) must be founded on deeply held moral, ethical, and religious convictions about right or wrong.

Man (one of Adams progeny) cannot be licensed.

One of the biggest “devices” of the confiscation and asset forfeiture plague and the State stampede of “licensing” is the use of "**personification**" to confiscate property. Personification is the idea that things or objects possess the free will and capacity to commit crimes. It is an idea deeply rooted in the practice of witchcraft, the occult, and devil worship. Objects are supposed to get that kind of power from the devil, or a curse.

A “license” issued by a fiction (corporation, government entity, etc.) is a permit rendered to another fiction (fictional legal entity) to do what would be otherwise against natural law. **The “lie sense” is a permit for you to lie to your senses; allow a fiction to rule over truth.**

Definitions follow:

A “LICENSE” TO LIE – (to the senses) = Lie Sense: a Permit to Lie to the Senses.

Jude 1:4 For there are certain men who crept in secretly, even they who were of old written of beforehand to this condemnation: ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into **lasciviousness**, and denying our only Master, God, and Lord, Jesus Christ.

Strong’s Concordance: lasciviousness, wantonness: Word Number 766

unbridled lust, excess, **licentiousness**, lasciviousness, wantonness, outrageousness, shamelessness, insolence. (lasciviousness and wantonness mean **licentiousness**)

Heritage Dictionary:

li·cen·tious *adj.* **1.** Lacking moral discipline or ignoring legal restraint... **2.** Having no regard for accepted rules or standards. [Latin *licenti*!/?sus, from *licentia*, freedom, license. See LICENSE.]

li·cense *n.* **1.a.** Official or legal permission to do or own a specified thing. See Synonyms at **permission**. **b.** Proof of permission granted, usually in the form of a document, card, plate, or tag: *a driver's license*. **2.** Deviation from normal rules, practices, or methods in order to achieve a certain end or effect: *poetic license*. **3.** Latitude of action, especially in behavior or speech. See Synonyms at

freedom. 4.a. Lack of due restraint; excessive freedom: *“When liberty becomes license, dictatorship is near”* (Will Durant). **b.** Heedlessness for the precepts of proper behavior; licentiousness.

REMEMBER: The “legal” definition of “license” is a “permit to do something that would otherwise be illegal.” Remember also, that “legalese” only gives enough information to place the inquirer off-balance and believe the intended meaning of the person defining the word, quite often to the “believers” injury.

World English Bible

2 Peter 2:18 For, uttering great swelling words of emptiness, they entice in the lusts of the flesh, by licentiousness, those who are indeed escaping from those who live in error;

Darby Bible

Mark 7:22 thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, a wicked eye, injurious language, haughtiness, folly;

2 Corinthians 12:21 lest my God should humble me as to you when I come again, and that I shall grieve over many of those who have sinned before, and have not repented as to the uncleanness and fornication and licentiousness which they have practiced.

Galatians 5:19 Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, licentiousness,

KJV

Psalms 5:6 Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing: the LORD will abhor the bloody and deceitful man.

leasing: Strong #: **3577** - - a lie, untruth, falsehood, deceptive thing

“Leasing” is just another word for “licensing.”

Licensing, or licentiousness, is the factor that has placed us back into bondage.

Deuteronomy 28:68 And the Lord shall bring you into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spoke unto you, You shall see it no more again; and there you shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you

What does the Power Elite call UNITED STATES? New Egypt! And *it is a fiction – you shall see it no more again*. And you have been brought into slavery by way of artificial vessels (ships) called a strawman. And no man bought us as slaves – WE SOLD OURSELVES INTO BONDAGE to our enemies who never paid a dime for our credit or us. Isaiah 52: 3, “Ye have sold yourselves for nought; and ye shall be redeemed without money.”

End of DEFINITIONS, now, move into Truth like you’ve never known it and learn how to “escape from Egypt.” Just remember, a “License” is a permit to Lie.

Colossians 2:20 (N I V) Since you died with Christ to the elemental spiritual forces of this world, **why**, as though you still belonged to the world, **do you submit to its rules**:

BOTTOM LINE: A license, any license, all licenses place us in a subordinate slave position. Licenses apply only to the fiction, the un-real, the not alive. **To “have” a license is truly against my religion.**

ALL GOVERNMENTS ARE CORPORATIONS

PROPRIETORS OF CHARLES RIVER BRIDGE v. PROPRIETORS OF, 36 U.S. 420 (1837) verifiable at <http://laws.findlaw.com/us/36/420.html>

"Corporations are also of all grades, and made for varied objects; **all governments are corporations**, created by usage and common consent, or grants and charters which create a body politic for prescribed purposes; but whether they are private, local or general, in their objects, for the enjoyment of property, or the exercise of power, they are all governed by the same rules of law, as to the construction and the obligation of the instrument by which the incorporation is made..."

There is a circus of conflicting deceitful codes that act as the operating procedures of the FEDERAL CORPORATION: the United States. Yes, the United States is a Corporation [See 28 U.S.C. § 30020(15)]. The States are sub-corporations of the Federal United States, the aforementioned Corporation. [See 1934, State Compact Act; Buck Act, 4 U.S.C. § 101].

"From the earliest of times the law has enforced rights and exacted liberties by utilizing a corporate concept, by recognizing, that is, juristic persons other than human beings. The theories by which this mode of legal operation has developed, has been justified, qualified, and defined are the subject matter of a very sizable library. The historic roots of a particular society, economic pressures, philosophic notions, all have had their share in the law's response to the ways of men in carrying on their affairs through what is now the familiar device of the corporation. Law has also responded to religious needs in recognizing juristic persons other than human beings." [U.S. v. Scophony Corporation of America, 333 U.S. 795 (1948)]

"The Government may carry on its operations through conventional executive agencies or through corporate forms especially created for defined ends." *Federal Crop Insurance Corp. v Merrill*, 332 US 380-388 (1947).

There IS a war going on and the battle is for your mind. "They" are getting to your "mind" by going through (using/changing) your NAME. In Merriam-Webster, pg. 1534, "*Under International Law of Warfare, all parties to a cause must appear by nom de guerre, because an "alien enemy cannot maintain an action during the war in his own name".*

Using this "*nom de guerre*" you are in conflict/battle in the current "Secret (commercial) War:"

As per: article by Chuck Morse, "Is the 'National Emergency of FDR' Still In Place?" You will find that: **"This was a classic example of sleight of hand.** In fact, Congress exempted all laws, based on the emergency of 1933 that were already in place. Rather than being based on the authority of the President under a 'national emergency' these federal laws have now been codified as a permanent part of the U.S. Federal Code. Included among the codified laws would be **Section 5(b) of the Trading with the Enemy Act, which classifies the American citizen as an enemy of the government**. Therefore, although the "national emergency" technically ended on September 14, 1976, when the 93rd Congress passed H.R. 3884, the National Emergencies Termination Act (50 USC 1601, Public Law 94-412) because **the last paragraph said that it didn't apply to any "authorities under the act of October 6, 1917, as amended," the classification of an American citizen still stands as enemy of the government."**

Now, allow me to "shock your conscience" a little; not one in a thousand Americans can tell me where the "United States" is located. **NO YOU CAN'T.**

The U.C.C. (Uniform Commercial Code), the "rule-book" for all transactions, is owned by UNIDROIT located in Rome, Italy (close to the "Holy See") and the U.S. government pays UNIDROIT \$260,000 per year for the

use of their copyrighted material. Every piece of legalese that moves in, by, or through the United States in is conjunction with U.C.C.

(i) Now, let's discover the "location" of the United States:

a. U.C.C. § 9-307 (h) [Location of United States.]

The United States is located in the District of Columbia; and,

b. "A "U.S. Citizen" upon leaving the District of Columbia becomes involved in "interstate commerce", as a "resident" does not have the common-law right to travel, of a Citizen of one of the several states." *Hendrick v. Maryland S.C. Reporter's Rd.* 610-625. (1914); and,

c. It is clear that a "U.S. Citizen", becomes a "resident" when outside the District of Columbia; and,

d. A Citizen of one of the several states is not the same as a U.S. citizen.

(ii) See also Internal Revenue Code Section 7701(39) which reads:

a. "I.R.C. Section 7701(39) IF ANY CITIZEN OR RESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES DOES NOT RESIDE IN (AND IS NOT FOUND IN) ANY UNITED STATES JUDICIAL DISTRICT, **SUCH CITIZEN OR RESIDENT SHALL BE TREATED AS RESIDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA** FOR PURPOSES OF ANY PROVISIONS OF THIS TITLE TO “ (A) jurisdiction of courts, or (B) enforcement of summons."

b. Also see Internal Revenue Code Section 7408(C) and Art. 1, Section 8, Clause 17 Constitution for the United States of America as defined and reinstated in *National Mutual Insurance Company of the District of Columbia v. Tidewater Transfer Company*, 337 U.S. 582, 93 L.Ed. 1556 (1948):

c. Which further states that **citizens of the District of Columbia are not embraced by the judicial power under Article 3** of the Constitution for the United States of America, the same statement is held in *Hepburn v. Dundas v. Elizey*, 2 Cranch (U.S.) 445, 2 L.Ed. 332.; In 1804, the Supreme Court, through Chief Justice Marshall, held that **a citizen of the District of Columbia was not a citizen of a state;** and,

d. In NATIONAL MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA v. TIDEWATER TRANSFER COMPANY, (SUPRA), "We therefore decline to overrule the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall:

We hold that **the District of Columbia is not a state** within Article 3 of the Constitution. In other words cases between citizens of the District and those of the states were not included of the catalogue of controversies over which the Congress could give jurisdiction to the federal courts by virtue of Article 3. In other words **Congress has exclusive legislative jurisdiction over citizens of Washington District of Columbia and through their plenary power nationally covers those citizens even when in one of the several states as though the district expands for the purpose of regulating its citizens wherever they go throughout the states in union**".

We have just learned that a citizen of a state, any state, is not the same as a U.S. citizen. Let's discover the primary differences:

"... the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States do not necessarily include all the rights protected by the first eight amendments to the Federal Constitution against the powers of the Federal Government". -- **Maxwell v. Dow**, 176 US 581, 597 (1899)

WARNING: Chew the next one up real good before you attempt to swallow it!

“The **right of trial by jury** in civil cases, guaranteed by the 7th Amendment (Walker v. Sauvinet, 92 U.S. 90, 23 L. ed. 678), and **the right to bear arms, guaranteed by the 2d Amendment** (Presser v. Illinois, 116 U.S. 252, 29 L. ed. 615, 6 Sup. Ct. Rep. 580), have been distinctly held **not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States**, ...” -- **Twining v. New Jersey**, 211 U.S. 78, 98 (1908)

“All offices attached to the seat of government shall be exercised in the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere, except as otherwise expressly provided by law.” 4 U.S.C. § 72

So, somebody has stepped WAY over the line, but how did they do it? You gave them a license to do it!

Remember, “*Under International Law of Warfare, all parties to a cause must appear by nom de guerre, because an “alien enemy cannot maintain an action during the war in his own name”.* Merriam-Webster, pg. 1534.

And, the Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd. ed., Clarendon Press (1989). *It is by International Doctrine that the use of nom de guerre would indicate a state of war.*

It is with the enforcement of obedience (military jurisdiction) by *vi et armis* (force of arms) that we can know the Government, Public Law, **Public Servants are waging war against the Private Citizen and the People**. [If you're writing tickets, fines, fees, receipts, etc., you're waging economic war on your mother, father, and kindred.]

According to Digest of International Law, Volume 10, and pages 95-127, the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Treasury, in disregard to the administrative orders of the President, conduct an “Alien Enemy Program” whose sole purpose is to unconstitutionally seize the properties of all Private Citizens, militarily, with the aid of such maritime hypothecations as “bottomry bonds”, etc.

Volume 20: Corpus Juris Sec. Section 1785: *“The United States Government is a foreign corporation with respect to a state”* NY re: Merriam 36 N.E. 505 141 S.Ct.1973, 41 L.Ed.287

Now, do you recall that I stated above that you gave them a “license” by way of your “name?” Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 8thed., pg. 2287 *“The omission of the Christian name by either plaintiff or defendant in a legal process prevents the court from acquiring jurisdiction, ...”* Your “Christian name” is not in all UPPER CASE letters.

And, to be a little more explicit, a “Delaware Corporation” demands that a corporation has a “last” name; figure that one out, especially when your “family” name is not part of your Christian Appellation.

Enter: The CLEARFIELD DOCTRINE

“As the use of private corporate commercial paper, debt currency or securities is concerned, removes the sovereignty status of the government of “We the People” and reduces it to an entity rather than a government in the area of finance and commerce as a corporation or person. Governments descend to the level of a mere private corporation and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen. This entity cannot compel performance upon its corporate statute or rules unless it, like any other corporation or person is the holder-in-due course of some contract or commercial agreement between it and the one upon whom the payment and performance are made and are willing to produce said documents and place the same evidence before trying to enforce its demands called statutes”. For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government.” Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 US. 363-371.

"When governments enter the world of commerce, they are subject to the same burdens as any private firm or corporation" -- U.S. v. Burr, 309 U.S. 242 See: 22 U.S.C.A.286e, Bank of U.S. vs. Planters Bank of Georgia, 6L, Ed. (9 Wheat) 244; 22 U.S.C.A. 286 et seq., C.R.S. 11-60-103

NOTE: Under the Clearfield Doctrine, the courts are no longer government entities in that they are demanding private monies and must have a contract with you to compel performance. They are no more special as a normal business than your local Jack In The Box.

Did/does the court demand payment in a certain "species"? [U.S. \$]

Did the court make payment [on the record, or by way of agreement] of any entry fees, etc.?

If one USD is given, or demanded, [species] HJR 192 is over-riden and all Instruments have become "bogus financial instruments" involving private creditors and all "enjoined in the fraud" may be prosecuted under a variety of statutes; conspiracy (18 U.S.C. Sec 371); mail fraud (18 U.S.C. Sec 1341); uttering a false security (18 U.S.C. Sec 472); bank fraud (18 U.S.C. Sec 1344); and possessing and uttering a counterfeit security (18 U.S.C. Sec 513). SEE, United States v. Uullman, 187 F.3d 816 (8th Cir. 1999); United States v. Hanzlicek, 187 F.3d 1228, 1230 (10th Cir. 1999); United States v. Wells, 163 F.3d 889 (4th Cir. 1998); United States v. Stockheimer, 157 F.3d 1082 (7th Cir. 1998).

DICTIONARY OF LAW (1893) **Corporation.** A creature of the crown, created by letters-patent. An artificial being, indivisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of law. 1 Blackstone, 295.

The **United States** may be deemed a corporation, United States v. Hillegas, 3 Wash. 73 (1811); **so may a State**, 1 Abb. U.S. 22 and 35 Ga. 315; and so, **a county**. United States under Title 28, Section 3002 (15)(A). "United States means - (A) a Federal corporation."

NO "LICENSE" OF JURISDICTION

As per the Supreme Court in Murdock v. Pennsylvania 319 US 105, "**A state may not, through a license tax, impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution.**"

Have you questioned, "what if I have no nexus with the state in form of license granted", as per; "It is impossible to prove jurisdiction exists absent a substantial nexus with the state, such as **voluntary subscription to license**. All jurisdictional facts supporting claim that supposed jurisdiction exists must appear **on the record** of the court." Pipe Line v Marathon. 102 S. Ct. 3858 quoting Crowell v Benson 883 US 22.

And, without a license, you're not a "Licensee", as per; "Where a **person is not at the time a licensee, neither the agency, nor any official has any jurisdiction** of said person to consider or make any order. One ground as to want of jurisdiction was, **accused was not a licensee and it was not claimed that he was.**" O'Neil v Dept Prof. & Vocations 7 CA 2d 398; Eiseman v Daugherty 6 CA 783

And, what if you're not employed for compensation as a "licensee" for the act so accused, as per: "Agency, or party sitting for the agency, (which would be the magistrate of a municipal court) **has no authority to enforce as to any licensee unless he is acting for compensation**. Such an act is highly penal in nature, and should not be construed to include anything which is not embraced within its terms. (Where) there is no charge within a complaint that the **accused was employed for compensation to do the act complained of, or that the act constituted part of a contract.**" Schomig v. Kaiser, 189 Cal 596.

More about non-granted jurisdiction as that of a "licensee", as per: "An action by Department of Motor Vehicles, whether directly or through a court sitting administratively as the hearing officer, must be clearly defined in the statute before it has subject matter jurisdiction, without such jurisdiction of the

licensee, all acts of the agency, by its employees, agents, hearing officers, are null and void." Doolan v. Carr, 125 US 618; City v Pearson, 181 Cal. 640.

And, failure to reveal material facts is grounds for estoppel. ***"Failure to reveal the material facts of a license or any agreement is immediate grounds for estoppel."*** Lo Bue v. Porazzo, 48 Cal.App.2d 82, 119, p.2d 346, 348.

And, who is required to "pay" for use of public highways, as per: ***"The tax is placed upon those obtaining compensation for the use of the public highways."*** –In re Bush, 6 Cal.2d 43 [Crim. No. 3945. In Bank. April 1, 1936.] In the Matter of the Application of C.E.BUSH for a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

Let's take this a couple steps further: as per; 18 USC 31, (6) *Motor vehicle.— The term "motor vehicle" means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways in the transportation of passengers, passengers and property, or property or cargo.*

And, as per; 18 USC 31, (10) *Used for commercial purposes.--- The term "used for commercial purposes" means the carriage of persons or property for any fare, fee, rate, charge, or other consideration, or directly or indirectly in connection with any business, or other undertaking intended for profit.*

Miscellaneous points:

Point 1. *The Fourth Amendment forbids stopping a vehicle even for limited purposes of questioning its occupants unless the police officer has a founded suspicion of criminal conduct.* U.S. V. Ramirez & Sandoval, 872 F2d. 1392.

Point 2. *"An action by Department of Motor Vehicles, whether directly or through a court sitting administratively as the hearing officer, must be clearly defined in the statute before it has subject matter jurisdiction, without such jurisdiction of the licensee, all acts of the agency, by its employees, agents, hearing officers, are null and void."* Doolan v. Carr, 125 US 618; City v Pearson, 181 Cal. 640.

Point 3. *"Agency, or party sitting for the agency, [which would be the magistrate of a municipal court] has no authority to enforce as to any licensee unless he [licensee] is acting for compensation. Such an act is highly penal in nature, and should not be construed to include anything which is not embraced within its terms. (Where) there is no charge within a complaint that the accused was employed for compensation to do the act complained of, or that the act constituted part of a contract." Schomig v. Kaiser, 189 Cal 596.*

Point 4. *"The high Courts, through their citations of authority, have frequently declared, that ***"...where any state proceeds against a private individual in a judicial forum it is well settled that the state, county, municipality, etc., waives any immunity to counters, cross claims and complaints, by direct or collateral means regarding the matters involved."*** Luckenback v. The Thekla, 295 F 1020, 226 Us 328; Lyders v. Lund, 32 F2d 308;*

Point 5. *"When enforcing mere statutes, judges of all courts do not act judicially (and thus are not*

protected by “**qualified**” or “**limited immunity**,” - **SEE:** *Owen v. City*, 445 U.S. 662; *Bothke v. Terry*, 713 F2d 1404) - - “**but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved agency -- but only in a “ministerial” and not a “discretionary capacity...”** *Thompson v. Smith*, 154 S.E. 579, 583; *Keller v. P.E.*, 261 US 428; *F.R.C. v. G.E.*, 281, U.S. 464.

Point 6. It is factual that any magistrate sitting in ministerial capacity has no ability to receive grants of "judicial" power from the legislature, as per: "*Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities.*" *Burns v. Sup. Ct.*, SF, 140 Cal. 1.

Point 7. And, as per the Supreme Court in *Murdock v. Pennsylvania* 319 US 105, "**A state may not, through a license tax, impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution.**"

BIBLICAL & LOGICAL REASONS FOR NOT SUBMITTING TO FOREIGN TAX:

NOTE: A “person” is licensed (taxed), not the real living man.

A “person” is a legal entity, not a living man. The “office of person” is a privilege created by a larger legal entity named United States. A United States (U.S.) citizen is a “person.” This “office of person” is a license from a larger licensed corporation.

Homo vocabulum est naturae; persona juris civilis - **Man is a term of nature; person of civil law.**

Private law is a license, and not a contract, for the receiver of the privilege has no action enforceable against the giver of the privilege:

A dispensation or license properly passeth no interest, nor alters or transfers property in any thing, but only makes an action lawful which without it had been unlawful.

A license is a mere **privilege without enforceable rights**, which distinguishes it from an easement giving definite property rights enforceable against the entire world.

A 'license' is not a contract between the state and the licensee, but is a mere personal permit. Neither is it property or a property right. **Nor does it create a vested right.**

A sovereign [*the lawgiver] is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal right as against the authority that makes the law on which the right depends. *Car on peut bien recovoir loy d'autruy, mais il est impossible par nature de se donner loy. Nemo suo statuto ligatur necessitative.*

So, whatever is established by the Commander-in-Chief or "Congress," is in **derogation** of the Christian common Law, and: One, is a privilege "protected by the military power of the Union"; and, Two, may be taxed constitutionally as an excise for revenue purposes:

DEROGATION. The partial abrogation of a law. To derogate from a law is to enact something which impairs its utility and force; to abrogate a law is to abolish it entirely.

All statutes are to be construed with reference to the provisions of the common law, and provisions in

derogation of the common law are held strictly. UCC 1-103.6

NOT A SLAVE OR WARD OF THE COURT

[WHO'S YOUR DADDY?]

Beware - all assumed or presumed authority of any governmental, quasi-governmental, International Monetary Fund, Internal Revenue Service, or any other regulatory or taxing agency functions under the doctrine of "Partus Sequitur Ventrem", meaning that the offspring is the property of the owner of the mother. Reference is made to; the case of *Alberty v United States* brought in 1896, approximately 40 (forty) years after the emancipation proclamation is proof positive that, unless proven otherwise, the federal government will declare jurisdiction based upon ownership, this long after Involuntary Servitude being proclaimed illegal.

The case of *Alberty v United States* was over the murder of a half-black, half Choctaw man by a half-black, half-Cherokee man on Cherokee territory, with the United States demanding, and getting, jurisdiction over the Cherokee Tribal justice, because of ownership.

In Black's Law Dictionary, we see that a Marriage License is only appropriate when a couple is contemplating a marriage between people of different races, as between a white person and a Negro.

Affiant specifically denies any association with "the State" (any State) in the States' capacity as "*Parens Patriae*", or as "*In Loco Parentis*", defined below:

Parens patriae - Lat. (literally) "parent of the country", the role of the state as sovereign. See Black's Law Dictionary, 5th ed.

In loco parentis - In the place of the parent; or, instead of a parent; charged factitiously with a parent's rights, duties, and responsibilities. See Black's Law Dictionary, 5th ed.

This exhibition is to dispel any presumptions/assumptions that when the mother (any mother, or other informant) signs the birth certificate of the child, the presumption is that she is the black slave that is still owned by the government, or that the child is a fatherless child (of a truth, most document administrators reporting in, and for, hospitals, do NOT care that there is a Father's Name on the birth certificate, but the Mother's MAIDEN Name is paramount) and automatically a ward of the court/government, therefore, without this admonition, the doctrine of *Partus Sequitur Ventrem* (above) may apply and the owner can do with the children as the owner wishes.

[Concerning such owned "children of the state"] "The law secures their parental right only so long as they shall promptly recognize and discharge their corresponding obligations. As the child owes allegiance to the government of the country of its birth, so it is entitled to the protection of that government, which as *parens patriae*, must consult its welfare, comfort, and interests in regulating its custody during its minority. *PURINTON V. JAMROCK, 195 Mass. 187, 80 N.E. 102, 18 L.R.A., N.S., 925*"

To continue the thought (as quoted in the 2000 Census brochure), **the object of the Census, by law, is to count the "defective, dependant, and delinquent classes"**. Virtually everyone counted in the 2000 Census is now presumed to be "defective, dependent, and delinquent", and thus, wards of the Court/State. Does that sound like a corporate collection of "incompetent persons"?

In the past volley of words, the point has been made that the *GOVERNMENT* has become the parent (Father) to all children, regardless of age. The natural Father has been replaced with a *Fictional Entity*, a fiction. So, what

is a fiction? It is a **lie**. The fiction is your (if you're under governmental jurisdiction) *Father*. Now, we see our father is a Liar. O.K., who's the father of lies?

The Holy Writ mentions the "motherless" only one time, however, it mentions the "fatherless" forty four (44) times. Could there be a message in this statement?

We are known as "Human Resources" in governmental documents. A "**Resource**" is a claim of "**property**" and when related to people constitutes "**slavery**."

Now, a few words [again] about U.S. citizens according to; *Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox*, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773, "*Therefore, the U.S. citizens residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as **property and franchises of the federal government as an "individual entity."***"

Oh, and a couple more things, you grant a "license" if you hire, or obtain, an attorney, as per: 7 CJS, Section 2,3, and 4; "A Client is one who applies to a lawyer or counselor for advice or direction in a question of law, or commits his cause to his management in prosecuting a claim or defending against a suit in a court of justice; one who retains the attorney, is responsible to him for his fees, and to whom the attorney is responsible for the management of the suit; one who communicates facts to an attorney expecting professional advice. Clients are also called "wards of the court" in regard to their relationship with their attorneys. ...attorney with an obligation to the courts and to the public no less significant than his obligation to his clients. Thus, an attorney occupies a dual position which imposes dual obligations. **His first duty is to the courts** and the public, not to the client, and whenever the duties to the client conflict with those he owes as an officer of the court in the administration of justice, **the former must yield to the latter.**"

Also, "Wards of the Court" are infants and persons of unsound mind. *Davis' Committee v. Loney*, 290 Ky. 644, 162 SW 2d 189, 190 Their rights must be guarded jealously. *Montgomery v. Erie R. Co.*, C.C.A.N.J., 97 F.2d 289, 292, and that;

If men, **through fear, fraud or mistake**, should in terms renounce or **give up any natural right**, the eternal law of reason and the grand end of society would absolutely vacate such renunciation. **The right to freedom being the gift of Almighty God, it is not in the power of man to alienate this gift and voluntarily become a slave. Samuel Adams**, our great president.

Now, remember, when some fat "orator" with a size 56" waist starts hammering on Romans 13, "obey those that have rule over you" exactly who [or, what] has rule over you. Our Creator has rule over His Creation. You have rule over what you create. If the "State" created you, they have rule over you. So, next time you hear, "render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's" remind that fat a\$\$ that Caesar is DEAD; thank God for that.

There is much information you must have in order to conduct and plan your service to God and Country. For example, you must KNOW who your adversaries are and what they plan and plot in order to control, enslave and destroy you. So, I'll end this little oration with a particular statement. Maybe you know who, or what, the Babylonian Harlot is; and, maybe you don't. Therefore, I will draw you a picture; every jack-booted armored code-enforcer that writes those collection tickets against "your" license and every fiction based collector of contraband securities based upon private "Federal Reserve Notes" and every agent that sucks your "currency" from your livelihood are doing one thing, and one thing ONLY. **They are feeding the Babylonian Whore; and, so are you when you "license" yourself to them.** Put that in your smoke and pipe it.

YOU ARE: either part of the Problem or part of the Solution. You know what you are.

Now, do you think you can become a "Conscientious Objector" to the sin of "license?"

Hiding Behind the BAR

Why Attorneys are *not* lawyers

In the U.S., they're collectively called everything from "attorney" to "lawyer" to "counselor." Are these terms truly equivalent, or has the identity of one been mistaken for another? What exactly is a "Licensed BAR Attorney?" This credential accompanies every legal paper produced by attorneys - along with a State Bar License number. As we are about to show you, an attorney is **not** a lawyer, yet the average American improperly interchanges these words as if they represent the same occupation, and the average American attorney unduly accepts the honor to be called "*lawyer*" when he is not.

In order to discern the difference, and where *we* stand within the current court system, it is necessary to examine the British origins of our U.S. courts and the terminology that has been established from the beginning. It's important to understand the proper *lawful* definitions for the various titles we now give these court related occupations.

The legal profession in the U.S. is directly derived from the British system. Even the word "**bar**" is of British origin:

BAR. A particular portion of a court room named from the space enclosed by two bars or rails: one of which separated the judge's bench from the rest of the room; the other shut off both the bench and the area for lawyers engaged in trials from the space allotted to suitors, witnesses, and others. Such persons as appeared as speakers (advocates, or counsel) before the court, were said to be "called to the bar", that is, privileged so to appear, speak and otherwise serve in the presence of the judges as "barristers." The corresponding phrase in the United States is "admitted to the bar." - *A Dictionary of Law (1893)*.

From the definition of the title and occupation of a "**barrister**" is derived:

BARRISTER, English law. 1. A counselor admitted to plead at the bar. 2. **Ouster barrister**, is one who pleads ouster or without the bar. 3. **Inner barrister**, a sergeant or king's counsel who pleads within the bar. 4. **Vacation barrister**, a counselor newly called to the bar, who is to attend for several long vacations the exercise of the house. 5. **Barristers** are called apprentices, *apprentitii ad legem*, being looked upon as learners, and not qualified until they obtain the degree of sergeant. Edmund Plowden, the author of the Commentaries, a volume of elaborate reports in the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Philip and Mary, and Elizabeth, describes himself as an apprentice of the common law. - *A Law Dictionary by John Bouvier (Revised Sixth Edition, 1856)*.

BARRISTER, n. [from bar.] A **counselor**, learned in the laws, qualified and admitted to please at the bar, and to take upon him the defense of clients; answering to the advocate or licentiate of other countries. Anciently, barristers were called, in England, apprentices of the law. **Outer barristers** are pleaders without the bar, to distinguish them from **inner barristers**, **benchers** or **readers**, who have been sometime admitted to please within the bar, as the king's counsel are. - *Webster's 1828 Dictionary*.

Overall, a **barrister** is one who has the privilege to plead at the courtroom bar separating the judicial from the non-judicial spectators. Currently, in U.S. courts, the inner bar between the bench (judge) and the outer bar no longer exists, and the outer bar separates the attorneys (not lawyers) from the spectator's gallery. This will be explained more as you read further. As with the word *bar*, each commonly used word describing the various court officers is derived directly from root words:

From the word "**solicit**" is derived the name and occupation of a solicitor; one who solicits or petitions an action in a court.

SOLICIT, v.t. [Latin *solicito*] 1. To ask with some degree of earnestness; to make petition to; to apply to for obtaining something. This word implies earnestness in seeking ... 2. To ask for with some degree of earnestness; to seek by petition; as, to solicit an office; to solicit a favor. - *Webster's 1828 Dictionary*.

From the word "**attorn**" is derived the name and occupation of an attorney; one who transfers or assigns property, rights, title and allegiance to the owner of the land.

ATTORN / v. *Me.* [Origin French. *atorner, aturner* assign, appoint, f. *a-torner* turn v.] 1. v.t. Turn; change, transform; deck out. 2. v.t Turn over (goods, service, allegiance, etc.) to another; transfer, assign. 3. v.i. Transfer ones tenancy, or (*arch.*) homage or allegiance, to another; formally acknowledge such transfer. **attorn tenant** (to) *Law* formally transfer ones tenancy (*to*), make legal acknowledgement of tenancy (to a new landlord). - *Oxford English Dictionary 1999*.

ATTORN, v.i. [Latin *ad* and *torno*.] In the feudal law, to turn, or transfer homage and service from one lord to another. This is the act of feudatories, vassals or tenants, upon the alienation of the estate. - *Webster's 1828 Dictionary*.

ATTORNMENT, n. The act of a feudatory, vassal or tenant, by which he consents, upon the alienation of an estate, to receive a new lord or superior, and transfers to him his homage and service. - *Webster's 1828 Dictionary*.

ATTORNMENT *n.* the transference of bailor status, tenancy, or (*arch.*) allegiance, service, etc., to another; formal acknowledgement of such transfer: *lme.* - *Oxford English Dictionary 1999*.

From the word **advocate** comes the meaning of the occupation by the same name; one who pleads or defends by argument in a court.

ADVOCATE, v.t. [Latin *advocatus*, from *advoco*, to call for, to plead for; of *ad* and *voco*, to call. See *Vocal*.] To plead in favor of; to defend by argument, before a tribunal; to support or vindicate. - *Webster's 1828 Dictionary*.

From the word "**counsel**" is derived the name and occupation of a counselor or lawyer; one who is learned in the law to give advice in a court of law;

COUNSEL, v.t. [Latin. to consult; to ask, to assail.] 1. To give advice or deliberate opinion to another for the government of his conduct; to advise. - *Webster's 1828 Dictionary*.

LAWYER. A counselor; one learned in the law. - *A Law Dictionary by John Bouvier (Revised Sixth Edition, 1856)*.

Although modern usage tends to group all these descriptive occupational words as the same, the fact is that they have different and distinctive meanings when used within the context of court activities:

Solicitor - one who petitions (initiates) for another in a court

Counselor - one who advises another concerning a court matter

Lawyer - [see counselor] learned in the law to advise in a court

Barrister - one who is privileged to plead *at* the bar

Advocate - one who pleads *within* the bar for a defendant

Attorney - one who transfers or assigns, within the bar, another's rights & property acting on behalf of the ruling crown (government)

It's very clear that an **attorney** is *not* a **lawyer**. The lawyer is a learned counselor who advises. The ruling government appoints an attorney as one who transfers a tenant's rights, allegiance, and title to the land owner (government).

Feudal Tenancy

If you think you are a landowner in America, take a close look at the warranty deed or fee title to your land. You will almost always find the words "**tenant**" or "**tenancy**." The title or deed document establishing your right as a tenant, not as that of a landowner, has been prepared for transfer by a licensed BAR Attorney, just as it was carried out within the original English feudal system we presumed we had escaped from in 1776.

A **human being** is the tenant to a feudal superior. A **feudal tenant** is a legal **person** who pays rent or services of some sort for the use and occupation of another's land. The land has been conveyed to the tenant's use, but the actual *ownership* remains with the superior. If a common **person** does not own what he thought was his land (he's legally defined as a "**feudal tenant**," *not* the superior owner), then a superior **person** owns the land and the **feudal tenant - person** pays him to occupy the land.

This is the hidden Feudal Law in America. When a **person** (a.k.a. human being, corporation, natural person, partnership, association, organization, etc.) pays taxes to the tax assessor of the civil county or city government (also a **person**), it is a payment to the superior land owner for the right to be a tenant and to occupy the land belonging to the superior. If this were not so, then how could a local government sell the house and land of a **person** for not rendering his services (taxes)?

We used to think that there was no possible way feudal law could be exercised in America, but the facts have proven otherwise. It's no wonder they hid the definition of a **human being** behind the definition of a **man**. The next time you enter into an agreement or contract with another **person** (legal entity), look for the keywords **person**, **individual**, and **natural person** describing who you are.

Are you the entity the other person claims you are? When you "appear" before their jurisdiction and courts, you have agreed that you are a legal person unless you show them otherwise. You will have to deny that you are the person and state who you really are. Is the flesh and blood standing there in that courtroom a person by their legal definition?

British Accredited Registry (BAR)?

During the middle 1600's, the Crown of England established a formal registry in London where barristers were ordered by the Crown to be accredited. The establishment of this first **International Bar Association** allowed barrister-lawyers from all nations to be formally recognized and accredited by the only recognized accreditation society. From this, the acronym **BAR** was established denoting (informally) the **British Accredited Registry**, whose members became a powerful and integral force within the International Bar Association (IBA). Although this has been denied repeatedly as to its existence, the acronym **BAR** stood for the British barrister-lawyers who were members of the larger **IBA**.

When America was still a chartered group of British colonies under patent - established in what was formally named the **British Crown territory of New England** - the first British Accredited Registry (BAR) was established in Boston during 1761 to attempt to allow only accredited barrister-lawyers access to the British

courts of New England. This was the first attempt to control who could represent defendants in the court at or within the bar in America.

Today, each corporate STATE in America has its own BAR Association, *i.e.* The Florida Bar or the California Bar, that licenses government officer **attorneys**, NOT **lawyers**. In reality, the U.S. courts only allow their officer **attorneys** to freely enter *within* the bar while prohibiting those learned of the law - lawyers - to do so. They prevent advocates, lawyers, counselors, barristers and solicitors from entering through the outer bar. *Only licensed BAR Attorneys* are permitted to freely enter within the bar separating the people from the bench because all BAR Attorneys are officers of the court itself. Does that tell you anything?

Here's where the whole word game gets really tricky. In each State, every licensed BAR Attorney calls himself an **Attorney at Law**. Look at the definitions above and see for yourself that an Attorney at Law is nothing more than an **attorney** - one who transfers allegiance and property to the ruling land owner.

Another name game they use is "**of counsel**," which means absolutely nothing more than an offer of advice. Surely, the mechanic down the street can do that! Advice is one thing; lawful representation is another.

A BAR licensed Attorney is *not* an advocate, so how can he do anything other than what his real purpose is? He can't plead on your behalf because that would be a conflict of interest. He can't represent the crown (ruling government) as an official officer at the same time he is allegedly representing a defendant. His sworn duty as a BAR Attorney is to transfer your ownership, rights, titles, and allegiance to the land owner. When you hire a BAR Attorney to represent you in their courts, you have hired an officer of that court whose sole purpose and occupation is to transfer what you have to the creator and authority of that court. A more appropriate phrase would be **legal plunder**.

The official duties of an Esquire

Let's not forget that all U.S. BAR Attorneys have entitled themselves, as a direct result of their official BAR license and oaths, with the British title of "**esquire**." This word is a derivative of the British word "**squire**."

SQUIRE, n. [a popular contraction of esquire] 1. In Great Britain, the title of a gentleman next in rank to a knight. 2. In Great Britain, an attendant on a noble warrior. 3. An attendant at court. 4. In the United States, the title of magistrates and lawyers. In New-England, it is particularly given to justices of the peace and judges. - *Webster's 1828 Dictionary*.

ESQUIRE *n.* Earlier as squire *n.* 1 *Ime.* [Origin French. *esquier* (mod. *écuyer*) f. Latin *scutarius* shield - bearer, f. *scutum* shield: see - ary 1.] 1. Orig. (now *Hist.*), a young nobleman who, in training for knighthood, acted as shield-bearer and attendant to a knight. Later, a man belonging to the higher order of English gentry, ranking next below a knight. *Ime.* **b** *Hist.* Any of various officers in the service of a king or nobleman. **c** A landed proprietor, a country squire. *arch.* - *Oxford English Dictionary 1999*.

During the English feudal laws of land ownership and tenancy, a squire - **esquire** - was established as the land proprietor charged with the duty of carrying out, among various other duties, the act of **attornment** [see definition above] for the land owner and nobleman he served. Could this be any simpler for the average American to understand? If our current U.S. BAR Attorneys were just lawyers, solicitors, barristers, advocates or counselors, then they would call themselves the same. They have named themselves just exactly what they are, yet we blindly cannot see the writing on the wall.

The BAR Attorneys have not hidden this from anyone. That's why they deliberately call themselves "**Esquires**" and "**Attorneys at law**." It is the American people who have hidden their own heads in the sand.

Knowing these simple truths, why would anyone consider the services of BAR Attorney-Esquire as his representative within the ruling courts of America? Their purposes, position, occupation, job, and duty is to transfer your allegiance, property, and rights to the landowner, *a.k.a.* STATE. They are sworn oath officers of the State whose sole authority is to transfer your property to their landowner-employer. Think about this the next time you enter their courtrooms. From now on, all Americans should refuse to enter past the outer bar when they are called. Who would voluntarily want to relinquish all he has by passing into their legal trap that exists inside that outer bar?

We must all refuse to recognize their royal position as **Squires** and refuse to hire them as our representatives and agents. They can't plead or argue for you anyway; all they can do is oversee the act of attornment on behalf of the ruling government whom they serve as official officers. Nothing stops your neighbor from being a barrister or lawyer. No real law prohibits any of us from being lawyers! Even Abraham Lincoln was a well-recognized lawyer, yet he had no formal law degree. Let the BAR Attorneys continue in their jobs as property transfer agent-officers for the State, but if no defendant hires them, they'll have to get new jobs or they'll starve. Fire your BAR Attorney and represent yourself as your own lawyer, or hire any non-BAR-licensed lawyer to assist you from outside the courtroom bar.

Refuse to acknowledge all judges who are also licensed BAR Attorneys. Every judge in Florida State is a member of the Florida BAR. This is unlawful and unconstitutional as a judge cannot be an Esquire nor can he represent any issue in commerce, such as that of the State. Every Florida State judge has compromised his purported neutral and impartial judicial position by being a State Officer through his BAR licensure. This is an unlawful monopoly of power and commerce.

Fire your BAR Attorney. Refuse to acknowledge their corrupt inner-bar courts of thievery. Formally charge them with the illegal act of practicing law without lawful authority. Why? A BAR Attorney is *not* a lawyer by lawful definition. An Esquire is an officer of the State with the duty to carry out State activities, including "attornment."

State officers have no constitutional authority to practice law as lawyers, barristers, advocates, or solicitors. Americans should begin formally charging these false lawyers with unlawfully practicing the profession of law since their BAR licenses only give them the privilege to be Attorneys and Squires over land transfers.

Also, remember this:

You are not a statutory PERSON. Their "public policey" only applies to their 14th Amendment creations known as the "persons." Withdraw your CONSENT to their 14th Amendment and "personhood" status and walk away with YOUR FREEDOM.

ARE COPS CONSTITUTIONAL?

*Roger Roots**

ABSTRACT

Police work is often lionized by jurists and scholars who claim to employ "textualist" and "originalist" methods of constitutional interpretation. Yet professional police were unknown to the United States in 1789, and first appeared in America almost a half-century *after* the Constitution's ratification. The Framers contemplated law enforcement as the duty of mostly private citizens, along with a few constables and sheriffs who could be called upon when necessary. This article marshals extensive historical and legal evidence to show that modern policing is in many ways inconsistent with the original intent of America's founding documents. The author argues that the growth of modern policing has substantially empowered the state in a way the Framers would regard as abhorrent to their foremost principles.

PART I

INTRODUCTION

Uniformed police officers are the most visible element of America's criminal justice system. Their numbers have grown exponentially over the past century and now stand at hundreds of thousands nationwide.¹ Police expenses account for the largest segment of most municipal budgets and generally dwarf expenses for fire, trash, and sewer services.² Neither casual observers nor learned authorities regard the sight of hundreds of armed, uniformed state agents on America's roads and street corners as anything peculiar — let alone invalid or unconstitutional.

Yet the dissident English colonists who framed the United States Constitution would have seen this modern 'police state' as alien to their foremost principles. Under the criminal justice model known to the Framers, professional police officers were unknown.³ The general public had broad law enforcement powers and only the executive functions of the law (e.g., the execution of writs, warrants and orders) were performed by constables or sheriffs (who might call upon members of the community for assistance).⁴ Initiation and investigation of criminal cases was the nearly exclusive province of private persons.

At the time of the Constitution's ratification, the office of sheriff was an appointed position, and constables were either elected or drafted from the community to serve without pay.⁵ Most of their duties involved civil executions rather than criminal law enforcement. The courts of that period were venues for private litigation — whether civil or criminal — and the state was rarely a party. Professional police as we know them today originated in American cities during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when municipal governments drafted citizens to maintain order.⁶ The role of these "nightly watch" officers gradually grew to encompass the catching of criminals, which had formerly been the responsibility of individual citizens.⁷

While this historical disconnect is widely known by criminal justice historians, rarely has it been juxtaposed against the Constitution and the Constitution's imposed scheme of criminal justice.⁸ "Originalist" scholars of the Constitution have tended to be supportive, rather than critical of modern policing.⁹ This article will show, however, that modern policing violates the Framers' most firmly held conceptions of criminal justice.

The modern police-driven model of law enforcement helps sustain a playing field that is fundamentally uneven for different players upon it. Modern police act as an army of assistants for state prosecutors and gather evidence solely with an eye toward the state's interests. Police seal off crime scenes from the purview of defense investigators, act as witnesses of convenience for the state in courts of law, and instigate a substantial amount of criminal activity under the guise of crime fighting. Additionally, police enforce social class norms and act as tools of empowerment for favored interest groups to the disadvantage of others.¹⁰ Police are also a political force that constantly lobbies for increased state power and decreased constitutional liberty for American citizens.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL TEXT

The Constitution contains no explicit provisions for criminal law enforcement.¹¹ Nor did the constitutions of any of the several states contain such provisions at the time of the Founding.¹² Early constitutions enunciated the intention that law enforcement was a universal duty that each person owed to the community, rather than a power of the government.¹³ Founding-era constitutions addressed law enforcement from the standpoint of individual liberties and placed explicit barriers upon the state.¹⁴

PRIVATE PROSECUTORS

For decades before and after the Revolution, the adjudication of criminals in America was governed primarily by the rule of private prosecution: (1) victims of serious crimes approached a community grand jury, (2) the grand jury investigated the matter and issued an indictment only if it concluded that a crime should be charged, and (3) the victim himself or his representative (generally an attorney but sometimes a state attorney general) prosecuted the defendant before a petit jury of twelve men.¹⁵ Criminal actions were only a step away from civil actions — the only material difference being that criminal claims ostensibly involved an interest of the public at large as well as the victim.¹⁶ Private prosecutors acted under authority of the people and in the name of the state — but for their own vindication.¹⁷ The very term "prosecutor" meant criminal plaintiff and implied a private person.¹⁸ A *government* prosecutor was referred to as an attorney general and was a rare phenomenon in criminal cases at the time of the nation's founding.¹⁹ When a private individual prosecuted an action in the name of the state, the attorney general was required to allow the prosecutor to use his name — even if the attorney general himself did not approve of the action.²⁰

Private prosecution meant that criminal cases were for the most part limited by the need of crime victims for vindication.²¹ Crime victims held the keys to a potential defendant's fate and often negotiated the settlement of criminal cases.²² After a case was initiated in the name of the people, however, private prosecutors were prohibited from withdrawing the action pursuant to private agreement with the defendant.²³ Court intervention was occasionally required to compel injured crime victims to appear against offenders in court and "not to make bargains to allow [defendants] to escape conviction, if they ... repair the injury."²⁴

Grand jurors often acted as the detectives of the period. They conducted their investigations in the manner of neighborhood sleuths, dispersing throughout the community to question people about their knowledge of crimes.²⁵ They could act on the testimony of one of their own members, or even on information known to grand jurors before the grand jury convened.²⁶ They might never have contact with a government prosecutor or any other officer of the executive branch.²⁷

Colonial grand juries also occasionally served an important law enforcement need by account of their sheer numbers. In the early 1700s, grand jurors were sometimes called upon to make arrests in cases where suspects were armed and in large numbers.²⁸ A lone sheriff or deputy had reason to fear even approaching a large group "without danger of his life or having his bones broken."²⁹ When a sheriff was unable to execute a warrant or perform an execution, he could call upon a *posse* of citizens to assist him.³⁰ The availability of the *posse comitatus* meant that a sheriff's resources were essentially unlimited.³¹

LAW ENFORCEMENT AS A UNIVERSAL DUTY

Law enforcement in the Founders' time was a *duty* of every citizen.³² Citizens were expected to be armed and equipped to chase suspects on foot, on horse, or with wagon whenever summoned. And when called upon to enforce the laws of the state, citizens were to respond "not faintly and with lagging steps, but honestly and bravely and with whatever implements and facilities [were] convenient and at hand."³³ Any person could act in the capacity of a constable without being one,³⁴ and when summoned by a law enforcement officer, a private person became a temporary member of the police department.³⁵ The law also presumed that any person acting in his public capacity as an officer was rightfully appointed.³⁶

Laws in virtually every state still require citizens to aid in capturing escaped prisoners, arresting criminal suspects, and executing legal process. The duty of citizens to enforce the law was and is a constitutional one. Many early state constitutions purported to bind citizens into a universal obligation to perform law enforcement functions, yet evinced no mention of any state power to carry out those same functions.³⁷ But the law

enforcement duties of the citizenry are now a long-forgotten remnant of the Framers' era. By the 1960s, only twelve percent of the public claimed to have ever personally acted to combat crime.³⁸

The Founders could not have envisioned 'police' officers as we know them today. The term "police" had a slightly different meaning at the time of the Founding.³⁹ It was generally used as a verb and meant to watch over or monitor the public health and safety.⁴⁰ In Louisiana, "police juries" were local governing bodies similar to county boards in other states.⁴¹ Only in the mid-nineteenth century did the term 'police' begin to take on the persona of a uniformed state law enforcer.⁴² The term first crept into Supreme Court jurisprudence even later.⁴³

Prior to the 1850s, rugged individualism and self-reliance were the touchstones of American law, culture, and industry. Although a puritan cultural and legal ethic pervaded their society, Americans had great toleration for victimless misconduct.⁴⁴ Traffic disputes were resolved through personal negotiation and common law tort principles, rather than driver licenses and armed police patrol.⁴⁵ Agents of the state did not exist for the protection of the individual citizen. The night watch of early American cities concerned itself primarily with the danger of fire, and watchmen were often afraid to enter some of the most notorious neighborhoods of cities like Boston.⁴⁶

At the time of Tocqueville's observations (in the 1830s), "the means available to the authorities for the discovery of crimes and arrest of criminals [were] few,"⁴⁷ yet Tocqueville doubted "whether in any other country crime so seldom escapes punishment."⁴⁸ Citizens handled most crimes informally, forming committees to catch criminals and hand them over to the courts.⁴⁹ Private mobs in early America dealt with larger threats to public safety and welfare, such as houses of ill fame.⁵⁰ Nothing struck a European traveler in America, wrote Tocqueville, more than the absence of government in the streets.⁵¹

Formal criminal justice institutions dealt only with the most severe crimes. Misdemeanor offenses had to be dealt with by the private citizen on the private citizen's own terms. "The farther back the [crime rate] figures go," according to historian Roger Lane, "the higher is the relative proportion of serious crimes."⁵² In other words, before the advent of professional policing, fewer crimes — and only the most serious crimes — were brought to the attention of the courts.

After the 1850s, cities in the northeastern United States gradually acquired more uniformed patrol officers. The criminal justice model of the Framers' era grew less recognizable. The growth of police units reflected a "change in attitude" more than worsening crime rates.⁵³ Americans became less tolerant of violence in their streets and demanded higher standards of conduct.⁵⁴ Offenses which had formerly earned two-year sentences were now punished by three to four years or more in a state penitentiary.⁵⁵

POLICE AS SOCIAL WORKERS

Few of the duties of Founding-era sheriffs involved criminal law enforcement. Instead, *civil* executions, attachments and confinements dominated their work.⁵⁶ When professional police units first arrived on the American scene, they functioned primarily as protectors of public safety, health and welfare. This role followed the "bobbie" model developed in England in the 1830s by the father of professional policing, Sir Robert Peel.⁵⁷

Early police agencies provided a vast array of municipal services, including keeping traffic thoroughfares clear. Boston police made 30,681 arrests during one fiscal year in the 1880s, but in the same year reported 1,472 accidents, secured 2,461 buildings found open, reported thousands of dangerous and defective streets, sidewalks, chimneys, drains, sewers and hydrants, tended to 169 corpses, assisted 148 intoxicated persons, located 1,572 lost children, reported 228 missing (but only 151 found) persons, rescued seven persons from drowning, assisted nearly 2,000 sick, injured, and insane persons, found 311 stray horse teams, and removed more *than fifty thousand* street obstructions.⁵⁸

Police were a "kind of catchall or residual welfare agency,"⁵⁹ a lawful extension of actual state 'police powers.'⁶⁰ In the Old West, police were a sanitation and repair workforce more than a corps of crime-fighting gun-slingers. Sheriff Wyatt Earp of OK Corral fame, for example, repaired boardwalks as part of his duties.⁶¹

THE WAR ON CRIME

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, police forces took on a brave new role: crime-fighting. The goal of maintaining public order became secondary to chasing lawbreakers. The police cultivated a perception that they were public heroes who "fought crime" in the general, rather than individual sense.

The 1920s saw the rise of the profession's second father — or perhaps its wicked stepfather — J. Edgar Hoover.⁶² Hoover's Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) came to epitomize the police profession in its sleuth and intelligence-gathering role. FBI agents infiltrated mobster organizations, intercepted communications between suspected criminals, and gathered intelligence for both law enforcement and political purposes.

This new view of police as soldiers locked in combat against crime caught on quickly.⁶³ The FBI led local police to develop integrated repositories of fingerprint, criminal, and fraudulent check records. The FBI also took over the gathering of crime statistics (theretofore gathered by a private association),⁶⁴ and went to war against "Public Enemy Number One" and others on their "Ten Most Wanted" list.⁶⁵ Popular culture began to see police as a "thin blue line," that "serves and protects" civilized society from chaos and lawlessness.⁶⁶

THE ABSENCE OF CONSTITUTIONAL CRIME-FIGHTING POWER

But the constitutions of the Founding Era gave no hint of any thin blue line. Nothing in their texts enunciated any governmental power to "fight crime" at all. "Crime-fighting" was intended as the domain of individuals touched by crime. **The original design under the American legal order was to restore a semblance of private justice. The courts were a mere forum, or avenue, for private persons to attain justice from a malffeasor.⁶⁷ The slow alteration of the criminal courts into a venue only for the government's claims against private persons turned the very spirit of the Founders' model on its head.**

To suggest that modern policing is extraconstitutional is not to imply that every aspect of police work is constitutionally improper.⁶⁸ Rather, it is to say that the totality and effect of modern policing negates the meaning and purpose of certain constitutional protections the Framers intended to protect and carry forward to future generations. Modern-style policing leaves many fundamental constitutional interests utterly unenforced.

Americans today, for example, are far more vulnerable to invasive searches and seizures by the state than were the Americans of 1791.⁶⁹ The Framers lived in an era in which much less of the world was in "plain view" of the government and a "stop and frisk" would have been rare indeed.⁷⁰ The totality of modern policing also places pedestrian and vehicle travel at the mercy of the state, a development the Framers would have almost certainly never sanctioned. These infringements result not from a single aspect of modern policing, but from the whole of modern policing's control over large domains of private life that were once "policed" by private citizens.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DISTINCTIONS

The treatment of law enforcement in the courts shows that the law of crime control has changed monumentally over the past two centuries. Under the common law, there was no difference whatsoever between the privileges, immunities, and powers of constables and those of private citizens. Constables were literally and figuratively

clothed in the same garments as everyone else and faced the same liabilities — civil and criminal — as everyone else under identical circumstances. Two centuries of jurisprudence, however, have recast the power relationships of these two roles dramatically.

Perhaps the first distinction between the rights of citizen and constabulary came in the form of increased power to arrest. Early in the history of policing, courts held that an officer could arrest if he had "reasonable belief both in the commission of a felony and in the guilt of the arrestee."⁷¹ This represented a marginal yet important distinction from the rights of a "private person," who could arrest only if a felony had *actually* been committed.⁷² It remains somewhat of a mystery, however, where this distinction was first drawn.⁷³ Scrutiny of the distinction suggests it arose in England in 1827 — more than a generation after ratification of the Bill of Rights in the United States.⁷⁴

Moreover, the distinction was illegitimate from its birth, being a bastardization of an earlier rule allowing constables to arrest upon transmission of reasonably reliable information from a third person.⁷⁵ The earlier rule made perfect sense when many arrests were executed by private persons. "Authority" was a narrow defense available only to those who met the highest standard of accuracy.⁷⁶ But when Americans **began to delegate** their law enforcement duties to professionals, the law relaxed to allow police to execute warrantless felony arrests upon information received from third parties. For obvious reasons, constables could not be required to be "right" all of the time, so the rule of strict liability for false arrest was lost.⁷⁷

The tradeoff has had the effect of depriving Americans of certainty in the executions of warrantless arrests. Judges now consider only the question of whether there was reasonable ground to suspect an arrestee, rather than whether the arrestee was guilty of any crime. This loss of certainty, when combined with greater deference to the state in most law enforcement matters, has essentially reversed the original intent and purpose of American law enforcement that the state act against stern limitations and at its own peril. Because arrest has become the near exclusive province of professional police, Americans have fewer assurances that they are free from unreasonable arrests.

Distinctions between the privileges of citizens and police officers grew more rapidly in the twentieth century. State and federal lawmakers enshrined police officers with expansive immunities from firearm laws⁷⁸ and from laws regulating the use of equipment such as radio scanners, body armor, and infrared scopes.⁷⁹ Legislatures also exempted police from toll road charges,⁸⁰ granted police confidential telephone numbers and auto registration,⁸¹ and even exempted police from fireworks regulations.⁸² Police are also protected by other statutory immunities and protections, such as mandatory death sentences for defendants who murder them,⁸³ reimbursement of moving expenses when officers receive threats to their lives,⁸⁴ and even special protections from assailants infected with the AIDS virus.⁸⁵ Officers who illegally eavesdrop, wiretap, or intrude upon privacy are protected by a *statutory* (as well as case law) "good faith" defense,⁸⁶ while private citizens who do so face up to five years in prison. The tendency of legislatures to equip police with ever-expanding rights, privileges and powers has, if anything, been strengthened rather than limited by the courts.⁸⁸

But this growing power differential contravenes the principles of equal citizenship that dominated America's founding. The great principle of the American Revolution was, after all, the doctrine of limited government.⁸⁹ Advocates of the Bill of Rights saw the chief danger of government as the inherently aristocratic and disparate power of government authority.⁹⁰ Founding-era constitutions enunciated the principle that all men are "equally free" and that all government is derived from the people.⁹¹

RESISTING ARREST

Nothing illustrates the modern disparity between the rights and powers of police and citizen as much as the modern law of resisting arrest. At the time of the nation's founding, any citizen *was privileged* to resist arrest if,

for example, probable cause for arrest did not exist or the arresting person could not produce a valid arrest warrant where one was needed.⁹² As recently as one hundred years ago, but with a tone that seems as if from some other, more distant age, the United States Supreme Court held that it was permissible (or at least defensible) to shoot an officer who displays a gun with intent to commit a warrantless arrest based on insufficient cause.⁹³ Officers who executed an arrest without proper warrant were themselves considered trespassers, and any trespasser had a right to violently resist (or even assault and batter) an officer to evade such arrest.⁹⁴

Well into the twentieth century, violent resistance was considered a lawful remedy for Fourth Amendment violations.⁹⁵ Even third-party intermeddlers were privileged to forcibly liberate wrongly arrested persons from unlawful custody.⁹⁶ The doctrine of non-resistance against unlawful government action was harshly condemned at the constitutional conventions of the 1780s, and both the Maryland and New Hampshire constitutions contained provisions denouncing nonresistance as "absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind."⁹⁷

By the 1980s, however, many if not most states had (1) eliminated the common law right of resistance,⁹⁸ (2) *criminalized* the resistance of any officer acting in his official capacity,⁹⁹ (3) eliminated the requirement that an arresting officer present his warrant at the scene,¹⁰⁰ and (4) drastically decreased the number and types of arrests for which a warrant is required.¹⁰¹ Although some state courts have balked at this march toward efficiency in favor of the state,¹⁰² none require the level of protection known to the Framers.¹⁰³

But the right to resist unlawful arrest can be considered a *constitutional* one. It stems from the right of every person to his bodily integrity and liberty of movement, among the most fundamental of all rights.¹⁰⁴ Substantive due process principles require that the government interfere with such a right only to further a compelling state interest¹⁰⁵ — and the power to arrest the citizenry unlawfully can hardly be characterized as a compelling state interest.¹⁰⁶ Thus, the advent of professional policing has endangered important rights of the American people.

The changing balance of power between police and private citizens is illustrated by the power of modern police to use violence against the population.¹⁰⁷

As professional policing became more prevalent in the twentieth century, police use of deadly force went largely without clearly delineated guidelines (outside of general tort law).¹⁰⁸ Until the 1970s, police officers shot and killed fleeing suspects (both armed and unarmed) at their own discretion or according to very general department oral policies.¹⁰⁹ Officers in some jurisdictions made it their regular practice to shoot at speeding motorists who refused orders to halt.¹¹⁰ More than one officer tried for murder in such cases — along with fellow police who urged dismissals — argued that such killings were in the discharge of official duties.¹¹¹ Departments that adopted written guidelines invariably did so in response to outcries following questionable shootings.¹¹² Prior to 1985, police were given near total discretion to fire on the public wherever officers suspected that a fleeing person had committed a felony.¹¹³ More than 200 people were shot and killed by police in Philadelphia alone between 1970 and 1983.¹¹⁴

In 1985, the United States Supreme Court purported to stop this carnage by invalidating the use of deadly force to apprehend unarmed, nonviolent suspects.¹¹⁵ *Tennessee v. Garner*¹¹⁶ involved the police killing of an unarmed juvenile burglary suspect who, if apprehended alive, would likely have been sentenced to probation.¹¹⁷ The Court limited police use of deadly force to cases of self defense or defense of others.¹¹⁸

As a practical matter, however, the *Garner* rule is much less stringent. Because federal civil rights actions inevitably turn not on a strict constitutional rule (such as the *Garner* rule), but on the perception of a defendant officer, officers enjoy a litigation advantage over all other parties.¹¹⁹ In no reported case has a judge or jury held an officer liable who used deadly force where a mere "reasonable" belief that human life was in imminent

danger existed.¹²⁰ Some lower courts have interpreted *Garner* to permit deadly force even where suspects pose no immediate and direct threat of death or serious injury to others.¹²¹ The U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals recently denied the criminal liability of an agent who shot and killed an innocent person to prevent another person from retreating to "take up a defensive position," drawing criticism from Judge Kozinski that the court had adopted the "007 standard" for police shootings.¹²²

Untold dozens, if not hundreds, of Americans have been shot in the back while fleeing police, even after the *Garner* decision. Police have shot and killed suspects who did nothing more than make a move,¹²³ reach for their identification too quickly,¹²⁴ reach into a jacket or pocket,¹²⁵ "make a motion" of going for a gun,¹²⁶ turn either toward or away from officers,¹²⁷ 'pull away' from an officer as an officer opened a car door,¹²⁸ rub their eyes and stumble forward after a mace attack,¹²⁹ or allegedly lunge with a knife,¹³⁰ a hatchet,¹³¹ or a ballpoint pen.¹³² Cops have also been known to open fire on and kill persons who brandished or refused to drop virtually any hand-held object — a Jack Daniel's whiskey bottle,¹³³ a metal rod,¹³⁴ a wooden stick,¹³⁵ a kitchen knife (even while eating dinner),¹³⁶ a screwdriver,¹³⁷ a rake¹³⁸ — or even refused an order to raise their hands.¹³⁹

Cops who shoot an individual holding a shiny object that can be said to resemble a gun — such as a cash box,¹⁴⁰ a shiny silver pen,¹⁴¹ a TV remote control,¹⁴² or even a can opener¹⁴³ — are especially likely to avoid liability. In line with this defense, police officers nationwide have been caught planting weapons on their victims in order to make shootings look like self defense.¹⁴⁴ In one of the more egregious examples ever proven in court, Houston police were found during the 1980s to have utilized an unofficial *policy* of planting guns on victims of police violence.¹⁴⁵ Seventy-five to eighty percent of all Houston officers apparently carried "throw-down" weapons for such purposes.¹⁴⁶ Only the dogged persistence of aggrieved relatives and the firsthand testimony of intrepid witnesses unraveled the police cover-up of the policy.¹⁴⁷

Resisting arrest, defending oneself, or fleeing may also place an American in danger of being killed by police.¹⁴⁸ Although the law clearly classifies such killings as unlawful, police are rarely made to account for such conduct in court.¹⁴⁹ Only where the claimed imminent threat seems too contrived — such as where an officer opened fire to defend himself from a pair of fingernail clippers¹⁵⁰ — or where abundant evidence of a police cover-up exists, will courts uphold damage awards against police officers who shoot civilians.¹⁵¹

As Professor Peter L. Davis points out, there is no good reason why police should not be liable *criminally* for their violations of the criminal code, just as other Americans would expect to be (and, indeed, as the constables of the Founding Era often were).¹⁵² Yet in modern criminal courts, police tend to be more bulletproof than the Kevlar vests they wear on the job. Remember that the district attorneys responsible for prosecuting police for their crimes are the same district attorneys who must defend those officers in civil cases involving the same facts.¹⁵³ Under the Framers' common law, this conflict of interest did not arise at all because a citizen grand jury — independent from the state attorney general — brought charges against a criminal officer, and the officer's victim prosecuted the matter before a petit jury.¹⁵⁴ But the modern model of law enforcement provides no real remedy, and no ready outlet for the law to work effectively against police criminals. Indeed, modern policing acts as an obstruction of justice with regard to police criminality.

The bloodstained record of shootings, beatings, tortures and mayhem by American police against the populace is too voluminous to be recounted in a single article.¹⁵⁵ At least 2,000 Americans have been killed at the hands of law enforcement since 1990.¹⁵⁶ Some one-fourth of these killings — about fifty per year — are alleged by some authorities to be in the nature of murders.¹⁵⁷ Yet only a handful have led to indictment, conviction and incarceration.¹⁵⁸ This is true even though most police killings involve victims who were unarmed or committed no crime.¹⁵⁹

Killings by police seem as likely as killings by death-row murderers to demonstrate extreme brutality or depravity. Police often fire a dozen or more bullets at a victim where one or two would stop the individual.¹⁶⁰

Such indicia of viciousness and ferocity would qualify as aggravating factors justifying the death penalty for a civilian murderer under the criminal laws of most states.¹⁶¹

From the earliest arrival of professional policing upon America's shores, police severely taxed both the largess and the liberties of the citizenry.¹⁶² In early municipal police departments, cops tortured, harassed and arrested thousands of Americans for vagrancy, loitering, and similar "crimes," or detained them on mere "suspicion."¹⁶³ Where evidence was insufficient to close a case, police tortured suspects into confessing to crimes they did not commit.¹⁶⁴ In the name of law enforcement, police became professional lawbreakers, "constantly breaking in upon common law and ... statute law."¹⁶⁵ In 1903 a former New York City police commissioner remarked that he had seen "a dreary procession of citizens with broken heads and bruised bodies against few of whom was violence needed to affect an arrest.... The police are practically above the law."¹⁶⁶

THE SAFETY OF THE POLICE PROFESSION

Defenders of police violence often cite the dangerous nature of police work, claiming the police occupation is filled with risks to life and health. Police training itself — especially elite SWAT-type or paramilitary training that many officers crave — reinforces the "dangerousness" of police work in the officers' own minds.¹⁶⁷ There is some truth to this perception, in that around one hundred officers are feloniously killed in the line of duty each year in the United States.¹⁶⁸

But police work's billing as a dangerous profession plummets in credibility when viewed from a broader perspective. Homicide, after all, is the second leading cause of death on the job for *all* American workers.¹⁶⁹ The taxicab industry suffers homicide rates almost *six times* higher than the police and detective industry.¹⁷⁰ A police officer's death on the job is almost as likely to be from an accident as from homicide.¹⁷¹ When overall rates of injury and death on the job are examined, policing barely ranks at all. The highest rates of fatal workplace injuries occur in the mining and construction industries, with transportation, manufacturing and agriculture following close behind.¹⁷² Fully 98 percent of all fatal workplace injuries occur in the civilian labor force.¹⁷³

Moreover, police work is generously rewarded in terms of financial, pension and other benefits, not to mention prestige. Police salaries may exceed \$100,000 annually plus generous health insurance and pension plans — placing police in the very highest percentiles of American workers in terms of compensation.¹⁷⁴ The founding generation would have been utterly astonished by such a transfer of wealth to professional law enforcers.¹⁷⁵ This reality of police safety, security and comfort is one of the best-kept secrets in American labor.

In all, it is questionable whether modern policing actually decreases the level of bloodshed on American streets. Police often bring mayhem, confusion and violence wherever they are called.¹⁷⁶ Approximately one-third of the people killed in high-speed police car chases (which are often unnecessarily escalated by police) are innocent bystanders.¹⁷⁷ Cops occasionally prevent rather than execute rescues.¹⁷⁸ "Police practices" ranked as the number one *cause* of violent urban riots of the 1960s.¹⁷⁹ Indeed, police actively participated in or even initiated some of the nation's worst riots.¹⁸⁰ During the infamous Chicago Police Riot during the Democratic National Convention in 1968, police physically attacked 63 newsmen and indiscriminately beat and clubbed numerous innocent bystanders.¹⁸¹

PROFESSIONALISM?

If the modern model of cop-driven criminal justice has any defense at all, it is its "professionalism." Private law enforcement of the type intended by the Framers was supposedly more inclined toward lax and arbitrary enforcement than professional officers who are sworn to uphold the law.¹⁸² Upon scrutiny, however, the claim

that professional police are more reliable, less arbitrary, and more capable of objective law enforcement than private law enforcers is drastically undermined.

The constitutional model of law enforcement (investigation by a citizen grand jury, arrest by private individuals, constables or citizens watch, and private prosecution) became seen as inefficient and ineffective as America entered its industrial age.¹⁸³ Yet the grand jury in its natural and unhobbled state is *more*, rather than less, able to pursue investigations when compared to professional police. Grand jurors are not constrained by the Fourth, Fifth or Sixth amendments — or at least the "exclusionary rule" fashioned by the courts to enforce those amendments.¹⁸⁴

In the absence of police troops to enforce the law, the early criminal justice system was hardly as hobbled and impotent as conventional wisdom suggests. Private watch groups and broad-based advocacy groups existed to enforce laws and track criminals among jurisdictions. Thousands of local antihorsethief associations and countless 'detecting societies' sprang up to answer the call of crime victims in the nineteenth century.¹⁸⁵ In Maine, the "Penobscot Temperance League" hired detectives to investigate and initiate criminal cases against illegal liquor traffickers.¹⁸⁶ In the 1870s a private group called the Society for the Suppression of Vice became so zealous in garnering prosecutions of the immoral that it was accused in 1878 of coercing a defendant into mailing birth control information in violation of federal statutes,¹⁸⁷ one of the earliest known instances of conduct that later became defined as entrapment.¹⁸⁸ Although some of these private crime-fighting groups were invested with limited state law enforcement powers,¹⁸⁹ they were not police officers in the modern sense and received no remuneration.

Such volunteer nonprofessionals continue to aid law enforcement as auxiliary officers in many American communities.¹⁹⁰ Additionally, private organizations affiliated with regional chambers of commerce, neighborhood watch and other citizens' groups continue to play a substantial — though underappreciated — role in fighting crime.¹⁹¹ America also has a long history of outright vigilante justice, although such vigilantism has been exaggerated both in its sordidness¹⁹² and in its scope.¹⁹³

Moreover, government-operated policing is hardly a monopoly even today, neither in maintaining order nor over matters of expertise and intelligence-gathering.¹⁹⁴ There are three times more private security guards than public police officers and even activities such as guarding government buildings (including police stations) and forensic analysis are now done by private security personnel.¹⁹⁵

The chief selling point for professional policing seems to be the idea that sworn government agents are more competent crime solvers than grand juries, private prosecutors, and unpaid volunteers. But this claim disintegrates when the realities of police personnel are considered. In 1998, for example, forty percent of graduating recruits of the Washington, D.C. police academy failed the comprehensive exam required for employment on the force and were described as "practically illiterate" and "borderline-retarded."¹⁹⁶ As a practical matter, police are more dependent upon the public than the public is dependent upon police.¹⁹⁷

Cops rely on the public for a very high percentage of their investigation clearances. As the rate of crimes committed by strangers increases, the rate of clearance by the police invariably declines.¹⁹⁸ Roughly two-thirds of major robbery and burglary arrests occur solely because a witness can identify the offender, the offender is caught at or near the crime scene, or the offender leaves evidence at the scene.¹⁹⁹ In contrast, where a suspect cannot be identified in such ways, odds are high that the crime will go unsolved.²⁰⁰

Studies show that as government policing has taken over criminal investigations, the rates of clearance for murder investigations have actually gone down. For more than three decades — while police units have expanded greatly in size, power and jurisdiction — the gap between the number of homicides in the United

States and the number of cases solved has widened by almost twenty percent.²⁰¹ Today, almost three in ten homicides go unsolved.²⁰²

DNA EVIDENCE ILLUSTRATES FALLIBILITY OF POLICE

Moreover, a surprisingly high number of police conclusions are simply wrong. Since 1963, at least 381 *murder* convictions have been reversed because of police or prosecutorial misconduct.²⁰³ In the 25-year period following the Supreme Court's ruling in *Gregg v. Georgia*²⁰⁴ reaffirming the use of capital punishment, one innocent person has been freed from death row for every seven who have been executed.²⁰⁵ In Illinois, Thirteen men have been freed from death row since 1977 after proving their innocence — more than the twelve who were actually put to death over the same period. Governor George Ryan finally ordered a moratorium on executions until the death penalty system could be revamped,²⁰⁶ referring to the death penalty system as "fraught with error."²⁰⁷

Yet death penalty cases are afforded far more due process and scrutiny of evidence than noncapital cases. If anything, the error rate of police in noncapital cases is likely substantially higher. Governor Ryan's words would seem to apply doubly to the entire system of police-driven investigation.

The advent of DNA analysis in the courtrooms of the 1990s greatly accelerated the rate at which police errors have been proven in court, even while avenues for defendants' appeals have been systematically cut off by Congress and state legislatures.²⁰⁸ DNA testing before trial has exonerated at least 5000 *prime suspects* who would likely have otherwise been tried on other police evidence.²⁰⁹ Often, exculpatory DNA revelations have come in cases where other police-generated evidence was irreconcilable, suggesting falsification of evidence or other police misconduct.²¹⁰ The sheer number of wrongly accused persons freed by DNA evidence makes it beyond dispute that police investigations are far less trustworthy than the public would like to believe.²¹¹

Even more unjustified is the notion that a justice system powered by professional police possesses higher levels of integrity, trustworthiness and credibility than the criminal justice model intended by the Framers. Within the criminal justice system, cops are regarded as little more than professional witnesses of convenience, if not professional perjurers, for the prosecution.²¹² Almost no authority credits police with high levels of honesty. Indeed, the daily work of cops requires strategic lying as part of the job description.²¹³ Cops lie about the strength of their evidence in order to obtain confessions,²¹⁴ about giving *Miranda* warnings to arrestees when on the witness stand,²¹⁵ and even about substantive evidence when criminal cases need more support. Cops throughout the United States have been caught fabricating, planting and manipulating evidence to obtain convictions where cases would otherwise be very weak.²¹⁶ Some authorities regard police perjury as so rampant that it can be considered a "subcultural norm rather than an individual aberration" of police officers.²¹⁷ Large-scale investigations of police units in virtually every major American city have documented massive evidence tampering, abuse of the arresting power, and discriminatory enforcement of laws according to race, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status. Recent allegations in Los Angeles charge that dozens of officers abused their authority by opening fire on unarmed suspects, planting evidence, dealing illegal drugs, or framing some 200 innocent people.²¹⁸ More than a hundred prosecutions had to be dismissed in Chicago in 1997 due to similar police misconduct.²¹⁹ During the infamous "French connection" case of the 1970s, New York City narcotics detectives were caught diverting 188 pounds of heroin and 31 pounds of cocaine for their own use, making the City's Special Investigating Unit the largest heroin and cocaine dealer in the city.²²⁰

Police criminality was so acute in New Orleans during the 1980s and 1990s that people were afraid to report crimes for fear that corrupt officers would retaliate or tip off organized crime figures. One New Orleans officer was convicted of ordering the execution of a witness who reported him to the internal affairs unit for allegedly pistol-whipping a teenager.²²¹ Thirty-six Washington, D.C. officers were indicted on charges such as drug dealing, sexual assault, murder, sodomy and kidnapping in 1992.²²²

In Detroit, repeated corruption allegations have seen a number of low- and high-ranking officers go to prison for drug trafficking, hiring hit men, providing drug protection, and looting informant funds.²²³ Police burglary rings have been uncovered in several cities.²²⁴

Patterns of police abuse tend to repeat themselves in major American cities despite endless attempts at reform.²²⁵ New York City police, for example, have been the subject of dozens of wide-ranging corruption probes over the past hundred years²²⁶ yet continue to generate corruption allegations.²²⁷ Police exhibit unique levels of occupational solidarity.²²⁸ Review boards and internal affairs commissions inevitably fail to penetrate police loyalty and find resistance from every rank.²²⁹ Cops inevitably form an isolated authoritarian subculture that is both cynical toward the rule of law and disrespectful of the rights of fellow citizens.²³⁰ The code of internal favoritism that holds police together may more aptly be described as syndicalism rather than professionalism. Historically, urban police "collected" from local businesses.²³¹ Today, a more subtle brand of racketeering prevails, whereby police assist those businesses which provide support for police and undermine businesses which are perceived as antagonistic to police interests. This same shakedown also applies to newspaper editors and politicians.²³²

Even at the federal level, where national investigators presume to police corruption and oversee local departments, favoritism toward the police role is rampant. In 1992, for example, the federal government filed criminal charges in only 27 cases of police criminality.²³³ A federal statute criminalizing violations of the Fourth Amendment has never been enforced even a single time, although it has been a part of the U.S. Code since 1921.²³⁴ Throughout the 1980s and '90s, the FBI Crime Laboratory actively abetted the misconduct of local police departments by misrepresenting forensic evidence to bolster police cases against defendants.²³⁵

COPS NOT COST-EFFECTIVE DETERRENT

In terms of pure economic returns, police are a surprisingly poor public investment. Typical urban police work is very expensive because police see a primary part of their role as intervention for its own sake — poking, prodding and questioning the public in hope of turning up evidence of wrongdoing. Toward this end, police spin quick U-turns, drive slowly and menacingly down alleyways, reverse direction to track suspected scofflaws, and conduct sidewalk pat-down searches of potential criminals absent clear indicia of potential criminality.²³⁶ Studies indicate, however, that such tactics are essentially worthless in the war on crime. One experiment found that when police do not 'cruise' but simply respond to dispatched calls, crime rates are completely unaffected.²³⁷

Thus the very aspect of modern policing that the public view as most effective — the creation of a 'police presence' — is in fact a monstrous waste of public resources.²³⁸ Similarly, the history of America's expenditures in the war on drugs provides little support for the proposition that money spent on policing yields positive returns.²³⁹ University of Chicago professor John Lott has found that while hiring police can reduce crime rates, the net benefit of hiring an additional officer is about a quarter of the benefit from arming the public with an equivalent dollar amount of concealed handguns.²⁴⁰

There is no doubt that modern police are a creation of lawful representative legislatures and are very popular with the general public.²⁴¹ But the rights of Americans depend upon freedom *from* government as much as freedom *of* government.²⁴² Constitutions must provide a countermajoritarian edifice to the threat posed by the will of the masses, and courts must at times pronounce even the most popular programs invalid when they contravene the fundamental liberties of a minority — or even the whole people at times when they inappropriately devalue their liberties.²⁴³

PART II

POLICE AS A STANDING ARMY

It is largely forgotten that the war for American independence was initiated in large part by the British Crown's practice of using troops to police civilians in Boston and other cities.²⁴⁴ Professional soldiers used in the same ways as modern police were among the primary grievances enunciated by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence. ("[George III] has kept among us standing armies"; "He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power"; "protecting them, by a mock trial...").²⁴⁵ The duties of such troops were in no way military but involved the keeping of order and the suppression of crime (especially customs and tax violations).

Constitutional arguments quite similar to the thesis of this article were made by America's Founders while fomenting the overthrow of their government. Thomas Jefferson proclaimed that although Parliament was supreme in its jurisdiction to make laws, "his majesty has no right to land a single armed man on our shores" to enforce unpopular laws.²⁴⁶ James Warren said that the troops in Boston were there on an unconstitutional mission because their role was not military but rather to enforce "obedience to Acts which, upon fair examination, appeared to be unjust and unconstitutional."²⁴⁷ Colonial pamphleteer Nicholas Ray charged that Americans did not have "an Enemy worth Notice within 3000 Miles of them."²⁴⁸ "[T]he troops of George the III have cross'd the wide atlantick, not to engage an enemy," charged John Hancock, but to assist constitutional traitors "in trampling on the rights and liberties of [the King's] most loyal subjects ..."²⁴⁹

The use of soldiers to enforce law had a long and sullied history in England and by the mid-1700s were considered a violation of the fundamental rights of Englishmen.²⁵⁰ The Crown's response to London's Gordon Riots of 1780 — roughly contemporary to the cultural backdrop of America's Revolution — brought on an immense popular backlash at the use of guards to maintain public order.²⁵¹ "[D]eep, uncompromising opposition to the maintenance of a semimilitary professional force in civilian life" remained integral to Anglo-Saxon legal culture for another half century.²⁵²

Englishmen of the Founding era, both in England and its colonies, regarded professional police as an "alien, continental device for maintaining a tyrannical form of Government."²⁵³ Professor John Phillip Reid has pointed out that few of the rights of Englishmen "were better known to the general public than the right to be free of standing armies."²⁵⁴ "Standing armies," according to one New Hampshire correspondent, "have ever proved destructive to the Liberties of a People, and where they are suffered, neither Life nor Property are secure."²⁵⁵

If pressed, modern police defenders would have difficulty demonstrating a single material difference between the standing armies the Founders saw as so abhorrent and America's modern police forces. Indeed, even the distinctions between modern police and actual military troops have blurred in the wake of America's modern crime war.²⁵⁶ Ninety percent of American cities now have active special weapons and tactics (SWAT) teams, using such commando-style forces to do "high risk warrant work" and even routine police duties.²⁵⁷ Such units are often instructed by active and retired United States military personnel.²⁵⁸

In Fresno, California, a SWAT unit equipped with battering rams, chemical agents, fully automatic submachine guns, and 'flashbang' grenades roams full-time on routine patrol.²⁵⁹ According to criminologist Peter Kraska, such military policing has never been seen on such a scale in American history, "where SWAT teams routinely break through a door, subdue all the occupants, and search the premises for drugs, cash and weapons."²⁶⁰ In high-crime or problem areas, police paramilitary units may militarily engage an entire neighborhood, stopping "anything that moves" or surrounding suspicious homes with machine guns openly displayed.²⁶¹

Much of the importance of the standing-army debates at the ratification conventions has been overlooked or misinterpreted by modern scholars. Opponents of the right to bear arms, for example, have occasionally cited the standing-army debates to support the proposition that the Framers intended the Second Amendment to protect the power of states to form militias.²⁶² Although this argument has been greatly discredited,²⁶³ it has helped illuminate the intense distrust that the Framers manifested toward occupational standing armies. The

standing army the Framers most feared was a soldiery conducting law enforcement operations in the manner of King George's occupation troops — like the armies of police officers that now patrol the American landscape.

THE SECOND AMENDMENT

The actual intent of the Second Amendment — that it protect a right of people to maintain the means of violently checking the power of government — has been all but lost in modern American society.²⁶⁴ Modern policing's increasing monopoly on firepower tends to undermine the Framers' intent that the whole people be armed, equipped, and empowered to resist the state. Many police organizations lobby incessantly for gun control, even though the criminological literature yields scant empirical support for general gun control as a crime-prevention measure.²⁶⁵

Nor is there much legitimacy to the claim that professional police are more accurate or responsible with firearms than the armed citizenry intended by the Framers. To this day, civilians shoot and kill at least twice as many criminals as police do every year,²⁶⁶ and their 'error rate' is several times lower.²⁶⁷ In a government study of handgun battles that lead to officer injuries, it was found that police who fired upon their killers were less than half as accurate as their civilian, nonprofessional, assailants.²⁶⁸

Moreover, police seem hardly less likely to misuse firearms than the general public.²⁶⁹ In New York City, where private possession of handguns has been virtually eliminated for most civilians, problems with off-duty police misusing firearms have repeatedly surfaced.²⁷⁰ Los Angeles police have been found to fire their weapons inappropriately in seventy-five percent of cases.²⁷¹ Between early 1989 and late 1992, more than one out of every seven shots fired by Washington, D.C. police officers was fired accidentally.²⁷²

THE THIRD AMENDMENT

Although standing armies were not specifically barred by the final version of the Constitution's text, some authorities have pointed to the Third Amendment²⁷³ as a likely fount for such a conceptual proposition.²⁷⁴ Additionally, the Amendment's proscription of quartering troops in homes might well have been interpreted as a general anti-search and seizure principle if the Fourth Amendment had never been enacted.²⁷⁵ The Third Amendment was inspired by sentiments quite similar to those that led to passage of the Second and Fourth Amendments, rather than fear of military operations. Writing in the 1830s, Justice Story regarded the Third Amendment as a security that "a man's house shall be his own castle, privileged against all *civil* and military intrusion."²⁷⁶

The criminal procedure concerns that dominated the minds of the Framers of the Bill of Rights were created not only before the Revolution but also after it. In the five years following British surrender, the independent states vied against each other for commercial advantage, debt relief, and land claims. Conflict was especially fierce between the rival settlers of Pennsylvania and Connecticut on lands in the west claimed simultaneously by both states.²⁷⁷ Both states sent partisan magistrates and troops into the region, and each faction claimed authority to remove claimants of the rival state.²⁷⁸ Magistrates occasionally ordered arrest without warrant, turned people out of their homes, and even ordered submission to the quartering of troops in homes.²⁷⁹ In 1784, a Pennsylvania grand jury indicted one such magistrate and forty others for abuse of their authority.²⁸⁰ Many agents had to be arrested before the troubles finally ended in 1788 — the very moment when the Constitution was undergoing its ratification debates.²⁸¹ These troubles, and not memories of life under the Crown, were fresh in the minds of the Framers who proposed and ratified the Bill of Rights.

The Third Amendment's proscription of soldiers quartered in private homes addressed a very real *domestic* concern about the abuse of state authority in 1791. This same fear of an omnipresent and all-controlling government is hardly unfounded in modern America. Indeed, the very evils the Framers sought to remedy with

the entire Bill of Rights — the lack of security from governmental growth, control and power — have come back to haunt modern Americans like never before.²⁸²

THE RIGHT TO BE LEFT ALONE

The 'police state' known by modern Americans would be seen as quite tyrannical to the Framers who ratified the Constitution. If, as Justice Brandeis suggested, the right to be left alone is the most important underlying principle of the Constitution,²⁸³ the cop-driven model of criminal justice is anathemic to American constitutional principles. Today a vast and omnipotent army of insurgents patrols the American landscape in place of grand juries, private prosecutors, and the occasional constable. This immense soldiery is forever at the beck and call of whatever social forces rule the day, or even the afternoon.²⁸⁴

THE FOURTH AMENDMENT

Now to the Fourth Amendment. The Amendment reads: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."²⁸⁵ This protection was clearly regarded as one of the more important provisions of the Bill of Rights during debates in and out of Congress prior to ratification.²⁸⁶ To this day, the Amendment is probably the most cited constitutional provision in challenges to police action.

The cold, hard reality, however, is that the interest protected by the amendment — security from certain types of searches and seizures — has been drastically scaled back since 1791. In saying this, I am mindful that there are those among the highest echelons of the bench and academy who claim that current Fourth Amendment law is *more protective* than the Framers intended.²⁸⁷ Indeed, there are those claiming the mantles of textualism and originalism who would decrease Fourth Amendment rights even further.²⁸⁸ The ever-influential Akhil Amar, for example, has argued that the Fourth Amendment's text does not really *require* warrants but merely lays out the evidentiary foundation required to *obtain* warrants.²⁸⁹ Amar joins other "originalist" scholars who emphasize that the only requirement of the Fourth Amendment's first clause ("The right of the people to be secure in their persons, papers, and effects from unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated") is that all searches and seizures be "reasonable."²⁹⁰ The warrant requirement pronounced in many Supreme Court opinions, according to Amar, places an unnecessary burden upon law enforcement and should be abandoned for a rule Amar considers more workable — namely civil damages for unreasonable searches after the fact as determined by juries.

This type of "originalism" has appealed to more than one U.S. Supreme Court justice,²⁹¹ at least one state high court,²⁹² and various legal commentators.²⁹³ Indeed, it has brought a perceivable shift to the Supreme Court's Fourth Amendment jurisprudence.²⁹⁴ Even the U.S. Justice Department has adopted this argument as its own in briefs filed in the U.S. Supreme Court arguing for elimination of the warrant requirement.²⁹⁵

The problem with this line of interpretation is that it does not square with the original view of the Framers. Even the most cursory examination of history reveals that law enforcers of the Founding Era, whether private persons, sheriffs or constables, were obligated to procure warrants in many circumstances that modern courts do not require warrants.²⁹⁶ The general rule that warrants were required for all searches and seizures except those involving circumstances of the utmost urgency seems so well settled at the time of ratification that it is difficult to imagine a scholar arguing otherwise.²⁹⁷ But Professor Amar does. "Supporters of the warrant requirement," the professor writes, "have yet to find any cases" enunciating the warrant requirement before the Civil War.²⁹⁸

Perhaps Amar has overlooked the 1814 case of *Grumon v. Raymond*, in which the Connecticut Supreme Court held both a constable, who executed an improper search warrant, and a justice of the peace who issued the

warrant, civilly liable for trespass.²⁹⁹ The court in *Grumon* clearly stated that the invalidity of the search warrant left the search's legality "on no better ground than it would be if [the search had been pursuant to] no process."³⁰⁰ Or maybe Amar is unfamiliar with the 1807 case of *Stoyel v. Lawrence*, holding a sheriff liable for executing a civil arrest warrant after the warrant's due date and declaring that the warrant "gave the officer no authority whatever, and, consequently, formed no defence";³⁰¹ or the 1763 Massachusetts case of *Rex v. Gay*, acquitting an arrestee for assaulting and beating a sheriff who arrested him pursuant to a facially invalid warrant;³⁰² or *Batchelder v. Whitcher*, holding an officer liable for ordering the seizure of hay by an unsealed warrant in 1838;³⁰³ or *Conner v. Commonwealth*, in which the Pennsylvania Supreme Court concluded in 1810 that if the requirement of warrants based on probable cause could be waived merely to allow constables to more easily arrest criminals, "the constitution is a dead letter."³⁰⁴

Even the cases Amar cites for the proposition that search warrants were not required under antebellum Fourth Amendment jurisprudence do not squarely support such a proposition.³⁰⁵ Most of them merely repeat the "warrant requirement" of the common law and find that their given facts fit within a common law exception.³⁰⁶ Similarly, the cases Amar cites that interpret various Fourth-Amendment equivalents of state constitutions by no means indicate that Founding-era law enforcers could freely search and seize without warrant wherever it was "reasonable" to do so.³⁰⁷

WARRANTS A FLOOR, NOT A CEILING

Under Founding-era common law, warrants were often considered as much a constitutional floor as a ceiling. Warrants did provide a defense for constables in most trespass suits, but were *not good enough* to immunize officials from liability for *some* unreasonable searches or seizures.³⁰⁸ The most often-cited English case known to the Framers who drafted the Fourth Amendment involved English constabulary who had acted pursuant to a search warrant but were nonetheless found civilly liable for stiff (punitive, actually) damages.³⁰⁹

For more than 150 years, it was considered *per se* unconstitutional for law enforcers to search and seize certain categories of objects, such as personal diaries or private papers, *even with perfectly valid warrants*.³¹⁰ Additionally, Fourth Amendment jurisprudence prohibited the government from seizing as evidence any personal property which was not directly involved in crime, *even with a valid warrant*.³¹¹ The rationale for this "mere evidence" rule was that the interests of property owners were superior to those of the state and could not be overridden by mere indirect evidentiary justifications.³¹² This rule, like many other obstacles to police search and seizure power, was discarded in the second half of the twentieth century by a Supreme Court much less respectful of property rights than its predecessors.³¹³

PRIVATE PERSONS AND THE FOURTH AMENDMENT

Under the Founders' Model, a private person like Josiah Butler, who lost twenty pounds of good pork under suspicious circumstances in 1787, could approach a justice of the peace and obtain a warrant to search the property of the suspected thief for the lost meat.³¹⁴ Private individuals applied for many or most of the warrants in the Founders' era and even conducted many of the arrests.³¹⁵ Even where sworn constables executed warrants, private persons often assisted them.³¹⁶ To avoid liability, however, searchers needed to secure a warrant before acting.³¹⁷ False arrest was subject to strict liability.³¹⁸

The Founders contemplated the enforcement of the common law to be a duty of private law enforcement, and assumed that private law enforcers would represent their interests with private means. However, the Founders viewed private individuals executing law enforcement duties as "public authority" and thus intended for the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to apply to such individuals when acting in their law enforcement capacities.³¹⁹ Consequently, the Supreme Court's 1921 decision in *Burdeau v. McDowell*³²⁰ — often cited for the proposition

that the Fourth Amendment applies only to government agents — was almost certainly either wrongly decided or wrongly interpreted by later courts.³²¹

Some of the earliest English interpretations of the freedom from search and seizure held the protection applicable to private citizens as much as or more so than government agents.³²² Massachusetts and Vermont were apparently the first states to require that search and arrest warrants be executed by sworn officers.³²³ New Hampshire adopted the same rule in 1826, more than a generation after the Bill of Rights was ratified.³²⁴ It is likely that some states allowed private persons to execute search warrants well into the nineteenth century.

Because many Founding-era arrests and searches were executed by private persons, and early constables *needed* the assistance of private persons to do their jobs, the Fourth Amendment was almost certainly intended for application to private individuals. *Burdeau* cited no previous authority for its proposition in 1921, and early American cases demonstrate an original intent that the Fourth Amendment apply to every searcher acting under color of law.³²⁵ On the open seas, most enforcement of prize and piracy laws was done by "privateers" acting for their own gain but who were held accountable in court for their misconduct.³²⁶

Later courts have taken this holding to mean that "a wrongful search or seizure conducted by a private party does not violate the Fourth Amendment." *Walter v. U.S.* 447 U.S. 649, 656 (1979). *See also* *United States v. Jacobsen*, 466 U.S. 109, 113 (1984) (saying "This Court has also consistently construed this protection as proscribing only governmental action; it is wholly inapplicable to a private individual not acting as an agent of the Government or with the participation or knowledge of any government official.").

As explained in Part I, early constables had powers no greater than those of other individuals, so they needed warrants before engaging in law enforcement activities beyond any citizen's authority. Like you or I, a constable would be thought outside the bounds of good etiquette (and well outside the law) were he to conduct an unconsented search of another's person, property or effects, and should — very reasonably — expect to be jailed, physically repulsed, or sued for such conduct.

A private person's only defense was the absolute correctness of his allegations. A person was liable if, for example, his complaint was too vague as to the address to be searched,³²⁷ he misspelled the name of the accused in his complaint,³²⁸ or he sought the execution of a warrant naming a "John Doe" as a target.³²⁹

This was the constitutional model secured to America by the Framers. The idea of police having special powers was only a seedling, alien to the scheme of ordered liberty and limited government created by the Constitution. Eventually, police interceded between private individuals and magistrates altogether, and today it is virtually unheard of for a private person to seek a search warrant from a magistrate.

Freedom from search and seizure has been retracting in favor of police ever since the ink was dry on the Bill of Rights. The Framers lived under a common law rule that required warrantless arrests be made only for felonies where no warrant could be immediately obtained.³³⁰ By the early to mid-1800s, the rule had changed to allow warrantless arrests for all felonies regardless of whether a warrant could be obtained.³³¹ Early American courts also apparently allowed warrantless arrests for misdemeanor breaches of peace committed in the arrestor's presence. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, most state courts had changed to allow warrantless arrest for *all crimes* of any kind committed in an officer's presence, as well as for all felonies committed either within or without an officer's presence regardless of whether a warrant can be obtained.³³²

By the mid-1900s, arrest had become the almost-exclusive province of paid police, and their power to arrest opened even wider. A trend toward allowing police to arrest without warrant for all crimes committed even *outside* their presence has recently developed,³³³ with little foreseeable court-imposed impediment.³³⁴ Almost

every American jurisdiction has legislated for the erosion of common law limitations with regard to domestic violence arrests and arrests for other high profile misdemeanors.³³⁵

Despite the Fourth Amendment, the Supreme Court has imposed almost no limits on warrantless arrest at all. Only forcibly entering a residence without warrant to arrest someone inside has been found to violate the Fourth Amendment.³³⁶ Outside the home, modern police have been essentially licensed by the Court to arrest almost anyone at any time so long as probable cause exists.³³⁷ The Supreme Court effectively buried the original purpose of warrantless arrest entirely in 1985, declaring that "[r]estraining police action until after probable cause is obtained... might... enable the suspect to flee in the interim."³³⁸

Long forgotten is the fact that common law allowance for warrantless arrest was precipitated solely on an *emergency* rationale and allowed only to protect the public from immediate danger.³³⁹

The rationale for the felon exception to the warrant requirement in 1791, for example, was that a felony was any crime punishable by death, generally thought to be limited to only a handful of serious crimes.³⁴⁰ Felons were considered "outlaws at war with society,"³⁴¹ and their apprehension without warrant qualified as one of the "exceptions justified by absolute necessity."³⁴² By the late twentieth century, however, many crimes the Framers would have considered misdemeanors or no crime at all had been declared felonies and the rationale for immediate community action to apprehend "felons" had changed greatly.³⁴³ The courts, however, have been slow to react to this far-reaching change.³⁴⁴ In any case, the vast majority of arrests (seventy to eighty percent) are for misdemeanors,³⁴⁵ which would have been proscribed without warrant under the Framers' law.

ORIGINALISTS CALL FOR CIVIL DAMAGES

The writings of most modern "originalist" scholars promote civil suits against police departments, instead of exclusion of evidence, as a remedy for police misconduct. Professor Amar, for example, champions a return to civil litigation, but with, somehow, a better return than such actions currently bring.³⁴⁶ He invents a fantastically implausible cause of action where "government should generally not prevail."³⁴⁷ He bases this idea on actual cases from the nineteenth century where people prevailed against constables and sheriffs in relatively routine circumstances, often with heavy damage awards.³⁴⁸

These cases actually occurred — but in an age before police took over American law enforcement. Civil damages really were a better remedy when many or most searches were sought — and sometimes conducted — by private persons who stood strictly liable in court if their allegations proved false or their conduct proved overzealous.³⁴⁹ American law provided recovery for every false arrest. If it was not the constable who executed the warrant, the private person, who lodged the original insufficient complaint, was liable.³⁵⁰

Under Founding-era common law, liability for officers was in many respects *higher* than for private persons. Sheriffs and deputies could be held liable for failing to arrest debtors for collection of debts³⁵¹ or to serve other process,³⁵² for allowing an imprisoned debtor to escape,³⁵³ for failing to keep entrusted goods secure³⁵⁴ or to deliver goods in custody at a proper time,³⁵⁵ or for failing to keep faithful accounting and custody of property.³⁵⁶ Sheriffs were also obligated to return writs within a specific time period, at pain of civil damages.³⁵⁷ They were liable to debtors whose property was sold at sheriffs sales if proper advertisement procedures were not followed³⁵⁸ and for negligently allowing other creditors to obtain priority interests on attached property.³⁵⁹

Law enforcers were liable for false imprisonment, even where they acted with court permission, if procedures were improper.³⁶⁰ A deputy was liable for damages to an arrestee whom he arrested outside his jurisdiction.³⁶¹ Sheriffs were even liable if their deputies executed civil process in a rude and insolent manner.³⁶² When executing writs, sheriffs were liable for any unnecessary violence against innocent third persons who obstructed them.³⁶³

The Founders' law knew no "good faith" defense for law enforcers. Sheriffs and justices who executed arrests pursuant to invalid warrants were considered trespassers (as were any judges who granted invalid warrants). Any person was justified in resisting, or even battering, such officers.³⁶⁴ Justices of the peace could be held liable for ordering imprisonment without taking proper steps.³⁶⁵

Any party who sued out or issued process did so at his peril and was civilly responsible for unlawful writs (even if the executing officer acted in good faith)³⁶⁶

Nor did state authority provide the umbrella of indemnification that now protects public officers. Sheriffs of the nineteenth century often sought protection from liability by obtaining bonds from private sureties.³⁶⁷ Their bonds were used to satisfy civil judgments against them while in office.³⁶⁸ If the amount of their bonds was insufficient to satisfy judgments, sheriffs were liable personally.³⁶⁹ It was not uncommon for a sheriff to find himself in jail as a debtor for failing to satisfy judgments against him.³⁷⁰ Even punitive damages against officers — long disfavored by modern courts with regard to municipal liability — were deemed proper and normal under the law of the Framers.³⁷¹

Unlike the early constables, uniformed police officers were generally introduced upon the American landscape by their oaths alone and without bonds. Their municipal employers (hence, the taxpayers) were on the hook for their civil liabilities. Although courts tended to treat police identically to bonded officials,³⁷² their susceptibility to civil redress was much lower. This change in the law of policing had the effect of depriving Americans of remedies for Fourth Amendment (and other) violations.³⁷³ The evil that now pervades criminal justice — swarms of officers unaccountable in court either criminally or civilly — was the very evil that the Founders sought to remedy in the late eighteenth century.³⁷⁴

DEVELOPMENT OF IMMUNITIES

But immunities follow duties, and duties placed upon police by lawmakers have exploded since 1791.³⁷⁵ Immunities grew slowly, beginning with a slight deference to officer conduct so long as there was no bad faith, corruption, malice or "misbehavior,"³⁷⁶ and ending with broad qualified immunity.³⁷⁷ When the practice of professional policing arrived from England upon American shores (for the second time, actually, if we consider modern police to be akin to the "standing armies" of the Founders' generation), cases began to enunciate a general deference to police conduct, permitting that the actions of officers in carrying out their duties "not to be harshly judged."³⁷⁸ Appellate courts began to reverse jury verdicts against officers upon new rules of law granting privileges unknown to private individuals.³⁷⁹

THE LOSS OF PROBABLE CAUSE, AND THE ONSET OF PROBABLE SUSPICION

Probable cause for the issuance of warrants has also become less strict.³⁸⁰ The Supreme Court regarded hearsay evidence as insufficient to constitute probable cause for seventeen years in the first half of the twentieth century,³⁸¹ but has since given police free reign to construct probable cause in whatever way they deem proper. Instead of *probability* that a crime has been committed, the courts now require only some possibility, a relaxed standard that "robs [probable cause] of virtually all operative significance."³⁸² This watered-down "probable cause" for the issuance of ex parte warrants would have shocked the Founders.³⁸³

At common law, one could sue and recover damages from a private person who swore out a false or misleading search warrant affidavit.³⁸⁴ In contrast, few modern officers will ever have to account for lies on warrant applications so long as they couch their "probable cause" in unprovables. "Anonymous citizen informants,"³⁸⁵ material omissions and misrepresentations,³⁸⁶ irrelevant or prejudicial information,³⁸⁷ and even outright falsities are now common fixtures of police-written search warrant applications.³⁸⁸ For years, Boston police simply made up imaginary informants to justify searches and seizures.³⁸⁹ Police themselves refer to the phenomenon as

"testilying" — an aspect of normal police work regarded as "an open secret" among principle players of the criminal justice system.³⁹⁰

POLICE AND THE "AUTOMOBILE EXCEPTION"

The courts have been particularly unkind to Fourth Amendment protections in the context of motor vehicle travel. Since the 1920s, Fourth Amendment jurisprudence has allowed for a gaping and ever-widening exception to the warrant requirement with regard to the nation's roadways.³⁹¹ Today, police force untold millions of motorists off the roads each year to be searched or scrutinized without judicial warrant of any kind.³⁹² Any police officer can generally find some pretext to justify a stop of any automobile.³⁹³ In effect, road travel itself is subject to a near total level of police control,³⁹⁴ a phenomenon that would have confounded the Framers, who treated seizures of wagons, horses and buggies as subject to the same constraints as seizures of other property.³⁹⁵

The courts have laid down such a malleable latticework of exceptions in favor of modern police that virtually any cop worth his mettle can adjust his explanations for a search to qualify under one exception or another. When no exception applies, police simply lie about the facts.³⁹⁶ "Judges regularly choose to accept even blatantly unbelievable police testimony."³⁹⁷ The practice on the streets has long been for police to follow their hunches, seek entrance at every door, and then attempt to justify searches after the fact.³⁹⁸ Justice Robert Jackson observed in 1949 that many unlawful searches of homes and automobiles are never revealed to the courts or the public because the searches turn up nothing.³⁹⁹

ONE EXCEPTION: THE EXCLUSIONARY RULE?

Conventional wisdom suggests there is one important exception to the long decline of Fourth Amendment protections: the exclusionary rule. Since 1914, the Supreme Court has required the exclusion of evidence seized in violation of the Fourth Amendment from being used against a defendant in federal court.⁴⁰⁰ In 1961, this rule was applied to the states in *Mapp v. Ohio*.⁴⁰¹ Shortly thereafter, the Supreme Court expanded the exclusionary rule to other protections such as the Fifth and Sixth Amendments in cases such as *Miranda v. Arizona*.⁴⁰²

Textualists and originalists have lobbed a steady stream of vitriol against the exclusionary rule for decades. No enunciation of such a rule, say these critics, can be found in the writings or statements of the Framers.⁴⁰³ Moreover, say such critics, the rule places a heavy burden on the efficiency of police (but simultaneously, somehow, fails to deter them in any way), and unfairly frees a small but not insignificant percentage of "guilty" offenders.⁴⁰⁴ So-called "conservative" legal scholars remember the Warren Court's imposition of the exclusionary rule upon the states in the 1960s as a bare-knuckled act of judicial activism⁴⁰⁵ and argue that the Court "[took] it upon itself, *without constitutional authorization*, to police the police."⁴⁰⁶

The *Miranda* and *Mapp* decisions provoked an onslaught of hostility by police organizations and their sympathizers that has not subsided decades later. High-ranking authorities (not the least of which were Justices Harlan and White, who dissented in *Miranda*) wrote that such decisions put society at risk from criminals.⁴⁰⁷ The *Miranda* rule, according to Justice White, would force "those who rely on the public authority for protection" to "engage in violent self-help with guns, knives and the help of their neighbors similarly inclined."⁴⁰⁸ Even more outraged was the chief of police of Garland, Texas, who responded, "We might as well close up shop."⁴⁰⁹

Yet the dire predictions that followed the *Miranda* and *Mapp* decisions were ultimately proved false.⁴¹⁰ Rather than returning to what Justice White decried as "violent self-help" (as the Constitution's framers truly intended), America continued its slide into increased dependence upon police for the most mundane aspects of law enforcement. If anything, reliance upon police for personal protection has increased since the 1960s.

I propose an altogether different interpretation of *Mapp*, *Miranda*, and some of the Warren Court's other criminal procedure decisions. While I concede that this jurisprudence grossly violated certain constitutional principles (most importantly, principles of federalism), I submit that such rulings were attempts to bring constitutional law into accord with the alien threat posed by modern policing. Professional policing's arrival upon the American scene required that the Court's Bill of Rights jurisprudence splinter a dozen ways to accommodate it. Thus, *Mapp* and *Miranda* were an application of brakes to a foreign element (modern policing) that is itself *without constitutional authorization*.

In many ways, the Warren Court was the first U.S. Supreme Court to face criminal procedural questions squarely in light of the advent of professional policing. The *Miranda* and *Mapp* decisions, according to noted criminal law expert David Rudovsky, "at least implicitly acknowledged widespread police and prosecutorial abuse,"⁴¹¹ a phenomenon that would have bedeviled the Framers. *Mapp's* holding was brought on more by the need to make the criminal justice system work fairly than by any other consideration.⁴¹² The same realities gave way to the rule of *Bivens v. Six Narcotics Agents*, in 1971, in which the Court conceded that an agent acting illegally in the name of the government possesses a far greater capacity for harm than any individual trespasser exercising his own authority (as prevailed as the common form of law enforcement in 1791).⁴¹³

Furthermore, the notion that exclusion cannot be justified under an originalist approach is not nearly as well-founded as its harshest critics suggest.⁴¹⁴ Critics of the rule point to the 1914 case of *Weeks v. United States*⁴¹⁵ as the rule's debut in Supreme Court jurisprudence.⁴¹⁶ However, the rule actually debuted in dicta in the 1886 case of *Boyd v. United States*.⁴¹⁷ Even this seemingly late date of the rule's debut can be attributed to the Court's lack of criminal appellate jurisdiction until the end of the nineteenth century.⁴¹⁸ The reality is that *Boyd*, the Court's first suggestion of the rule, represents, for practical purposes, the *very first Fourth Amendment case* decided by the Supreme Court. The exclusionary rule thus has a better pedigree than it is credited with.⁴¹⁹

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

In a previous article, I described the limitation of common law grand jury powers by Rule 6 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure as an unconstitutional infringement of the Fifth Amendment Grand Jury Clause.⁴²⁰ The fact that most criminal charges are now initiated not by crime victims but by armed state agents who serve the state's interests represents a drastic alteration of Founding-era criminal procedure.⁴²¹ The suppression of grand jurors' lawful powers belies the intent of the Constitution that law enforcement officials be subject to stringent oversight by the citizenry through grand juries. Modern policing, in effect, acts as a middleman between the people and the judicial branch of government that was never contemplated by the Framers.

The Fifth Amendment also prohibits the compulsion of self-incriminating testimony.⁴²² Various competing interpretations ebbed and flowed from this provision until 1966, when the Supreme Court held that police are required to actually tell suspects about the Fifth and Sixth Amendments' protections before interrogating them.⁴²³ The sheer volume of criticism by police organizations of the *Miranda* ruling over the next three decades indicates the strong state interest in keeping the Constitution's protections concealed from the American public.

Modern police interrogation could scarcely have been imagined by the Framers who met in Philadelphia in the late eighteenth century. Police tactics such as falsifying physical evidence, faking identification lineups, administering fake lie detector tests and falsifying laboratory reports to obtain confessions are methods developed by the *professionals* of the twentieth century.⁴²⁴ Against such methods a modern suspect stands little chance of keeping his tongue. Like the exclusionary rule and the entrapment defense, the *Miranda* rule operates as an awkward leveling device between the rights of American citizens and their now-leviathanic government.

In 2000, the Supreme Court upheld (indeed, "constitutionalized") the *Miranda* rule in the face of widespread predictions that the police-favoring Rehnquist majority would abandon the rule.⁴²⁵ The Court delivered an opinion recognizing that "the routine practices of [police] interrogation [is] itself a relatively new development."⁴²⁶ The *Miranda* requirement, according to Justice Rehnquist, was therefore justified as an extension of *due process* — a far more sustainable course than one extending from the wording of the Fifth and Sixth Amendments.⁴²⁷

The *Dickerson* decision illustrates the increasingly awkward peace between the Bill of Rights and the phenomenon of modern policing. Because the Framers did not contemplate wide-scale execution of government power through paid, full-time agents, modern jurisprudence reconciling the Bill of Rights with today's police practices seems increasingly farfetched. Justices Scalia and Thomas dissented from the *Dickerson* majority with well-founded textualist objections, arguing that the majority was writing a "prophylactic, extraconstitutional Constitution" to protect the public from police.⁴²⁸ Yet in light of the extraconstitutional nature of modern police, the *Dickerson* majority opinion is no less consistent with the Framers' constitutional intent.

DUE PROCESS

Due process of law depends upon assurances that a level playing field exists between rival adversaries pitted against each other.⁴²⁹ The constitutional design pitted a citizen defendant against his citizen accuser before a jury of his (the defendant's) peers. The state provided only the venue, the process, and assurances that the rule of law would govern the outcome. By comparison, a modern defendant is hardly pitted in a fair fight, facing the vast treasury and human resources of the STATE. While the criminal justice system of the Founding era was victim-driven, and thus self-limiting, today's system is fueled by a professional army of police who measure their success in numbers of arrests and convictions.⁴³⁰

Police themselves often ignore standard concepts of fairness, official regulations, and statutes in their war on crime.⁴³¹ Police agencies have even been known to develop institutional means to circumvent court attempts to equalize the playing field.⁴³² In the face of unwanted publicity or controversy surrounding police brutality cases, police departments have been known to release arrest records to the media to vilify victims of police misconduct.⁴³³

The police model of law enforcement tilts the entire system of criminal justice in favor of the state. The police, though supposedly neutral investigators, are in reality an arm of the prosecutor's office.⁴³⁴ Where police secure a crime scene for investigation, they in fact secure it *for the prosecution* alone and deny access to anyone other than the prosecution. A suspect or his defense attorneys often must obtain court permission to view the scene or search for evidence. Only such exculpatory evidence as by accident falls into the hands of the prosecution need be revealed to the suspect or defendant.⁴³⁵ In cases where police misconduct is an issue, police use their monopoly over the crime scene to prepare the evidence to suit their version of events.⁴³⁶

Mapp, *Miranda* and *Dickerson* notwithstanding, the tendency of modern courts to work around police practices, rather than nullify or restrain them, poses the very threat to due process of law the Framers saw as most dangerous to liberty. Instead of viewing the system as a true adversarial contest with neutral rules, judges and lawmakers have decided that catching (nonpolice) lawbreakers is more important than maintaining a code of integrity.⁴³⁷ The "sporting theory of criminal justice," wrote Justice Warren Burger, "has been experiencing a decline in our jurisprudence."⁴³⁸ In its place is a system where the government views the nonpolice lawbreaker as a threat to its authority and places top priority on defeating him in court.⁴³⁹

ENTRAPMENT

Abandonment of victim-driven, mostly private prosecution has led to consequences the Framers could never have predicted and would likely never have sanctioned. Even in the most horrific examples of colonial criminal justice (and there were many), defendants were rarely if ever entrapped into criminal activity. The development of modern policing as an omnipotent power of the state, however, has necessitated the simultaneous development of complicated doctrines such as entrapment and "outrageous government conduct" as counterweights.

It was not until the late nineteenth century that any English or American case dealt with entrapment as a true defense to a criminal charge.⁴⁴⁰ (The case law until then had been virtually devoid of police conduct issues altogether).⁴⁴¹ Beginning in 1880, English case law slowly became involved with phenomena such as state agents inducing suspects to sell without proper certificates,⁴⁴² persuading defendants to supply drugs to terminate pregnancy,⁴⁴³ and enticing people to commit other victimless crimes. Dicta in some English cases expressed outrage that police might someday "be told to commit an offense themselves for the purpose of getting evidence against someone."⁴⁴⁴ Police who commit such offenses, said one English court, "ought also to be convicted and punished, for the order of their superior would afford no defense."⁴⁴⁵

Entrapment did not arise as a defense in the United States until 1915, when the conduct of government officers for the first time brought the issue before the federal courts. In *Woo Wai v. United States*, the Ninth Circuit overturned a conviction of a defendant for illegally bringing Chinese persons into the United States upon evidence that government officers had induced the crime.⁴⁴⁶ Growth in police numbers and "anti-crime" warfare was so rapid that in 1993, the Wyoming Supreme Court wrote that entrapment had "probably replaced ineffectiveness of defense counsel and challenged conduct of prosecutors as the most prevalent issues in current appeals."⁴⁴⁷

The growth of the use of entrapment by the state raises troubling questions about the nature and purposes of American government. Rather than "serving and protecting" the public, modern police often serve and protect the interests of the state against the liberties and interests of the people. A significant amount of police brutality, for example, seems aimed at mere philosophical, rather than physical, opposition. Police dominance over the civilian (rather than service to or protection of him) is the "only truly iron and inflexible rule" followed by police officers.⁴⁴⁸ Thus, any person who defies police faces virtually certain negative repercussions, whether a ticket, a legal summons, an arrest, or a bullet.⁴⁴⁹ One study found nearly half of all illegal force by police occurred in response to mere defiance of an officer rather than a physical threat.⁴⁵⁰

In the political sphere, police serve the interests of those in power *against* the rights of the public. New York police of the late nineteenth century were found by the New York legislature to have committed "almost every conceivable crime against the elective franchise," including arresting and brutalizing opposition-party voters, stuffing ballot boxes, and using "oppression, fraud, trickery [and] crime" to ensure the dominant party held the city.⁴⁵¹ In the twentieth century, J. Edgar Hoover's FBI agents burglarized hundreds of offices of law-abiding, left-wing political parties and organizations, "often with the active cooperation or tacit consent of local police."⁴⁵² The FBI has also spent thousands of man-hours surveiling and investigating writers, playwrights, directors and artists whose political views were deemed a threat to the interests of the ruling political establishment.⁴⁵³

Police today are a constant agent on behalf of governmental power. Both in the halls of legislatures and before the courts, police act as lobbyists against individual liberties.⁴⁵⁴ Police organizations, funded by monies funneled directly from police wages, lobby incessantly against legislative constraints on police conduct.⁴⁵⁵ Police organizations also file *amicus curie* briefs in virtually every police procedure case that goes before the Supreme Court, often predicting dire consequences if the Court rules against them. In 2000, for example, the police lobby filed *amicus* briefs in favor of allowing police to stop and frisk persons upon anonymous tips, warning that if the Court ruled against them, "the consequence for law enforcement and the public could be increased assaults and perhaps even murders."⁴⁵⁶

CONCLUSION

The United States of America was founded without professional police. Its earliest traditions and founding documents evidenced no contemplation that the power of the state would be implemented by omnipresent police forces. On the contrary, America's constitutional Framers expressed hostility and contempt for the standing armies of the late eighteenth century, which functioned as law enforcement units in American cities. The advent of modern policing has greatly altered the balance of power between the citizen and the state in a way that would have been seen as constitutionally invalid by the Framers. The implications of this altered balance of power are far-reaching, and should invite consideration by judges and legislators who concern themselves with constitutional questions.

* Roger Isaac Roots, J.D., M.C.J., graduated from Roger Williams University School of Law in 1999, Roger Williams University School of Justice Studies in 2001, and Montana State University-Billings (B.S., Sociology) in 1995. He is a former federal prisoner and founder of the Prison Crisis Project, a not-for-profit law and policy think tank based in Providence, Rhode Island. He is grateful to Duane Horton of Portsmouth, Rhode Island for his scrupulous proof-reading efforts and thoughtful insights.

¹ As of June, 1996, there were more than 700,000 full- and part-time professional state-sworn police in the United States. See BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, CENSUS OF STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, 1996 (1998) available at <<http://virlib.ncjrs.org/Statistics.asp>>. Figures for earlier decades and centuries are difficult to obtain, but a few indicators suggest that the ratio of police per citizen has grown by at least four thousand percent. In 1816, the British Parliament reported that there was at that time one constable for every 18,187 persons in Great Britain. See Jerome Hall, *Legal and Social Aspects of Arrest Without a Warrant*, 49 HARVARD L. REV. 566, 582 (1936). Conventional wisdom would suggest that American ratios were, if anything, lower. Today there is approximately one officer for every 386 Americans.

² The City of Los Angeles, for example, spends almost half (49.1%) of its annual discretionary budget on police but only 17.7% on fire and 14.8% on public works. See *City of Los Angeles 1999-2000 Budget Summary* (visited Dec. 2000) <<http://www.cityofla.org/cao/bud9900.pdf>>. The City of Chicago spends over forty percent of its annual budget on police. See *Chicago Budget 1999* (visited Dec. 2000) <<http://www.ci.chi.il.us/mayor/Budget1999/sld011.htm>> (pie chart). Seattle spends more than \$150 million, or 41 percent of its annual budget, on police and police pensions. See *City of Seattle 2000 Proposed Budget* (visited Dec. 2000) <<http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/budget>>. The City of New York is one exception, due primarily to New York State's unique system for funding education. Police and the administration of justice constitute the third largest segment, or twelve percent, of the City's budget, after education and human resources. See THE CITY OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2000 1 (2000) (pie chart).

³ See Carol S. Steiker, *Second Thoughts About First Principles*, 107 HARV. L. REV. 820, 830 (1994) (saying twentieth century police and "our contemporary sense of 'policing' would be utterly foreign to our colonial forebears").

⁴ See *id.*

⁵ See *id.* at 831 (saying the sole monetary reward for such officers was occasional compensation by private individuals for returning stolen property).

⁶ See CHARLES SILBERMAN, CRIMINAL VIOLENCE, CRIMINAL JUSTICE 314 (1978). The City of Boston, for example, enacted an ordinance requiring drafted citizens to walk the streets "to prevent any danger by fire, and to see that good order is kept." *Id.*

⁷ *C.f. id.* (mentioning that cops' role of maintaining order predates their role of crime control).

⁸ *But see, e.g.,* Steiker, *supra* note 3, at 824 (saying the "invention ... of armed quasi-military, professional police forces, whose form, function, and daily presence differ dramatically from that of the colonial constabulary, requires that modern-day judges and scholars rethink" Fourth Amendment remedies).

⁹ See, e.g., ROBERT H. BORK, SLOUCHING TOWARDS GOMORRAH: MODERN LIBERALISM AND AMERICAN DECLINE 104 (1996) (criticizing Supreme Court rulings that have "steadily expanded" the rights of criminals and placed limitations upon police conduct).

¹⁰ *Cf.* E.X. BOOZHIE, THE OUTLAW'S BIBLE 15 (1988) (stating the true mission of police is to protect the status quo for the benefit of the ruling class).

¹¹ As a textual matter, the Constitution grants authority to the federal government to define and punish criminal activity in only five instances. Article I grants Congress power (1) "[t]o provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States," art. I, § 8, cl. 6; (2) "[t]o define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations," *id.*, cl. 10; (3) "[t]o make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces," *id.* at cl. 14; (4) "[t]o exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over" the District of Columbia and federal reservations. *id.* at cl. 17; see also *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 264, 426 (1821) ("Congress has a right to punish murder in a fort, or other place within its exclusive jurisdiction; but no general right to punish murder committed within any of the states"). Likewise, (5) Article III defines the crime of "Treason against the United States" and grants to Congress the "Power to declare [its] Punishment...." U.S. CONST. art. III, § 3.

¹² Several early constitutions expressed a right of citizens "to be protected in the enjoyment of life, liberty and property," and therefore purported to bind citizens to contribute their proportion toward expenses of such protection. See DELAWARE DEC. OF RIGHTS of Sept. 11, 1776, § 10; PA. CONST. of Sept. 28, 1776, Dec. of Rights, § VIII; VT. CONST. of July 8, 1777, Chap. 1, § IX. Other typical provisions required that the powers of government be exercised only by the consent of the people, see, e.g., N.C. CONST. of Dec. 18, 1776, § V, and that all persons invested with government power be accountable for their conduct. See MD. CONST. of Nov. 11, 1776, § IV.

¹³ The constitutions of several early states expressed the intent that citizens were obligated to carry out law enforcement duties. See, e.g., DELAWARE DEC. OF RIGHTS of Sept. 11, 1776, § 10 (providing every citizen shall yield his personal service when necessary, or an equivalent); N.H. CONST. of June 2, 1784, Part I, art. I, § XII (providing that every member of the community is bound to "yield his personal service when necessary, or an equivalent"); VT. CONST. of July 8, 1777, Chap. 1, § IX (providing every member of society is bound to contribute his proportion towards the expenses of his protection, "and to yield his personal service, when necessary").

¹⁴ *C.f.* JAMES BOVARD, LOST RIGHTS: THE DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN LIBERTY 51 (1st ed. 1994) (discussing Revolution-era perception that the law was a means to restrain government and to secure rights of citizens).

¹⁵ Originally, all criminal procedure fell under the rule of private vengeance. A victim or aggrieved party made a direct appeal to county authorities to force a defendant to face him.

See ARTHUR TRAIN, *THE PRISONER AT THE BAR* 120 n. (1926). From these very early times, "grand" or "accusing" juries were formed to examine the accusations of private individuals. *Id.* at 121 n. Although the accusing jury frequently acted as a trial jury as well, it eventually evolved into a separate body that took on the role of accuser on behalf of aggrieved parties. It deliberated secretly, acting on its members' own personal information and upon the application of injured parties. *Id.* at 124 n.

¹⁶ In the early decades of American criminal justice, criminal cases were hardly different from civil actions, and could easily be confused for one another if "the public not being joined in it." *Clark v. Turner*, 1 Root 200 (Conn. 1790) (holding action for assault and battery was no more than a civil case because the public was not joined). It was apparently not unusual for trial judges themselves to be confused about whether a case was criminal or civil, and to make judicial errors regarding procedural differences between the two types of cases. See *Meacham v. Austin*, 5 Day 233 (Conn. 1811) (upholding lower court's dismissal of criminal verdict because the case's process had been consistent with civil procedure rather than criminal procedure).

¹⁷ See *Respublica v. Griffiths*, 2 Dall. 112 (Pa. 1790) (involving action by private individual seeking public sanction for his prosecution).

¹⁸ See, e.g., *Smith v. State*, 7 Tenn. 43 (1846) (using the term prosecutor to describe a private person); *Plumer v. Smith*, 5 N.H. 553 (1832) (same); *Commonwealth v. Harkness*, 4 Binn. 193 (Pa. 1811) (same).

¹⁹ See Harold J. Krent, *Executive Control Over Criminal Law Enforcement: Some Lessons From History*, 38 AM. U. L. REV. 275, 281-90 (1989) (saying that any claim that criminal law enforcement is a 'core' or exclusive executive power is historically inaccurate and therefore the Attorney General need not be vested with authority to oversee or trigger investigations by the independent counsel).

²⁰ See *Respublica v. Griffiths*, 2 Dall. 112 (Pa. 1790) (holding the Attorney General must allow his name to be used by the prosecutor).

²¹ Private prosecutors generally had to pay the costs of their prosecutions, even though the state also had an interest. See *Dickinson v. Potter*, 4 Day 340 (Conn. 1810). Government attorneys general took over the prosecutions of only especially worthy cases and pursued such cases at public expense. See *Waldron v. Turtle*, 4 N.H. 149, 151 (1827) (stating if a prosecution is not adopted and pursued by the attorney general, "it will not be pursued at the public expense, although in the name of the state").

²² See *State v. Bruce*, 24 Me. 71, 73 (1844) (stating a threat by crime victim to prosecute a supposed thief is proper but extortion for pecuniary advantage is criminal).

²³ See *Plumer v. Smith*, 5 N.H. 553 (1832) (holding promissory note invalid when tendered by a criminal defendant to his private prosecutor in exchange for promise not to prosecute).

²⁴ *Shaw v. Reed*, 30 Me. 105, 109 (1849).

²⁵ See *In re April 1956 Term Grand Jury*, 239 F.2d 263 (7th Cir. 1956).

²⁶ See *Goodman v. United States*, 108 F.2d 516 (9th Cir. 1939).

²⁷ See Krent, *supra* note 19, at 293.

²⁸ *C.f.* Ellen D. Larned, 1 History of Windham County, Connecticut 272-73 (1874) (recounting attempts by Windham County authorities in 1730 to arrest a large group of rioters who broke open the Hartford Jail and released a prisoner).

²⁹ *Id.* at 273.

³⁰ *See* Buckminster v. Applebee, 8 N.H. 546 (1837) (stating the sheriff has a duty to raise the posse to aid him when necessary).

³¹ *See* Waterbury v. Lockwood, 4 Day 257, 259-60 (Conn. 1810) (citing English cases).

³² *See* Jerome Hall, *Legal and Social Aspects of Arrest Without A Warrant*, 49 HARV. L. REV. 566, 579 (1936).

³³ *Barrington v. Yellow Taxi Corp.*, 164 N.E. 726, 727 (N.Y. 1928).

³⁴ *See* Eustis v. Kidder, 26 Me. 97, 99 (1846).

³⁵ By the early 1900s, courts held that civilians called into posse service who were killed in the line of duty were entitled to full death benefits. *See* Monterey County v. Rader, 248 P. 912 (Cal. 1926); Village of West Salem v. Industrial Commission, 155 N.W. 929 (Wis. 1916).

³⁶ *United States v. Rice*, 27 Fed. Cas. 795 (W.D.N.C. 1875).

³⁷ The Constitution is not without provisions for criminal procedure. Indeed, much of the Bill of Rights is an outline of basic criminal procedure. *See* LAWRENCE M. FRIEDMAN, A HISTORY OF AMERICAN LAW 118 (2d ed. 1985). But these provisions represent enshrinements of individual liberties rather than government power. The only constitutional provisions with regard to criminal justice represent *barriers* to governmental power, rather than provisions for that power. Indeed, the Founders' intent to protect individual liberties was made clear by the language of the Ninth Amendment and its equivalent in state constitutions of the founding era. The Ninth Amendment, which declares that "[t]he enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people," provides a clear indication that the Framers assumed that persons may do whatever is not justly prohibited by the Constitution rather than that the government may do whatever is not justly prohibited to it. *See* Randy E. Barnett, *Introduction: James Madison's Ninth Amendment*, in THE RIGHTS RETAINED BY THE PEOPLE 43 (Randy E. Barnett ed., 1989).

³⁸ *See* JAMES S. CAMPBELL ET AL., LAW AND ORDER RECONSIDERED: REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON LAW AND LAW ENFORCEMENT TO THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE 450 (1970) (discussing survey by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice).

³⁹ The term "policing" originally meant promoting the public good or the community life rather than preserving security. *See* Rogan Kersh et al., *"More a Distinction of Words than Things": The Evolution of Separated Powers in the American States*, 4 ROGER WILLIAMS U. L. REV. 5, 21 (1998).

⁴⁰ *See, e.g.*, N.C. CONST. of Dec. 18, 1776, Dec. of Rights, § II (providing that people of the state have a right to regulate the internal government and "police thereof"); PA. CONST. of Sept. 28, 1776, Dec. of Rights, art. III (stating that the people have a right of "governing and regulating the internal police of [the people]").

⁴¹ See *Police Jury v. Britton*, 82 U.S. (15 Wall.) 566 (1872). The purpose of such juries was 1) to police slaves and runaways, (2) to repair roads, bridges, and other infrastructure, and (3) to lay taxes as necessary for such acts. *Id.* at 568. See also BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 801 (abridged 6th ed. 1991).

⁴² When Blackstone wrote of offenses against "the public police and economy" in 1769, he meant offenses against the "due regulation and domestic order of the kingdom" such as clandestine marriage, bigamy, rendering bridges inconvenient to pass, vagrancy, and operating gambling houses. 4 WILLIAM BLACKSTONE, COMMENTARIES 924-27 (George Chase ed., Baker, Voorhis & Co. 1938) (1769).

⁴³ See, e.g., *Wolf v. Colorado*, 338 U.S. 25, 27-28 (1948) (proclaiming that "security of one's privacy against arbitrary intrusion by the police" is at the core of the Fourth Amendment (clearly a slight misstatement of the Founders' original perception)).

⁴⁴ See Roger Lane, *Urbanization and Criminal Violence in the 19th Century: Massachusetts as a Test Case*, in NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES 445, 451 (Graham & Gurr dir., 1969) (saying citizens were traditionally supposed to take care of themselves, with help of family, friends, or servants "when available").

⁴⁵ See, e.g., *Kennard v. Burton*, 25 Me. 39 (1845) (involving collision between two wagons).

⁴⁶ Lane, *supra* note 44, at 451.

⁴⁷ ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA 96 (J.P. Mayer ed., Harper Perennial Books 1988) (1848).

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ See *id.* at 96.

⁵⁰ See Pauline Maier, *Popular Uprisings and Civil Authority in Eighteenth-Century America*, 27 WM. & MARY Q. 3-35 (1970).

⁵¹ DE TOCQUEVILLE, *supra* note 47, at 72.

⁵² Lane, *supra* note 44, at 450.

⁵³ See *id.*

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ See *id.* at 451.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., *Lamb v. Day*, 8 Vt. 407 (1836) (involving suit against constable for improper execution of civil writ); *Tomlinson v. Wheeler*, 1 Aik. 194 (Vt. 1826) (involving sheriff's neglect to execute civil judgment); *Stoyel v. Edwards*, 3 Day 1 (1807) (involving sheriff's execution of civil judgment).

⁵⁷ If the modern police profession has a father, it is Sir Robert Peel, who founded the Metropolitan Police of London in 1829. See SUE TITUS REID, CRIMINAL JUSTICE: BLUEPRINTS 58 (5th ed. 1999) (attributing the founding of the first modern police force to Peel). Peel's uniformed officers — nicknamed 'Bobbies' after the

first name of their founder — operated under the direction of a central headquarters (Scotland Yard, named for the site once used by the Kings of Scotland as a residence), walking beats on a full-time basis to prevent crime. *See id.* Less than three decades later, Parliament enacted a statute requiring every borough and county to have a London-type police force. *See id.*

The 'Bobbie' model of policing caught on more slowly in the United States, but by the 1880s most major American cities had adopted some type of full-time paid police force. *See id.* at 59 (noting that the county sheriff system continued in rural areas).

⁵⁸ *See* LAWRENCE M. FRIEDMAN, *CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN AMERICAN HISTORY* 151-52 (1993) (citation omitted).

⁵⁹ *Id.* at 151.

⁶⁰ *See id.* at 152 (describing early police use of station houses as homeless shelters for the poor). This same type of public problem-solving still remains a large part of police work. Police are called upon to settle landlord-tenant disputes, deliver emergency care, manage traffic, regulate parking, and even to respond to alleged haunted houses. *See id.* at 151 (recounting 1894 alleged ghost incident in Oakland, California). Police continue to provide essential services to communities, especially at night and on weekends when they are the only social service agency. *See* SILBERMAN, *supra* note 6, at 321.

⁶¹ *See* GARRY WILLS, *A NECESSARY EVIL: A HISTORY OF AMERICAN DISTRUST OF GOVERNMENT* 248 (1999) (citation omitted).

⁶² *See* REID, *supra* note 57, 65 (5th ed. 1999).

⁶³ *See* JEROME H. SKOLNICK & JAMES J. FYFE, *ABOVE THE LAW: POLICE AND THE EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE* 129 (1993).

⁶⁴ *See id.*

⁶⁵ *See id.* at 130.

⁶⁶ *See* E.X. BOOZHIE, *THE OUTLAW'S BIBLE* 15 (1988).

⁶⁷ Private prosecution was not without costs to taxpayers. The availability of free courtrooms to air grievances tended to promote litigation. In 1804, the Pennsylvania legislature acted to allow juries to make private prosecutors pay the costs of prosecution in especially trifling cases. Act of Dec. 8, 1804 PL3, 4 Sm L 204 (repealed 1860). Private persons were thereafter liable for court costs if they omitted material exculpatory information from a grand jury, thereby causing a grand jury to indict without knowledge of potential defenses. *See Commonwealth v. Harkness*, 4 Binn. 194 (Pa. 1811). This protection, like many others, was lost when police and public prosecutors took over the criminal justice system in the twentieth century. *See United States v. Williams*, 504 U.S. 36 (1992) (holding prosecutor has no duty to present exculpatory evidence to grand jury).

⁶⁸ In the American constitutional scheme, the states have 'general jurisdiction,' meaning they may regulate for public health and welfare and enact whatever means to enforce such regulation as is necessary and constitutionally proper. *See, e.g., Garcia v. San Antonio Metro. Transit Auth.*, 469 U.S. 528 (1985), *National League of Cities v. Usery*, 426 U.S. 833 (1976) (both standing for the general proposition that states have constitutional power to provide for protection, health, safety, and quality of life for their citizens). *See also*

Lawrence Tribe, *American Constitutional Law*, §§ 6-3, 7-3 (2d ed. 1988). State and municipal police forces can therefore be viewed as constitutional to the extent they actually carry out the lawful enactments of the state.

⁶⁹ *See infra* notes 285-398 and their accompanying text.

⁷⁰ *See* Silas J. Wasserstrom, *The Incredible Shrinking Fourth Amendment*, 21 AM. CRIM. L. REV. 257, 347 (1984).

⁷¹ *See* Jerome Hall, *Legal and Social Aspects of Arrest Without A Warrant*, 49 HARV. L. REV. 566, 567 (1936).

⁷² *See id.*

⁷³ *See id.* at 567-71 (discussing earliest scholarly references to the distinction). A 1936 Harvard Law Review article suggested the distinction is a false one owed to improper marshalling of scholarship. *See id.* (writing of "the general misinterpretation" resulting from a 1780 case in England).

⁷⁴ *See id.* at 575 n.44 (citing the case of *Beckwith v. Philby*, 6 B. & C. 635 (K. B. 1827)).

⁷⁵ *See id.* at 571-72. Although official right was apparently considered somewhat greater than that of private citizens during much of the 1700s, the case law enunciates no support for any such distinction until *Rohan v. Sawin*, 59 Mass. (5 Cush.) 281 (1850). It was apparently already the common practice of English constables to arrest upon information from the public in the 1780's. *See id.* at 572. The "earlier requirement of a charge of a felony had already been entirely forgotten" in England by the early nineteenth century. *Id.* at 573. According to Hall, the only real distinction in practice in the early nineteenth century was that officers were privileged to draw their suspicions from statements of others, whereas private arrestors had to base their cause for arrest on *their own* reasonable beliefs. *See id.* at 569.

⁷⁶ *See* *Rohan v. Sawin*, 59 Mass. (5 Cush.) 281, 285 (1850).

⁷⁷ *See id.*

⁷⁸ *See* 18 U.S.C. § 925 (a)(1) (2000) (exempting government officers from federal firearm disabilities).

⁷⁹ *See, e.g.*, CAL. PENAL CODE § 468 (West 1985) (releasing police from liability for possession of sniper scopes and infrared scopes).

⁸⁰ *See, e.g.*, FLA. STAT. CH. 338. 155 (1990).

⁸¹ *See, e.g.*, FLA. STAT. CH. 320.025 (1990) (allowing confidential auto registration for police).

⁸² *See* ARK. CODE ANN. § 20-22-703 (Michie 2000).

⁸³ *See* 18 U.S.C. § 1114 (amended 1994) (providing whoever murders a federal officer in first degree shall suffer death).

⁸⁴ *See* CAL. PENAL CODE § 832.9 (West 1995).

⁸⁵ *See, e.g.*, CAL. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §§ 199.95-199.99 (West 1990) (mandating HIV testing for persons charged with interfering with police officers whenever officers request).

⁸⁶ See Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2511 (2000); *United States v. Leon*, 104 S. Ct. 3405 (1984).

⁸⁷ See *Williams v. Poulos*, 11 F.3d 271 (1st Cir. 1993).

⁸⁸ See, e.g., *People v. Curtis*, 450 P.2d 33, 35 (Cal. 1969) (speaking of the "[g]eneral acceptance" by courts of the elimination of the right to resist unlawful arrest).

⁸⁹ See HERBERT J. STORING, *WHAT THE ANTI-FEDERALISTS WERE FOR: THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF THE OPPONENTS OF THE CONSTITUTION* 53 (1981). The statements of James Madison when introducing the proposed amendments to the Constitution before the House of Representatives, June 8, 1789, also support such a reading of the Bill of Rights. *House of Representatives, June 8, 1789 Debates, reprinted in THE ORIGIN OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT: A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS 1787-1792* 647, 657 (David E. Young, ed.) (2d ed. 1995) (stating "the great object in view is to limit and qualify the powers of Government").

⁹⁰ See STORING, *supra* note 89, at 48.

⁹¹ See, e.g., MD. CONST. of 1776, art. I (declaring that "all government of right originates from the people, is founded in compact only, and instituted solely for the good of the whole"); MASS. CONST. of 1780, art. I ("All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights"); N.H. CONST. of 1784, art. I ("All men are born equally free and independent").

⁹² See *Coyle v. Hurtin*, 10 Johns. 85 (N.Y. 1813).

⁹³ See *Bad Elk v. United States*, 177 U.S. 529 (1900).

⁹⁴ See *Rex v. Gay*, Quincy Mass. Rep. 1761-1772 91 (Mass. 1763) (acquitting assault defendant who beat a sheriff when sheriff attempted to arrest him pursuant to invalid warrant).

⁹⁵ See *Wolf v. Colorado*, 338 U.S. 25, 30 n. 1, 31 n. 2 (1948) (citing cases upholding right to resist unlawful search and seizure).

⁹⁶ See *Adams v. State*, 48 S.E. 910 (Ga. 1904).

⁹⁷ See MD. CONST. of 1776, art. IV; N.H. Const. of 1784, art. X.

⁹⁸ See, e.g., *State v. Kutchara*, 350 N.W.2d 924, 927 (Minn. 1984) (saying Minnesota law does not recognize right to resist unlawful arrest or search); *People v. Curtis*, 450 P.2d 33, 36 (Cal. 1969) (holding California law prohibits forceful resistance to unlawful arrest).

⁹⁹ See, e.g., CAL. PENAL CODE § 243 (criminalizing the resistance, delay or obstruction of an officer in the discharge of "any duty of his office"). CAL. PENAL CODE § 834(a) (1957) ("If a person has knowledge ... that he is being arrested by a peace officer, it is the duty of such person to refrain from using force or any weapon to resist such arrest").

¹⁰⁰ See, e.g., *United States v. Charles*, 883 F.2d 355 (5th Cir. 1989) (excusing as harmless error the failure of officers executing warrant to have the warrant in hand during raid); *United States v. Cafero*, 473 F.2d 489, 499 (3d Cir. 1973) (holding failure to deliver copy of warrant to the party being searched or seized does not invalidate search or seizure in the absence of prejudice); *Willeford v. State*, 625 S.W.2d 88, 90 (Tex. App.

1981) (upholding validity of search and seizure before arrival of warrant). Not only has the requirement that officers show their warrant before executing it been eliminated, but the requirement that officers announce their authority and purpose before executing search warrants has been all but eliminated. *See Richards v. Wisconsin*, 570 U.S. 385 (1997) (eliminating requirement that officers be refused admittance before using force to enter the place to be searched in many cases).

¹⁰¹ *See* William A. Schroeder, *Warrantless Misdemeanor Arrests and the Fourth Amendment*, 58 MO. L. REV. 771 (1993) (discussing the erosion of requirements for arrest warrants in many jurisdictions).

¹⁰² *See, e.g., Polk v. State*, 142 So. 480, 481 (Miss. 1932) (striking down statute allowing warrantless arrest for misdemeanors committed outside an officer's presence); *Ex Parte Rhodes*, 79 So. 462, 462-63 (Ala. 1918) (holding statute unconstitutional which allowed for warrantless arrest for out-of-presence misdemeanors).

¹⁰³ *See* Schroeder, *supra* note 101, at 793.

¹⁰⁴ *See Thor v. Superior Court*, 855 P.2d 375, 380 (Cal. 1993) (saying the developing consensus "uniformly recognizes" a patient's right to control his own body, stemming from the "long-standing importance in our Anglo-American legal tradition of personal autonomy and the right of self-determination.") (citations omitted). "For self-determination to have any meaning, it cannot be subject to the scrutiny of anyone else's conscience or sensibilities." *Id.* at 385.

¹⁰⁵ *See Michael v. Hertzler*, 900 P.2d 1144, 1145 (Wyo. 1995) (stating if a statute reaches a fundamental interest, courts are to employ strict scrutiny in making determination as to whether enactment is essential to achieve compelling state interest).

¹⁰⁶ "[Only] the gravest abuses, endangering paramount interests, give occasion for permissible limitation." *Thomas v. Collins*, 323 U.S. 516, 530 (1945). A "compelling state interest" is defined as "[o]ne which the state is forced or obliged to protect." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 282 (6th ed. 1990) (citing *Coleman v. Coleman*, 291 N.E.2d 530, 534 (1972)).

¹⁰⁷ The American constitutional order grants to every individual a privilege to stand his ground in the face of a violent challenger and meet violence with violence. A "duty to retreat" evolved in some jurisdictions, however, where a defender contemplates the use of *deadly force*. *See* WAYNE R. LAFAVE & AUSTIN W. SCOTT, CRIMINAL LAW 461 (2d ed. 1986). But with police, the courts have never imposed a duty to retreat. *See id.* This, combined with the recurring police claim that an attacker might get close enough to grasp the officer's sidearm, has meant, in practical terms, that an officer may repel even a minor physical threat with deadly force.

The effect of this exception for law enforcement officers has been to grant an almost absurd advantage to police in 'self-defense' incidents. Not only do cops have no duty to retreat, but they seem privileged to kill whenever a plausible threat of any injury manifests itself. *See infra*, notes 115-147, and accompanying text. Cops — unlike the general public — appear excused whenever they open fire on an individual who threatens *any* harm — even utterly nonlethal — against them, such as a verbal threat to punch the officer combined with a step forward. *See infra*, notes 123-147, and accompanying text.

¹⁰⁸ *See* James J. Fyfe, *Police Use of Deadly Force: Research and Reform*, in THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: POLITICS AND POLICIES 134-40 (George F. Cole & Mare G. Gertz eds., 7th ed. 1998).

¹⁰⁹ *Id.* at 135 (quoting Chapman and Crockett).

¹¹⁰ See *People v. Klein*, 137 N.E. 145, 149 (Ill. 1922) (reporting that "numerous" peace officers testified that shooting was the customary method of arresting speeders during trial of peace officer accused of murder).

¹¹¹ See *id.*; *Miller v. People*, 74 N.E. 743 (Ill. 1905) (involving village marshal who shot and killed speeding carriage driver).

¹¹² See *Fyfe*, *supra* note 108, at 137.

¹¹³ See *id.* at 140.

¹¹⁴ See *id.* at 141 (table showing fatal shootings per 1,000 police officers, Philadelphia). A study of Philadelphia P.D. firearm discharges from 1970 through 1978 found only two cases that resulted in departmental discipline against officers on duty. See *id.* at 147 n.2. One case involved an officer firing unnecessary shots into the air; the other involved an officer who shot and killed his wife in a police station during an argument over his paycheck. See *id.*

¹¹⁵ See *Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1 (1985).

¹¹⁶ 471 U.S. 1 (1985).

¹¹⁷ See *Fyfe*, *supra* 108, at 136.

¹¹⁸ The *Garner* decision has been interpreted in different ways by different courts and law-making bodies. See Michael R. Smith, *Police Use of Deadly Force: How Courts and Policy-Makers Have Misapplied Tennessee v. Garner*, 1 KAN. J. L. & PUB. POL'Y, 100, 100-01 (1998). Smith argues that many of these interpretations stem from inaccurate readings of *Garner* and that lower courts have failed to hold police officers liable according to the standard required by the Supreme Court. See *id.*

¹¹⁹ On behalf of modern police, courts have adopted a qualified immunity defense to police misconduct claims. Essentially, where cops can justify by plausible explanation that their conduct was within the bounds of their occupational duties, there is a "good faith" defense. See *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800 (1982); *Procunier v. Navarette*, 434 U.S. 555 (1978); *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409 (1976); *Wood v. Strickland*, 420 U.S. 308 (1975). But as David Rudovsky points out, the "good faith" defense is an artificial ingredient to normal tort liability. "The standard rule," notes Rudovsky, "is that a violation of another's rights or the failure to adhere to prescribed standards of conduct constitutes grounds for liability." David Rudovsky, *The Criminal Justice System and the Role of the Police*, in *THE POLITICS OF LAW: A PROGRESSIVE CRITIQUE*, 242, 248 (David Kairys ed., 1982). The "good faith" defense for police is thus an artificial layer of tort immunity protection not normally available to other types of litigants. Under the standard rules of tort law, after all, a defendant's good faith, intent, or knowledge of the law are irrelevant. See *id.* at 248.

¹²⁰ See *Smith*, *supra* note 118, at 117.

¹²¹ See *id.* at 106.

¹²² *Idaho v. Horiuchi*, 215 F.3d 986 (9th Cir. 2000) (Kozinski, J., dissenting).

¹²³ OCTOBER 22 COALITION TO STOP POLICE BRUTALITY ET AL., *STOLEN LIVES: KILLED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT* 307 (2d. ed. 1999) (hereinafter "STOLEN LIVES") (saying officer shot and killed victim after victim 'made a move' following a foot chase).

¹²⁴ *See id.* at 207 (listing a 1993 Michigan case).

¹²⁵ *See id.* at 262 (reporting 1990 Brooklyn case in which cop had shot unarmed teenage suspect in back of head for allegedly reaching into jacket).

¹²⁶ *See id.* at 250 (reporting 1996 New York case in which man was shot 24 times by police while sitting in car with his hands in the air); *id.* at 252 (reporting shooting of alleged car thief after motion as if they were going for a gun').

¹²⁷ *See id.* at 262 (reporting 1990 Bronx shooting precipitated by the decedent turning toward an officer as officer opened door of decedent's cab).

¹²⁸ *See id.* at 263 (reporting 1988 New York case initiated when a driver made illegal turn and ending with police pumping 16 bullets into her).

¹²⁹ *See id.* at 262 (reporting 1990 Brooklyn case in which decedent was shot nine times while standing and twice in back while lying on ground).

¹³⁰ *See id.* at 240 (reporting a 1998 New York case).

¹³¹ *See id.* at 232 (reporting 1991 New Mexico case).

¹³² *See id.* at 220 (reporting 1998 Nevada case).

¹³³ *See id.* at 29.

¹³⁴ *Id.* at 44.

¹³⁵ *Id.* at 46. The possession of a wooden stick has cost more than one person his life at the hands of police. *See also id.* at 68.

¹³⁶ *Id.* at 53.

¹³⁷ *Id.* at 53.

¹³⁸ *See Detroit Police Kill Mentally Ill Deaf Man*, BOSTON GLOBE, Aug. 31, 2000 at A8.

¹³⁹ *See STOLEN LIVES*, *supra* note 123, at 57. ¹⁴⁰ *See id.* at 60.

¹⁴¹ *See id.* at 62.

¹⁴² *See id.* at 206 (listing a 1993 Michigan case). In another Michigan case, a cop shot someone who merely had a VCR remote control in his pocket, claiming he mistook it for a gun. *See id.* at 205.

¹⁴³ *See id.* at 305 (saying Houston police surrounded truck and fired 59 times at victim as he sat in truck holding can opener). No civilian witnesses saw the "shiny object" (can opener) police claimed they saw. *See id.*

¹⁴⁴ Police use of throwdown guns has been alleged across the country. Guns which are introduced without a suspect's fingerprints when they should have fingerprints, and guns that are found by police officers after an initial, supposedly complete, search of a crime scene by other detectives, can be said to raise questions about

police use of throw-down guns. *C.f.* Joe Cantlupe & David Hasemyer, *Pursuit of Justice: How San Diego Police Officers Handled the Killing of One of Their Own. It Is a Case Flawed by Erratic Testimony and Questionable Conduct*, SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIBUNE, Sept. 11, 1994, at A1 (raising the issue in a San Diego case).

¹⁴⁵ See *Webster v. City of Houston*, 689 F.2d 1220, 1227 (5th Cir. 1982).

¹⁴⁶ *Id.* at 1222.

¹⁴⁷ See *id.* at 1221-23 (describing "damning" evidence of official cover-up and police vindication as a matter of policy).

¹⁴⁸ See *STOLEN LIVES*, *supra* note 123, at 72. In one 1987 Los Angeles case, a man was shot four times and killed when he picked up a discarded pushbroom to deflect police baton blows. See *id.* 72.

¹⁴⁹ See *id.* at iv. In one particularly egregious case, a police killing was upheld as beyond liability where officers shot a speeding trucker who refused to stop. See *Cole v. Bone*, 993 F.2d 1328 (8th Cir. 1993). *But see, e.g.*, *Gutierrez-Rodriguez v. Cartagena*, 882 F.2d 553 (1st Cir. 1989) (affirming verdict against plainclothes officers who shot driver who drove away); *Sherrod v. Berry*, 827 F.2d 195 (7th Cir. 1987) (affirming verdict against officers who shot driver as driver reached into jacket pocket during questioning); *Moody v. Ferguson*, 732 F. Supp. 176 (D.S.L. 1989) (rendering judgment against officers who shot driver fleeing in vehicle from traffic stop).

¹⁵⁰ See *Zuchel v. City and County of Denver, Colorado*, 997 F.2d 730 (10th Cir. 1993).

¹⁵¹ See Alison L. Patton, *The Endless Cycle of Abuse: Why 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Is Ineffective in Deterring Police Brutality*, 44 HASTINGS L. J. 753, 754 (1993) (saying plaintiffs rarely win absent independent witnesses or physical evidence).

¹⁵² See Peter L. Davis, *Rodney King and the Decriminalization of Police Brutality in America*, 53 MD. L. REV. 271, 288 (1994). Prior to the 1900s, it was not uncommon for law enforcers who killed suspects during confrontations to be placed on trial for their lives even when they reacted to violent resisters. See *United States v. Rice*, 27 F. Cas. 795 (C.C.N.C. 1875) (No. 16,153) (involving deputy United States Marshall on trial for murder of tax evasion suspect); *State v. Brown*, 5 Del. (5 Harr.) 505 (Ct. Gen. Sess. 1853) (fining peace officers for assault and false imprisonment); *Conner v. Commonwealth*, 3 Bin. 38 (Pa. 1810) (involving a constable indicted for refusing to execute arrest warrant). Even justices of the peace could be criminally indicted for dereliction of duties. See *Respublica v. Montgomery*, Dall. 419 (1795) (upholding validity of a criminal charge against a justice of the peace who failed to suppress a riot).

¹⁵³ See Davis, *supra* note 152, at 290 (noting the hopeless conflict of interest in handling police violence complaints).

¹⁵⁴ For an overview of the powers of early grand juries to accuse government officials, see Roger Roots, *If It's Not a Runaway, It's Not a Real Grand Jury*, 33 CREIGHTON L. REV. 821 (2000).

¹⁵⁵ See Steiker, *supra* note 3, at 836 (saying police excesses such as beatings, torture, false arrests and the third degree are well documented).

¹⁵⁶ See *STOLEN LIVES*, *supra* note 123, at vii.

¹⁵⁷ See International Secretariat of Amnesty International, News Release, *From Alabama to Wyoming: 50 Counts of Double Standards — The Missing Entries in the US Report on Human Rights*, Feb. 25, 1999.

¹⁵⁸ See STOLEN LIVES, *supra* note 123, at iv.

¹⁵⁹ See *id.* at v.

¹⁶⁰ Certain examples demonstrate. FBI agents in Elizabeth, New Jersey shot 38 times inside an apartment to kill an unarmed man who they first tried to say had fired first. See *id.* at 226. In February 1999, Bronx police fired 41 bullets at an unarmed African immigrant in his apartment doorway. See *id.* at 234. After this unlawful killing, cops unlawfully searched the decedent's apartment to justify shooting, failing to find any evidence of drugs. See *id.* In August 1999, Manhattan cops fired a total of 35 shots at alleged robber (who probably did not fire), injuring bystander and sending crowds fleeing. See *id.*

¹⁶¹ Most states that allow the death penalty require that aggravating factors exist before imposition of capital punishment. See, e.g., IDAHO CODE § 19-2515 (1997) (allowing death penalty for crimes involving "especially heinous, atrocious or cruel, [or] manifesting exceptional depravity" or showing "utter disregard for human life"); TEX. CRIM. P. ANN. § 37.071 (West 1981) (listing factors such as whether the crime was "unreasonable in response to the provocation"); WYO. STAT. ANN. § 6-2-102 (Michie 1999) (allowing death penalty only upon a finding of aggravating factors such as a creation of great risk of death to two or more persons or for "especially atrocious or cruel" conduct).

¹⁶² The earliest attempts at professionalization of constables failed in the United States due to insufficiency of public funds. See Steiker, *supra* note 3, at 831. Some of the earliest U.S. Supreme Court decisions regarding police forces involve disputes over municipal police spending. See, e.g., Louisiana ex rel. Hubert v. New Orleans, 215 U.S. 170 (1909) (resolving dispute over debts run up by municipal police district); New Orleans v. Benjamin, 153 U.S. 411 (1894) (involving dispute over unbudgeted debts run up by New Orleans police board); District of Columbia v. Hutton, 143 U.S. 18 (1891) (dealing with salary dispute involving District of Columbia police force).

¹⁶³ See FRIEDMAN, *supra* note 58, at 362 (1993). Dallas police, for example, arrested 8,526 people in 1929 "on suspicion" but charged less than five percent of them with a crime. See *id.*

¹⁶⁴ The infamous case of *Brown v. Mississippi*, 297 U.S. 278 (1936), provides a grim reminder of the torture techniques that have been employed upon suspects during the past century. In *Brown*, officers placed nooses around the necks of suspects, temporarily hanged them, and cut their backs to pieces with a leather strap to gain confessions. *Id.* at 281-82.

¹⁶⁵ FRIEDMAN, *supra* note 58, at 151 n.20 (quoting George S. McWatters, who studied New York detectives in the 1870s).

¹⁶⁶ See TITUS REID, *supra* note 57, at 122 (citations omitted).

¹⁶⁷ See Peter B. Kraska & Victor E. Kappeler, *Militarizing American Police: The Rise and Normalization of Paramilitary Units*, 44 SOC. PROBS. 1, 11 (1997).

¹⁶⁸ One-hundred-seventeen federal, state, and local officers were killed feloniously in 1996 — the lowest number since 1960. See Sue TITUS REID, *supra* note 57, at 123.

¹⁶⁹ See National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, *Violence in the Work Place*, June 1997.

¹⁷⁰ See *id.*

¹⁷¹ Approximately 40 percent of police deaths are due to accidents. See TITUS REID, *supra* note 57, at 123.

¹⁷² See National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, *Fatal Injuries to Workers in the United States, 1980-1989: A Decade of Surveillance* 14 (April 15, 1999); Robert Rockwell, *Police Brutality: More than Just a Few Bad Apples*, REFUSE & RESIST, Aug. 14, 1997 (describing the "cultivation of the myth of policing as the most dangerous occupation").

¹⁷³ See *id.* at 13.

¹⁷⁴ See SKOLNICK & FYFE, *supra* note 63, at 93.

¹⁷⁵ See Hall, *supra* note 71, at 582-83 (describing early constables as "[a]bominably paid").

¹⁷⁶ *C.f.* STOLEN LIVES, *supra* note 123, at v (saying when police arrive on the scene, they often escalate the situation rather than defuse it).

¹⁷⁷ See STOLEN LIVES, *supra* note 123, at vi.

¹⁷⁸ See, e.g., *Brandon v. City of Providence*, 708 A.2d 893 (R.I. 1998) (finding municipality immune from liability when cops prevented relatives of injured shooting victim from taking victim to the hospital before victim died). See also *Stolen Lives*, *supra* note 157, at 305 (saying Tennessee police prevented fire fighters from saving victim of fire in 1997 case). Other notorious examples can be cited, including the 1993 Waco fire (in which fire trucks were held back by federal agents) and the 1985 MOVE debacle in Philadelphia in which police dropped a bomb on a building occupied by women and children and then held back fire fighters from rescuing bum victims. See WILLIE L. WILLIAMS, *TAKING BACK OUR STREETS: FIGHTING CRIME IN AMERICA* 16 (1996) (saying investigative hearings revealed cops had held back rescuers as a 'tactical decision').

¹⁷⁹ See SKOLNICK & FYFE, *supra* note 63, at 75 (citing U.S. Civil Disorder Commission study).

¹⁸⁰ See SKOLNICK & FYFE, *supra* note 63, at 83 (describing police riots at Columbia University and Los Angeles).

¹⁸¹ See *RIGHTS IN CONFLICT: THE OFFICIAL REPORT TO THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE* xxiii, xxvi (1968).

¹⁸² See John D. Bessler, *The Public Interest and the Unconstitutionality of Private Prosecutors*, 47 *ARK. L. REV.* 511 (1994) (attacking private prosecution as unfair, arbitrary, and not in the public interest).

¹⁸³ See Hall, *supra* note 71, at 580-85 (detailing inadequacies of private law enforcement).

¹⁸⁴ See *United States v. Wong*, 431 U.S. 174 (1977) (holding Miranda requirements do not apply to a witness testifying before a grand jury); *United States v. Calandra*, 414 U.S. 338 (1974) (holding grand jury witness may not refuse to answer questions on ground that they are based on evidence obtained from unlawful search); *United States v. Dionisio*, 410 U.S. 1 (1973) (holding seizure of a person by subpoena for grand jury appearance is generally not within Fourth Amendment's protection).

¹⁸⁵ See Richard M. Brown, *Historical Patterns of Violence in America*, in NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES 57 (Graham & Gurr, ed. 1969).

¹⁸⁶ See *State v. Walker*, 32 Me. 195 (1850) (upholding actions of the private group).

¹⁸⁷ See *United States v. Whittier*, 28 F. Cas. 591 (C.C.E.D. Mo. 1878).

¹⁸⁸ See *supra* notes 438-445 and accompanying text for a discussion of the evolution of entrapment as a law enforcement practice.

¹⁸⁹ See Richard Maxwell Brown, *The American Vigilante Tradition*, in NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES 57 (Graham & Gurr, dir. 1969).

¹⁹⁰ See JAMES S. CAMPBELL, ET AL., LAW AND ORDER RECONSIDERED: REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON LAW AND LAW ENFORCEMENT 441 (1970) (discussing successes of citizen auxiliary units in Queens, New York and other areas).

¹⁹¹ See *id.* 437-54 (1970) (discussing successes of citizen involvement in law enforcement).

¹⁹² American frontier vigilantism generally targeted serious criminals such as murderers, coach robbers and rapists as well as horse thieves, counterfeiter, outlaws, and 'bad men.' See NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES 97 (Graham & Gurr, dir. 1969). Arguably, such offenders qualified as felons and would have faced the death penalty under the common law even if more conventional court processes were followed. That such vigilante movements often followed rudimentary due process of law is attested by historians such as Richard Maxwell Brown, who recounts that "vigilantes' attention to the spirit of law and order caused them to provide, by their lights, a fair but speedy trial." Richard Maxwell Brown, *supra* note 189, at 164. The northern Illinois Regulator movement of 1841, for example, provided accused horse thieves and murderers with a lawyer, an opportunity to challenge jurors, and an arraignment. See *id.* at 163. At least one accused murderer was *acquitted* by a vigilante court on the Wyoming frontier. See Joe B. Frantz, *The Frontier Tradition: An Invitation to Violence*, in NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES 129-30 (Graham & Gurr, dir. 1969). Many accused were let off with whipping and expulsion rather than execution in the early decades of vigilante justice. See Brown, *supra* note 189, at 164. Less than half of all vigilante groups ever killed anyone. See *id.* Ironically, the move by vigilante groups toward killing convicted suspects began in the 1850s, — corresponding closely with the meteoric rise of professional policing. See *id.*

Vigilante movements occasionally developed to *rescue* the law from corrupt public officials who were violating the law. The case of the vigilantes who arrested and hanged Sheriff Henry Plummer of Virginia City, Montana in 1864 is such an example. See LEW L. CALLAWAY, MONTANA'S RIGHTEOUS HANGMEN (1997) (arguing the vigilantes had no choice but to take the law into their own hands).

¹⁹³ "[T]he Western frontier developed too swiftly for the courts of justice to keep up with the progression of the people." Joe B. Frantz, *supra* note 192, at 128. Vigilante movements did little more than play catch-up to what can only be described as rampant frontier lawlessness. Five-thousand wanted men roamed Texas in 1877. See *id.* at 128. Major crimes often went totally unprosecuted and countless offenders whose crimes were well known lived openly without fear of arrest on the western frontier. See *id.* Vigilantes filled in only the most

gaping holes in court jurisdiction, generally (but not always) intervening to arrest only the perpetrators of serious crimes. *See id.* and at 130 (saying "improvised group action" was the only resort for many on the far frontier).

¹⁹⁴ David H. Bayley & Clifford D. Shearing, *The Future of Policing*, in *THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: POLITICS AND POLICIES* 150, 150 (George F. Cole & Marc G. Gertz, eds., 7th ed. 1998).

¹⁹⁵ *See id.* at 151, 154.

¹⁹⁶ Tucker Carlson, *Washington's Inept Police Force*, *WALL ST. J.*, Nov. 3, 1993, at A19.

¹⁹⁷ *See SILBERMAN*, *supra* note 6, at 297. Silberman points out that New York City police solved only two percent of robbery cases in which a witness could not identify an offender or the offender was not captured at the scene. *See id.*

¹⁹⁸ *See id.* at 296 (saying clearance rate dropped precipitously between 1960 and 1976 as proportion of crimes committed by strangers increased).

¹⁹⁹ *See id.* (citing figures registered between 1960 and 1976).

²⁰⁰ *See id.* at 296.

²⁰¹ *See* Laura Parker & Gary Fields, *Unsolved Killings on Rise: Percent of Cases Closed Drops From 86% to 69%*, *USA TODAY*, Feb. 22, 2000, at A1.

²⁰² *See id.*

²⁰³ *See* BARRY SCHECK, ET AL., *ACTUAL INNOCENCE* 175 (2000).

²⁰⁴ 428 U.S. 153 (1976) (finding death penalty constitutional so long as adequate procedures are provided to a defendant).

²⁰⁵ *See* SCHECK, *supra* note 203, at 218.

²⁰⁶ *See Illinois Governor Orders Execution Moratorium*, *USA TODAY*, Feb. 1, 2000, at 3A.

²⁰⁷ *See id.*

²⁰⁸ *See* SCHECK, *supra* note 203, at 218 (noting an average of 4.6 condemned people per year have been set free after 1996, while only 2.5 death row inmates per year were freed between 1973 and 1993).

²⁰⁹ *See id.* at xv (noting these 5,000 exonerations came from only the first 18 thousand results of DNA testing at crime laboratories — a rate of almost 30% exonerated).

²¹⁰ *C.f. id.* at 180 (detailing indictment of four officers for perjury and obstruction of justice in the wake of one DNA exoneration).

²¹¹ DNA testing has proven that at least 67 people were sent to prison or death row for crimes they did not commit. *See id.* at xiv. This number grows each month. *See id.*

²¹² *C.f.* Morgan Cloud, *The Dirty Little Secret*, 43 EMORY L. J. 1311, 1311 (1994) (saying "[p]olice perjury is the dirty little secret of our criminal justice system").

²¹³ *See* BURTON S. KATZ, JUSTICE OVERRULED: UNMASKING THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM 77-86 (1999).

²¹⁴ *See* SILBERMAN, *supra* note 6, at 308 (describing interrogation techniques of police as "an art form in its own right."). Lying or bluffing can often persuade a suspect to admit crimes to the police which would not otherwise be proven. *See id.*

²¹⁵ *C.f. id.* (recounting that an officer under observation would simply lie on the stand if challenged in court about whether Miranda warnings were given before questioning a suspect).

²¹⁶ *See* Joe Cantlupe & David Hasemyer, *Pursuit of Justice: How San Diego Police Officers Handled the Killing of One of Their Own. It Is a Case Flawed by Erratic Testimony and Questionable Conduct*, SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIBUNE, Sept. 11, 1994, at A1 (exposing that some officers gave false testimony in case of suspected cop-killers).

²¹⁷ Andrew Horwitz, *Taking the Cop Out of Copping a Plea: Eradicating Police Prosecution of Criminal Cases*, 40 ARIZ. L. REV. 1305, 1321 (1998) (quoting Jerome H. Skolnick).

²¹⁸ *See* Daniel B. Wood, *One precinct stirs a criminal-justice crisis*, CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, Feb. 18, 2000, at 1.

²¹⁹ *See* TITUS REID, *supra* note 57, at 120.

²²⁰ *See* SILBERMAN, *supra* note 6, at 231.

²²¹ *See* Gary Fields, *New Orleans' Crime Fight Started With Police*, USA TODAY, Feb. 1, 2000, at 6A.

²²² *See* Tucker Carlson, *Washington's Inept Police Force*, WALL ST. J., Nov. 3, 1993, at A19.

²²³ *See Abuse of Power*, DETROIT NEWS, May 3, 1996.

²²⁴ *See* Lawrence W. Sherman, *Becoming Bent: Moral Careers of Corrupt Policemen*, IN "ORDER UNDER LAW": READINGS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE 96, 104-06 (1981) (discussing police burglary scandals of the 1960s).

²²⁵ *See* Wood, *supra* note 218, at 5 (citing critics).

²²⁶ *See* FRIEDMAN, *supra* note 58, at 154. The Lexow Committee of 1894 was perhaps the first to probe police misconduct in New York City. The Committee found that the police had formed a "separate and highly privileged class, armed with the authority and the machinery of oppression." *See id.* Witnesses before the Committee testified to brutal beatings, extortion and perjury by New York police. *See id.* at 154-55.

²²⁷ In April 1994, for example, thirty-three New York officers were indicted and ultimately convicted of perjury, drug dealing and robbery. *See* James Lardner, *Better Cops. Fewer Robbers*, N.Y. TIMES MAG., Feb. 9, 1997, pp. 44-52. The following year, sixteen Bronx police officers were indicted for robbing drug dealers, beating people, and abusing the public. *See id.*

²²⁸ See Jerome H. Skolnick, *A Sketch of the Policeman's "Working Personality,"* in *THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: POLITICS AND POLICIES* 116, 123 (George F. Cole & Marc G. Gertz 7th ed. 1998).

²²⁹ See Wood, *supra* note 218, at 5 (quoting critics).

²³⁰ *C.f.* TITUS REID, *supra* note 57, at 117-119 (describing police subculture).

²³¹ See FRIEDMAN, *supra* note 58, at 154 (saying New York police of the 1890s engaged in routine extortion of businesses, collecting kickbacks from push-cart vendors, corner groceries, and businessmen whose flag poles extended too far into the street). In Chicago, police historically sought "contributions" from saloonkeepers. See *id.* at 155.

²³² See, e.g., PATRICK J. BUCHANAN, *RIGHT FROM THE BEGINNING* 283-84 (1990) (detailing police favoritism toward one St. Louis newspaper and antagonism toward its competitor); Jonathan D. Rockoff, *Comment Costs Kennedy Police Backing*, *PROVIDENCE J.*, April 21, 2000, at 1B (describing police unions' threats to drop their support for Rep. Kennedy due to Kennedy's public remarks).

²³³ See Davis, *supra* note 152, at 355.

²³⁴ See Wasserstrom, *supra* note 70, at 293-94 n.188 (1984) (stating no one has ever been convicted under the statute, 18 U.S.C. § 2236).

²³⁵ See U.S. Dep't of Justice, Office of Inspector General, *The FBI Laboratory: An Investigation into Laboratory Practices and Alleged Misconduct in Explosives-Related and Other Cases* (April 1997) (detailing Justice Department's findings of impropriety at the FBI Crime Lab).

²³⁶ *Cf.* SILBERMAN, *supra* note 6, at 211-14 (observing the behavior of cops on patrol).

²³⁷ See *id.* at 215-16 (citing study conducted in Kansas City in the 1970s).

²³⁸ *C.f. id.* at 215 (pointing to mounting criticism of traditional approach). Studies of police pull-overs and sidewalk stops invariably demonstrate patterns of economic, racial, and social discrimination as well. See, e.g., Bruce Landis, *State Police Records Support Charges of Bias in Traffic Stops*, *PROVIDENCE J.*, Sept. 5, 1999 at 1A (reporting Rhode Island traffic stop statistics demonstrate racial bias by state police).

²³⁹ The United States' 'war on drugs' is a perfect illustration of the difficulties of implementing broad-ranging social policy through police enforcement mechanisms. "Not since Vietnam ha[s] a national mission failed so miserably." JIM MCGEE & BRIAN DUFFY, *MAIN JUSTICE: THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO ENFORCE THE NATION'S CRIMINAL LAWS AND GUARD ITS LIBERTIES* 43 (1996). The federal drug control budget increased from \$4.3 billion in 1988 to \$11.9 billion in 1992, yet national drug supply increased greatly and prices dropped during the same period. See *id.* at 42. The costs of enforcement in 1994 ranged from \$79,376 per arrestee by the DEA to \$260,000 per arrestee by the FBI, with no progress made at all toward decreasing the drug trade. See *id.*

²⁴⁰ See JOHN R. LOTT, JR., *MORE GUNS, LESS CRIME: UNDERSTANDING CRIME AND GUN CONTROL LAWS* 213 n.3 (1998) (citing forthcoming paper).

²⁴¹ Some two-thirds of the public say they have a great deal of respect for the police. See SHMUEL LOCK, *CRIME, PUBLIC OPINION, AND CIVIL LIBERTIES: THE TOLERANT PUBLIC* 69 (1999). Interestingly, however, lawyers are more than 20 percentage points lower in their general assessment of police. See *id.*

²⁴² Public opinion polls repeatedly show that a majority of the public favor decreasing constitutional protections. *See, e.g., id.* at 6. It must be noted, however, that the general public is *more* inclined than lawyers and the Supreme Court to favor protecting some civil liberties. For example, 49 percent of the public disapproves of police searching private property by air without warrant, while only 37 percent of lawyers disapprove and the Supreme Court upheld the practice in *United States v. Dunn*, 480 U.S. 294 (1987). *See id.* at 39. A majority of the public (51%) would prohibit police from searching one's garbage without a warrant, while only 36 percent of lawyers disapprove and the Supreme Court upheld the practice in *California v. Greenwood*, 486 U.S. 35 (1988). *See id.* The public is also less inclined than lawyers to approve of using illegally obtained evidence to impeach a witness. *See id.* at 45.

²⁴³ *C.f.* *Illinois v. Krull*, 480 U.S. 340, 365 (1987) (O'Connor, J., dissenting) (stating Fourth Amendment rights have at times proved unpopular and the Framers drafted the Fourth Amendment in fear that future majorities might compromise Fourth Amendment values).

²⁴⁴ *See* JOHN PHILLIP REID, *IN DEFIANCE OF THE LAW: THE STANDING-ARMY CONTROVERSY, THE Two CONSTITUTIONS, AND THE COMING OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION* (1981) (recounting the history and constitutional background of the standing-army controversy that preceded the Revolution).

²⁴⁵ THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE paras. 12, 13, 14 (U.S. 1776).

²⁴⁶ *See* JOHN P. REID, *supra* note 244, at 79.

²⁴⁷ *See id.* at 79.

²⁴⁸ *See id.* at 50 (citation omitted).

²⁴⁹ *See id.* at 29 (quoting the orations of Hancock).

²⁵⁰ In Edinburgh in 1736, a unit of town guards maintaining order during the execution of a convicted smuggler was pelted with stones and mud until some soldiers began firing weapons at the populace. *See* JOHN P. REID, *supra* note 244, at 114-15 (recounting the history and constitutional background of the standing-army controversy which preceded the Revolution). After nine citizens were found dead, the captain of the guard was tried for murder, convicted, and himself condemned to be hanged. *See id.*

When officers of the crown indicated a willingness to pardon the captain, a mob of civilians "rescued" the captain from prison and hanged him. *See id.*

²⁵¹ *See* Hall, *supra* note 71, at 587-88.

²⁵² *Id.* at 587.

²⁵³ Ben C. Roberts, *On the Origins and Resolution of English Working-Class Protest*, in NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE, *VIOLENCE IN AMERICA: HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES* 238, 252 (Graham & Gurr, dir. 1969).

²⁵⁴ JOHN P. REID, *supra* note 244, at 80.

²⁵⁵ *See id.* at 95 (quoting from a 1770 issue of the *New Hampshire Gazette*).

²⁵⁶ See Kraska & Kappeler, *supra* note 167, at 2-3 (citing National Institute of Justice report detailing "partnership" between Defense and Justice Departments in equipping personnel to "engage the crime war").

²⁵⁷ See William Booth, *The Militarization of 'Mayberry,'* WASH. POST, June 17, 1997, at A1.

²⁵⁸ See *id.*

²⁵⁹ See *id.*

²⁶⁰ See *id.* (quoting Kraska).

²⁶¹ See Kraska & Kappeler, *supra* note 167, at 10.

²⁶² See Roger Roots, *The Approaching Death of the Collective Right Theory of the Second Amendment*, 39 DUQUESNE L. REV. 71 (2000).

²⁶³ See *id.*

²⁶⁴ *C.f. id.*

²⁶⁵ See JOHN R. LOTT, JR., MORE GUNS, LESS CRIME: UNDERSTANDING CRIME AND GUN CONTROL LAWS (1998) (supporting a proposition consistent with the title); GARY KLECK, POINT BLANK: GUNS AND VIOLENCE IN AMERICA (1991).

²⁶⁶ KLECK, *supra* note 265, at 111-116, 148.

²⁶⁷ See George F. Will, *Are We a Nation of Cowards?*, NEWSWEEK, Nov. 15, 1993, at 93. The error rate is defined as the rate of shootings involving an innocent person mistakenly identified as a criminal. See *id.*

²⁶⁸ See ANTHONY J. PINIZZOTTO, ET AL., U.S. DEPT OF JUSTICE, NAT'L INST. OF JUSTICE, IN THE LINE OF FIRE: A STUDY OF SELECTED FELONIOUS ASSAULTS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS 8 (1997) (table showing 41 percent accuracy by police as opposed to 91 percent accuracy by their assailants with handguns).

²⁶⁹ See, e.g., *Morgan v. California*, 743 F.2d 728 (9th Cir. 1984) (involving drunk officers who backed their car into innocent civilian couple and then brandished guns to threaten them).

²⁷⁰ See *Shapiro v. New York City Police Dept.*, 595 N.Y.S.2d 864 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1993) (upholding revocation of pistol license of cop who threatened drivers with gun during two traffic disputes); *Matter of Beninson v. Police Dept.*, 574 N.Y.S.2d 307 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1991) (involving revocation of pistol permit of cop based on two displays of firearms in traffic situations).

²⁷¹ See JOSHUA DRESSLER, UNDERSTANDING CRIMINAL LAW 255 n. 34 (2d ed. 1995) (citing review of nearly 700 shootings).

²⁷² See Tucker Carlson, *Washington's Inept Police Force*, WALL ST. J., Nov. 3, 1993, at A19.

²⁷³ U.S. CONST. amend. III ("No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law").

²⁷⁴ See Morton J. Horwitz, *Is the Third Amendment Obsolete?*, 26 VALPARAISO U. L. REV. 209, 214 (1991) (stating the Third Amendment might have produced a constitutional bar to standing armies in peacetime if public antipathy toward standing armies had remained intense over time).

²⁷⁵ See *id.*

²⁷⁶ 3 JOSEPH STORY, COMMENTARIES ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES 747-48 (1833) (emphasis added).

²⁷⁷ For a well-written local history of this conflict, see HENRY BLACKMAN PLUMB, HISTORY OF HANOVER TOWNSHIP 121-140 (1885).

²⁷⁸ See *id.*

²⁷⁹ See *id.* at 125-26.

²⁸⁰ See *id.* at 130.

²⁸¹ See *id.* at 138 (adding that those convicted "were allowed easily to escape, and no fines were ever attempted to be collected").

²⁸² See, e.g., JAMES BOVARD, FREEDOM IN CHAINS: THE RISE OF THE STATE AND THE DEMISE OF THE CITIZEN (1999) (presenting a thesis in line with the title); JAMES BOVARD, LOST RIGHTS: THE DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN LIBERTY (1994) (detailing America's loss of freedom).

²⁸³ See *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting) (saying the right to be let alone is "the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized man.").

²⁸⁴ C.f. Stephen D. Mastrofski, et al., *The Helping Hand of the Law: Police Control of Citizens on Request*, 38 CRIMINOLOGY 307 (2000) (detailing study finding officers are likely to use their power to control citizens at mere request of other citizens).

²⁸⁵ U.S. CONST. amend. IV.

²⁸⁶ See, e.g., Maryland Minority, *Address to the People of Maryland*, Maryland Gazette, May 6, 1788, reprinted in THE ORIGIN OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT, *supra* note 89, at 356, 358 (stating that an amendment protecting people from unreasonable search and seizure was considered indispensable by many who opposed the Constitution).

²⁸⁷ See, e.g., AKHIL R. AMAR, THE CONSTITUTION AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE: FIRST PRINCIPLES 1-45 (1997). Amar argues that the Amendment lays down only a few "first principles" — namely "that all searches and seizures must be reasonable, that warrants (and only warrants) always require probable cause, and that the officialdom should be held liable for unreasonable searches and seizures." *Id.* at 1.

²⁸⁸ See, e.g., Richard A. Posner, *Rethinking the Fourth Amendment*, 1981 SUP. CT. REV. 49 (arguing that the Fourth Amendment should not provide a guilty criminal with any right to avoid punishment).

²⁸⁹ See AMAR, *supra* note 287, at 3-17 (arguing the Framers intended no warrant requirement).

²⁹⁰ See *id.*

²⁹¹ See *California v. Acevedo*, 500 U.S. 565, 581 (1991) (Scalia, J., concurring) (referencing Amar's claims for support). Ten years earlier, in *Robbins v. California*, 453 U.S. 420 (1981), Justice Rehnquist cited a 1969 book by Professor Telfred Taylor — Amar's predecessor in the argument that the Fourth Amendment's text requires only an ad hoc test of reasonableness — for the same proposition. *Id.* at 437 (Rehnquist, J., dissenting).

²⁹² See, e.g., *Hulit v. State*, 982 S.W.2d 431, 436 (Tex. Crim. App. 1998) (citing Amar for proposition that Fourth Amendment requires no warrants).

²⁹³ See, e.g., Max Boot, *Out of Order: Arrogance, Corruption, and Incompetence on the Bench* 66 (1998) (reciting the Amar/Taylor thesis without reservation).

²⁹⁴ Since the addition of Justice Rehnquist to the Supreme Court, the Court has traveled far down the road toward ejecting the warrant requirement. See generally *Wasserstrom*, *supra* note 70. The Court has increasingly tended to adopt a mere balancing test, pitting the citizen's "Fourth Amendment interests" (rather than his "rights") against "legitimate governmental interests." See, e.g., *Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648, 654 (1979).

²⁹⁵ In *United States v. Chadwick*, 433 U.S. 1, 6 (1977), the United States Justice Department mounted a "frontal attack" on the warrant requirement and argued that the warrant clause of the Fourth Amendment protected only "interests traditionally identified with the home." Accordingly, the Justice Department would have eliminated warrants in every other setting.

²⁹⁶ Compare *Howard v. Lyon*, 1 Root 107 (Conn. 1787) (involving constable who obtained "escape warrant" to recapture an escaped prisoner and even had the warrant "renewed" in Rhode Island where prisoner fled), and *Bromley v. Hutchins*, 8 Vt. 68 (1836) (upholding damages against a deputy sheriff who arrested an escapee without warrant outside the deputy's jurisdiction), with *United States v. Watson*, 423 U.S. 411 (1976) (allowing warrantless arrest of most suspects in public so long as probable cause exists).

²⁹⁷ See Morgan Cloud, *Searching through History; Searching for History*, 63 U. CHI. L. REV. 1707, 1713 (1996) (citing the exhaustive research of William Cuddihy for the proposition that specific warrants were required at Founding).

²⁹⁸ AMAR, *supra* note 287, at 5.

²⁹⁹ 1 Conn. 40 (1814).

³⁰⁰ See *id.* at 44.

³⁰¹ 3 Day 1, 3 (Conn. 1807).

³⁰² 1761-1772 Quincy Mass. Reports (1763). Perhaps Amar's statement can be read as a commentary on the dearth of originalist scholarship among those who support strong protections for criminal suspects and defendants. "Originalism" as a means of constitutional interpretation is not always definable in a single way, and "originalists" may often contradict each other as to their interpretation of given cases. See Richard S. Kay, *"Originalist" Values and Constitutional Interpretation*, 19 HARV. J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 335 (1995). Professor Kay has identified four distinct interpretive methods as being "originalist" — any two of which might produce differing conclusions: 1) original text, 2) original intentions, 3) original understanding, and 4) original values. See *id.* at 336. This being conceded, originalism has generally been the domain of "conservative" jurists for the past generation, fueled by reactions to the methods of adjudication employed by the Warren Court. See *id.* at 335.

³⁰³ 9 N.H. 239 (1838).

³⁰⁴ 3 Bin. 38, 43 (Pa. 1810).

³⁰⁵ Admittedly, two of Amar's cited cases present troubling statements of the law. The rule of Amar's first case, *Jones v. Root*, 72 Mass. 435 (1856), is somewhat difficult to discern. Although the case may be read as a total rejection of required warrants (as Amar contends, *supra* note 287, at 4-5 n.10), it may also be read as an adoption of the "in the presence" exception to the warrant requirement known to the common law. The court's opinion is no more than a paragraph long and merely upholds the instruction of a lower court that a statute allowing warrantless seizure of liquors was constitutional. *Jones*, 72 Mass. at 439. The opinion also upheld the use of an illustration by the trial judge that suggested the seizure was similar to a seizure of stolen goods observed *in the presence* of an officer. *See id.* at 437.

A second case may also be read to mean that the government may search and seize without warrant, but might also be read as enunciating the "breach of peace" exception to the warrant requirement. *Mayo v. Wilson*, 1 N.H. 53 (1817) involved a town tythingman who seized a wagon and horses of an apparent teamster engaged in commercial delivery on the Sabbath, in violation of a New Hampshire statute. Amar quotes *Mayo's* pronouncement that the New Hampshire Fourth-Amendment equivalent "does not seem intended to restrain the legislature ..." But elsewhere in the opinion, the New Hampshire Supreme Court stated that an arrest *required* a "warrant in law" — either a magistrate's warrant, or excusal by the commission of a felony or breach of peace. *Mayo*, 1 N.H. at 56. "[B]ut if the affray be over, there *must be an express warrant.*" *Id.* (emphasis added). Not much support for Amar's thesis there.

Mayo was decided only fourteen years after the dawn of judicial review in *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), during an era when the constitutional interpretations of legislatures were thought to have equal weight to the interpretations of the judiciary. *Cf.* HENRY J. ABRAHAM, *THE JUDICIAL PROCESS* 335-40 (7th ed. 1998) (describing the slow advent of the concept of judicial review). Indeed, the first act of a state legislature to be declared unconstitutional came only seven years earlier, *see Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810), and the first state court decision invalidated by the Supreme Court had come only one year earlier. *See Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*, 14 U.S. 304 (1816). The very heart of the *Mayo* decision that Amar relies on (the proposition that state legislatures have concurrent power of constitutional review with the judiciary) was so thoroughly discredited soon afterward that Amar's extrapolation that Founding era courts did not require warrants seems exceedingly far-fetched.

As judicial review gathered sanction, the doctrine apparently enunciated in *Mayo* became increasingly discredited. *See Ex Parte Rhodes*, 79 So. 462 (Ala. 1918) (saying "[t]here is not to be found a single authority, decision, or textbook, in the library of this court, that sanctions the doctrine that the legislature, a municipality, or Congress can determine what is a 'reasonable' arrest").

³⁰⁶ Amar cites six cases (all referred to in *United States v. Watson*, 423 U.S. 411 (1976)), as standing for the proposition that state Fourth Amendment equivalents did not presume a warrant requirement. AMAR, *supra* note 287, at 5 n. 11. The first case, *State v. Brown*, 5 Del. (5 Harr.) 505 (Ct. Gen. Sess. 1853), is difficult to reconcile with Amar's thesis that antebellum courts recognized no warrant requirement. *Brown* upheld a *criminal* verdict against a night watchman who entered a residence in pursuit of a fleeing chicken thief and instead falsely arrested — without warrant — the proprietor. The second case cited by Amar, *Johnson v. State*, 30 Ga. 426 (1860), simply upheld a guilty verdict against a man who shot a policeman during a warrantless arrest for being an accomplice to a felony. The Georgia Supreme Court repeated the common law exception allowing that an officer may arrest felons without warrant. The third case, *Baltimore & O. R.R. Co. v. Cain*, 81 Md. 87, 31 A. 801 (1895), merely reversed a civil jury verdict for an arrestee on grounds that the appellant railroad company was entitled to a jury instruction allowing for a breach-of-peace exception to the warrant requirement. The fourth case, *Reuck v. McGregor*, 32 N.J.L. 70 (Sup. Ct. 1866), reversed a civil verdict on

grounds of excessive damages — while *upholding civil liability* for causing warrantless arrest of an apparently wrongly-accused thief. *Holley v. Mix*, 3 Wend. 350 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1829), Amar's fifth case, offers little support for Amar's thesis. *Holley* upheld a civil judgment against a private person and an officer who arrested a suspect pursuant to an invalid warrant. Finally, *Wade v. Chaffee*, 8 R.I. 224 (1865), simply held that a constable was not bound to procure a warrant where he had probable cause to believe an arrestee was guilty of a felony, even though no fear of escape was present.

³⁰⁷ Amar cites four cases as standing for the proposition that state courts interpreted their state constitutional predecessors of the Fourth Amendment's text as requiring no warrants for searches or seizures. AMAR, *supra* note 287, at 5 n.10. *Jones v. Root*, 72 Mass. (6 Gray) 435 (1856), upheld a Massachusetts "no-warrant" statute in a one-paragraph opinion explained *supra* note 306. In *Rohan v. Sawin*, 59 Mass. (5 Cush.) 281 (1850), Massachusetts' highest court found that a warrantless arrest qualified under the "felon" exception to the warrant requirement. *Mayo v. Wilson*, 1 N.H. 53 (1817), is described *supra* note 306.

Finally, the 1814 Pennsylvania case of *Wakely v. Hart*, 6 Binn. 316 (Pa. 1814), resolved a civil suit brought by an accused thief (Wakely) against his arresters upon grounds that the arrest had been warrantless and Wakely had been guilty only of a misdemeanor. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court upheld a jury's verdict for the arresters, upon the rather-fudged finding that Wakely had fled from the charges against him and had been guilty of at least "an offence which approaches very near to a felony," if not an actual felony. *Wakely*, 6 Binn. at 319-20.

³⁰⁸ See Eric Schnapper, *Unreasonable Searches and Seizures of Papers*, 71 VA. L. REV. 869, 874 (1985) (saying the search and seizure clause of the Fourth Amendment "embodies requirements independent of the warrant clause" but which were more strict at Founding than warrant requirement).

³⁰⁹ See *Wilkes v. Wood*, 19 Howell's State Trials 1153, 1167 (c.p. 1763) (stating "a jury have it in their power to give damages for more than the injury received").

³¹⁰ See Schnapper, *supra* note 308, at 917 (referring to *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616 (1886)). *Boyd's* proposition was slowly watered down and distinguished until the case of *Andresen v. Maryland* finished it off. *Andresen v. Maryland*, 427 U.S. 463 (1976) (holding that business documents evidencing fraudulent real estate dealings could be constitutionally seized by warrant).

³¹¹ See *Gouled v. United States*, 255 U.S. 298 (1921) (pronouncing "mere evidence" rule, which stood for more than 45 years).

³¹² See Schnapper, *supra* note 308, at 923-29.

³¹³ See *Warden v. Hayden*, 387 U.S. 294 (1967) (holding that police can obtain even indirect evidence by use of search warrants). *Hayden* overturned at least five previous Supreme Court decisions by declaring that "privacy" rather than property was the "principle object of the Fourth Amendment." *Id.* at 296 n.1, 304.

³¹⁴ See *Frisbie v. Butler*, 1 Kirby 213 (Conn. 1787).

³¹⁵ See, e.g., *Stevens v. Fassett*, 27 Me. 266 (1847) (involving defendant who had obtained two arrest warrants against plaintiff without officer assistance); *State v. McAllister*, 25 Me. 490 (1845) (involving crime victim who swore out warrant affidavit against alleged assailant); *State v. J.H.*, 1 Tyl. 444 (Vt. 1802) (quashing criminal charge gained by unsworn complaint of private individual).

³¹⁶ See *Humes v. Taber*, 1 RI. 464 (1850) (involving search by sheriff accompanied by private persons).

³¹⁷ See *Kimball v. Munson*, 2 Kirby (Conn.) 3 (1786) (upholding civil damages against two men who arrested suspect without warrant to obtain reward).

³¹⁸ See *Wasserstrom*, *supra* note 70, at 289.

³¹⁹ The Framers regarded private persons acting under color of "public authority" to be subject to constitutional constraints like the proscription against double jeopardy..See *Stevens v. Fassett*, 27 Me. 266 (1847) (holding private prosecutors were prohibited from twice putting a defendant in jeopardy for the same offense).

³²⁰ 256 U.S. 465 (1921).

³²¹ *Burdeau v. McDowell* involved a corporate official (McDowell) who was fired by his employer for financial malfeasance at work. After McDowell's termination, company representatives raided his office, opened his safe, and rifled through his papers. See *id.* at 473. Upon finding incriminating evidence against McDowell, company representatives alerted the United States Justice Department and turned over certain papers to the government. A district judge ordered the stolen papers returned to McDowell before they could be seen by a grand jury. The Supreme Court reversed, stating the Fourth Amendment "was intended as a restraint upon the activities of sovereign authority, and was not intended to be a limitation upon other than governmental agencies." *Id.* at 475.

³²² See *Cloud*, *supra* note 297, at 1716 (discussing transition during early 1700s from concept that 'a man's house is his castle (except against the government)' to the legal adage that 'a man's house is his castle (especially against the government)').

³²³ Massachusetts and Vermont apparently required that only public officers execute search warrants in the early nineteenth century. See *Commonwealth v. Foster*, 1 Mass. 488 (1805) (holding justice of peace had no authority to issue a warrant to a private person to arrest a criminal suspect); *State v. J.H.*, 1 Tyl. 444 (Vt. 1802).

³²⁴ See *Bissell v. Bissell*, 3 N.H. 520 (1826).

³²⁵ See *Kimball v. Munson*, which upheld civil damages against two men who arrested an alleged horse thief without warrant in response to a constable's reward offer. 2 Kirby 3 (Conn. 1786). Kimball suggested the two private persons would have been protected from liability had they secured a warrant soon after their arrest of the suspect. See also *Frisbie v. Butler*, 1 Kirby 213 (Conn. 1787) (applying specificity requirement to search warrant issued to private person).

³²⁶ See *Del Col v. Arnold*, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 333 (1796) (holding that "privateers" on the open seas who capture illegal vessels under the auspices of government authority act at their own peril and may be held liable for all damages to the captured vessels — even where the captured vessels are engaged in crimes on the high seas).

³²⁷ See *Humes v. Taber*, 1 R.I. 464 (1850)

³²⁸ See *Melvin v. Fisher*, 8 N.H. 406, 407 (1836) (saying "he who causes another to be arrested by a wrong name is a trespasser, even if the process was intended to be against the person actually arrested).

³²⁹ See *Holley v. Mix*, 3 Wend. 350 (N.Y. 1829).

³³⁰ See *Kimball v. Munson*, 2 Kirby 3 (Conn. 1786) (faulting two arrestors for failing to obtain a proper warrant immediately after their warrantless arrest of a suspected felon); *Knot v. Gay*, 1 Root 66, 67 (Conn. 1774) (stating warrantless arrest is permitted "where an highhanded offense had been committed, and an immediate arrest became necessary, to prevent an escape").

- ³³¹ See *Wade v. Chaffee*, 8 R.I. 224 (R.I. 1865) (holding a constable is not bound to procure a warrant before arresting a felon even though there may be no reason to fear the escape of the felon).
- ³³² See, e.g., *Oleson v. Pincock*, 251 P. 23, 25 (Utah 1926); *Burroughs v. Eastman*, 59 N.W. 817 (Mich. 1894); *Minnesota v. Cantieny*, 24 N.W. 458 (Minn. 1885); William A. Schroeder, *Warrantless Misdemeanor Arrests and the Fourth Amendment*, 58 Mo. L. REV. 790-91 (1993).
- ³³³ See Schroeder, *supra* note 101, at 784 n.14-16 (listing eight jurisdictions allowing such arrests).
- ³³⁴ *But see id.* at 791 n.39 (listing four cases that have held warrantless arrests for crimes committed outside an officer's presence unconstitutional).
- ³³⁵ See *id.* at 779-81 n.13 (providing two pages of statutory provisions allowing warrantless arrest for domestic violence and other specific misdemeanors).
- ³³⁶ See *Welsh v. Wisconsin*, 466 U.S. 740 (1984) (requiring warrant to forcibly enter a home to arrest someone inside for a misdemeanor traffic offense); *Payton v. New York*, 445 U.S. 573, 589 (1980) (requiring warrant to forcibly enter a home to arrest a suspected felon unless exigent circumstances prevail).
- ³³⁷ See *United States v. Watson*, 423 U.S. 411, 412 (1976). *Watson* represents one of the starkest redrawings of search and seizure law ever pronounced by the Supreme Court. Essentially, the Court declared that officers may arrest without warrant wherever they have probable cause. Justice Thurgood Marshall released a blistering dissent accusing the majority of betraying the "the only clear lesson of history" that the common law "considered the arrest warrant far more important than today's decision leaves it." *Id.* at 442 (Marshall, J., dissenting).
- ³³⁸ *United States v. Hensley*, 469 U.S. 221, 229 (1985).
- ³³⁹ See *Conner v. Commonwealth*, 3 Bin. 38, 42-43 (Pa. 1810) (insisting that public safety alone justifies exceptions to the warrant requirement).
- ³⁴⁰ See *Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1, 14 (1985). The number of crimes considered felonies varied greatly according to location and period. Plymouth Colony knew only seven in 1636: treason, willful murder, willful arson, conversing with the devil, rape, adultery, and sodomy. See Julius Goebel, Jr., *King's Law and Local Custom in Seventeenth Century New England*, 31 COLUM. L. REV. 416, n.43 (1931). In general, the American colonists considered far fewer crimes to be felonies than did the people of England. *C.f.* Thorp L. Wolford, *The Laws and Liberties of 1648*, reprinted in *ESSAYS IN THE HISTORY OF EARLY AMERICAN LAW* 147, 182 (David H. Flaherty, ed. 1969) (saying there were far more felonies in English than in Massachusetts law).
- ³⁴¹ JOSHUA DRESSLER, *UNDERSTANDING CRIMINAL LAW* 253 (2d ed. 1995).
- ³⁴² *United States v. Rabinowitz*, 339 U.S. 56, 70 (1950) (Frankfurter, J. dissenting).
- ³⁴³ See *United States v. Watson*, 423 U.S. 411, 439-440 (1976).
- ³⁴⁴ *But see id.* at 438 (Marshall, J., dissenting) ("[T]he fact is that a felony at common law and a felony today bear only slight resemblance, with the result that the relevance of the common-law rule of arrest to the modern interpretation of our Constitution is minimal").
- ³⁴⁵ See WAYNE R. LAFAVE & JEROLD H. ISRAEL, *CRIMINAL PROCEDURE* 20 (2d ed. 1992).

³⁴⁶ See AMAR, *supra* note 287, at 44. The remedial suggestions proposed by Amar (strict liability tort remedies, class actions, attorneys' fees, statutorily-generated punitive damages, and injunctive relief) are, if anything, less loyal to originalist ideals than the warrant requirement he criticizes. See Carol S. Steiker, *Second Thoughts About First Principles*, 107 HARV. L. REV. 820, 828 (1994) (suggesting Amar's departures from the Framers' intent regarding remedies belie his proclaimed adherence to the Framers' "vision" regarding warrants, probable cause and the exclusionary rule).

³⁴⁷ See AMAR, *supra* note 287, at 44 n. 226 (saying the "government should generally not prevail" in Amar's type of ideal tort actions).

³⁴⁸ See AMAR *supra* note 287, at 12.

³⁴⁹ See Wasserstrom, *supra* note 70, at 289 (saying false arrest was subject to strict liability in colonial times).

³⁵⁰ See *Holley v. Mix*, 3 Wend. 350, 354 (N.Y. 1829) (stating if any person charge another with felony, the charge will justify an officer taking the suspect in custody, but the person making the charge will be liable for false arrest if no felony was committed).

³⁵¹ See *Clarke v. Little*, 1 Smith 100, 101 (N.H. 1805) (addressing liabilities of deputy to debtor's creditors).

³⁵² *Hall v. Brooks* 8 Vt. 485 (1836) (holding constable liable for refusing to serve court process).

³⁵³ See *Shewel v. Fell*, 3 Yeates 17, 22 (Pa. 1800) (holding sheriff liable to prisoner's creditor for entire debt of prison escapee).

³⁵⁴ See *Chapman v. Bellows*, 1 Smith 127 (N.H. 1805).

³⁵⁵ See *Morse v. Betton*, 2 N.H. 184, 185 (1820).

³⁵⁶ See *Lamb v. Day*, 8 Vt. 407 (1836) (holding constable liable for allowing mare in his custody to be used); *Bissell v. Huntington*, 2 N.H. 142, 146-47 (1819).

³⁵⁷ See *Webster v. Quimby*, 8 N.H. 382, 386 (1836).

³⁵⁸ See *Administrator of Janes v. Martin*, 7 Vt. 92 (Vt. 1835).

³⁵⁹ See *Kittredge v. Bellows*, 7 N.H. 399 (1835).

³⁶⁰ See *Herrick v. Manly*, 1 Cai. R. 253 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1803).

³⁶¹ See *Bromley v. Hutchins*, 8 Vt. 194, 196 (Vt. 1836).

³⁶² See *Hazard v. Israel*, 1 Binn. 240 (Pa. 1808).

³⁶³ See *Fullerton v. Mack*, 2 Aik. 415 (1828).

³⁶⁴ See *Rex v. Gay*, Quincy, Mass. Rep. 1761-1772 (1763) (acquitting defendant who battered sheriff when sheriff attempted arrest with warrant irregular on its face).

³⁶⁵ See *Percival v. Jones*, 2 Johns. Cas. 49, 51 (N.Y. 1800) (holding justice of peace liable for issuing arrest execution against person privileged from imprisonment).

³⁶⁶ See *id.*

³⁶⁷ See *Preston v. Yates*, 24 N.Y. 534 (1881) (involving sheriff who obtained indemnity bond from private party).

³⁶⁸ See *Grinnell v. Phillips*, 1 Mass. 530, 537 (1805) (involving Massachusetts statute requiring officers to be bonded).

³⁶⁹ See *Tilley v. Cottrell*, 43 A. 369 (R.I. 1899) (holding constable liable for damages against him for which his indemnity bond did not cover).

³⁷⁰ *C.f.* *White v. French*, 81 Mass. 339 (1860) (involving officer arrested when his obligor failed to pay for officer's liability); *Treasurer of the State v. Holmes*, 2 Aik. 48 (Vt. 1826) (involving sheriff jailed for debt in Franklin County, Vermont).

³⁷¹ At the time of Founding, juries remedied improper searches and seizures by levying heavy damages from officers who conducted them. See AMAR, *supra* note 287, at 12. The ratification debates made it clear that no method of curbing "the insolence of office" worked as well as juries giving "ruinous damages whenever an officer has deviated from the rigid letter of the law, or been guilty of any unnecessary act of insolence or oppression." Maryland Farmer, *Essays by a Farmer* (1), reprinted in THE COMPLETE ANTI-FEDERALIST 5, 14 (Herbert J. Storing ed., 1981). Punitive damages were apparently common in search and seizure trespass cases, and provided "an invaluable maxim" for securing proper and reasonable conduct by public officers. Today, however, municipalities never have to pay out punitive damages. See *Newport v. Fact Concerts, Inc.*, 453 U.S. 247, 271 (1981).

³⁷² See *Johnson v. Georgia*, 30 Ga. 426 (1860) (holding that a policeman is as much under protection of the law as any public officer).

³⁷³ Many Founding-Era constitutions contained statements declaring a right of remedy for every person. See, e.g., DEL. CONST. of 1776, § 12 (providing that "every freeman for every injury done him in his goods, lands or person, by any other person, ought to have remedy by the course of the law of the land"); MASS. CONST. of 1780, art. I, § XI (providing "Every subject of the commonwealth ought to find a certain remedy, by having recourse to the laws, for all injuries or wrongs"); N.H. CONST. of 1784, part I, § XIV (stating "Every subject of this state is entitled to a certain remedy"). Some early proposals for the national Bill of Rights also included such remedy provisions. See, e.g., Proposed Amended Federal Constitution, April 30, 1788, reprinted in THE ORIGIN OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT: A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS 1787-1792 790, 791 (David E. Young, ed.) (2d ed. 1995) (providing that "every individual... ought to find a certain remedy against all injuries, or wrongs").

³⁷⁴ *C.f.* THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE para. 11 (U.S. 1776) ("He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance").

³⁷⁵ A small history lesson regarding the early development of officer immunity is provided in *Seaman v. Patten*, 2 Cai. R. 312 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1805). Early tax and custom enforcement agents were unsworn volunteers, having "generally received a portion of the spoil." *Id.* at 315. Corresponding to this system, such agents acted at their own peril and were civilly liable for their every impropriety. This "hard rule" of high officer liability was still in

force a generation after the Constitution was ratified, although courts began to hold officers less accountable for their mistakes when officers became sworn to perform certain ever-more-difficult duties. *See id.*

³⁷⁶ *See Seaman*, 2 Cai. R. at 317; *Bissell v. Huntington*, 2 N.H. 142, 147 (1819) (declaring that sheriffs good faith acts should receive "most favourable construction."). "[N]either the court, the bar, nor the public should favor prosecutions against them for petty mistakes." *Id.* at 147.

³⁷⁷ *See Diana Hassel, Living a Lie; The Cost of Qualified Immunity*, 64 Mo. L. REV. 123, 151 n. 122.

³⁷⁸ *State v. Dunning*, 98 S.E. 530, 531 (N.C. 1919).

³⁷⁹ *See, e.g., Stinnett v. Commonwealth*, 55 F.2d 644, 647 (4th Cir. 1932) (reversing jury verdict against officer on grounds that "courts should not lay down rules which will make it so dangerous for officers to perform their duties that they will shrink and hesitate from action"); *State v. Dunning*, 98 S.E. 530 (N.C. 1919) (reversing criminal verdict against officer who shot approaching man on grounds that the officer enjoyed a privilege to use deadly force instead of retreating).

³⁸⁰ The Supreme Court's recent jurisprudence has offered a more relaxed definition of "probable cause" as a "fluid concept" of "suspicion" rather than a fixed standard of probability. *See Wasserstrom, supra* note 70, at 337 (analyzing Justice Rehnquist's opinion in *Illinois v. Gates*).

³⁸¹ *See Grau v. United States*, 287 U.S. 124, 128 (1932), *overturned by Brinegar v. United States*, 338 U.S. 160 (1949).

³⁸² *Wasserstrom, supra* note 70, at 274.

³⁸³ *See AMAR, supra* note 287, at 20. Judges of the Founding era appear to have been somewhat more reluctant than modern judges to issue search and seizure warrants. For an early example of judicial scrutiny of warrant applications, see *United States v. Lawrence*, 3 U.S. 42 (1795) (upholding refusal of district judge to issue warrant for arrest of French deserter in the face of what government claimed was probable cause). Today, search warrant applications are rarely denied. The "secret wiretap court" established by Congress to process wiretap applications in 1978, has rejected only one wiretap request in its 22-year life. *See Richard Willing, Wiretaps sought in record numbers*, USA TODAY, June 5, 2000, at A1 (saying the court approved 13,600 wiretap requests in the same period).

³⁸⁴ Private persons were liable if, for example, their complaint was too vague as to the address to be searched, *see Humes v. Taber*, 1 R.I. 464 (1850); misspelled the name of the accused, *see Melvin v. Fisher*, 8 N.H. 406, 407 (1836) (saying "he who causes another to be arrested by a wrong name is a trespasser, even if the process was intended to be against the person actually arrested); or called for the execution of a warrant naming a "John Doe" as a target, *see Holley v. Mix*, 3 Wend. 350 (N.Y. 1829).

³⁸⁵ *See Hervey v. Estes*, 65 F.3d 784 (9th Cir. 1995) (involving challenge to search warrant wrongfully obtained through false references to anonymous sources).

³⁸⁶ *See Hummel-Jones v. Strobe*, 25 F.3d 647 (8th Cir. 1994) (involving police officer's failure to disclose to judge that an undercover deputy sheriff was the "confidential informant" referred to in a search warrant application).

³⁸⁷ See David B. Kopel & Paul H. Blackman, *The Unwarranted Warrant: The Waco Search Warrant and the Decline of the Fourth Amendment*, 18 HAMLINE J. PUB. L & POL'Y 1, 13 (saying Waco warrant was filled with statements irrelevant to Koresh's alleged firearm violations).

³⁸⁸ See *id.* at 21 (noting ATF agent's false claims that various spare parts were machine gun conversion kits).

³⁸⁹ See ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ, *THE ABUSE EXCUSE AND OTHER COP-OUTS, SOB STORIES, AND EVASIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY* 235 (1994).

³⁹⁰ *Id.* at 233.

³⁹¹ The 1920's saw an explosion of police privilege to oversee two separate — but often interrelated — elements of American life: Prohibition and the automobile. See FRIEDMAN, *supra* note 58, at 300 (saying search and seizure became a particularly salient issue during Prohibition). In 1925, the Supreme Court, by split decision, released an opinion that would grow within the next 75 years into an immense expansion of police prerogatives while at the same time representing an enormous loss of personal security for American automobile travelers. *Carroll v. United States* upheld a warrantless search of an automobile for liquor as valid under the infamous Volstead Act, enacted to breathe life into the Eighteenth Amendment. 267 U.S. 137 (1925). The Carroll opinion led lower courts to more than one interpretation, see Francis H. Bohlen & Harry Shulman, *Arrest With and Without a Warrant*, 75 U. Pa. L. Rev. 485, 488-89 (1927), but slowly became recognized as a pronouncement of an "automobile exception" to the warrant requirement. See *United States v. Ross*, 456 U.S. 798, 822 (1982).

Two decades after *Carroll*, Justice Robert H. Jackson tried in earnest to force the genie back into the bottle by narrowing the automobile exception to cases of serious crimes, but a 7-2 majority outnumbered him. See *Brinegar v. United States*, 338 U.S. 160, 180-81 (1949) (Jackson, J., dissenting). Since *Brinegar*, the "automobile exception" has been a fixture of Fourth Amendment jurisprudence, and has greatly expanded. The automobile exception now accounts for the broadest umbrella of warrant exceptions. See, e.g., *California v. Acevedo*, 500 U.S. 565 (1991) (allowing warrantless search of containers in automobiles even without probable cause to search the vehicle as a whole). Indeed, the automobile exception has expanded so far that it has made a mockery of Fourth Amendment doctrine. As Justice Scalia pointed out in his *Acevedo* concurrence, an anomaly now exists protecting a briefcase carried on the sidewalk from warrantless search but allowing the same briefcase to be searched without warrant if taken into a car. *Acevedo* at 581 (Scalia, J., concurring).

³⁹² Police surveillance of American roadways has brought the bar of justice far closer to most Americans than ever before. Few accounts of the sheer scale of traffic stops are available, but anecdotal evidence suggests traffic encounters with police number in the hundreds of millions annually. In North Carolina alone, more than 1.2 million traffic infractions were recorded in a single year. See FRIEDMAN, *supra* note 58, at 279. Of actual traffic stops, no reliable estimate can be made.

³⁹³ See SKOLNICK & FYFE, *supra* note 63, at 99.

³⁹⁴ In *Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648 (1979), the Supreme Court actually considered, but stopped short of, allowing cops to randomly stop any traveler without any particularized reason — with one justice (Rehnquist) arguing that cops may do so. *Prouse*, 440 U.S. at 664 (Rehnquist, J., dissenting).

³⁹⁵ See *Flanders v. Herbert*, 1 Smith (N.H.) 205 (1808) (finding constable who stopped a driver and horse team pursuant to an invalid writ of attachment liable for trespass). Private tort principles rather than state licensing programs governed highway travel at the time of the Framers. See *Kennard v. Burton*, 25 Me. 39 (1845).

³⁹⁶ See David Rudovsky, *The Criminal Justice System and the Role of the Police*, in *THE POLITICS OF LAW: A PROGRESSIVE CRITIQUE*, 242, 247 (David Kairys, ed. 1982).

³⁹⁷ *Id.*

³⁹⁸ Prior to the imposition of the exclusionary rule in *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961), the Cincinnati police force rarely applied for search warrants. In 1958, the police obtained three warrants. In 1959 the police obtained none. See Bradley C. Canon, *Is the Exclusionary Rule in Failing Health?: Some New Data and a Plea Against a Precipitous Conclusion*, 62 KENTUCKY L. J. 681, 709 (1974). Similarly, the use of search warrants by the New York City Police Department prior to *Mapp* was negligible, but afterward, over 5000 warrants were issued. See Wasserstrom, *supra* note 70, at 297 n. 203.

³⁹⁹ *Brinegar v. United States*, 338 U.S. 160, 181 (1949) (Jackson, J., dissenting) (expressing belief that many unlawful searches are never revealed because no evidence is recovered).

⁴⁰⁰ See *Weeks v. United States*, 232 U.S. 383 (1914).

⁴⁰¹ 367 U.S. 643 (1961).

⁴⁰² 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

⁴⁰³ See AMAR, *supra* note 287, at 21 (claiming "[s]upporters of the exclusionary rule cannot point to a single major statement from the Founding — or even the antebellum or Reconstruction eras — supporting Fourth Amendment exclusion of evidence in a criminal trial").

⁴⁰⁴ See BURTON S. KATZ, *JUSTICE OVERRULED: UNMASKING THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM* 43 (1997) (saying in two consecutive sentences that "[t]he exclusionary rule has failed in its only goal" but that "[t]he cost... is almost unbelievably high").

⁴⁰⁵ See, e.g., *id.* at 43 (saying *Mapp* was the "culmination of an activist judicial trend").

⁴⁰⁶ Fred E. Inbau, *Public Safety v. Individual Civil Liberties: The Prosecutor's Stand*, 53 J. CRIM. L., CRIMINOLOGY & P. S. 85 (1962), reprinted in 89 J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY 1413, 1413 (1999) (emphasis added).

⁴⁰⁷ *Miranda v. State of Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 516 (1966) (Harlan, J., dissenting) (saying "the Court is taking a real risk with society's welfare in imposing its new regime on the country. The social costs of crime are too great to call the new rules anything but a hazardous experimentation.").

⁴⁰⁸ *Id.* at 542 (White, J., dissenting).

⁴⁰⁹ See J. Richard Johnston, *Plea Bargaining in Exchange for Testimony: Has Singleton Really Resolved the Issues?*, CRIMINAL JUSTICE, Fall 1999, at 32 (quoting from Ed Cray's biography of Earl Warren, *Chief Justice*).

⁴¹⁰ See *id.*

⁴¹¹ David Rudovsky, *The Criminal Justice System and the Role of the Police*, in *THE POLITICS OF LAW: A PROGRESSIVE CRITIQUE* 246 (David Kairys, ed. 1982).

⁴¹² Six years prior to the *Mapp* decision, the influential California Supreme Court justice Roger Traynor concluded that exclusion was necessary to level the playing field between state and citizen. "It is morally incongruous," wrote Traynor, "for the state to flout constitutional rights and at the same time demand that its citizens observe the law." *People v. Cahan*, 282 P.2d 905, 911 (Cal. 1955).

⁴¹³ See *Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388, 392 (1971).

⁴¹⁴ See *Illinois v. Krull*, 480 U.S. 340, 362 (1987) (O'Connor, J., dissenting) (saying the exclusionary rule is much more soundly based in history than is popularly thought).

⁴¹⁵ 232 U.S. 383 (1914).

⁴¹⁶ See, e.g., *Katz*, *supra* note 214, at 43 (saying there was no exclusionary rule for 123 years and "[t]here is a good reason for that.>").

⁴¹⁷ 116 U.S. 616 (1886).

⁴¹⁸ See *AMAR*, *supra* note 287, at 146 (explaining that the Supreme Court reported very few criminal cases of any kind until the end of the 1800's).

⁴¹⁹ In the course of researching other matters for this article, I stumbled across a small number of *pre-Boyd* cases appearing to stand for variations of the exclusionary rule. See *In re May*, 1 N.W. 1021 (Mich. 1879) (ordering release of prostitute arrested without warrant); *People v. Crocker*, 1 Mich. 31 (1869) (ordering discharge of defendant arrested by unsigned warrant); *Commonwealth v. Foster*, 1 Mass. 488 (1805) (overturning jury's guilty verdict where defendants were arrested pursuant to faulty arrest warrant); *State v. J.H.*, 1 Tyl. 444 (Vt. 1802) (ordering discharge of person arrested upon warrant where no clear evidence of complainant's oath appeared).

The earliest case I discovered to mention the question of exclusion was *Frisbie v. Butler*, 1 Kirby 213 (Conn. 1787), a case that preceded the Bill of Rights by four years. *Frisbie* found a warrant plainly illegal, but stated "yet, how far this vitiates the proceedings upon the arraignment, may be a question, which is not necessary now to determine." *Id.* at 215. While this case by no means applied the rule of exclusion, it quite clearly establishes that exclusion was a consideration in the minds of Founding-era judges.

And while the rules of the above cases are subject to interpretation, they at least stand for the proposition that an unlawful seizure, by itself, has an impact on a subsequent criminal prosecution. This rule is actually far more favorable to criminal defendants than modern Supreme Court allows. See *New York v. Harris*, 495 U.S. 14 (1990) (holding that police may detain a suspect even though they improperly arrested him); *Frisbie v. Collins*, 342 U.S. 519 (1952) (holding an invalid arrest is not a defense to the offense charged).

I cannot believe that my list of cases is in any way exhaustive. While I have not undertaken any systematic study of this matter, the cases I cite suggest to me that the exclusionary rule (or some remedial rule quite similar to the exclusionary rule) may have far stronger historical roots than it is credited with.

⁴²⁰ See Roger Roots, *If It's Not a Runaway, It's Not a Real Grand Jury*, 33 CREIGHTON L. REV. 821 (2000).

⁴²¹ See *id.*

⁴²² See U.S. CONST. amend. V (providing no person "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself").

⁴²³ See *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

⁴²⁴ See SKOLNICK & FYFE, *supra* note 63, at 61.

⁴²⁵ See *Dickerson v. United States*, 530 U.S. 428 (2000).

⁴²⁶ *Id.* at 435 n. 1.

⁴²⁷ See *id.* at 435.

⁴²⁸ *Id.* at 434 (Scalia, J., dissenting).

⁴²⁹ *C.f.* *Hayes v. Missouri*, 120 U.S. 68, 70 (1887) (recognizing that impartiality in criminal cases requires that "[b]etween [the accused] and the state the scales are to be evenly held"); *Unites States v. Singleton*, 165 F.3d 1297, 1314 (10th Cir. 1999) (Kelly, J., dissenting) (speaking of "the policy of ensuring a level playing field between the government and defendant in a criminal case").

⁴³⁰ See BOOZHIE, *supra* note 10, at 238.

⁴³¹ See *id.*

⁴³² G. Gordon Liddy points out in his 1980 autobiography *Will* that when the courts began requiring that the FBI provide defense attorneys with FBI reports on defendants, the FBI circumvented such orders by recording investigation notes on unofficial attachments which were never provided to the defense. See G. GORDON LIDDY, *WILL* 354 (1980).

⁴³³ See, e.g., *id.* at 216 (reporting 1996 St. Louis case in which police released arrest record of dead person whom police had killed to damage his reputation); *id.* at 238 (reporting 1998 New York case in which police released rap sheet of their victim but withheld identity of involved officers); *id.* at 240 (reporting case in which police revealed dead suspect was on parole and used his case to call for abolishing parole).

⁴³⁴ Perhaps the most extreme example of lopsided investigative resources occurred in the Oklahoma City bombing case in 1995. Defense attorneys complained that "the resources of every federal, state, and local agency in the United States" were at the government's disposal — including a 24-hour FBI command center with 400 telephones to coordinate evidence-gathering for the prosecution. See *Petition For Writ of Mandamus of Petitioner-Defendant, Timothy James McVeigh* at 13, *McVeigh v. Matsch* (No. 96-CR-68-M) (10th Cir. Mar. 25, 1997). In contrast, the defense complained that "without subpoena power, without the right to take depositions, and without access to national intelligence information, the McVeigh defense can go no further." *Id.* at 4.

⁴³⁵ See *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) (finding that suppression of evidence favorable to defense violates due process). Prosecutors are required by the *Brady* doctrine to reveal exculpatory evidence in their possession or in the possession of the investigating agency. See *United States v. Zuno-Arce*, 44 F3d 1420 (9th Cir. 1995). Only one federal court of appeals has held that prosecutors are imputed to hold knowledge of information "readily available" to them and require such knowledge to be transferred to the defense. See *Williams v. Whitley*, 940 F2d 132 (5th Cir. 1991). However, nothing in the law mandates that police look for exculpatory evidence.

⁴³⁶ See, e.g., *STOLEN LIVES*, *supra* note 123, at 248 (reporting 1997 New York City case in which officers closed off scene of shooting by police for a half an hour after the shooting). Upon being allowed to enter the

shooting scene, observers noticed that police had moved large kitchen table to the side of room to make police claim that victim (who had apparently been on other side of the table from officers) had lunged at them more plausible. *See id.*

⁴³⁷ *See* BOOZHIE, *supra* note 10, at 238.

⁴³⁸ Brewer v. Williams, 430 U.S. 387, 417 (1977) (Burger, J., dissenting).

⁴³⁹ BOOZHIE, *supra* note 10, at 238.

⁴⁴⁰ *See* PAUL MARCUS, THE ENTRAPMENT DEFENSE 3 (2d ed. 1995).

⁴⁴¹ *See id.* at 3-4.

⁴⁴² *See* Blaikie v. Linton, 18 Scot. Law Rep. 583 (1880).

⁴⁴³ *See* Regina v. Bickley, 2 Crim. App. R. 53, 73 J.P.R. 239 (C.A. 1909).

⁴⁴⁴ Brannan v. Peek, 2 All E.R. 572, 574 (Q.B. 1947).

⁴⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁴⁴⁶ 223 F. 412 (9th Cir. 1915).

⁴⁴⁷ Rivera v. State, 846 P.2d 1, 11 (Wyo. 1993).

⁴⁴⁸ SKOLNICK & FYFE, *supra* note 63, at 102 (quoting Paul Chevigny).

⁴⁴⁹ *See id.* *See also* STOLEN LIVES, *supra* note 123, at 302. Kevin McCoullough, who was suing the City of Chattanooga for unjust imprisonment, was shot dead by police at his workplace after he allegedly threw or ran at police with a metal object. McCoullough had predicted his own murder by police in statements to co-workers. *See id.*

⁴⁵⁰ *See id.* (citing President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice study).

⁴⁵¹ *See* FRIEDMAN, *supra* note 58, at 154 (citations omitted).

⁴⁵² JEFFREY REIMAN, THE RICH GET RICHER AND THE POOR GET PRISON: IDEOLOGY, CLASS, AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE 166 (5th ed. 1997).

⁴⁵³ *See* HERBERT MITGANG, DANGEROUS DOSSIERS (1988). The FBI kept a 207-page file on cartoonist Bill Mauldin, a 153-page file on book publisher Alfred A. Knopf, and a 23-page file on Lincoln biographer Carl Sandburg, for example. *See id.* at 249, 195, and 81.

⁴⁵⁴ The Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), the largest police organization in the United States, has over 270,000 members and has been named one of the most powerful lobbying groups in Washington. *See* National Fraternal Order of Police, *Press Release*, Sept. 17, 1997, available at <<http://www.mofop.org/power>>.

⁴⁵⁵ An example of the police lobby's power is its ability to scuttle asset forfeiture reform. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) managed to keep congressional leaders from attaching forfeiture reform

to budget legislation in 1999. *See* IACP, *End of Session Report for the 1st Session of 106th Congress: FY 2000 Funding Issues*, Jan. 17, 2000. *See also* Peter L. Davis, *Rodney King and the Decriminalization of Police Brutality in America*, 53 MD. L. REV. 271, 281 n.40 (1994). Police unions in many jurisdictions successfully thwart efforts to establish civilian review boards. *See id.* at 282.

⁴⁵⁶ *See* Richard Willing, *High Court Restricts Police Power to Frisk*, USA TODAY, Mar. 29, 2000, 4A.

Admiralty on Land!!

By James Montgomery

The Letter below is restored from a page that disappeared from the WEB

AMERICAN PEOPLE, YOU have the ability to understand the information in this letter. **YOU** have the ability to understand the present law and past law, the Constitution. That's right...I'm saying the Constitution is past tense, as a restrictive document on Congress. I do not make this statement lightly and I can prove it.

The Constitution was a commercial compact between states, giving the federal government limited powers. The Bill of Rights was meant not as our source of rights, but as further limitations on the federal government. Our fore-fathers saw the potential for danger in the U. S. Constitution. To insure the Constitution was not presumed to be our source of rights, the 10th Amendment was added. I will use a quote from Thomas Jefferson, February 15, 1791, where he quotes the 10th Amendment...

"I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground; that "all powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people." To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition."

The created United States government cannot define the rights of their creator, the American people. Three forms of law were granted to the Constitution, common law, equity (contract law) and Admiralty law. Each had their own jurisdiction and purpose. The first issue I want to cover is the United States flag. Obviously from known history our flag did not have a yellow fringe bordering three sides. The United States did not start putting flags with a yellow fringe on them in government buildings and public buildings until 1959. Of course the question you would ask yourself; why did it change and are there any legal meanings behind this? **Oh yes!**

First the appearance of our flag is defined in Title 4 sec. 1. U.S.C.

"The flag of the United States shall be thirteen horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; and the union of the flag shall be forty-eight stars, white in a blue field." (Note - of course when new states are admitted new stars are added.)

A foot note was added on page 1113 of the same section which says:

"Placing of fringe on the national flag, the dimensions of the flag, and arrangement of the stars are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but within the discretion of the President as Commander-In-Chief of the Army and Navy." - 1925, 34 Op.Atty.Gen. 483.

The president as military commander can add a yellow fringe to our flag. When would this be done? During a time of war. Why? A flag with a fringe is an ensign, a military flag. Read the following.

"Pursuant to U.S.C. Chapter 1, 2, and 3; Executive Order No. 10834, August 21, 1959, 24 F.R. 6865, a military flag is a flag that resembles the regular flag of the United States, except that it has a **YELLOW FRINGE**, bordered on three sides. The President of the United States designates this deviation from the regular flag, by executive order, and in his capacity as **COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF** of the Armed forces."

From the National Encyclopedia, Volume 4:

"Flag, an emblem of a nation; usually made of cloth and flown from a staff. From a military standpoint flags are of two general classes, those flown from stationary masts over army posts, and those carried by troops in formation. The former are referred to by the general name flags. The latter are called colors when carried by dismounted troops. Colors and Standards are more nearly square than flags and are made of silk with a knotted Fringe of Yellow on three sides.....use of the flag. The most general and appropriate use of the flag is as a symbol of authority and power."

The reason I started with the Flag issue is because it is so easy to grasp. The main problem I have with the yellow fringe is that by its use our Constitutional Republic is no more. Our system of law was changed without the public's knowledge. It was kept secret. This is fraud. The American people were allowed to believe this was just a decoration. Because the law changed from Common Law (God's Law) to Admiralty Law (the kings law) your status also changed from sovereign to subject. From being able to own property (allodial title) to not owning property (tenet on the land). If you think you own your property, stop paying taxes, it will be taken under the prize law.

"The ultimate ownership of all property is in the state; individual so-called `ownership' is only by virtue of government, i.e., law, amounting to a mere user; and use must be in accordance with law and subordinate to the necessities of the State." - Senate Document No. 43, "Contracts payable in Gold" written in 1933.

By our allowing these military flags to fly, the American people have admitted our defeat and loss of status. Read on, you'll see what I mean. Remember the Constitution recognizes three forms of law; being governed by the Law of the Flag is Admiralty law. I will cover this in a minute; the following is a definition of the legal term Law of the Flag.

"...The agency of the master is devolved upon him by the law of the flag. The same law that confers his authority ascertains its limits, and the flag at the mast-head is notice to all the world of the extent of such power to bind the owners or freighters by his act. The foreigner who deals with this agent has notice of that law, and, if he be bound by it, there is not injustice. His notice is the national flag which is hoisted on every sea and under which the master sails into every port, and every circumstance that connects him with the vessel isolates that vessel in the eyes of the world, and demonstrates his relation to the owners and freighters as their agent for a specific purpose and with power well defined under the national maritime law." - Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914.

Don't be thrown by the fact they are talking about the sea, and that it doesn't apply to land, I will prove to you that Admiralty law has come on land. Next a court case:

"Pursuant to the "Law of the Flag", a military flag does result in jurisdictional implication when flown. The Plaintiff cites the following: "Under what is called international law, the law of the flag, a ship-owner who sends his vessel into a foreign port gives notice by his flag to all who enter into contracts with the shipmaster that he intends the law of the flag to regulate those contracts with the shipmaster that he either submit to its operation or not contract with him or his agent at all." - Ruhstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41, 45, 185 ILL. 133, 49 LRA 181, 76 AM.

When you walk into a court and see this flag you are put on notice that you are in an Admiralty Court and that the king is in control. Also, if there is a king the people are no longer sovereign. You're probably saying this is the most incredible thing I have ever heard. YOU have read the proof; it will stand up in court. But wait, there is more, you probably would say, how could this happen? Here's how. Admiralty law is for the sea, maritime law governs contracts between parties that trade over the sea. Well, that's what our fore-fathers intended.

However, in 1845 Congress passed an act saying Admiralty law could come on land. The bill may be traced in Cong. Globe, 28th Cong., 2d. Sess. 43, 320, 328, 337, 345(1844-45), no opposition to the Act is reported. Congress held a committee on this subject in 1850 and they said:

"The committee also alluded to "the great force" of "the great constitutional question as to the power of Congress to extend maritime jurisdiction beyond the ground occupied by it at the adoption of the Constitution...." - Ibid. H.R. Rep. No. 72 31st Cong., 1st Sess. 2 (1850)

It was up to the Supreme Court to stop Congress and say NO! The Constitution did not give you that power, nor was it intended. But no, the courts began a long train of abuses; here are some excerpts from a few court cases.

"This power is as extensive upon land as upon water. The Constitution makes no distinction in that respect. And if the admiralty jurisdiction, in matters of contract and tort which the courts of the United States may lawfully exercise on the high seas, can be extended to the lakes under the power to regulate commerce, it can with the same propriety and upon the same construction, be extended to contracts and torts on land when the commerce is between different States. And it may embrace also the vehicles and persons engaged in carrying it on (my note - remember what the law of the flag said when you receive benefits from the king.) It would be in the power of Congress to confer admiralty jurisdiction upon its courts, over the cars engaged in transporting passengers or merchandise from one State to another, and over the persons engaged in conducting them, and deny to the parties the trial by jury. Now the judicial power in cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction has never been supposed to extend to contracts made on land and to be executed on land. But if the power of regulating commerce can be made the foundation of jurisdiction in its courts, and a new and extended admiralty jurisdiction beyond its heretofore known and admitted limits, may be created on water under that authority, the same reason would justify the same exercise of power on land." -- Propeller Genessee Chief et al. v. Fitzhugh et al. 12 How. 443 (U.S. 1851)

And all the way back, before the U.S. Constitution, John Adams talking about his state's Constitution, said:

"Next to revenue (taxes) itself, the late extensions of the jurisdiction of the admiralty are our greatest grievance. The American Courts of Admiralty seem to be forming by degrees into a system that is to overturn our Constitution and to deprive us of our best inheritance, the laws of the land. It would be thought in England a dangerous innovation if the trial, of any matter on land was given to the admiralty." -- Jackson v. Magnolia, 20 How. 296 315, 342 (U.S. 1852)

This began the most dangerous precedent of all the Insular Cases. This is where Congress took a boundless field of power. When legislating for the states, they are bound by the Constitution, when legislating for their insular possessions they are not restricted in any way by the Constitution. Read the following quote from the Harvard law review of AMERICAN INS. CO. v. 356 BALES OF COTTON, 26 U.S. 511, 546 (1828), relative to our insular possessions:

"These courts, then, are not constitutional courts in which the judicial power conferred by the Constitution on the general government can be deposited. They are incapable of receiving it. They are legislative courts, created in virtue of the general right of sovereignty which exists in the government, or in virtue of that clause which enables Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States. The jurisdiction with which they are invested is not a part of that judicial power which is conferred in the third article of the Constitution, but is conferred by Congress in the execution of those general powers which that body possesses over the territories of the United States." -- Harvard Law Review, Our New Possessions. page 481.

Here are some Court cases that make it even clearer:

"...[T]he United States may acquire territory by conquest or by treaty, and may govern it through the exercise of the power of Congress conferred by Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution..." "In exercising this power, Congress is not subject to the same constitutional limitations, as when it is legislating for the United States. ... And in general the guarantees of the Constitution, save as they are limitations upon the exercise of executive and legislative power when exerted for or over our insular possessions, extend to them only as Congress, in the exercise of its legislative power over territory belonging to the United States, has made those guarantees applicable." -- *Hooven & Allison & Co. vs Evatt*, 324 U.S. 652 (1945)

"The idea prevails with some indeed, it found expression in arguments at the bar that we have in this country substantially or practically two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers as other nations of the earth are accustomed to exercise."

"I take leave to say that if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will be the result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism."

"It will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of a government outside of the supreme law of the land finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the constitution." -- *Downes vs Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)

These actions allowed Admiralty law to come on land. If you will remember the definition of the Law of the Flag. When you receive benefits or enter into contracts with the king you come under his law which is Admiralty law. And what is a result of your connection with the king? A loss of your Sovereign status. Our ignorance of the law is no excuse. I'll give you an example, something you deal with everyday. Let's say you get a seat belt ticket. What law did you violate? Remember the Constitution recognizes three forms of law. Was it common law? Who was the injured party? No one. So it could not have been common law even though here, the State of N. C. has made chapter 20 of the Motor Vehicle code carry common law penalties, jail time. This was the only thing they could do to cover up the jurisdiction they were operating in. Was it Equity law? No, there is no contract in dispute, driving is a privilege granted by the king. If it were a contract the UCC would apply, and it doesn't. In a contract both parties have equal rights. In a privilege, you do as you are told or the privilege is revoked. Well guess what, there is only one form of law left, admiralty. Ask yourself when did licenses begin to be required? 1933.

All district courts are admiralty courts; see the Judiciary Act of 1789.

"It is only with the extent of powers possessed by the district courts, acting as instance courts of admiralty, we are dealing. The Act of 1789 gives the entire constitutional power to determine "all civil causes of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction," leaving the courts to ascertain its limits, as cases may arise." -- *Waring ET AL. v. Clarke*, Howard 5 12 L. ed. 1847

When you enter a court room and come before the judge and the U.S. flag with the yellow fringe flying, you are put on notice of the law you are in. American's aren't aware of this, so they continue to claim Constitutional rights. In the Admiralty setting the constitution does not apply and the judge, if pushed, will inform you of this by placing you under contempt for continuing to bring it up. If the judge is pressed, his name for this hidden

law is statutory law. Where are the rules and regulations for statutory law kept? They don't exist. If statutory law existed, there would be rules and regulations governing its procedures and court rules. They do not exist!!!

The way you can tell that this is Admiralty is from the yellow fringed flag and from the actions of the law, compelled performance (Admiralty). The judges can still move at common law (murder etc.) and equity (contract disputes etc.). It's up to the type of case brought before the court. If the case is Admiralty, the only way back to the common law is the saving to suitor clause and action under Admiralty. The court and rules of all three jurisdictions have been blended. Under Admiralty you are compelled to perform under the agreement you made by asking and receiving the king's government (license). You receive the benefit of driving on federal roads (military roads), so you have voluntarily obligated yourself to this system of law, this is why you are compelled to obey. If you don't it will cost you money or jail time or both. The type of offence determines the jurisdiction you come under, but the court itself is an Admiralty court defined by the flag. Driving without a seat belt under Chapter 20 DMV code carries a criminal penalty for a non common law offense. Again where is the injured party or parties? This is Admiralty law. Here is a quote to prove what I said about the roads being military, this is only one benefit, there are many:

"Whilst deeply convinced of these truths, I yet consider it clear that under the war-making power Congress may appropriate money toward the construction of a military road when this is absolutely necessary for the defense of any State or Territory of the Union against foreign invasion. Under the Constitution, Congress has power "to declare war," "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and to call forth the militia to "repel invasions." Thus endowed, in an ample manner, with the war-making power, the corresponding duty is required that "the United States shall protect each of them [the States] against invasion." Now, how is it possible to afford this protection to California and our Pacific possessions except by means of a military road through the Territories of the United States, over which men and munitions of war may be speedily transported from the Atlantic States to meet and to repel the invader?.... Besides, the Government, ever since its origin, has been in the constant practice of constructing military roads." -- Inaugural Address of James Buchanan, March 4, 1857 .Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1902.

I want to briefly mention the Social Security Act, the nexus Agreement you have with the king. You were told the SS# was for retirement and you had to have it to work. It sounds like a license to me, and it is, it is a license granted by the President to work in this country, under the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended in March 9, 1933, as you will see in a moment. Was it really for your retirement? What does F.I.C.A. stand for? Federal Insurance Contribution Act. What does contribution mean at law and not Webster's Dictionary? This is where they were able to get you to admit that you were jointly responsible for the national debt, and you declared that you were a 14th Amendment citizen (which I won't go into in this paper), or the Erie Railroad v. Tompkins case; where common law was overturned. Read the following definition to learn what it means to have a SS# and pay a contribution:

"Contribution. Right of one who has discharged a common liability to recover of another also liable, the aliquot portion which he ought to pay or bear. Under principle of "contribution," a tort-feasor against whom a judgment is rendered is entitled to recover proportional shares of judgment from other joint tort-feasor whose negligence contributed to the injury and who were also liable to the plaintiff. (Note - tort feasor means wrong doer, what did you do to be defined as a wrong doer?) The share of a loss payable by an insure when contracts with two or more insurers cover the same loss. The insurer's share of a loss under a coinsurance or similar provision. The sharing of a loss or payment among several. The act of any one or several of a number of co-debtors, co-sureties, etc., in reimbursing one of their number who has paid the whole debt or suffered the whole liability, each to the extent of his proportionate share. -- (Blacks Law Dictionary 6th Ed.)

Guess what? It gets worse. What does this date 1933 mean? Well you better sit down. First, remember World War I, in 1917 President Wilson declared the War Powers Act of October 6, 1917, basically stating that he was stopping all trade with the enemy except for those he granted a license, excluding Americans. Read the

following from this Trading with the enemy Act, where he defines enemy: In the War Powers Act of 1917, Chapter 106, Section 2 (c) it says that these declared war powers did not affect citizens of the United States:

"Such other individuals, or body or class of individuals, as may be natives, citizens, or subjects of any nation with which the United States is at war, OTHER THAN CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES, wherever resident or wherever doing business, as the President, if he shall find the safety of the United States of the successful prosecution of the war shall so require, may, by proclamation, include within the term "enemy."

Now, this leads us up to 1933. Our country was recovering from a depression and now was declared bankrupt. I know you are saying. Why was it that the American people were never told about this? Public policy and National Security overruled the public right to know. Read the following Congressional quote:

"My investigation convinced me that during the last quarter of a century the average production of gold has been falling off considerably. The gold mines of the world are practically exhausted. There is only about \$11,000,000,000 in gold in the world, with the United States owning a little more than four billions. We have more than \$100,000,000,000 in debts payable in gold of the present weight and fineness. . . As a practical proposition these contracts cannot be collected in gold for the obvious reason that the gold supply of the entire world is not sufficient to make payment." -- Congressional Record, Congressman Dies, March 15, 1933

Before 1933 all contracts with the government were payable in gold. Now I ask you - Who in their right mind would enter into contracts totaling One Hundred billion dollars in gold, when there was only eleven billion in gold in the whole world, and we had about four billion. To keep from being hung by the American public, they (Congress) obeyed the bankster's demands and turned over our country to them. They never came out and said we were in bankruptcy but, the fact remains, we are. In 1933 the gold of the whole country had to be turned in to the banksters, and all government contracts in gold were canceled. This is bankruptcy.

The Bankruptcy of The United States

United States Congressional Record, March 17, 1993 Vol. 33, page H-1303

"Mr. Speaker, we are here now in chapter 11. Members of Congress are official trustees presiding over the greatest reorganization of any bankrupt entity in world history, the U.S. government."

It is an established fact that the United States Federal Government has been dissolved by the Emergency Banking Act, March 9, 1933, 48 Stat. 1, Public Law 89-719; declared by President Roosevelt, being bankrupt and insolvent. H.J.R. 192, 73rd Congress m session June 5, 1933 - Joint Resolution To Suspend The Gold Standard and Abrogate The Gold Clause dissolved the Sovereign Authority of the United States and the official capacities of all United States Governmental Offices, Officers, and Departments and is further evidence that the United States Federal Government exists today in name only.

The receivers of the United States Bankruptcy are the International Bankers, via the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. All United States Offices, Officials, and Departments are now operating within a de facto status in name only under Emergency War Powers. With the Constitutional Republican form of Government now dissolved, the receivers of the Bankruptcy have adopted a new form of government for the United States. This new form of government is known as a Democracy, being an established Socialist/Communist order under a new governor for America. This act was instituted and established by transferring and/or placing the Office of the Secretary of Treasury to that of the Governor of the International Monetary Fund. Public Law 94-564, page 8, Section H.R. 13955 reads in part: "The U.S. Secretary of Treasury receives no compensation for representing the United States?"

Gold and silver were such a powerful money during the founding of the united states of America, that the founding fathers declared that only gold or silver coins can be "money" in America. Since gold and silver coinage were heavy and

inconvenient for a lot of transactions, they were stored in banks and a claim check was issued as a money substitute. People traded their coupons as money, or "currency." Currency is not money, but a money substitute. Redeemable currency must promise to pay a dollar equivalent in gold or silver money. Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs) make no such promises, and are not "money." A Federal Reserve Note is a debt obligation of the federal United States government, not "money?" The federal United States government and the U.S. Congress were not and have never been authorized by the Constitution for the united states of America to issue currency of any kind, but only lawful money, -gold and silver coin.

It is essential that we comprehend the distinction between real money and paper money substitute. One cannot get rich by accumulating money substitutes, one can only get deeper into debt. We the People no longer have any "money." Most Americans have not been paid any "money" for a very long time, perhaps not in their entire life. Now do you comprehend why you feel broke? Now, do you understand why you are "bankrupt," along with the rest of the country?

Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs) are unsigned checks written on a closed account. FRNs are an inflatable paper system designed to create debt through inflation (devaluation of currency). Whenever there is an increase of the supply of a money substitute in the economy without a corresponding increase in the gold and silver backing, inflation occurs.

Inflation is an invisible form of taxation that irresponsible governments inflict on their citizens. The Federal Reserve Bank who controls the supply and movement of FRNs has everybody fooled. They have access to an unlimited supply of FRNs, paying only for the printing costs of what they need. FRNs are nothing more than promissory notes for U.S. Treasury securities (T-Bills) - a promise to pay the debt to the Federal Reserve Bank.

There is a fundamental difference between "paying" and "discharging" a debt. To pay a debt, you must pay with value or substance (i.e. gold, silver, barter or a commodity). With FRNs, you can only discharge a debt. You cannot pay a debt with a debt currency system. You cannot service a debt with a currency that has no backing in value or substance. No contract in Common law is valid unless it involves an exchange of "good & valuable consideration." Unpayable debt transfers power and control to the sovereign power structure that has no interest in money, law, equity or justice because they have so much wealth already.

Their lust is for power and control. Since the inception of central banking, they have controlled the fates of nations.

The Federal Reserve System is based on the Canon law and the principles of sovereignty protected in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. In fact, the international bankers used a "Canon Law Trust" as their model, adding stock and naming it a "Joint Stock Trust." The U.S. Congress had passed a law making it illegal for any legal "person" to duplicate a "Joint Stock Trust" in 1873. The Federal Reserve Act was legislated post-facto (to 1870), although post-facto laws are strictly forbidden by the Constitution. [1:9:3]

The Federal Reserve System is a sovereign power structure separate and distinct from the federal United States government. The Federal Reserve is a maritime lender, and/or maritime insurance underwriter to the federal United States operating exclusively under Admiralty/Maritime law. The lender or underwriter bears the risks, and the Maritime law compelling specific performance in paying the interest, or premiums are the same.

Assets of the debtor can also be hypothecated (to pledge something as a security without taking possession of it.) as security by the lender or underwriter. The Federal Reserve Act stipulated that the interest on the debt was to be paid in gold. There was no stipulation in the Federal Reserve Act for ever paying the principle.

Prior to 1913, most Americans owned clear, allodial title to property, free and clear of any liens or mortgages until the Federal Reserve Act (1913)

"Hypothecated" all property within the federal United States to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, -in which the Trustees (stockholders) held legal title. The U.S. citizen (tenant, franchisee) was registered as a "beneficiary" of the trust via his/her birth certificate. In 1933, the federal United States hypothecated all of the present and future properties, assets and labor of their "subjects," the 14th Amendment U.S. citizen, to the Federal Reserve System.

In return, the Federal Reserve System agreed to extend the federal United States corporation all the credit "money substitute" it needed. Like any other debtor, the federal United States government had to assign collateral and security to their creditors as a condition of the loan. Since the federal United States didn't have any assets, they assigned the private property of their "economic slaves", the U.S. citizens as collateral against the unpayable federal debt. They also pledged

the unincorporated federal territories, national parks forests, birth certificates, and nonprofit organizations, as collateral against the federal debt. All has already been transferred as payment to the international bankers.

Unwittingly, America has returned to its pre-American Revolution, feudal roots whereby all land is held by a sovereign and the common people had no rights to hold allodial title to property. Once again, we "the People" are the tenants and sharecroppers renting our own property from a Sovereign in the guise of the Federal Reserve Bank. We the people have exchanged one master for another.

This has been going on for over eighty years without the "informed knowledge" of the American people, without a voice protesting loud enough. Now it's easy to grasp why America is fundamentally bankrupt.

Why don't more people own their properties outright?

Why are 90% of Americans mortgaged to the hilt and have little or no assets after all debts and liabilities have been paid? Why does it feel like you are working harder and harder and getting less and less?

We are reaping what has been sown, and the results of our harvest are a painful bankruptcy and foreclosure on American property, precious liberties, and way of life. Few of our elected representatives in Washington, D.C. have dared to tell the truth. The federal United States is bankrupt. Our children will inherit this unpayable debt, and the tyranny to enforce paying it.

America has become completely bankrupt in world leadership, financial credit and its reputation for courage, vision and human rights. This is an undeclared economic war, bankruptcy, and economic slavery of the most corrupt order! Wake up America! Take back your Country."

-- Congressman Traficant on the House floor, March 17, 1993

The wealth of the nation including our land was turned over to the banksters. In return, the nation's 100 billion dollar debt was forgiven. I have two papers that have circulated the country on this subject. Remember Jesus said "money is the root of all evil" The Congress of 1933 sold every American into slavery to protect their asses. Read the following Congressional quotes:

"I want to show you where the people are being imposed upon by reason of the delegation of this tremendous power. I invite your attention to the fact that section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act provides that whenever the Government of the United States issues and delivers money, Federal Reserve notes, which are based on the credit of the Nation--they represent a mortgage upon your home and my home, and upon all the property of all the people of the Nation--to the Federal Reserve agent, an interest charge shall be collected for the Government." -- Congressional Record, Congressman Patman, March 13, 1933

"That is the equity of what we are about to do. Yes; you are going to close us down. Yes; you have already closed us down, and have been doing it long before this year. Our President says that for 3 years we have been on the way to bankruptcy. We have been on the way to bankruptcy longer than 3 years. We have been on the way to bankruptcy ever since we began to allow the financial mastery of this country gradually to get into the hands of a little clique that has held it right up until they would send us to the grave." -- Congressional Record, Congressman Long, March 11, 1933

What did Roosevelt do? Sealed our fate and our children's fate, but worst of all, he declared War on the American People. Remember the War Powers Act, the Trading with the enemy Act? He declared emergency powers with his authority being the War Powers Act, the Trading with the enemy Act. The problem is he redefined who the enemy was, read the following: (remember what I said about the SS# being a license to work)

The declared National Emergency of March 9, 1933 amended the War Powers Act to include the American People as enemies:

"In Title 1, Section 1 it says: The actions, regulations, rules, licenses, orders and proclamations heretofore or hereafter taken, promulgated, made, or issued by the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury since March 4, 1933, pursuant to the authority conferred by subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, are hereby approved and confirmed."

"Section 2. Subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Act of October 6, 1917, (40 Stat. L. 411), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit between or payments by banking institutions as defined by the President, and export, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, **BY ANY PERSON WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OR ANY PLACE SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION THEREOF.**"

Here is the legal phrase subject to the jurisdiction thereof, but at law this refers to alien enemy and also applies to 14th Amendment citizens:

"As these words are used in the first section of the 14th Amendment of the Federal Constitution, providing for the citizenship of all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, the purpose would appear to have been to exclude by the fewest words (besides children of members of the Indian tribes, standing in a peculiar relation to the National Government, unknown to the common Law), the two classes of cases, children born of *ALIEN ENEMIES(emphasis mine), in hostile occupation, and children of diplomatic representatives of a foreign state, both of which, by the law of England and by our own law, from the time of the first settlement of the English colonies in America, had been recognized exceptions to the fundamental rule of citizenship by birth within the country." - United States v Wong Kim Ark, 169 US 649, 682, 42 L Ed 890, 902, 18 S Ct 456. Ballentine's Law Dictionary

Congressman Beck had this to say about the War Powers Act:

"I think of all the damnable heresies that have ever been suggested in connection with the Constitution, the doctrine of emergency is the worst. It means that when Congress declares an emergency there is no Constitution. This means its death....But the Constitution of the United States, as a restraining influence in keeping the federal government within the carefully prescribed channels of power, is moribund, if not dead. We are witnessing its death-agonies, for when this bill becomes a law, if unhappily it becomes law, there is no longer any workable Constitution to keep the Congress within the limits of its constitutional powers." - Congressman James Beck in Congressional Record 1933

The following are excerpts from the Senate Report, 93rd Congress, November 19, 1973, Special Committee On The Termination Of The National Emergency United States Senate. They were going to terminate all emergency powers, but they found out they did not have the power to do this so guess which one stayed in, the Emergency Act of 1933, the Trading with the Enemy Act October 6, 1917 as amended in March 9, 1933.

"Since March 9, 1933, the United States has been in a state of declared national emergency....Under the powers delegated by these statutes, the President may: seize property; organize and control the means of production; seize commodities; assign military forces abroad; institute martial law; seize and control all transportation and communication; regulate the operation of private enterprise; restrict travel; and, in a plethora of particular ways, control the lives of all American citizens."

"A majority of the people of the United States have lived all of their lives under emergency rule. For 40 (now 63) years, freedoms and governmental procedures guaranteed by the Constitution have, in varying degrees, been abridged by laws brought into force by states of national emergency....from, at least, the Civil War in important ways shaped the present phenomenon of a permanent state of national emergency." - Senate Report, 93rd Congress, November 19, 1973

You may be asking yourself is this the law, and if so where is it, read the following: In Title 12 U.S.C, in section 95b you'll find the following codification of the Emergency War Powers:

"The actions, regulations, rules, licenses, orders and proclamations heretofore or hereafter taken, promulgated, made, or issued by the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury since March 4, 1933, pursuant to the authority conferred by subsection (b) of section 5 of the Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (12 U.S.C., 95a), are hereby approved and confirmed." - (March 9, 1933, c. 1, Title 1, 1, 48 Stat. 1)

So you can further understand the word Alien Enemy and what it means to be declared an enemy of this government, read the following definitions: The phrase Alien Enemy is defined in Bouvier's Law Dictionary as:

One who owes allegiance to the adverse belligerent. - 1 Kent 73.

He who owes a temporary but not a permanent allegiance is an alien enemy in respect to acts done during such temporary allegiance only; and when his allegiance terminates, his hostile character terminates also; -1 B. & P.163.

Alien enemies are said to have no rights, no privileges, unless by the king's special favor, during time of war; - 1 Bla. Com. 372; Bynkershoek 195; 8 Term 166. [Remember we've been under a declared state of war since October 6, 1917, as amended March 9, 1933 to include every United States citizen.]

"The phrase Alien Enemy is defined in Words and Phrases as: Residence of person in territory of nation at war with United States was sufficient to characterize him as "alien enemy" within Trading with the Enemy Act, even if he had acquired and retained American citizenship." - Matarrese v. Matarrese, 59 A.2d 262, 265, 142 N.J. Eq. 226.

"Residence or doing business in a hostile territory is the test of an "alien enemy: within meaning of Trading with the Enemy Act and Executive Orders thereunder." - Executive Order March 11, 1942, No. 9095, as amended, 50 U.S.C.A. Appendix 6; Trading with the Enemy Act 5 (b). In re Oneida Nat. Bank & Trust Co. of Utica, 53 N.Y.S. 2d. 416, 420, 421, 183 Misc. 374.

"By the modern phrase, a man who resides under the allegiance and protection of a hostile state for commercial purposes is to be considered to all civil purposes as much an `alien enemy' as if he were born there." - Hutchinson v. Brock, 11 Mass. 119, 122.

Am I done with the proof? Not quite, believe it or not, it gets worse. I have established that war has been declared against the American people and their children. **The American people that voted for the 1933 government were responsible for Congress' actions, because Congress was there in their proxy (voter's**

registration). What is one of the actions taken against an enemy during time of War? In the Constitution the Congress was granted the power during the time of war to grant Letters of Marque. What is a letter of Marque? Well, read the following:

A commission granted by the government to a private individual to take the property of a foreign state as reparation for an injury committed by such state, its citizens or subjects. The prizes so captured are divided between the owners of the privateer, the captain, and the crew. - Bouvier's Law Dictionary 1914.

Think about the mission of the IRS, they are a private organization, or their backup, the ATF. These groups have been granted letters of Marque, read the following:

"The trading with the enemy Act, originally and as amended, in strictly a war measure, and finds its sanction in the provision empowering Congress "to declare war, grant letters of Marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water." -- Stoehr v. Wallace 255 U.S.

Under the Constitution the Power of the Government had its checks and balances; power was divided between the three branches of government. To do anything else means you no longer have a Constitutional government. I'm not even talking about the obvious which we have already covered, read the following:

"The Secretary of the Treasury and/or the Attorney General may require, by means of regulations, rulings, instructions, or otherwise, any **person** to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, from time to time and at any time or times, complete information relative to, any transaction referred to in section 5 (b) of the Act of October 6, 1917." -- Title 12 Banks and Banking page 570.

How about Clinton's new Executive Order of June 6, 1994 where the Alphabet agencies are granted their own power to obtain money and the military if need be to protect them. These are un-elected officials, sounds un-Constitutional to me, but read on.

"The delegations of authority in this Order shall not affect the authority of any agency or official pursuant to any other delegation of presidential authority, presently in effect or hereafter made, under section 5 (b) of the act of October 6, 1917, as amended (12 U.S.C. 95a)"

How can the President delegate to un-elected officials power that he was elected to have, and declare that it cannot be taken away, by the voters or the courts or Congress? I will tell you how, under martial law, under the War Powers Act. The American public is asleep and is unaware nor do they care about what is going on, because it may interfere with their making money. I guess Thomas Jefferson was right again:

"...And to preserve their independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts as that we must be taxed in our meat and in our drink, in our necessaries and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our callings and our creeds, as the people of England are, our people, like them, must come to labor sixteen hours in the twenty-four, and give the earnings of fifteen of these to the government for their debts and daily expenses; and the sixteenth being insufficient to afford us bread, we must live, as they now do, on oatmeal and potatoes; have not time to think, no means of calling the mismanager's to account; but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow sufferers..." -- (Thomas Jefferson) THE MAKING OF AMERICA, p. 395

Submitted January 28

"Lloyd Bentsen, of Texas, to be U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years; U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; U.S. Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years; U.S. Governor of the African Development Bank for a term of 5 years; U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank; U.S. Governor of African Development Fund; and U.S. Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development." -- Presidential Documents, February 1, 1993.

At the same time, Bentsen was the Secretary of Treasury. Gee, I don't know, this sounds like a conflict of **entrust** and interest to me, how about you? Also, Congress is the only one under the Constitution able to appropriate money.

A few months ago Secretary of Treasury Ruban sent tons of money to Mexico without Congress' approval. He was president of the bank that made the loans to Mexico. He was later made Secretary of Treasury and paid Mexico's debt to his bank with taxpayer's money. Again, sounds like a conflict of **entrust** to me.

"Without limitation as to any other powers or authority of the Secretary of the Treasury or the Attorney General under any other provision of this Order, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and empowered to prescribe from time to time regulations, rulings, and instructions to carry out the purposes of this Order and to provide therein or otherwise the conditions under which licenses may be granted by or through such officers or agencies as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and the decision of the Secretary with respect to the granting, denial or other disposition of an application or license shall be final." -- Section 7, Title 12 U.S.C. Banks and Banking

Do the issues I have brought up sound like this is a Constitutional government to you? I have not covered the main nexus, the money. I didn't make up this information. It is the government's own documents and legal definitions taken from their dictionaries. I wish the hard working Americans in the government that are loyal to an American Republic could read this. The more people that know the truth the better.

Who Is Running America?

The Bankruptcy of America, the Corporate United States, and the New World Order

From Archive Sources

Who is running America? Have you ever asked that question?

Under the doctrine of Parens Patriae, "Government As Parent", as a result of the manipulated bankruptcy of the United States of America in 1930, **ALL the assets of the American people**, their person, and of our country itself are held by the Depository Trust Corporation at 55 Water Street, NY, NY, secured by UCC Commercial Liens, which are then monetized as "debt money" by the Federal Reserve. It may interest you to know that under the umbrella of the Depository Trust Corporation lay the CEDE Corporation, the Federal Reserve Corporation, the American Bar Association, the legal arm of the banking interests, and the Internal Revenue Service, the system's collection agency.

Did you ever hear of the Independent Treasury Act of 1920?

The Independent Treasury Act of 1920 suspended the de jure (meaning "**by right of legal establishment**") Treasury Department of the United States government. Our Congress turned the treasury department over to a private corporation, **which when seen in its true light, is a fascist monopolistic cartel**, the Federal Reserve and their agents. The bulk of the ownership of the Federal Reserve System, a very well kept secret from the American Citizen, is held by these banking interests, and NONE is held by the United States Treasury:

Rothschild Bank of London
Rothschild Bank of Berlin
Warburg Bank of Hamburg
Warburg Bank of Amsterdam
Lazard Brothers of Paris
Israel Moses Seif Banks of Italy
Chase Manhattan Bank of New York
Goldman, Sachs of New York
Lehman Brothers of New York
Kuhn Loeb Bank of New York

The Federal Reserve is at the root of most of our present statutory regulations, "laws", in the control and regulation of virtually all aspects of human activity in the United States, through successively socialistic constructions laid upon the Commerce clause of the Constitution. Basically, the Federal Reserve is the "STATE" of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies.

If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around [the banks] . . . will deprive the people of all property until their children wake-up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered . . . The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people, to whom it properly belongs." -- Thomas Jefferson -- The Debate Over The Recharter Of The Bank Bill, (1809)

How did this happen?

All our law is private law, written by The National Law Institute, Law Professors, and the Bar Association, the Agents of Foreign Banking interests. They have come to this position of writing the law by fraudulently deleting the "Titles of Nobility and Honour" Thirteenth Amendment from the Constitution for the United States, creating an oligarchy of Lawyers and Bankers controlling all three branches of our government. Most of our law comes directly through The Hague or the U.N. Almost all U.N. treaties have been codified into the U.S. codes. That's where all our educational programs originate. The U.N. controls our education system.

The Federal Register Act was created by Pres. Roosevelt in 1935. Title 3 sec. 301 et seq. by Executive Order. He gave himself the power to create federal agencies and appoint a head of the agency. He then re-delegated his authority to make law (statutory regulations) to those agency heads. One big problem there, the president has no constitutional authority to make law. **Under the Constitution re-delegation of delegated authority is a felony breach.**

The president then gave the agencies the authority to tax. We now have government by appointment running this country. **This is the shadow government sometimes spoken about, but never referred to as government by appointment. This type of government represents taxation without representation.**

Perhaps this is why some people believe the Constitution was suspended. It wasn't suspended; it was buried in bureaucratic red tape.

Now, it is an historical fact that with the Declaration of Independence, to provide a united effort during and after the War for Independence, the Colonies as independent nations joined together under the Articles of Confederation, and as Independent Sovereign States drew up constitutions which formed governments to serve the people of each former colony. The Articles of Confederation, after a period of 8 years, were determined to have several flaws. The Congress of delegates called a Convention in 1787 to correct the flaws. The Convention, instead of modifying the Articles of Confederation as directed, in secret sessions took it upon themselves to write an entirely new Constitution, which when ratified by the State Conventions of the Freemen of the Individual States, created the Federal government to serve them in those areas where the States operating individually could not effectively serve. In this new Constitution the people and the States delegated to the Federal government certain responsibilities, reserving all rights not so enumerated to the States and to the People in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution. As a consequence, the responsibility of the State became one of protecting the people from the tyranny of federal government, to insure that the federal government did not reach beyond the bounds of the Constitution. This worked fairly effectively, until 1933 when Roosevelt assumed office.

The Conference of Chief Justices, Conference of State Court Administrators, the National Associations of Attorney Generals, Secretaries of State and State Auditors, State Purchasing Offices, Lieutenant Governors, and State Legislators, and the Governors of the 50 states comprise the membership of the Council of State Governments. The Council of State Governments is located at 676 N. ST. Clair, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

The Council of State Governments has now been absorbed into the National Conference on Uniform State Laws run by the Bar Association.

The movement for uniform state laws dates back more than a century. The Alabama State Bar called for uniformity as early as 1881, but it was nearly a decade later, at the 12th annual meeting of the ABA in 1889, that the legal community made its formal motion to work for uniformity in the then 44 state union. New York was the first state to move, appointing three commissioners in 1890. Other states soon heeded the call: Delaware, Georgia, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania attended the first Conference in Saratoga Springs, New York, in 1892. The commissioners wasted no time. They urged adoption of three acts and proposed raising the marrying age to 18 for males and 16 for females. They also adopted a table of weights and measures, noting that with the exception of wheat, legal weights of a bushel varied in all the states.

By the turn of the century, 33 states and two territories had appointed commissioners on uniform laws. In 1910, only Nevada and the Territory of Alaska still had not; they came aboard in 1912.

100 YEARS OF UNIFORM LAWS “Abridged Chronology”

1890 - New York state legislature passes first state act authorizing governor to appoint three commissioners. The American Bar Association (ABA) recommends that other states follow New York's lead.

1891 - Connecticut's Lyman D. Brewster named to chair newly-created ABA committee on uniform law. Pennsylvania, Michigan, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Delaware appoint commissioners.

1892 - First conference held in Saratoga Springs New York. Above states plus Georgia attend formal meeting.

1893 - Committees appointed on such subjects as wills, marriage and divorce, commercial law, descent and distribution.

1895 - Conference requests committee on commercial law be formed. Drafts, Negotiable Instrument Law, precursor to Article 3 of Uniform Commercial Code.

1896 - Negotiable Instrument Law approved by Conference. First time that a uniform act is adopted in every state and the District of Columbia.

1897 - For the first time, Commissioners urged to work toward enactment of uniform legislation in their states.

1898/1899 - Sessions devoted to the consideration of proposed divorce legislation.

1899 - At the end of the 1890s, 33 of the existing 45 states and two territories had appointed uniform law commissioners and eight uniform acts had been drafted, each enacted in at least one state. All these acts were subsequently superseded or declared obsolete.

1900 - Uniform Divorce Procedure Act adopted. Louis B. Brandeis begins five years of service as member of Massachusetts commission.

1901 - Woodrow Wilson begins tenure (until 1908) as commissioner from New Jersey.

1903 - ABA makes first appropriation in support of work of Conference. James Barr Ames of Harvard Law School commissioned to draft the Uniform Partnership Act.

1905 - Samuel W. Pennypacker, Pennsylvania Governor, invites other governors to send delegation to a national divorce conference--meets twice in 1906; three acts endorsed.

1906 - First roll call by states as Uniform Warehouse Receipts Act is approved. Legal scholar Roscoe Pound serves for one year as a commissioner from Nebraska.

1907 - Uniform Desertion Act and Non-Support Act and Uniform Marriage Act authorized. Act Regulating Annulment of Marriage of Divorce adopted. Also, Act Providing for the Return of Marriage Statistics, Act Providing for the Return of Divorce Statistics.

1908 - Work begins on Uniform Corporation Act.

1910 - Twenty uniform acts approved in decade of the teens. The Uniform Partnership Act, begun in 1906, was completed by William Draper Lewis, Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

1911 - Uniform Marriage and Marriage License Act and Uniform Child Labor Act approved.

1912 - Uniform Marriage Evasion Act adopted. Woodrow Wilson, commissioner from New Jersey from 1901 to 1908 elected U.S. President in a landslide.

1914 - Uniform Partnership Act completed. Will be adopted by all the states. Also Foreign Acknowledgement Act, Cold Storage Act, Workmen's Compensation Act.

1915 - Name changed to National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. Constitution and by-laws completely revised. Each act now must be considered section by section during at least two annual meetings.

1916 - Uniform Limited Partnership Act as well as Extradition of Persons of Unsound Minds Act approved, also Land Registration Act.

1917 - Uniform Flag Act approved.

1918 - Uniform Fraudulent Conveyance Act approved.

1920 - Certain Acts withdrawn; others declared obsolete. After pruning, 26 acts remain as recommended for passage in state legislatures.

1930 - During the 30s, Conference adopts 31 acts.

1935 - Conference entered into agreement with American Law Institute for cooperative drafting of acts in area of common interest.

1936 - After revisions, withdrawals and acts declared obsolete, 53 uniform acts remained as recommended for approval.

On April 25, 1938, the Supreme Court overturned the standing precedents of the prior 150 years concerning "COMMON LAW" in the federal government.

"THERE IS NO FEDERAL COMMON LAW, AND CONGRESS HAS NO POWER TO DECLARE SUBSTANTIVE RULES OF COMMON LAW applicable IN A STATE, WHETHER they be LOCAL or GENERAL in their nature, be they COMMERCIAL LAW or a part of LAW OF TORTS." (See: *ERIE RAILROAD CO. vs. THOMPkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 82 L. Ed. 1188)

The Common Law is the fountain source of Substantive and Remedial Rights, if not our very Liberties. The members and associates of the Bar thereafter formed committees, **granted themselves special privileges, immunities and franchises**, and held meetings concerning the Judicial procedures, and further, to amend laws *"to conform to a trend of judicial decisions or to accomplish similar objectives"*, including hodgepodging the jurisdictions of Law and Equity together, which is known today as *"One Form of Action."* [See: *Constitution and By Laws*, Article 3, Section 3.3(c), 1990-91 Reference Book, see also *Colorado Methods of Practice*, West Publishing, Vol. 4, pages 2-3, Authors Comments.]

1939 - ABA gets more involved in approval of uniform law products. Thirty-nine acts are presented to the Board of Governors of the ABA for consideration and approval. During the same year, all acts on aeronautics and motor vehicles are eliminated as well as the Land Registration Act, Child Labor Act of 1930, Uniform Divorce Jurisdiction Act, Firearms Act, Marriage Act and more. Six acts are reclassified as Model acts.

1940 - At start of decade, after deletions, etc., 53 acts out of 93 which had been approved since the group's founding remain on the books. Drafting committee for the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) approved.

1941 - Speaking of the Commercial Code project, the Conference president states: "...this is the most important and the most far reaching project on which the conference has ever embarked." It would take the major part of the next 10 year period to complete.

1942 - UCC effort begins in earnest with completion of work on the revised Uniform Sales Act.

1943 - Members of the conference participate in drafting committee in Washington, D.C. to work on legislation which the government might desire in connection with the war effort. No new acts.

1944 - Conference receives \$150,000 grant from the Falk Foundation of Pittsburgh to support work on the UCC.

1945 - No annual meeting for the first time due to difficulties of civilian transport during the war.

1946 - Falk Foundation increases its support of the UCC with an additional \$100,000.

1947 - Uniform Law Conference (ULC) and American Law Institute join in partnership to put all the components together for the UCC. Uniform Divorce Recognition Act approved.

1950 - Approval of the Uniform Marriage License Application Act, Uniform Adoption Act and the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act (URESAs). The latter has been one of the most successful ULC products.

1951 - On May 18, during a joint meeting with the American Law Institute in Washington, D.C., the UCC was approved. Later that year the ABA formally approved the code as well. Considered the outstanding accomplishment of the Conference, the Code remains the ULC's signature product.

One of the Uniform Laws drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the American Law Institute governing commercial transactions (including sales and leasing of goods, transfer of

funds, commercial paper, bank deposits and collections, letters of credit, bulk transfers, warehouse receipts, bills of lading, investment securities, and secured transactions), The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), has been adopted in whole or substantially by all states. (See: *Blacks Law*, 6th Ed. pg. 1531) **In essence, all court decisions are based on commercial law or business law and has criminal penalties associated with it.** Rather than openly calling this new law Admiralty/Maritime Jurisdiction, it is called Statutory Jurisdiction.

America as a bankrupt nation is owned completely by its creditors.

The creditors own the Congress, they own the Executive, they own the Judiciary and they own all the State governments. Do you have a Birth Certificate? They own you too.

1952 - Uniform Rules of Criminal Procedure approved---first venture of the Conference into this area of the law.

1953 - Pennsylvania the first state to enact the UCC. Uniform Rules of Evidence adopted.

1954 - Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act approved.

1956 - Gift to Minors Act approved. Will be adopted in every state. For the first time, ULC enters the field of international law.

1957 - Massachusetts becomes second state to enact the UCC, after revisions by the Editorial Board.

1958 - Uniform Securities Act approved.

1960 - Uniform Paternity Act passed. By 1960, UCC enacted in Kentucky, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Rhode Island.

1961 - Permanent Editorial Board on the UCC formed---8 more states pass UCC. Constitution amended to provide that all members of Conference must be members of the bar.

1962 - Four more states adopt UCC, including New York. Probate Code project approved.

1963 - Third comprehensive law project approved, on retail installment sales, consumer credit, small loans and usury. Eleven more UCC states. William H. Renquist begins term as commissioner from Arizona; serves until 1968.

1964 - Special Committee of Uniform Divorce and Marriage laws recommends that a study of divorce law be authorized and that funds be sought. One more UCC state.

1965 - Divorce and Marriage Law committee instructed to commence drafting if funds can be obtained for the project. Thirteen more UCC states.

1966 - Five more UCC states.

1968 - Much of annual meeting devoted to the Uniform Consumer Credit Code and the Uniform Probate Code --two projects nearing completion. By 1968, 49 states, the District of Columbia and U.S. Virgin Islands have enacted the UCC---only exception being Louisiana. A big year. Other developments in 1968: the Consumer Credit Code is approved as well as revisions to the Anatomical Gift Act, Child Custody Jurisdiction Act and revisions to URESA.

1969 - Probate Code approved. Preliminary analysis of the uniform marriage and divorce legislation distributed.

1970 - Controlled Substances Act and Uniform Marriage and Divorce Act approved.

1971 - Uniform Alcoholism and Intoxication Act approved.

1972 - Uniform Residential Landlord and Tenant Act, Disposition of Community Property Rights At Death Act and UMVARA, the Uniform Motor Vehicle Accident Reparations Act approved.

1973 - Uniform Parentage Act supersedes Paternity Act. Uniform Crime Victims Reparations Act approved.

1974 - Conference approves Rules of Criminal Procedure and Eminent Domain Code. Louisiana, the only state not to adopt the Uniform Commercial Code due to difficulties in reconciling its provisions with those of the Civil Code, adopts Articles 1,3,4,5,7, and 8.

1975 - Uniform Land Transactions Act approved.

1976 - Major revision of the Uniform Partnership Act approved; also Uniform Simplification of Land Transfers and Uniform Class Action Acts.

1978 - Uniform Brain Death and Uniform Federal Lien Registration Act approved.

1979 - Uniform Trade Secrets and Durable Power of Attorney acts among those approved.

1980 - Determination of Death Act supersedes 1978 Brain Death Act. Uniform Planned Community Act, Model Real Estate Time-Share Act and Model Periodic Payment of Judgments Act also adopted.

1981 - Two important updated acts approved: new Model State Administration Procedure and Unclaimed Property Acts. Also two new acts: the Model Real Estate Cooperative Act and the Uniform Conservation Easement Act.

1982 - Uniform Condominium and Planned Community Acts and Model Real Estate Cooperative Act combined into the Uniform Common Interest Ownership act.

The enumerated, specified, and distinct Jurisdictions established by the ordained Constitution (1789), Article III, Section 2, and under the Bill of Rights (1791), Amendment VII, were further hodgepodged and fundamentally changed in 1982 to include Admiralty Jurisdiction, which was once again brought inland. This was the FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE necessary to effect unification of CIVIL and ADMIRALTY PROCEDURE. Just as 1938 Rules ABOLISHED THE DISTINCTION between Actions At Law and Suits in Equity, this CHANGE WOULD ABOLISH THE DISTINCTION between CIVIL ACTIONS and SUITS IN ADMIRALTY." (See: *Federal Rules of Procedure*, 1982 Ed., pg. 17. Also see *Federalist Papers*, No. 83, *Declaration Of Resolves Of The First Continental Congress*, Oct. 14th, 1774, *Declaration Of Cause And Necessity Of Taking Up Arms*, July 16, 1775, *Declaration Of Independence*, July 4, 1776, *Bennet vs. Butterworth*, 52 U.S. 669)

1983 - Uniform Marital Property Act and Uniform Premarital agreement Act approved. Uniform Transfers to Minors Act replaces the uniformly enacted Uniform Gifts to Minors Act.

1984 - Uniform Statutory Will Act approved; new Uniform fraudulent Transfer Act supersedes Fraudulent Conveyance Act of 1918.

1985 - Uniform Health-Care Information Act, Uniform Land Security Interest act, Uniform Personal Property Leasing Act and Uniform Rights of the Terminally Ill Act approved.

1986 - New drafting effort to revise Articles 3 and 4 of the UCC and draft new provisions begins.

1987 - Approval of the revised Uniform Anatomical Gift Act approved as well as new Uniform Custodial Trust Act, Uniform Construction Lien Act and Uniform Franchise and Business Opportunities Act. Also revision of Rules of Criminal Procedure.

1988 - Final approval of amendments to the Uniform Securities Act and amendments to Article 6 of the UCC dealing with bulk sales. Conference also approves Uniform Statutory Form Power of Attorney Act and Uniform Punitive and Unknown Fathers Act and takes on the controversial issue of surrogate mother contracts with Uniform Status of Children of Assisted Conception Act.

1989 - Article 4A of the UCC, dealing with electronic funds transfers, approved. Also approved: amendments to the Rights of the Terminally Ill Act, authorizing withdrawal of life support by a surrogate decision maker; the Uniform Pretrial Detention Act, confining violent criminals before trial; the Uniform Non-probate Transfers on Death Act and amendments to Article VI of the Uniform Probate Code.

1990 - Major revision of 1970 Uniform Controlled Substances Act-- the law in 46 jurisdictions-- approved. Substantial revision of UCC Article 3 also approved, as well as an updated Article II of the Uniform Probate Code, to keep pace with current thinking on marital property.

This private corruption of the law has occurred despite the Constitutional responsibility conferred on Congress by Article I, Section 8 of the Federal Constitution which states that it is Congress that "makes all Laws."

What does that have to do with anything? Uniform Laws seem to be a good Idea.

Well now, that is a good question. Let us continue.....

An Expose On The Legal Fraud Perpetrated On All Americans

**THE COURTS RECOGNIZE ONLY TWO CLASSES OF PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES
TODAY: DEBTORS AND CREDITORS**

The concept of DEBTORS and CREDITORS is very important to understand.

Every legal action where you are brought before the court: e.g. traffic ticket, property dispute or permits, income tax, credit cards, bank loans or anything else government might dream up to charge you where you find yourself in front of a court. It is an equity court, administrating commercial law having a debtor-creditor law as the controlling law. Today, we have an equity court but not an equity court as defined by the Constitution of the United States or any other legal documents before 1938.

All the courts of this once great land have been changed starting with the Supreme Court decision of 1938 in ERIE V. THOMPCKINS. I'll give you background which led to this decision. **There is a terrible FRAUD being perpetrated on all Americans. Please understand that this fraud is a 24 hour, 7 days a week, year after year continuous fraud. This fraud is constantly upon you all your life. It doesn't just happen once in a while. This fraud is perpetually and incessantly upon you and your family.**

U.S. INC. GOES TO GENEVA 1930's

In order for you to understand just how this fraud works, you need to know the history of its inception.

It goes like this: From 1928 -1932 there were five years of Geneva conventions. The nations of the world met in Geneva Switzerland for 5 continuous years in order to set up what would be the policy of all the participating countries. During the year of 1930 the U.S., Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal etc. all declared bankruptcy. If you try to look up the 1930 minutes, you will not find them because they don't publish this particular volume. If you try to find the 1930 volume which contains the minutes of what happened, you will probably not find it. This volume has been pulled out of circulation or is hidden in the library and is very hard to find. This volume contains the evidence of the bankruptcy.

Going into 1932, they stopped meeting in Geneva. In 1932 Franklin Roosevelt came into power as President of the United States. Roosevelt's job was to put into place and administer the bankruptcy that had been declared two years earlier. The corporate government needed a key Supreme Court decision. The corporate United States government had to have a legal case on the books to set the stage for recognizing, implementing and supporting the bankruptcy. Now, this doesn't mean the bankruptcy wasn't implemented before 1938 with the Erie vs. Thompkins decision. The bankruptcy started in 1930-1931. The bankruptcy definitely started when Roosevelt came into office. He was sworn in during the month of January 1933. He started right away in the bankruptcy with what is known as "The Banking Holiday," and proceeded in pulling the gold coin out of circulation. That was the beginning of the corporate United States Public Policy for bankruptcy. Executive Orders 6073, 6102, 6111 & Executive Order 6260 "Trading With The Enemy Act."

ROOSEVELT STACKS SUPREME COURT

It is a known historical fact that during 1933 and 1937 - 1938, there was a big fight between Roosevelt and the Supreme Court Justices. Roosevelt tried to stack the Supreme Court with a bunch of his pals. Roosevelt tried to enlarge the number of justices and he tried to change the slant of the justices. The corporate United States had to have one Supreme Court case which would support their bankruptcy problem.

There was resistance to Roosevelt's court stacking efforts. Some of the justices tried to warn us that Roosevelt was tampering with the law and with the courts. Roosevelt was trying to see to it that prior decisions of the court were overturned. He was trying to bring in a new order, a new procedure for the law of the land.

THE CORPORATE UNITED STATES GOES BANKRUPT

A bankruptcy case was needed on the books to legitimize the fact that the corporate U.S. had already declared bankruptcy! This bankruptcy was effectuated by compact that the corporate several states had with the corporate government (Corporate Capitol of the several corporate states). This compact tied the corporate several states to corporate Washington D.C, (the headquarters of the corporation called "The United States").

Since the United States Corporation, having established its headquarters within the District of Columbia, declared itself to be in the state of bankruptcy, it automatically declared bankruptcy for all its subsidiaries which were effectively connected corporate members (who happened to be the corporate state governments of the Union). The corporate state governments didn't have to vote on the bankruptcy. The bankruptcy automatically became effective by reason of the Compact/Agreement between each of the corporate state governments and THE MOTHER CORPORATION. (Note: the liberty of using the term "Mother Corporation" to communicate the interconnected power of the corporate Federal government relative to her associated corporate States has been taken.

It is Historical knowledge that the original Union States created the Federal Government, however, for all practical purposes, the Federal government has taken control of her "Creators", the States.) She has become a beast out of control for power. She has for her trade names the following: "United States", "U.S.", "U.S.A.", "United States of America", Washington D.C., District of Columbia, Feds, and Federal Government. She has her own U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Parks, Post Office etc. etc. etc. Because she is claiming to be bankrupt, she freely gives her land, her personnel, and the money she steals from the Americans via the IRS and her state corporations to the United Nations and the International Bankers as payment for her debt. The UN and the International Bankers use this money and services for various worldwide projects, including war.

War is an extremely lucrative business for the bankers of the New World Order. Loans for destruction. Loans for re-construction. Loans for controlling people in her new world order.

THE U.S. INC. DECLARES BANKRUPTCY

The corporate U.S. then, is the head corporate member, who met at Geneva to decide for all its corporate body members. The corporate representatives of the corporate several states were in attendance. If the states had their own power to declare bankruptcy regardless of whether Washington D.C. declared bankruptcy or not, then the several states would have been represented at Geneva. The several states of America were not represented. Consequently, whatever Washington D.C. agreed to at Geneva was passed on automatically, via compact to the several corporate states as a group, association, corporation, or as a club member; they all agreed and declared bankruptcy as one government corporate group in 1930. The several states only needed a representative at Geneva by way of the U.S. in Washington D.C. The delegates of the corporate United States attended the meetings and spoke for the several corporate states as well as for the Federal Corporate Government. And, presto, BANKRUPTCY was declared for all!

From 1930 to 1938 the states could not enact any law or decide any case that would go against the Federal Government. The case had to come down from the Federal level so that the states could then rely on the Federal decision and use this decision within the states as justification for the bankruptcy process within the states.

UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE EMERGES AS LAW OF THE LAND

Are you beginning to get the picture?

By 1938 the corporate Federal Government had the true bankruptcy case they had been looking for. Now, the bankruptcy that had been declared back in 1930 could be upheld and administered. That's why the Supreme Court had to be stacked and made corrupt from within. The new players on the Supreme Court fully understood that they had to destroy all other case law that had been established prior to 1938. The Federal Government had to have a case to destroy all precedent, all appearance, and even the statute of law itself. That is, the Statutes at large had to be perverted. They finally got their case in *Erie vs. Thompkins*. It was right after that case that the American Law Institute and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws listed right in the front of the Uniform Commercial Code, began creating the Uniform Commercial Code that is on our backs today. Let us quote directly from the preface of the Official Text of the Uniform Commercial Code 12th Edition:

"The Code was originally approved by its sponsors and the American Bar Association in 1952, and was revised in 1958 to incorporate a number of changes that had been recommended by the New York Law Revision Commission and other agencies. Subsequent amendments that were deemed desirable in light of experience under the Code were approved by the Permanent Editorial Board in 1962 and 1966"

The above named groups and associations of private lawyers got together and started working on the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC). It was somewhere between 1938 and 1940, I don't recall, but by the early 40's and during the war, this committee was working to form the UCC and getting it ready to go on the market. The UCC is the Law Merchant's code for the administration of the bankruptcy. The UCC is now the "law of the land" as far as the courts are concerned. This Legal Committee of lawyers put everything: Negotiable Instruments, Security, Sales, Contracts, and the whole mess under the UCC. That's where the "Uniform" word comes from. It means it was uniform from state to state as well as being uniform with the District of Columbia.

It doesn't mean you didn't have the uniform instrument laws on the books before this time. It means the laws were not uniform from state to state. By the middle 1960's, every state had passed the UCC into law. The states had no choice but to adopt newly formed Uniform Commercial Code as the Law of the Land. The states fully understood they had to administrate Bankruptcy. Washington D.C. adopted the Uniform Commercial Code in 1963, just six weeks after President John F. Kennedy was killed.

YOUR LAWYER'S SECRET OATH?

What was the effect and the significance of Erie vs. Thompkins case decision of 1938? The significance is that since the Erie Decision, no cases are allowed to be cited that are prior to 1938. There can be no mixing of the old law with the new law. The lawyers, who are members of the American Bar Association, were and are currently under and controlled by the Lawyer's guild of Great Britain, created, formed, and implemented the new bankruptcy law. The American Bar Association is a franchise of the Lawyer's Guild of Great Britain.

Since the Erie vs. Thompkins case was decided, the practice of law in this country was never again to be the same. It has been reported, that every lawyer in existence, and every lawyer coming up has to take a "secret" oath to support bankruptcy. As Officers of the Court they have sworn to uphold the law as it exists, and as they have been taught. In so doing, not only do the lawyers promise to support the bankruptcy, but the lawyers and judges promise never to reveal who the true creditor/party is in the bankruptcy proceedings (if, indeed, many of them are even aware or know). In court, there is never identification and appearance of the true character and principle of the proceedings. If there is no appearance of the true party to the action, then there is no way the defendant is able to know the TRUE NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE ACTION. You are never told the true NATURE AND CAUSE OF WHY YOU ARE IN FRONT OF THEIR COURT. The court is forbidden to tell you that information.

That's why, if you question the true nature and cause, the judge will tell you "It's not my job to tell you. You are not retaining me as an attorney and I can't give you legal advice from the bench. I suggest you hire a lawyer."

HIRE A LAWYER?

The problem here is, if you hire a lawyer who is pledged not to reveal the true nature and the cause, how will you ever find out the nature and the cause? YOU WON'T! If the true nature and the cause of the action against you is revealed, it will expose the real creditor from whom this action and cause came. In other words, they will have to name the TRUE creditor. The true creditor will have to state the nature and the cause. The true creditor will have to say "It's a bankruptcy proceeding." The true creditor will have to say, "I'm the creditor and he's the debtor."

That declaration would open the door for you to question "Who the hell are you? How did you get attached to my back and by what vehicle did I promise to become a debtor to you?" In this country, the courts on every level, from the justice of the peace level all the way up..... even into the International law arena, (called the World Court), are administrating the bankruptcy and are pledged not to reveal who the true creditors really are

and how you personally became pledged as a party or participant to the corporate United States debt. What would really kill these people off would be to compel the International Bankers to send a lawyer into the courtroom and present himself as the attorney for THE TRUE CREDITOR, THE INTERNATIONAL BANKERS. THEN, HAVE THE ATTORNEY PUT INTO THE RECORD THE TRUE NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE PROCEEDING AGAINST YOU ON THAT PARTICULAR DAY.

The International Bankers told these various countries that they were now in a state of bankruptcy. The countries had been taken over by the creditor/bankers. And there was no choice, but for all these participating countries to declare bankruptcy. If they didn't agree to declare bankruptcy, the bankers threatened to collapse the economies and thereby put the countries back into the depression like the one from which they were just emerging. The bankers made an offer they couldn't refuse. To review and elaborate: In 1930 there was a worldwide depression.

The Bankers said, "Look. You can do it either of two ways. The easy way or the hard way." "You just accept the bankruptcy and we'll let you out of the depression. If you don't, you're on your own." So all the countries involved agreed, because they realized that the International bankers had them by the throat. The countries therefore agreed that over a period of several years that they would pass statutes and legislation for the implementation of the bankruptcy in favor of the international bankers.

Now, it would probably be correct to say that the key bankers were the Rothschild's and their agents by way of Rockefeller, by way of the Federal Reserve Bank. Who the bankers were is immaterial. The fact remains that there was an International bankruptcy, and an International conspiracy to cover it up. There was a banking creditor who made the offer; the countries accepted the offer in order to enable the representative countries to continue without revolution and to allow the politicians to remain comfortably in place. Under a delusion of solvency the countries were allowed to continue to operate as though they were solvent; while in fact, the representative countries were bankrupt.

THE SNARE

The bankruptcy scheme was/is an extremely clever and diabolical plan. How did they possibly pull this scheme off in the area of real estate? The bankers did it with real estate, the same way they did it in the area of Federal Income Taxes. **These Foreign bankers simply and deceptively devised ways and means to con you into declaring yourself as a "CITIZEN" or a "RESIDENT" of the corporate U.S. Remember the corporate United States is Bankrupt per agreement and public policy. After you have been tricked into claiming you are one of their corporate United States Citizens, you are given a social security number which ties you to certain meager "benefits" and "privileges." Then, the bankers con your employer to function as an unpaid tax collector to con you into filling out their W-4 intangible property gift forms and 1040 voluntary agreements.**

These slick paper agreements establish your "voluntary" indebtedness to the banker creditor. If at any time you decide to balk at this scheme because you don't like it, the real creditor never has to make an appearance in court to list the true nature and cause of the action which is being brought against you. You end up dealing with an agency. The agency can conveniently grant itself immunity from prosecution because all it is doing (without your knowledge, of course) is administrating the bankruptcy to which the government agreed to per the Geneva meetings.

The court system never lets you put the original creditor on the courtroom stand, so you can ask him how he got attached to your back. The system is set up in such a way that the true creditor is protected and never has to make an appearance and never has to answer any of your questions or produce documents.

Therefore, the true creditor never has to produce the law that gives him the right to pledge you (your body and labor) into indebtedness (bondage/servitude).

Why? The Geneva agreement in 1930 was done by treaty. The bankruptcy was not done by legislation. The agreement came first; signed in secrecy, AND THEN Congress passed legislation to fulfill the bankruptcy obligation required by the treaty. Legislation being passed by Congress was henceforth and is thereby bankruptcy legislation. When cases came before the courts, the courts could make decisions based on the new controlling law of bankruptcy. It had nothing to do with Constitutional rights. Now, any case brought in is under the new bankruptcy law and is not considered as a true constitutional case. It is now a bankruptcy case as distinct from, but cleverly disguised as a constitutional case.

THE FRAUD

The members of the Supreme Court, of course, realized what was happening to them and the system of law. The court was being asked to perform in a creditor, debtor bankrupt proceeding to the benefit of the banker creditors. The members of the Supreme Court said, "NO. We will not give you a bankrupt proceeding decision that you can then enforce against everybody; a decision not only effecting corporate Washington D.C. but also having effect within the corporate state governments."

This, by the way, is fraud. It wouldn't be fraud if the government of corporate Washington D.C. and the government of the several corporate states declared bankruptcy then let the people know about the bankruptcy. (Notice: when I say corporate "government" I don't mean you and me. You and I are not the corporate government. The corporate government is the corporate capital of the corporate state. The government is a neutral government zone known as the corporate capital of the corporate state. The government is where the corporate state is. It is corporate headquarters. Just like corporate Washington D.C. is the seat of the corporate Federal Government. The capital of the corporate state is the seat of the corporate state government. If the corporate Federal Government and her subsidiary corporate state governments want to join forces and declare bankruptcy that's not fraud. This is their corporate business.

However, it is fraud when those two corporate entities declare bankruptcy but do not disclose to you, me, and every other American, that they have so declared bankruptcy.

Further they have not and do not disclose that their intention is to get you and every other American in this country to pledge to pay off their corporate debt to their corporate creditors. The corporate bankruptcy is the corporate state and federal responsibility, not the responsibility of Americans, The People.

THE UNITED STATES INC. IS DISTINCT AND SEPARATE FROM PRIVATE AMERICANS

"We the People" who created and signed the contract/compact/agreement/charter of, by, and for the Constitutional Corporation (U.S.) using the trade name of the "United States of America," is a corporate entity (legal fiction) which is **DISTINCT AND SEPARATE** from Americans or the un-enfranchised people of America. The private natural American people did not create the corporation of the United States. **THE UNITED STATES Inc.** did not create the private natural American people. America and Americans were in existence prior to the creation of the United States Corporation. The United States Corporation has located its U.S. headquarters in Washington D.C.

Virginia State (state territory) gave land to the newly formed United States Corporation. Notice here, we have a state giving something of value (land) to the United States. The United States Corporation agreed in the

Constitutional contract, to protect the States. Instead, because of their bankruptcy (Corporate U.S. Bankruptcy) this particular U.S. corporation has enslaved the States and the people by deception and at the will of their foreign bankers with whom they have been doing business. Our forefathers gave their lives and property to prevent enslavement.

Today, we are again enslaved. Private natural American people have been tricked, deceived, and set-up to carry the U.S. Inc. perpetual corporate debt under bankruptcy laws. Every time Americans appear in court, the corporate U.S. bankruptcy is being administrated against them without their knowledge and lawful consent. That is FRAUD.

All corporate bankruptcy administration is done by "Public Policy" of, by, and for the Mother Corporation (U.S. Inc.).

THE MOTHER CORPORATION'S "PUBLIC POLICY"


The corporate bankruptcy is carried out under the corporate public policy of the corporate Federal Government in corporate Washington D.C. The states use state public policy to carry out Federal public policy of Washington D.C. Public policy and only public policy is being administered against you in the corporate courts today. The public policy that is dictated by all the courts, from the smallest to the most powerful courts in the world, is public policy. This is why I said, in another tape that the Russian people would be enslaved into indebtedness. What will happen is that it will become public policy in Russia to have the people go into joint corporate debt. The Russians will be forced to promise to pay those debts. They will be forced to pay off on those corporate debts. Corporate public policy is the crux of the whole bankruptcy implementation. Corporate public policy is forever a corporate public policy and the laws that have passed since 1938 are all corporate public policy laws dealing only with corporate public policy. Understand that U.S. corporate public policy is not an American public policy. The public policy is OF, (belonging to) the United States corporation. This U.S. corporate bankruptcy public policy is not OF (belonging to) America, the Republic.

The Erie vs. Thompkins 1938 case was a decision based upon public policy. All decisions at any level since 1938 have been public policy decisions. All statutes, rules, regulations, and procedures that have been passed, whether civil or criminal, whether it is Federal or State, have all been passed to implement the public policy of bankruptcy. Since 1933, when FDR came into office, he brought in public policy. He established that it was the public policy of the government to call in all the gold. It was the public policy of the government to declare a banking holiday. It was the public policy of the Government in Washington D.C., (the Federal Government) to give out government assistance. Public policy operates the same within the states. All Federal court decisions can only be handed down if the states support Federal public policy. The state legal system must be compatible with the Federal legal system.

THE MONKEY-WRENCH

This is why, when people like us go to court without being represented by a lawyer, we throw a monkey-wrench into their corporate administrative proceedings. Why? All public policy corporate lawyers are pledged to uphold the "public policy" which is the corporate U.S. administration of their corporate bankruptcy. That's why you'll find stamped on many if not all our briefs, **"THIS CASE IS NOT TO BE CITED IN ANY OTHER CASE AND IS NOT TO BE REPORTED IN ANY COURTS."** The reason for this notation is that when we go in to defend ourselves or file a claim we are not supporting the corporate bankruptcy administration and procedure. The arguments we put forth predate 1938.


We come in with Constitutional law etc. All these early cases support our rights not to be in bankruptcy. However, the corporate court, lawyers, and judges have promised to give no judicial recognition of any case before 1938.



The Map of the United States as It Might Be Redrawn by the "Revisionists"—States' Rights Would Be Abolished and the Country Would Be Divided Into Nine Departments
YESTERDAYS PLAN - TODAY'S REALITY
TEN REGIONS INSTEAD OF 50 STATES

REGIONALISM - or the (NEW FEDERALISM) as our Pres. Nixon refers to it, is dead here as it was proposed almost 40 years ago. It then proposed 9 Groups instead of 10 states.

REGIONAL ALIGNMENTS



Region	Capital	States	Region	Capital	States
1	Boston	Conn., Maine., Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt.	6	Dallas-Ft. Worth	Ark., La., N. Mex., Tex.
2	N.Y. City	N.Y., N.J., Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands	7	Kansas City	Iowa, Kan., Mo., N.D.
3	Phila.	Del., D.C., Md., Pa., Va., West Va.	8	Denver	Colo., Mont., N.D., Utah, Wyo.
4	Atlanta	Ala., Fla., Ga., Ky., Miss., N.C., S.C., Tenn.	9	San Francisco	Ariz., Cal., Hawaii, Nev.
5	Chicago	Ill., Ind., Minn., Mich., Ohio, Wisc.	10	Seattle	Alaska, Idaho, Ore., Washington

"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed, or erected within the jurisdiction of any other state; (nor any State formed by the junction of two or more States,) or parts of States without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as the Congress."

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
 Article IV, Section 3, Paragraph 1

President Nixon on 3-27-69 through the Government Reorganization Act divided the U States into ten Regions. To further implement this Regional Governance over the U. President Nixon signed Executive-Order 11647-and entered it in the Federal Register 12, 1972. (Vol. 37, No. 30)

Through the authority vested in him as President of the U.S., he established a Regional Council for each of the ten standard regions. It stated that, the President designate one member of each such Council as Chairman-of that Council and such chair shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

THE INTERNATIONAL BANKERS' CORPORATE PLANTATION U.S.A. STYLE

Before 1938, the law was not a public policy law. All these old cases were not public law deciding cases. Today, the cases are all decided under corporate public policy. The public policy exists in order to administer the bankruptcy for the benefit of the banker creditors and to protect the banker creditor.

Corporate public policy can allow the creditor to say to the corporate legislatures, "I want a law passed requiring my debtors to wear seat belts. Why? Because I want to be able to milk my debtors for the longest period possible."

It doesn't behoove the creditor to allow his labor producing debtors die at an average age of 30 years. What would happen to the bankers' lending, interest, penalties, increase, repayment etc., on the entire funding and lending process if the average American life span was only 30 years? Why, the bankers would have to have 2 1/2 times the current consumer population to equal their current take. The bankers would need (instead of 250 million Americans) 600 million or even more. Maybe the bankers would need 2 Billion Americans because the individual can't contract for debt until he/she is 18 or 21 years of age. Therefore, if the average life span is only a 30 year period, the creditor could collect on the debt for only 12 years.

Now, if the bankers can just get people to live an average of 70 years) you are talking a whopping 50 years of indebtedness for which they contract and for which they are forced to pay back with usury/interest. With this situation, the banker creditor can now float loans worth 50 years of potential indebtedness and its payoff with interest in the name of the people, as opposed to 9 to 12 years.

The creditors and their property and their people are well taken care of. The creditor doesn't want the population to decrease per se, unless, it is convenient for the debtor to run up debts in another's name and then liquidate that debtor or that group of debtor people. For example let's consider the AIDS problem today among the black people. What better group to inject AIDS into than the black people?

Read the Strecker Memorandum on AIDS and the World Health Organization connection. This documents their tainted vaccination program in Africa and elsewhere. Why not kill them off? Don't you understand that the blacks as a whole have absorbed all the debt that they can? The blacks have reached the maximum of the debt that they can carry. In fact, they have gone over their limit to pay back. They are now heavily into welfare, public housing, Medicaid, Medicare, food stamps etc. Now, the situation is that instead of paying off the creditor, they have become a drain on the creditor. The creditor must now pay them to live and take care of them. What creditor in his right mind wants to spend money on a bunch of people from whom he can't collect any revenue?

The corporate public policy (of the corporate United States and the states and the county and of the cities) is that YOU must take care of these people. You must provide them with welfare etc. Why? Because when you, as a member of the corporate body politic allow laws to be passed which says the minorities must be taken care of, then the corporate legislature can say the public policy is that the people want these people taken care of. Therefore, when given the chance, the legislature can say the public policy is that the people want these blacks and poor whites to be taken care of and given a chance; therefore, we must raise taxes to fund all these benefits, privileges and opportunities.

This is what these people need to make them socially, politically, and economically equal with everyone else. The legislatures have passed all kinds of statutes providing for huge indebtedness and they float the indebtedness off your backs because you have never gone into court to challenge them by telling them it is not

your public policy to assume the debts of other people. On the contrary, all the court decisions coming put, indicate it is the corporate public policy and it is your willingness to support the corporate public policy to pay off these debts.

Remember, "public" means of and for the corporate Government. It does not mean of and for private people. "Public" means corporate government. It is corporate government policy. When they talk about public debt, they are talking about corporate government debt and your presumed pledge against this corporate created debt.

THE REAL ESTATE SNARE

How do they work this scheme in the area of real estate? These banker creeps have made an agreement that it is corporate public policy, that all land (property) be pledged to the creditor to satisfy the debt of the bankruptcy, which the creditor claims under bankruptcy. They get away with this the same way they get away with any other case that is brought before the court, whether it is a traffic ticket, IRS, or whatever.

Here is how it works. You have signed instruments giving information and jurisdiction to the bankers through their agents. The instruments (forms) you signed include, but are not limited to the following: social security registration, use of the social security number, IRS forms, driver license, traffic citation, jury duty, voter registration, using their address, zip code, U.S. postal service, a deed, a mortgage application, etc. etc. The bankers then use that instrument (document) under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) as a contract/agreement. These documents are considered promissory contract where you promise to perform. This scheme involves you, without you ever becoming directly in contact or in contract with the true creditor. What's more, you are never informed as to whom that true creditor is and it is never divulged to you the true nature and the true cause of the paperwork that you are filling out.

If you will examine your real estate deed, you will find that you promised to pay taxes to the corporate government. On property you originally acquired through a mortgage, you will notice that the bank never promised to pay taxes. You did. The corporate government at all levels never promised to pay taxes to the creditor. You did.

In tax and collection problems relating to real estate being enforced against you, you will notice that there is no mention in the mortgage or the deed stating the true nature and cause of the action. Since you have made the promise to perform, you get a bill every year for property taxes. You don't realize that the only way they can bill you for taxes is through your own stupidity of agreeing to pay the tax. You volunteered. They took advantage of you, conning you to promise to pay property taxes. When they send you their bill, they are coming against you for the collection of the promise you made to the creditor.

Now the creditor on the paperwork appears that it is the local bank. The bank has loaned you credit. The bank hasn't loaned you anything. It is not their credit to loan. This is why the bank can't loan credit. There is a credit involved, but not the bank's credit. It is the credit of the International Bankers. The International bankers are making you the loan based upon their operation of bankruptcy claim which they presume to have against you personally as well as your property. Now, let's say you get a tax bill and you decide "I'm not going to pay it." You will find that the courts and the lawyers and the county agencies are set up to protect the true creditor simply by not identifying the creditor. By not being identified as the true creditor, the international banker can make you a credit loan that has no value in reality.

In the case of real property, he claims to loan you the use of your own property for which you pay a tax as rent. He is allowed to do this because you are presumed by statutory law and the banker to be in bankruptcy. This fraud is not revealed because he does not have to make an appearance in court to present and defend his claim. His name is not mentioned in the case.

Let's say you are not aware of your remedies provided for you within the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC). The UCC provides or allows you to dishonor the county's presentment of the tax bill. You don't pay your tax bill. You, therefore, just sit on it and don't do or say anything. A couple of years go by and all of a sudden you are being sent letters to pay up what is owed or else in a certain period of time, your property will be taken from you and put up for tax sale.

Now here is what is interesting..... If you don't pay your tax bill and they contact you asking you to pay it and you don't do it, they will declare that you are in default. It is based on that default, as provided for in the UCC, that they sell your property for the tax (rent).

However, the county never goes into court to put into the record the identification of the real creditor. And the county does not state the true nature and cause of the action against you (bankruptcy action disguised as a tax action). Why? Under the bankruptcy implementation, they have developed a legal procedure which is based upon your promise to pay. This procedure provides that they don't have to come to the court to get a court order authorizing the sale of your property. Therefore, the real creditor never makes an appearance in court.

In reality, you are denied any possibility of appearing in court to exercise your right to challenge the creditor and ask if he became the creditor under "public policy"; to ask if it is under "public policy", just what is the "public policy" and how did you (as an international banker) become "creditor" to me and everyone else in this country (American people). They don't want you to ask the real creditor (the International Bankers) to produce the documents upon which your personal debt is established. If they were forced to go into court, they would have to produce the deed or mortgage showing you knowingly, willingly, and voluntarily promised to pay the corporate public debt. You did not knowingly, willingly, and voluntarily promise to pay any U.S. Corporate Bankruptcy obligation made in the 1930's.

This would, of course, expose their racket. In fact, there was absolutely no debt connected to you until you agreed to it through their deception and fraud. The deception in a broader sense permeates the education system and the news media, etc., to sell you on the idea that you are a statutory "U.S. citizen" and "resident of the United States." (INCORPORATED).

YOUR SIGNATURE IS YOUR MOST VALUABLE PROPERTY

Your property is pledged for the rest of your life upon your signature and your promise to perform is pledged into perpetual debt. The bankers don't even bother to go to court. They leave it up to the agencies to administer the agency corporate public policy. It is the public policy of that agency to bill you on your promise to perform. If you don't pay, they follow up on the public policy on notice of default and give you one more chance to pay. Then they proceed to sell the property at a tax auction. They never go to court or appear in court to back up their claim against you. Did any of your government licensed and controlled teachers ever stress that your signature is your most valuable personal property? Did your government teachers ever tell you that any time you sign any document, you should sign it "without prejudice," or with "All Rights Reserved" above your signature. This means you are reserving your God given unalienable rights which cannot be transferred and all other rights for which your forefathers died.

The Corporate U.S. Government provides, or at best pretends to provide for this reservation of rights under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) 1-207 and 1-103. You need more information in this area. It is not in the best interest of the United States Corporate "PUBLIC" schools to teach you about their bankruptcy proceedings and how they have set the snare to compel you into paying their debt. The Corporate "PUBLIC" schools are strictly designed for their corporate citizen/subjects. That is, the Corporate U.S. Public School "citizens."

Notice all the emphases on being a "good" citizen. Basically all their teachers and their students are trained to produce labor and material in exchange for valueless green paper called "money." It is not money; it functions "AS" money. Lawful money must be backed by something of value. Bankers take your labor, services, and material (homes, cars, farms, etc.) in exchange for their valueless corporate paper. This paper is backed only by the "full faith and Confidence of the United States Government" - THE MOTHER CORPORATION.

I do not have faith or confidence in the U.S. BANKRUPT CORPORATE GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATORS WHO HAVE PERVERTED THEIR Constitutional CHARTER, enslaving the sovereign American people into their bankruptcy obligations. Their fraudulent money laundering process promotes your payment on the corporate government's bankruptcy debt. This debt is mathematically impossible to pay off. You and your family are in continual financial bondage to the international bankers. They love it so!

Black's Law Dictionary, 1990, defines "Money Changers" as:business of a banker... today handled by the international departments of banks." What did Christ do to the Money Changers? Oh, yes, he severely interfered with their activity. Three days later he was crucified. And what of Abraham Lincoln? He was killed for interfering with the money changers. Kennedy as well.

Let's return to the subject of your property, and the tax sale for not paying property taxes. In this situation under a standard deed (not common law deed) you are actually in default. Not because you understand the default or you like being in default, you just are in default of the tax payment. So they put your property up for sale. At the tax sale, Joe Doe, average American, bids on your property and gets it. Now, there is a procedure he must go through step by step to establish. He is required to give you another chance. You have six months and a day to pay off the default. If, at this time, you pay off the amount the county says you owe, plus penalties, interest, fines, etc., then your property is taken off default status and it is yours to continue to pay taxes on the next year.

THE COVER-UP

There was a deal struck that, if any person who doesn't have a lawyer to bring a case before the courts, and this person proves the fraud, and speaks the truth about the fraud, the courts are compelled to not allow the case to be cited or published anywhere. The courts cannot afford to have the case freely available in the public archives. This would be evidence of the fraud. That is why you can't hire an attorney. An attorney is compelled to uphold the fraud.

"TRUST ME"

"I'm Here To Help You."

"I Have The Governments Permission To Practice Law"

"I'm A Member of the Bar"

The attorney is there for one reason. That reason is to make sure the bankruptcy scam (established by the corporate public policy of the corporate Federal Government) is upheld. The lawyer's will cite no cases for you that will go against the bankruptcy in corporate public policy. Whatever the lawyers do for you is a bunch of Bull Shit. The lawyers have to support the bankruptcy and public policy even at your expense. The lawyers can't go against the corporate Federal Government statutes implementing, protecting and administrating the bankruptcy.

For all cases cited, those in the US Code or the state annotated code or any other source, you may be sure that they are only those selected cases that support the public policy of bankruptcy. The legal system has to work that way. After the last 30-40-50-60 years of cases after cases having been decided based upon upholding the bankruptcy, how could the legal system possibly allow someone to come into court and put in the record substantial information and argument to prove the fraud?

BLOOD IN THE STREETS?

Can you imagine how damaging it would be, if they allowed your case to be cited in another case, or if they allowed the public to examine a copy of your brief that exposes evidence of the fraud? This exposure would render null and void everything for which they have worked so hard. Wouldn't this exposure make the people mad? Wouldn't this exposure mean there would be blood running in the streets? (Especially the cities where the poor people have been really taken by this diabolical system.) What they are concerned about is that the case never be cited. That goes against the bankruptcy for fear of exposing the bankruptcy and the people will then pick up their guns and shoot the SOB's.

ATTENTION: LAW STUDENT!

You said you wanted to be a lawyer. Well, I hope you've read this carefully, because here is the legal system you're headed to serve, and serve you will. You say you wanted to be a lawyer so you can find out what oath they're taking, in "secret", behind closed doors in solemn preparation for the "business of the court" as judges and lawyers.

Now you know the oath. The oath is simply to uphold the bankruptcy. If you want to be a lawyer and want to make a living as a lawyer, be careful. They will weed you out at the beginning if you don't bring in your paperwork under the bankruptcy procedures. If you try to defend your clients and try to help your clients they will get rid of you. They will pull your license. So you spent all that money and time going to school under the guise of helping people and you're wasting your time. Without a license you can't go into a courtroom. I would think about this if I were you.

THE LAWYERS GUILD CONNECTION

Here is what happens. The American Bar Association is a franchise of the Lawyers Guild of Great Britain. The American Bar Association is not connected primarily with what happens in any case on the local level. However, when a case leaves the local level, by that is meant, the state court, city court or the justice of the peace, or even the federal court; and goes to the appeals court, it appears that the American Bar Association takes notice of the case. It would seem that the American Bar Association must have an agreement that any action brought on appeal, must be reviewed by the American Bar Association. If this is true, it would all make sense. How else would the American Bar Association, a branch of the Lawyers Guild of Great Britain, which is the legal arm of the Rothschild's Dynasty, be able to monitor and administer the corporate bankruptcy. It would appear that the American Bar Association would be compelled to review all appeal cases and to make certain any case brought under common law or the constitutional law that would expose the bankruptcy, would be immediately stamped on the back that "this case is not to be cited or published." I believe that this is the stamp origin and purpose of the stamp message in such cases. The justice department may be able to do that in Washington D.C. I can't see where any judge or lawyer could have the authority to stamp or label the case as one not to be cited for future cases. I think that is an official stamp from the American Bar Association.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

Now, Mr. /Ms. Law Student, if you're still attending classes and you have a good professor, ask him/her about just where the stamp comes from that you've seen on many cases. Just who put it on the paperwork and just who authorized the citation restriction? Just who is tampering with the law? There is one thing certain the creditor and or his agents are watching these cases very carefully. The creditor and his agents must balance their books. When you think of the IRS, be aware that the IRS is an agent of the creditor, the corporate

International Bankers. This is just one of the Bankers' state side agencies. The General Accounting Office (GAO) is another agency they use for this country.

This is where all the accounting goes on to keep track of the debt. All the states have to send reports to Washington D.C. Washington D.C. has to send reports to the (GAO). Take a look at your state Comptroller's Annual Report to the Governor of your state. I found it in the library located in the city of the corporate state capital. Look under "Trust Fund" for each state sub-corporation like the state courts, IRS, Banks, Education, etc. you will be amazed at the amount of money being pumped into the Trust Fund from the various Corporate State Departmental Revenues (all revenue is referred to as taxes: fines, fees, licenses, etc.). There are millions and billions of your hard earned worthless Federal Reserve notes, "dollars", being held in "trust." This money is being siphoned off into the coffers of the International Bankers while the corporate government officials are hounding you for more and more tax dollars.

All this accounting system is NOT so the people will know what is going on. The accounting reports are for the bankers and creditors to keep tabs on just where their collections are coming from. The bankers want to know if the bankruptcy debt payments are coming in and just how much and from what sources. This accounting is the purpose behind M1, M2, M3, M4, and M5. All this accounting is closely monitored at least once a week. These M's are the reports of the amounts of money in circulation showing the amount of debt and credit out there; the floating of debt in the form of bonds. There are five different categories. This system had to come into existence in order for the creditors to be on top of the bankruptcy at all times. This system allows the creditors to figure out and know exactly what is going on in their domain.

It all makes sense. Don't the bankers hire bill collectors? Creditors hire bill collectors to snoop around do see why you're not paying. They want do know how much you are going to pay so they can figure out how much will be coming in. How much they will collect. They want to know who will pay and who won't.

THE WHOLE SYSTEM IS NOTHING BUT CREDIT AND DEBT.

THE WORLD CREDIT UNION

Here is what is going to very quickly happen internationally. All of the governments around the world are going to unite. They will create one big giant credit union for collecting the debt for the International Bankers. We have allowed ourselves do get into this very sad situation, but **THAT IS THE WAY IT IS.**

The ultimate result of shielding men from the effects of folly is to fill the world with fools. -- "State Tamperings with Money Banks" -- Herbert Spencer (1820-1903)

WELCOME TO YOUR NEW WORLD ORDER

Secrets of the Federal Reserve

by Eustace Mullins

Chapter 1 — Jekyll Island

"The matter of a uniform discount rate was discussed and settled at Jekyll Island."--Paul M. Warburg ¹

On the night of November 22, 1910, a group of newspaper reporters stood disconsolately in the railway station at Hoboken, New Jersey. They had just watched a delegation of the nation's leading financiers leave the station on a secret mission. It would be years before they discovered what that mission was, and even then they would not understand that the history of the United States underwent a drastic change after that night in Hoboken.

The delegation had left in a sealed railway car, with blinds drawn, for an undisclosed destination. They were led by Senator Nelson Aldrich, head of the National Monetary Commission. President Theodore Roosevelt had signed into law the bill creating the National Monetary Commission in 1908, after the tragic Panic of 1907 had resulted in a public outcry that the nation's monetary system be stabilized. Aldrich had led the members of the Commission on a two-year tour of Europe, spending some three hundred thousand dollars of public money. He had not yet made a report on the results of this trip, nor had he offered any plan for banking reform.

Accompanying Senator Aldrich at the Hoboken station were his private secretary, Shelton; A. Piatt Andrew, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Special Assistant of the National Monetary Commission; Frank Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank of New York, Henry P. Davison, senior partner of J.P. Morgan Company, and generally regarded as Morgan's personal emissary; and Charles D. Norton, president of the Morgan-dominated First National Bank of New York. Joining the group just before the train left the station were Benjamin Strong, also known as a lieutenant of J.P. Morgan; and Paul Warburg, a recent immigrant from Germany who had joined the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb.

Six years later, a financial writer named Bertie Charles Forbes (who later founded the Forbes Magazine; the present editor, Malcom Forbes, is his son), wrote:

"Picture a party of the nation's greatest bankers stealing out of New York on a private railroad car under cover of darkness, stealthily hiding hundreds of miles South, embarking on a mysterious launch, sneaking onto an island deserted by all but a few servants, living there a full week under such rigid secrecy that the names of not one of them was once mentioned lest the servants learn the identity and disclose to the world this strangest, most secret expedition in the history of American finance. I am not romancing; I am giving to the world, for the first time, the real story of how the famous Aldrich currency report, the foundation of our new currency system, was written The utmost secrecy was enjoined upon all. The public must not glean a hint of what was to be done. Senator Aldrich notified each one to go quietly into a private car of which the railroad had received orders to draw up on an unfrequented platform. Off the party set, New York's ubiquitous reporters had been foiled . . . Nelson (Aldrich) had confided to Henry, Frank, Paul and Piatt that he was to keep them locked up at Jekyll Island, out of the rest of the world, until they had evolved and compiled a scientific currency system for the United States, the real birth of the present Federal Reserve System, the plan done on Jekyll Island in the conference with Paul, Frank and Henry Warburg is the link that binds the Aldrich system and the present system together. He more than any one man has made the system possible as a working reality." ²

The official biography of Senator Nelson Aldrich states:

"In the autumn of 1910, six men went out to shoot ducks, Aldrich, his secretary Shelton, Andrews, Davison, Vanderlip and Warburg. Reporters were waiting at the Brunswick (Georgia) station. Mr. Davison went out and talked to them. The

reporters dispersed and the secret of the strange journey was not divulged. Mr. Aldrich asked him how he had managed it and he did not volunteer the information." ³

Davison had an excellent reputation as the person who could conciliate warring factions, a role he had performed for J.P. Morgan during the settling of the Money Panic of 1907. Another Morgan partner, T.W. Lamont, says:

"Henry P. Davison served as arbitrator of the Jekyll Island expedition." ⁴

From these references, it is possible to piece together the story. Aldrich's private car, which had left Hoboken station with its shades drawn, had taken the financiers to Jekyll Island, Georgia. Some years earlier, a very exclusive group of millionaires, led by J.P. Morgan, had purchased the island as a winter retreat. They called themselves the Jekyll Island Hunt Club, and, at first, the island was used only for hunting expeditions, until the millionaires realized that its pleasant climate offered a warm retreat from the rigors of winters in New York, and began to build splendid mansions, which they called "cottages", for their families' winter vacations. The club building itself, being quite isolated, was sometimes in demand for stag parties and other pursuits unrelated to hunting. On such occasions, the club members who were not invited to these specific outings were asked not to appear there for a certain number of days. Before Nelson Aldrich's party had left New York, the club's members had been notified that the club would be occupied for the next two weeks.

The Jekyll Island Club was chosen as the place to draft the plan for control of the money and credit of the people of the United States, not only because of its isolation, but also because it was the private preserve of the people who were drafting the plan. The New York Times later noted, on May 3, 1931, in commenting on the death of George F. Baker, one of J.P. Morgan's closest associates, that "Jekyll Island Club has lost one of its most distinguished members. One-sixth of the total wealth of the world was represented by the members of the Jekyll Island Club." Membership was by inheritance only.

The Aldrich group had no interest in hunting. Jekyll Island was chosen for the site of the preparation of the central bank because it offered complete privacy, and because there was not a journalist within fifty miles. Such was the need for secrecy that the members of the party agreed, before arriving at Jekyll Island, that no last names would be used at any time during their two week stay. The group later referred to themselves as the First Name Club, as the last names of Warburg, Strong, Vanderlip and the others were prohibited during their stay. The customary attendants had been given two week vacations from the club, and new servants brought in from the mainland for this occasion who did not know the names of any of those present. Even if they had been interrogated after the Aldrich party went back to New York, they could not have given the names. This arrangement proved to be so satisfactory that the members, limited to those who had actually been present at Jekyll Island, later had a number of informal get-togethers in New York.

Why all this secrecy? Why this thousand mile trip in a closed railway car to a remote hunting club? Ostensibly, it was to carry out a program of public service, to prepare banking reform which would be a boon to the people of the United States, which had been ordered by the National Monetary Commission. The participants were no strangers to public benefactions. Usually, their names were inscribed on brass plaques, or on the exteriors of buildings which they had donated. This was not the procedure which they followed at Jekyll Island. No brass plaque was ever erected to mark the selfless actions of those who met at their private hunt club in 1910 to improve the lot of every citizen of the United States.

In fact, no benefaction took place at Jekyll Island. The Aldrich group journeyed there in private to write the banking and currency legislation which the National Monetary Commission had been ordered to prepare in public. At stake was the future control of the money and credit of the United States. If any genuine monetary reform had been prepared and presented to Congress, it would have ended the power of the elitist one world money creators. Jekyll Island ensured that a central bank would be established in the United States which would give these bankers everything they had always wanted.

As the most technically proficient of those present, Paul Warburg was charged with doing most of the drafting of the plan. His work would then be discussed and gone over by the rest of the group. Senator Nelson Aldrich was there to see that the completed plan would come out in a form which he could get passed by Congress, and the other bankers were there to include whatever details would be needed to be certain that they got everything they wanted, in a finished draft composed

during a onetime stay. After they returned to New York, there could be no second get together to rework their plan. They could not hope to obtain such secrecy for their work on a second journey.

The Jekyll Island group remained at the club for nine days, working furiously to complete their task. Despite the common interests of those present, the work did not proceed without friction. Senator Aldrich, always a domineering person, considered himself the chosen leader of the group, and could not help ordering everyone else about. Aldrich also felt somewhat out of place as the only member who was not a professional banker. He had had substantial banking interests throughout his career, but only as a person who profited from his ownership of bank stock. He knew little about the technical aspects of financial operations. His opposite number, Paul Warburg, believed that every question raised by the group demanded, not merely an answer, but a lecture. He rarely lost an opportunity to give the members a long discourse designed to impress them with the extent of his knowledge of banking. This was resented by the others, and often drew barbed remarks from Aldrich. The natural diplomacy of Henry P. Davison proved to be the catalyst which kept them at their work. Warburg's thick alien accent grated on them, and constantly reminded them that they had to accept his presence if a central bank plan was to be devised which would guarantee them their future profits. Warburg made little effort to smooth over their prejudices, and contested them on every possible occasion on technical banking questions, which he considered his private preserve.

"In all conspiracies there must be great secrecy." ⁵

The "monetary reform" plan prepared at Jekyll Island was to be presented to Congress as the completed work of the National Monetary Commission. It was imperative that the real authors of the bill remain hidden. So great was popular resentment against bankers since the Panic of 1907 that no Congressman would dare to vote for a bill bearing the Wall Street taint, no matter who had contributed to his campaign expenses. The Jekyll Island plan was a central bank plan, and in this country there was a long tradition of struggle against inflicting a central bank on the American people. It had begun with Thomas Jefferson's fight against Alexander Hamilton's scheme for the First Bank of the United States, backed by James Rothschild. It had continued with President Andrew Jackson's successful war against Alexander Hamilton's scheme for the Second Bank of the United States, in which Nicholas Biddle was acting as the agent for James Rothschild of Paris. The result of that struggle was the creation of the Independent Sub-Treasury System, which supposedly had served to keep the funds of the United States out of the hands of the financiers. A study of the panics of 1873, 1893, and 1907 indicates that these panics were the result of the international bankers' operations in London. The public was demanding in 1908 that Congress enact legislation to prevent the recurrence of artificially induced money panics. Such monetary reform now seemed inevitable. It was to head off and control such reform that the National Monetary Commission had been set up with Nelson Aldrich at its head, since he was majority leader of the Senate.

The main problem, as Paul Warburg informed his colleagues, was to avoid the name "Central Bank". For that reason, he had decided upon the designation of "Federal Reserve System". This would deceive the people into thinking it was not a central bank. However, the Jekyll Island plan would be a central bank plan, fulfilling the main functions of a central bank; it would be owned by private individuals who would profit from ownership of shares. As a bank of issue, it would control the nation's money and credit.

In the chapter on Jekyll Island in his biography of Aldrich, Stephenson writes of the conference: "How was the Reserve Bank to be controlled? It must be controlled by Congress. The government was to be represented in the board of directors, it was to have full knowledge of all the Bank's affairs, but a majority of the directors were to be chosen, directly or indirectly, by the banks of the association." ⁶

Thus the proposed Federal Reserve Bank was to be "controlled by Congress" and answerable to the government, but the majority of the directors were to be chosen, "directly or indirectly" by the banks of the association. In the final refinement of Warburg's plan, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors would be appointed by the President of the United States, but the real work of the Board would be controlled by a Federal Advisory Council, meeting with the Governors. The Council would be chosen by the directors of the twelve Federal Reserve Banks, and would remain unknown to the public.

The next consideration was to conceal the fact that the proposed "Federal Reserve System" would be dominated by the masters of the New York money market. The Congressmen from the South and the West could not survive if they voted for a Wall Street plan. Farmers and small businessmen in those areas had suffered most from the money panics. There had

been great popular resentment against the Eastern bankers, which during the nineteenth century became a political movement known as "populism". The private papers of Nicholas Biddle, not released until more than a century after his death, show that quite early on the Eastern bankers were fully aware of the widespread public opposition to them.

Paul Warburg advanced at Jekyll Island the primary deception which would prevent the citizens from recognizing that his plan set up a central bank. This was the regional reserve system. He proposed a system of four (later twelve) branch reserve banks located in different sections of the country. Few people outside the banking world would realize that the existing concentration of the nation's money and credit structure in New York made the proposal of a regional reserve system a delusion.

Another proposal advanced by Paul Warburg at Jekyll Island was the manner of selection of administrators for the proposed regional reserve system. Senator Nelson Aldrich had insisted that the officials should be appointive, not elected, and that Congress should have no role in their selection. His Capitol Hill experience had taught him that congressional opinion would often be inimical to the Wall Street interests, as Congressmen from the West and South might wish to demonstrate to their constituents that they were protecting them against the Eastern bankers.

Warburg responded that the administrators of the proposed central banks should be subject to executive approval by the President. This patent removal of the system from Congressional control meant that the

Federal Reserve proposal was unconstitutional from its inception, because the Federal Reserve System was to be a bank of issue. Article 1, Sec. 8, Par. 5 of the Constitution expressly charges Congress with "the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." Warburg's plan would deprive Congress of its sovereignty, and the systems of checks and balances of power set up by Thomas Jefferson in the Constitution would now be destroyed. Administrators of the proposed system would control the nation's money and credit, and would themselves be approved by the executive department of the government. The judicial department (the Supreme Court, etc.) was already virtually controlled by the executive department through presidential appointment to the bench.

Paul Warburg later wrote a massive exposition of his plan, *The Federal Reserve System, Its Origin and Growth* ⁷ of some 1750 pages, but the name "Jekyll Island" appears nowhere in this text. He does state (Vol. 1, p. 58):

"But then the conference closed, after a week of earnest deliberation, the rough draft of what later became the Aldrich Bill had been agreed upon, and a plan had been outlined which provided for a 'National Reserve Association,' meaning a central reserve organization with an elastic note issue based on gold and commercial paper."

On page 60, Warburg writes, "The results of the conference were entirely confidential. Even the fact there had been a meeting was not permitted to become public." He adds in a footnote, "Though eighteen [sic] years have since gone by, I do not feel free to give a description of this most interesting conference concerning which Senator Aldrich pledged all participants to secrecy."

B.C. Forbes' revelation ⁸ of the secret expedition to Jekyll Island, had had surprisingly little impact. It did not appear in print until two years after the Federal Reserve Act had been passed by Congress, hence it was never read during the period when it could have had an effect, that is, during the Congressional debate on the bill. Forbes' story was also dismissed, by those "in the know," as preposterous, and a mere invention. Stephenson mentions this on page 484 of his book about Aldrich. ⁹

"This curious episode of Jekyll Island has been generally regarded as a myth. B.C. Forbes got some information from one of the reporters. It told in vague outline the Jekyll Island story, but made no impression and was generally regarded as a mere yarn."

The coverup of the Jekyll Island conference proceeded along two lines, both of which were successful. The first, as Stephenson mentions, was to dismiss the entire story as a romantic concoction which never actually took place. Although there were brief references to Jekyll Island in later books concerning the Federal Reserve System, these also attracted little public attention. As we have noted, Warburg's massive and supposedly definite work on the Federal Reserve System does

not mention Jekyll Island at all, although he does admit that a conference took place. In none of his voluminous speeches or writings do the words "Jekyll Island" appear, with a single notable exception. He agreed to Professor Stephenson's request that he prepare a brief statement for the Aldrich biography. This appears on page 485 as part of "The Warburg Memorandum". In this excerpt, Warburg writes, "The matter of a uniform discount rate was discussed and settled at Jekyll Island."

Another member of the "First Name Club" was less reticent. Frank Vanderlip later published a few brief references to the conference. In the *Saturday Evening Post*, February 9, 1935, p. 25, Vanderlip wrote: "Despite my views about the value to society of greater publicity for the affairs of corporations, there was an occasion near the close of 1910, when I was as secretive, indeed, as furtive, as any conspirator . . . Since it would have been fatal to Senator Aldrich's plan to have it known that he was calling on anybody from Wall Street to help him in preparing his bill, precautions were taken that would have delighted the heart of James Stillman (a colorful and secretive banker who was President of the National City Bank during the Spanish-American War, and who was thought to have been involved in getting us into that war) . . . I do not feel it is any exaggeration to speak of our secret expedition to Jekyll Island as the occasion of the actual conception of what eventually became the Federal Reserve System."

In a Travel feature in *The Washington Post*, March 27, 1983, "Follow The Rich to Jekyll Island", Roy Hoopes writes:

"In 1910, when Aldrich and four financial experts wanted a place to meet in secret to reform the country's banking system, they faked a hunting trip to Jekyll and for 10 days holed up in the Clubhouse, where they made plans for what eventually would become the Federal Reserve Bank."

Vanderlip later wrote in his autobiography, *From Farmboy to Financier*: ¹⁰

"Our secret expedition to Jekyll Island was the occasion of the actual conception of what eventually became the Federal Reserve System. The essential points of the Aldrich Plan were all contained in the Federal Reserve Act as it was passed."

Professor E.R.A. Seligman, a member of the international banking family of J. & W. Seligman, and head of the Department of Economics at Columbia University, wrote in an essay published by the *Academy of Political Science*, Proceedings, v. 4, No. 4, p. 387-90:

"It is known to a very few how great is the indebtedness of the United States to Mr. Warburg. For it may be said 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 existence of a Federal Reserve Board creates, in everything but in name, a real central bank. In the two fundamentals of command of reserves and of a discount policy, the Federal Reserve Act has frankly accepted the principle of the Aldrich Bill, and these principles, as has been stated, were the creation of Mr. Warburg and Mr. Warburg alone. It must not be forgotten that Mr. Warburg had a practical object in view. In formulating his plans and in advancing in them slightly varying suggestions from time to time, it was incumbent on him to remember that the education of the country must be gradual and that a large part of the task was to break down prejudices and remove suspicion. His plans therefore contained all sorts of elaborate suggestions designed to guard the public against fancied dangers and to persuade the country that the general scheme was at all practicable. It was the hope of Mr. Warburg that with the lapse of time it might be possible to eliminate from the law a few clauses which were inserted largely at his suggestion for educational purposes."

Now that the public debt of the United States has passed a [6] trillion dollars [in 2006], we may indeed admit "how great is the indebtedness of the United States to Mr. Warburg." At the time he wrote the Federal Reserve Act, the public debt was almost nonexistent.

Professor Seligman points out Warburg's remarkable prescience that the real task of the members of the Jekyll Island conference was to prepare a banking plan which would gradually "educate the country" and "break down prejudices and remove suspicion". The campaign to enact the plan into law succeeded in doing just that.

Chapter 2 — The Aldrich Plan

"Finance and the tariff are reserved by Nelson Aldrich as falling within his sole purview and jurisdiction. Mr. Aldrich is endeavoring to devise, through the National Monetary Commission, a banking and currency law. A great many hundred thousand persons are firmly of the opinion that Mr. Aldrich sums up in his personality the greatest and most sinister menace to the popular welfare of the United States. Ernest Newman recently said, 'What the South visits on the Negro in a political way, Aldrich would mete out to the mudsills of the North, if he could devise a safe and practical way to accomplish it.'"--Harper's Weekly, May 7, 1910."

The participants in the Jekyll Island conference returned to New York to direct a nationwide propaganda campaign in favor of the "Aldrich Plan". Three of the leading universities, Princeton, Harvard, and the University of Chicago, were used as the rallying points for this propaganda, and national banks had to contribute to a fund of five million dollars to persuade the American public that this central bank plan should be enacted into law by Congress.

Woodrow Wilson, governor of New Jersey and former president of Princeton University, was enlisted as a spokesman for the Aldrich Plan. During the Panic of 1907, Wilson had declared, "All this trouble could be averted if we appointed a committee of six or seven public-spirited men like J.P. Morgan to handle the affairs of our country."

In his biography of Nelson Aldrich in 1930, Stephenson says:

"A pamphlet was issued January 16, 1911, 'Suggested Plan for Monetary Legislation', by Hon. Nelson Aldrich, based on Jekyll Island conclusions." Stephenson says on page 388, "An organization for financial progress has been formed. Mr. Warburg introduced a resolution authorizing the establishment of the Citizens' League, later the National Citizens League . . . Professor Laughlin of the University of Chicago was given charge of the League's propaganda." ¹¹

It is notable that Stephenson characterizes the work of the National Citizens League as "propaganda", in line with Seligman's exposition of Warburg's work as "the education of the country" and "to break down prejudices".

Much of the five million dollars of the bankers slush fund was spent under the auspices of the National Citizens' League, which was made up of college professors. The two most tireless propagandists for the Aldrich Plan were Professor O.M. Sprague of Harvard, and J. Laurence Laughlin of the University of Chicago.

Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., notes:

"J. Laurence Laughlin, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Citizens' League since its organization, has returned to his position as professor of political economics in the University of Chicago. In June, 1911, Professor Laughlin was given a year's leave from the university, that he might give all of his time to the campaign of education undertaken by the League . . . He has worked indefatigably, and it is largely due to his efforts and his persistence that the campaign enters the final stage with flattering prospects of a successful outcome . . . The reader knows that the University of Chicago is an institution endowed by John D. Rockefeller, with nearly fifty million dollars." ¹²

In his biography of Nelson Aldrich, Stephenson reveals that the Citizens' League was also a Jekyll Island product. In chapter 24 we find that: The Aldrich Plan was represented to Congress as the result of three years of work, study and travel by members of the National Monetary Commission, with expenditures of more than three hundred thousand dollars.*

Testifying before the Committee on Rules, December 15, 1911, after the Aldrich plan had been introduced in Congress, Congressman Lindbergh stated:

"Our financial system is a false one and a huge burden on the people . . . I have alleged that there is a Money Trust. The Aldrich plan is a scheme plainly in the interest of the Trust . . . Why does the Money Trust press so hard for the Aldrich Plan now, before the people know what the money trust has been doing?"

Lindbergh continued his speech,

"The Aldrich Plan is the Wall Street Plan. It is a broad challenge to the Government by the champion of the Money Trust. It means another panic, if necessary, to intimidate the people. Aldrich, paid by the Government to represent the people, proposes a plan for the trusts instead. It was by a very clever move that the National Monetary Commission was created. In 1907 nature responded most beautifully and gave this country the most bountiful crop it had ever had. Other industries were busy too, and from a natural standpoint all the conditions were right for a most prosperous year. Instead, a panic entailed enormous losses upon us. Wall Street knew the American people were demanding a remedy against the recurrence of such a ridiculously unnatural condition. Most Senators and Representatives fell into the Wall Street trap and passed the Aldrich Vreeland Emergency Currency Bill. But the real purpose was to get a monetary commission which would frame a proposition for amendments to our currency and banking laws which would suit the Money Trust. The interests are now busy everywhere educating the people in favor of the Aldrich Plan. It is reported that a large sum of money has been raised for this purpose. Wall Street speculation brought on the Panic of 1907. The depositors' funds were loaned to gamblers and anybody the Money Trust wanted to favour. Then when the depositors wanted their money, the banks did not have it. That made the panic."

Edward Vreeland, co-author of the bill, wrote in the August 25, 1910 Independent (which was owned by Aldrich), "Under the proposed monetary plan of Senator Aldrich, monopolies will disappear, because they will not be able to make more than four percent interest and monopolies cannot continue at such a low rate. Also, this will mark the disappearance of the Government from the banking business."

Vreeland's fantastic claims were typical of the propaganda flood unleashed to pass the Aldrich Plan. Monopolies would disappear, the Government would disappear from the banking business. Pie in the sky.

Nation Magazine, January 19, 1911, noted, "The name of Central Bank is carefully avoided, but the 'Federal Reserve Association', the name given to the proposed central organization, is endowed with the usual powers and responsibilities of a European Central Bank."

After the National Monetary Commission had returned from Europe, it held no official meetings for nearly two years. No records or minutes were ever presented showing who had authored the Aldrich Plan. Since they held no official meetings, the members of the commission could hardly claim the Plan as their own. The sole tangible result of the Commission's three hundred thousand dollar expenditure was a library of thirty massive volumes on European banking. Typical of these works is a thousand page history of the Reichsbank, the central bank which controlled money and credit in Germany, and whose principal stockholders, were the Rothschilds and Paul Warburg's family banking house of M.M. Warburg Company. The Commission's records show that it never functioned as a deliberative body. Indeed, its only "meeting" was the secret conference held at Jekyll Island, and this conference is not mentioned in any publication of the Commission. Senator Cummins passed a resolution in Congress ordering the Commission to report on January 8, 1912, and show some constructive results of its three years' work. In the face of this challenge, the National Monetary Commission ceased to exist.

With their five million dollars as a war chest, the Aldrich Plan propagandists waged a no-holds barred war against their opposition. Andrew Frame testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee of the American Bankers Association. He represented a group of Western bankers who opposed the Aldrich Plan:

CHAIRMAN CARTER GLASS:

"Why didn't the Western bankers make themselves heard when the American Bankers Association gave its unqualified and, we are assured, unanimous approval of the scheme proposed by the National Monetary Commission?"

ANDREW FRAME:

"I'm glad you called my attention to that. When that monetary bill was given to the country, it was but a few days previous to the meeting of the American Bankers Association in New Orleans in 1911. There was not one banker in a hundred who had read that bill. We had twelve addresses in favor of it. General Hamby of Austin, Texas, wrote a letter to President Watts asking for a hearing against the bill. He did not get a very courteous answer. I refused to vote on it, and a great many other bankers did likewise."

MR. BULKLEY:

"Do you mean that no member of the Association could be heard in opposition to the bill?"

ANDREW FRAME:

"They throttled all argument."

MR. KINDRED:

"But the report was given out that it was practically unanimous."

ANDREW FRAME:

"The bill had already been prepared by Senator Aldrich and presented to the executive council of the American Bankers Association in May, 1911. As a member of that council, I received a copy the day before they acted upon it. When the bill came in at New Orleans, the bankers of the United States had not read it."

MR. KINDRED:

"Did the presiding officer simply rule out those who wanted to discuss it negatively?"

ANDREW FRAME:

"They would not allow anyone on the program who was not in favor of the bill."

CHAIRMAN GLASS:

"What significance has the fact that at the next annual meeting of the American Bankers Association held at Detroit in 1912, the Association did not reiterate its endorsement of the plan of the National Monetary Commission, known as the Aldrich scheme?"

ANDREW FRAME:

"It did not reiterate the endorsement for the simple fact that the backers of the Aldrich Plan knew that the Association would not endorse it. We were ready for them, but they did not bring it up."

Andrew Frame exposed the collusion which in 1911 procured an endorsement of the Aldrich Plan from the American Bankers Association but which in 1912 did not even dare to repeat its endorsement, for fear of an honest and open discussion of the merits of the plan.

Chairman Glass then called as witness one of the ten most powerful bankers in the United States, George Blumenthal, partner of the international banking house of Lazard Freres and brother-in-law of Eugene Meyer, Jr. Carter Glass effusively welcomed Blumenthal, stating that "Senator O'Gorman of New York was kind enough to suggest your name to us."

A year later, O'Gorman prevented a Senate Committee from asking his master, Paul Warburg, any embarrassing questions before approving his nomination as the first Governor of the Federal Reserve Board.

George Blumenthal stated, "Since 1893 my firm of Lazard Freres has been foremost in importations and exportations of gold and has thereby come into contact with everybody who had anything to do with it."

Congressman Taylor asked,

"Have you a statement there as to the part you have had in the importation of gold into the United States?" Taylor asked this because the Panic of 1893 is known to economists as a classic example of a money panic caused by gold movements.

"No," replied George Blumenthal, "I have nothing at all on that, because it is not bearing on the question."

A banker from Philadelphia, Leslie Shaw, dissented with other witnesses at these hearings, criticizing the much vaunted "decentralization" of the System. He said,

"Under the Aldrich Plan the bankers are to have local associations and district associations, and when you have a local organization, the centered control is assured. Suppose we have a local association in Indianapolis; can you not name the three men who will dominate that association? And then can you not name the one man everywhere else. When you have hooked the banks together, they can have the biggest influence of anything in this country, with the exception of the newspapers."

To promote the Democratic currency bill, Carter Glass made public the sorry record of the Republican efforts of Senator Aldrich's National Monetary Commission.

His House Report in 1913 said,

"Senator MacVeagh fixes the cost of the National Monetary Commission to May 12, 1911 at \$207,130. They have since spent another hundred thousand dollars of the taxpayer's money. The work done at such cost cannot be ignored, but, having examined the extensive literature published by the Commission, the Banking and Currency Committee finds little that bears upon the present state of the credit market of the United States. We object to the Aldrich Bill on the following points:

- Its entire lack of adequate government or public control of the banking mechanism it sets up.
- Its tendency to throw voting control into the hands of the large banks of the system.
- The extreme danger of inflation of currency inherent in the system.
- The insincerity of the bond-funding plan provided for by the measure, there being a barefaced pretense that this system was to cost the government nothing.
- The dangerous monopolistic aspects of the bill.
- Our Committee at the outset of its work was met by a well-defined sentiment in favor of a central bank which was the manifest outgrowth of the work that had been done by the National Monetary Commission."

Glass's denunciation of the Aldrich Bill as a central bank plan ignored the fact that his own Federal Reserve Act would fulfill all the functions of a central bank. Its stock would be owned by private stockholders who could use the credit of the Government for their own profit; it would have control of the nation's money and credit resources; and it would be a bank of issue which would finance the government by "mobilizing" credit in time of war.

In "The Rationale of Central Banking," Vera C. Smith (Committee for Monetary Research and Education, June, 1981) writes,

"The primary definition of a central bank is a banking system in which a single bank has either a complete or residuary monopoly in the note issue. A central bank is not a natural product of banking development. It is imposed from outside or comes into being as the result of Government favors."

Thus a central bank attains its commanding position from its government granted monopoly of the note issue. This is the key to its power. Also, the act of establishing a central bank has a direct inflationary impact because of the fractional reserve system, which allows the creation of book-entry loans and thereby, money, a number of times the actual "money" which the bank has in its deposits or reserves.

The Aldrich Plan never came to a vote in Congress, because the Republicans lost control of the House in 1910, and subsequently lost the Senate and the Presidency in 1912.

Chapter 3 — The Federal Reserve Act

"Our financial system is a false one and a huge burden on the people . . . This Act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth." -- Congressman Charles Augustus Lindbergh, Sr.

The speeches of Senator LaFollette and Congressman Lindbergh became rallying points of opposition to the Aldrich Plan in 1912. They also aroused popular feeling against the Money Trust. Congressman Lindbergh said, on December 15, 1911,

"The government prosecutes other trusts, but supports the money trust. I have been waiting patiently for several years for an opportunity to expose the false money standard, and to show that the greatest of all favoritism is that extended by the government to the money trust."

Senator LaFollette publicly charged that a money trust of fifty men controlled the United States. George F. Baker, partner of J.P. Morgan, on being queried by reporters as to the truth of the charge, replied that it was absolutely in error. **He said that he knew from personal knowledge that not more than eight men ran this country.**

The Nation Magazine replied editorially to Senator LaFollette that "If there is a Money Trust, it will not be practical to establish that it exercises its influence either for good or for bad."

Senator LaFollette remarks in his memoirs that his speech against the Money Trust later cost him the Presidency of the United States, just as Woodrow Wilson's early support of the Aldrich Plan had brought him into consideration for that office.

Congress finally made a gesture to appease popular feeling by appointing a committee to investigate the control of money and credit in the United States. This was the Pujo Committee, a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which conducted the famous "Money Trust" hearings in 1912, under the leadership of Congressman Arsene Pujo of Louisiana, who was regarded as a spokesman for the oil interests. These hearings were deliberately dragged on for five months, and resulted in six-thousand pages of printed testimony in four volumes. Month after month, the bankers made the train trip from New York to Washington, testified before the Committee and returned to New York. The hearings were extremely dull, and no startling information turned up at these sessions. The bankers solemnly admitted that

they were indeed bankers, insisted that they always operated in the public interest, and claimed that they were animated only by the highest ideals of public service, like the Congressmen before whom they were testifying.

The paradoxical nature of the Pujo Money Trust Hearings may better be understood if we examine the man who single-handedly carried on these hearings, Samuel Untermyer. He was one of the principal contributors to Woodrow Wilson's Presidential campaign fund, and was one of the wealthiest corporation lawyers in New York. He states in his autobiography in "Who's Who" of 1926 that he once received a \$775,000 fee for a single legal transaction, the successful merger of the Utah Copper Company and the Boston Consolidated and Nevada Company, a firm with a market value of one hundred million dollars. He refused to ask either Senator LaFollette or Congressman Lindbergh to testify in the investigation which they alone had forced Congress to hold.

As Special Counsel for the Pujo Committee, Untermyer ran the hearings as a one-man operation. The Congressional members, including its chairman, Congressman Arsene Pujo, seemed to have been struck dumb from the commencement of the hearings to their conclusion. One of these silent servants of the public was Congressman James Byrnes, of South Carolina, representing Bernard Baruch's home district, who later achieved fame as "Baruch's man", and was placed by Baruch in charge of the Office of War Mobilization during the Second World War.

Although he was a specialist in such matters, Untermyer did not ask any of the bankers about the system of interlocking directorates through which they controlled industry. He did not go into international gold movements, which were known as a factor in money panics, or the international relationships between American bankers and European bankers. The international banking houses of Eugene Meyer, Lazard Freres, J. & W. Seligman, Ladenburg Thalmann, Speyer Brothers, M. M. Warburg, and the Rothschild Brothers did not arouse Samuel Untermyer's curiosity, although it was well known in the New York financial world that all of these family banking houses either had branches or controlled subsidiary houses in Wall Street.

When Jacob Schiff appeared before the Pujo Committee, Mr. Untermyer's adroit questioning allowed Mr. Schiff to talk for many minutes without revealing any information about the operations of the banking house of Kuhn Loeb Company, of which he was senior partner, and which Senator Robert L. Owen had identified as the representative of the **European Rothschilds in the United States**.

The aging J.P. Morgan, who had only a few more months to live, appeared before the Committee to justify his decades of international financial deals. He stated for Mr. Untermyer's edification that "Money is a commodity." This was a favorite ploy of the money creators, as they wished to make the public believe that the creation of money was a natural occurrence akin to the growing of a field of corn, although it was actually a bounty conferred upon the bankers by governments over which they had gained control.

J.P. Morgan also told the Pujo Committee that, in making a loan, he seriously considered only one factor, a man's character; even the man's ability to repay the loan, or his collateral, were of little importance. This astonishing observation startled even the blasé members of the Committee.

The farce of the Pujo Committee ended without a single well-known opponent of the money creators being allowed to appear or testify. As far as Samuel Untermyer was concerned, Senator LaFollette and Congressman Charles Augustus Lindbergh had never existed. Nevertheless, these Congressmen had managed to convince the people of the United States that the New York bankers did have a monopoly on the nation's money and credit.

At the close of the hearings, the bankers and their subsidized newspapers claimed that the only way to break this monopoly was to enact the banking and currency legislation now being proposed to Congress, a bill which would be passed a year later as the Federal Reserve Act. The press seriously demanded that the New York banking monopoly be broken by turning over the administration of the new banking system to the most knowledgeable banker of them all, Paul Warburg.

The Presidential campaign of 1912 records one of the more interesting political upsets in American history. The incumbent, William Howard Taft, was a popular president, and the Republicans, in a period of general prosperity, were firmly in control of the government through a Republican majority in both houses. The Democratic challenger, Woodrow

Wilson, Governor of New Jersey, had no national recognition, and was a stiff, austere man who excited little public support.

Both parties included a monetary reform bill in their platforms: The Republicans were committed to the Aldrich Plan, which had been denounced as a Wall Street plan, and the Democrats had the Federal Reserve Act. Neither party bothered to inform the public that the bills were almost identical except for the names.

In retrospect, it seems obvious that the money creators decided to dump Taft and go with Wilson. How do we know this? Taft seemed certain of reelection, and Wilson would return to obscurity.

Suddenly, Theodore Roosevelt "threw his hat into the ring." He announced that he was running as a third party candidate, the "Bull Moose". His candidacy would have been ludicrous had it not been for the fact that he was exceptionally well-financed. Moreover, he was given unlimited press coverage, more than Taft and Wilson combined. As a Republican ex-president, it was obvious that Roosevelt would cut deeply into Taft's vote. This proved the case, and Wilson won the election.

To this day, no one can say what Theodore Roosevelt's program was, or why he would sabotage his own party. Since the bankers were financing all three candidates, they would win regardless of the outcome. Later Congressional testimony showed that in the firm of Kuhn Loeb Company, Felix Warburg was supporting Taft, Paul Warburg and Jacob Schiff were supporting Wilson, and Otto Kahn was supporting Roosevelt.

The result was that a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President were elected in 1912 to get the central bank legislation passed. It seems probable that the identification of the Aldrich Plan as a Wall Street operation predicted that it would have a difficult passage through Congress, as the Democrats would solidly oppose it, whereas a successful Democratic candidate, supported by a Democratic Congress, would be able to pass the central bank plan. Taft was thrown overboard because the bankers doubted he could deliver on the Aldrich Plan, and Roosevelt was the instrument of his demise.

*The final electoral vote in 1912 was Wilson - 409; Roosevelt - 167; and Taft - 15.

To further confuse the American people and blind them to the real purpose of the proposed Federal Reserve Act, the architects of the Aldrich Plan, powerful Nelson Aldrich, although no longer a senator, and Frank Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank, set up a hue and cry against the bill. They gave interviews whenever they could find an audience denouncing the proposed Federal Reserve Act as inimical to banking and to good government. The bugaboo of inflation was raised because of the Act's provisions for printing Federal Reserve notes. The Nation, on October 23, 1913, pointed out, "Mr. Aldrich himself raised a hue and cry over the issue of government "fiat money", that is, money issued without gold or bullion back of it, although a bill to do precisely that had been passed in 1908 with his own name as author, and he knew besides, that the 'government' had nothing to do with it, that the Federal Reserve Board would have full charge of the issuing of such moneys."

Frank Vanderlip's claims were so bizarre that Senator Robert L. Owen, chairman of the newly formed Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which had been formed on March 18, 1913, accused him of openly carrying on a campaign of misrepresentation about the bill. The interests of the public, so Carter Glass claimed in a speech on September 10, 1913 to Congress, would be protected by an advisory council of bankers. "There can be nothing sinister about its transactions. Meeting with it at least four times a year will be a bankers' advisory council representing every regional reserve district in the system. How could we have exercised greater caution in safeguarding the public interests?"

Glass claimed that the proposed Federal Advisory Council would force the Federal Reserve Board of Governors to act in the best interest of the people.

Senator Root raised the problem of inflation, claiming that under the Federal Reserve Act, note circulation would always expand indefinitely, causing great inflation. However, the later history of the Federal Reserve System showed that it not only caused inflation, but that the issue of notes could also be restricted, causing deflation, as occurred from 1929 to 1939.

One of the critics of the proposed "decentralized" system was a lawyer from Cleveland, Ohio, Alfred Crozier: Crozier was called to testify for the Senate Committee because he had written a provocative book in 1912, *U.S. Money vs. Corporation Currency*.^{*} He attacked the Aldrich-Vreeland Act of 1908 as a Wall Street instrument, and he pointed out that when our government had to issue money based on privately owned securities, we were no longer a free nation.

Crozier testified before the Senate Committee that,

"It should prohibit the granting or calling in of loans for the purpose of influencing quotation prices of securities and the contracting of loans or increasing interest rates in concert by the banks to influence public opinion or the action of any legislative body. Within recent months, William McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States was reported in the open press as charging specifically that there was a conspiracy among certain of the large banking interests to put a contraction upon the currency and to raise interest rates for the sake of making the public force Congress into passing currency legislation desired by those interests. The so-called administration currency bill grants just what Wall Street and the big banks for twenty-five years have been striving for, that is, **PRIVATE INSTEAD OF PUBLIC CONTROL OF CURRENCY**. It does this as completely as the Aldrich Bill. Both measures rob the government and the people of all effective control over the public's money, and vest in the banks exclusively the dangerous power to make money among the people scarce or plenty. The Aldrich Bill puts this power in one central bank. The Administration Bill puts it in twelve regional central banks, all owned exclusively by the identical private interests that would have owned and operated the Aldrich Bank. President Garfield shortly before his assassination declared that whoever controls the supply of currency would control the business and activities of the people. **Thomas Jefferson warned us a hundred years ago that a private central bank issuing the public currency was a greater menace to the liberties of the people than a standing army.**"

It is interesting to note how many assassinations of Presidents of the United States follow their concern with the issuing of public currency; Lincoln with his Greenback, non-interest-bearing notes, and Garfield, making a pronouncement on currency problems just before he was assassinated. [and John F. Kennedy after issuing U.S. Treasury Notes in 1963]

We now begin to understand why such a lengthy campaign of planned deception was necessary, from the secret conference at Jekyll Island to the identical "reform" plans proposed by the Democratic and Republican parties under different names. The bankers could not wrest control of the issuance of money from the citizens of the United States, to whom it had been designated through its Congress by the Constitution, until the Congress granted them their monopoly for a central bank. Therefore, much of the influence exerted to get the Federal Reserve Act passed was done behind the scenes, principally by two shadowy, non-elected persons: The German immigrant, Paul Warburg, and Colonel Edward Mandell House of Texas.

Paul Warburg made an appearance before the House Banking and Currency Committee in 1913, in which he briefly stated his background: "I am a member of the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb Company. I came over to this country in 1902, having been born and educated in the banking business in Hamburg, Germany, and studied banking in London and Paris, and have gone all around the world. In the Panic of 1907, the first suggestion I made was 'Let us get a national clearing house.' The Aldrich Plan contains some things which are simply fundamental rules of banking. Your aim in this plan (the Owen-Glass bill) must be the same--centralizing of reserves, mobilizing commercial credit, and getting an elastic note issue."

Warburg's phrase, "mobilization of credit" was an important one, because the First World War was due to begin shortly, and the first task of the Federal Reserve System would be to finance the World War. The European nations were already bankrupt, because they had maintained large standing armies for almost fifty years, a situation created by their own central banks, and therefore they could not finance a war. A central bank always imposes a tremendous burden on the nation for "rearmament" and "defense", in order to create inextinguishable debt, simultaneously creating a military dictatorship and enslaving the people to pay the "interest" on the debt which the bankers have artificially created.

In the Senate debate on the Federal Reserve Act, Senator Stone said on December 12, 1913, "The great banks for years have sought to have and control agents in the Treasury to serve their purposes. Let me quote from this World article, 'Just as soon as Mr. McAdoo came to Washington, a woman whom the National City Bank had

installed in the Treasury Department to get advance information on the condition of banks, and other matters of interest to the big Wall Street group, was removed. Immediately the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary, John Skelton Williams, were criticized severely by the agents of the Wall Street group."

"I myself have known more than one occasion when bankers refused credit to men who opposed their political views and purposes. When Senator Aldrich and others were going around the country exploiting this scheme, the big banks of New York and Chicago were engaged in raising a munificent fund to bolster up the Aldrich propaganda. I have been told by bankers of my own state that contributions to this exploitation fund had been demanded of them and that they had contributed because they were afraid of being blacklisted or boycotted. There are bankers of this country who are enemies of the public welfare. In the past, a few great banks have followed policies and projects that have paralyzed the industrial energies of the country to perpetuate their tremendous power over the financial and business industries of America."

Carter Glass states in his autobiography that he was summoned by Woodrow Wilson to the White House, and that Wilson told him he intended to make the reserve notes obligations of the United States. Glass says, "I was for an instant speechless. I remonstrated. There is not any government obligation here, Mr. President. Wilson said he had had to compromise on this point in order to save the bill."

The term "compromise" on this point came directly from Paul Warburg. Col. Elisha Ely Garrison, in Roosevelt,* Wilson and the Federal Reserve Law wrote,

"In 1911, Lawrence Abbot, Mr. Roosevelt's private officer at 'The Outlook' handed me a copy of the so-called Aldrich Plan for currency reform. I said, I could not believe that Mr. Warburg was the author. This plan is nothing more than the Aldrich-Vreeland legislation which provided for currency issue against securities. Warburg knows that as well as I do. I am going to see him at once and ask him about it. All right, the truth. Yes, I wrote it, he said. Why? I asked. It was a compromise, answered Warburg."¹³

Garrison says that Warburg wrote him on February 8, 1912.

"I have no doubt that at the end of a thorough discussion, either you will see it my way or I will see it yours--but I hope you will see it mine."

This was another famous Warburg saying when he secretly lobbied Congressmen to support his interest, the veiled threat that they should "see it his way". Those who did not found large sums contributed to their opponents at the next elections, and usually went down in defeat.

Col. Garrison, an agent of Brown Brothers bankers, later Brown Brothers Harriman, had entree everywhere in the financial community. He writes of Col. House, "Col. House agreed entirely with the early writing of Mr. Warburg." Page 337, he quotes Col. House:

"I am also suggesting that the Central Board be increased from four members to five and their terms lengthened from eight to ten years. This would give stability and would take away the power of a President to change the personnel of the board during a single term of office."

House's phrase, "take away the power of a President" is significant, because later Presidents found themselves helpless to change the direction of the government because they did not have the power to change the composition of the Federal Reserve Board to attain a majority on it during that President's term of office. Garrison also wrote in this book,

"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."

Colonel Edward Mandell House * was referred to by Rabbi Stephen Wise in his autobiography, 'Challenging Years' as "the unofficial Secretary of State". House noted that he and Wilson knew that in passing the Federal Reserve Act, they had created an instrument more powerful than the Supreme Court. The Federal Reserve Board of Governors actually comprised a Supreme Court of Finance, and there was no appeal from any of their rulings.

In 1911, prior to Wilson's taking office as President, House had returned to his home in Texas and completed a book called Philip Dru, Administrator. Ostensibly a novel, it was actually a detailed plan for the future government of the United States, "**which would establish Socialism as dreamed by Karl Marx**", according to House. This "novel" predicted the enactment of the graduated income tax, excess profits tax, unemployment insurance, social security, and a flexible currency system. In short, it was the blueprint which was later followed by the Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt administrations. It was published "anonymously" by B. W. Huebsch of New York, and widely circulated among government officials, who were left in no doubt as to its authorship.

George Sylvester Viereck **, who knew House for years, later wrote an account of the Wilson-House relationship, The Strangest Friendship in History. ¹⁴ In 1955, Westbrook Pegler, the Hearst columnist from 1932 to 1956, heard of the Philip Dru book and called Viereck to ask if he had a copy. Viereck sent Pegler his copy of the book, and Pegler wrote a column about it, stating:

"One of the institutions outlined in Philip Dru is the Federal Reserve System. The Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Kahns, the Rockefellers and Morgans put their faith in House. The Schiff, Warburg, Rockefeller and Morgan interests were personally represented in the mysterious conference at Jekyll Island. Frankfurter landed on the Harvard law faculty, thanks to a financial contribution to Harvard by Felix Warburg and Paul Warburg, and so we got Alger and Donald Hiss, Lee Pressman, Harry Dexter White and many other protégés of Little Weenie." *

House's openly Socialistic views were forthrightly expressed in Philip Dru, Administrator; on pages 57-58, House wrote:

"In a direct and forceful manner, he pointed out that our civilization was fundamentally wrong, inasmuch, among other things, as it restricted efficiency; that if society were properly organized, there would be none who were not sufficiently clothed and fed. The result, that the laws, habits and ethical training in vogue were alike responsible for the inequalities in opportunity and the consequent wide difference between the few and the many; that the results of such conditions was to render inefficient a large part of the population, the percentage differing in each country in the ratio that education and enlightenment and unselfish laws bore to ignorance, bigotry and selfish laws." ¹⁵

In his book, House (Dru) envisions himself becoming a dictator and forcing on the people his radical views, page 148: "They recognized the fact that Dru dominated the situation and that a master mind had at last risen in the Republic." He now assumes the title of General. "General Dru announced his purpose of assuming the powers of a dictator . . . they were assured that he was free from any personal ambition . . . he proclaimed himself 'Administrator of the Republic.'" **

This pensive dreamer who imagined himself a dictator actually managed to place himself in the position of the confidential advisor to the President of the United States, and then to have many of his desires enacted into law! On page 227, he lists some of the laws he wishes to enact as dictator. Among them are an old age pension law, laborers insurance compensation, cooperative markets, a federal reserve banking system, cooperative loans, national employment bureaus, and other "social legislation", some of which was enacted during Wilson's administration, and others during the Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. The latter was actually a continuation of the Wilson Administration, with many of the same personnel, and with House guiding the administration from behind the scenes.

Like most of the behind-the-scenes operators in this book, Col. Edward Mandell House had the obligatory "London connection". Originally a Dutch family, "Huis", his ancestors had lived in England for three hundred years, after which his father settled in Texas, where he made a fortune in blockade-running during the Civil War, shipping cotton and other contraband to his British connections, including the Rothschilds, and bringing back supplies for the beleaguered Texans. The senior House, not trusting the volatile Texas situation, prudently deposited all his profits from his blockade-running in gold with Baring banking house in London. * At the close of the Civil War, he was one of the wealthiest men in Texas. He

named his son "Mandell" after one of his merchant associates. According to Arthur Howden Smith, when House's father died in 1880, his estate was distributed among his sons as follows: Thomas William got the banking business; John, the sugar plantation; and Edward M. the cotton plantations, which brought him an income of \$20,000 a year. ¹⁶

At the age of twelve, the young Edward Mandell House had brain fever, and was later further crippled by sunstroke. He was a semi-invalid, and his ailments gave him an odd Oriental appearance. He never entered any profession, but used his father's money to become the kingmaker of Texas politics, successively electing five governors from 1893 to 1911. In 1911 he began to support Wilson for president, and threw the crucial Texas delegation to him which ensured his nomination. House met Wilson for the first time at the Hotel Gotham, May 31, 1912.

In *The Strangest Friendship In History, Woodrow Wilson and Col. House*, by George Sylvester Viereck, Viereck writes:

"What," I asked House, "cemented your friendship?" "The identity of our temperaments and our public policies," answered House. "What was your purpose and his?" "To translate into legislation certain liberal and progressive ideas." ¹⁷

House told Viereck that when he went to Wilson at the White House, he handed him \$35,000. This was exceeded only by the \$50,000 which Bernard Baruch had given Wilson.

The successful enactment of House's programs did not escape the notice of other Wilson associates. In Vol. 1, page 157 of *The Intimate Papers of Col. House*, House notes, "Cabinet members like Mr. Lane and Mr. Bryan commented upon the influence of Dru with the President. 'All that the book has said should be,' wrote Lane, 'comes about. The President comes to 'Philip Dru' in the end.'" ¹⁸

House recorded some of his efforts on behalf of the Federal Reserve Act in *The Intimate Papers of Col. House*, "December 19, 1912. I talked with Paul Warburg over the phone concerning currency reform. I told of my trip to Washington and what I had done there to get it in working order. I told him that the Senate and the Congressmen seemed anxious to do what he desired, and that President-elect Wilson thought straight concerning the issue." ¹⁹

Thus we have Warburg's agent in Washington, Col. House, assuring him that the Senate and Congressmen will do what he desires, and that the President-elect "thought straight concerning the issue." In this context, representative government seems to have ceased to exist. House continues in his "Papers":

"March 13, 1913. Warburg and I had an intimate discussion concerning currency reform.

March 27, 1913. Mr. J.P. Morgan, Jr. and Mr. Denny of his firm came promptly at five.

McAdoo came about ten minutes afterward. Morgan had a currency plan already printed. I suggested he have it typewritten, so it would not seem too prearranged, and send it to Wilson and myself today.

July 23, 1913. I tried to show Mayor Quincy (of Boston) the folly of the Eastern bankers taking an antagonistic attitude towards the Currency Bill. I explained to Major Henry Higginson ²⁰ with what care the bill had been framed. Just before he arrived, I had finished a review by Professor Sprague of Harvard of Paul Warburg's criticism of the Glass-Owen Bill, and will transmit it to Washington tomorrow. Every banker known to Warburg, who knows the subject practically, has been called up about the making of the bill.

October 13, 1913. Paul Warburg was my first caller today. He came to discuss the currency measure. There are many features of the Owen-Glass Bill that he does not approve. I promised to put him in touch with McAdoo and Senator Owen so that he might discuss it with them.

November 17, 1913. Paul Warburg telephoned about his trip to Washington. Later, he and Mr. Jacob Schiff came over for a few minutes. Warburg did most of the talking. He had a new suggestion in regard to grouping the regular reserve banks so as to get the units welded together and in easier touch with the Federal Reserve Board."

George Sylvester Viereck in *The Strangest Friendship in History*, Woodrow Wilson and Col. House wrote:

"The Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Kahns, the Rockefellers, the Morgans put their faith in House. When the Federal Reserve legislation at last assumed definite shape, House was the intermediary between the White House and the financiers."²⁰

On page 45, Viereck notes, "Col. House looks upon the reform of the monetary system as the crowning internal achievement of the Wilson Administration."²¹

The Glass Bill (the House version of the final Federal Reserve Act) had passed the House on September 18, 1913 by 287 to 85. On December 19, 1913, the Senate passed their version by a vote of 54-34. More than forty important differences in the House and Senate versions remained to be settled, and the opponents of the bill in both houses of Congress were led to believe that many weeks would yet elapse before the Conference bill would be ready for consideration. The Congressmen prepared to leave Washington for the annual Christmas recess, assured that the Conference bill would not be brought up until the following year. Now the money creators prepared and executed the most brilliant stroke of their plan. In a single day, they ironed out all forty of the disputed passages in the bill and quickly brought it to a vote. On Monday, December 22, 1913, the bill was passed by the House 282-60 and the Senate 43-23.

On December 21, 1913, *The New York Times* commented editorially on the act, "New York will be on a firmer basis of financial growth, and we shall soon see her as the money centre of the world."

The New York Times reported on the front page, Monday, December 22, 1913 in headlines: MONEY BILL MAY BE LAW TODAY--CONFEREES HAD ADJUSTED NEARLY ALL DIFFERENCES AT 1:30 THIS MORNING--NO DEPOSIT GUARANTEES--SENATE YIELDS ON THIS POINT BUT PUTS THROUGH MANY OTHER CHANGES -- "With almost unprecedented speed, the conference to adjust the House and Senate differences on the Currency Bill practically completed its labours early this morning. On Saturday the Conferees did little more than dispose of the preliminaries, leaving forty essential differences to be thrashed out Sunday. . . . No other legislation of importance will be taken up in either House of Congress this week. Members of both houses are already preparing to leave Washington."

"Unprecedented speed", says *The New York Times*. One sees the fine hand of Paul Warburg in this final strategy. Some of the bill's most vocal critics had already left Washington. It was a long-standing political courtesy that important legislation would not be acted upon during the week before Christmas, but this tradition was rudely shattered in order to perpetrate the Federal Reserve Act on the American people.

The Times buried a brief quote from Congressman Lindbergh that "the bill would establish the most gigantic trust on earth," and quoted Representative Guernsey of Maine, a Republican on the House Banking and Currency Committee, that "This is an inflation bill, the only question being the extent of the inflation."

Congressman Lindbergh said on that historic day, to the House:

"This Act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth. When the President signs this bill, the invisible government by the Monetary Power will be legalized. The people may not know it immediately, but the day of reckoning is only a few years removed. The trusts will soon realize that they have gone too far even for their own good. The people must make a declaration of independence to relieve themselves from the Monetary Power. This they will be able to do by taking control of Congress. Wall Streeters could not cheat us if you Senators and Representatives did not make a humbug of Congress. . . . If we had a people's Congress, there would be stability.

The greatest crime of Congress is its currency system. The worst legislative crime of the ages is perpetrated by this banking bill. The caucus and the party bosses have again operated and prevented the people from getting the benefit of their own government."

The December 23, 1913 New York Times editorially commented, in contrast to Congressman Lindbergh's criticism of the bill, "The Banking and Currency Bill became better and sounder every time it was sent from one end of the Capitol to the other. Congress worked under public supervision in making the bill."

By "public supervision", The Times apparently meant Paul Warburg, who for several days had maintained a small office in the Capitol building, where he directed the successful pre-Christmas campaign to pass the bill, and where Senators and Congressmen came hourly at his bidding to carry out his strategy.

The "unprecedented speed" with which the Federal Reserve Act had been passed by Congress during what became known as "the Christmas massacre" had one unforeseen aspect. Woodrow Wilson was taken unaware, as he, like many others, had been assured the bill would not come up for a vote until after Christmas. Now he refused to sign it, because he objected to the provisions for the selection of Class B. Directors. William L. White relates in his biography of Bernard Baruch that Baruch, a principal contributor to Wilson's campaign fund, was stunned when he was informed that Wilson refused to sign the bill. He hurried to the White House and assured Wilson that this was a minor matter, which could be fixed up later through "administrative processes". The important thing was to get the Federal Reserve Act signed into law at once. With this reassurance, Wilson signed the Federal Reserve Act on December 23, 1913. **History proved that on that day, the Constitution ceased to be the governing covenant of the American people, and our liberties were handed over to a small group of international bankers.**

The December 24, 1913 New York Times carried a front page headline "WILSON SIGNS THE CURRENCY BILL!" Below it, also in capital letters, were two further headlines, "PROSPERITY TO BE FREE" and "WILL HELP EVERY CLASS". Who could object to any law which provided benefits to everyone? The Times described the festive atmosphere while Wilson's family and government officials watched him sign the bill. "The Christmas spirit pervaded the gathering," exulted The Times.

In his biography of Carter Glass, Rixey Smith states that those present at the signing of the bill included Vice President Marshall, Secretary Bryan, Carter Glass, Senator Owen, Secretary McAdoo, Speaker Champ Clark, and other Treasury officials. None of the real writers of the bill, the drafters of Jekyll Island, were present. They had prudently absented themselves from the scene of their victory. Rixey Smith also wrote, "It was as though Christmas had come two days early." On December 24, 1913, Jacob Schiff wrote to Col. House,

"My dear Col. House. I want to say a word to you for the silent, but no doubt effective work you have done in the interest of currency legislation and to congratulate you that the measure has finally been enacted into law. I am with good wishes, faithfully yours, JACOB SCHIFF."

Representative Moore of Kansas, in commenting on the passage of the Act, said to the House of Representatives:

"The President of the United States now becomes the absolute dictator of all the finances of the country. He appoints a controlling board of seven men, all of whom belong to his political party, even though it is a minority. The Secretary of the Treasury is to rule supreme whenever there is a difference of opinion between himself and the Federal Reserve Board. AND, only one member of the Board is to pass out of office while the President is in office."

The ten year terms of office of the members of the Board were lengthened by the Banking Act of 1935 to fourteen years, which meant that these directors of the nation's finances, although not elected by the people, held office longer than three presidents.

While Col. House, Jacob Schiff and Paul Warburg basked in the glow of a job well done, the other actors in this drama were subject to later afterthoughts. Woodrow Wilson wrote in 1916, National Economy and the Banking System, Sen. Doc. No. 3, No. 223, 76th Congress, 1st session, 1939: "Our system of credit is concentrated (in the Federal Reserve System). The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities, are in the hands of a few men."

When he was asked by Clarence W. Barron whether he approved of the bill as it was finally passed. Warburg remarked, "Well, it hasn't got quite everything we want, but the lack can be adjusted later by administrative processes."

Woodrow Wilson and Carter Glass are given credit for the Act by most contemporary historians, but of all those concerned, Wilson had least to do with Congressional action on the bill. George Creel, a veteran Washington correspondent, wrote in Harper's Weekly, June 26, 1915:

"As far as the Democratic Party was concerned, Woodrow Wilson was without influence, save for the patronage he possessed. It was Bryan who whipped Congress into line on the tariff bill, on the Panama Canal tolls repeal, and on the currency bill." Mr. Bryan later wrote, "That is the one thing in my public career that I regret--my work to secure the enactment of the Federal Reserve Law."

On December 25, 1913, The Nation pointed out that "The New York Stock Market began to rise steadily upon news that the Senate was ready to pass the Federal Reserve Act."

This belies the claim that the Federal Reserve Act was a monetary reform bill. The New York Stock Exchange is generally considered an accurate barometer of the true meaning of any financial legislation passed in Washington. Senator Aldrich also decided that he no longer had misgivings about the Federal Reserve Act. In a magazine which he owned, and which he called The Independent, he wrote in July, 1914: "Before the passage of this Act, the New York bankers could only dominate the reserves of New York. Now we are able to dominate the bank reserves of the entire country."

H.W. Loucks denounced the Federal Reserve Act in The Great Conspiracy of the House of Morgan, "In the Federal Reserve Law, they have wrested from the people and secured for themselves the constitutional power to issue money and regulate the value thereof." On page 31, Loucks writes, "The House of Morgan is now in supreme control of our industry, commerce and political affairs.

They are in complete control of the policy making of the Democratic, Republican and Progressive parties. The present extraordinary propaganda for 'preparedness' is planned more for home coercion than for defense against foreign aggression."²²

The signing of the Federal Reserve Act by Woodrow Wilson represented the culmination of years of collusion with his intimate friend, Col. House, and Paul Warburg. One of the men with whom House became acquainted in the Wilson Administration was Franklin D. Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of Navy. As soon as he obtained the Democratic nomination for President, in 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt made a "pilgrimage" to Col. House's home at Magnolia, Mass. Roosevelt, after the Republican hiatus of the 1920s, filled in the goals of Philip Dru, Administrator,²³ which Wilson had not been able to carry out. The late Roosevelt achievements included the enactment of the social security program, excess profits tax, and the expansion of the graduated income tax to 90% of earned income.

House's biographer, Charles Seymour, wrote: "He was wearied by the details of party politics and appointments. Even the share he had taken in constructive domestic legislation (the Federal Reserve Act, tariff revision, and the Income Tax amendment) did not satisfy him. From the beginning of 1914 he gave more and more of his time to what he regarded as the highest form of politics and that for which he was particularly suited--international affairs."²⁴

In 1938, shortly before he died, House told Charles Seymour,

"During the last fifteen years I have been close to the center of things, although few people suspect it. No important foreigner has come to the United States without talking to me. I was close to the movement that nominated Roosevelt. He has given me a free hand in advising him. All the Ambassadors have reported to me frequently."

A comparative print of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 as passed by the House of Representatives and amended by the Senate shows the following striking change:

The Senate struck out, "To suspend the officials of Federal Reserve banks for cause, stated in writing with opportunity of hearing, require the removal of said official for incompetency, dereliction of duty, fraud or deceit, such removal to be subject to approval by the President of the United States." This was changed by the Senate to read "To suspend or remove

any officer or director of any Federal Reserve Bank, the cause of such removal to be forthwith communicated in writing by the Federal Reserve Board to the removed officer or director and to said bank." This completely altered the conditions under which an officer or director might be removed. We no longer know what the conditions for removal are, or the cause. Apparently incompetency, dereliction of duty, fraud or deceit do not matter to the Federal Reserve Board. Also, the removed officer does not have the opportunity of appeal to the President. In answer to written inquiry, the Assistant Secretary of the Federal Reserve Board replied that only one officer has been removed "for cause" in the thirty-six years, the name and details of this matter being a "private concern" between the individual, the Reserve Bank concerned, and the Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve System began its operations in 1914 with the activity of the Organization Committee, appointed by Woodrow Wilson, and composed of Secretary of the Treasury William McAdoo, who was his son-in-law, Secretary of Agriculture Houston and Comptroller of the Currency John Skelton Williams.

On January 6, 1914. J.P. Morgan met with the Organizing Committee in New York. He informed them that there should not be more than seven regional districts in the new system.

This committee was to select the locations of the "decentralized" reserve banks. They were empowered to select from eight to twelve reserve banks, although J.P. Morgan had testified he thought that not more than four should be selected. Much politicking went into the selection of these sites, as the twelve cities thus favored would become enormously important as centers of finance. New York, of course, was a foregone conclusion. Richmond was the next selection, as a payoff to Carter Glass and Woodrow Wilson, the two Virginians who had been given political credit for the Federal Reserve Act. The other selections of the Committee were Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago, St. Louis, Atlanta, Dallas, Minneapolis, Kansas City, and San Francisco. All of these cities later developed important "financial districts" as the result of this selection.

These local battles, however, paled in view of the complete dominance of the Federal Reserve bank of New York in the system. Ferdinand Lundberg pointed out, in *America's Sixty Families*, that, "In practice, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York became the fountainhead of the system of twelve regional banks, for New York was the money market of the nation. The other eleven banks were so many expensive mausoleums erected to salve the local pride and quell the Jacksonian fears of the hinterland. Benjamin Strong, president of the Bankers Trust (J.P. Morgan) was selected as the first Governor of the New York Federal Reserve Bank. Adept in high finance, Strong for many years manipulated the country's monetary system at the discretion of directors representing the leading New York banks. Under Strong, the Reserve System was brought into interlocking relations with the Bank of England and the Bank of France. Benjamin Strong held his position as Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York until his sudden death in 1928, during a Congressional investigation of the secret meetings between Reserve Governors and heads of European central banks which brought on the Great Depression of 1929-31." ²⁵

Strong had married the daughter of the President of Bankers Trust, which brought him into the line of succession in the dynastic intrigues which play such an important role in the world of high finance. He also had been a member of the original Jekyll Island group, the First Name Club, and was thus qualified for the highest position in the Federal Reserve System, as the Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York which dominated the entire system.

Paul Warburg also is mentioned in J. Laurence Laughlin's definitive volume, *The Federal Reserve Act, Its Origins and Purposes*,

"Mr. Paul Warburg of Kuhn, Loeb Company offered in March, 1910 a fairly well thought out plan to be known as the United Reserve Bank of the United States. This was published in *The New York Times* of March 24, 1910. The group interested in the purposes of the National Monetary Commission met secretly at Jekyll Island for about two weeks in December, 1910, and concentrated on the preparation of a bill to be presented to Congress by the National Monetary Commission. The men who were present at Jekyll Island were Senator Aldrich, H. P. Davison of J.P. Morgan Company, Paul Warburg of Kuhn, Loeb Company, Frank Vanderlip of the National City Bank, and Charles D. Norton of the First National Bank. No doubt the ablest banking mind in the group was that of Mr. Warburg, who had had a European banking training. Senator Aldrich had no special training in banking." ²⁶

A mention of Paul Warburg, written by Harold Kelloch, and titled, "Warburg the Revolutionist" appeared in the Century Magazine, May, 1915. Kelloch writes:

"He imposed his ideas on a nation of a hundred million people . . . Without Mr. Warburg there would have been no Federal Reserve Act. The banking house of Warburg and Warburg in Hamburg has always been strictly a family business. None but a Warburg has been eligible for it, but all Warburgs have been born into it. In 1895 he married the daughter of the late Solomon Loeb of Kuhn Loeb Company. He became a member of Kuhn Loeb Company in 1902. Mr. Warburg's salary from his private business has been approximately a half million a year. Mr. Warburg's motives had been purely those of patriotic self-sacrifice."

The true purposes of the Federal Reserve Act soon began to disillusion many who had at first believed in its claims. W. H. Allen wrote in Moody's Magazine, 1916,

"The purpose of the Federal Reserve Act was to prevent concentration of money in the New York banks by making it profitable for country bankers to use their funds at home, but the movement of currency shows that the New York banks gained from the interior in every month except December, 1915, since the Act went into effect. The stabilization of rates has taken place in New York alone. In other parts, high rates continue. The Act, which was to deprive Wall Street of its funds for speculation, has really given the bulls and the bears such a supply as they have never had before. The truth is that far from having clogged the channel to Wall Street, as Mr. Glass so confidently boasted, it actually widened the old channels and opened up two new ones. The first of these leads directly to Washington and gives Wall Street a string on all the surplus cash in the United States Treasury. Besides, in the power to issue bank-note currency, it furnishes an inexhaustible supply of credit money; the second channel leads to the great central banks of Europe, whereby, through the sale of acceptances, virtually guaranteed by the United States Government, Wall Street is granted immunity from foreign demands for gold which have precipitated every great crisis in our history."

For many years, there has been considerable mystery about who actually owns the stock of the Federal Reserve Banks. Congressman Wright Patman, leading critic of the System, tried to find out who the stockholders were. The stock in the original twelve regional Federal Reserve Banks was purchased by national banks in those twelve regions. Because the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was to set the interest rates and direct open market operations, thus controlling the daily supply and price of money throughout the United States, it is the stockholders of that bank who are the real directors of the entire system. For the first time, it can be revealed who those stockholders are. This writer has the original organization certificates of the twelve Federal Reserve Banks, giving the ownership of shares by the national banks in each district.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York issued 203,053 shares, and, as filed with the Comptroller of the Currency May 19, 1914, the large New York City banks took more than half of the outstanding shares. The Rockefeller Kuhn, Loeb-controlled National City Bank took the largest number of shares of any bank, 30,000 shares. J.P. Morgan's First National Bank took 15,000 shares. When these two banks merged in 1955, they owned in one block almost one fourth of the shares in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which controlled the entire system, and thus they could name Paul Volcker or anyone else they chose to be Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. Chase National Bank took 6,000 shares. The Marine National Bank of Buffalo, later known as Marine Midland, took 6,000 shares. This bank was owned by the Schoellkopf family, which controlled Niagara Power Company and other large interests. National Bank of Commerce of New York City took 21,000 shares. The shareholders of these banks which own the stock of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York are the people who have controlled our political and economic destinies since 1914.

They are the Rothschilds, of Europe, Lazard Freres (Eugene Meyer), Kuhn Loeb Company, Warburg Company, Lehman Brothers, Goldman Sachs, the Rockefeller family, and the J.P. Morgan interests.

These interests have merged and consolidated in recent years, so that the control is much more concentrated. National Bank of Commerce is now Morgan Guaranty Trust Company. Lehman Brothers has merged with Kuhn, Loeb Company, First National Bank has merged with the National City Bank, and in the other eleven Federal Reserve Districts, these same shareholders indirectly own or control shares in those banks, with the other shares owned by the leading families in those

areas who own or control the principal industries in these regions. * The "local" families set up regional councils, on orders from New York, of such groups as the Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and other instruments of control devised by their masters. They finance and control political developments in their area, name candidates, and are seldom successfully opposed in their plans.

With the setting up of the twelve "financial districts" through the Federal Reserve Banks, the traditional division of the United States into the forty-eight states was overthrown, and we entered the era of "regionalism", or twelve regions which had no relation to the traditional state boundaries.

These developments following the passing of the Federal Reserve Act proved every one of the allegations Thomas Jefferson had made against a central bank in 1791:

- **that the subscribers to the Federal Reserve Bank stock had formed a corporation, whose stock could be and was held by aliens;**
- **that this stock would be transmitted to a certain line of successors;**
- **that it would be placed beyond forfeiture and escheat;**
- **that they would receive a monopoly of banking, which was against the laws of monopoly;**
- **and that they now had the power to make laws, paramount to the laws of the states.**
- **No state legislature can countermand any of the laws laid down by the Federal Reserve Board of Governors for the benefit of their private stockholders.**
- **This board issues laws as to what the interest rate shall be, what the quantity of money shall be and what the price of money shall be.**
- **All of these powers abrogate the powers of the state legislatures and their responsibility to the citizens of those states.**

The New York Times stated that the Federal Reserve Banks would be ready for business on August 1, 1914, but they actually began operations on November 16, 1914. At that time, their total assets were listed at \$143,000,000, from the sale of shares in the Federal Reserve Banks to stockholders of the national banks which subscribed to it.

The actual part of this \$143,000,000 which was paid in for these shares remains shrouded in mystery. Some historians believe that the shareholders only paid about half of the amount in cash; others believe that they paid in no cash at all, but merely sent in checks which they drew on the national banks which they owned. This seems most likely, that from the very outset, the Federal Reserve operations were "paper issued against paper", that bookkeeping entries comprised the only values which changed hands.

The men whom President Woodrow Wilson chose to make up the first Federal Reserve Board of Governors were men drawn from the banking group. He had been nominated for the Presidency by the Democratic Party, which had claimed to represent the "common man" against the "vested interests". According to Wilson himself, he was allowed to choose only one man for the Federal Reserve Board. The others were chosen by the New York bankers. Wilson's choice was Thomas D. Jones, a trustee of Princeton and director of International Harvester and other corporations. The other members were Adolph C. Miller, economist from Rockefeller's University of Chicago and Morgan's Harvard University, and also serving as Assistant Secretary of the Interior; Charles S. Hamlin, who had served previously as an Assistant Secretary to the Treasury for eight years; F.A. Delano, a Roosevelt relative, and railroad operator who took over a number of railroads for Kuhn, Loeb Company, W.P.G. Harding, President of the First National Bank of Atlanta; and Paul Warburg of Kuhn, Loeb Company. According to The Intimate Papers of Col. House, Warburg was appointed because "The President accepted (House's) suggestion of Paul Warburg of New York because of his interest and experience in currency problems under both Republican and Democratic Administrations." ²⁷ Like Warburg, Delano had also been born outside the continental limits of the United States, although he was an American citizen. Delano's father, Warren Delano, according to Dr. Josephson and other authorities, was active in Hong Kong in the Chinese opium trade, and Frederick Delano was born in Hong Kong in 1863.

In The Money Power of Europe, Paul Emden writes that "The Warburgs reached their outstanding eminence during the last twenty years of the past century, simultaneously with the growth of Kuhn, Loeb Company in New York, with whom they stood in a personal union and family relationship. Paul Warburg with magnificent success carried through in 1913 the

reorganization of the American banking system, at which he had with Senator Aldrich been working since 1911, and thus most thoroughly consolidated the currency and finances of the United States."²⁸

The New York Times ²⁹

Despite his retirement from Kuhn, Loeb Company in May of 1914 to serve on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, Warburg was asked to appear before a Senate Subcommittee in June of 1914 and answer some questions about his behind-the-scenes role in getting the Federal Reserve Act through Congress. This might have meant some questions about the secret conference in Jekyll Island, and Warburg refused to appear. On July 7, 1914 he wrote a letter to G.M. Hitchcock, Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, stating that it might impair his usefulness on the Board if he were required to answer any questions, and that he would therefore withdraw his name. It seemed that Warburg was prepared to bluff the Senate Committee into confirming him without any questions asked. On July 10, 1914, The New York Times defended Warburg on the editorial page and denounced the "Senatorial Inquisition". Since Warburg had not yet been asked any questions, the term "Inquisition" seemed remarkably inappropriate, nor was there any real danger that the Senators were preparing to use instruments of torture on Mr. Warburg. The imbroglio was resolved when the Senate Committee, in abject surrender, agreed that Mr. Warburg would be given a list of questions in advance of his appearance so that he could go over them, and that he could be excused from answering any questions which might tend to impair his service on the Board of Governors. The Nation reported on July 23, 1914 that "Mr. Warburg finally had a conference with Senator O'Gorman and agreed to meet the members of the Senate Subcommittee informally, with a view to coming to an understanding, and to giving them any reasonable information they might desire. The opinion in Washington is that Mr. Warburg's confirmation is assured."

The Nation was correct. Mr. Warburg was confirmed, the way having been smoothed by his "fixer", Senator O'Gorman of New York, more familiarly known as "the Senator from Wall Street". Senator Robert L. Owen had previously charged that Warburg was the American representative of the Rothschild family, but questioning him about this would indeed have smacked of the mediaeval "Inquisition", and his fellow Senators were too civilized to indulge in such barbarity. *

During the Senate Hearings on Paul Warburg before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, August 1, 1914, Senator Bristow asked,

"How many of these partners (of Kuhn, Loeb Company) are American citizens?"

WARBURG: "They are all American citizens except Mr. Kahn. He is a British subject."

BRISTOW: "He was at one time a candidate for Parliament, was he not?"

WARBURG: "There was talk about it, it had been suggested and he had it in his mind."

Paul Warburg also stated to the Committee, "I went to England, where I stayed for two years, first in the banking and discount firm of Samuel Montague & Company. After that I went to France, where I stayed in a French bank."

CHAIRMAN: "What French bank was that?"

WARBURG: "It is the Russian bank for foreign trade which has an agency in Paris."

BRISTOW: "I understand you to say that you were a Republican, but when Mr. Theodore Roosevelt came around, you then became a sympathizer with Mr. Wilson and supported him?"

WARBURG: "Yes."

BRISTOW: "While your brother (Felix Warburg) was supporting Taft?"

WARBURG: "Yes."

Thus three partners of Kuhn, Loeb Company were supporting three different candidates for President of the United States. Paul Warburg was supporting Wilson, Felix Warburg was supporting Taft, and Otto Kahn was supporting Theodore Roosevelt. Paul Warburg explained this curious situation by telling the Committee that they had no influence over each other's political beliefs, "as finance and politics don't mix."

Questions about Warburg's appointment vanished in a hue and cry with Wilson's sole appointment to the Board of Governors, Thomas B. Jones. Reporters had discovered that Jones, at the time of his appointment, was under indictment by the Attorney General of the United States. Wilson leaped to the defense of his choice, telling reporters that "The majority of the men connected with what we have come to call 'big business' are honest, incorruptible and patriotic." Despite Wilson's protestations, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee scheduled hearings on the fitness of Thomas D. Jones to be a member of the Board of Governors. Wilson then wrote a letter to Senator Robert L. Owen, Chairman of that Committee:

White House

June 18, 1914

Dear Senator Owen:

Mr. Jones has always stood for the rights of the people against the rights of privilege. His connection with the Harvester Company was a public service, not a private interest. He is the one man of the whole number who was in a peculiar sense my personal choice.

Sincerely,

Woodrow Wilson

Woodrow Wilson said, "There is no reason to believe that the unfavorable report represents the attitude of the Senate itself." After several weeks, Thomas D. Jones withdrew his name, and the country had to do without his services.

The other members of the first Board of Governors were Secretary of the Treasury, William McAdoo, Wilson's son-in-law, and President of the Hudson-Manhattan Railroad, a Kuhn, Loeb Company controlled enterprise, and Comptroller of the Currency John Skelton Williams.

When the Federal Reserve Banks were opened for business on November 16, 1914, Paul Warburg said, "This date may be considered as the Fourth of July in the economic history of the United States."

Chapter 4 — The Federal Advisory Council

In steamrolling the Federal Reserve Act through the House of Representatives, Congressman Carter Glass declared on September 30, 1913 on the floor of the House that the interests of the public would be protected by an advisory council of

bankers. "There can be nothing sinister about its transactions. Meeting with it at least four times a year will be a bankers' advisory council representing every regional reserve district in the system. How could we have exercised greater caution in safeguarding the public interest?"

Carter Glass neither then nor later gave any substantiation for his belief that a group of bankers would protect the interests of the public, nor is there any evidence in the history of the United States that any group of bankers has ever done so. In fact, the Federal Advisory Council proved to be the "administrative process" which Paul Warburg had inserted into the Federal Reserve Act to provide just the type of remote but unseen control over the System which he desired. When he was asked by financial reporter C.W. Barron, just after the Federal Reserve Act was enacted into law by Congress, whether he approved of the bill as it was finally passed, Warburg replied, "Well, it hasn't got quite everything we want, but the lack can be adjusted later by administrative processes." The council proved to be the ideal vehicle for Warburg's purposes, as it has functioned for seventy years in almost complete anonymity, its members and their business associations, unnoticed by the public.

Senator Robert Owen, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, had said, as quoted in *The New York Times*, August 3, 1913 before passage of the act:

"The Federal Reserve Act will furnish the bank and industrial and commercial interests with the discount of qualified commercial paper and thus stabilize our commercial and industrial life. The Federal Reserve banks are not intended as money making banks, but to serve a great national purpose of accommodating commerce and businessmen and banks, safeguard a fixed market for manufactured goods, for agricultural products and for labor. There is no reason why the banks should be in control of the Federal Reserve system. Stability will make our commerce expand healthfully in every direction."

Senator Owen's optimism was doomed by the domination of the Jekyll Island promoters over the initial composition of the Federal Reserve System. Not only did the Morgan-Kuhn, Loeb alliance purchase the dominant control of stock in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, with almost half of the shares owned by the five New York banks under their control, First National Bank, National City Bank, National Bank of Commerce, Chase National Bank and Hanover National Bank, but they also persuaded President Woodrow Wilson to appoint one of the Jekyll Island group, Paul Warburg, to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Each of the twelve Federal Reserve Banks was to elect a member of the Federal Advisory Council, which would meet with the Federal Reserve Board of Governors four times a year in Washington, in order to "advise" the Board on future monetary policy. This seemed to assure absolute democracy, as each of the twelve "advisors", representing a different region of the United States, would be expected to speak up for the economic interests of his area, and each of the twelve members would have an equal vote. The theory may have been admirable in its concept, but the hard facts of economic life resulted in a quite different picture.

The president of a small bank in St. Louis or Cincinnati, sitting in conference with Paul Warburg and J.P. Morgan to "advise" them on monetary policy, would be unlikely to contradict two of the most powerful international financiers in the world, as a scribbled note from either one of them would be sufficient to plunge his little bank into bankruptcy. In fact, the small banks of the twelve Federal Reserve districts existed only as satellites of the big New York financial interests, and were completely at their mercy.

Martin Mayer, in *The Bankers*, points out that "J.P. Morgan maintained correspondent relationships with many small banks all over the country."³⁰ The big New York banks did not confine themselves to multi-million dollar deals with other great financial interests, but carried on many smaller and more routine dealings with their "correspondent" banks across the United States.

Apparently secure in their belief that their activities would never be exposed to the public, the Morgan-Kuhn, Loeb interests boldly selected the members of the Federal Advisory Council from their correspondent banks and from banks in which they owned stock. No one in the financial community seemed to notice, as nothing was said about it during seventy years of the Federal Reserve System's operation.

To avoid any suspicion that New York interests might control the Federal Advisory Council, its first president, elected in 1914 by the other members, was J.B. Forgan, president of the First National Bank of Chicago. Rand McNally Bankers Directory for 1914 lists the principal correspondents of the large banks. The principal correspondent bank of the Baker-Morgan controlled First National Bank of New York is listed as the First National Bank of Chicago. The principal correspondent listed by the First National Bank of Chicago is the Bank of Manhattan in New York, controlled by Jacob Schiff and Paul Warburg of Kuhn, Loeb Company. James B. Forgan also was listed as a director of Equitable Life Insurance Company, also controlled by Morgan. However, the relationship between First National Bank of Chicago and these New York banks was even closer than these listings indicate.

On page 701 of *The Growth of Chicago Banks* by F. Cyril James, we find mention of "the First National Bank of Chicago's profitable connection with the Morgan interests. A goodwill ambassador was hastily sent to New York to invite George F. Baker to become a director of the First National Bank of Chicago." ³¹ (J.B. Forgan to Ream, January 7, 1903.) In effect, Baker and Morgan had personally chosen the first president of the Federal Advisory Council.

James B. Forgan (1852-1924) also shows the obligatory "London Connection" in the operation of the Federal Reserve System. Born in St. Andrew's, Scotland, he began his banking career there with the Royal Bank of Scotland, a correspondent of the Bank of England. He came to Canada for the Bank of British North America, worked for the Bank of Nova Scotia, which sent him to Chicago in the 1880's, and by 1900 he had become president of the First National Bank of Chicago. He served for six years as president of the Federal Advisory Council, and when he left the council, he was replaced by Frank O. Wetmore, who had also replaced him as president of the First National Bank of Chicago when Forgan was named chairman of the board.

Representing the New York Federal Reserve district on the first Federal Advisory Council was J.P. Morgan. He was named chairman of the Executive Committee. Thus, Paul Warburg and J.P. Morgan sat in conference at the meetings of the Federal Reserve Board during the first four years of its operation, surrounded by the other Governors and members of the council, who could hardly have been unaware that their futures would be guided by these two powerful bankers.

Another member of the Federal Advisory Council in 1914 was Levi L. Rue, representing the Philadelphia district. Rue was president of the Philadelphia National Bank. Rand McNally Bankers Directory of 1914 listed as principal correspondent of the First National Bank of New York, the Philadelphia National Bank. First National Bank of Chicago also listed Philadelphia National Bank as its principal correspondent in Philadelphia. The other members of the Federal Advisory Council included Daniel S. Wing, president of the First National Bank of Boston, W.S. Rowe, president of the First National Bank of Cincinnati, and C.T. Jaffray, president of the First National Bank of Minneapolis. These were all correspondent banks of the New York "big five" banks who controlled the money market in the United States.

Jaffray had an even closer connection with the Baker-Morgan interests. In 1908, to reinvest the large annual dividends from their First National Bank of New York stock, Baker and Morgan set up a holding company, First Security Corporation, which bought 500 shares of the First National Bank of Minneapolis. Thus Jaffray was little more than a wage-earning employee of Baker and Morgan, although he had been "selected" by stockholders of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis to represent their interests. First Security Corporation also owned 50,000 shares of Chase National Bank, 5400 shares of National Bank of Commerce, 2500 shares of Bankers Trust, 928 shares of Liberty National Bank, the bank of which Henry P. Davison had been president when he was tapped to join the J.P. Morgan firm, and shares of New York Trust, Atlantic Trust and Brooklyn Trust. First Security concentrated on bank stocks which rapidly appreciated in value, and paid handsome annual dividends. In 1927, it earned five million dollars, but paid the shareholders eight million, taking the rest from its surplus.

Another member of the initial Federal Advisory Council was E.F. Swinney, president of the First National Bank of Kansas City. He was also a director of Southern Railway, and lists himself in *Who's Who* as "independent in politics".

Archibald Kains represented the San Francisco district on the Federal Advisory Council, although he maintained his office in New York, as president of the American Foreign Banking Corporation.

After serving as a Governor of the Federal Reserve Board from 1914-1918, Paul Warburg did not request another term. However, he was not ready to sever his connection with the Federal Reserve System which he had done so much to set up

and put into operation. J.P. Morgan obligingly gave up his seat on the Federal Advisory Council, and for the next ten years, Paul Warburg continued to represent the Federal Reserve district of New York on the Council. He was vice president of the council 1922-25, and president 1926-27. Thus Warburg remained the dominant presence at Federal Reserve Board meetings throughout the 1920s, when the European central banks were planning the great contraction of credit which precipitated the Crash of 1929 and the Great Depression.

Although most of the Federal Advisory Council's "advice" to the Board of Governors has never been reported, on rare instances a few glimpses into its deliberations were afforded by brief items in *The New York Times*. On November 21, 1916, *The Times* reported that the Federal Advisory Council had met in Washington for its quarterly conference.

"There was talk about absorbing Europe's extension of credit to South America and other countries. Federal Reserve officials said that to maintain a position as one of the world's bankers the United States must expect to be called upon to render a good deal of the service performed largely by England in the past, in extending short term credits necessary in the production and transportation of goods of all kinds in the world's trade, and that acceptances in foreign trade require lower discounts and the freest and most reliable gold markets." (The First World War was at its zenith in 1916.)

In addition to his service on the Board of Governors and the Federal Advisory Council, Paul Warburg continued to address bankers' groups about the monetary policies they were expected to follow. On October 22, 1915, he addressed the Twin City Bankers Club, St. Paul, Minnesota during which speech he stated,

"It is to your interest to see the Federal Reserve banks as strong as they possibly can be. It staggers the imagination to think what the future may have in store for the development of American banking. With Europe's foremost powers limited to their own field, with the United States turned into a creditor nation for all the world, the boundaries of the field that lies open for us are determined only by our power of safe expansion. The scope of our banking future will ultimately be limited by the amount of gold that we can muster as the foundation of our banking and credit structure."

The composition of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors and the Federal Reserve Advisory Council, from its initial membership to the present day, shows links to the Jekyll Island conference and the London banking community which offers incontrovertible evidence, acceptable in any court of law, that there was a plan to gain control of the money and credit of the people of the United States, and to use it for the profit of the architects. Old Jekyll Island hands were Frank Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank, which bought a large portion of the shares of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York in 1914; Paul Warburg of Kuhn, Loeb Company; Henry P. Davison, J.P. Morgan's righthand man, and director of the First National Bank of New York and the National Bank of Commerce, which took a large portion of Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock; and Benjamin Strong, also known as a Morgan lieutenant, who served as Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York during the 1920's.*

The selection of the regional members of the Federal Advisory Council from the list of bankers who worked most closely with the "big five" banks of New York, and who were their principal correspondent banks, proves that the much-touted "regional safeguarding of the public interest" by Carter Glass and other Washington proponents of the Federal Reserve Act was from its very inception a deliberate deception. The fact that for seventy years this council was able to meet with the Federal Reserve Board of Governors and to "advise" the Governors on decisions of monetary policy which affected the daily lives of every person in the United States, without the public being aware of their existence, demonstrates that the planners of the central bank operation knew exactly how to achieve their objectives through "administrative processes" of which the public would remain ignorant. The claim that the "advice" of the council members is not binding on the Governors or that it carries no weight is to claim that four times a year, twelve of the most influential bankers in the United States take time from their work to travel to Washington to meet with the Federal Reserve Board merely to drink coffee and exchange pleasantries. It is a claim which anyone familiar with the workings of the business community will find impossible to take seriously. In 1914, it was a four-day trip each way for bankers from the Far West to come to Washington for a council meeting with the Federal Reserve Board. These men had extensive business interests which demanded their time. J.P. Morgan was a director of sixty-three corporations which held annual meetings, and could hardly be expected to travel to Washington to attend meetings of the Federal Reserve Board if his advice was to be considered of no importance.**

Chapter 5 — The House of Rothschild

The success of the Federal Reserve Conspiracy will raise many questions in the minds of readers who are unfamiliar with the history of the United States and finance capital. How could the Kuhn, Loeb-Morgan alliance, powerful though it might be, believe that it would be capable, first, of devising a plan which would bring the entire money and credit of the people of the United States into their hands, and second, of getting such a plan enacted into law?

The capability of devising and enacting the "National Reserve Plan", as the immediate result of the Jekyll Island expedition was called, was easily within the powers of the Kuhn, Loeb-Morgan alliance, according to the following from McClure's Magazine, August 1911, "The Seven Men" by John Moody:

"Seven men in Wall Street now control a great share of the fundamental industry and resources of the United States. Three of the seven men, J.P. Morgan, James J. Hill, and George F. Baker, head of the First National Bank of New York belong to the so-called Morgan group; four of them, John D. and William Rockefeller, James Stillman, head of the National City Bank, and Jacob H. Schiff of the private banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb Company, to the so-called Standard Oil City Bank group... the central machine of capital extends its control over the United States... The process is not only economically logical; it is now practically automatic." ³²

Thus we see that the 1910 plot to seize control of the money and credit of the people of the United States was planned by men who already controlled most of the country's resources. It seemed to John Moody "practically automatic" that they should continue with their operations.

What John Moody did not know, or did not tell his readers, was that the most powerful men in the United States were themselves answerable to another power, a foreign power, and a power which had been steadfastly seeking to extend its control over the young republic of the United States since its very inception. This power was the financial power of England, centered in the London Branch of the House of Rothschild. The fact was that in 1910, the United States was for all practical purposes being ruled from England, and so it is today. The ten largest bank holding companies in the United States are firmly in the hands of certain banking houses, all of which have branches in London. They are J.P. Morgan Company, Brown Brothers Harriman, Warburg, Kuhn Loeb and J. Henry Schroder. All of them maintain close relationships with the House of Rothschild, principally through the Rothschild control of international money markets through its manipulation of the price of gold. Each day, the world price of gold is set in the London office of N.M. Rothschild and Company.

Although these firms are ostensibly American firms, which merely maintain branches in London, the fact is that these banking houses actually take their direction from London. Their history is a fascinating one, and unknown to the American public, originating as it did in the international traffic in gold, slaves, diamonds, and other contraband. There are no moral considerations in any business decision made by these firms. They are interested solely in money and power.

Tourists today gape at the magnificent mansions of the very rich in Newport, Rhode Island, without realizing that not only do these "cottages" stand as a memorial to the baronial desires of our Victorian millionaires, but that their erection in Newport represented a nostalgic memorialization of the great American fortunes, which had their beginnings in Newport when it was the capital of the slave trade.

The slave trade for centuries had its headquarters in Venice, until Seventeenth Century Britain, the new master of the seas, used its control of the oceans to gain a monopoly. As the American colonies were settled, its fiercely independent people, most of whom did not want slaves, found to their surprise that slaves were being sent to our ports in great numbers.

For many years, Newport was the capital of this unsavory trade. William Ellery, the Collector of the Port of Newport, said in 1791:

"...an Ethiopian could as soon change his skin as a Newport merchant could be induced to change so lucrative a trade... for the slow profits of any manufactory."

John Quincy Adams remarked in his Diary, page 459, "Newport's former prosperity was chiefly owing to its extensive employment in the African slave trade."

The pre-eminence of J.P. Morgan and the Brown firm in American finance can be dated to the development of Baltimore as the nineteenth century capital of the slave trade. Both of these firms originated in Baltimore, opened branches in London, came under the aegis of the House of Rothschild, and returned to the United States to open branches in New York and to become the dominant power, not only in finance, but also in government. In recent years, key posts such as Secretary of Defense have been held by Robert Lovett, partner of Brown Brothers Harriman, and Thomas S. Gates, partner of Drexel and Company, a J.P. Morgan subsidiary firm. The present Vice President, George Bush, is the son of Prescott Bush, a partner of Brown Brothers Harriman, for many years the senator from Connecticut, and the financial organizer of Columbia Broadcasting System of which he also was a director for many years.

To understand why these firms operate as they do, it is necessary to give a brief history of their origins. Few Americans know that J.P. Morgan Company began as George Peabody and Company. George Peabody (1795-1869), born at South Danvers, Massachusetts, began business in Georgetown, D.C. in 1814 as Peabody, Riggs and Company, dealing in wholesale dry goods, and in operating the Georgetown Slave Market. In 1815, to be closer to their source of supply, they moved to Baltimore, where they operated as Peabody and Riggs, from 1815 to 1835. Peabody found himself increasingly involved with business originating from London, and in 1835, he established the firm of George Peabody and Company in London. He had excellent entree in London business through another Baltimore firm established in Liverpool, the Brown Brothers. Alexander Brown came to Baltimore in 1801, and established what is now known as the oldest banking house in the United States, still operating as Brown Brothers Harriman of New York; Brown, Shipley and Company of England; and Alex Brown and Son of Baltimore. The behind the scenes power wielded by this firm is indicated by the fact that Sir Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England for many years, was a partner of Brown, Shipley and Company. * Considered the single most influential banker in the world, Sir Montagu Norman was organizer of "informal talks" between heads of central banks in 1927, which led directly to the Great Stockmarket Crash of 1929.

Soon after he arrived in London, George Peabody was surprised to be summoned to an audience with the gruff Baron Nathan Mayer Rothschild. Without mincing words, Rothschild revealed to Peabody, that much of the London aristocracy openly disliked Rothschild and refused his invitations. He proposed that Peabody, a man of modest means, be established as a lavish host whose entertainments would soon be the talk of London. Rothschild would, of course, pay all the bills. Peabody accepted the offer, and soon became known as the most popular host in London. His annual Fourth of July dinner, celebrating American Independence, became extremely popular with the English aristocracy, many of whom, while drinking Peabody's wine, regaled each other with jokes about Rothschild's crudities and bad manners, without realizing that every drop they drank had been paid for by Rothschild.

It is hardly surprising that the most popular host in London would also become a very successful businessman, particularly with the House of Rothschild supporting him behind the scenes. Peabody often operated with a capital of 500,000 pounds on hand, and became very astute in his buying and selling on both sides of the Atlantic. His American agent was the Boston firm of Beebe, Morgan and Company, headed by Junius S. Morgan, father of John Pierpont Morgan. Peabody, who never married, had no one to succeed him, and he was very favorably impressed by the tall, handsome Junius Morgan. He persuaded Morgan to join him in London as a partner in George Peabody and Company in 1854. In 1860, John Pierpont Morgan had been taken on as an apprentice by the firm of Duncan, Sherman in New York. He was not very attentive to business, and in 1864, Morgan's father was outraged when Duncan, Sherman refused to make his son a partner. He promptly extended an arrangement whereby one of the chief employees of Duncan, Sherman, Charles H. Dabney, was persuaded to join John Pierpont Morgan in a new firm, Dabney, Morgan and Company. Bankers Magazine, December, 1864, noted that Peabody had withdrawn his account from Duncan, Sherman, and that other firms were expected to do so. The Peabody account, of course, went to Dabney, Morgan Company.

John Pierpont Morgan was born in 1837, during the first money panic in the United States. Significantly, it had been caused by the House of Rothschild, with whom Morgan was later to become associated.

In 1836, President Andrew Jackson, infuriated by the tactics of the bankers who were attempting to persuade him to renew the charter of the Second Bank of the United States, said, **"You are a den of vipers. I intend to rout you out and by the Eternal God I will rout you out. If the people only understood the rank injustice of our money and banking system, there would be a revolution before morning."**

Although Nicholas Biddle was President of the Bank of the United States, it was well known that Baron James de Rothschild of Paris was the principal investor in this central bank. Although Jackson had vetoed the renewal of the charter

of the Bank of the United States, he probably was unaware that a few months earlier, in 1835, the House of Rothschild had cemented a relationship with the United States Government by superseding the firm of Baring as financial agent of the Department of State on January 1, 1835.

Henry Clews, the famous banker, in his book, *Twenty-eight Years in Wall Street*³³, states that the Panic of 1837 was engineered because the charter of the Second Bank of the United States had run out in 1836. Not only did President Jackson promptly withdraw government funds from the Second Bank of the United States, but he deposited these funds, \$10 million, in state banks. The immediate result, Clews tells us, is that the country began to enjoy great prosperity. This sudden flow of cash caused an immediate expansion of the national economy, and the government paid off the entire national debt, leaving a surplus of \$50 million in the Treasury.

The European financiers had the answer to this situation. Clews further states, "The Panic of 1837 was aggravated by the Bank of England when it in one day threw out all the paper connected with the United States."

The Bank of England, of course, was synonymous with the name of Baron Nathan Mayer Rothschild. Why did the Bank of England in one day "throw out" all paper connected with the United States, that is, refuse to accept or discount any securities, bonds or other financial paper based in the United States? The purpose of this action was to create an immediate financial panic in the United States, cause a complete contraction of credit, halt further issues of stocks and bonds, and ruin those seeking to turn United States securities into cash. In this atmosphere of financial panic, John Pierpont Morgan came into the world. His grandfather, Joseph Morgan, was a well to do farmer who owned 106 acres in Hartford, Connecticut. He later opened the City Hotel, and the Exchange Coffee Shop, and in 1819, was one of the founders of the Aetna Insurance Company.

George Peabody found that he had chosen well in selecting Junius S. Morgan as his successor. Morgan agreed to continue the sub rosa relationship with N.M. Rothschild Company, and soon expanded the firm's activities by shipping large quantities of railroad iron to the United States. It was Peabody iron which was the foundation for much of American railroad tracks from 1860 to 1890. In 1864, content to retire and leave his firm in the hands of Morgan, Peabody allowed the name to be changed to Junius S. Morgan Company. The Morgan firm then and since has always been directed from London. John Pierpont Morgan spent much of his time at his magnificent London mansion, Prince's Gate.

One of the high water marks of the successful Rothschild-Peabody Morgan business venture was the Panic of 1857. It had been twenty years since the Panic of 1837: its lessons had been forgotten by hordes of eager investors who were anxious to invest the profits of a developing America. It was time to fleece them again. The stock market operates like a wave washing up on the beach. It sweeps with it many minuscule creatures who derive all of their life support from the oxygen and water of the wave. They coast along at the crest of the "Tide of Prosperity". Suddenly the wave, having reached the high water mark on the beach, recedes, leaving all of the creatures gasping on the sand. Another wave may come in time to save them, but in all likelihood it will not come as far, and some of the sea creatures are doomed. In the same manner, waves of prosperity, fed by newly created money, through an artificial contraction of credit, recedes, leaving those it had borne high to gasp and die without hope of salvation.

Corsair, the Life of J.P. Morgan,³⁴ tells us that the Panic of 1857 was caused by the collapse of the grain market and by the sudden collapse of Ohio Life and Trust, for a loss of five million dollars. With this collapse nine hundred other American companies failed. Significantly, one not only survived, but prospered from the crash. In Corsair, we learn that the Bank of England lent George Peabody and Company five million pounds during the panic of 1857. Winkler, in *Morgan the Magnificent*³⁵ says that the Bank of England advanced Peabody one million pounds, an enormous sum at that time, and the equivalent of one hundred million dollars today, to save the firm. However, no other firm received such beneficence during this Panic. The reason is revealed by Matthew Josephson, in *The Robber Barons*. He says on page 60:

"For such qualities of conservatism and purity, George Peabody and Company, the old tree out of which the House of Morgan grew, was famous. In the panic of 1857, when depreciated securities had been thrown on the market by distressed investors in America, Peabody and the elder Morgan, being in possession of cash, had purchased such bonds as possessed real value freely, and then resold them at a large advance when sanity was restored."³⁶

Thus, from a number of biographies of Morgan, the story can be pieced together. After the panic had been engineered, one firm came into the market with one million pounds in cash, purchased securities from distressed investors at panic prices, and later resold them at an enormous profit. That firm was the Morgan firm, and behind it was the clever maneuvering of Baron Nathan Mayer Rothschild. The association remained secret from the most knowledgeable financial minds in London and New York, although Morgan occasionally appeared as the financial agent in a Rothschild operation. As the Morgan firm grew rapidly during the late nineteenth century, until it dominated the finances of the nation, many observers were puzzled that the Rothschilds seemed so little interested in profiting by investing in the rapidly advancing American economy. John Moody notes, in *The Masters of Capital*, page 27, "The Rothschilds were content to remain a close ally of Morgan... as far as the American field was concerned."³⁷ Secrecy was more profitable than valor.

The reason that the European Rothschilds preferred to operate anonymously in the United States behind the facade of J.P. Morgan and Company is explained by George Wheeler, in *Pierpont Morgan and Friends, the Anatomy of a Myth*, page 17:

"But there were steps being taken even now to bring him out of the financial backwaters—and they were not being taken by Pierpont Morgan himself. The first suggestion of his name for a role in the recharging of the reserve originated with the London branch of the House of Rothschild, Belmont's employers."³⁸

Wheeler goes on to explain that a considerable anti-Rothschild movement had developed in Europe and the United States which focused on the banking activities of the Rothschild family. Even though they had a registered agent in the United States, August Schoenberg, who had changed his name to Belmont when he came to the United States as the representative of the Rothschilds in 1837, it was extremely advantageous to them to have an American representative who was not known as a Rothschild agent.

Although the London house of Junius S. Morgan and Company continued to be the dominant branch of the Morgan enterprises, with the death of the senior Morgan in 1890 in a carriage accident on the Riviera, John Pierpont Morgan became the head of the firm. After operating as the American representative of the London firm from 1864-1871 as Dabney Morgan Company, Morgan took on a new partner in 1871, Anthony Drexel of Philadelphia and operated as Drexel Morgan and Company until 1895. Drexel died in that year, and Morgan changed the name of the American branch to J.P. Morgan and Company.

LaRouche³⁹ tells us that on February 5, 1891, a secret association known as the Round Table Group was formed in London by Cecil Rhodes, his banker, Lord Rothschild, the Rothschild in-law, Lord Rosebery, and Lord Curzon. He states that in the United States the Round Table was represented by the Morgan group. Dr. Carrol Quigley refers to this group as "The British-American Secret Society" in *Tragedy and Hope*, stating that "The chief backbone of this organization grew up along the already existing financial cooperation running from the Morgan Bank in New York to a group of international financiers in London led by Lazard Brothers (in 1901)."⁴⁰

William Guy Carr, in *Pawns In The Game* states that, "In 1899, J.P. Morgan and Drexel went to England to attend the International Bankers Convention. When they returned, J.P. Morgan had been appointed head representative of the Rothschild interests in the United States. As the result of the London Conference, J.P. Morgan and Company of New York, Drexel and Company of Philadelphia, Grenfell and Company of London, and Morgan Harjes Cie of Paris, M.M. Warburg Company of Germany and America, and the House of Rothschild were all affiliated."⁴¹

Apparently unaware of the Peabody connection with the Rothschilds and the fact that the Morgans had always been affiliated with the House of Rothschild, Carr supposed that he had uncovered this relationship as of 1899, when in fact it went back to 1835. *

After World War I, the Round Table became known as the Council on Foreign Relations in the United States, and the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London. The leading government officials of both England and the United States were chosen from its members. In the 1960s, as growing attention centered on the surreptitious governmental activities of the Council on Foreign Relations, subsidiary groups, known as the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderbergers, representing the identical financial interests, began operations, with the more important officials, such as Robert Roosa, being members of all three groups.

George F. Peabody History of the Great American Fortunes, Gustavus Myers, Mod. Lib. 537, notes that J.P. Morgan's father, Junius S. Morgan, had become a partner of George Peabody in the banking business.

"When the Civil War came on, George Peabody and Company were appointed the financial representatives in England of the U.S. Government... with this appointment their wealth suddenly began to pile up; where hitherto they had amassed the riches by stages not remarkably rapid, they now added many millions within a very few years." According to writers of the day, the methods of George Peabody & Company were not only unreasonable but double treason, in that, while in the act of giving inside aid to the enemy, George Peabody & Company were the potentiaries of the U.S. Government and were being well paid to advance its interests. "Springfield Republic", 1866: "For all who know anything on the subject know very well that Peabody and his partners gave us no faith and no help in our struggle for national existence. They participated to the fullest in the common English distrust of our cause and our success, and talked and acted for the South rather than for our nation. No individuals contributed so much to flooding our money markets and weakening financial confidence in our nationality than George Peabody & Company, and none made more money by the operation. All the money that Mr. Peabody is giving away so lavishly among our institutions of learning was gained by the speculations of his house in our misfortunes." Also, New York Times, Oct. 31, 1866: Reconstruction Carpetbaggers Money Fund. Lightning over the Treasury Building, John Elson, Meador Publishing Co., Boston 41, pg. 53, "The Bank of England with its subsidiary banks in America (under the domination of J.P. Morgan) the Bank of France, and the Reichsbank of Germany, composed an interlocking and cooperative banking system, the main objective of which was the exploitation of the people."

According to William Guy Carr, in Pawns In The Game, ⁴² the initial meeting of these ex-officio planners took place in Mayer Amschel Bauer's Goldsmith Shop in Frankfurt in 1773. Bauer, who adopted the name of "Rothschild" or Red Shield, from the red shield which he hung over his door to advertise his business (the red shield today is the official coat of arms of the City of Frankfurt), (See Cover) "was only thirty years of age when he invited twelve other wealthy and influential men to meet him in Frankfurt. His purpose was to convince them that if they agreed to pool their resources they could then finance and control the World Revolutionary Movement and use it as their Manual of Action to win ultimate control of the wealth, natural resources, and manpower of the entire world. This agreement reached, Mayer unfolded his revolutionary plan. The project would be backed by all the power that could be purchased with their pooled resources. By clever manipulation of their combined wealth it would be possible to create such adverse economic conditions that the masses would be reduced to a state bordering on starvation by unemployment... Their paid propagandists would arouse feelings of hatred and revenge against the ruling classes by exposing all real and alleged cases of extravagance, licentious conduct, injustice, oppression, and persecution. They would also invent infamies to bring into disrepute others who might, if left alone, interfere with their overall plans... Rothschild turned to a manuscript and proceeded to read a carefully prepared plan of action.

1. He argued that LAW was FORCE only in disguise. He reasoned it was logical to conclude 'By the laws of nature right lies in force.'

2. Political freedom is an idea, not a fact. In order to usurp political power all that was necessary was to preach 'Liberalism' so that the electorate, for the sake of an idea, would yield some of their power and prerogatives which the plotters could then gather into their own hands.

3. The speaker asserted that the Power of Gold had usurped the power of Liberal rulers.... He pointed out that it was immaterial to the success of his plan whether the established governments were destroyed by external or internal foes because the victor had to of necessity ask the aid of 'Capital' which 'Is entirely in our hands'.

4. He argued that the use of any and all means to reach their final goal was justified on the grounds that the ruler who governed by the moral code was not a skilled politician because he left himself vulnerable and in an unstable position.

5. He asserted that 'Our right lies in force. The word RIGHT is an abstract thought and proves nothing. I find a new RIGHT... to attack by the Right of the Strong, to reconstruct all existing institutions, and to become the sovereign Lord of all those who left to us the Rights to their powers by laying them down to us in their liberalism.

6. The power of our resources must remain invisible until the very moment when it has gained such strength that no cunning or force can undermine it. He went on to outline twenty-five points:

Number 8. dealt with the use of alcoholic liquors, drugs, moral corruption, and all vice to systematically corrupt youth of all nations.

9. They had the right to seize property by any means, and without hesitation, if by doing so they secured submission and sovereignty.

10. We were the first to put the slogans Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity into the mouths of the masses, which set up a new aristocracy. The qualification for this aristocracy is WEALTH which is dependent on us.

11. Wars should be directed so that the nations engaged on both sides should be further in our debt.

12. Candidates for public office should be servile and obedient to our commands, so that they may readily be used.

13. Propaganda--their combined wealth would control all outlets of public information.

14. Panics and financial depressions would ultimately result in World Government, a new order of one world government."

The Rothschild family has played a crucial role in international finance for two centuries, as Frederick Morton, in *The Rothschilds* writes:

"For the last one hundred and fifty years the history of the House of Rothschild has been to an amazing extent the backstage history of Western Europe."³⁸ (Preface)... Because of their success in making loans not to individuals, but to nations, they reaped huge profits, although as Morton writes, p. 36, "Someone once said that the wealth of Rothschild consists of the bankruptcy of nations."⁴³

E.C. Knuth writes, in *The Empire of the City*, "The fact that the House of Rothschild made its money in the great crashes of history and the great wars of history, the very periods when others lost their money, is beyond question."⁴⁴

The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia, states, "The clearest example of a personal linkup (international directorates) on a Western European scale is the Rothschild family. The London and Paris branches of the Rothschilds are bound not just by family ties but also by personal link-ups in jointly controlled companies."⁴⁵ The encyclopaedia further described these companies as international monopolies.

The sire of the family, Mayer Amschel Rothschild, established a small business as a coin dealer in Frankfurt in 1743. Although previously known as Bauer *, he advertised his profession by putting up a sign depicting an eagle on a red shield, an adaptation of the coat of arms of the City of Frankfurt, to which he added five golden arrows extending from the talons, signifying his five sons. Because of this sign, he took the name 'Rothschild' or "Red Shield". When the Elector of

Hesse earned a fortune by renting Hessian mercenaries to the British to put down the rebellion in the American colonies, Rothschild was entrusted with this money to invest. He made an excellent profit both for himself and the Elector, and attracted other accounts. In 1785 he moved to a larger house, 148 Judengasse, a five story house known as "The Green Shield" which he shared with the Schiff family.

The five sons established branches in the principal cities of Europe, the most successful being James in Paris and Nathan Mayer in London. Ignatius Balla in *The Romance of the Rothschilds*⁴⁶ tells us how the London Rothschild established his fortune. He went to Waterloo, where the fate of Europe hung in the balance, saw that Napoleon was losing the battle, and rushed back to Brussels. At Ostend, he tried to hire a boat to England, but because of a raging storm, no one was willing to go out. Rothschild offered 500 francs, then 700, and finally 1,000 francs for a boat. One sailor said, "I will take you for 2000 francs; then at least my widow will have something if we are drowned." Despite the storm, they crossed the Channel.

The next morning, Rothschild was at his usual post in the London Exchange. Everyone noticed how pale and exhausted he looked. Suddenly, he started selling, dumping large quantities of securities. Panic immediately swept the Exchange. Rothschild is selling; he knows we have lost the Battle of Waterloo. Rothschild and all of his known agents continued to throw securities onto the market. Balla says, "Nothing could arrest the disaster. At the same time he was quietly buying up all securities by means of secret agents whom no one knew. In a single day, he had gained nearly a million sterling, giving rise to the saying, 'The Allies won the Battle of Waterloo, but it was really Rothschild who won.'"*

In *The Profits of War*, Richard Lewinsohn says, "Rothschild's war profits from the Napoleonic Wars financed their later stock speculations. Under Metternich, Austria after long hesitation, finally agreed to accept financial direction from the House of Rothschild."⁴⁷

After the success of his Waterloo exploit, Nathan Mayer Rothschild gained control of the Bank of England through his near monopoly of "Consols" and other shares. Several "central" banks, or banks which had the power to issue currency, had been started in Europe: The Bank of Sweden, in 1656, which began to issue notes in 1661, the earliest being the Bank of Amsterdam, which financed Oliver Cromwell's seizure of power in England in 1649, ostensibly because of religious differences. Cromwell died in 1657 and the throne of England was re-established when Charles II was crowned in 1660. He died in 1685. In 1689, the same group of bankers regained power in England by putting King William of Orange on the throne. He soon repaid his backers by ordering the British Treasury to borrow 1,250,000 pounds from these bankers. He also issued them a Royal Charter for the Bank of England, which permitted them to consolidate the National debt (which had just been created by this loan) and to secure payments of interest and principal by direct taxation of the people. The Charter forbade private goldsmiths to store gold and to issue receipts, which gave the stockholders of the Bank of England a money monopoly. The goldsmiths also were required to store their gold in the Bank of England vaults. Not only had their privilege of issuing circulating medium been taken away by government decree, but their fortunes were now turned over to those who had supplanted them.*

In his "Cantos", 46; 27, Ezra Pound refers to the unique privileges which William Paterson advertised in his prospectus for the Charter of the Bank of England:

"Said Paterson hath benefit of interest on all the moneys which it, the bank, creates out of nothing."

The "nothing" which is referred to, of course, is the bookkeeping operation of the bank, which "creates" money by entering a notation that it has "lent" you one thousand dollars, money which did not exist until the bank made the entry.

By 1698, the British Treasury owed 16 million pounds sterling to the Bank of England. By 1815, principally due to the compounding of interest, the debt had risen to 885 million pounds sterling. Some of this increase was due to the wars which had flourished during that period, including the Napoleonic Wars and the wars which England had fought to retain its American Colony.

William Paterson (1658-1719) himself benefited little from "the moneys which the bank creates out of nothing", as he withdrew, after a policy disagreement, from the Bank of England a year after it was founded. A later William Paterson

became one of the framers of the United States Constitution, while the name lingers on, like the pernicious central bank itself.

Paterson had found himself unable to work with the Bank of England's stockholders. Many of them remained anonymous, but an early description of the Bank of England stated it was "A society of about 1330 persons, including the King and Queen of England, who had 10,000 pounds of stock, the Duke of Leeds, Duke of Devonshire, Earl of Pembroke, and the Earl of Bradford."

Because of his success in his speculations, Baron Nathan Mayer de Rothschild, as he now called himself, reigned as the supreme financial power in London. He arrogantly exclaimed, during a party in his mansion, "I care not what puppet is placed upon the throne of England to rule the Empire on which the sun never sets. The man that controls Britain's money supply controls the British Empire, and I control the British money supply."

His brother James in Paris had also achieved dominance in French finance. In Baron Edmond de Rothschild, David Druck writes, "(James) Rothschild's wealth had reached the 600 million mark. Only one man in France possessed more. That was the King, whose wealth was 800 million. The aggregate wealth of all the bankers in France was 150 million less than that of James Rothschild. This naturally gave him untold powers, even to the extent of unseating governments whenever he chose to do so. It is well known, for example, that he overthrew the Cabinet of Prime Minister Thiers." ⁴⁸

The expansion of Germany under Bismarck was accompanied by his dependence on Samuel Bleichroder, Court Bankers of the Prussian Emperor, who had been known as an agent of the Rothschilds since 1828. The later Chancellor of Germany, Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, was the son of Moritz Bethmann of Frankfurt, who had intermarried with the Rothschilds. Emperor Wilhelm I also relied heavily on Bischoffsheim, Goldschmidt, and Sir Ernest Cassel of Frankfurt, who emigrated to England and became personal banker to the Prince of Wales, later Edward VII. Cassel's daughter married Lord Mountbatten, giving the family a direct relationship to the present British Crown.

Josephson ⁴⁹ states that Philip Mountbatten was related through the Cassels to the Meyer Rothschilds of Frankfurt. Thus, the English royal House of Windsor has a direct family relationship to the Rothschilds. In 1901, when Queen Victoria's son, Edward, became King Edward VII, he re-established the Rothschild ties.

Paul Emden in Behind The Throne says,

"Edward's preparation for his metier was quite different from that of his mother, hence he 'ruled' less than she did. Gratefully, he retained around him men who had been with him in the age of the building of the Baghdad Railway...there were added to the advisory staff Leopold and Alfred de Rothschild, various members of the Sassoon family, and above all his private financial advisor Sir Ernest Cassel." ⁵⁰

The enormous fortune which Cassel made in a relatively short time gave him an immense power which he never misused. He amalgamated the firm of Vickers Sons with the Naval Construction Company and the Maxim-Nordenfeldt Guns and Ammunition Company, a fusion from which there arose the worldwide firm of Vickers Sons and Maxim. On an entirely different capacity from Cassel were businessmen like the Rothschilds. The firm was run on democratic principles, and the various partners all had to be members of the family. With great hospitality and in a princely manner they led the lives of grand seigneurs, and it was natural that Edward VII should find them congenial. Thanks to their international family relationships and still more extended business connections, they knew the whole world, were well informed about everybody, and had reliable knowledge of matters which did not appear on the surface. This combination of finance and politics had been a trademark of the Rothschilds from the very beginning. The House of Rothschild always knew more than could be found in the papers and even more than could be read in the reports which arrived at the Foreign Office. In other countries also the relations of the Rothschilds extended behind the throne. Not until numerous diplomatic publications appeared in the years after the war did a wider public learn how strongly Alfred de Rothschild's hand affected the politics of Central Europe during the twenty years before the war (World War I)."

With the control of the money came the control of the news media. Kent Cooper, head of the Associated Press, writes in his autobiography, *Barriers Down*, "International bankers under the House of Rothschild acquired an interest in the three leading European agencies." ⁵¹

Thus the Rothschilds bought control of Reuters International News Agency, based in London, Havas of France, and Wolf in Germany, which controlled the dissemination of all news in Europe.

In *Inside Europe*⁵², John Gunther wrote in 1936 that any French prime minister, at the end of 1935, was a creature of the financial oligarchy, and that this financial oligarchy was dominated by twelve regents, of whom six were bankers, and were headed by Baron Edmond de Rothschild.

The iron grip of the "London Connection" on the media was exposed in a recent book by Ben J. Bagdikian *The Media Monopoly*, described as "A startling report on the 50 corporations that control what America sees, hears, reads".⁵³ Bagdikian, who edited the nation's most influential magazine the *Saturday Evening Post* until the monopoly suddenly closed it down, reveals the interlocking directorates among the fifty corporations which control the news, but fails to trace them back to the five London banking houses which control them. He mentions that CBS interlocks with the *Washington Post*, *Allied Chemical*, *Wells Fargo Bank*, and others, but does not tell the reader that *Brown Brothers Harriman* controls CBS, or that the *Eugene Meyer family (Lazard Freres)* controls *Allied Chemical* and the *Washington Post*, and *Kuhn Loeb Co.* the *Wells Fargo Bank*. He shows the *New York Times* interlocked with *Morgan Guaranty Trust*, *American Express*, *First Boston Corporation* and others, but does not show how the banking interlocks. He does not mention the *Federal Reserve System* in his entire book, which is conspicuous by its absence.

Bagdikian documents that the media monopoly is steadily closing down more newspapers and magazines. *Washington D.C.*, with one paper, *The Post*, is unique among world capitals. London has eleven daily newspapers, Paris fourteen, Rome eighteen, Tokyo seventeen, and Moscow nine. He cites a study from the 1982 *World Press Encyclopaedia* that the United States is at the bottom of industrial nations in the number of daily newspapers sold per 1,000 population. Sweden leads the list with 572, the United States is at the bottom with 287. There is universal distrust of the media by Americans, because of their notorious monopoly and bias. The media unanimously urge higher taxes on working people, more government spending, a welfare state with totalitarian powers, close relations with Russia, and a rabid denunciation of anyone who opposes Communism. This is the program of "the London Connection." It flaunts a maniacal racism, and has as its motto the dictum of its high priestess, Susan Sontag, that "The white race is the cancer of history." Everyone should be against cancer. The media monopoly deals with its opponents in one of two ways; either frontal assault of libel which the average person cannot afford to litigate, or an iron curtain of silence, the standard treatment for any work which exposes its clandestine activities.

Although the Rothschild plan does not match any single political or economic movement since it was enunciated in 1773, vital parts of it can be discerned in all political revolution since that date. LaRouche ⁵⁴ points out that the Round Tables sponsored Fabian Socialism in England, while backing the Nazi regime through a Round Table member in Germany, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, and that they used the Nazi Government throughout World War II through Round Table member Admiral Canaris, while Allen Dulles ran a collaborating intelligence operation in Switzerland for the Allies.

Chapter 6 — The London Connection

"So you see, my dear Coningsby, that the world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes." ⁵⁵ -- Disraeli, Prime Minister of England during Queen Victoria's reign.

In 1775, the colonists of America declared their independence from Great Britain, and subsequently won their freedom by the American Revolution. Although they achieved political freedom, financial independence proved to be a more difficult matter. In 1791, Alexander Hamilton, at the behest of European bankers, formed the first Bank of the United States, a central bank with much the same powers as the Bank of England. The foreign influences behind this bank, more than a century later, were able to get the Federal Reserve Act through Congress, giving them at last the central bank of issue for our economy. Although the Federal Reserve Bank was neither Federal, being owned by private stockholders, nor a Reserve, because it was intended to create money, instead of to hold it in reserve, it did achieve enormous financial power, so much so that it has gradually superseded the popular elected government of the United States. Through the

Federal Reserve System, American independence was stealthily but invincibly absorbed back into the British sphere of influence. Thus the London Connection became the arbiter of policy of the United States.

Because of England's loss of her colonial empire after the Second World War, it seemed that her influence as a world political power was waning. Essentially, this was true. The England of 1980 is not the England of 1880. She no longer rules the waves; she is a second rate, perhaps third rate, military power, but paradoxically, as her political and military power waned, her financial power grew. In Capital City we find, "On almost any measure you care to take, London is the world's leading financial centre . . . In the 1960s London dominance increased . . ." ⁵⁶

A partial explanation of this fact is given:

"Daniel Davison, head of London's Morgan Grenfell, said, 'The American banks have brought the necessary money, customers, capital and skills which have established London in its present preeminence . . . only the American banks have a lender of last resort. The Federal Reserve Board of the United States can, and does, create dollars when necessary. Without the Americans, the big dollar deals cannot be put together.

Without them, London would not be credible as an international financial centre.'" ⁵⁷

Thus London is the world's financial center, because it can command enormous sums of capital, created at its command by the Federal Reserve Board of the United States. But how is this possible? We have already established that the monetary policies of the United States, the interest rates, the volume and value of money, and sales of bonds, are decided, not by the figurehead of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, but by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The pretended decentralization of the Federal Reserve System and its twelve, equally autonomous "regional" banks, is and has been a deception since the Federal Reserve Act became law in 1913. That United States monetary policy stems solely from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is yet another fallacy. That the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is itself autonomous and free to set monetary policy for the entire United States without any outside interference is especially untrue.

We might believe in this autonomy if we did not know that the majority stock of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was purchased by three New York City banks: First National Bank, National City Bank, and the National Bank of Commerce. An examination of the principal stockholders in these banks, in 1914, and today, reveals a direct London connection.

In 1812, the National City Bank began business as the City Bank, in the same room in which the defunct Bank of the United States, whose charter had expired, had been doing business. It represented many of the same stockholders, who were now functioning under a legitimate American charter. During the early 1800s, the most famous name associated with City Bank was Moses Taylor (1806-1882). Taylor's father had been a confidential agent employed in buying property for the Astor interests while concealing the fact that Astor was the purchaser. Through this tactic, Astor succeeded in buying many farms, and also a great deal of potentially valuable real estate in Manhattan. Although Astor's capital was reputed to come from his fur trading, a number of sources indicate that he also represented foreign interests. LaRouche ⁵⁸ states that Astor, in exchange for providing intelligence to the British during the years before and after the Revolutionary War, and for inciting Indians to attack and kill American settlers along the frontier, received a handsome reward. He was not paid cash, but was given a percentage of the British opium trade with China. It was the income from this lucrative concession which provided the basis for the Astor fortune.

With his father's connection with the Astors, young Moses Taylor had no difficulty in finding a place as apprentice in a banking house at the age of 15. Like so many others in these pages, he found his greatest opportunities when many other Americans were going bankrupt during an abrupt contraction of credit. During the Panic of 1837, when more than half the business firms in New York failed, he doubled his fortune. In 1855, he became president of City Bank. During the Panic of 1857, the City Bank profited by the failure of many of its competitors. Like George Peabody and Junius Morgan, Taylor seemed to have an ample supply of cash for buying up distressed stocks. He purchased nearly all the stock of Delaware Lackawanna Railroad for \$5 a share. Seven years later, it was selling for \$240 a share. Moses Taylor was now worth fifty million dollars.

In August, 1861, Taylor was named Chairman of the Loan Committee to finance the Union Government in the Civil War. The Committee shocked Lincoln by offering the government \$5,000,000 at 12% to finance the war. Lincoln refused and financed the war by issuing the famous "Greenbacks" through the U.S. Treasury, which were backed by gold. Taylor continued to increase his fortune throughout the war, and in his later years, the youthful James Stillman became his protégé. In 1882, when Moses Taylor died, he left seventy million dollars.* His son-in-law, Percy Pyne, succeeded him as president of City Bank, which had now become National City Bank. Pyne was paralyzed, and was barely able to function at the bank. For nine years, the bank stagnated, nearly all its capital being the estate of Moses Taylor. William Rockefeller, brother of John D. Rockefeller, had bought into the bank, and was anxious to see it progress. He persuaded Pyne to step aside in 1891 in favor of James Stillman, and soon the National City Bank became the principal repository of the Rockefeller oil income. William Rockefeller's son, William, married Elsie, James Stillman's daughter, Isabel. Like so many others in New York banking, James Stillman also had a British connection. His father, Don Carlos Stillman, had come to Brownsville, Texas, as a British agent and blockade runner during the Civil War. Through his banking connections in New York, Don Carlos had been able to find a place for his son as apprentice in a banking house. In 1914, when National City Bank purchased almost ten per cent of the shares of the newly organized Federal Reserve Bank of New York, two of Moses Taylor's grandsons, Moses Taylor Pyne and Percy Pyne, owned 15,000 shares of National City stock. Moses Taylor's son, H.A.C. Taylor, owned 7699 shares of National City Bank. The bank's attorney, John W. Sterling, of the firm of Shearman and Sterling, also owned 6000 shares of National City Bank. However, James Stillman owned 47,498 shares, or almost twenty percent of the bank's total shares of 250,000. [See Chart I]

The second largest purchaser of Federal Reserve Bank of New York shares in 1914, First National Bank, was generally known as "the Morgan Bank", because of the Morgan representation on the board, although the bank's founder George F. Baker held 20,000 shares, and his son G.F. Baker, Jr., had 5,000 shares for twenty-five percent of the bank's total stock of 100,000 shares. George F. Baker Sr.'s daughter married George F. St. George of London. The St. Georges later settled in the United States, where their daughter, Katherine St. George, became a prominent Congresswoman for a number of years. Dr. E.M. Josephson wrote of her, "Mrs. St. George, a first cousin of FDR and New Dealer, said, 'Democracy is a failure'." George Baker, Jr.'s daughter, Edith Brevoort Baker, married Jacob Schiff's grandson, John M. Schiff, in 1934. John M. Schiff is now honorary chairman of Lehman Brothers Kuhn Loeb Company.

The third large purchase of Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock in 1914 was the National Bank of Commerce which issued 250,000 shares. J.P. Morgan, through his controlling interest in Equitable Life, which held 24,700 shares and Mutual Life, which held 17,294 shares of National Bank of Commerce, also held another 10,000 shares of National Bank of Commerce through J.P. Morgan and Company (7800 shares), J.P. Morgan, Jr. (1100 shares), and Morgan partner H.P. Davison (1100 shares). Paul Warburg, a Governor of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, also held 3000 shares of National Bank of Commerce. His partner, Jacob Schiff had 1,000 shares of National Bank of Commerce. This bank was clearly controlled by Morgan, who was really a subsidiary of Junius S. Morgan Company in London and the N.M. Rothschild Company of London, and Kuhn, Loeb Company, which was also known as a principal agent of the Rothschilds.

The financier Thomas Fortune Ryan also held 5100 shares of National Bank of Commerce stock in 1914. His son, John Barry Ryan, married Otto Kahn's daughter, Kahn was a partner of Warburg and Schiff in Kuhn, Loeb Company, Ryan's granddaughter, Virginia Fortune Ryan, married Lord Airlie, the present head of J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation in London and New York.

Another director of National Bank of Commerce in 1914, A.D. Juillard, was president of A.D. Juillard Company, a trustee of New York Life, and Guaranty Trust, all of which were controlled by J.P. Morgan. Juillard also had a British connection, being a director of the North British and Mercantile Insurance Company. Juillard owned 2000 shares of National Bank of Commerce stock, and was also a director of Chemical Bank.

In *The Robber Barons*, by Matthew Josephson, Josephson tells us that Morgan dominated New York Life, Equitable Life and Mutual Life by 1900, which had one billion dollars in assets, and which had fifty million dollars a year to invest. He says,

"In this campaign of secret alliances he (Morgan) acquired direct control of the National Bank of Commerce; then a part ownership in the First National Bank, allying himself to the very strong and conservative financier, George F. Baker, who

headed it; then by means of stock ownership and interlocking directorates he linked to the first named banks other leading banks, the Hanover, the Liberty, and Chase."⁶⁰

Mary W. Harriman, widow of E.H. Harriman, also owned 5,000 shares of National Bank of Commerce in 1914. E.H. Harriman's railroad empire had been entirely financed by Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb Company. Levi P. Morton also owned 1500 shares of National Bank of Commerce stock in 1914. He had been the twenty-second vice-president of the United States, was an ex-Minister from the U.S. to France, and president of L.P. Morton Company, New York, Morton-Rose and Company and Morton Chaplin of London. He was a director of Equitable Life Insurance Company, Home Insurance Company, Guaranty Trust, and Newport Trust.

The astounding idea that the Federal Reserve System of the United States is actually operated from London will probably be rejected at first hearing by most Americans. However, Minsky has become famous for his theory of the "dominant frame". He states that in any particular situation, there is a "dominant frame" to which everything in that situation is related and through which it can be interpreted. The "dominant frame" in the monetary policy decisions of the Federal Reserve System is that these decisions are made by those who stand to benefit most from them. At first glance, this would seem to be the principal stockholders of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. However, we have seen that these stockholders all have a "London Connection". The "London Connection" becomes more obvious as the dominant power when we find in *The Capital City*⁶¹ that only seventeen firms are allowed to operate as merchant bankers in the City of London, England's financial district. All of them must be approved by the Bank of England. In fact, most of the Governors of the Bank of England come from the partners of these seventeen firms. Clarke ranks the seventeen in order of their capitalization. Number 2 is the Schroder Bank. Number 6 is Morgan Grenfell, the London branch of the House of Morgan and actually its dominant branch. Lazard Brothers is Number 8. N.M. Rothschild is Number 9. Brown Shipley Company, the London branch of Brown Brothers Harriman, is Number 14. These five merchant banking firms of London actually control the New York banks which own the controlling interest in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

The control over Federal Reserve System decisions is also founded in another unique situation. Each day, representatives of four other London banking firms meet in the offices of N.M. Rothschild Company in London to fix the price of gold for that day. The other four bankers are from Samuel Montagu Company, which ranks Number 5 on the list of seventeen London merchant banking firms, Sharps Pixley, Johnson Matheson, and Mocatta and Goldsmid. Despite the huge tide of paper pyramided currency and notes which are now flooding the world, at some point, every credit extension must return to be based, in however minuscule a fashion, on some deposit of gold in some bank somewhere in the world. Because of this factor, the London merchant bankers, with their power to set the price of gold each day, become the final arbiters of the volume of money and the price of money in those countries which must bow to their power. Not the least of these is the United States. No official of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, or of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, can command the power over the money of the world which is held by these London merchant bankers. Great Britain, while waning in political and military power, today exercises the greatest financial power. It is for this reason that London is the present financial center of the world.

Chapter 7 — The Hitler Connection

J. Henry Schroder Banking Company is listed as Number 2 in capitalization in *Capital City*⁶² on the list of the seventeen merchant bankers who make up the exclusive Accepting Houses Committee in London. Although it is almost unknown in the United States, it has played a large part in our history. Like the others on this list, it had first to be approved by the Bank of England. And, like the Warburg family, the von Schrodgers began their banking operations in Hamburg, Germany. At the turn of the century, in 1900, Baron Bruno von Schroder established the London branch of the firm. He was soon joined by Frank Cyril Tiarks, in 1902. Tiarks married Emma Franziska of Hamburg, and was a director of the Bank of England from 1912 to 1945.

During World War I, J. Henry Schroder Banking Company played an important role behind the scenes. No historian has a reasonable explanation of how World War I started. Archduke Ferdinand was assassinated at Sarajevo by Gavril Principes, Austria demanded an apology from Serbia, and Serbia sent the note of apology. Despite this, Austria declared war, and soon the other nations of Europe joined the fray. Once the war had gotten started, it was found that it wasn't easy to keep it going. The principal problem was that Germany was desperately short of food and coal, and without Germany, the war could not go on. John Hamill in *The Strange Career of Mr. Hoover*⁶³ explains how the problem was solved. ^{*} He quotes

from *Nordeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 4, 1915, "Justice, however, demands that publicity should be given to the preeminent part taken by the German authorities in Belgium in the solution of this problem. The initiative came from them and it was only due to their continuous relations with the American Relief Committee that the provisioning question was solved." Hamill points out "That is what the Belgian Relief Committee was organized for--to keep Germany in food."

The Belgian Relief Commission was organized by Emile Francqui, director of a large Belgian bank, *Societe Generale*, and a London mining promoter, an American named Herbert Hoover, who had been associated with Francqui in a number of scandals which had become celebrated court cases, notably the Kaiping Coal Company scandal in China, said to have set off the Boxer Rebellion, which had as its goal the expulsion of all foreign businessmen from China. Hoover had been barred from dealing on the London Stock Exchange because of one judgement against him, and his associate, Stanley Rowe, had been sent to prison for ten years. With this background, Hoover was called an ideal choice for a career in humanitarian work.

Although his name is unknown in the United States, Emile Francqui was the guiding spirit behind Herbert Hoover's rise to fortune. Hamill (on page 156) identifies Francqui as the director of many atrocities committed against natives in the Congo. "For every cartridge they spent, they had to bring in a man's hand". Francqui's frightful record may have been the source for the charge later leveled against German soldiers in Belgium, that they chopped off the hands of women and children, a claim which proved to be groundless. Hamill also says that Francqui "tricked the Americans out of the Hankow-Canton railroad concession in China in 1901, and at the same time had 'stood by' in case Hoover needed any further help in the 'taking' of the Kaiping coal mines. This is the humanitarian who had sole charge of the distribution of the Belgian 'relief' during the World War, for which Hoover did the buying and shipping. Francqui was a director with Hoover, in the Chinese Engineering and Mining Company (the Kaiping mines), through which Hoover transported 200,000 Chinese slave workers to the Congo to work Francqui's copper mines."

Hamill says on page 311 that "Francqui opened the offices of the Belgian Relief in his bank, *Societe Generale*, as a one-man show, with a letter of permission from the German Governor General von der Goltz dated October 16, 1914.

The *New York Herald Tribune* of February 18, 1930, quoted by Congressman Louis McFadden in the House on February 26, 1930, said, "One of Belgium's two directors on the Bank for International Settlements will be Emile Francqui of the *Societe Generale*, a member of both the Young and Dawes Plan Committees. The board of directors of the international bank will have no more colorful character than Emile Francqui, former Minister of Finance, veteran of the Congo and China . . . he is rated as the richest man in Belgium, and among the twelve richest men in Europe."

Despite his prominence, The *New York Times* Index mentions Francqui only a few times during two decades before his death. On October 3, 1931, The *New York Times* quoted *Le Peuple* of Brussels that Francqui would visit the United States. "As a friend of President Hoover, Monsieur Francqui will not fail to pay a visit to the President."

On October 30, 1931, The *New York Times* reported this visit with the headline, "Hoover-Francqui Talk was Unofficial". "It was stated that Mr. Francqui spent Tuesday night as a personal guest of the President, and that they talked of world financial problems in general, strictly unofficial. Mr. Francqui was an associate of President Hoover during the latter's ministrations in Belgium during the war. Their visit had no official significance. Mr. Francqui is a private citizen and not engaged in any official mission."

No reference is made to the Hoover-Francqui business associations which were the subject of huge lawsuits in London. The Francqui visit probably involved Hoover's Moratorium on German War Debts, which stunned the financial world. On December 15, 1931, Chairman McFadden informed the House of a dispatch in the *Public Ledger* of Philadelphia, October 24, 1931, "GERMAN REVEALS HOOVER'S SECRET. The American President was in intimate negotiations with the German government regarding a year's debt holiday as early as December, 1930." McFadden continued, "Behind the Hoover announcement there were many months of hurried and furtive preparations both in Germany and in Wall Street offices of German bankers. Germany, like a sponge, had to be saturated with American money. Mr. Hoover himself had to be elected, because this scheme began before he became President. If the German international bankers of Wall Street--that is Kuhn Loeb Company, J. & W. Seligman, Paul Warburg, J. Henry Schroder--and their satellites had not had this job waiting to be done, Herbert Hoover would never have been elected President of the United States. The election of Mr. Hoover to the Presidency was through the influence of the Warburg Brothers, directors of the great bank of Kuhn Loeb

Company, who carried the cost of his election. In exchange for this collaboration Mr. Hoover promised to impose the moratorium of German debts. Hoover sought to exempt Kreuger's loan to Germany of \$125 million from the operation of the Hoover Moratorium. The nature of Kreuger's swindle was known here in January when he visited his friend, Mr. Hoover, in the White House."

Not only did Hoover entertain Francqui in the White House, but also Ivar Kreuger, the most famous swindler of the twentieth century.

When Francqui died on November 13, 1935, The New York Times memorialized him as "the copper king of the Congo . . . Mr. Francqui, last year having gained dictatorial powers over the belga, maintained it on the gold standard during a crisis. In 1891 he led an expedition into the Congo and gained it for King Leopold. A man of great wealth, rated among the twelve richest men in Europe, he secured enormous copper deposits. He was Minister of State in 1926 and Minister of Finance in 1934. It was his pride that he never accepted a centime of remuneration for his services to the government. While consul general at Shanghai, he secured valuable concessions, notably the Kaiping coal mines and the railway concession for the Tientsin Railroad. He was governor of the Societe Generale de Belgique, Lloyd Royal Belge, and regent of La Banque Nationale de Belgique."

The Times does not mention Francqui's business partnerships with Hoover. Like Francqui, Hoover also refused remuneration for "government service", and as Secretary of Commerce and as President of the United States, he turned his salary back to the government.

On December 13, 1932, Chairman McFadden introduced a resolution of impeachment against President Hoover for high crimes and misdemeanors, which covers many pages, including violation of contracts, unlawful dissipation of the financial resources of the United States, and his appointment of Eugene Meyer to the Federal Reserve Board. The resolution was tabled and never acted upon by the House.

In criticizing Hoover's Moratorium of German War Debts, McFadden had referred to Hoover's "German" backers. Although all of the principals of "the London Connection" did originate in Germany, most of them in Frankfurt, at the time they sponsored Hoover's candidacy for the Presidency of the United States, they were operating from London, as Hoover himself had done for most of his career.

Also, the Hoover Moratorium was not intended to "help" Germany, as Hoover had never been "pro-German". The Moratorium on Germany's war debts was necessary so that Germany would have funds for rearming. In 1931, the truly forward-looking diplomats were anticipating the Second World War, and there could be no war without an "aggressor".

Hoover had also carried out a number of mining promotions in various parts of the world as a secret agent for the Rothschilds, and had been rewarded with a directorship in one of the principal Rothschild enterprises, the Rio Tinto Mines in Spain and Bolivia. Francqui and Hoover threw themselves into the seemingly impossible task of provisioning Germany during the First World War. Their success was noted in *Nordeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 13, 1915, which noted that large quantities of food were now arriving from Belgium by rail. *Schmoller's Yearbook for Legislation, Administration and Political Economy* for 1916, shows that one billion pounds of meat, one and a half billion pounds of potatoes, one and a half billion pounds of bread, and one hundred twenty-one millions pounds of butter had been shipped from Belgium to Germany in that year. A patriotic British woman who had operated a small hospital in Belgium for several years, Edith Cavell, wrote to the *Nursing Mirror* in London, April 15, 1915, complaining that the "Belgian Relief" supplies were being shipped to Germany to feed the German army. The Germans considered Miss Cavell to be of no importance, and paid no attention to her, but the British Intelligence Service in London was appalled by Miss Cavell's discovery, and demanded that the Germans arrest her as a spy.

Sir William Wiseman, head of British Intelligence, and partner of Kuhn Loeb Company, feared that the continuance of the war was at stake, and secretly notified the Germans that Miss Cavell must be executed. The Germans reluctantly arrested her and charged her with aiding prisoners of war to escape. The usual penalty for this offense was three months imprisonment, but the Germans bowed to Sir William Wiseman's demands, and shot Edith Cavell, thus creating one of the principal martyrs of the First World War.

With Edith Cavell out of the way, the "Belgian Relief" operation continued, although in 1916, German emissaries again approached London officials with the information that they did not believe Germany could continue military operations, not only because of food shortages, but because of financial problems. More "emergency relief" was sent, and Germany continued in the war until November, 1918. Two of Hoover's principal assistants were a former lumber shipping clerk from the West Coast, Prentiss Gray, and Julius H. Barnes, a grain salesman from Duluth. Both men became partners in J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation in New York after the war, and amassed large fortunes, principally in grain and sugar.

With the entry of the United States into the war, Barnes and Gray were given important posts in the newly created U.S. Food Administration, which also was placed under Herbert Hoover's direction. Barnes became President of the Grain Corporation of the U.S. Food Administration from 1917 to 1918, and Gray was chief of Marine Transportation. Another J. Henry Schroder partner, G. A. Zabriskie, was named head of the U.S. Sugar Equalization Board. Thus the London Connection controlled all food in the United States through its grain and sugar "Czars" during the First World War. Despite many complaints of corruption and scandal in the U.S. Food Administration, no one was ever indicted. After the war, the partners of J. Henry Schroder Company found that they now owned most of Cuba's sugar industry. One partner, M.E. Rionda, was president of Cuba Cane Corporation, and director of Manati Sugar Company, American British and Continental Corporation, and other firms. Baron Bruno von Schroder, senior partner of the firm, was a director of North British and Mercantile Insurance Company. His father, Baron Rudolph von Schroder of Hamburg, was a director of Sao Paulo Coffee Ltd., one of the largest Brazilian coffee companies, with F.C. Tiarks, also of the Schroder firm. *

After the war, Zabriskie, who had been sugar Czar of the United States by presiding over the U.S. Sugar Equalization Board, became the president of several of the largest baking corporations in the United States: Empire Biscuit, Southern Baking Corporation, Columbia Baking, and other firms.

As his principal assistant in the U.S. Food Administration, Hoover chose Lewis Lichtenstein Strauss, who was soon to become a partner in Kuhn Loeb Company, marrying the daughter of Jerome Hanauer of Kuhn Loeb. Throughout his distinguished humanitarian service with the Belgian Relief Commission, the U.S. Food Administration, and, after the war, the American Relief Administration, Hoover's closest associate was one Edgar Rickard, born in Pontgibaud, France. In Who's Who, he states that he was "World War administrative assistant to Herbert Hoover in all war and post-war organizations including the Commission For Relief in Belgium. He also served on the U.S. Food Administration from 1914-1924." He remained one of Hoover's closest friends, and usually the Rickards and Hoovers took their vacations together. After Hoover became Secretary of Commerce under Coolidge, Hamill tells us that Hoover awarded his friend the Hazeltine Radio patents, which paid him one million dollars a year in royalties.

In 1928, "the London Connection" decided to run Herbert Hoover for president of the United States. There was only one problem; although Herbert Hoover had been born in the United States, and was thus eligible for the office of the presidency, according to the Constitution, he had never had a business address or a home address in the United States, as he had gone abroad just after completing college at Stanford. The result was that during his campaign for the presidency, Herbert Hoover listed as his American address Suite 2000, 42 Broadway, New York, which was the office of Edgar Rickard. Suite 2000 was also shared by the grain tycoon and partner of J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation, Julius H. Barnes.

After Herbert Hoover was elected president of the United States, he insisted on appointing one of the old London crowd, Eugene Meyer, as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. Meyer's father had been one of the partners of Lazard Freres of Paris, and Lazard Brothers of London. Meyer, with Baruch, had been one of the most powerful men in the United States during World War I, a member of the famous Triumvirate which exercised unequalled power; Meyer as Chairman of the War Finance Corporation, Bernard Baruch as Chairman of the War Industries Board, and Paul Warburg as Governor of the Federal Reserve System.

A longtime critic of Eugene Meyer, Chairman Louis McFadden of the House Banking and Currency Committee, was quoted in The New York Times, December 17, 1930, as having made a speech on the floor of the House attacking Hoover's appointment of Meyer, and charging that "He represents the Rothschild interest and is liaison officer between the French Government and J.P. Morgan." On December 18, The Times reported that "Herbert Hoover is deeply concerned" and that McFadden's speech was "an unfortunate occurrence." On December 20, The Times commented on the editorial page, under the headline, "McFadden Again", "The speech ought to insure the Senate ratification of Mr.

Meyer as head of the Federal Reserve. The speech was incoherent, as Mr. McFadden's speeches usually are." As The Times predicted, Meyer was duly approved by the Senate.

Not content with having a friend in the White House, J. Henry Schroder Corporation was soon embarked on further international adventures, nothing less than a plan to set up World War II. This was to be done by providing, at a crucial juncture, the financing for Adolf Hitler's assumption of power in Germany. Although any number of magnates have been given credit for the financing of Hitler, including Fritz Thyssen, Henry Ford, and J.P. Morgan, they, as well as others, did provide millions of dollars for his political campaigns during the 1920s, just as they did for others who also had a chance of winning, but who disappeared and were never heard from again. In December of 1932, it seemed inevitable to many observers of the German scene that Hitler was also ready for a toboggan slide into oblivion. Despite the fact that he had done well in national campaigns, he had spent all the money from his usual sources and now faced heavy debts. In his book *Aggression*, Otto Lehmann-Russbeldt tells us that "Hitler was invited to a meeting at the Schroder Bank in Berlin on January 4, 1933. The leading industrialists and bankers of Germany tided Hitler over his financial difficulties and enabled him to meet the enormous debt he had incurred in connection with the maintenance of his private army. In return, he promised to break the power of the trade unions. On May 2, 1933, he fulfilled his promise."⁶⁴

Present at the January 4, 1933 meeting were the Dulles brothers, John Foster Dulles and Allen W. Dulles of the New York law firm, Sullivan and Cromwell, which represented the Schroder Bank. The Dulles brothers often turned up at important meetings. They had represented the United States at the Paris Peace Conference (1919); John Foster Dulles would die in harness as Eisenhower's Secretary of State, while Allen Dulles headed the Central Intelligence Agency for many years. Their apologists have seldom attempted to defend the Dulles brothers appearance at the meeting which installed Hitler as the Chancellor of Germany, preferring to pretend that it never happened. Obliquely, one biographer Leonard Mosley bypasses it in Dulles when he states,

"Both brothers had spent large amounts of time in Germany, where Sullivan and Cromwell had considerable interest during the early 1930's, having represented several provincial governments, some large industrial combines, a number of big American companies with interests in the Reich, and some rich individuals."⁶⁵

Allen Dulles later became a director of J. Henry Schroder Company. Neither he nor J. Henry Schroder were to be suspected of being pro-Nazi or pro-Hitler; the inescapable fact was that if Hitler did not become Chancellor of Germany, there was little likelihood of getting a Second World War going, the war which would double their profits.*

The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia states "The banking house Schroder Bros. (it was Hitler's banker) was established in 1846; its partners today are the barons von Schroeder, related to branches in the United States and England."^{66**}

The financial editor of "The Daily Herald" of London wrote on Sept. 30, 1933 of "Mr. Norman's decision to give the Nazis the backing of the Bank (of England.)" John Hargrave, in his biography of Montagu Norman says,

"It is quite certain that Norman did all he could to assist Hitlerism to gain and maintain political power, operating on the financial plane from his stronghold in Threadneedle Street." [i.e. Bank of England.--Ed.]

Baron Wilhelm de Ropp, a journalist whose closest friend was Major F.W. Winterbotham, chief of Air Intelligence of the British Secret Service, brought the Nazi philosopher, Alfred Rosenberg, to London and introduced him to Lord Hailsham, Secretary for War, Geoffrey Dawson, editor of The Times, and Norman, Governor of the Bank of England. After talking with Norman, Rosenberg met with the representative of the Schroder Bank of London. The managing director of the Schroder Bank, F.C. Tiarks, was also a director of the Bank of England. Hargrave says (p. 217), "Early in 1934 a select group of City financiers gathered in Norman's room behind the windowless walls, Sir Robert Kindersley, partner of Lazard Brothers, Charles Hambro, F.C. Tiarks, Sir Josiah Stamp, (also a director of the Bank of England). Governor Norman spoke of the political situation in Europe. A new power had established itself, a great 'stabilizing force', namely, Nazi Germany. Norman advised his co-workers to include Hitler in their plans for financing Europe. There was no opposition."

In Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler, Antony C. Sutton writes "The Nazi Baron Kurt von Schroeder acted as the conduit for I.T.T. money funneled to Heinrich Himmler's S.S. organization in 1944, while World War II was in progress, and the

United States was at war with Germany."⁶⁷ Kurt von Schroeder, born in 1889, was partner in the Cologne Bankhaus, J.H. Stein & Co., which had been founded in 1788. After the Nazis gained power in 1933, Schroeder was appointed the German representative at the Bank of International Settlements. The Kilgore Committee in 1940 stated that Schroeder's influence with the Hitler Administration was so great that he had Pierre Laval appointed head of the French Government during the Nazi Occupation. The Kilgore Committee listed more than a dozen important titles held by Kurt von Schroeder in the 1940's, including President of Deutsche Reichsbahn, Reich Board of Economic Affairs, SS Senior Group Leader, Council of Reich Post Office, Deutsche Reichsbank and other leading banks and industrial groups. Schroeder served on the board of all International Telephone and Telegraph subsidiaries in Germany.

In 1938, the London Schroder Bank became the German financial agent in Great Britain. The New York branch of Schroder had been merged in 1936 with the Rockefellers, as Schroder, Rockefeller, Inc. at 48 Wall Street. Carlton P. Fuller of Schroder was president of this firm, and Avery Rockefeller was vice-president. He had been a behind the scenes partner of J. Henry Schroder for years, and had set up the construction firm of Bechtel Corporation, whose employees (on leave) now play a leading role in the Reagan Administration, as Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State.

Ladislav Farago, in *The Game of the Foxes*,⁶⁸ reported that Baron William de Ropp, a double agent, had penetrated the highest echelons in pre-World War II days, and Hitler relied upon de Ropp as his confidential consultant about British affairs. It was de Ropp's advice which Hitler followed when he refused to invade England.

Victor Perlo writes, in *The Empire of High Finance*:

"The Hitler government made the London Schroder Bank their financial agent in Britain and America. Hitler's personal banking account was with J.M. Stein Bankhaus, the German subsidiary of the Schroder Bank. F.C. Tiarks of the British J. Henry Schroder Company was a member of the Anglo-German Fellowship with two other partners as members, and a corporate membership."⁶⁹

The story goes much further than Perlo suspects. J. Henry Schroder WAS the Anglo-German Fellowship, the English equivalent of the America First movement, and also attracting patriots who did not wish to see their nation involved in a needless war with Germany. During the 1930's, until the outbreak of World War II, the Schrodgers poured money into the Anglo-German Fellowship, with the result that Hitler was convinced he had a large pro-German fifth column in England composed of many prominent politicians and financiers. The two divergent political groups in the 1930's in England were the War Party, led by Winston Churchill, who furiously demanded that England go to war against Germany, and the Appeasement Party, led by Neville Chamberlain. After Munich, Hitler believed the Chamberlain group to be the dominant party in England, and Churchill a minor rabble-rouser. Because of his own financial backers, the Schrodgers, were sponsoring the Appeasement Party, Hitler believed there would be no war. He did not suspect that the backers of the Appeasement Party, now that Chamberlain had served his purpose in duping Hitler, would cast Chamberlain aside and make Churchill the Prime Minister. It was not only Chamberlain, but also Hitler, who came away from Munich believing that it would be "Peace in our time."

The success of the Schrodgers in duping Hitler into this belief explains several of the most puzzling questions of World War II. Why did Hitler allow the British Army to decamp from Dunkirk and return home, when he could have wiped them out? Against the frantic advice of his generals, who wished to deliver the coup de grace to the English Army, Hitler held back because he did not wish to alienate his supposed vast following in England. For the same reason, he refused to invade England during a period when he had military superiority, believing that it would not be necessary, as the Anglo-German Fellowship group was ready to make peace with him. The Rudolf Hess flight to England was an attempt to confirm that the Schroder group was ready to make peace and form a common bond against the Soviets.

Rudolf Hess continues to languish in prison today, many years after the war, because he would, if released, testify that he had gone to England to contact the members of the Anglo-German Fellowship, that is, the Schroder group, about ending the war. *

"If anyone supposes this is all ancient history, with no application to the present political scene, we introduce the name of John Lowery Simpson of Sacramento, California. Although he appears for the first time in Who's Who in America for 1952, Mr. Simpson states that he served under Herbert Hoover on the Commission for Relief in Belgium from 1915 to 1917; U.S. Food Administration, 1917 to 1918, American Relief Commission, 1919, and with P.N. Gray Company, Vienna, 1919 to 1921. Gray was the Chief of Maritime Transportation for the U.S. Food Administration, which enabled him to set up his own shipping company after the war. Like other Hoover humanitarians, Simpson also joined the J. Henry Schroder Banking Company (Adolf Hitler's personal bankers) and the J. Henry Schroder Trust Company. He also became a partner of Schroder-Rockefeller Company when that investment trust backed a construction company which became the world's largest, the firm of Bechtel Incorporated. Simpson was chairman of the finance committee of Bechtel Company, Bechtel International, and Canadian Bechtel. Simpson states he was consultant to the Bechtel-McCone interests in war production during World War II. He served on the Allied Control Commission in Italy 1943-44. He married Margaret Mandell, of the merchant family for whom Col. Edward Mandell House was named, and he backed a California personality, first for Governor, then for President. As a result, Simpson and J. Henry Schroder Company now have serving them as Secretary of Defense, former Bechtel employee Caspar Weinberger. As Secretary of State they have serving them George Pratt Schultz, also a Bechtel employee, who happens to be a Standard Oil heir, reaffirming the Schroder-Rockefeller company ties. Thus the "conservative" Reagan Administration has a Secretary of Defense from Schroder Company, a Secretary of State from Schroder-Rockefeller, and a vice president whose father was senior partner of Brown Brothers Harriman."

The Heritage Foundation has also been an important factor in the policy-making of the Reagan Administration. Now we find that the Heritage Foundation is part of the Tavistock Institute network, directed by British Intelligence. The financial decisions are still made at the Bank of England, and who is head of the Bank of England? Sir Gordon Richardson, chairman of J. Henry Schroder Co. of London and New York from 1962 to 1972, when he became Governor of the Bank of England. The "London Connection" has never been more firmly in the saddle of the United States Government.

On July 3, 1983, The New York Times announced that Gordon Richardson, Governor of the Bank of England for the past ten years, had been replaced by Robert Leigh-Pemberton, Chairman of the National Westminster Bank. The list of directors of National Westminster Bank reads like a Who's Who of the British ruling class. They include the Chairman, Lord Aldenham, who is also Chairman of Antony Gibbs & Son, merchant bankers, one of the seventeen privileged firms chartered by the Bank of England; Sir Walter Barrie, Chairman of the British Broadcasting System; F.E. Harmer, Governor of the London School of Economics, the training school for the international bankers, and chairman of New Zealand Shipping Company; Sir E.C. Mieville, private secretary to the King of England 1937-45; Marquess of Salisbury, Lord Cecil, Lord Privy Seal (the Cecils have been considered one of England's three ruling families since the Middle Ages); Lord Leathers, Baron of Purfleet, Minister of War Transport 1941-45, chairman of William Cory group of companies; Sir W.H. Coates and W.J. Worboys of Imperial Chemical Industries (the English DuPont); Earl of Dudley, chairman British Iron & Steel, Sir W. Benton Jones, chairman United Steel and many other steel companies; Sir G.E. Schuster, Bank of New Zealand; East India Coal Company; A. d'A. Willis, Ashanti Goldfields and many banks, tea companies and other firms; V.W. Yorke, chairman of Mexican Railways Ltd.

Richardson, former chairman of Schroders with a New York subsidiary holding Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock, was replaced by the chairman of National Westminster, with a subsidiary in New York holding Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock. Robert Leigh Pemberton, a director of Equitable Life Assurance Society (J.P. Morgan), married the daughter of the Marchioness of Exeter, (the Cecil Burghley family). Thereby, the control of the London Connection remains constantly in effect.

The list of the present directors of J. Henry Schroder Bank and Trust shows the continuing international influence since the First World War. George A. Braga is also director of Czarnikow-Rionda Company, vice-president of Francisco Sugar Company, president of Manati Sugar Company, and vice-president of New Tuinicui Sugar Company. His relative, Rionda B. Braga, is president of Francisco Sugar Company and vice-president of Manati Sugar Company. The Schroder control of sugar goes back to the U.S. Food Administration under Herbert Hoover and Lewis L. Strauss of Kuhn, Loeb, Company during World War I. Schroder's attorneys are the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell. John Foster Dulles of this firm was present during the historic agreement to finance Hitler, and was later Secretary of State in the Eisenhower administration. Alfred Jaretzki, Jr., of Sullivan and Cromwell is also a director of Manati Sugar Company and Francisco Sugar Company.

Another director of J. Henry Schroder is Norris Darrell, Jr., born in Berlin, Germany, partner of Sullivan and Cromwell, and a director of Schroder Trust Company. Bayless Manning, partner of the Wall Street law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind and Wharton, is also a director of J. Henry Schroder. He was president of the Council on Foreign Relations from 1971-1977, and is editor in chief of the Yale Law Review.

Paul H. Nitze, the prominent "disarmament negotiator" for the United States government, is a director of Schroder's Inc. He married Phyllis Pratt, of the Standard Oil fortune, whose father gave the Pratt family mansion as the building which houses the Council on Foreign Relations.

Chapter 8 — World War One

"Money is the worst of all contraband."--William Jennings Bryan

It is now apparent that there might have been no World War without the Federal Reserve System. A strange sequence of events, none of which were accidental, had occurred. Without Theodore Roosevelt's "Bull Moose" candidacy, the popular President Taft would have been reelected, and Woodrow Wilson would have returned to obscurity. * If Wilson had not been elected, we might have had no Federal Reserve Act, and World War One could have been avoided. The European nations had been led to maintain large standing armies as the policy of the central banks which dictated their governmental decisions. In April, 1887, the Quarterly Journal of Economics had pointed out:

"A detailed revue of the public debts of Europe shows interest and sinking fund payments of"\$5,343 million annually (five and one-third billion). M. Neymarck's conclusion is much like Mr. Atkinson's. "The finances of Europe are so involved that the governments may ask whether war, with all its terrible chances, is not preferable to the maintenance of such a precarious and costly peace. If the military preparations of Europe do not end in war, they may well end in the bankruptcy of the States. Or, if such follies lead neither to war nor to ruin, then they assuredly point to industrial and economic revolution."

From 1887 to 1914, this precarious system of heavily armed but bankrupt European nations endured, while the United States continued to be a debtor nation, borrowing money from abroad, but making few international loans, because we did not have a central bank or "mobilization of credit". The system of national loans developed by the Rothschilds served to finance European struggles during the nineteenth century, because they were spread out over Rothschild branches in several countries. By 1900, it was obvious that the European countries could not afford a major war. They had large standing armies, universal military service, and modern weapons, but their economies could not support the enormous expenditures. The Federal Reserve System began operations in 1914, forcing the American people to lend the Allies twenty-five billion dollars which was not repaid, although considerable interest was paid to New York bankers. The American people were driven to make war on the German people, with whom we had no conceivable political or economic quarrel. Moreover, the United States comprised the largest nation in the world composed of Germans; almost half of its citizens were of German descent, and by a narrow margin, German had been voted down as the national language. *--The German Ambassador to Turkey, Baron Wangeheim asked the American Ambassador to Turkey, Henry Morgenthau, why the United States intended to make war in Germany.

"We Americans," replied Morgenthau, speaking for the group of Harlem real estate operators of which he was the head, "are going to war for a moral principle."

J.P. Morgan received the proceeds of the First Liberty Loan to pay off \$400,000,000 which he advanced to Great Britain at the outset of the war. To cover this loan, \$68,000,000 in notes had been issued under the provisions of the Aldrich-Vreeland Act for issuing notes against securities, the only time this provision was employed. The notes were retired as soon as the Federal Reserve Banks began operation, and replaced by Federal Reserve Notes.

During 1915 and 1916, Wilson kept faith with the bankers who had purchased the White House for him, by continuing to make loans to the Allies. His Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, protested constantly, stating that "Money is the worst of all contraband." By 1917, the Morgans and Kuhn, Loeb Company had floated a billion and a half dollars in loans to the Allies. The bankers also financed a host of "peace" organizations which worked to get us involved in the World War. The Commission for Relief in Belgium manufactured atrocity stories against the Germans, while a Carnegie

organization, The League to Enforce Peace, agitated in Washington for our entry into war. This later became the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which during the 1940s was headed by Alger Hiss. One writer * claimed that he had never seen any "peace movement" which did not end in war.

The U.S. Ambassador to Britain, Walter Hines Page, complained that he could not afford the position, and was given twenty-five thousand dollars a year spending money by Cleveland H. Dodge, president of the National City Bank. H.L. Mencken openly accused Page in 1916 of being a British agent, which was unfair. Page was merely a bankers' agent.

On March 5, 1917, Page sent a confidential letter to Wilson. "I think that the pressure of this approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan Financial Agency for the British and French Governments . . .

The greatest help we could give the Allies would be a credit. Unless we go to war with Germany, our Government, of course, cannot make such a direct grant of credit."

The Rothschilds were wary of Germany's ability to continue in the war, despite the financial chaos caused by their agents, the Warburgs, who were financing the Kaiser, and Paul Warburg's brother, Max, who, as head of the German Secret Service, authorized Lenin's train to pass through the lines and execute the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. According to Under Secretary of the Navy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, America's heavy industry had been preparing for war for a year. Both the Army and Navy Departments had been purchasing war supplies in large amounts since early in 1916. Cordell Hull remarks in his Memoirs:

"The conflict forced the further development of the income-tax principle. Aiming, as it did, at the one great untaxed source of revenue, the income-tax law had been enacted in the nick of time to meet the demands of the war. And the conflict also assisted the putting into effect of the Federal Reserve System, likewise in the nick of time."⁷⁰

One may ask, in the nick of time for whom? Certainly not for the American people, who had no need for "mobilization of credit" for a European war, or to enact an income tax to finance a war. Hull's statement affords a rare glimpse into the machinations of our "public servants".

The Notes of the Journal of Political Economy, October, 1917, state:

"The effect of the war upon the business of the Federal Reserve Banks has required an immense development of the staffs of these banks, with a corresponding increase in expenses. Without, of course, being able to anticipate so early and extensive a demand for their services in this connection, the framers of the Federal Reserve Act had provided that the Federal Reserve Banks "should act as fiscal agents of the Government."

The bankers had been waiting since 1887 for the United States to enact a central bank plan so that they could finance a European war among the nations whom they had already bankrupted with armament and "defense" programs. The most demanding function of the central bank mechanism is war finance.

On October 13, 1917, Woodrow Wilson made a major address, stating:

"It is manifestly imperative that there should be a complete mobilization of the banking reserves of the United States. The burden and the privilege (of the Allied loans) must be shared by every banking institution in the country. I believe that cooperation on the part of the banks is a patriotic duty at this time, and that membership in the Federal Reserve System is a distinct and significant evidence of patriotism."

E.W. Kemmerer writes that "As fiscal agents of the Government, the federal reserve banks rendered the nations services of incalculable value after our entrance into the war. They aided greatly in the conservation of our gold resources, in the regulation of our foreign exchanges, and in the centralization of our financial energies. One shudders when he thinks what might have happened if the war had found us with our former decentralized and antiquated banking system."

Mr. Kemmerer's shudders ignore the fact that if we had kept "our antiquated banking system" we would not have been able to finance the World War or to enter as a participant ourselves.

Woodrow Wilson himself did not believe in his crusade to save the world for democracy. He later wrote that "The World War was a matter of economic rivalry."

On being questioned by Senator McCumber about the circumstances of our entry into the war, Wilson was asked, "Do you think if Germany had committed no act of war or no act of injustice against our citizens that we would have gotten into this war?"

"I do think so," Wilson replied.

"You think we would have gotten in anyway?" pursued McCumber.

"I do," said Wilson.

In Wilson's War Message in 1917, he included an incredible tribute to the Communists in Russia who were busily slaughtering the middle class in that unfortunate country.

"Assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening in the last few weeks in Russia. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor."⁷¹

Wilson's paean to a bloodthirsty regime which has since murdered sixty-six million of its inhabitants in the most barbarous manner exposes his true sympathies and his true backers, the bankers who had financed the blood purge in Russia. When the Communist Revolution seemed in doubt, Wilson sent his personal emissary, Elihu Root, to Russia with one hundred million dollars from his Special Emergency War Fund to save the toppling Bolshevik regime.

The documentation of Kuhn, Loeb Company's involvement in the establishment of Communism in Russia is much too extensive to be quoted here, but we include one brief mention, typical of the literature on this subject. In his book, *Czarism and the Revolution*, Gen. Arsene de Goulevitch writes,

"Mr. Bakmetiev, the late Russian Imperial Ambassador to the United States, tells us that the Bolsheviks, after victory, transferred 600 million roubles in gold between the years 1918-1922 to Kuhn, Loeb Company."

After our entry into World War I, Woodrow Wilson turned the government of the United States over to a triumvirate of his campaign backers, Paul Warburg, Bernard Baruch and Eugene Meyer. Baruch was appointed head of the War Industries Board, with life and death powers over every factory in the United States. Eugene Meyer was appointed head of the War Finance Corporation, in charge of the loan program which financed the war. Paul Warburg was in control of the nation's banking system.*

Knowing that the overwhelming sentiment of the American people during 1915 and 1916 had been anti-British and pro-German, our British allies viewed with some trepidation the prominence of Paul Warburg and Kuhn, Loeb Company in the prosecution of the war. They were uneasy about his high position in the Administration because his brother, Max Warburg, was at that time serving as head of the German Secret Service. On December 12, 1918, the United States Naval Secret Service Report on Mr. Warburg was as follows:

"WARBURG, PAUL: New York City. German, naturalized citizen, 1911. was decorated by the Kaiser in 1912, was vice chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Handled large sums furnished by Germany for Lenin and Trotsky. Has a brother who is leader of the espionage system of Germany."

Strangely enough, this report, which must have been compiled much earlier, while we were at war with Germany, is not dated until December 12, 1918. AFTER the Armistice had been signed. Also, it does not contain the information that Paul Warburg resigned from the Federal Reserve Board in May, 1918, which indicates that it was compiled before May, 1918, when Paul Warburg would theoretically have been open to a charge of treason because of his brother's control of Germany's Secret Service.

Paul Warburg's brother Felix in New York was a director of the Prussian Life Insurance Company of Berlin, and presumably would not have liked to see too many of his policyholders killed in the war. On September 26, 1920, The New York Times mentioned in its obituary of Jacob Schiff in reference to Kuhn, Loeb and Company, "During the world War certain of its members were in constant contact with the Government in an advisory capacity. It shared in the conferences which were held regarding the organization and formation of the Federal Reserve System."

The 1920 Schiff obituary revealed for the first time that Jacob Schiff, like the Warburgs, also had two brothers in Germany during World War I, Philip and Ludwig Schiff, of Frankfurt-on-Main, who also were active as bankers to the German Government! This was not a circumstance to be taken lightly, as on neither side of the Atlantic were the said bankers obscure individuals who had no influence in the conduct of the war. On the contrary, the Kuhn, Loeb partners held the highest governmental posts in the United States during World War I, while in Germany, Max and Fritz Warburg, and Philip and Ludwig Schiff, moved in the highest councils of government. From Memoirs of Max Warburg, "The Kaiser thumbed the table violently and shouted, 'Must you always be right?' but then listened carefully to Max's view on financial matters."⁷²

In June, 1918, Paul Warburg wrote a private note to Woodrow Wilson, "I have two brothers in Germany who are bankers. They naturally now serve their country to their utmost ability, as I serve mine."⁷³

Neither Wilson nor Warburg viewed the situation as one of concern, and Paul Warburg served out his term on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, while World War I continued to rage.

The background of Kuhn, Loeb & Company had been exposed in "Truth Magazine", edited by George Conroy: "Mr. Schiff is head of the great private banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. which represents the Rothschild interest on this side of the Atlantic. He has been described as a financial strategist and has been for years the financial minister to the great impersonal power known as Standard Oil.

He was hand-in-glove with the Harrimans, the Goulds and the Rockefellers, in all their railroad enterprises and has become the dominant power in the railroad and financial world in America."

Louis Brandeis, because of his great ability as a lawyer and for other reasons which will appear later, was selected by Schiff as the instrument through which Schiff hoped to achieve his ambition in New England. His job was to carry on an agitation which would undermine public confidence in the New Haven system and cause a decrease in the price of its securities, thus forcing them on the market for the wreckers to buy."⁷⁴

We mention Schiff's lawyer, Brandeis, here because the first available appointment on the Supreme Court of the United States which Woodrow Wilson was allowed to fill was given to the Kuhn, Loeb lawyer, Brandeis.

Not only was the U.S. Food Administration managed by Hoover's director, Lewis Lichtenstein Strauss, who married into the Kuhn Loeb Company by marrying Alice Hanauer, daughter of partner Jerome Hanauer, but in the most critical field, military intelligence, Sir William Wiseman, chief of the British Secret Service, was a partner of Kuhn, Loeb & Company. He worked most closely with Wilson's alter ego, Col. House. "Between House and Wiseman there were soon to be few political secrets, and from their mutual comprehension resulted in large measure our close cooperation with the British."⁷⁵

One example of House's cooperation with Wiseman was a confidential agreement which House negotiated pledging the United States to enter into World War I on the side of the Allies. Ten months before the election which returned Wilson to the White House in 1916 'because he kept us out of war', Col. House negotiated a secret agreement with England and France on behalf of Wilson which pledged the United States to intervene on behalf of the Allies. On March 9, 1916, Wilson formally sanctioned the undertaking.⁷⁶

Nothing could more forcefully illustrate the duplicity of Woodrow Wilson's nature than his nationwide campaign on the slogan, "He kept us out of war", when he had pledged ten months earlier to involve us in the war on the side of England and France. This explains why he was regarded with such contempt by those who learned the facts of his career. H.L. Mencken wrote that Wilson was "the perfect model of the Christian cad", and that we ought "to dig up his bones and make dice of them."

According to The New York Times, Paul Warburg's letter of resignation stated that some objection had been made because he had a brother in the Swiss Secret Service. The New York Times has never corrected this blatant falsehood, perhaps because Kuhn, Loeb Company owned a controlling interest in its stock. Max Warburg was not Swiss, and although he had probably come into contact with the Swiss Secret Service during his term of office as head of the German Secret Service, no responsible editor at The New York Times could have been unaware of the fact that Max Warburg was German, and that his family banking house was in Hamburg, and that he held a number of high positions in the German Government. He represented Germany at the Versailles Peace Conference, and remained peacefully in Germany until 1939, during a period when persons of his religion were being persecuted. To avoid injury during the approaching war, when bombs would rain on Germany, Max Warburg was allowed to sail to New York, his funds intact.

At the outset of World War I, Kuhn, Loeb Company had figured in the transfer of German shipping interests to other control. Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to the United States, in a letter to Lord Grey wrote:

"Another matter is the question of the transfer of the flag to the Hamburg Amerika ships. The company is practically a German Government affair. The ships are used for Government purposes, the Emperor himself is a large shareholder, and so is the great banking house of Kuhn, Loeb Company. A member of that house (Warburg) has been appointed to a very responsible position in New York, although only just naturalized. He is concerned in business with the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the President's son-in-law. It is he who is negotiating on behalf of the Hamburg Amerika Shipping Company."⁷⁷

On November 13, 1914, in a letter to Sir Valentine Chirol, Spring-Rice wrote, (p. 241, v. 2)

"I was told today that The New York Times has been practically acquired by Kuhn, Loeb and Schiff, special protégé of the (German) Emperor. Warburg, nearly related to Kuhn Loeb and Schiff is a brother of the well known Warburg of Hamburg, the associate of Ballin (Hamburg) Amerika line), is a member of the Federal Reserve Board or rather THE member. He practically controls the financial policy of the Administration, and Paish & Blackett (England) had mainly to negotiate with him. Of course, it was exactly like negotiating with Germany. Everything that was said was German property."

Col. Garrison wrote in Roosevelt, Wilson and the Federal Reserve Law, that "Through the banking House of the Kuhn Loeb Company, a powerful weapon would have been placed in the hands of the German Kaiser over the destiny of American business and American citizens."⁷⁸

Garrison was referring to the Hamburg Amerika affair.

It seemed strange that Woodrow Wilson felt it necessary to place the nation in the hands of three men whose personal history was one of ruthless speculation and the quest for personal gain, or that during war with Germany, he found as persons of supreme trust a German immigrant naturalized in 1911, the son of an immigrant from Poland, and the son of an immigrant from France. Bernard Baruch first attracted attention on Wall Street in 1890 while working for A.A. Housman & Co.

In 1896 he merged the six principal tobacco companies of the United States into the Consolidated Tobacco Company, forcing James Duke and the American Tobacco Trust to enter into this combination. The second great trust set up by Baruch brought the copper industry into the hands of the Guggenheim family, who have controlled it ever since. Baruch worked with Edward H. Harriman, who was Schiff's front man in controlling America's railway system for the Rothschild family. Baruch and Harriman also combined their talents to gain control over the New York City transit system, which has been in perilous financial condition ever since.

In 1901, Baruch formed the firm of Baruch Brothers, bankers, with his brother Herman, in New York. In 1917, when Baruch was appointed Chairman of the War Industries Board, the name was changed to Hentz Brothers.

Testifying before the Nye Committee on September 13, 1937, Bernard Baruch stated that "All wars are economic in their origin." So much for religious and political disagreements, which had been specially touted as the cause of wars. *



Paul Warburg
Levi P. Morton - Guaranty Trust - J. P. Morgan

Shareholders - First National Bank of N.Y.

J.P. Morgan
George F. Baker
George F. Baker Jr.
Edith Brevoort Baker
US Congress - 1946-64

Shareholders - Hanover National Bank N.Y.

James Stillman
William Rockefeller

Shareholders - Chase National Bank N.Y.

George F. Baker

Baruch's erstwhile partner, Eugene Meyer, (Alaska-Juneau Gold Mining Co.), later claimed that Baruch was a nitwit, and that Meyer, with his family banking connections (Lazard Freres), had guided Baruch's investment career. These claims appeared in the fiftieth anniversary edition of The Washington Post, editorial page, June 4, 1983, with a parting shot from Meyer's editor, Al Friendly, that "Every journalist in Washington, Meyer included, knew that Bernard M. Baruch was a self-aggrandizing phony."

The third member of the Triumvirate, Eugene Meyer, was son of the partner in the international banking house of Lazard Freres, of Paris and New York. In My Own Story Baruch explains how Meyer became head of the War Finance Corporation. "At the outset of World War One," he says, "I sought out Eugene Meyer, Jr. . . . who was a man of the highest integrity with a keen desire to be of public service."⁷⁹

The nation has suffered greatly from persons who desired to be of public service, because their desires often went considerably beyond their passion for office. In fact, Meyer and Baruch had operated an Alaska venture, Alaska-Juneau Gold Mining Company in 1915, and had worked together on other financial schemes. Meyer's family house of Lazard Freres specialized in international gold movements.

Eugene Meyer's stewardship of the War Finance Corporation comprises one of the most amazing financial operations ever partially recorded in this country. We say "partially recorded", because subsequent Congressional investigations revealed that each night, the books were being altered before being brought in for the next day's investigation. Louis McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, figured in two investigations of Meyer, in 1925, and again in 1930, when Meyer was proposed as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. The Select Committee to Investigate the Destruction of Government Bonds, submitted, on March 2, 1925, "Preparation and Destruction of Government Bonds--68th Congress, 2d Session, Report No. 1635.: p.2 - "Duplicate bonds amounting to 2314 pairs and duplicate coupons amounting to 4698 pairs ranging in

denominations from \$50 to \$10,000 have been redeemed to July 1, 1924. Some of these duplications have resulted from error and some from fraud."

These investigations may explain why, at the end of World War One, Eugene Meyer was able to buy control of Allied Chemical and Dye Corporation, and later on, the nation's most influential newspaper, The Washington Post. The duplication of bonds, "one for the government, one for me" in denominations to the amount of \$10,000 each, resulted in a tidy sum.

p. 6 of these Hearings. "These transactions of the Treasury prior to June 20, 1920 (including settlements for purchases and sales), executed by the War Finance Corporation (Eugene Meyer, managing director), were largely directed by the managing director of the War Finance Corporation, and settlements with the Treasury were made principally by him with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and the books show that the basis of the price paid by the Government for over \$1,894 millions worth of bonds (\$1,894,000,000.00), which the Treasury purchased through the War Finance Corporation was not the market price and was not the cost of the bond plus interest, and the elements entering into the settlement are not disclosed by the correspondence. The managing director of the War Finance Corporation stated that he and an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Jerome J. Hanauer, partner of Kuhn, Loeb Co. whose daughter married Lewis L. Strauss) agreed to the price, and it was simply an arbitrary figure set by an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury as to the bonds so purchased by the War Finance Corporation. During the period of these transactions and up until quite a recent date the managing director of the War Finance Corporation, Eugene Meyer, Jr., in his private capacity maintained an office at No. 14 Wall Street, New York City, and through the War Finance Corporation sold about \$70 millions in bonds to the Government, and also bought through the War Finance Corporation about \$10 millions in bonds, and approved the bills for most, if not all, of these bonds in his official capacity as managing director of the War Finance Corporation. When these transactions, just referred to, were disclosed to the committee in open hearing, the managing director

CHART II

This chart shows the interlocking banking directorates which were revealed by the backgrounds of the officials selected to be the original members of the Federal Advisory Council in 1914. The principals were the same bankers who had been present or represented at the Jekyll Island Conference in 1910, and during the campaign to have the Federal Reserve Act enacted into law by Congress in 1913. These officials represented the largest stock holdings in the New York banks which bought the controlling stock in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and also were the principal correspondent banks of the banks in other Federal Reserve districts who, in

turn, selected their officials to represent them on the Federal Advisory Council.




CHART II

appeared before the committee and stated the fact that commissions were paid on these transactions, they were in turn paid over to the brokers, selected by the managing director, who executed the orders issued by his

Oil Company

J. Henry Schroder Banking Company N.Y.

J. Henry Schroder Trust Company N.Y.

Allen Dulles
Sullivan & Cromwell
Director - CIA

John Foster Dulles
Sullivan & Cromwell
U. S. Secretary of State
Rockefeller Foundation

Prentiss Gray

Belgian Relief Comm.
Chief Marine Transportation
US Food Administration WW I
Manati Sugar Co. American &
British Continental Corp.

Lord Airlie

Chairman; Virginia Fortune Ryan
daughter of Otto Kahn
of Kuhn,Loeb Co.

M. E. Rionda

Pres. Cuba Cane Sugar Co.
Manati Sugar Co. many other
sugar companies.

G. A. Zabriskie

Chmn U.S. Sugar Equalization
Board 1917-18; Pres Empire
Biscuit Co., Columbia Baking
Co. , Southern Baking Co.

Emile Francoui

Belgian Relief Comm.
KaiPing Coal Mines
Tientsin Railroad
Congo Copper
La Banque Nationale de Belgique

Suite 2000 | 42 Broadway N. Y

Edgar Richard

Belgium Relief Comm
Amer Relief Comm
U.S. Food Admin
1918-24, Hazeltine Corp.

Julius H. Barnes

Belgium Relief Comm
Pres Grain Corp.
U.S. Food Admin 1917-18
C.B Pitney Bowes Corp
Manati Sugar Corp.

Herbert Hoover

Chmn Belgium Relief Com
U.S. Food Admin
Sec of Commerce 1924-28
KaiPing Coal Mines
Congo Copper
President U.S. 1928-32

John Lowery Simpson

Sacramento, Calif Belgium Relief
Comm. U. S. Food Administration
Prentiss Gray Co. J. Henry Schroder
Trust, Schroder-Rockefeller, Chmn
Fin Comm, Bechtel International
Co. Bechtel Co. (Casper Weinberger)
Sec of Defense, George P. Schultz

Baron Kurt Von Schroder

Schroder Banking Corp. J.H. Stein
Bankhaus (Hitler's personal bank
account) served on board of all
German subsidiaries of ITT .

Sec of State (Reagan Admin).

|
|
|
|

Bank for International Settlements,
SS Senior Group Leader, Himmler's
Circle of Friends (Nazi Fund),
Deutsche Reichsbank, president

Schroder-Rockefeller & Co. , N.Y.

Avery Rockefeller, J. Henry Schroder
Banking Corp., Bechtel Co., Bechtel
International Co. , Canadian Bechtel
Company.

|
|
|

Gordon Richardson

Governor, Bank of England 1973-PRESENT
C.B. of J. Henry Schroder N.Y.
Schroder Banking Co., New York,
Lloyds Bank
Rolls Royce

Meyer's directorship of the War Finance Corporation, the alteration of the books during a Congressional investigation, and the fact that Meyer came out of this situation with many millions of dollars with which he proceeded to buy Allied Chemical Corporation, The Washington Post, and other properties? Incidentally, Lazard Brothers, Meyer's family banking house, personally manages the fortunes of many of our political luminaries, including the Kennedy family fortune.

Besides these men, Warburg, Baruch, and Meyer, a host of J.P. Morgan Co., and Kuhn, Loeb Co., partners, employees, and satellites came to Washington after 1917 to administer the fate of the American people.

The Liberty Loans, which sold bonds to our citizens, were nominally in the jurisdiction of the United States Treasury, under the leadership of Wilson's Secretary of the Treasury, William G. McAdoo, whom Kuhn, Loeb Co. had placed in charge of the Hudson-Manhattan Railway Co. in 1902. Paul Warburg had most of the Kuhn Loeb Co. firm with him in Washington during the War. Jerome Hanauer, partner in Kuhn, Loeb Co., was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of Liberty Loans. The two Under-secretaries of the Treasury during the War were S. Parker Gilbert and Roscoe C. Leffingwell. Both Gilbert and Leffingwell came to the Treasury from the law firm of Cravath and Henderson, and returned to that firm when they had fulfilled their mission for Kuhn, Loeb Co. in the Treasury. Cravath and Henderson were the lawyers for Kuhn Loeb Co. Gilbert and Leffingwell subsequently received partnerships in J.P. Morgan Co.

Kuhn, Loeb Company, the nation's largest owners of railroad properties in this country and in Mexico, protected their interests during the First World War by having Woodrow Wilson set up a United States Railroad Administration. The Director-General was William McAdoo, Comptroller of the Currency. Warburg replaced this set up in 1918 with a tighter organization which he called the Federal Transportation Council. The purpose of both of these organizations was to prevent strikes against Kuhn, Loeb Company during the War, in case the railroad workers should try to get in wages some of the millions of dollars in wartime profits which Kuhn, Loeb received from the United States Government.

Among the important bankers present in Washington during the War was Herbert Lehman, of the rapidly rising firm of Lehman Brothers, Bankers, New York, Lehman was promptly put on the General Staff of the Army, and given the rank of Colonel.

The Lehmans had had prior experience in "taking the profits out of war", a double entendre and one of Baruch's favorite phrases. In Men Who Rule America, Arthur D. Howden Smith writes of the Lehmans during the Civil War, "They were often agents, fixers for both sides, intermediaries for confidential communications and handlers of the many illicit transactions in cotton and drugs for the Confederacy, purveyors of information for the North. The Lehmans, with Mayer in Montgomery, the first capital of the Confederacy, Henry in New Orleans, and Emanuel in New York were ideally situated to take advantage of every opportunity for profit which appeared. They seem to have missed few chances." ⁸⁰

CHART IV

The Peabody-Morgan chart shows the London Connection of these prominent banking firms, which have been headquartered in London since their inception. The Peabody fortune set up an Educational Fund in 1865, which was later absorbed by John D. Rockefeller into the General Educational Board in 1905, which, in turn, was absorbed by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1960.

Chart not found yet.

CHART V

The David Rockefeller chart shows the link between the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Standard Oil of Indiana, General Motors, and Allied Chemical Corporation (Eugene Meyer family) and Equitable Life (J.P. Morgan).

DAVID ROCKEFELLER

 Chairman of the Board
 Chase Manhattan Corp

 Chase Manhattan Corp.

Officer & Director Interlocks -----

Private Investment Co. for America

Allied Chemicals Corp.

Firestone Tire & Rubber Company

General Motors

Orion Multinational Services Ltd.

Rockefeller Family & Associates

ASARCO. Inc

Chrysler Corp.

Southern Peru Copper Corp.

Intl' Basic Economy Corp.

Industrial Minerva Mexico S.A.

R.H. Macy & Co.

Continental Corp.

Selected Risk Investments S.A.

Honeywell Inc.

Omega Fund, Inc.

Northwest Airlines, Inc.

Squibb Corporation

Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.

Olin Foundation

Minnesota Mining & Mfg Co (3M)

Mutual Benefit Life Ins. Co. of NJ

American Express Co.	AT & T
Hewlett Packard	Pacific Northwestern Bell Co.
FMC Corporation	BeachviLime Ltd.
Utah Intl' Inc.	Eveleth Expansion Company
Exxon Corporation	Fidelity Union Bancorporation
International Nickel/Canada	Cypress Woods Corporation
Federated Capital Corporation	Intl' Minerals & Chemical Corp.
Equitable Life Assurance Soc U.S.	Burlington Industries
Federated Dept Stores	Wachovia Corporation
General Electric	Jefferson Pilot Corporation
Scott Paper Co.	R. J. Reynolds Industries Inc.
American Petroleum Institute	United States Steel Corp.
Richardson Merril Inc.	Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.
May Department Stores Co.	Norton-Simon Inc.
Sperry Rand Corporation	Stone-Webster Inc.
San Salvador Development Comp.	Standard Oil of Indiana

Other appointments during the First World War were as follows:

J.W. McIntosh, director of the Armour meat-packing trust, who was made chief of Subsistence for the United States Army in 1918. He later became Comptroller of the Currency during Coolidge's Administration, and ex-officio member of the Federal Reserve Board. During the Harding Administration, he did his bit as Director of Finance for the United States Shipping Board when the Board sold ships to the Dollar Lines for a hundredth of their cost and then let the Dollar Line default on its payments. After leaving public service, J.W. McIntosh became a partner in J.W. Wollman Co., New York Stockbrokers.

W.P.G. Harding, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, was also managing director of the War Finance Corporation under Eugene Meyer.

George R. James, member of the Federal Reserve Board in 1923-24, had been Chief of the Cotton Section of the War Industries Board.

Henry P. Davison, senior partner in J.P. Morgan Co., was appointed head of the American Red Cross in 1917 in order to get control of the three hundred and seventy million dollars cash which was collected from the American people in donations.

Ronald Ransom, banker from Atlanta, and Governor of the Federal Reserve Board under Roosevelt in 1938-39, had been the Director in Charge of Personnel for Foreign Service for the American Red Cross in 1918.

John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of the Currency, was appointed National Treasurer of the American Red Cross.

President Woodrow Wilson, the great liberal who signed the Federal Reserve Act and declared war against Germany, had an odd career for a man who is now enshrined as a defender of the common people. His chief supporter in both his campaigns for the Presidency was Cleveland H. Dodge, of Kuhn Loeb, who controlled National City Bank of New York. Dodge was also President of the Winchester Arms Company and Remington Arms Company. He was very close to President Wilson throughout the great democrat's political career. Wilson lifted the embargo on shipment of arms to Mexico on February 12, 1914, so that Dodge could ship a million dollars worth of arms and ammunition to Carranza and promote the Mexican Revolution. Kuhn, Loeb Co. which owned the Mexican National Railways System, had become dissatisfied with the administration of Huerta and had him kicked out.

When the British naval auxiliary Lusitania was sunk in 1915, it was loaded with ammunition from Dodge's factories. Dodge became Chairman of the "Survivors of Victims of the Lusitania Fund", which did so much to arouse the public against Germany. Dodge also was notorious for using professional gangsters against strikers in his plants, yet the liberal Wilson does not appear to have ever been disturbed by this.

Another clue to Wilson's peculiar brand of liberalism is to be found in Chaplin's book Wobbly, which relates how Wilson scrawled the word "REFUSED" across the appeal for clemency sent him by the aging and ailing Eugene Debs, who had been sent to Atlanta Prison for "speaking and writing against war". The charge on which Debs was convicted was "spoken and written denunciation of war". This was treason to the Wilson dictatorship, and Debs was imprisoned. As head of the Socialist Party, Debs ran for the Presidency from Atlanta Prison, the only man ever to do so, and polled more than a million votes. It was ironic that Debs' leadership of the Socialist Party, which at that time represented the desires of many Americans for an honest government, should fall into the sickly hands of Norman Thomas, a former student and admirer of Woodrow Wilson at Princeton University. Under Thomas' leadership, the Socialist Party no longer stood for anything, and suffered a steady decline in influence and prestige.

Wilson continued to be deeply involved in the Bolshevik Revolution, as were House and Wiseman. Vol. 3, p. 421 of House Intimate Papers records a cable from Sir William Wiseman to House from London, May 1, 1918, suggesting allied intervention at the invitation of the Bolsheviks to help organize the Bolshevik forces. Lt. Col. Norman Thwaites, in his memoirs, Velvet and Vinegar says, "Often during the years 1917-20 when delicate decisions had to be made, I consulted with Mr. (Otto) Kahn, whose calm judgment and almost uncanny foresight as to political and economic tendencies proved most helpful. Another remarkable man with whom I have been closely associated is Sir William Wiseman who was advisor on American affairs to the British delegation at the Peace Conference, and liaison officer between the American and British Government during the war. He was rather more the Col. House of this country in his relations with Downing Street." ⁸¹

CHART VI

This chart shows the interlocks between the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, J. Henry Schroder Banking Corp., J. Henry Schroder Trust Co., Rockefeller Center, Inc., Equitable Life Assurance Society (J.P. Morgan), and the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston.

Alan Pifer, President
Carnegie Corporation of New York


|

Thus these two "unofficial" advisors to the British and American governments had a code solely for each other, which no one else could understand. Even stranger was the fact that the international Communist

CHART VIII

This chart shows the link between the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Brown Brothers Harriman, Sun Life Assurance Co. (N.M. Rothschild and Sons), and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Maurice F. Granville
Chairman of The Board
Texaco Incorporated



espionage apparatus for many years used Col. House's book, Philip Dru, Administrator, as their official code book. Francois Coty writes,

"Gorodin, Lenin's agent in China, was alleged to have with him a copy of the book published by Col. House, Philip Dru, Administrator and a code expert who lived in China told this writer that the purpose of having constant access to this book by Gorodin was to use it for coding and decoding messages." ⁸³

After the Armistice, Woodrow Wilson assembled the American Delegation to the Peace Conference, and embarked for Paris. It was, on the whole, a most congenial group, consisting of the bankers who had always guided Wilson's policies. He was accompanied by Bernard Baruch, Thomas W. Lamont of J.P. Morgan Co., Albert Strauss of J & W Seligman bankers, who had been chosen by Wilson to replace Paul Warburg on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, J.P. Morgan, and Morgan lawyers Frank Polk and John W. Davis.

Accompanying them were Walter Lippmann, Felix Frankfurter, Justice Brandeis, and other interested parties. Mason's biography of Brandeis states that "In Paris in June of 1919, Brandeis met with such friends as Paul Warburg, Col. House, Lord Balfour, Louis Marshall, and Baron Edmond de Rothschild."

Indeed, Baron Edmond de Rothschild served as the genial host to the leading members of the American Delegation, and even turned over his Paris mansion to them, although the lesser members had to rough it at the elegant Hotel Crillon with Col. House and his personal staff of 201 servants.

Baruch later testified before the Graham Committee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "I was economic advisor with the peace mission. GRAHAM: Did you frequently advise the President while there? BARUCH: Whenever he asked my advice I gave it. I had something to do with the reparations clauses. I was the American Commissioner in charge of what they called the Economic Section. I was a member of the Supreme Economic Council in charge of raw metals. GRAHAM: Did you sit in the council with the gentlemen who were negotiating the treaty? BARUCH: Yes, sir, some of the time. GRAHAM: All except the meetings that were participated in by the Five? (The Five being the leaders of the five allied nations). BARUCH: And frequently those also."

CHART IX

This chart shows the interlocks between the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and J.P. Morgan Co., Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., and the Rothschild affiliates of Royal Bank of Canada, Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada, Sun Alliance, and London Assurance Group.

Chart not found YET

Paul Warburg accompanied Wilson on the American Commission to Negotiate Peace as his chief financial advisor. He was pleasantly surprised to find at the head of the German delegation his brother, Max Warburg, who brought along Carl Melchior, also of M.M. Warburg Company, William Georg von Strauss, Franz Urbig, and Mathias Erzberger.

Thomas W. Lamont states in his privately printed memoirs, *Across World Frontiers*, "The German delegation included two German bankers of the Warburg firm whom I happened to know slightly and with whom I was glad to talk informally, for they seemed to be striving earnestly to offer some reparations composition that might be acceptable to the Allies."⁸⁴ Lamont was also pleased to see Sir William Wiseman, chief advisor to the British delegation.

The bankers at the conference convinced Wilson that they needed an international government to facilitate their international monetary operations. Vol. IV, p. 52, *Intimate Papers of Col. House* quotes a message from Sir William Wiseman to Lord Reading, August 16, 1918, "The President has two main principles in view; there must be a League of Nations and it must be virile."

Wilson, who seems to have lived in a world of fantasy, was shocked when American citizens booed him during his campaign to have them sign over their hard won independence to what appeared to many to be an international dictatorship. He promptly went into a depression, and retired to his bedroom. His wife immediately shut the White House doors against Col. House, and from September 25, 1919 to April 13, 1920, she ruled the United States with the aid of an intimate friend, her "military aide", Col. Rixey Smith. As everyone was shut out of their deliberations, no one ever knew which of the pair functioned as the President, and which was the Vice President.

The admirers of Woodrow Wilson were led for decades by Bernard Baruch, who stated that Woodrow Wilson was the greatest man he ever knew. Wilson's appointments to the Federal Reserve Board, and that body's responsibility for financing the First World War, as well as Wilson's handing over the United States to the immigrant triumvirate during the War, made him appear to be the most important single effector of ruin in American history.

It is no wonder that after his abortive trip to Europe, where he was hissed and jeered in the streets by the French people, and snickered at in the halls of Versailles by Orlando and Clemenceau, Woodrow Wilson returned home to take to his bed. The sight of the destruction and death in Europe, for which he was directly responsible, was perhaps more of a shock than he could bear. The Italian Minister Pentaleoni expressed the feelings of the European peoples when he wrote that:

"Woodrow Wilson is a type of Pecksniff who was now disappeared amid universal execration."

It is America's misfortune that our subsidized press and educational system have been devoted to enshrining a man who colluded in causing so much death and sorrow throughout the world.

The financial cartel suffered only minor setbacks in those crucial years. On February 12, 1917, The New York Times reported that "The five members of the Federal Reserve Board were impeached on the floor of the House by Rep. Charles A. Lindbergh, Republican member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. According to Mr. Lindbergh, 'the conspiracy began in' 1906 when the late J.P. Morgan, Paul M. Warburg, a present member of the Federal Reserve Board, the National City Bank and other banking firms 'conspired' to obtain currency legislation in the interest of big business and the appointment of a special board to administer such a law, in order to create industrial slaves of the masses, the aforesaid conspirators did conspire and are now conspiring to have the Federal Reserve Board administered so as to enable the conspirators to coordinate all kinds of big business and to keep themselves in control of big business in order to amalgamate all the trusts into one great trust in restraint and control of trade and commerce." The impeachment resolution was not acted on by the House.

The New York Times reported on August 10, 1918, "Mr. Warburg's term having expired, he voluntarily retired from the Federal Reserve Board." Thus the previous intimation that Mr. Warburg left the Federal Reserve Board because he had a brother in the Secret Service of a foreign country, namely, Germany, with whom we were at war, was not the cause of his retirement. In any case, he did not leave the Federal Reserve Administration, as he immediately took over J.P. Morgan's seat on the Federal Advisory Council, from which post he continued to administer the Federal Reserve System for the next ten years.

Chapter 9 — The Agricultural Depression

When Paul Warburg resigned from the Federal Reserve Board of Governors in 1918, his place was taken by Albert Strauss, partner in the international banking house of J & W Seligman. This banking house had large interests in Cuba and South America, and played a prominent part in financing the many revolutions in those countries. Its most notorious publicity came during the Senate Finance Committee's investigation in 1933, when it was brought out that J & W Seligman had given a \$415,000 bribe to Juan Leguia, son of the President of Peru, in order to get that nation to accept a loan.

A partial list of Albert Strauss' directorships, according to "Who's Who", shows that he was: Chairman of the Board of the Cuba Cane Sugar Corporation; director, Brooklyn Manhattan Transit Co., Coney Island Brooklyn RR, New York Rapid Transit, Pierce-Arrow, Cuba Tobacco Corporation, and the Eastern Cuba Sugar Corporation.

Governor Delano resigned in August, 1918, to be commissioned a Colonel in the Army. The war ended on November 11, 1918.

William McAdoo was replaced in 1918 by Carter Glass as Secretary of the Treasury. Both Strauss and Glass were present during the secret meeting of the Federal Reserve Board on May 18, 1920, when the Agricultural Depression of 1920-21 was made possible.

One of the main lies about the Federal Reserve Act when it was being ballyhooed in 1913 was its promise to take care of the farmer. Actually, it has never taken care of anybody but a few big bankers. Prof. O.M.W. Sprague, Harvard economist, writing in the Quarterly Journal of Economics of February, 1914, said:

"The primary purpose of the Federal Reserve Act is to make sure that there will always be an available supply of money and credit in this country to meet unusual banking requirements."

There is nothing in that wording to help the farmer.

The First World War had introduced into this country a general prosperity, as revealed by the stocks of heavy industry on the New York Exchange in 1917-1918, by the increase in the amount of money circulated, and by the enormous bank clearings during the whole of 1918. It was the assigned duty of the Federal Reserve System to get back the vast amount of money and credit which had escaped their control during this time of prosperity. This was done by the Agricultural Depression of 1920-21.

The operations of the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee in 1917-18, while Paul Warburg was still Chairman, show a tremendous increase in purchases of bankers' and trade acceptances. There was also a great increase in the purchase of United States Government securities, under the leadership of the able Eugene Meyer, Jr. A large part of the stock market speculation in 1919, at the end of the War when the market was very unsettled, was financed with funds borrowed from Federal Reserve Banks with Government securities as collateral. Thus the Federal Reserve System set up the Depression, first by causing inflation, and then raising the discount rate and making money dear.

In 1914, Federal Reserve Bank rates had dropped from six percent to four percent, had gone to a further low of three percent in 1916, and had stayed at that level until 1920. The reason for the low interest rate was the necessity for floating the billion dollar Liberty Loans. At the beginning of each Liberty Loan Drive, the Federal Reserve Board put a hundred million dollars into the New York money market through its open market operations, in order to provide a cash impetus for the drive. The most important role of the Liberty Bonds was to soak up the increase in circulation of the medium of exchange (integer of account) brought about by the large amount of currency and credit put out during the war. Laborers were paid high wages, and farmers received the highest prices for their produce they had ever known. These two groups accumulated millions of dollars in cash which they did not put into Liberty Bonds. That money was effectively out of the hands of the Wall Street group which controlled the money and credit of the United States. They wanted it back, and that is why we had the Agricultural Depression of 1920-21.

Much of the money was deposited in small country banks in the Middle West and West which had refused to have any part of the Federal Reserve System, the farmers and ranchers of those regions seeing no good reason why they should give a group of international financiers control of their money. The main job of the Federal Reserve System was to break these small country banks and get back the money which had been paid out to the farmers during the war, in effect, ruin them, and this it proceeded to do.

First of all, a Federal Farm Loan Board was set up which encouraged the farmers to invest their accrued money in land on long term loans, which the farmers were eager to do. Then inflation was allowed to take its course in

this country and in Europe in 1919 and 1920. The purpose of the inflation in Europe was to cancel out a large portion of the war debts owed by the Allies to the American people, and its purpose in this country was to draw in the excess moneys which had been distributed to the working people in the form of higher wages and bonuses for production. As prices went higher and higher, the money which the workers had accumulated became worth less and less, inflicting upon them an unfair drain, while the propertied classes were enriched by the inflation because of the enormous increase in the value of land and manufactured goods. The workers were thus effectively impoverished, but the farmers, who were as a class more thrifty, and who were more self-sufficient, had to be handled more harshly.

G.W. Norris, in "Collier's Magazine" of March 20, 1920, said:

"Rumor has it that two members of the Federal Reserve Board had a plain talk with some New York bankers and financiers in December, 1919. Immediately afterwards, there was a notable decline in transactions on the stock market and a cessation of company promotions. It is understood that action in the same general direction has already been taken in other sections of the country, as evidence of the abuse of the Federal Reserve System to promote speculation in land and commodities appeared."

Senator Robert L. Owen, Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, testified at the Senate Silver Hearings in 1939 that:

"In the early part of 1920, the farmers were exceedingly prosperous. They were paying off the mortgages and buying a lot of new land, at the instance of the Government--had borrowed money to do it--and then they were bankrupted by a sudden contraction of credit and currency which took place in 1920. What took place in 1920 was just the reverse of what should have been taking place. Instead of liquidating the excess of credits created by the war through a period of years, the Federal Reserve Board met in a meeting which was not disclosed to the public. They met on the 8th of May, 1920, and it was a secret meeting. They spent all day conferring; the minutes made sixty printed pages, and they appear in Senate Document 310 of February 19, 1923. The Class A Directors, the Federal Reserve Advisory Council, were present, but the Class B Directors, who represented business, commerce, and agriculture, were not present. The Class C Directors, representing the people of the United States, were not present and were not invited to be present.

Only the big bankers were there, and their work of that day resulted in a contraction of credit which had the effect the next year of reducing the national income fifteen billion dollars, throwing millions of people out of employment, and reducing the value of lands and ranches by twenty billion dollars."

Carter Glass, member of the Board in 1920 as Secretary of the Treasury, wrote in his autobiography, *Adventure in Constructive Finance* published in 1928; "Reporters were not present, of course, as they should not have been and as they never are at any bank board meeting in the world."⁸⁵

It was Carter Glass who had complained that, if a suggested amendment by Senator LaFollette were passed, on the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, to the effect that no member of the Federal Reserve Board should be an official or director or stockholder of any bank, trust company, or insurance company, we would end up by having mechanics and farm laborers on the Board. Certainly mechanics and farm laborers could have caused no more damage to the country than did Glass, Strauss, and Warburg at the secret meeting of the Federal Reserve Board.

Senator Brookhart of Iowa testified that at that secret meeting Paul Warburg, also President of the Federal Advisory Council, had a resolution passed to send a committee of five to the Interstate Commerce Commission and ask for an increase in railroad rates. As head of Kuhn, Loeb Co. which owned most of the railway mileage

in the United States, he was already missing the huge profits which the United States Government had paid during the war, and he wanted to inflict new price raises on the American people.

Senator Brookhart also testified that:

"I went into Myron T. Herrick's office in Paris, and told him that I came there to study cooperative banking. He said to me, 'as you go over the countries of Europe, you will find that the United States is the only civilized country in the world that by law is prohibiting its people from organizing a cooperative system.' I went up to New York and talked to about two hundred people. After talking cooperation and standing around waiting for my train--I did not specifically mention cooperative banking, it was cooperation in general--a man called me off to one side and said, 'I think Paul Warburg is the greatest financier we have ever produced. He believes a lot more of your cooperative ideas than you think he does, and if you want to consult anybody about the business of cooperation, he is the man to consult, because he believes in you, and you can rely on him.' A few minutes later I was steered up against Mr. Warburg himself, and he said to me, 'You are absolutely right about this cooperative idea. I want to let you know that the big bankers are with you. I want to let you know that now, so that you will not start anything on cooperative banking and turn them against you.' I said, 'Mr. Warburg, I have already prepared and tomorrow I am going to offer an amendment to the Lant Bill authorizing the establishment of cooperative national banks.' That was the intermediate credit act which was then pending to authorize the establishment of cooperative national banks. That was the extent of my conversation with Mr. Warburg, and we have not had any since."

Mr. Wingo testified that in April, May, June and July of 1920, the manufacturers and merchants were allowed a very large increase in credits. This was to tide them through the contraction of credit which was intended to ruin the American farmers, who, during this period, were denied all credit.

At the Senate Hearings in 1923, Eugene Meyer, Jr. put his finger on a primary reason for the Federal Reserve Board's action in raising the interest rate to 7% on agricultural and livestock paper:

"I believe," he said, "that a great deal of trouble would have been avoided if a larger number of the eligible non-member banks had been members of the Federal Reserve System."

Meyer was correct in pointing this out. The purpose of the Board's action was to break those state and joint land stock banks which had steadfastly refused to surrender their freedom to the banker's dictatorship set up by the System. Kemmerer in the ABC of the Federal Reserve System had written in 1919 that:

"The tendency will be toward unification and simplicity which will be brought about by the state institutions, in increasing numbers, becoming stockholders and depositors in the reserve banks."

However, the state banks had not responded.

The Senate Hearings of 1923 investigating the causes of the Agricultural Depression of 1920-21 had been demanded by the American people. The complete record of the secret meeting of the Federal Reserve Board on May 18, 1920 had been printed in the "Manufacturers' Record" of Baltimore, Maryland, a magazine devoted to the interests of small Southern manufacturers.

Benjamin Strong, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and close friend of Montagu Norman, the Governor of the Bank of England, claimed at these Hearings: "The Federal Reserve System has done more for the farmer than he has yet begun to realize."

Emmanuel Goldenweiser, Director of Research for the Board of Governors, claimed that the discount rate was raised purely as an anti-inflationary measure, but he failed to explain why it was a raise aimed solely at farmers and workers, while at the same time the System protected the manufacturers and merchants by assuring them increased credits.

The final statement on the Federal Reserve Board's causing the Agricultural Depression of 1920-21 was made by William Jennings Bryan. In "Hearst's Magazine" of November, 1923, he wrote:

"The Federal Reserve Bank that should have been the farmer's greatest protection has become his greatest foe. The deflation of the farmer was a crime deliberately committed."

Chapter 10 — The Money Creators

The editorial page of The New York Times, January 18, 1920, carried an interesting comment on the Federal Reserve System. The unidentified writer, perhaps Paul Warburg, stated, "**The Federal Reserve is a fount of credit, not of capital.**" This is one of the most revealing statements ever made about the Federal Reserve System. It says that the Federal Reserve System will never add anything to our capital structure, or to the formation of capital, because it is organized to produce credit, to create money for credit money and speculations, instead of providing capital funds for the improvement of commerce and industry. Simply stated, capitalization would mean the providing of notes backed by a precious metal or other commodity. Reserve notes are unbacked paper loaned at interest.

On July 25, 1921, Senator Owen stated on the editorial page of The New York Times, The Federal Reserve Board is the most gigantic financial power in all the world. Instead of using this great power as the Federal Reserve Act intended that it should, the board....delegated this power to the banks, threw the weight of its influence toward the support of the policy of German inflation." The senator whose name was on the Act saw that it was not performing as promised.

After the Agricultural Depression of 1920-21, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors settled down to eight years of providing rapid credit expansion of the New York bankers, a policy which culminated in the Great Depression of 1929-31 and helped paralyze the economic structure of the world. Paul Warburg had resigned in May, 1918, after the monetary system of the United States had been changed from a bond-secured currency to a currency based upon commercial paper and the shares of the Federal Reserve Banks. Warburg returned to his five hundred thousand dollar a year job with Kuhn, Loeb Company, but he continued to determine the policy of the Federal Reserve System, as President of the Federal Advisory Council and as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Acceptance Council.

From 1921 to 1929, Paul Warburg organized three of the greatest trusts in the United States, the International Acceptance Bank, largest acceptance bank in the world, Agfa Ansco Film Corporation, with headquarters in Belgium, and I.G. Farben Corporation whose American branch Warburg set up as I.G. Chemical Corporation. The Westinghouse Corporation is also one of his creations.

In the early 1920s, the Federal Reserve System played the decisive role in the re-entry of Russia into the international finance structure. Winthrop and Stimson continued to be the correspondents between Russian and American bankers, and Henry L. Stimson handled the negotiations concluding in our recognition of the Soviet after Roosevelt's election in 1932. This was an anti-climax, because we had long before resumed exchange relations with Russian financiers.

The Federal Reserve System began purchasing Russian gold in 1920, and Russian currency was accepted on the Exchanges. According to Colonel Ely Garrison, in his autobiography, and according to the United States Naval

Secret Service Report on Paul Warburg, the Russian Revolution had been financed by the Rothschilds and Warburgs, with a member of the Warburg family carrying the actual funds used by Lenin and Trotsky in Stockholm in 1918.

An article in the English monthly "Fortnightly", July, 1922, says,

"During the past year, practically every single capitalistic institution has been restored. This is true of the State Bank, private banking, the Stock Exchange, the right to possess money to unlimited amount, the right of inheritance, the bill of exchange system, and other institutions and practices involved in the conduct of private industry and trade. A great part of the former nationalized industries are now found in semi-independent trusts."

The organization of powerful trusts in Russia under the guise of Communism made possible the receipt of large amounts of financial and technical help from the United States. The Russian aristocracy had been wiped out because it was too inefficient to manage a modern industrial state. The international financiers provided funds for Lenin and Trotsky to overthrow the Czarist regime and keep Russia in the First World War. Peter Drucker, spokesman for the oligarchy in America, declared in an article in the Saturday Evening Post in 1948, that:

"RUSSIA IS THE IDEAL OF THE MANAGED ECONOMY TOWARDS WHICH WE ARE MOVING."

In Russia, the issuance of sufficient currency to handle the needs of their economy occurred only after a government had been put in power which had absolute control of the people. During the 1920s, Russia issued large quantities of so-called "inflation money", a managed currency. The same "Fortnightly" article (of July, 1922) observed that:

"As economic pressure produced the 'astronomical dimensions system' of currency; it can never destroy it. Taken alone, the system is self-contained, logically perfected, even intelligent. And it can perish only through the collapse or destruction of the political edifice which it decorates."

"Fortnightly" also remarked, in 1929, that:

"Since 1921, the daily life of the Soviet citizen is no different from that of the American citizen, and the Soviet system of government is more economical."

Admiral Kolchak, leader of the White Russian armies, was supported by the international bankers, who sent British and American troops to Siberia in order to have a pretext for printing Kolchak rubles. At one time in 1920, the bankers were manipulating on the London Exchange the old Czarist rubles, Kerensky rubles and Kolchak rubles, the values of all three fluctuating according to the movements of the Allied troops aiding Kolchak. Kolchak also was in possession of considerable amounts of gold which had been seized by his armies. After his defeat, a trainload of this gold disappeared in Siberia. At the Senate Hearings in 1921 on the Federal Reserve System, it was brought out that the System had been receiving this gold. Congressman Dunbar questioned Governor W.P.G. Harding of the Federal Reserve Board as follows:

DUNBAR: "In other words, Russia is sending a great deal of gold to the European countries, which in turn send it to us?"

HARDING: "This is done to pay for the stuff bought in this country and to create dollar exchange."

DUNBAR: "At the same time, that gold came from Russia through Europe?"

HARDING: "Some of it is thought to be Kolchak gold, coming through Siberia, but it is none of the Federal Reserve Banks' business. The Secretary of the Treasury has issued instructions to the assay office not to take any gold which does not bear the mint mark of a friendly nation."

Just what Governor Harding meant by "a friendly nation" is not clear. In 1921, we were not at war with any country, but Congress was already beginning to question the international gold dealings of the Federal Reserve System. Governor Harding could very well shrug his shoulders and say that it was none of the Federal Reserve Banks' business where the gold came from. Gold knows no nationality or race. The United States by law had ceased to be interested in where its gold came from in 1906, when Secretary of the Treasury Shaw made arrangements with several of the larger New York banks (ones in which he had interests) to purchase gold with advances of cash from the United States Treasury, which would then purchase the gold from these banks. The Treasury could claim that it did not know where its gold came from since their office only registers the bank from which it made the purchase. Since 1906, the Treasury has not known from which of the international gold merchants it was buying its gold.

The international gold dealings of the Federal Reserve System, and its active support in helping the League of Nations to force all the nations of Europe and South America back on the gold standard for the benefit of international gold merchants like Eugene Meyer, Jr. and Albert Strauss, is best demonstrated by a classic incident, the sterling credit of 1925.

J.E. Darling wrote, in the English periodical, "Spectator", on January 10, 1925 that: "Obviously, it is of the first importance to the United States to induce England to resume the gold standard as early as possible. An American controlled Gold Standard, which must inevitably result in the United States becoming the world's supreme financial power, makes England a tributary and satellite, and New York the world's financial centre."

Mr. Darling fails to point out that the American people have as little to do with this as the British people, and that resumption of the gold standard by Britain would benefit only that small group of international gold merchants who own the world's gold. No wonder that "Banker's Magazine" gleefully remarked in July, 1925 that:

"The outstanding event of the past half year in the banking world was the restoration of the gold standard."

The First World War changed the status of the United States from that of a debtor nation to the position of the world's greatest creditor nation, a title formerly occupied by England. Since debt is money, according to the Governor Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board, this also made us the richest nation of the world. The war also caused the removal of the headquarters of the world's acceptance market from London to New York, and Paul Warburg became the most powerful trade acceptance banker in the world. The mainstay of the international financiers, however, remained the same. The gold standard was still the basis of foreign exchange, and the small group of internationals who owned the gold controlled the monetary system of the Western nations.

Professor Gustav Cassel wrote in 1928:

"The American dollar, not the gold standard, is the world's monetary standard. The American Federal Reserve Board has the power to determine the purchasing power of the dollar by making changes in the rate of discount, and thus controls the monetary standard of the world."

If this were true, the members of the Federal Reserve Board would be the most powerful financiers in the world. Occasionally their membership includes such influential men as Paul Warburg or Eugene Meyer, Jr., but usually they are a rubber-stamp committee for the Federal Advisory Council and the London bankers.

In May, 1925, the British Parliament passed the Gold Standard Act, putting Great Britain back on the gold standard. The Federal Reserve System's major role in this event came out on March 16, 1926, when George Seay, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee that:

"A verbal understanding confirmed by correspondence, extended Great Britain a two hundred million dollar gold loan or credit. All negotiations were conducted between Benjamin Strong, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England. The purpose of this loan was to help England get back on the gold standard, and the loan was to be met by investment of Federal Reserve funds in bills of exchange and foreign securities."

The Federal Reserve Bulletin of June, 1925, stated that:

"Under its arrangement with the Bank of England the Federal Reserve Bank of New York undertakes to sell gold on credit to the Bank of England from time to time during the next two years, but not to exceed \$200,000,000 outstanding at any one time."

A two hundred million dollar gold credit had been arranged by a verbal understanding between the international bankers, Benjamin Strong and Montagu Norman. It was apparent by this time that the Federal Reserve System had other interests at heart than the financial needs of American business and industry. Great Britain's return to the gold standard was further facilitated by an additional gold loan of a hundred million dollars from J.P. Morgan Company. Winston Churchill, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, complained later that the cost to the British government of this loan was \$1,125,000 the first year, this sum representing the profit to J.P. Morgan Company in that time.

The matter of changing the discount rate, for instance, has never been satisfactorily explained. Inquiry at the Federal Reserve Board in Washington elicited the reply that "the condition of the money market is the prime consideration behind changes in the rate." Since the money market is in New York, it takes no imagination to deduce that New York bankers may be interested in changes of the rate and often attempt to influence it.

Norman Lombard, in the periodical "World's Work" writes that:

"In their consideration and disposal of proposed changes of policy, the Federal Reserve Board should follow the procedure and ethics observed by our court of law. Suggestions that there should be a change of rate or that the Reserve Banks should buy or sell securities may come from anyone and with no formality or written argument. The suggestion may be made to a Governor or Director of the Federal Reserve System over the telephone or at his club over the luncheon table, or it may be made in the course of a casual call on a member of the Federal Reserve Board. The interests of the one proposing the change need not be revealed, and his name and any suggestions he makes are usually kept secret. If it concerns the matter of open market operations, the public has

no inkling of the decision until the regular weekly statement appears, showing changes in the holdings of the Federal Reserve Banks. Meanwhile, there is no public discussion, there is no statement of the reasons for the decision, or of the names of those opposing or favoring it."

The chances of the average citizen meeting a Governor of the Federal Reserve System at his club are also slight.

The House Hearings on Stabilization of the Purchasing Power of the Dollar in 1928 proved conclusively that the Federal Reserve Board worked in close cooperation with the heads of European central banks, and that the Depression of 1929-31 was planned at a secret luncheon of the Federal Reserve Board and those heads of European central banks in 1927. The Board has never been made responsible to the public for its decisions or actions. The constitutional checks and balances seem not to operate in finance.

The true allegiance of the members of the Federal Reserve Board has always been to the central bankers. The three features of the central bank, its ownership by private stockholders who receive rent and profit for their use of the nation's credit, absolute control of the nation's financial resources, and mobilization of the nation's credit to finance foreigners, all were demonstrated by the Federal Reserve System during the first fifteen years of its operations.

Further demonstration of the international purposes of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 is provided by the "Edge Amendment" of December 24, 1919, which authorizes the organization of corporations expressly for "engaging in international foreign banking and other international or foreign financial operations, including the dealing in gold or bullion, and the holding of stock in foreign corporations." In commenting on this amendment, E.W. Kemmerer, economist from Princeton University, remarked that:

"The federal reserve system is proving to be a great influence in the internationalizing of American trade and American finance."

The fact that this internationalizing of American trade and American finance has been a direct cause for involving us in two world wars does not disturb Mr. Kemmerer. There is plenty of evidence to show how Paul Warburg used the Federal Reserve System as the instrument for getting trade acceptance adopted on a wide scale by American businessmen.

The use of trade acceptances, (which are the currency of international trade) by bankers and corporations in the United States prior to 1915 was practically unknown. The rise of the Federal Reserve System exactly parallels the increase in the use of acceptances in this country, nor is this a coincidence. The men who wanted the Federal Reserve System were the men who set up acceptance banks and profited by the use of acceptances.

As early as 1910, the National Monetary Commission began to issue pamphlets and other propaganda urging bankers and businessmen in this country to adopt trade acceptances in their transactions. For three years the Commission carried on this campaign, and the Aldrich Plan included a broad provision authorizing the introduction and use of bankers' acceptances into the American system of commercial paper.

The Federal Reserve Act of 1913 as passed by Congress did not specifically authorize the use of acceptances, but the Federal Reserve Board in 1915 and 1916 defined "trade acceptance", further defined by Regulation A Series of 1920, and further defined by Series 1924. One of the first official acts of the Board of Governors in 1914 was to grant acceptances a preferentially low rate of discount at Federal Reserve Banks. Since acceptances were not being used in this country at that time, no explanation of business exigency could be advanced for this action. It was apparent that someone in power on the Board of Governors wanted the adoptance of acceptances.

The National Bank Act of 1864, which was the determining financial authority of the United States until November, 1914, did not permit banks to lend their credit. Consequently, the power of banks to create money was greatly limited. We did not have a bank of issue, that is, a central bank, which could create money. To get a central bank, the bankers caused money panic after money panic on the business people of the United States, by shipping gold out of the country, creating a money shortage, and then importing it back. After we got our central bank, the Federal Reserve System, there was no longer any need for a money panic, because the banks could create money. However, the panic as an instrument of power over the business and financial community was used again on two important occasions, in 1920, causing the Agricultural Depression, because state banks and trust companies had refused to join the Federal Reserve System, and in 1929, causing the Great Depression, which centralized nearly all power in this country in the hands of a few great trusts.

A trade acceptance is a draft drawn by the seller of goods on the purchaser, and accepted by the purchaser, with a time of expiration stamped upon it. The use of trade acceptances in the wholesale market supplies short-term, assured credit to carry goods in process of production, storage, transit, and marketing. It facilitates domestic and foreign commerce. Seemingly, then, the bankers who wished to replace the open-book account system with the trade acceptance system were progressive men who wished to help American import-export trade. Much propaganda was issued to that effect, but this was not really the story.

The open-book system, heretofore used entirely by American business people, allowed a discount for cash. The acceptance system discourages the use of cash, by allowing a discount for credit. The open-book system also allowed much easier terms of payment, with liberal extensions on the debt. The acceptance does not allow this, since it is a short-term credit with the time-date stamped upon it. It is out of the seller's hands, and in the hands of a bank, usually an acceptance bank, which does not allow any extension of time. Thus, the adoption of acceptances by American businessmen during the 1920's greatly facilitated the domination and swallowing up of small business into huge trusts, which accelerated the crash of 1929.

Trade acceptances had been used to some extent in the United States before the Civil War. During that war, exigencies of trade had destroyed the acceptance as a credit medium, and it had not come back into favor in this country, our people preferring the simplicity and generosity of the open-book system. Open-book accounts are a single-name commercial paper, bearing only the name of the debtor. Acceptances are two-name paper, bearing the name of the debtor and the creditor. Thus they became commodities to be bought and sold by banks. To the creditor, under the open-book system, the debt is a liability. To the acceptance bank holding an acceptance, the debt is an asset. The men who set up acceptance banks in this country, under the leadership of Paul Warburg, secured control of the billions of dollars of credit existing as open accounts on the books of American businessmen.

Governor Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board stated before the House Banking and Currency Committee that: "Debt is the basis for the creation of money."

Large holders of trade acceptances got the use of billions of dollars worth of credit-money, besides the rate of interest charged upon the acceptance itself. It is obvious why Paul Warburg should have devoted so much time, money, and energy to getting acceptances adopted by this country's banking machinery.

On September 4, 1914, the National City Bank accepted the first time-draft drawn on a national bank under provisions of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. This was the beginning of the end of the open-book account system as an important factor in wholesale trade. Beverly Harris, vice-president of the National City Bank of New York, issued a pamphlet in 1915 stating that:

"Merchants using the open account system are usurping the functions of bankers."

In The New York Times on June 14, 1920, Paul Warburg, Chairman of the American Acceptance Council, said:

"Unless the Federal Reserve Board puts itself heart and soul behind the untrammled development of acceptances as a prime investment for banks of the Federal Reserve Banks the future safe and sound development of the system will be jeopardized."

This was a statement of the purpose of Warburg and his bunch who wanted "monetary reform" in this country. They were out to get control of all credit in the United States, and they got it, by means of the Federal Reserve System, the acceptance system, and the lack of concern by the citizens.

The First World War was a boon to the introduction of trade acceptances, and the volume jumped to four hundred million dollars in 1917, growing through the 1920s to more than a billion dollars a year, which culminated in a high peak just before the Great Depression of 1929-31. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York's charts show that its use of acceptances reached a peak in November, 1929, the month of the stock market crash, and declined sharply thereafter. The acceptance people by then had gotten what they wanted, which was control of American business and industry. "Fortune Magazine" in February of 1950 pointed out that:

"Volume of acceptances declined from \$1,732 million in 1929 to \$209 million in 1940, because of the concentration of acceptance banking in a few hands, and the Treasury's low-interest policy, which made direct loans cheaper than acceptance. There has been a slight upturn since the war, but it is often cheaper for large companies to finance imports from their own coffers."

In other words, the "large companies" more accurately, the great trusts, now have control of credit and have not needed acceptances. Besides the barrage of propaganda issued by the Federal Reserve System itself, the National Association of Credit Men, the American Bankers' Association, and other fraternal organizations of the New York bankers devoted much time and money to distributing acceptance propaganda. Even their flood of lectures and pamphlets proved insufficient, and in 1919 Paul Warburg organized the American Acceptance Council, which was devoted entirely to acceptance propaganda.

The first convention held by this association at Detroit, Michigan, on June 9, 1919, coincided with the annual convention of the National Association of Credit Men, held there on that date, so that "interested observers might with facility participate in the lectures and meetings of both groups," according to a pamphlet issued by the American Acceptance Council.

Paul Warburg was elected President of this organization, and later became chairman of the Executive Committee of the American Acceptance Council, a position which he held until his death in 1932. The Council published lists of corporations using trade acceptances, all of them businesses in which Kuhn, Loeb Co. or its affiliates held control. Lectures given before the Council or by members of the Council were attractively bound and distributed free by the National City Bank of New York to the country's businessmen.

Louis T. McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, charged in 1922 that the American Acceptance Council was exercising undue influence on the Federal Reserve Board and called for a Congressional investigation, but Congress was not interested.

At the second annual convention of the American Acceptance Council, held in New York on December 2, 1920, President Paul Warburg stated:

"It is a great satisfaction to report that during the year under review it was possible for the American Acceptance Council to further develop and strengthen its relations with the Federal Reserve Board."

During the 1920s Paul Warburg, who had resigned from the Federal Reserve Board after holding a position as Governor for a year in wartime, continued to exercise direct personal influence on the Federal Reserve Board by meeting with the Board as President of the Federal Advisory Council and as President of the American Acceptance Council. He was, from its organization in 1920 until his death in 1932, Chairman of the Board of the International Acceptance Bank of New York, the largest acceptance bank in the world. His brother, Felix M. Warburg, also a partner in Kuhn, Loeb Co., was director of the International Acceptance Bank and Paul's son, James Paul Warburg, was Vice-President. Paul Warburg was also a director on other important acceptance banks in this country, such as Westinghouse Acceptance Bank, which were organized in the United States immediately after the World War, when the headquarters of the international acceptance market was moved from London to New York, and Paul Warburg became the most powerful acceptance banker in the world.

Paul Warburg became an even more legendary figure by his memorialization as "Daddy Warbucks" in the comic strip, "Little Orphan Annie". The strip celebrated a homeless waif and her dog who are adopted by "the richest man in the world", Daddy Warbucks, a takeoff on "Warburg", who has almost magical powers and can accomplish anything by the power of his limitless wealth. Those in the know snickered when "Annie", the musical comedy version of this story, had a highly successful run of several years on Broadway, because the vast majority of the audience had no idea that this was merely another Warburg operation.

It was the transference of the acceptance market from England to this country which gave rise to Thomas Lamont's ecstatic speech before the Academy of Political Science in 1917 that:

"The dollar, not the pound, is now the basis for international exchange."

Americans were proud to hear that, but they did not realize at what a price.

Visible proof of the undue influence of the American Acceptance Council on the Federal Reserve Board, about which Congressman McFadden complained, is the chart showing the rate-pattern of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York during the 1920s. The Bank's official discount rate follows exactly for nine years the ninety-day bankers' acceptance rate, and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York sets the discount rate for the rest of the Reserve Banks.

Throughout the 1920s the Board of Governors retained two of its first members, C.S. Hamlin and Adolph C. Miller. These men found themselves careers as arbiters of the nation's monetary policy. Hamlin was on the Board from 1914 until 1936, when he was appointed Special Counsel to the Board, while Miller served from 1914 until 1931. These two men were allowed to stay on the Board so many years because they were both eminently respectable men who gave the Board a certain prestige in the eyes of the public. During these years one important banker after another came on the Board, served for awhile, and went on to better things. Neither Miller nor Hamlin ever objected to anything that the New York bankers wanted. They changed the discount rate and they performed open market operation with Government securities whenever Wall Street wanted them to. Behind them was the figure of Paul Warburg, who exercised a continuous and dominant influence as President of the Federal Advisory Council, on which he had such men of common interests with himself as Winthrop Aldrich and J.P. Morgan. Warburg was never too occupied with his duties of organizing the big international trusts to supervise the nation's financial structures. His influence from 1902, when he arrived in this country as immigrant from Germany, until 1932, the year of his death, was dependent on his European alliance with the banking cartel. Warburg's son, James Paul Warburg, continued to exercise such influence, being appointed Franklin D. Roosevelt's Director of the Budget when that great man assumed office in 1933, and setting up the Office of War Information, our official propaganda agency during the Second World War.

In *The Fight for Financial Supremacy*, Paul Einzig, editorial writer for the *London Economist*, wrote that:

"Almost immediately after World War I a close cooperation was established between the Bank of England and the Federal Reserve authorities, and more especially with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.* This cooperation was largely due to the cordial relations existing between Mr. Montagu Norman of the Bank of England and Mr. Benjamin Strong, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York until 1928. On several occasions the discount rate policy of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was guided by a desire to help the Bank of England."

Chapter 11 — Lord Montagu Norman

The collaboration between Benjamin Strong and Lord Montagu Norman is one of the greatest secrets of the twentieth century. Benjamin Strong married the daughter of the president of Bankers Trust in New York, and subsequently succeeded to its presidency. Carroll Quigley, in *Tragedy and Hope* says: "Strong became Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York as the joint nominee of Morgan and of Kuhn, Loeb Company in 1914."⁸⁷

Lord Montagu Norman is the only man in history who had both his maternal grandfather and his paternal grandfather serve as Governors of the Bank of England. His father was with Brown, Shipley Company, the London Branch of Brown Brothers (now Brown Brothers Harriman). Montagu Norman (1871-1950) came to New York to work for Brown Brothers in 1894, where he was befriended by the Delano family, and by James Markoe, of Brown Brothers. He returned to England, and in 1907 was named to the Court of the Bank of England. In 1912, he had a nervous breakdown, and went to Switzerland to be treated by Jung, as was fashionable among the powerful group which he represented.*

Lord Montagu Norman was Governor of the Bank of England from 1916 to 1944. During this period, he participated in the central bank conferences which set up the Crash of 1929 and a worldwide depression. In *The Politics of Money* by Brian Johnson, he writes, "Strong and Norman, intimate friends, spent their holidays together at Bar Harbour and in the South of France." Johnson says, "Norman therefore became Strong's alter ego. . . . "Strong's easy money policies on the New York money market from 1925-28 were the fulfillment of his agreement with Norman to keep New York interest rates below those of London. For the sake of international cooperation, Strong withheld the steadying hand of high interest rates from New York until it was too late. Easy money in New York had encouraged the surging American boom of the late 1920s, with its fantastic heights of speculation."⁸⁸

Benjamin Strong died suddenly in 1928. The *New York Times* obituary, Oct. 17, 1928, describes the conference between the directors of the three great central banks in Europe in July, 1927, "Mr. Norman, Bank of England, Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and Dr. Hjalmar Schacht of the Reichsbank, their meeting referred to at the time as a meeting of 'the world's most exclusive club'. No public reports were ever made of the foreign conferences, which were wholly informal, but which covered many important questions of gold movements, the stability of world trade, and world economy."

The meetings at which the future of the world's economy are decided are always reported as being "wholly informal", off the record, no reports made to the public, and on the rare occasions when outraged Congressmen summon these mystery figures to testify about their activities they merely trace the outline of steps taken, and develop no information about what was really said or decided.

At the Senate Hearings on the Federal Reserve System in 1931, H. Parker Willis, one of the authors and First Secretary of the Federal Reserve Board from 1914 until 1920, pointedly asked Governor George Harrison, Strong's successor as Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York:

"What is the relationship between the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and the money committee of the Stock Exchange?"

"There is no relationship," Governor Harrison replied.

"There is no assistance or cooperation in fixing the rate in any way?", asked Willis.

"No," said Governor Harrison, "although on various occasions they advise us of the state of the money situation, and what they think the rate ought to be." This was an absolute contradiction of his statement that "There is no relationship". The Federal Reserve Bank of New York which set the discount rate for the other Reserve Banks, actually maintained a close liaison with the money committee of the Stock Exchange.

The House Stabilization Hearings of 1928 proved conclusively that the Governors of the Federal Reserve System had been holding conferences with heads of the big European central banks. Even had the Congressmen known the details of the plot which was to culminate in the Great Depression of 1929-31, there would have been nothing they could have done to stop it. The international bankers who controlled gold movements could inflict their will on any country, and the United States was as helpless as any other.

Notes from these House Hearings follow:

MR. BEEDY: "I notice on your chart that the lines which produce the most violent fluctuations are found under 'Money Rates in New York.' As the rates of money rise and fall in the big cities the loans that are made on investments seem to take advantage of them, at present, a quite violent change, while industry in general does not seem to avail itself of these violent changes, and that line is fairly even, there being no great rises or declines.

GOVERNOR ADOLPH MILLER: This was all more or less in the interests of the international situation. They sold gold credits in New York for sterling balances in London.

REPRESENTATIVE STRONG: (No relation to Benjamin): Has the Federal Reserve Board the power to attract gold to this country?

E.A. GOLDENWEISER, research director for the Board: The Federal Reserve Board could attract gold to this country by making money rates higher.

GOVERNOR ADOLPH MILLER: I think we are very close to the point where any further solicitude on our part for the monetary concerns of Europe can be altered. The Federal Reserve Board last summer, 1927, set out by a policy of open market purchases, followed in course by reduction on the discount rate at the Reserve Banks, to ease the credit situation and to cheapen the cost of money. The official reasons for that departure in credit policy were that it would help to stabilize international exchange and stimulate the exportation of gold.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: Will you tell us briefly how that matter was brought to the Federal Reserve Board and what were the influences that went into the final determination?

GOVERNOR ADOLPH MILLER: You are asking a question impossible for me to answer.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: Perhaps I can clarify it--where did the suggestion come from that caused this decision of the change of rates last summer?

GOVERNOR ADOLPH MILLER: The three largest central banks in Europe had sent representatives to this country. There were the Governor of the Bank of England, Mr. Hjalmar Schacht, and Professor Rist, Deputy Governor of the Bank of France. These gentlemen were in conference with officials of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. After a week or two, they appeared in Washington for the better part of a day. They came down the evening of one day and were the guests of the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board the following day, and left that afternoon for New York.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: Were the members of the Board present at this luncheon?

GOVERNOR ADOLPH MILLER: Oh, yes, it was given by the Governors of the Board for the purpose of bringing all of us together.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: Was it a social affair, or were matters of importance discussed?

GOVERNOR MILLER: I would say it was mainly a social affair. Personally, I had a long conversation with Dr. Schacht alone before the luncheon, and also one of considerable length with Professor Rist. After the luncheon I began a conversation with Mr. Norman, which was joined in by Governor Strong of New York.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: Was that a formal meeting of the Board?

GOVERNOR ADOLPH MILLER: No.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: It was just an informal discussion of the matters they had been discussing in New York?

GOVERNOR MILLER: I assume so. It was mainly a social occasion. What I said was mainly in the nature of generalities. The heads of these central banks also spoke in generalities.

MR. KING: What did they want?

GOVERNOR MILLER: They were very candid in answers to questions. I wanted to have a talk with Mr. Norman, and we both stayed behind after luncheon, and were joined by the other foreign representatives and the officials of the New York Reserve Bank. These gentlemen were all pretty concerned with the way the gold standard was working. They were therefore desirous of seeing an easy money market in New York and lower rates, which would deter gold from moving from Europe to this country. That would be very much in the interest of the international money situation which then existed.

MR. BEEDY: Was there some understanding arrived at between the representatives of these foreign banks and the Federal Reserve Board or the New York Federal Reserve Bank?

GOVERNOR MILLER: Yes.

MR. BEEDY: It was not reported formally?

GOVERNOR MILLER: No. Later, there came a meeting of the Open-Market Policy Committee, the investment policy committee of the Federal Reserve System, by which and to which certain recommendations were made. My recollection is that about eighty million dollars worth of securities were purchased in August consistent with this plan.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: Was there any conference between the members of the Open Market Committee and those bankers from abroad?

GOVERNOR MILLER: They may have met them as individuals, but not as a committee.

MR. KING: How does the Open-Market Committee get its ideas?

GOVERNOR MILLER: They sit around and talk about it. I do not know whose idea this was. It was distinctly a time in which there was a cooperative spirit at work.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: You have outlined here negotiations of very great importance.

GOVERNOR MILLER: I should rather say conversations.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: Something of a very definite character took place?

GOVERNOR MILLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: A change of policy on the part of our whole financial system which has resulted in one of the most unusual situations that has ever confronted this country financially (the stock market speculation boom of 1927-1929). It seems to me that a matter of that importance should have been made a matter of record in Washington.

GOVERNOR MILLER: I agree with you.

REPRESENTATIVE STRONG: Would it not have been a good thing if there had been a direction that those powers given to the Federal Reserve System should be used for the continued stabilization of the purchasing power of the American dollar rather than be influenced by the interests of Europe?

GOVERNOR MILLER: I take exception to that term "influence". Besides, there is no such thing as stabilizing the American dollar without stabilizing every other gold currency. They are tied together by the gold standard. Other eminent men who come here are very adroit in knowing how to approach the folk who make up the personnel of the Federal Reserve Board.

MR. STEAGALL: The visit of these foreign bankers resulted in money being cheaper in New York?

GOVERNOR MILLER: Yes, exactly.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: I would like to put in the record all who attended that luncheon in Washington.

GOVERNOR MILLER: In addition to the names I have given you, there was also present one of the younger men from the Bank of France. I think all members of the Federal Reserve Board were there. Under Secretary of the Treasury Ogden Mills was there, and the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Schuneman, also, two or three men from the State Department and Mr. Warren of the Foreign Department of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Oh yes, Governor Strong was present.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: This conference, of course, with all of these foreign bankers did not just happen. The prominent bankers from Germany, France, and England came here at whose suggestion?

GOVERNOR MILLER: A situation had been created that was distinctly embarrassing to London by reason of the impending withdrawal of a certain amount of gold which had been recovered by France and that had originally been shipped and deposited in the Bank of England by the French Government as a war credit. There was getting to be some tension of mind in Europe because France was beginning to put her house in order for a return to the gold standard. This situation was one which called for some moderating influence.

MR. KING: Who was the moving spirit who got those people together?

GOVERNOR MILLER: That is a detail with which I am not familiar.

REPRESENTATIVE STRONG: Would it not be fair to say that the fellows who wanted the gold were the ones who instigated the meeting?

GOVERNOR MILLER: They came over here.

REPRESENTATIVE STRONG: The fact is that they came over here, they had a meeting, they banqueted, they talked, they got the Federal Reserve Board to lower the discount rate, and to make the purchases in the open market, and they got the gold.

MR. STEAGALL: Is it true that action stabilized the European currencies and upset ours?

GOVERNOR MILLER: **Yes, that was what it was intended to do.**

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: Let me call your attention to the recent conference in Paris at which Mr. Goldenweiser, director of research for the Federal Reserve Board, and Dr. Burgess, assistant Federal Reserve Agent of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, were in consultation with the representatives of the other central banks. Who called the conference?

GOVERNOR MILLER: My recollection is that it was called by the Bank of France.

GOVERNOR YOUNG: No, it was the League of Nations who called them together."

The secret meeting between the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board and the heads of the European central banks was not called to stabilize anything. It was held to discuss the best way of getting the gold held in the United States by the System back to Europe to force the nations of that continent back on the gold standard. The League of Nations had not yet succeeded in doing that, the objective for which that body was set up in the first place, because the Senate of the United States had refused to let Woodrow Wilson betray us to an international monetary authority. It took the Second World War and Franklin D. Roosevelt to do that.

Meanwhile, Europe had to have our gold and the Federal Reserve System gave it to them, five hundred million dollars worth. **The movement of that gold out of the United States caused the deflation of the stock boom, the end of the business prosperity of the 1920s and the Great Depression of 1929-31**, the worst calamity which has ever befallen this nation. It is entirely logical to say that the American people suffered that depression as a punishment for not joining the League of Nations. The bankers knew what would happen when that five hundred million dollars worth of gold was sent to Europe. They wanted the Depression because it put the business and finance of the United States in their hands.

The Hearings continue:

MR. BEEDY: "Mr. Ebersole of the Treasury Department concluded his remarks at the dinner we attended last night by saying that the Federal Reserve System did not want stabilization and the American businessman did not want it. They want these fluctuations in prices, not only in securities but in commodities, in trade generally, because those who are now in control are making their profits out of that very instability. If control of these people does not come in a legitimate way, there may be an attempt to produce it by general upheavals such as have characterized society in days gone by. Revolutions have been promoted by dissatisfaction with existing conditions, the control being in the hands of the few, and the many paying the bills.

CHAIRMAN MCFADDEN: I have here a letter from a member of the Federal Reserve Board who was summoned to appear here. I would like to have it put in the record. It is from Governor Cunningham:

Dear Mr. Chairman:

For the past several weeks I have been confined to my home on account of illness and am now preparing to spend a few weeks away from Washington for the purpose of hastening convalescence.

Edward H. Cunningham

This is in answer to an invitation extended him to appear before our Committee. I also have a letter from George Harrison, Deputy Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

My dear Mr. Congressman:

Governor Strong sailed for Europe last week. He had not been at all well since the first of the year, and, while he did appear before your Committee last March, it was only shortly after that that he suffered a very severe attack of shingles, which has sorely racked his nerves.

George L. Harrison, May 19, 1928

I also desire to place in the record a statement in the New York Journal of Commerce, dated May 22, 1928, from Washington:

'It is stated in well-informed circles here that the chief topic being taken up by Governor Strong of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York on his present visit to Paris is the arrangement of stabilization credits for France, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. A second vital question Mr. Strong will take up is the amount of gold France is to draw from this country.'

Further questioning by Chairman McFadden about the strange illness of Benjamin Strong brought forth the following testimony from Governor Charles S. Hamlin of the Federal Reserve Board on May 23rd, 1928:

"All I know is that Governor Strong has been very ill, and he has gone over to Europe primarily, I understand, as a matter of health. Of course, he knows well the various offices of the European central banks and undoubtedly will call on them."

Governor Benjamin Strong died a few weeks after his return from Europe, without appearing before the Committee.

The purpose of these hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in 1928 was to investigate the necessity for passing the Strong bill, presented by Representative Strong (no relation to Benjamin, the international banker), which would have provided that the Federal Reserve System be

empowered to act to stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar. This had been one of the promises made by Carter Glass and Woodrow Wilson when they presented the Federal Reserve Act before Congress in 1912, and such a provision had actually been put in the Act by Senator Robert L. Owen, but Carter Glass' House Committee on Banking and Currency had struck it out. The traders and speculators did not want the dollar to become stable, because they would no longer be able to make a profit. The citizens of this country had been led to gamble on the stock market in the 1920s because the traders had created a nationwide condition of instability.

The Strong Bill of 1928 was defeated in Congress.

The financial situation in the United States during the 1920s was characterized by an inflation of speculative values only. It was a trader-made situation. Prices of commodities remained low, despite the over-pricing of securities on the exchange.

The purchasers did not expect their securities to pay dividends. The idea was to hold them awhile and sell them at a profit. It had to stop somewhere, as Paul Warburg remarked in March, 1929. Wall Street did not let it stop until the people had put their savings into these over-priced securities. We had the spectacle of the President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge, acting as a shill for the stock market operators when he recommended to the American people that they continue buying on the market, in 1927. There had been uneasiness about the inflated condition of the market, and the bankers showed their power by getting the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue statements that brokers' loans were not too high, and that the condition of the stock market was sound.

Irving Fisher warned us in 1927 that the burden of stabilizing prices all over the world would soon fall on the United States. One of the results of the Second World War was the establishment of an International Monetary Fund to do just that. Professor Gustav Cassel remarked in the same year that:

"The downward movement of prices has not been a spontaneous result of forces beyond our control. It is the result of a policy deliberately framed to bring down prices and give a higher value to the monetary unit."

The Democratic Party, after passing the Federal Reserve Act and leading us into the First World War, assumed the role of an opposition party during the 1920s. They were on the outside of the political fence, and were supported during those lean years by liberal handouts from Bernard Baruch, according to his biography. How far outside of it they were and how little chance they had in 1928, is shown by a plank in the official Democratic Party platform adopted at Houston on June 28, 1928:

"The administration of the Federal Reserve System for the advantage of the stock-market speculators should cease. It must be administered for the benefit of farmers, wage-earners, merchants, manufacturers, and others engaged in constructive business."

This idealism insured defeat for its protagonist, Al Smith, who was nominated by Franklin D. Roosevelt. The campaign against Al Smith also was marked by appeals to religious intolerance, because he was a Catholic. The bankers stirred up anti-Catholic sentiment all over the country to achieve the election of their World War I protégé, Herbert Hoover.

Instead of being used to promote the financial stability of the country, as had been promised by Woodrow Wilson when the Act was passed, financial instability has been steadily promoted by the Federal Reserve Board. An official memorandum issued by the Board on March 13, 1939, stated that:

"The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System opposes any bill which proposes a stable price level."

Politically, the Federal Reserve Board was used to advance the election of the bankers' candidates during the 1920s. The "Literary Digest" on August 4, 1928, said, on the occasion of the Federal Reserve Board raising the rate to five percent in a Presidential year:

"This reverses the politically desirable cheap money policy of 1927, and gives smooth conditions on the stock market. It was attacked by the Peoples' Lobby of Washington, D.C. which said that 'This increase at a time when farmers needed cheap money to finance the harvesting of their crops was a direct blow at the farmers, who had begun to get back on their feet after the Agricultural Depression of 1920-21.

"The New York World" said on that occasion:

"Criticism of Federal Reserve Board policy by many investors is not based on its attempt to deflate the stock market, but on the charge that the Board itself, by last year's policy, is completely responsible for such stock market inflation as exists."

A damning survey of the Federal Reserve System's first fifteen years appears in the "North American Review" of May, 1929, by H. Parker Willis, professional economist who was one of the authors of the Act and First Secretary of the Board from 1914 until 1920. He expresses complete disillusionment.

"My first talk with President-elect Wilson was in 1912. Our conversation related entirely to banking reform. I asked whether he felt confident we could secure the administration of a suitable law and how we should get it applied and enforced. He answered: 'We must rely on American business idealism.' He sought for something which could be trusted to afford opportunity to American Idealism. It did serve to finance the World War and to revise American banking practices. The element of idealism that the President prescribed and believed we could get on the principle of noblesse oblige from American bankers and businessmen was not there.

Since the inauguration of the Federal Reserve Act we have suffered one of the most serious financial depressions and revolutions ever known in our history, that of 1920-21. We have seen our agriculture pass through a long period of suffering and even of revolution, during which one million farmers left their farms, due to difficulties with the price of land and the odd status of credit conditions. We have suffered the most extensive era of bank failures ever known in this country. Forty-five hundred banks have closed their doors since the Reserve System began functioning. In some Western towns there have been times when all banks in that community failed, and given banks have failed over and over again. There has been little difference in liability to failure between members and non-members of the Federal Reserve System.

"Wilson's choice of the first members of the Federal Reserve Board was not especially happy. They represented a composite group chosen for the express purpose of placating this, that, or the other big interest. It was not strange that appointees used their places to pay debts. When the Board was considering a resolution to the effect that future members of the reserve system should be appointed solely on merit, because of the demonstrated incompetence of some of their number. Comptroller John Skelton Williams moved to strike out the word 'solely' and in this he was sustained by the Board. The inclusion of certain elements (Warburg, Strauss, etc.) in the Board gave an opportunity for catering to special interests that was to prove disastrous later on.

"President Wilson erred, as he often erred, in supposing that the holding of an important office would transform an incumbent and revivify his patriotism. The Reserve Board reached the low ebb of the Wilson period with the appointment of a member who was chosen for his ability to get delegates for a Democratic candidate for the Presidency. However, this level was not the dregs reached under President Harding. He appointed an old crony, D.R. Crissinger, as Governor of the Board, and named several other super-serviceable politicians to other places. Before his death he had done his utmost to debauch the whole undertaking. The System has gone steadily downhill ever since.

"Reserve Banks had hardly assumed their first form when it became apparent that local bankers had sought to use them as a means of taking care of 'favorite sons', that is, persons who had by common consent become a kind of general charge upon the banking community, or inefficients of various kinds. When reserve directors were to be chosen, the country bankers often refused to vote, or, when they voted, cast their ballots as directed by city correspondents. In these circumstances popular or democratic control of reserve banks was out of the question. Reasonable efficiency might have been secured if honest men, recognizing their public duty, had assumed power. If such men existed, they did not get on the Federal Reserve Board. In one reserve bank today the chief management is in the hands of a man who never did a day's actual banking in his life, while in another reserve institution both Governor and Chairman are the former heads of now defunct banks. They naturally have a high failure record in their district. In a majority of districts the standard of performance as judged by good banking standards is disgracefully low among reserve executive officials. The policy of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia is known in the System as the 'Friends and Relatives Banks.'

"It was while making war profits in considerable amounts that someone conceived the idea of using the profits to provide themselves with phenomenally costly buildings. Today the Reserve Banks must keep a full billion dollars of their money constantly at work merely to pay their own expenses in normal times.

"The best illustration of what the System has done and not done is offered by the experience which the country was having with speculation, in May, 1929. Three years prior to that, the present bull market was just getting under way. In the autumn of 1926 a group of bankers, among them one of world famous name, were sitting at a table in a Washington hotel. One of them raised the question whether the low discount rates of the System were not likely to encourage speculation.

"'Yes', replied the famous banker, 'they will, but that cannot be helped. It is the price we must pay for helping Europe.'

"It may well be questioned whether the encouragement of speculation by the Board has been the price paid for helping Europe or whether it is the price paid to induce a certain class of financiers to help Europe, but in either case European conditions should not have had anything to do with the Board's discount policy. The fact of the matter is that the Federal Reserve Banks do not come into contact with the community.

"The 'small man' from Maine to Texas has gradually been led to invest his savings in the stock market, with the result that the rising tide of speculation, transacted at a higher and higher rate of speed, has swept over the legitimate business of the country.

"In March, 1928, Roy A. Young, Governor of the Board, was called before a Senate committee.

"Do you think the brokers' loans are too high?" he was asked.

"I am not prepared to say whether brokers' loans are too high or too low," he replied, "but I am sure they are safely and conservatively made."

"Secretary of the Treasury Mellon in a formal statement assured the country that they were not too high, and Coolidge, using material supplied him by the Federal Reserve Board, made a plain statement to the country that they were not too high. The Federal Reserve Board, charged with the duty of protecting the interests of the average man, thus did its utmost to assure the average man that he should feel no alarm about his savings. Yet the Federal Reserve Board issued on February 2, 1929, a letter addressed to the Reserve Bank Directors cautioning them against grave danger of further speculation.

"What could be expected from a group of men such as composed the Board, a set of men who were solely interested in standing from under when there was any danger of friction, displaying a bovine and canine appetite for credit and praise, while eager only to 'stand in' with the 'big men' whom they know as the masters of American finance and banking?"

H. Parker Willis omitted any reference to Lord Montague Norman and the machinations of the Bank of England which were about to result in the Crash of 1929 and the Great Depression.

Chapter 12 — The Great Depression

R.G. Hawtrey, the English economist, said, in the March, 1926 American Economic Review: **"When external investment outstrips the supply of general savings the investment market must carry the excess with money borrowed from the banks. A remedy is control of credit by a rise in bank rate."**

The Federal Reserve Board applied this control of credit, but not in 1926, nor as a remedial measure. It was not applied until 1929, and then the rate was raised as a punitive measure, to freeze out everybody but the big trusts.

Professor Cassel, in the Quarterly Journal of Economics, August 1928, wrote that: "The fact that a central bank fails to raise its bank rate in accordance with the actual situation of the capital market very much increases the strength of the cyclical movement of trade, with all its pernicious effects on social economy. A rational regulation of the bank rate lies in our hands, and may be accomplished only if we perceive its importance and decide to go in for such a policy. With a bank rate regulated on these lines the conditions for the development of trade cycles would be radically altered, and indeed, our familiar trade cycles would be a thing of the past."

This is the most authoritative premise yet made relating that our business depressions are artificially precipitated. The occurrence of the Panic of 1907, the Agricultural Depression of 1920, and the Great Depression of 1929, all three in good crop years and in periods of national prosperity, suggests that premise is not guesswork. Lord Maynard Keynes pointed out that most theories of the business cycle failed to relate their analysis adequately to the money mechanism. Any survey or study of a depression which failed to list such factors as gold movements and pressures on foreign exchange would be worthless, yet American economists have always dodged this issue.

The League of Nations had achieved its goal of getting the nations of Europe back on the gold standard by 1928, but three-fourths of the world's gold was in France and the United States. The problem was how to get that gold to countries which needed it as a basis for money and credit. The answer was action by the Federal Reserve System.

Following the secret meeting of the Federal Reserve Board and the heads of the foreign central banks in 1927, the Federal Reserve Banks in a few months doubled their holdings of Government securities and acceptances, which resulted in the exportation of five hundred million dollars in gold in that year. The System's market activities forced the rates of call money down on the Stock Exchange, and forced gold out of the country. Foreigners also took this opportunity to purchase heavily in Government securities because of the low call money rate.

"The agreement between the Bank of England and the Washington Federal Reserve authorities many months ago was that we would force the export of 725 million of gold by reducing the bank rates here, thus helping the stabilization of France and Europe and putting France on a gold basis." ⁸⁹ (April 20, 1928)

On February 6, 1929, Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, came to Washington and had a conference with Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury. Immediately after that mysterious visit, the Federal Reserve Board abruptly changed its policy and pursued a high discount rate policy, abandoning the cheap money policy which it had inaugurated in 1927 after Mr. Norman's other visit. The stock market crash and the deflation of the American people's financial structure was scheduled to take place in March. To get the ball rolling, Paul Warburg gave the official warning to the traders to get out of the market. In his annual report to the stockholders of his International Acceptance Bank, in March, 1929, Mr. Warburg said:

"If the orgies of unrestrained speculation are permitted to spread, the ultimate collapse is certain not only to affect the speculators themselves, but to bring about a general depression involving the entire country."

During three years of "unrestrained speculation", Mr. Warburg had not seen fit to make any remarks about the condition of the Stock Exchange. A friendly organ, The New York Times, not only gave the report two columns on its editorial page, but editorially commented on the wisdom and profundity of Mr. Warburg's observations. Mr. Warburg's concern was genuine, for the stock market bubble had gone much farther than it had been intended to go, and the bankers feared the consequences if the people realized what was going on. When this report in The New York Times started a sudden wave of selling on the Exchange, the bankers grew panicky, and it was decided to ease the market somewhat. Accordingly, Warburg's National City Bank rushed twenty-five million dollars in cash to the call money market, and postponed the day of the crash.

The revelation of the Federal Reserve Board's final decision to trigger the Crash of 1929 appears, amazingly enough, in The New York Times. On April 20, 1929, the Times headlined, "Federal Advisory Council Mystery Meeting in Washington. Resolutions were adopted by the council and transmitted to the board, but their purpose was closely guarded. An atmosphere of deep mystery was thrown about the proceedings both by the board and the council. Every effort was made to guard the proceedings of this extraordinary session. Evasive replies were given to newspaper correspondents."

Only the innermost council of "The London Connection" knew that it had been decided at this "mystery meeting" to bring down the curtain on the greatest speculative boom in American history. Those in the know began to sell off all speculative stocks and put their money in government bonds. Those who were not privy to this secret information, and they included some of the wealthiest men in America, continued to hold their speculative stocks and lost everything they had.

In FDR, My Exploited Father-in-Law, Col. Curtis B. Dall, who was a broker on Wall Street at that time, writes of the Crash, "Actually it was the calculated 'shearing' of the public by the World Money-Powers, triggered by the planned sudden shortage of the supply of call money in the New York money market."²⁰ Overnight, the Federal Reserve System had raised the call rate to twenty percent. Unable to meet this rate, the speculators' only alternative was to jump out of windows.

The New York Federal Reserve Bank rate, which dictated the national interest rate, went to six percent on November 1, 1929. After the investors had been bankrupted, it dropped to one and one-half percent on May 8, 1931. Congressman Wright Patman in "A Primer On Money", says that the money supply decreased by eight billion dollars from 1929 to 1933, causing 11,630 banks of the total of 26,401 in the United States to go bankrupt and close their doors.

The Federal Reserve Board had already warned the stockholders of the Federal Reserve Banks to get out of the Market, on February 6, 1929, but it had not bothered to say anything to the rest of the people. Nobody knew what was going on except the Wall Street bankers who were running the show. Gold movements were completely unreliable. The Quarterly Journal of Economics noted that:

"The question has been raised, not only in this country, but in several European countries, as to whether customs statistics record with accuracy the movements of precious metals, and, when investigation has been made, confidence in such figures has been weakened rather than strengthened. Any movement between France and England, for instance, should be recorded in each country, but such comparison shows an average yearly discrepancy of fifty million francs for France and eighty-five million francs for England. These enormous discrepancies are not accounted for."

The Right Honorable Reginald McKenna stated that:

"Study of the relations between changes in gold stock and movement in price levels shows what should be very obvious, but is by no means recognized, that the gold standard is in no sense automatic in operation. The gold standard can be, and is, usefully managed and controlled for the benefit of a small group of international traders."

In August 1929, the Federal Reserve Board raised the rate to six percent. The Bank of England in the next month raised its rate from five and one-half percent to six and one-half percent. Dr. Friday in the September, 1929, issue of Review of Reviews, could find no reason for the Board's action:

"The Federal Reserve statement for August 7, 1929, shows that signs of inadequacy for autumn requirements do not exist. Gold resources are considerably more than the previous year, and gold continues to move in, to the financial embarrassment of Germany and England. The reasons for the Board's action must be sought elsewhere. The public has been given only the hint that 'This problem has presented difficulties because of certain peculiar conditions'. Every reason which Governor Young advanced for lowering the bank rate last year exists now. Increasing the rate means that not only is there danger of drawing gold from abroad, but imports of the yellow metal have been in progress for the last four months. To do anything to accentuate this is to take the responsibility for bringing on a world-wide credit deflation."

Thus we find that not only was the Federal Reserve System responsible for the First World War, which it made possible by enabling the United States to finance the Allies, but its policies brought on the world-wide depression of 1929-31. Governor Adolph C. Miller stated at the Senate Investigation of the Federal Reserve Board in 1931 that:

"If we had had no Federal Reserve System, I do not think we would have had as bad a speculative situation as we had, to begin with."

Carter Glass replied, "You have made it clear that the Federal Reserve Board provided a terrific credit expansion by these open market transactions."

Emmanuel Goldenweiser said, "In 1928-29 the Federal Board was engaged in an attempt to restrain the rapid increase in security loans and in stock market speculation. The continuity of this policy of restraint, however, was interrupted by reduction in bill rates in the autumn of 1928 and the summer of 1929."

Both J.P. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb Co. had "preferred lists" of men to whom they sent advance announcements of profitable stocks. The men on these preferred lists were allowed to purchase these stocks at cost, that is, anywhere from 2 to 15 points a share less than they were sold to the public. The men on these lists were fellow bankers, prominent industrialists, powerful city politicians, national Committeemen of the Republican and Democratic Parties, and rulers of foreign countries. The men on these lists were notified of the coming crash and sold all but so-called gilt-edged stocks, General Motors, Dupont, etc. The prices on these stocks also sank to record lows, but they came up soon afterwards. How the big bankers operated in 1929 is revealed by a

Newsweek story on May 30, 1936, when a Roosevelt appointee, Ralph W. Morrison, resigned from the Federal Reserve Board:

"The consensus of opinion is that the Federal Reserve Board has lost an able man. He sold his Texas utilities stock to Insull for ten million dollars and in 1929 called a meeting and ordered his banks to close out all security loans by September 1. As a result, they rode through the depression with flying colors."

Predictably enough, all of the big bankers rode through the depression "with flying colors." The people who suffered were the workers and farmers who had invested their money in get-rich stocks, after the President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon, had persuaded them to do it.

There had been some warnings of the approaching crash in England, which American newspapers never saw. The London Statist on May 25, 1929 said:

"The banking authorities in the United States apparently want a business panic to curb speculation."

The London Economist on May 11, 1929, said:

"The events of the past year have seen the beginnings of a new technique, which, if maintained and developed, may succeed in 'rationing the speculator without injuring the trader.'"

Governor Charles S. Hamlin quoted this statement at the Senate hearings in 1931 and said, in corroboration of it:

"That was the feeling of certain members of the Board, to remove Federal Reserve credit from the speculator without injuring the trader."

Governor Hamlin did not bother to point out that the "speculators" he was out to break were the school-teachers and small town merchants who had put their savings into the stock market, or that the "traders" he was trying to protect were the big Wall Street operators, Bernard Baruch and Paul Warburg.

When the Federal Reserve Bank of New York raised its rate to six percent on August 9, 1929, market conditions began which culminated in tremendous selling orders from October 24 into November, which wiped out a hundred and sixty billion dollars worth of security values. That was a hundred and sixty billions which the American citizens had one month and did not have the next. Some idea of the calamity may be had if we remember that our enormous outlay of money and goods in the Second World War amounted to not much more than two hundred billions of dollars, and a great deal of that remained as negotiable securities in the national debt. The stock market crash is the greatest misfortune which the United States has ever suffered.

The Academy of Political Science of Columbia University in its annual meeting in January, 1930, held a post-mortem on the Crash of 1929. Vice-President Paul Warburg was to have presided, and Director Ogden Mills was to have played an important part in the discussion. However, these two gentlemen did not show up. Professor Oliver M.W. Sprague of Harvard University remarked of the crash:

"We have here a beautiful laboratory case of the stock market's dropping apparently from its own weight."

It was pointed out that there was no exhaustion of credit, as in 1893, nor any currency famine, as in the Panic of 1907, when clearing-house certificates were resorted to, nor a collapse of commodity prices, as in 1920. What then, had caused the crash? The people had purchased stocks at high prices and expected the prices to continue

to rise. The prices had to come down, and they did. It was obvious to the economists and bankers gathered over their brandy and cigars at the Hotel Astor that the people were at fault. Certainly the people had made a mistake in buying over-priced securities, but they had been talked into it by every leading citizen from the President of the United States on down. Every magazine of national circulation, every big newspaper, and every prominent banker, economist, and politician, had joined in the big confidence game of urging people to buy those over-priced securities. When the Federal Reserve Bank of New York raised its rate to six percent, in August 1929, people began to get out of the market, and it turned into a panic which drove the prices of securities down far below their natural levels. As in previous panics, this enabled both Wall Street and foreign operators in the know to pick up "blue-chip" and gilt-edged" securities for a fraction of their real value.

The Crash of 1929 also saw the formation of giant holding companies which picked up these cheap bonds and securities, such as the Marine Midland Corporation, the Lehman Corporation, and the Equity Corporation. In 1929 J.P. Morgan Company organized the giant food trust, Standard Brands. There was an unequalled opportunity for trust operators to enlarge and consolidate their holdings.

Emmanuel Goldenweiser, director of research for the Federal Reserve System, said, in 1947:

"It is clear in retrospect that the Board should have ignored the speculative expansion and allowed it to collapse of its own weight."

This admission of error eighteen years after the event was small comfort to the people who lost their savings in the Crash.

The Wall Street Crash of 1929 was the beginning of a world-wide credit deflation which lasted through 1932, and from which the Western democracies did not recover until they began to rearm for the Second World War. During this depression, the trust operators achieved further control by their backing of three international swindlers, The Van Sweringen brothers, Samuel Insull, and Ivar Kreuger. These men pyramided billions of dollars worth of securities to fantastic heights. The bankers who promoted them and floated their stock issue could have stopped them at any time, by calling loans of less than a million dollars, but they let these men go on until they had incorporated many industrial and financial properties into holding companies, which the banks then took over for nothing. Insull piled up public utility holdings throughout the Middle West, which the banks got for a fraction of their worth. Ivar Kreuger was backed by Lee Higginson Company, supposedly one of the nation's most reputable banking houses. The Saturday Evening Post called him "more than a financial titan", and the English review Fortnightly said, in an article written December 1931, under the title, "A Chapter in Constructive Finance": "It is as a financial irrigator that Kreuger has become of such vital importance to Europe." *

"Financial irrigator" we may remember, was the title bestowed upon Jacob Schiff by Newsweek Magazine, when it described how Schiff had bought up American railroads with Rothschild's money.

The New Republic remarked on January 25th, 1933, when it commented on the fact that Lee Higginson Company had handled Kreuger and Toll Securities on the American market:

"Three-quarters of a billion dollars was made away with. Who was able to dictate to the French police to keep secret the news of this extremely important suicide for some hours, during which somebody sold Kreuger securities in large amounts, thus getting out of the market before the debacle?"

The Federal Reserve Board could have checked the enormous credit expansion of Insull and Kreuger by investigating the security on which their loans were being made, but the Governors never made any examination of the activities of these men.

The modern bank with the credit facilities it affords, gives an opportunity which had not previously existed for such operators as Kreuger to make an appearance of abundant capital by the aid of borrowed capital. This enables the speculator to buy securities with securities. The only limit to the amount he can corner is the amount to which the banks will back him, and, if a speculator is being promoted by a reputable banking house, as Kreuger was promoted by Lee Higginson Company, the only way he could be stopped would be by an investigation of his actual financial resources, which in Kreuger's case would have proved to be nil.

The leader of the American people during the Crash of 1929 and the subsequent depression was Herbert Hoover. After the first break of the market (the five billion dollars in security values which disappeared on October 24, 1929) President Hoover said:

"The fundamental business of the country, that is, production and distribution of commodities, is on a sound and prosperous basis."

His Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon, stated on December 25, 1929, that:

"The Government's business is in sound condition."

His own business, the Aluminum Company of America, apparently was not doing so well, for he had reduced the wages of all employees by ten percent.

The New York Times reported on April 7, 1931, "Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, conferred with the Federal Reserve Board here today. Mellon, Meyer, and George L. Harrison, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, were present."

The London Connection had sent Norman over this time to ensure that the Great Depression was proceeding according to schedule. Congressman Louis McFadden had complained, as reported in The New York Times, July 4, 1930, "Commodity prices are being reduced to 1913 levels. Wages are being reduced by the labor surplus of four million unemployed. The Morgan control of the Federal Reserve System is exercised through control of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the mediocre representation and acquiescence of the Federal Reserve Board in Washington." As the depression deepened, the trust's lock on the American economy strengthened, but no finger was pointed at the parties who were controlling the system.

Chapter 13 — The 1930's

In 1930 Herbert Hoover appointed to the Federal Reserve Board an old friend from World War I days, Eugene Meyer, Jr., who had a long record of public service dating from 1915, when he went into partnership with Bernard Baruch in the Alaska-Juneau Gold Mining Company. Meyer had been a Special Advisor to the War Industries Board on Non-Ferrous Metals (gold, silver, etc.); Special Assistant to the Secretary of War on aircraft production; in 1917 he was appointed to the National Committee on War Savings, and was made Chairman of the War Finance Corporation from 1918-1926. He then was appointed chairman of the Federal Farm Loan Board from 1927-29. Hoover put him on the Federal Reserve Board in 1930, and Franklin D. Roosevelt created the Reconstruction Bank for Reconstruction and Development in 1936.

Meyer must have been a man of exceptional ability to hold so many important posts. However, there were some Senators who did not believe he should hold any Government office, because of his family background as an international gold dealer and his mysterious operations in billions of dollars of Government securities in the First World War. Consequently, the Senate held Hearings to determine whether Meyer ought to be on the Federal Reserve Board.

At these Hearings, Representative Louis T. McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, said:

"Eugene Meyer, Jr. has had his own crowd with him in the government since he started in 1917.

His War Finance Corporation personnel took over the Federal Farm Loan System, and almost immediately afterwards, the Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank and the Ohio Joint Stock Land Bank failed."

REPRESENTATIVE RAINEY: Mr. Meyer, when he nominally resigned as head of the Federal Farm Loan Board, did not really cease his activities there. He left behind him an able body of wreckers. They are continuing his policies and consulting with him. Before his appointment, he was frequently in consultation with Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Dewey. Just before his appointment, the Chicago Joint Land Stock Bank, the Dallas Joint Stock Land Bank, the Kansas City Joint Land Stock Bank, and the Des Moines Land Bank were all functioning. Their bonds were selling at par. The then farm commissioner had an understanding with Secretary Dewey that nothing would be done without the consent and approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board. A few days afterwards, United States Marshals, with pistols strapped at their sides, and sometimes with drawn pistols, entered these five banks and demanded that the banks be turned over to them. Word went out all over the United States, through the newspapers, as to what had happened, and these banks were ruined. This led to the breach with the old Federal Farm Loan Board, and to the resignation of three of its members, and the appointment of Mr. Meyer to be head of that Board.

SENATOR CAREY: Who authorized the marshals to take over the banks?

REP. RAINEY: Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Dewey. That started the ruin of all these rural banks, and the Gianninis bought them up in great numbers."

World's Work of February 1931, said:

"When the World War began for us in 1917, Mr. Eugene Meyer, Jr. was among the first to be called to Washington. In April, 1918, President Wilson named him Director of the War Finance Corporation. This corporation loaned out 700 million dollars to banking and financial institutions."

The Senate Hearings on Eugene Meyer, Jr. continued:

REPRESENTATIVE MCFADDEN: "Lazard Freres, the international banking house of New York and Paris, was a Meyer family banking house. It frequently figures in imports and exports of gold, and one of the important functions of the Federal Reserve System has to do with gold movements in the maintenance of its own operations. In looking over the minutes of the hearing we had last Thursday, Senator Fletcher had asked Mr. Meyer, 'Have you any connections with international banking?' Mr. Meyer had answered, 'Me? Not personally.' This last question and answer do not appear in the stenographic transcript. Senator Fletcher remembers asking the question and the answer. It is an odd omission.

SENATOR BROOKHART: I understand that Mr. Meyer looked it over for corrections.

REPRESENTATIVE MCFADDEN: Mr. Meyer is a brother-in-law of George Blumenthal, a member of the firm of J.P. Morgan Company, which represents the Rothschild interests. He also is a liaison officer between the French Government and J.P. Morgan. Edmund Platt, who had eight years to go on a term of ten years as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, resigned to make room for Mr. Meyer. Platt was given a Vice-Presidency of Marine Midland Corporation by Meyer's brother-in-law Alfred A. Cook. Eugene Meyer, Jr. as head of the War Finance Corporation, engaged in the placing of two billion dollars in Government securities,

placed many of those orders first with the banking house now located at 14 Wall Street in the name of Eugene Meyer, Jr. Mr. Meyer is now a large stockholder in the Allied Chemical Corporation. I call your attention to House Report No. 1635, 68th Congress, 2nd Session, which reveals that at least twenty-four million dollars in bonds were duplicated. Ten billion dollars worth of bonds surreptitiously destroyed. Our committee on Banking and Currency found the records of the War Finance Corporation under Eugene Meyer, Jr. extremely faulty. While the books were being brought before our committee by the people who were custodians of them and taken back to the Treasury at night, the committee discovered that alterations were being made in the permanent records."

The record of public service did not prevent Eugene Meyer, Jr. from continuing to serve the American people on the Federal Reserve Board, as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and as head of the International Bank.

President Rand, of the Marine Midland Corporation, questioned about his sudden desire for the services of Edmund Platt, said:

"We pay Mr. Platt \$22,000 a year, and we took his secretary over, of course." This meant another five thousand a year.

Senator Brookhart showed that Eugene Meyer, Jr. administered the Federal Farm Loan Board against the interests of the American farmer, saying:

"Mr. Meyer never loaned more than 180 million dollars of the capital stock of 500 million dollars of the farm loan board, so that in aiding the farmers he was not even able to use half of the capital."

MR. MEYER: Senator Kenyon wrote me a letter which showed that I cooperated with great advantage to the people of Iowa.

SENATOR BROOKHART: "You went out and took the opposite side from the Wall Street crowd. They always send somebody out to do that. I have not yet discovered in your statements much interest in making loans to the farmers at large, or any real effort to help their condition. In your two years as head of the Federal Farm Loan Board you made very few loans compared to your capital. You loaned only one-eighth of the demand, according to your own statement."

Despite the damning evidence uncovered at these Senate Hearings, Eugene Meyer, Jr. remained on the Federal Reserve Board.

During this tragic period, chairman Louis McFadden of the House Banking and Currency Committee continued his lone crusade against the "London Connection" which had wrecked the nation. On June 10, 1932, McFadden addressed the House of Representatives:

"Some people think the Federal Reserve banks are United States Government institutions. They are not government institutions. They are private credit monopolies which prey upon the people of the United States for the benefit of themselves and their foreign customers. The Federal Reserve banks are the agents of the foreign central banks. Henry Ford has said, 'The one aim of these financiers is world control by the creation of inextinguishable debts.' The truth is the Federal Reserve Board has usurped the Government of the United States by the arrogant credit monopoly which operates the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Banks."

On January 13, 1932, McFadden had introduced a resolution indicting the Federal Reserve Board of Governors for "Criminal Conspiracy": /p>

"Whereas I charge them, jointly and severally, with the crime of having treasonably conspired and acted against the peace and security of the United States and having treasonably conspired to destroy constitutional government in the United States. Resolved, that the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized and directed as a whole or by subcommittee to investigate the official conduct of the Federal Reserve Board and agents to determine whether, in the opinion of the said committee, they have been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor which in the contemplation of the Constitution requires the interposition of the Constitutional powers of the House."

No action was taken on this Resolution. McFadden came back on December 13, 1932 with a motion to impeach President Herbert Hoover. Only five Congressmen stood with him on this, and the resolution failed. The Republican majority leader of the House remarked, "Louis T. McFadden is now politically dead."

On May 23, 1933, McFadden introduced House Resolution No. 158, Articles of Impeachment against the Secretary of the Treasury, two Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, and officers and directors of the Federal Reserve Banks for their guilt and collusion in causing the Great Depression. "I charge them with having unlawfully taken over 80 billion dollars from the United States Government in the year 1928, the said unlawful taking consisting of the unlawful recreation of claims against the United States Treasury to the extent of over 80 billion dollars in the year 1928, and in each year subsequent, and by having robbed the United States Government and the people of the United States by their theft and sale of the gold reserve of the United States."

The Resolution never reached the floor. A whispering campaign that McFadden was insane swept Washington, and in the next Congressional elections, he was overwhelmingly defeated by thousands of dollars poured into his home district of Canton, Pennsylvania.

In 1932, the American people elected Franklin D. Roosevelt President of the United States. This was hailed as the freeing of the American people from the evil influence which had brought on the Great Depression, the ending of Wall Street domination, and the disappearance of the banker from Washington.

Roosevelt owed his political career to a fortuitous circumstance. As Assistant Secretary of the Navy during World War I, because of old school ties, he had intervened to prevent prosecution of a large ring of homosexuals in the Navy which included several Groton and Harvard chums. This brought him to the favorable appreciation of a wealthy international homosexual set which travelled back and forth between New York and Paris, and which was presided over by Bessie Marbury, of a very old and prominent New York family. Bessie's "wife", who lived with her for a number of years, was Elsie de Wolfe, later Lady Mendl in a "mariage de convenance", the arbiter of the international set. They recruited J.P. Morgan's youngest daughter, Anne Morgan, into their circle, and used her fortune to restore the Villa Trianon in Paris, which became their headquarters. During World War I, it was used as a hospital. Bessie Marbury expected to be awarded the Legion of Honor by the French Government as a reward, but J.P. Morgan, Jr., who despised her for corrupting his youngest sister, requested the French Government to withhold the award, which they did. Smarting from this rebuff, Bessie Marbury threw herself into politics, and became a power in the Democratic National Party. She had also recruited Eleanor Roosevelt into her circle, and, during a visit to Hyde Park, Eleanor confided that she was desperate to find something for "poor Franklin" to do, as he was confined to a wheelchair, and was very depressed.

"I know what we'll do," exclaimed Bessie, "We'll run him for Governor of New York!" Because of her power, she succeeded in this goal, and Roosevelt later became President.

One of the men Roosevelt brought down from New York with him as a Special Advisor to the Treasury was Earl Bailie of J & W Seligman Company, who had become notorious as the man who handed the \$415,000 bribe to Juan Leguia, son of the President of Peru, in order to get the President to accept a loan from J & W Seligman Company. There was a great deal of criticism of this appointment, and Mr. Roosevelt, in keeping with his new role as defender of the people, sent Earl Bailie back to bringing in New York.

Franklin D. Roosevelt himself was an international banker of ill repute, having floated large issues of foreign bonds in this country in the 1920s. These bonds defaulted, and our citizens lost millions of dollars, but they still wanted Mr. Roosevelt as President. The New York Directory of Directors lists Mr. Roosevelt as President and Director of United European Investors, Ltd., in 1923 and 1924, which floated many millions of German marks in this country, all of which defaulted. Poor's Directory of Directors lists him as a director of The International Germanic Trust Company in 1928. Franklin D. Roosevelt was also an advisor to the Federal International Banking Corporation, an Anglo-American outfit dealing in foreign securities in the United States.

Roosevelt's law firm of Roosevelt and O'Connor during the 1920s represented many international corporations. His law partner, Basil O'Connor, was a director in the following corporations:

Cuban-American Manganese Corporation, Venezuela-Mexican Oil Corporation, West Indies Sugar Corporation, American Reserve Insurance Corporation, Warm Springs Foundation. He was director in other corporations, and later head of the American Red Cross.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt took office as President of the United States, he appointed as Director of the Budget James Paul Warburg, son of Paul Warburg, and Vice President of the International Acceptance Bank and other corporations. Roosevelt appointed as Secretary of the Treasury W.H. Woodin, one of the biggest industrialists in the country, Director of the American Car Foundry Company and numerous other locomotive works, Remington Arms, The Cuba Company, Consolidated Cuba Railroads, and other big corporations. Woodin was later replaced by Henry Morgenthau, Jr., son of the Harlem real estate operator who had helped put Woodrow Wilson in the White House. With such a crew as this, Roosevelt's promises of radical social changes showed little likelihood of fulfillment. One of the first things he did was to declare a bankers' moratorium, to help the bankers get their records in order.

World's Work says:

"Congress has left Charles G. Dawes and Eugene Meyer, Jr. free to appraise, by their own methods, the security which prospective borrowers of the two billion dollar capital may offer."

Roosevelt also set up the Securities Exchange Commission, to see to it that no new faces got into the Wall Street gang, which caused the following colloquy in Congress:

REPRESENTATIVE WOLCOTT: At hearings before this committee in 1933, the economists showed us charts which proved beyond all doubt that the dollar value commodities followed the price level of gold. It did not, did it?

LEON HENDERSON: No.

REPRESENTATIVE GIFFORD: Wasn't Joe Kennedy put in [as Chairman of the Securities Exchange Committee] by President Roosevelt because he was sympathetic with big business?

LEON HENDERSON: I think so.

Paul Einzig pointed out in 1935 that:

"President Roosevelt was the first to declare himself openly in favor of a monetary policy aiming at a deliberately engineered rise in prices. In a negative sense his policy was successful. Between 1933 and 1935 he succeeded in reducing private indebtedness, but this was done at the cost of increasing public indebtedness."

In other words, he eased the burden of debts off of the rich onto the poor, since the rich are few and the poor many.

Senator Robert L. Owen, testifying before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in 1938, said:

"I wrote into the bill which was introduced by me in the Senate on June 26, 1913, a provision that the powers of the System should be employed to promote a stable price level, which meant a dollar of stable purchasing, debt-paying power. It was stricken out. The powerful money interests got control of the Federal Reserve Board through Mr. Paul Warburg, Mr. Albert Strauss, and Mr. Adolph C. Miller and they were able to have that secret meeting of May 18, 1920, and bring about a contraction of credit so violent it threw five million people out of employment. In 1920 that Reserve Board deliberately caused the Panic of 1921. The same people, unrestrained in the stock market, expanding credit to a great excess between 1926 and 1929, raised the price of stocks to a fantastic point where they could not possibly earn dividends, and when the people realized this, they tried to get out, resulting in the Crash of October 24, 1929."

Senator Owen did not go into the question of whether the Federal Reserve Board could be held responsible to the public. Actually, they cannot. They are public officials who are appointed by the President, but their salaries are paid by the private stockholders of the Federal Reserve Banks.

Governor W.P.G. Harding of the Federal Reserve Board testified in 1921 that:

"The Federal Reserve Bank is an institution owned by the stockholding member banks. The Government has not a dollar's worth of stock in it."

However, the Government does give the Federal Reserve System the use of its billions of dollars of credit, and this gives the Federal Reserve its characteristic of a central bank, the power to issue currency on the Government's credit. We do not have Federal Government notes or gold certificates as currency. We have Federal Reserve Bank notes, issued by the Federal Reserve Banks, and every dollar they print is a dollar in their pocket.

W. Randolph Burgess, of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, stated before the Academy of Political Science in 1930 that:

"In its major principles of operation the Federal Reserve System is no different from other banks of issue, such as the Bank of England, the Bank of France, or the Reichsbank."

All of these central banks have the power of issuing currency in their respective countries. Thus, the people do not own their own money in Europe, nor do they own it here. It is privately printed for private profit. The people have no sovereignty over their money, and it has developed that they have no sovereignty over other major political issues such as foreign policy.

As a central bank of issue, the Federal Reserve System has behind it all the enormous wealth of the American people. When it began operations in 1913, it created a serious threat to the central banks of the impoverished countries of Europe. Because it represented this great wealth, it attracted far more gold than was desirable in the

1920s, and it was apparent that soon all of the world's gold would be piled up in this country. This would make the gold standard a joke in Europe, because they would have no gold over there to back their issue of money and credit. It was the Federal Reserve's avowed aim in 1927, after the secret meeting with the heads of the foreign central banks, to get large quantities of that gold sent back to Europe, and its methods of doing so, the low interest rate and heavy purchases of Government securities, which created vast sums of new money, intensified the stock market speculation and made the stock market crash and resultant depression a national disaster.

Since the Federal Reserve System was guilty of causing this disaster, we might suppose that they would have tried to alleviate it. However, through the dark years of 1931 and 1932, the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board saw the plight of the American people worsening and did nothing to help them. This was more criminal than the original plotting of the Depression. Anyone who lived through those years in this country remembers the widespread unemployment, the misery, and the hunger of our people. At any time during those years the Federal Reserve Board could have acted to relieve this situation.

The problem was to get some money back into circulation. So much of the money normally used to pay rent and food bills had been sucked into Wall Street that there was no money to carry on the business of living. In many areas, people printed their own money on wood and paper for use in their communities, and this money was good, since it represented obligations to each other which people fulfilled.

The Federal Reserve System was a central bank of issue. It had the power to, and did, when it suited its owners, issue millions of dollars of money. Why did it not do so in 1931 and 1932? The Wall Street bankers were through with Mr. Herbert Hoover, and they wanted Franklin D. Roosevelt to come in on a wave of glory as the saviour of the nation. Therefore, the American people had to starve and suffer until March of 1933, when the White Knight came riding in with his crew of Wall Street bribers and put some money into circulation. That was all there was to it. As soon as Mr. Roosevelt took office, the Federal Reserve began to buy Government securities at the rate of ten million dollars a week for ten weeks, and created a hundred million dollars in new money, which alleviated the critical famine of money and credit, and the factories started hiring people again.

During the Roosevelt Administration, The Federal Reserve Board, insofar as the public was concerned, was Marriner Eccles, an emulator and admirer of "the Chief". Eccles was a Utah banker, President of the First Securities Corporation, a family investment trust consisting of a number of banks which Eccles had picked up cheap during the Agricultural Depression of 1920-21. Eccles also was a director of such corporations as Pet Milk Company, Mountain States Implement Company, and Amalgamated Sugar. As a big banker, Eccles fitted in well with the group of powerful men who were operating Roosevelt.

There was some discussion in Congress as to whether Eccles ought to be on the Federal Reserve Board at the same time he had all of these banks in Utah, but he testified that he had very little to do with the First Securities Corporation besides being President of it, and so he was confirmed as Chairman of the Board.

Eugene Meyer, Jr. now resigned from the Board to spend more of his time lending the two billion dollar capital of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and determining the value of collateral by his own methods.

The Banking Act of 1935, which greatly increased Roosevelt's power over the nation's finances, was an integral part of the legislation by which he proposed to extend his reign in the United States. It was not opposed by the people as was the National Recovery Act, because it was not so naked an infringement of their liberties. It was, however, an important measure. First of all, it extended the terms of office of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors to fourteen years, or, three and a half times the length of a Presidential term. This meant that a President assuming office who might be hostile to the Board could not appoint a majority to it who would be

favorable to him. Thus, a monetary policy inaugurated before a President came into the White House would go on regardless of his wishes.

The Banking Act of 1935 also repealed the clause of the Glass-Steagall Banking Act of 1933, which had provided that a banking house could not be on the Stock Exchange and also be involved in investment banking. This clause was a good one, since it prevented a banking house from lending money to a corporation which it owned. Still it is to be remembered that this clause covered up some other provisions in that Act, such as the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, providing insurance money to the amount of 150 million dollars, to guarantee fifteen billion dollars worth of deposits. This increased the power of the big bankers over small banks and gave them another excuse to investigate them. The Banking Act of 1933 also legislated that all earnings of the Federal Reserve Banks must by law go to the banks themselves. At last the provision in the Act that the Government share in the profits was gotten rid of. It had never been observed, and the increase in the assets of the Federal Reserve Banks from 143 million dollars in 1913 to 45 billion dollars in 1949 went entirely to the private stockholders of the banks. Thus, the one constructive provision of the Banking Act of 1933 was repealed in 1935, and also the Federal Reserve Banks were now permitted to loan directly to industry, competing with the member banks, who could not hope to match their capacity in arranging large loans.

When the provision that banks could not be involved in investment banking and operate on the Stock Exchange was repealed in 1935, Carter Glass, originator of that provision, was asked by reporters:

"Does that mean that J.P. Morgan can go back into investment banking?"

"Well, why not?" replied Senator Glass. "There has been an outcry all over the country that the banks will not make loans. Now the Morgans can go back to underwriting."

Because that provision was unfavorable to them, the bankers had simply clamped down on making loans until it was repealed.

Newsweek of March 14, 1936, noted that:

"The Federal Reserve Board fired nine chairmen of Reserve Banks, explaining that 'it intended to make the chairmanships of the Reserve Banks largely a part-time job on an honorary basis.'"

This was another instance of the centralization of control in the Federal Reserve System. The regional district system had never been an important factor in the administration of monetary policy, and the Board was not cutting down on its officials outside of Washington. The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency had asked, during the Gold Reserve Hearings of 1934:

"Is it not true, Governor Young, that the Secretary of the Treasury for the past twelve years has dominated the policy of the Federal Reserve Banks and the Federal Reserve Board with respect to the purchase of United States bonds?"

Governor Young had denied this, but it had already been brought out that on both of his hurried trips to this country in 1927 and 1929 to dictate Federal Reserve policy, Governor Montagu Norman of the Bank of England had gone directly to Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, to get him to purchase Government securities on the open market and start the movement of gold out of this country back to Europe.

The Gold Reserve Hearings had also brought in other people who had more than a passing interest in the operations of the Federal Reserve System. James Paul Warburg, just back from the London Economic Conference with Professor O.M.W. Sprague and Henry L. Stimson, came in to declare that he thought we ought

to modernize the gold standard. Frank Vanderlip suggested that we do away with the Federal Reserve Board and set up a Federal Monetary Authority. This would have made no difference to the New York bankers, who would have selected the personnel anyway. And Senator Robert L. Owen, longtime critic of the system, made the following statement:

"The people did not know the Federal Reserve Banks were organized for profit-making. They were intended to stabilize the credit and currency supply of the country. That end has not been accomplished. Indeed, there has been the most remarkable variation in the purchasing power of money since the System went into effect. The Federal Reserve men are chosen by the big banks, through discreet little campaigns, and they naturally follow the ideals which are portrayed to them as the soundest from a financial point of view."

Benjamin Anderson, economist for the Chase National Bank of New York, said:

"At the moment, 1934, we have 900 million dollars excess reserves. In 1924, with increased reserves of 300 million, you got some three or four billion in bank expansion of credit very quickly. That extra money was put out by the Federal Reserve Banks in 1924 through buying government securities and was the cause of the rapid expansion of bank credit. The banks continued to get excess reserves because more gold came in, and because, whenever there was a slackening, the Federal Reserve people would put out some more. They held back a bit in 1926.

Things firmed up a bit that year. And then in 1927 they put out less than 300 million additional reserves, set the wild stock market going, and that led us right into the smash of 1929."

Dr. Anderson also stated that:

"The money of the Federal Reserve Banks is money they created. When they buy Government securities they create reserves. They pay for the Government securities by giving checks on themselves, and those checks come to the commercial banks and are by them deposited in the Federal Reserve Banks, and then money exists which did not exist before."

SENATOR BULKLEY: It does not increase the circulating medium at all?

ANDERSON: No.

This is an explanation of the manner in which the Federal Reserve Banks increased their assets from 143 million dollars to 45 billion dollars in thirty-five years. They did not produce anything, they were non-productive enterprises, and yet they had this enormous profit, merely by creating money, 95 percent of it in the form of credit, which did not add to the circulating medium. It was not distributed among the people in the form of wages, nor did it increase the buying power of the farmers and workers. It was credit-money created by bankers for the use and profit of bankers, who increased their wealth by more than forty billion dollars in a few years because they had obtained control of the Government's credit in 1913 by passing the Federal Reserve Act.

Marriner Eccles also had much to say about the creation of money. He considered himself an economist, and had been brought into the Government service by Stuart Chase and Rexford Guy Tugwell, two of Roosevelt's early brain-trusters. Eccles was the only one of the Roosevelt crowd who stayed in office throughout his administration.

Before the House Banking and Currency Committee on June 24, 1941, Governor Eccles said:

"Money is created out of the right to issue credit-money."

Turning over the Government's credit to private bankers in 1913 gave them unlimited opportunities to create money. The Federal Reserve System could also destroy money in large quantities through open market operations. Eccles said, at the Silver Hearings of 1939:

"When you sell bonds on the open market, you extinguish reserves."

Extinguishing reserves means wiping out a basis for money and credit issue, or, tightening up on money and credit, a condition which is usually even more favorable to bankers than the creation of money. Calling in or destroying money gives the banker immediate and unlimited control of the financial situation, since he is the only one with money and the only one with the power to issue money in a time of money shortage. The money panics of 1873, 1893, 1920-21, and 1929-31, were characterized by a drawing in of the circulating medium. In economical terms, this does not sound like such a terrible thing, but when it means that people do not have money to pay their rent or buy food, and when it means that an employer has to lay off three-fourths of his help because he cannot borrow the money to pay them, the enormous guilt of the bankers and the long record of suffering and misery for which they are responsible would suggest that no punishment might be too severe for their crimes against their fellowmen.

On September 30, 1940, Governor Eccles said:

"If there were no debts in our money system, there would be no money."

This is an accurate statement about our money system. Instead of money being created by the production of the people, the annual increase in goods and services, it is created by the bankers out of the debts of the people. Because it is inadequate, it is subject to great fluctuations and is basically unstable. These fluctuations are also a source of great profit. For that reason, the Federal Reserve Board has consistently opposed any legislation which attempts to stabilize the monetary system. Its position has been set forth definitively in Chairman Eccles' letter to Senator Wagner on March 9, 1939, and the Memorandum issued by the Board on March 13, 1939.

Chairman Eccles wrote that:

". . . you are advised that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System does not favor the enactment of Senate Bill No. 31, a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, or any other legislation of this general character."

The Memorandum of the Board stated, in its "Memorandum on Proposals to maintain prices at fixed levels":

"The Board of Governors opposes any bill which proposes a stable price level, on the grounds that prices do not depend primarily on the price or cost of money; that the Board's control over money cannot be made complete; and that steady average prices, even if obtainable by official action, would not insure lasting prosperity."

Yet William McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Board of Governors in 1952, said before the Subcommittee on Debt Control, the Patman Committee, on March 10, 1952 that "One of the fundamental purposes of the Federal Reserve Act is to protect the value of the dollar."

Senator Flanders questioned him: "Is that specifically stated in the original legislation setting up the Federal Reserve System?"

"No," replied Mr. Martin, "but it is inherent in the entire legislative history and in the surrounding circumstances."

Senator Robert L. Owen has told us how it was taken out of the original legislation against his will, and that the Board of Governors has opposed such legislation. Apparently Mr. Martin does not know this.

Steady average prices, indeed, are impossible so long as we have the speculators on the stock exchange driving prices up and down in order to reap profits for themselves. Despite Governor Eccles' insistence that steady average prices would not insure lasting prosperity, they could do much to bring about this condition. A man on a yearly wage of \$2,500 is not more prosperous if the price of bread increases five cents a loaf during the year.

In 1935, Eccles said before the House Committee on Banking and Currency:

"The Government controls the gold reserve, that is, the power to issue money and credit, thus largely regulating the price structure."

This is an almost direct contradiction of Eccles' statement in 1939 that prices do not depend, primarily, on the price or cost of money.

In 1935, Governor Eccles stated before the House Committee:

"The Federal Reserve Board has the power of open market operations. Open-market operations are the most important single instrument of control over the volume and cost of credit in this country. When I say "credit" in this connection, I mean money, because by far the largest part of money in use by the people of this country is in the form of bank credit or bank deposits. When the Federal Reserve Banks buy bills or securities in the open market, they increase the volume of the people's money and lower its cost; and when they sell in the open market they decrease the volume of money and increase its cost. Authority over these operations, which affect the welfare of the whole people, must be invested in a body representing the national interest."

Governor Eccles testimony exposes the heart of the money machine which Paul Warburg revealed to his incredulous fellow bankers at Jekyll Island in 1910. Most Americans comment that they cannot understand how the Federal Reserve System operates. It remains beyond understanding, not because it is complex, but because it is so simple. If a confidence man comes up to you and offers to demonstrate his marvelous money machine, you watch while he puts in a blank piece of paper, and cranks out a \$100 bill. That is the Federal Reserve System. You then offer to buy this marvelous money machine, but you cannot. It is owned by the private stockholders of the Federal Reserve Banks, whose identities can be traced partially, but not completely, to "the London Connection."

At the House Banking and Currency Committee Hearings on June 6, 1960, Congressman Wright Patman, Chairman, questioned Carl E. Allen, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. (p. 4).

PATMAN: "Now Mr. Allen, when the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee buys a million dollar bond you create the money on the credit of the Nation to pay for that bond, don't you?"

ALLEN: That is correct.

PATMAN: And the credit of the Nation is represented by Federal Reserve Notes in that case, isn't it? If the banks want the actual money, you give Federal Reserve notes in payment, don't you?"

ALLEN: That could be done, but nobody wants the Federal Reserve notes.

PATMAN: Nobody wants them, because the banks would rather have the credit as reserves."

This is the most incredible part of the Federal Reserve operation and one which is difficult for anyone to understand. How can any American citizen grasp the concept that there are people in this country who have the power to make an entry in a ledger that the government of the United States now owes them one billion dollars, and to collect the principal and interest on this "loan"?

Congressman Wright Patman tells us in "The Primer of Money", p. 38 of going into a Federal Reserve Bank and asking to see their bonds on which the American people are paying interest. After being shown the bonds, he asked to see their cash, but they only had some ledgers and blank checks. Patman says,

"The cash, in truth, does not exist and has never existed. What we call 'cash reserves' are simply bookkeeping credits entered upon ledgers of the Federal Reserve Banks. The credits are created by the Federal Reserve Banks and then passed along through the banking system."

Peter L. Bernstein, in A Primer On Money, Banking and Gold says:

"The trick in the Federal Reserve notes is that the Federal reserve banks lose no cash when they pay out this currency to the member banks. Federal Reserve notes are not redeemable in anything except what the Government calls 'legal tender'--that is, money that a creditor must be willing to accept from a debtor in payment of sums owed him. But since all Federal Reserve notes are themselves declared by law to be legal money, they are really redeemable only in themselves . . . they are an irredeemable obligation issued by the Federal Reserve Banks." ⁹¹

As Congressman Patman puts it,

"The dollar represents a one dollar debt to the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve Banks create money out of thin air to buy Government bonds from the United States Treasury, lending money into circulation at interest, by bookkeeping entries of checkbook credit to the United States Treasury. The Treasury writes up an interest bearing bond for one billion dollars. The Federal Reserve gives the Treasury a one billion dollar credit for the bond, and has created out of nothing a one billion dollar debt which the American people are obligated to pay with interest." (Money Facts, House Banking and Currency Committee, 1964, p. 9)

Patman

continues,

"Where does the Federal Reserve system get the money with which to create Bank Reserves?"

Answer. It doesn't get the money, it creates it. When the Federal Reserve writes a check, it is creating money. The Federal Reserve is a total moneymaking machine. It can issue money or checks."

In 1951, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York published a pamphlet, "A Day's Work at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York." On page 22, we find that:

"There is still another and more important element of public interest in the operation of banks besides the safekeeping of money; banks can 'create' money. One of the most important factors to remember in this connection is that the supply of money affects the general level of prices--the cost of living. The Cost of Living Index and money supply are parallel."

The decisions of the Federal Reserve Board, or rather, the decisions which they are told to make by "parties unknown", affect the daily lives of every American by the effect of these decisions on prices. Raising the interest rate, or causing money to become "dearer" acts to limit the amount of money available in the market, as does the raising of reserve requirements by the Federal Reserve System. Selling bonds by the Open Market Committee also extinguishes and lowers the money supply. Buying government securities on the open market

"creates" more money, as does lowering the interest rate and making money "cheaper". It is axiomatic that an increase in the money supply brings prosperity, and that a decrease in the money supply brings on a depression. Dramatic increases in the money which outstrip the supply of goods brings on inflation, "too much money chasing too few goods". A more esoteric aspect of the monetary system is "velocity of circulation", which sounds much more technical than it is. This is the speed at which money changes hands; if it is gold buried in the peasant's garden, that is a slow velocity of circulation, caused by a lack of confidence in the economy or the nation. Very rapid velocity of circulation, such as the stock market boom of the late 1920s, means quick turnover, spending and investment of money, and it stems from confidence, or overconfidence, in the economy. With a high velocity of circulation, a smaller money supply circulates among as many people and goods as a larger money supply would circulate with a slower velocity of circulation. We mention this because the velocity of circulation, or confidence in the economy, also is greatly affected by the Federal Reserve actions. Milton Friedman comments in Newsweek, May 2, 1983, "The Federal Reserve's major function is to determine the money supply. It has the power to increase or decrease the money supply at any rate it chooses."

This is an enormous power, because increasing the money supply can cause the re-election of an administration, while decreasing it can cause an administration to be defeated. Friedman goes on to criticize the Federal Reserve, "How is it that an institution which has so poor a record of performance nevertheless has so high a public reputation and even commands a considerable measure of credibility for its forecasts?"

All open market transactions, which affect the money supply, are conducted for a single System account by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York on the behalf of all the Federal Reserve Banks, and supervised by an officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The conferences at which decisions are made to buy or sell securities by the Open Market Committee remain closed to the public, and the deliberations also remain a mystery. On May 8, 1928, The New York Times reported that Adolph C. Miller, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee, stated that open market purchases and rediscount rates were established through "conversations". At that time, the purchases on the open market amounted to seventy or eighty million dollars a day, and would be ten times that today. These are vast sums to be manipulated on the basis of mere "conversations", but that is as much information as we can obtain.

Because of these mysterious transactions which affect the life, liberty and happiness of every American citizen, there have been numerous proposals such as Senate Document No. 23, presented by Mr. Logan on January 24, 1939, that "The Government should create, issue and circulate all the currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of the consumers. The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of Government, but it is the Government's greatest creative opportunity."

On March 21, 1960, Congressman Wright Patman used a simple illustration in the Congressional Record of how banks "create money".

"If I deposit \$100 with my bank and the reserve requirements imposed by the Federal Reserve Bank are 20% then the bank can make a loan to John Doe of up to \$80. Where does the \$80 come from? It does not come out of my deposit of \$100; on the contrary, the bank simply credits John Doe's account with \$80. The bank can acquire Government obligations by the same procedure, by simply creating deposits to the credit of the government. Money creating is a power of the commercial banks . . . Since 1917 the Federal Reserve has given the private banks forty-six billion dollars of reserves."

How this is done is best revealed by Governor Eccles at Hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on June 24, 1941:

ECCLES: "The banking system as a whole creates and extinguishes the deposits as they make loans and investments, whether they buy Government Bonds or whether they buy utility bonds or whether they make Farmer's loans.

MR. PATMAN: I am thoroughly in accord with what you say, Governor, but the fact remains that they created the money, did they not?

ECCLES: Well, the banks create money when they make loans and investments."

On September 30, 1941, before the same Committee, Governor Eccles was asked by Representative Patman:

"How did you get the money to buy those two billion dollars worth of Government securities in 1933?

ECCLES: We created it.

MR. PATMAN: Out of what?

ECCLES: Out of the right to issue credit money.

MR. PATMAN: And there is nothing behind it, is there, except our Government's credit?

ECCLES: That is what our money system is. If there were no debts in our money system, there wouldn't be any money."

On June 17, 1942, Governor Eccles was interrogated by Mr. Dewey.

ECCLES: "I mean the Federal Reserve, when it carries out an open market operation, that is, if it purchases Government securities in the open market, it puts new money into the hands of the banks which creates idle deposits.

DEWEY: There are no excess reserves to use for this purpose?

ECCLES: Whenever the Federal Reserve System buys Government securities in the open market, or buys them direct from the Treasury, either one, that is what it does.

DEWEY: What are you going to use to buy them with? You are going to create credit?

ECCLES: That is all we have ever done. That is the way the Federal Reserve System operates.

The Federal Reserve System creates money. It is a bank of issue."

At the House Hearing of 1947, Mr. Kolburn asked Mr. Eccles:

"What do you mean by monetization of the public debt?

ECCLES: I mean the bank creating money by the purchase of Government securities. All is created by debt--either private or public debt.

FLETCHER: Chairman Eccles, when do you think there is a possibility of returning to a free and open market, instead of this pegged and artificially controlled financial market we now have?

ECCLES: Never. Not in your lifetime or mine."

Congressman Jerry Voorhis is quoted in U.S. News, August 31, 1959, as questioning Secretary of Treasury Anderson, "Do you mean that Banks, in buying Government securities, do not lend out their customers' deposits? That they create the money they use to buy the securities?"

ANDERSON: That is correct.

Banks are different from other lending institutions. When a savings association, an insurance company, or a credit union makes a loan, it lends the very dollar that its customers have previously paid in. But when a bank makes a loan, it simply adds to the borrower's deposit account in the bank by the amount of the loan. The money is not taken from anyone. It is new money, recreated by the bank, for the use of the borrower."

Strangely enough, there has never been a court trial on the legality or Constitutionality of the Federal Reserve Act. Although it is on much the same shaky grounds as the National Recovery Act, or NRA, which was challenged in *Schechter Poultry v. United States of America*, 29 U.S. 495, 55 US 837.842 (1935), the NRA was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court on the grounds that "Congress may not abdicate or transfer to others its legitimate functions. Congress cannot Constitutionally delegate its legislative authority to trade or industrial associations or groups so as to empower them to make laws."

Article 1, Sec. 8 of the Constitution provides that "The Congress shall have power to borrow money on the credit of the United States . . . and to coin Money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures." According to the NRA decision, Congress cannot delegate this power to the Federal Reserve System, nor can it delegate its legislative authority to the Federal Reserve System to allow the System to fix the rate of bank reserves, the rediscount rate, or the volume of money. All of these are "legislated" by the Federal Reserve Board, meeting in legislative sessions to determine these matters and to issue "laws" or regulations fixing them.

The Second World War gave the big bankers who owned the Federal Reserve System a chance to unload on the country billions of dollars printed early in 1930, in the biggest counterfeiting operation in history, all legalized by Roosevelt's government, of course. Henry Hazlitt writes in the January 4, 1943 issue of *Newsweek Magazine*:

"The money that began to appear in circulation a week ago, December 21, 1942, was really printing press money in the fullest sense of the term, that is, money which has no collateral of any kind behind it. The Federal Reserve statement that 'The Board of Governors, after consultation with the Treasury Department, has authorized Federal Reserve Banks to utilize at this time the existing stocks of currency printed in the early thirties, known as 'Federal Reserve Banknotes'. We repeat, these notes have absolutely no collateral of any kind behind them."

Governor Eccles also testified to some other interesting matters of the Federal Reserve and war finance at the Senate Hearings on the Office of Price Administration in 1944:

"The currency in circulation was increased from seven billion dollars in four years to twenty-one and a half billion. We are losing some considerable amounts of gold during the war period. As our exports have gone out, largely on a lend-lease basis, we have taken imports on which we have given dollar balances. These countries are now drawing off these dollar balances in the form of gold.

MR. SMITH: Governor Eccles, what is the objective that the foreign governments are after in this projected program whereby we would contribute gold to an international fund?

GOVERNOR ECCLES: I would like to discuss OPA, and leave the stabilization fund for a time when I am prepared to go into it.

MR. SMITH: Just a minute. I feel that this fund is very pertinent to what we are talking about today.

MR. FORD: I believe that the stabilization fund is entirely off the OPA and consequently we ought to stick to the business at hand."

The Congressmen never did get to discuss the Stabilization Fund, another setup whereby we would give the impoverished countries of Europe back the gold which had been sent over here. In 1945, Henry Hazlitt, commenting in Newsweek of January 22, on Roosevelt's annual budget message to Congress, quoted Roosevelt as saying:

"I shall later recommend legislation reducing the present high gold reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve Banks."

Hazlitt pointed out that the reserve requirement was not high, it was just what it had been for the past thirty years. Roosevelt's purpose was to free more gold from the Federal Reserve System and make it available for the Stabilization Fund, later called the International Monetary Fund, part of the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the equivalent of the League Finance Committee which would have swallowed the financial sovereignty of the United States if the Senate had let us join it.

Chapter 14 — Congressional Exposé

"Mr. Volcker's politics is something of an enigma." -- New York Times

Since 1933 when Eugene Meyer resigned from the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, no member of the international banking families has personally served on the Board of Governors. They have chosen to work from behind the scenes through carefully selected presidents of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York and other employees.

The present chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors is Paul Volcker. His appointment was greeted by one well-known economist with the following prediction, "Volcker's selection has been by far the worst. Carter has put Dracula in charge of the blood bank. To us, it means a crash and depression in the 80s is more certain than ever."

Col. E.C. Harwood's Research Report, August 6, 1979, gave much the same view. "Paul Volcker is from the same mold as the unsound money men who have misguided the monetary actions of this nation for the past five decades. The outcome probably will be equally disastrous for the dollar and the U.S. economy."

Despite these gloomy views, the report from The New York Times on the selection of Volcker was positively ecstatic. On July 26, 1979, The Times commented that Volcker learned "the business" from Robert Roosa, now partner of Brown Brothers Harriman, and that Volcker had been part of the Roosa Brain Trust at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and, later, at the Treasury in the Kennedy administration. "David Rockefeller, the chairman of Chase, and Mr. Roosa were strong influences in the Mr. Carter decision to name Mr. Volcker for the Reserve Board chairmanship." The New York Times did not point out that David Rockefeller and Robert Roosa had previously chosen Mr. Carter, a member of the Trilateral Commission, as the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party, or that Mr. Carter would hardly refuse to appoint their choice of Paul Volcker as the new Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Nor is it straining the point to be reminded that this manner of selection of the Chairman of the Board of Governors is directly in the line of royal prerogative going back to

George Peabody's initial agreement with N.M. Rothschild, to the Jekyll Island meeting, and to the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act.

The Times noted that "Volcker's choice was approved by European banks in Bonn, Frankfurt and Zurich." William Simon, former Secretary of Treasury, was quoted as saying "a marvelous choice." The Times further noted that the Dow market rose on Volcker's nomination, registering the best gains in three weeks for a rise of 9.73 points, and that the dollar rose sharply on foreign exchange@ at home and abroad.

Who was Volcker, that his appointment could have such an effect on the stock market and the value of the dollar in foreign exchange? He represented the most powerful house of "the London Connection," Brown Brothers Harriman, and the London houses which directed the Rockefeller empire. On July 29, 1979, The Times had said of Volcker, "New Man Will Chart His Own Course".

Volcker's background shows that this was nonsense. His course has always been charted for him by his masters in London. He attended Princeton, obtained an M.A. at Harvard, and went to the London School of Economics 1951-52, the banker's graduate school. He then came to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York as an economist from 1952-57, economist at Chase Manhattan Bank, 1957-61, with Treasury Department 1961-65, as deputy under secretary for monetary affairs, 1963-65, and under secretary for monetary affairs, 1969-74. He then became President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York from 1975-79, when Carter, at the behest of Robert Roosa and David Rockefeller, appointed him Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. He was succeeded as President of Federal Reserve Bank of New York by Anthony Solomon, a Harvard Ph.D. who was with the OPA 1941-42 and with the government financial mission to Iran 1942-46. He operated a canned food company in Mexico from 1951-61, was president of International Investment Corp. for Yugoslavia 1969-72 (a communist country), under secretary for monetary affairs at Treasury 1977-80. In short, Solomon's background was much the same as Paul Volcker's.

The New York Times stated on December 2, 1981, "For years the Federal Reserve was the second or third most secret institution in town. The Sunshine Act of 1976 penetrated the curtain a trifle. The board now holds a public meeting once a week on Wednesday at 10 a.m., but not to discuss Monetary policy, which is still regarded as top secret and not to be discussed in public." The Times mentioned that when Open Market Committee meetings are held, Solomon and Volcker sit together at the head of the table and relay the instructions which they have received from abroad.

Behind Volcker and Solomon stands Robert Roosa, Secretary of the Treasury in Carter's shadow cabinet, and representing Brown Brothers Harriman, the Trilateral Commission, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Bilderbergers, and the Royal Economic Institute. He is a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation*, and a director of Texaco and American Express companies. Dr. Martin Larson points out that "The international consortium of financiers known as the Bilderbergers, who meet annually in profound secrecy to determine the destiny of the western world, is a creature of the Rockefeller-Rothschild alliance, and that it held its third meeting on St. Simons Island, only a short distance from Jekyll Island." Larson also states that "The Rockefeller interests work in close alliance with the Rothschilds and other central banks."**

On June 18, 1983, President Ronald Reagan ended months of speculation by announcing that he was reappointing Paul Volcker as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors for another four year term, although Volcker's term was not up until August 6, 1983. Reagan's reappointment of a Carter appointee puzzled some political observers, but apparently he had succumbed to considerable pressure, as indicated by a lead editorial in The Washington Post, June 10, 1983, "There is no one who matches Mr. Volcker in both political standing and grasp of the intricate networks that make up the world's financial system." The anonymous writer gave no documentation for his elevation of Volcker to the standing of the world's greatest financier, and as for his political standing, The New York Times commented on June 19, 1983, "Mr. Volcker's politics is something of an enigma." His "non-political" stance conforms with the Washington tradition of "the

political independence of the Fed" which has been maintained for many years. However, the problem of its dependence on "the London connection" has never been discussed in Washington.

In reality, Volcker is more of a politician than an economist. After attending the London School of Economics, and finding out who issues the orders of the international financial community, Volcker has ever since played the game. Not once has he failed to carry out the orders of the "London Connection".

Can it really be possible that "The London Connection" exists, and that men like Volcker and Solomon receive their instructions, in however devious or indirect a manner, from foreign bankers? Let us look at the evidence, circumstantial, to be sure, but circumstantial evidence of the quality which has often sent men to the penitentiary or to the electric chair. John Moody pointed out in 1911 that seven men of the Morgan group, allied with the Standard Oil-Kuhn, Loeb group, ruled the United States. Where do these groups stand in the financial picture today?

U.S. News published on April 11, 1983, a list of the largest bank holding companies in the United States by assets as of December 31, 1982. Number 1 is Citicorp, New York, with assets of \$130 billion. This is Baker and Morgan's First National Bank of New York, merged with National City Bank in 1955, two of the largest purchasers of Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock in 1914. Number 3, is Chase Manhattan, New York, with assets of \$80.9 billion. This is Chase and Bank of Manhattan merged, the Rockefeller and Kuhn Loeb group, also purchasers of Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock in 1914. Number 4 is Manufacturers Hanover of New York \$64 billion, also purchaser of Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock in 1914. Number 5 is J.P. Morgan Company of New York, \$58.6 billion in assets and holder of considerable Federal Reserve Bank stock. Number 6 is Chemical Bank of New York, \$48.3 billion also purchaser of Federal Reserve stock in 1914. And Number 11, First Chicago Corporation, the First National Bank of Chicago which was principal correspondent of the Morgan-Baker bank in New York, and which furnished the first two presidents of the Federal Advisory Council.

The direct line which leads from the participants in the Jekyll Island Conference of 1910 to the present day is illustrated by a passage from "A Primer on Money", Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 2d session, August 5, 1964, p. 75:

"The practical effect of requiring all purchases to be made through the open market is to take money from the taxpayer and give it to the dealers. It forces the Government to pay a toll for borrowing money. There are six 'bank' dealers: First National City Bank of New York; Chemical Crop. Exchange Bank, New York, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, Bankers Trust of New York, First National Bank of Chicago, and Continental Illinois Bank of Chicago."

Thus the banks which receive a "toll" on all money borrowed by the Government of the United States are the same banks which planned the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. There is ample evidence demonstrating the present preeminence of the same banks which set up the Federal Reserve System in 1914. For instance, Warren Brookes writes on the editorial page of The Washington Post, June 6, 1983:

"Citicorp (National City Bank and First National Bank of New York, merged in 1955) just recorded an 18.6% return on equity, J.P. Morgan, 17%, Chemical Bank and Bankers Trust, nearly 16%, an exceptional rate of return."

These are the banks which bought the first issue of Federal Reserve Bank stock in 1914, and which owned the controlling interest in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which sets the interest rate and is the bank for all open market operations.

These banks also profit steadily from the otherwise inexplicable fluctuations in monetary growth and interest rates. Brookes further comments on "actual monetary growth rates alternately gyrating from 0 to 17% in successive six month periods for three recession-wracked years. The two measures of money growth most admired by Milton Friedman M2 and M3, have actually shown little change on a year to year basis in the 1972-82 period."

Thus we have money growth rates gyrating from 0 to 17% but no actual year to year changes, which raises the question of why we cannot have stability of monetary growth throughout the year. The answer is that the big profits are made by these gyrations, and the next question is, who sets in motion these gyrations? The answer is "the London Connection".

To draw attention from the continued control of the bankers and their heirs, who obtained the government monopoly of the nation's money and credit in 1913, the paid propagandists of the controlled media monopoly and academia are constantly trotting forth new and more exotic theories of economics. Thus James Burnham, one of the National Review propagandists, won fame with a ridiculous theory of "the managers". He postulated that the old arbiters of wealth, the J.P. Morgans, the Warburgs and the Rothschilds had, by 1950, disappeared from the scene, being replaced by a new class of "managers". This theory, which had no foundation in fact, served to obscure the fact that the same people still controlled the monetary system of the world. The "managers" were just that, executives like Volcker who were front men, paid employees who would continue to receive their paychecks only as long as they carried out their employers' instructions. Burnham remains a well-paid propagandist at the National Review, which many prominent leaders, including President Reagan, believe to be a "conservative" publication.

From 1914 to 1982, a period in which many thousands of American banks went bankrupt, the original purchasers of Federal Reserve Bank stock have not only survived but they have consolidated their power. And what of "the London Connection"? Does it still exist, and is it still dictating the economic destiny of the United States? The Washington Post, May 19, 1983, carried a story datelined Nairobi, Kenya, noting the meeting of the African Development Bank. "The British merchant bank, Morgan Grenfell and a syndicate of the United States, Kuhn Loeb, Lehman Brothers International, the French Lazard Freres and Britain's Warburg are discreetly acting as financial advisors to about ten debt-plagued African states."

There are the same names we encountered in 1914, still managing the finances of the world, with profits for themselves but with disastrous results for everyone else. Perhaps we can look for relief to the present Administration of President Reagan. Unfortunately, before reaching him we have to run the gamut of the long list of his principal staff, composed of men from J. Henry Schroder, Brown Brothers Harriman, and other leading components of "The London Connection".

Lopez Portillo, President of Mexico, in addressing the Mexican National Congress of Mexico in September, 1982, called the world credit boom of the past decade a financial pestilence akin to the Black Death which swept Europe in the fourteenth century. "As in mediaeval times, it flattens country after country. It is transmitted by rats and it yields unemployment and misery, industrial bankruptcy and enrichment by speculation. The remedy prescribed by faith healers is forced inactivity and depriving the patient of food."

Forbes Magazine stated October 11, 1982, "The world gasps for liquidity, not because the supply of money has contracted but because too much of it now goes to pay off old debts rather than fund new productive investments."

The policy of high interest rates and tight money has been disastrous for the United States. In early 1983, a slight easing of money and credit promises some relief, but as long as the Federal Reserve system and its unseen manipulators continue their control of the money supply, we can expect more problems. The Nation on

December 11, 1982, in commenting on economic problems, stated, "The blame for all this lies at the door of the Federal Reserve System working as usual on behalf of the international banking system."

The evidence of how the Federal Reserve System works on behalf of the international banking system is graphically illustrated by a series of charts drawn up by the staff of the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing of the House of Representatives, 94th Congress, 2d session, August, 1976, "FEDERAL RESERVE DIRECTORS: A STUDY OF CORPORATE AND BANKING INFLUENCE". * We present as our Chart V page 49 of this study, showing the interlocking directorates of David Rockefeller. As our Chart VI we reproduce page 55 of this study, showing the interlocking directorates of Frank R. Milliken, one of the Class C Directors **of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. In this chart are all the main personages in our story of the Jekyll Island conference: Citibank, J.P. Morgan and Company, Kuhn Loeb and Company, and many related firms. As Chart VII we reproduce page 53 of this study, showing the interlocking directorates of another Class C Director of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Alan Pifer. As President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, he interlocks with J. Henry Schroder Trust Company, J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation, Rockefeller Center, Inc., Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Equitable Life Assurance Society (J.P. Morgan), and others. Thus an August, 1976 study from the House Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing, brings before us all of our main cast of personages, functioning today just as they did in 1914.

This 120 page Congressional study details public policy functions of the Federal Reserve District Banks, how directors are selected, who is selected, the public relations lobbying factor, bank domination and bank examination, and corporate interlocks with Reserve banks. Charts were used to illustrate Class A, Class B, and Class C directorships of each district bank. For each branch bank a chart was designed giving information regarding bank appointed directors and those appointed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

In his Foreword to the study, Chairman Henry S. Reuss, (D-Wis) wrote:

"This Committee has observed for many years the influence of private interests over the essentially public responsibilities of the Federal Reserve System.

As the study makes clear, it is difficult to imagine a more narrowly based board of directors for a public agency than has been gathered together for the twelve banks of the Federal Reserve System.

Only two segments of American society--banking and big business--have any substantial representation on the boards, and often even these become merged through interlocking directorates Small farmers are absent. Small business is barely visible. No women appear on the district boards and only six among the branches. Systemwide--including district and branch boards--only thirteen members from minority groups appear.

The study raises a substantial question about the Federal Reserve's oft-repeated claim of "independence". One might ask, independent from what? Surely not banking or big business, if we are to judge from the massive interlocks revealed by this analysis of the district boards.

The big business and banking dominance of the Federal Reserve System cited in this report can be traced, in part, to the original Federal Reserve Act, which gave member commercial banks the right to select two-thirds of the directors of each district bank. But the Board of Governors in Washington must share the responsibility for this imbalance. They appoint the so-called "public" members of the boards of each district bank, appointments which have largely reflected the same narrow interests of the bank-elected members Until we have basic reforms, the Federal Reserve System will be handicapped in carrying out its public responsibilities as an economic stabilization and bank regulatory agency. The System's mandate is too essential to the nation's welfare to leave so much of the machinery under the control of narrow private interests.

Concentration of economic and financial power in the United States has gone too far."

In a section of the text entitled "The Club System", the Committee noted:

"This 'club' approach leads the Federal Reserve to consistently dip into the same pools--the same companies, the same universities, the same bank holding companies--to fill directorships."

This Congressional study concludes as follows:

"Many of the companies on these tables, as mentioned earlier, have multiple interlocks to the Federal Reserve System. First Bank Systems; Southeast Banking Corporation; Federated Department Stores; Westinghouse Electric Corporation; Proctor and Gamble; Alcoa; Honeywell, Inc.; Kennecott Copper; Owens-Corning Fiberglass; all have two or more director ties to district or branch banks.

In Summary, the Federal Reserve directors are apparently representatives of a small elite group which dominates much of the economic life of this nation."

END OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

ADDENDUM

As of 11:05 Tuesday, July 26, 1983, the list of member banks holding Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock includes twenty-seven New York City banks. Listed below are the number of shares held by ten of these banks, amounting to 66% of the total outstanding number of shares, namely 7,005,700:

	Shares	Percent
Bankers Trust Company	438,831	(6%)
Bank of New York	141,482	(2%)
Chase Manhattan Bank	1,011,862	(14%)
Chemical Bank	544,962	(8%)
Citibank	1,090,813	(15%)
European American Bank & Trust	127,800	(2%)
J. Henry Schroder Bank & Trust	37,493	(.5%)
Manufacturers Hanover	509,852	(7%)
Morgan Guaranty Trust	655,443	(9%)
National Bank of North America	105,600	(2%)

The tremendous number of shares held today as against the original purchases in 1914 is brought about by Section 5 of the original Federal Reserve Act which called for a member bank to buy and hold stock in the district Federal Reserve Bank equal to 6% of its capital and surplus.

Currently, shares held by five of the above named banks comprise 53% of the total Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock. An examination of the major stockholders of the New York City banks shows clearly that a few families, related by blood marriage, or business interests, still control the New York City banks which, in turn, hold the controlling stock of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

It is notable that three of the banks holding Federal Reserve Bank of New York stock, in the amount of 270,893 shares, are subsidiaries of foreign banks. J. Henry Schroder Bank and Trust is listed by Standard and Poors as a subsidiary of Schrodgers Ltd. of London. The National Bank of North America is a subsidiary of the National Westminster Bank, one of London's "Big Five". European American Bank is a subsidiary of the European American Bank, Bahamas, LTD. It is interesting to note that the directors of the European American Bank & Trust include Milton F. Rosenthal, president and Chief Operating Officer of the international gold company, Engelhard Minerals and Chemical; Hamilton F. Potter, a partner in Sullivan and Cromwell (J. Henry Schroder Bank & Trust attorneys); Edward H. Tuck, partner of Shearman and Sterling (Citibank's attorneys); F.H. Ulrich and Hans Liebkutsch, managing directors of the giant Midland Bank of London, one of the "Big Five"; and Roger Alloo, Paul-Emmanuel Janssen, and Maurice Laure of the Societe Generale de Banque (Brussels, Belgium). [See [Chart III](#)]

This information, derived from the latest issue of the tabulation available from the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, is cited as current evidence which indicates that the controlling stock in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which sets the rate and scale of operations for the entire Federal Reserve System is heavily influenced by banks directly controlled by "The London Connection", that is, the Rothschild-controlled Bank of England. [See [Chart I](#)]

APPENDIX 1

E.C. Knuth, in *The Empire of the City*, priv. printed, 1946, p. 27, refers to "the Bank of England, the full partner of the American Administration in the conduct of the financial affairs of all the world" and cites the *Encyclopaedia Americana*, 1943 edition.

Barron cites Lord Swaythling, (April 8, 1923), "Lord Swaythling said, 'Exchange can only be run from London. This is the center in Exchange.'" (They Told Barron, by Clarence W. Barron, founder of *Baron's Weekly*, Harpers, New York, 1930, p. 27.)

Exchange, in the international financial world, means the transactions in money or securities, or simply, the "exchange" of the values of these securities. It is necessary that this "exchange" take place where the values can be established, and this place is the "City" in London.

London was established as the primary center of exchange because of the "Consols" of the Bank of England, bonds which could never be redeemed, but which paid a stable rate of return. Henry Clews writes, in *The Wall Street View*, Silver Burdett Co. 1900, p. 255, "The Consolidated Act of 1757 consolidated the debts of the nation of England at 3%, which were kept in an account at the Bank of England and is the great bulwark of its deposits." By ostentatiously "dumping" "Consols" on the London Exchange after the Battle of Waterloo, in a pretended panic, Nathan Meyer Rothschild then secretly bought up the Consols sold in the panic by other holders at a low rate, and became the largest holder of Consols, and thus won control of the Bank of England in 1815.

12% Dividends

Although a Labor government nationalized the Bank of England in 1946, *The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* points out (vol. I, p. 490c) that the Bank of England continues to pay 12% dividends per annum, just as it had done prior to the nationalization. The "Governor" is appointed by the government, in a situation similar to that in the United States, where

the Governors of the Federal Reserve System are appointed by the President. However, as is pointed out in the Encyclopaedia Americana v. 13, p. 272, "In practice, the governors of the Bank of England have not hesitated to criticize and bring pressure on the government in public."

Bank Rate

The interest rate set by the Bank of England is known as "the Bank rate", and it is a controlling factor in interest rates throughout the world, although rates in other countries may be higher or lower than this "Bank rate". The Bank of England manages the government debt, and is called upon to arbitrate in political affairs. It served as the intermediary with the Iran revolutionaries in negotiating for the return of the American hostages--a recent example.

We should not be surprised that the present Governor of the Bank of England, Sir Gordon Richardson is a prominent international financial figure, who appears elsewhere in these pages because of his connection with the J. Henry Schroder @Wagg in London from 1962 to 1972, when he became Governor of the Bank of England. He was also director of J. Henry Schroder Co., New York, and Schroder Banking Corp., New York. He also serves as director of Rolls Royce and Lloyd's Bank. Although he resides in London, he maintains a home in New York, and is listed in the current Manhattan directory simply as "G. Richardson, 45 Sutton Place S.", although a prior listing showed him at 4 Sutton Place. Sutton Place was developed as a fashionable address for the international set by Bessie Marbury, whom we earlier cited for her connection with the Morgan family and the Roosevelts.

The present directors of the Bank of England (1982) include Leopold de Rothschild of N.M. Rothschild & Sons, Sir Robert Clark, chairman of Hill Samuel Bank, the most influential bank after Rothschilds, John Clay, of Hambros Bank, and David Scholey, of Warburg Bank, and joint chairman of S.C. Warburg Co.

Anthony Sampson writes, in "The Changing Anatomy of Britain", Random House, New York, 1982, p. 279, "The more cosmopolitan banks with foreign experts and directors, such as Warburgs, Montagus, Rothschilds and Kleinworts, had also discovered a huge new source of profits in the market for Eurodollars which began in the late fifties and multiplied through the 60s . . . British bankers themselves controlled relatively small funds, but they knew how to make money out of other people's money."

The Eurodollar market, a new development in "created money" is monopolized by the above firms.

Eurodollar Empire

"Today, together with allies on the island of Manhattan (Britain's most important piece of real estate), the British Empire controls the entire \$1.5 trillion Eurodollar financial market, another \$300-\$500 billion in the Cayman Islands, Bahamas, and \$50-\$100 billion in the Hong-Kong Singapore "Asia-dollar market". . . . Consider the \$1.5 trillion Eurodollar market an "outlaw" market in the U.S. dollars over which this nation has no control. Here control and profits are overwhelmingly in the hands of London banks, who set the terms of lending and the interest rate on this mass of American dollars in relation to the London Interbank Borrowing Rate (LIBOR) . . . U.S. banks like Citibank (New York City), on whose board of directors sits the powerful British financier, Lord Aldington, collaborate openly in this market. At the same time, British banks including the known central bank for the world's drug trade, the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank, pour into America to devour U.S. banks. In 1978 the Hongshang (Ed.--Hongkong and Shanghai Bank) took over New York's Marine Midland Bank, the state's 11th largest commercial bank. . . The British also control the creation of American dollars.

While Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volcker tightens credit against the domestic economy, British-controlled banks in the Cayman Islands (such as the European American Bank--Ed.) a British possession 200 miles off Florida, and in the Bermudas and a dozen other "free banking" computer terminals create hundreds of billions of American dollars. How is this done? There are no reserve ratios or other restrictions on the creation of dollar-denominated credits in the Empire's "free enterprise" banking. A \$1 million bona fide credit coming from the United States can be turned into \$20 to \$100 million in dollar-denominated credits as it passes through the British system without reserve ratios." *

Not only the financial power, but also the legal power, has remained seated in Britain. The Washington Post commented on June 18, 1983 that after the American Revolution, all the old laws remained in effect in the new United States: Some of these laws of "English common law" dated back to 1278, long before America was discovered.

This enormous financial power of "the City" is revealed in many areas. Dean Acheson states, in "Present at the Creation", 1969, W.W. Norton, New York, p. 779, "We stayed at the embassy residence, the old J.P. Morgan mansion, 14 Prince's Gate, facing Hyde Park." How many Americans are aware that the U.S. Embassy residence in London is the J.P. Morgan home, or that Dean Acheson, a former Morgan employee, described himself as Secretary of State on p. 505, "My own attitude had long been, and was known to have been, pro-British." No one commented on an American Secretary of State's open bias in favor of England.

The Federal Reserve "created" money is not used only for financial matters; this money is also used to maintain the bankers' control of every aspect of political, economic and social life. It is used to bankroll the enormous expenditures of political candidates, the swollen budgets of universities, the huge outlays required to start newspapers or magazines, and a vast array of foundations, "think-tanks" and other instruments of mind control.

Psychological Warfare

Few Americans know that almost every development in psychology in the United States in the past sixty-five years has been directed by the Bureau of Psychological Warfare of the British Army. A short time ago, the present writer learned a new name, The Tavistock Institute of London, also known as the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. "Human relations" covers every aspect of human behavior, and it is the modest goal of the Tavistock Institute to obtain and exercise control over every aspect of human behavior of American citizens.

Because of the intensive artillery barrages of World War I, many soldiers were permanently impaired by shell shock. In 1921, the Marquess of Tavistock, 11th Duke of Bedford, gave a building to a group which planned to conduct rehabilitation programs for shell shocked British soldiers. The group took the name of "Tavistock Institute" after its benefactor. The General Staff of the British Army decided it was crucial that they determine the breaking point of the soldier under combat conditions. The Tavistock Institute was taken over by Sir John Rawlings Reese, head of the British Army Psychological Warfare Bureau. A cadre of highly trained specialists in psychological warfare was built up in total secrecy. In fifty years, the name "Tavistock Institute" appears only twice in the Index of the New York Times, yet this group, according to LaRouche and other authorities, organized and trained the entire staffs of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the Strategic Bombing Survey, Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces, and other key American military groups during World War II. During World War II, the Tavistock Institute combined with the medical sciences division of the Rockefeller Foundation for esoteric experiments with mind-altering drugs. The present drug culture of the United States is traced in its entirety to this Institute, which supervised the Central Intelligence Agency's training programs. The "LSD counter culture" originated when Sandoz A.G., a Swiss pharmaceutical house owned by S.G. Warburg & Co., developed a new drug from lysergic acid, called LSD. James Paul Warburg (son of Paul Warburg who had written the Federal Reserve Act in 1910), financed a subsidiary of the Tavistock Institute in the United States called the Institute for Policy Studies, whose director, Marcus Raskin, was appointed to the National Security Council. James Paul Warburg set up a CIA program to experiment with LSD on CIA agents, some of whom later committed suicide. This program, MK-Ultra, supervised by Dr. Gottlieb, resulted in huge lawsuits against the United States Government by the families of the victims.

The Institute for Policy Studies set up a campus subsidiary, Students for Democratic Society (SDS), devoted to drugs and revolution. Rather than finance SDS himself, Warburg used CIA funds, some twenty million dollars, to promote the campus riots of the 1960s.

The English Tavistock Institute has not restricted its activities to left-wing groups, but has also directed the programs of such supposedly "conservative" American think tanks as the Herbert Hoover Institute at Stanford University, Heritage Foundation, Wharton, Hudson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Rand. The "sensitivity training" and "sexual encounter" programs of the most radical California groups such as Esalen Institute and its many imitators were all developed and implemented by Tavistock Institute psychologists.

One of the rare items concerning the Tavistock Institute appears in Business Week, Oct. 26, 1963, with a photograph of its building in the most expensive medical offices area of London. The story mentions "the Freudian bias" of the Institute, and comments that it is amply financed by British blue-chip corporations, including Unilever, British Petroleum, and Baldwin Steel. According to Business Week, the psychological testing programs and group relations training programs of the Institute were implemented in the United States by the University of Michigan and the University of California, which are hotbeds of radicalism and the drug network.

It was the Marquess of Tavistock, 12th Duke of Bedford, whom Rudolf Hess flew to England to contact about ending World War II. Tavistock was said to be worth \$40 million in 1942. In 1945, his wife committed suicide by taking an overdose of pills.

BIOGRAPHIES

NELSON ALDRICH (1841-1915)

Senator from Rhode Island; head of National Monetary Commission; his daughter Abby Aldrich married John D. Rockefeller, Jr.; he became the grandfather of his namesake. Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller, as well as the present David Rockefeller and Laurence Rockefeller.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN (1860-1925)

Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of State, three times losing presidential candidate of the Democratic Party, in 1896, 1900, and 1908, and head of the Democratic Party.

ALFRED OWEN CROZIER (1863-1939)

A prominent attorney in Grand Rapids, Cincinnati, and New York, Crozier wrote eight books on legal and monetary problems, focussing on his opposition to the supplanting of Constitutional money by the corporation currency printed by private firms for their profit.

CLARENCE DILLON (1882-1979)

Born in San Antonio, Texas, son of Samuel Dillon and Bertha Lapowitz. Harvard, 1905. Married Anne Douglass of Milwaukee. His son, C. Douglas Dillon (later Secretary of the Treasury, 1961-65) was born in Geneva, Switzerland in 1909 while they were abroad. Dillon met William A. Read, founder of the Wall Street bond broker William A. Read and Company, through introduction by Harvard classmate William A. Phillips in 1912 and Dillon joined Read's Chicago office in that year. He moved to New York in 1914. Read died in 1916, and Dillon bought a majority interest in the firm. During World War 1, Bernard Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board, (known as the Czar of American industry) asked Dillon to be assistant chairman of the War Industries Board. In 1920, William A. Read & Company name was changed to Dillon, Read & Company. Dillon was director of American Foreign Securities Corporation, which he had set up in 1915 to finance the French Government's purchases of munitions in the United States. His righthand man at Dillon Read, James Forrestal, became Secretary of the Navy, later Secretary of Defense, and died under mysterious circumstances at a Federal hospital. In 1957, Fortune Magazine listed Dillon as one of the richest men in the United States, with a fortune then estimated to be from \$150 to \$200 million.

ALAN GREENSPAN (1926-)

Appointed by President Reagan to succeed Paul Volcker as Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in 1987. Greenspan had succeeded Herbert Stein as chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors in 1974. He was the protégé of former chairman of the Board of Governors, Arthur Burns of Austria (Bernstein). Burns was a monetarist representing the Rothschild's Viennese School of Economics, which manifested its influence in England through the Royal Colonial Society, a front for Rothschilds and other English bankers who stashed their profits from the

world drug trade in the Hong Kong Shanghai Bank. The staff economist for the Royal Colonial Society was Alfred Marshall, inventor of the monetarist theory, who, as head of the Oxford Group, became the patron of Wesley Clair Mitchell, who founded the National Bureau of Economic Research for the Rockefellers in the United States. Mitchell, in turn, became the patron of Arthur Burns and Milton Friedman, whose theories are now the power techniques of Greenspan at the Federal Reserve Board. Greenspan is also the protégé of Ayn Rand, a weirdo who interposed her sexual affairs with guttural commands to be selfish. Rand was also the patron of CIA propagandist William Buckley and the National Review. Greenspan was director of major Wall Street firms such as J.P. Morgan Co., Morgan Guaranty Trust (the American bank for the Soviets after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917), Brookings Institution, Bowery Savings Bank, the Dreyfus Fund, General Foods, and Time, Inc. Greenspan's most impressive achievement was as chairman of the National Commission on Social Security from 1981-1983. He juggled figures to convince the public that Social Security was bankrupt, when in fact it had an enormous surplus. These figures were then used to fasten onto American workers a huge increase in Social Security withholding tax, which invoked David Ricardo's economic dictum of the iron law of wages, that workers could only be paid a subsistence wage, and any funds beyond that must be extorted from them forcibly by tax increases. As a partner of J.P. Morgan Co. since 1977, Greenspan represented the unbroken line of control of the Federal Reserve System by the firms represented at the secret meeting on Jekyll Island in 1910, where Henry P. Davison, righthand man of J.P. Morgan, was a key figure in the drafting of the Federal Reserve Act. Within days of taking over as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Greenspan immediately raised the interest rate on Sept. 4, 1987, the first such increase in three years of general prosperity, and precipitated the stock market crash of Oct., 1987, Black Monday, when the Dow Jones average plunged 508 points. Under Greenspan's direction, the Federal Reserve Board has steadily nudged the United States deeper and deeper into recession, without a word of criticism from the complaisant members of Congress.

COLONEL EDWARD MANDELL HOUSE (1858-1938)

Son of a Rothschild agent in Texas. Succeeded in electing five consecutive governors of Texas; became Woodrow Wilson's advisor in 1912. Cooperated with Paul Warburg to get the Federal Reserve Act passed by Congress in 1913.

ROBERT MARION LAFOLLETTE (1855-1925)

Served in Senate from Wisconsin 1905-25. Led agrarian reformers in opposing Eastern bankers and their plans for the Federal Reserve Act. Ran for President in 1924 on Progressive-Socialist ticket.

CHARLES AUGUSTUS LINDBERGH, SR. (1860-1924)

Congressman from Minnesota (1907-1917) who led the fight against enactment of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913. He served until 1917 when he resigned to run for governor of Minnesota. He ran a good campaign despite adverse newspaper attacks led by The New York Times. His campaign was adversely affected when Federal agents burned his books, including Why Is Your Country At War? and the papers and contents of his home office in Little Falls, Minnesota.

LOUIS T. McFADDEN (1876-1936)

Congressman and Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, 1927-33; courageously opposed the manipulators of the Federal Reserve System in the 1920's and the 1930's. Introduced bills to impeach Federal Reserve Board of Governors and allied officials. After three attempts on his life, he died mysteriously.

JOHN PIERPONT MORGAN (1837-1913)

Considered the dominant American financier at the turn of the century. Who's Who in 1912 stated he "controls over 50,000 miles of railroads in the United States." Organized United States Steel Corporation. Became representative of House of Rothschild through his father, Junius S. Morgan, who had become London partner of George Peabody & Company, later Junius S. Morgan Company, a Rothschild agent. John Pierpont Morgan, Jr. succeeded his father as head of the Morgan empire.

DAVID MULLINS (1946-)

Appointed Governor of the Federal Reserve Board May 21, 1990, David Mullins' term runs to Jan. 31, 1996. He was recently nominated to serve as Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and served as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Domestic Finance 1988-90, receiving the department's highest award, the Alexander Hamilton Award, for his service in such programs as synthetic fuels, federal finance, Farm Credit Assistance Board, and author of the President's Plan for rescuing the savings and loan institutions. He is a distant cousin of the author, descended from John Mullins, the first recorded settler in the western area of Virginia, hero of the battle of King's Mountain, and recipient of a 200 acre grant of land for his service in the American Revolution.

WRIGHT PATMAN (1893-1976)

Congressman and Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee 1963-74. Led the fight in Congress to stop the manipulators of the Federal Reserve System from 1937 to his death in 1976.

CONGRESSMAN ARSENE PUJO

Served in Congress 1903-1913. Democrat from Louisiana. Chairman of House Banking and Currency Committee. Chairman of "Pujo Hearings" Subcommittee, 1912.

SIR GORDON RICHARDSON (1915-)

Head of the Bank of England since 1973. Chairman J. Henry Schroder Wagg, London, 1962-72; director of J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation, New York; Schroder Banking Corporation, New York; Lloyd's Bank, London; Rolls Royce.

JACOB SCHIFF (1847-1920)

Born in Rothschild house in Frankfurt, Germany. Emigrated to United States, married Therese Loeb, daughter of Solomon Loeb, founder of Kuhn, Loeb and Co. Schiff became senior partner of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., and as representative of Rothschild interests gained control of most of railway mileage in United States.

BARON KURT VON SCHRODER (1889-)

Adolph Hitler's personal banker, advanced funds for Hitler's accession to power in Germany in 1933; German representative of the London and New York branches of J. Henry Schroder Banking Corporation; SS Senior Group Leader; director of all German subsidiaries of I.T.T; Himmler's Circle of Friends; advisor to board of directors, Deutsche Reichsbank (German central bank).

ANTHONY MORTON SOLOMON (1919-)

Educated at Harvard, economist Office of Price Administration, 1941-42; financial mission to Iran, 1942-46; Agency for international Development South America, 1965-69; president international Investment Corporation for Yugoslavia 1969-72; advisor to Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, 1972-73; Undersecretary Monetary Affairs, U.S. Treasury, 1977-80; president Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 1980-

SAMUEL UNTERMYER (1858-1940)

A partner of the law firm of Guggenheimer and Untermyer of New York, who conducted the "Pujo Hearings" of the House Banking and Currency Committee in 1912. Counsel for Rogers and Rockefeller in many large suits against F. Augustus Heinze, Thomas W Lawson and others. Earned a single fee of \$775,000 for handling merger of Utah Copper Company. Reported in The New York Times May 26, 1924 as urging immediate recognition of Soviet Russia at Carnegie Hall meeting. Untermyer's prestige and power is illustrated by the fact that this front page obituary in The New York Times covered six columns. His listing in Who's Who was the longest for thirteen years.

FRANK VANDERLIP (1864-1937)

Assistant Secretary of Treasury 1897-1901; won prestige for financing Spanish American War by floating \$200,000,000 in bonds during his incumbency for what is known as "National City Bank's War" President of National City Bank 1909-19. One of the original Jekyll Island group who wrote Federal Reserve Act in November, 1910. No mention of this important fact is made in extensive obituary in The New York Times, June 30, 1937.

GEORGE SYLVESTER VIERECK (1884-1962)

Author of the definitive study *The Strangest Friendship in History, Woodrow Wilson and Col. House*, Liveright, 1932. A leading poet of the early 1900's, reviewed on the front page of *The New York Times Book Review*, and known as the leading German-American citizen of the United States.

PAUL VOLCKER (1927-)

Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors since 1979, appointed by President Carter, reappointed by President Reagan for another four year term beginning August 6, 1983. Educated at Princeton, Harvard and London School of Economics; employed by Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 1952-57; Chase Manhattan Bank, 1957-61; Treasury Department, 1961-74; president Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 1975-79.

PAUL WARBURG (1868-1932)

Conceded to be the actual author of our central bank plan, the Federal Reserve System, by knowledgeable authorities. Emigrated to the United States from Germany 1904; partner, Kuhn Loeb and Company bankers, New York; naturalized 1911. Member of the original Federal Reserve Board of Governors, 1914-1918; president Federal Advisory Council, 1918-1928. Brother of Max Warburg, who was head of German Secret Service during World War I and who represented Germany at the Peace Conference, 1918-1919, while Paul was chairman of the Federal Reserve System.

SIR WILLIAM WISEMAN (1885-1962)

Partner of Kuhn, Loeb and Company; head of British Secret Service during World War I. Worked closely with Col. House dominating the United States and England.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Newspapers:

New York Times 1858-1983

Washington Post 1933-1983

<PPeriodicals:

Barron's Weekly 1921-1983

Business Week 1929-1983

Forbes Magazine 1917-1983

Fortune 1930-1983

Harper's 1850-1983

National Review 1955-1983

Newsweek 1933-1983

The Nation 1865-1983

The New Republic 1914-1983

Time 1923-1983

Books:

Current Biography 1940-1983 H.W. Wilson Co., N.Y.

Dictionary of National Biography, Scribners, N.Y. 1934-1965

Directory of Directors, London 1896-1983

Directory of Directors In The City of New York 1898-1918

The Concise Dictionary of National Biography, 1903-1979, Oxford University Press

Congressional Record 1910-1983

International Index to Periodicals 1920-1965, H.W. Wilson Co., N.Y.

Poole's Index to Periodical Literature 1802-1906, Wm. T Poole, Chicago

Readers Guide to Periodicals 1900-1983

Rand McNally's Bankers Guide 1904-1928

Moody's Banking and Finance 1928-1968

Who's Who in America 1890-1983, A.N. Marquis Co.

Who's Who, Great Britain 1921-1983

Who Was Who In America 1607-1906, A.N. Marquis Co.

Who's Who in the World 1972-1983, A.N. Marquis Co.

Who's Who in Finance and Industry 1936-1969, A.N. Marquis Co.

Standard and Poor's Register of Directors 1928-1983

Senate Committee Hearings on Federal Reserve Act, 1913

House Committee Hearings on Federal Reserve Act, 1913

House Committee Hearings on the Money Trust (Pujo Committee) 1913

House Investigation of Federal Reserve System, 1928

Senate Investigation of Fitness of Eugene Meyer to be a Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, 1930

Senate Hearings on Thomas B. McCabe to be a Governor of the Federal Reserve System, 1948

House Committee Hearings on Extension of Public Debt, 1945

Federal Reserve Directors: A Study of Corporate and Banking Influence, Staff Report, Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing, House of Representatives, 94th Congress, 2d Session, August, 1976.

The Federal Reserve System, Purposes and Functions, Board of Governors, 1963

A History of Monetary Crimes, Alexander Del Mar, the Del Mar Society, 1899

Fiat Money Inflation in France, Andrew Dickson White, Foundation for Economic Education, N.Y. 1959

The War on Gold, Antony C. Sutton, 76 Press, California, 1977

Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler, Antony C. Sutton, 76 Press, California, 1976

Collected Speeches of Louis T McFadden, Congressional Record

The Truth About Rockefeller, E.M. Josephson, Chedney Press, N.Y. 1964

The Strange Death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, E.M. Josephson, Chedney Press, N.Y. 1948

Behind the Throne, Paul Emden, Hoddard Stoughton, London, 1934

The Money Power of Europe, Paul Emden, Hoddard Stoughton, London

The Robber Barons, Mathew Josephson, Harcourt Brace, N.Y. 1934

The Rothschilds, Frederic Morton, Curtis Publishing Co., 1961

The Magnificent Rothschilds, Cecil Roth, Robert Hale Co., 1939

Pawns In The Game, William Guy Carr, (privately printed), 1956

Tearing Away the Veils, Francois Coty, Paris, 1940

Writers on English Monetary History, 1626-1730, London, 1896

The Federal Reserve System After Fifty Years, Committee on Banking and Currency, Jan., Feb. 1964

The Bankers' Conspiracy, Arthur Kitson, 1933

Laws Of The United States Relating to Currency, Finance and Banking From 1789 to 1891, Charles F. Dunbar, Ginn & Co., Boston, 1893

Monetary Policy of Plenty Instead of Scarcity, Committee on Banking and Currency, 1937-1938

The Strangest Friendship In History, Woodrow Wilson and Col. House, George

Sylvester Viereck, Liveright, N.Y. 1932

Federal Reserve Policy Making, G.L. Bach, Knapf, N.Y. 1950

Rulers of America, A Study of Finance Capital, Anna Rockester, International Publishers, N.Y. 1936

Banking in the United States Before the Civil War, National Monetary Commission, 1911

National Banking System, National Monetary Commission, 1911

The Federal Reserve System, Paul Warburg, Macmillan, N.Y. 1930

Roosevelt, Wilson and the Federal Reserve Law, Col. Elisha Garrison, Christopher Publishing House, Boston, 1931

Men Who Run America, Arthur D. Howden Smith, Bobbs Merrill, N.Y., 1935

Financial Giants of America, George E Redmond, Stratford, Boston, 1922

The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia, Macmillan, London, 1973

Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1979

Encyclopaedia Americana, 1982

Dope, Inc., Goldman, Steinberg et at, New Benjamin Franklin House Publishing Company, N.Y. 1978

Banking and Currency and the Money Trust, Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr. 1913

The Strange Career of Mr. Hoover Under Two Flags, John Hamill, William Faro, N.Y. 1931

The Federal Reserve System, H. Parker Willis, Ronald Co., 1923

A.B.C. of the Federal Reserve System, E.W. Kemmerer, Princeton Univ., 1919

Adventures in Constructive Finance, Carter Glass, Doubleday, N.Y. 1927

Banking Reform in the United States, Paul Warburg, Columbia Univ., 1914

U.S. Money vs. Corporation Currency, Alfred Crozier, Cleveland, 1912

Philip Dru, Administrator, E.M. House, B.W. Huebsch, N.Y. 1912

The Intimate Papers of Col. House, edited by Charles Seymour, 4 v. 1926-1928, Houghton Mifflin Co.

The Great Conspiracy of the House of Morgan, H.W. Loucks, 1916

Capital City, McRae and Cairncross, Eyre Methuen, London, 1963

Aggression, Otto Lehmann-Russbeldt, Hutchinson, London, 1934

The Empire of High Finance, Victor Perlo, International Pub., 1957

Memoirs of Max Warburg, Berlin, 1936

Letters and Friendships of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice

Tragedy and Hope, Carroll Quigley, Macmillan, N.Y.

The Politics of Money, Brian Johnson, McGraw Hill, N.Y. 1970

A Primer on Money, House Banking and Currency Committee, 1964

Pierpont Morgan and Friends, The Anatomy of A Myth, George Wheeler, Prentice Hall, N.J., 1973

Pierpont Morgan, Herbert Satterlee, Macmillan, N.Y., 1940

Morgan the Magnificent, John K. Winkler, Vanguard, N.Y., 1930

Wilson, Arthur Link (5 vol.) Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.

Historical Beginning... The Federal Reserve, Roger T Johnson, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 1977 (7 printings, 1977-1982, totaling 92,000 copies.) [It is noteworthy that this 64 page booklet makes no mention of Jekyll Island, Paul Warburg's authorship, or source of promotion funds which resulted in enactment of the Federal Reserve Act on December 23, 1913.]

The Federal Reserve and Our Manipulated Dollar, Martin A. Larson, Devin Adair Co., Old Greenwich, Conn., 1975

Chain Banking, Stockholder and Loan Links of 200 Largest Member Banks, House Banking and Currency Committee, Jan. 3, 1963

International Banking, Staff Report, Committee on Banking Currency and Housing, May 1976

Audit of the Federal Reserve System, Hearings Before the House Banking and Currency Committee, 1975.

Questions and Answers

While lecturing in many countries, and appearing on radio and television programs as a guest, the author is frequently asked questions about the Federal Reserve System. The most frequently asked questions and the answers are as follows:

Q: What is the Federal Reserve System?

A: The Federal Reserve System is not Federal; it has no reserves; and it is not a system, but rather, a criminal syndicate. It is the product of criminal syndicalist activity of an international consortium of dynastic families comprising what the author terms "The World Order" (see "THE WORLD ORDER" and "THE CURSE OF CANAAN", both by Eustace Mullins). The Federal Reserve system is a central bank operating in the United States. Although the student will find no such definition of a central bank in the textbooks of any university, the author has defined a central bank as follows: It is the dominant financial power of the country which harbors it. It is entirely private-owned, although it seeks to give the appearance of a governmental institution. It has the right to print and issue money, the traditional prerogative of monarchs. It is set up to provide financing for wars. It functions as a money monopoly having total power over all the money and credit of the people.

Q: When Congress passed the Federal Reserve Act on December 23, 1913, did the Congressmen know that they were creating a central bank?

A: The members of the 63rd Congress had no knowledge of a central bank or of its monopolistic operations. Many of those who voted for the bill were duped; others were bribed; others were intimidated. The preface to the Federal Reserve Act reads "An Act to provide for the establishment of Federal reserve banks, to furnish an elastic currency, to afford means of rediscounting commercial papers, to establish a more effective supervision of banking in the United States, and for other purposes." The unspecified "other purposes" were to give international conspirators a monopoly of all the money and credit of the people of the United States; to finance World War I through this new central bank, to place American workers at the mercy of the Federal Reserve system's collection agency, the Internal Revenue Service, and to allow the monopolists to seize the assets of their competitors and put them out of business.

Q: Is the Federal Reserve system a government agency?

A: Even the present chairman of the House Banking Committee claims that the Federal Reserve is a government agency, and that it is not privately owned. The fact is that the government has never owned a single share of Federal Reserve Bank stock. This charade stems from the fact that the President of the United States appoints the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, who are then confirmed by the Senate. The secret author of the Act, banker Paul Warburg, a representative of the Rothschild bank, coined the name "Federal" from thin air for the Act, which he wrote to achieve two of his pet aspirations, an "elastic currency", read (rubber check), and to facilitate trading in acceptances, international trade credits. Warburg was founder and president of the International Acceptance Corporation, and made billions in profits by trading in this commercial paper. Sec. 7 of the Federal Reserve Act provides "Federal reserve banks, including the capital and surplus therein, and income derived therefrom, shall be exempt from Federal, state and local taxation, except taxes on real estate." Government buildings do not pay real estate tax.

Q: Are our dollar bills, which carry the label "Federal Reserve notes" government money?

A: Federal Reserve notes are actually promissory notes, promises to pay, rather than what we traditionally consider money. They are interest bearing notes issued against interest bearing government bonds, paper issued with nothing but paper backing, which is known as fiat money, because it has only the fiat of the issuer to guarantee these notes. The Federal Reserve Act authorizes the issuance of these notes "for the purposes of making advances to Federal reserve banks... The said notes shall be obligations of the United States. They shall be redeemed in gold on demand at the Treasury Department of the United States in the District of Columbia." Tourists visiting the Bureau of Printing and Engraving on the Mall in Washington, D.C. view the printing of Federal Reserve notes at this governmental agency on contract from the Federal Reserve System for the nominal sum of .00260 each in units of 1,000, at the same price regardless of the denomination. These notes, printed for a private bank, then become liabilities and obligations of the United States government and are added to our present \$4 trillion debt. The government had no debt when the Federal Reserve Act was passed in 1913.

Q: Who owns the stock of the Federal Reserve Banks?

A: The dynastic families of the ruling World Order, internationalists who are loyal to no race, religion, or nation. They are families such as the Rothschilds, the Warburgs, the Schiffs, the Rockefellers, the Harrimans, the Morgans and others known as the elite, or "the big rich".

Q: Can I buy this stock?

A: No. The Federal Reserve Act stipulates that the stock of the Federal Reserve Banks cannot be bought or sold on any stock exchange. It is passed on by inheritance as the fortune of the "big rich". Almost half of the owners of Federal Reserve Bank stock are not Americans.

Q: Is the Internal Revenue Service a governmental agency?

A: Although listed as part of the Treasury Department, the IRS is actually a private collection agency for the Federal Reserve System. It originated as the Black Hand in mediaeval Italy, collectors of debt by force and extortion for the ruling Italian mob families. All personal income taxes collected by the IRS are required by law to be deposited in the nearest Federal Reserve Bank, under Sec. 15 of the Federal Reserve Act, "The moneys held in the general fund of the Treasury

may bedeposited in Federal reserve banks, which banks, when required by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as fiscal agents of the United States."

Q: Does the Federal Reserve Board control the daily price and quantity of money?

A: The Federal Reserve Board of Governors, meeting in private as the Federal Open Market Committee with presidents of the Federal Reserve Banks, controls all economic activity throughout the United States by issuing orders to buy government bonds on the open market, creating money out of nothing and causing inflationary pressure, or, conversely, by selling government bonds on the open market and extinguishing debt, creating deflationary pressure and causing the stock market to drop.

Q: Can Congress abolish the Federal Reserve System?

A: The last provision of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, Sec. 30, states, "The right to amend, alter or repeal this Act is expressly reserved." This language means that Congress can at any time move to abolish the Federal Reserve System, or buy back the stock and make it part of the Treasury Department, or to alter the System as it sees fit. It has never done so.

Q: Are there many critics of the Federal Reserve beside yourself?

A: When I began my researches in 1948, the Fed was only thirty-four years old. It was never mentioned in the press. Today the Fed is discussed openly in the news section and the financial pages. There are bills in congress to have the Fed audited by the Government Accounting Office. Because of my exposé, it is no longer a sacred cow, although the Big Three candidates for President in 1992, Bush, Clinton and Perot, joined in a unanimous chorus during the debates that they were pledged not to touch the Fed.

Q: Have you suffered any personal consequences because of your exposé of the Fed?

A: I was fired from the staff of the Library of Congress after I published this exposé in 1952, the only person ever discharged from the staff for political reasons. When I sued, the court refused to hear the case. The entire German edition of this book was burned in 1955, the only book burned in Europe since the Second World War. I have endured continuous harassment by government agencies, as detailed in my books "A WRIT FOR MARTYRS" and "MY LIFE IN CHRIST". My family also suffered harassment. When I spoke recently in Wembley Arena in London, the press denounced me as "a sinister lunatic".

Q: Does the press always support the Fed?

A: There have been some encouraging defections in recent months. A front page story in the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 8, 1993, stated, "The current Fed structure is difficult to justify in a democracy. It's an oddly undemocratic institution. Its organization is so dated that there is only one Reserve bank west of the Rockies, and two in Missouri...Having a central bank with a monopoly over the issuance of the currency in a democratic society is a very difficult balancing act."

FEDERAL REGIONALISM

The Abolishment of Local Government

Below is the blueprint for the abolishment of state and county government by the institution of "**Regionalism.**" Centralization of power must be stopped because centralized power in the federal government, and the resulting loss of States' rights, is the one thing necessary for the success of a **ONE WORLD GOVERNMENT.**

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE IV, SECTION 3, PARAGRAPH 1:

"**New States** may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of two or more States; or parts of States without the consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as the Congress."

President Nixon, o March 27, 1969, through the Government Reorganization Act divided the United States into 10 Regions. To further implement this Regional Governance over the U.S.A., President Nixon signed Executive Order 11647 and entered it in the Federal Register February 12, 1972. (Vol .37, No.30) Through the authority vested in him as President of the United States, President Nixon established a Federal Regional Council for each of the 10 standard regions. It stated that, the President shall designate one member of each Council as Chairman of the Council and such Chairman shall serve at the pleasure of the President. The fact that State borders have been destroyed to create 10 REGIONS instead of 50 Union States is something your government doesn't want you to know.

There is no constitutional jurisdiction for the federal government to legislate for a municipal government in a Union State. **The usurpation of state jurisdiction can only be achieved by conspiracy and fraud on the part of our duly elected public servants.** It stands to reason that if there is no constitutional jurisdiction for the federal government to legislate for a municipal government in a Union state, there is also no jurisdiction for a federal bureaucracy to legislate for a municipal government in a Union state. As example: the EPA, the DEA, the IRS and the FBI, etc., have no Constitutional authority to legislate in a Union State. These are agencies of the Federal government, having jurisdiction only on federal territory. **This is something your government doesn't want you to know.**

Demeaning the authority of elected officials and replacement of these officials by appointed Federal "administrators" is a **CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER** to representative government posed by Federal Regional Government. Outlawed by the Supreme Court decision of January 13, 1982 (Case #80-1350, "Community Communications Co, Inc v City of Boulder, CO) the ten regional capitols were dismantled by President Reagan's *Executive Order #12407* on February 22, 1983.

However, grant making agencies of the ten Federal Regions remain in place assuring continuity of control over all Americans and their elected representatives by the central government.

Federal grants to state government are the fuel which make the Regional engines "go." The individual Union States are **blackmailed**, through the withholding of federal funds, if federal legislation is not enacted into State law, thereby opening the door to a power base for the silent revolution of Federal Regionalism.

There is a clear pattern of uniformity in all laws passed. On the state level, all fifty legislatures appear to become simultaneously concerned about solving a particular problem in an identical fashion. On the local level, the same thing happens in thousands of City Halls and County Seats. **This strange coincidence is never publicized by the press**, thereby it is rarely questioned by the public. Unknown to most of the public, all our laws are written by the **Uniform Commission on State Law**, also known as the **Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. (ACIR)**

FATAL STEPS

PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATIONS 2039 and 2040 March 6, 1933, March 9, 1933

Declaration of National Emergency and Declaration of War against the American People by the Government of the United States.

WAR POWERS ACT . . . March 9, 1933

TITLE 12 USC. Section 95(a) and 95(b)

This Act states that "During time of war or during any period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise investigate, regulate, prohibit, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit between or payments by banking institutions as defined by the President and export, hoarding, melting, or earmarkings of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, by any person within the United States or anyplace subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

FEDERAL REGISTER ACT . . . July 26, 1935

The Federal Register Act enabled the president to create unlimited bureaucracies and empower them with the force of law. All that was needed to implement bureaucratic regulations into law was to enter or publish those regulations in the Federal Register, by-passing all constitutional oversight.

THE BUCK ACT . . . October 9, 1940

Congress in 1940 passed the "Buck Act" 4 U.S.C.S. 104-113. **By clever legal maneuvers from 1935 to 1940, the feds entirely circumvented the U.S. Constitution.** In Section 110(e), this Act allowed any department of the federal government to create a "Federal Area" for imposition of the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939, the imposition of this tax is at 4 U.S.C.S. section 111, and the rest of the taxing law is in Title 26, The Internal Revenue Code. The Social Security Board had already created an overlay of a "Federal Area."

As a result, the Federal Government created Federal "States" which are exactly like the Sovereign States, occupy the same territory and boundaries, but whose names are capitalized versions of the Sovereign States. (Remember that Proper Names and Proper Nouns in the English language have only the first letter Capitalized.) For example, the Federal "State" of ILLINOIS is overlaid upon the Sovereign State of Illinois. Further, it is designated by the Federal abbreviation of "IL", instead of the Sovereign State abbreviation of "Ill." So too is Arizona designated "AZ" instead of the lawful abbreviation of "Ariz.", "CA" instead of "Calif.", etc. If you use a two-letter CAPITALIZED abbreviation, you are declaring that the location is under the jurisdiction of the "federal" government instead of the powers of the "Sovereign" state.

As a result of creating these "shadow" States, the Federal government assumes that every area is a "Federal Area," and that the Citizens therein are "Federal" citizens.

THE STORY OF THE BUCK ACT

Authored by Richard McDonald / edited by Mitch Modeleski

In order for you to understand the full import of what is happening, certain laws must be explained to you.

When passing new statutes, the Federal government always does everything according to the principles of law. In order for the Federal Government to tax a Citizen of one of the several states, they had to create some sort of contractual nexus. This contractual nexus is the "*Social Security Number*".

In 1935, the federal government instituted Social Security. The *Social Security Board* then created 10 Social Security "*Districts*". The combination of these "*Districts*" resulted in a "*Federal area*" which covered all the several states like a clear plastic overlay. See Map on page 50.

In 1939, the federal government instituted the "*Public Salary Tax Act of 1939*". This *Act* is a *municipal law* of the District of Columbia for taxing all federal and state government employees and those who live and work in any "*Federal area*".

Now, the government knows that it cannot tax state Citizens who live and work outside the territorial jurisdiction of **Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17** (1:8:17) or **Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2** (4:3:2) in the *U.S. Constitution*. So, in 1940, Congress passed the "*Buck Act*", (4 U.S.C.S. Sections 105-113). In Section 110(e), the *Act* authorized any department of the federal government to create a "*Federal area*" for imposition of the "*Public Salary Tax Act*" of 1939. This tax is imposed at 4 U.S.C.S. Sec. 111. The rest of the taxing law is found in the Internal Revenue Code. The Social Security Board had already created a "*Federal area*" overlay.

"4 U.S.C.S. Sec. 110(d). **The term "State"** includes any Territory or possession of the United States."

"4 U.S.C.S. Sec. 110(e). The term "*Federal area*" means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United States or any department, establishment, or agency of the United States; and any *Federal area*, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a *Federal area* located within such State."

There is no reasonable doubt that the "*federal State*" is imposing an *excise tax* under the provisions of 4 U.S.C.S. Section 105, which states in pertinent part:

"**Sec. 105.** *State, and so forth, taxation affecting Federal areas; sales or use tax.*

"(a) **No person** shall be relieved from liability for payment of, collection of, or accounting for any sales or use tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such tax, on the ground that the sale or use, with respect to which such tax is levied, occurred in whole or in part within a *Federal area*; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect any such tax in any *Federal area* within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a *Federal area*."

Irrespective of what the tax is called, if its purpose is to produce revenue, it is an "*income tax*" or a "*receipts tax*" under the *Buck Act* [4 U.S.C.A. Sects. 105-110]. *Humble Oil & Refining Co. v. Calvert*, 464 SW 2d. 170 (1971), *affd* (Tex) 478 SW 2d. 926, *cert. den.* 409 U.S. 967, 34 L.Ed. 2d. 234, 93 S.Ct. 293.

Thus, the obvious question arises: What is a "*Federal area*"? A "*Federal area*" is any area designated by any agency, department, or establishment of the federal government. This includes the *Social Security areas* designated by the Social Security Administration, any public housing area that has federal funding, a home that

has a federal bank loan, a road that has federal funding, and almost everything that the federal government touches through any type of aid. *Springfield v. Kenny*, 104 N.E. 2d 65 (1951 App.). This "*Federal area*" attaches to anyone who has a Social Security Number or any personal contact with the federal or state governments. Through this mechanism, the federal government usurped the Sovereignty of the People, as well as the Sovereignty of the several states, by creating "*Federal areas*" within the boundaries of the states under the [purported] authority of *Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2* (4:3:2) in the federal Constitution, which states:

"2. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States, and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

Therefore, all U.S. citizens [i.e. citizens of the District of Columbia] residing in one of the states of the Union, are classified as "property", as franchisees of the federal government, and as an "individual entity". See *Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox*, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773. Under the "*Buck Act*", (4 U.S.C.S. Sects. 105-113), the federal government has created "*Federal areas*" within the boundaries of all the several states. These areas are similar to any territory that the federal government acquires through purchase, conquest or treaty, thereby imposing *federal territorial law* upon all people in these "*Federal areas*." Federal territorial law is evidenced by the Executive Branch's yellow-fringed U.S. flag flying in schools, offices and all courtrooms.

You must live on the land in one of the states in the Union of states, not within any "*Federal State*" or "*Federal area*", nor can you be involved in any activity that would make you subject to "*federal laws*." You cannot have a valid Social Security Number, a "*resident*" driver's license, or a motor vehicle registered in your name. You cannot have a "*federal*" bank account, a Federal Register Account Number relating to Individual **persons** [SSN], (see Executive Order Number 9397, November 1943), or any other known "**contract implied in fact**" that would place you within any "*Federal area*" and thus within the territorial jurisdiction of the municipal laws of Congress. Remember, all *Acts* of Congress are territorial in nature and only apply within the territorial jurisdiction of Congress. (See *American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co.*, 213 U.S. 347, 356-357 (1909); *U.S. v. Spelar*, 338 U.S. 217, 222, 94 L.Ed. 3, 70 S.Ct. 10 (1949); *New York Central R.R. Co. v. Chisholm*, 268 U.S. 29, 31-32, 69 L.Ed. 828, 45 S.Ct. 402 (1925).)

There has been created a fictional "Federal State within a state." See *Howard v. Sinking Fund of Louisville*, 344 U.S. 624, 73 S.Ct. 465, 476, 97 L.Ed. 617 (1953); *Schwartz v. O'Hara TP. School Dist.*, 100 A. 2d. 621, 625, 375 Pa. 440. (Compare also 31 C.F.R. Parts 51.2 and 52.2, which also identify a fictional State within a state.) This fictional "State" is identified by the use of two-letter abbreviations like "CA", "AZ" and "TX", as distinguished from the authorized abbreviations like "Calif.", "Ariz." and "Tex.", etc. This fictional State also uses ZIP Codes which are within the municipal, exclusive legislative jurisdiction of Congress.

This entire scheme was accomplished by passage of the "*Buck Act*", (4 U.S.C.S. Sects. 105-113), to implement the application of the "*Public Salary Tax Act*" of 1939 to workers within the private sector. This subjects all private sector workers (who have a Social Security number) to all state and federal laws "*within this State*", a "*fictional Federal area*" overlaying the land in California and in all other states in the Union. In California, this is established by *California Form 590, Revenue and Taxation*. All you have to do is to state that you live in California. This establishes that you do not live in a "*Federal area*" and that you are exempt from the *Public Salary Tax Act* of 1939 and also from the *California Income Tax* for residents who live "*in this State*".

The following definition is used throughout the several states in the application of their municipal laws which require some form of contract for proper application. This definition is also included in all the codes of California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah and New York:

"In this State" or "in the State" means within the exterior limits of the State ... and includes all territories within such limits owned or ceded to the United States of America."

This definition concurs with the "*Buck Act*" (supra) which states:

"110(d) The term "State" includes any Territory or possession of the United States."

"110(e) The term "Federal area" means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United States or any department, establishment, or agency of the United States; and any Federal area, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a Federal area located within such State."

FEDERAL REGIONALISM Continued

PUBLIC LAW 79-404 entitled "**Administrative Procedures Act of 1946.**"

This act set up the procedure yielding lawmaking authority to agencies in the executive sector of government (federal bureaucracies), and provided that administrative rules and regulations be printed in the Federal Register giving these regulations the force of law.

TITLE 3 USC Section 301, October 31, 1951: General authorization to delegate functions; publication of delegations.

This law authorized the President of the United States to designate and empower the head of any department or agency in the executive branch, or any official thereof who is required to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to perform without approval, ratification, or other action by the President (1) any function which is vested in the President by law, or (2) any function which such officer is required or authorized by law to perform only with or subject to the approval, ratification, or other action of the President: Provided, That nothing contained in the act relieved the President of his responsibility in office for the acts of any such head or other official designated by him to perform such functions. Such designation and authorization would be in writing, and published in the Federal Register.

PUBLIC LAW 86-380 and its amendment **89-733, 1959** under the Eisenhower Administration, created the **Advisory Council On Intergovernmental Relations. (ACIR)** This commission consists of 26 individuals, of which 14 are appointees representing groups such as the Council of State Governments, The League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the Governors Conference . . . **all proponents and strong lobbyists for Federal grant programs that are subordinating local governments to Regional governing bodies.**

PUBLIC LAW 89-136 entitled "**Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965**".

This act is the basis for the manner in which the 10 Federal regions are to be governed by a "**Multi-State Regional Commission**". It also states that the Secretary of Commerce has the power to "**acquire in any lawful manner, any property (real or personal) whenever deemed necessary.**"

PUBLIC LAW 89-754. The Model Cities Act of 1966.

Section 204 of this act requires that a broad spectra of public facilities type projects which seek federal assistance must be brought under the aegis of area wide Regional comprehensive planning agencies, the clearing house system.

PUBLIC LAW 90-577 1968, 90th Congress, INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT

"To achieve the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities among the levels of government . . . to establish coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration . . . to provide for the acquisition, use, and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies."

PUBLIC LAW 90-577 destroyed the separation of powers which is the principle of the U.S. Constitution. By its Title IV the U.S. Congress purported to yield legislative power to the president. He, in turn, allegedly transferred that law making power to his appointed directors in the grant making agencies of the Federal Regions per section 403 of the Bill. Out of that arrangement has grown the A-95 regional clearing house review system, designed by the Office of Management and Budget. The resulting Federal Region-Sub State control system straps regional governance (**control by regulation**) as a way of life over all America.

The separation of powers principle of the U.S. Constitution is destroyed by Title IV of this Regional Law in which Congress yields Legislative Power to the U.S. President. Through this act, the President was empowered to yield that lawmaking power to his appointees. (Section 403) From that arrangement has grown the controversial **A-95 REGIONAL CLEARING HOUSE review system** designed by the executive OMB (Office of Budget and Management). This system binds Regionalism over all of America by non-laws (**administrative rules and regulations**) which are not backed by LAW.

Congress thus legislated a system of government that is not permitted by our U.S. Constitution.

March 27, 1969, President Richard M. Nixon announced that he had divided the United States into eight (subsequently ten) Federal Regions. The President, by his act, set in motion a series of events which, unless reversed will dissolve sovereign state governments, disenfranchise the electorate, and merge the American pioneer spirit in an amorphous "**world citizenship**". **The American people have been moved into the orbit of a financial/industrial cabal who control their corporate world state through the United Nations, the U.S. Congress, and other front organizations.**

The fatal steps which transformed the Republic into a **dictatorship of the financial elite** are set out in the following Congressional statutes, executive orders, and proclamations which trace a seditious conspiracy of interlocking subversion in government departments during the period October 16, 1968 to 20 October, 1972.

27 March, 1969

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON RESTRUCTURING OF GOVERNMENT SERVICE SYSTEMS,

The White House

Quoting the Reorganization Act, signed the same day, as his authority, President Nixon divided the United States into eight (later ten) Federal Regions or provinces, each with a new provincial capitol. Coordination and control of the ten Federal Regions would be administered from Washington. Formation of such "super states" is, of course, a violation of paragraph 1, section 3, Article IV, United States Constitution.

Objective: To transfer political power from the respective sovereign State government to appointed Federal agencies, whose controllers are the directors of the corporate world state.

30 October, 1969

EXECUTIVE ORDER #11490, "Assigning Emergency Preparedness Functions to Federal Departments and Agencies," . . .

The Federal Register

E.O. 11490 consolidated executive orders of previous administrations into one omnibus directive, and provided for implementation of its powers "by an order or directive issued by the President in any national emergency type of situation."

E.O. 11490 authorizes the Office of Emergency Planning to put all controls into effect "in times of economic or financial crisis."

Takeover by government agencies includes: communications media; all electrical power, gas, petroleum fuels, and minerals; food resources and farms; all modes of transportation and control of highways, seaports, etc.; health, education, and welfare functions; airports and aircraft.

Provision is also made for the mobilization of civilians into work brigades under government supervision. The order directs the Postmaster General to operate a national registration of all persons; permits the Housing and Finance Authority to relocate communities, and grants authority to the Department of Justice to enforce the plans set out in E.O. 11490, and to operate penal and correctional institutions.

29 December, 1970

PUBLIC LAW 91-596 – OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

ACT OF 1970

PUBLIC LAW 91-596 known as the "Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970" was passed. This Act was necessary in order to gain control of private property "usage". The Act specifically limited itself to private businesses and excluded State, County, Municipal, School District, and Conservation District governing bodies.

It set forth that its enabling legislation must provide that the above State government and its political subdivisions must also abide by the standards set forth in the Federal Act.

15 August, 1971

EXECUTIVE ORDER 311615, "Providing for Stabilization of Prices, Rents, Wages, and Salaries,"

The Federal Register

E.O. 11615 designated the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as the director of a Cost of Living Council, with authority to request the Department of Justice to bring actions for injunctions "whenever it appears to the Council that any person has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage in any acts or practices constituting a violation of any regulation or order issued pursuant to this Order." (See EO 11490).

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board thus became czar over prices, rents, wages, and salaries, in addition to his control over money, interest rates, and the stock market, granted under the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913.

15 August, 1971

PROCLAMATION #4074, "Imposition of Supplemental Duty for Balance of Payments Purposes," The President.

The principal objective of Proclamation 4074 was to "declare a national emergency" and so establish stand-by authority to implement any or all of the provisions of Executive Order #11490 at such time as the American people had been conditioned to accept dictatorship. The people are now being brainwashed to accept, in fact demand, full government control over their lives and property.

12 February, 1972

EXECUTIVE ORDER #11647, "Federal Regional Councils",

E.O.#11647 established a Federal Regional Council for each of the ten standard Federal Regions" which Nixon effected by proclamation on March 27, 1969. The Office of Management and Budget was designed to be the control agency.

By this order the ten provincial capitols were staffed by the directors of grant-making agencies: Department of Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Secretarial Representatives of the Department of Transportation, and the directors of the regional offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

The President of the United States subsequently appointed a commissar for each Federal Region.

18 October, 1972

PUBLIC LAW 92-500 -- FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

PUBLIC LAW 92-500, which is known as the "Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972" was passed which set forth that States may assume pollution control enforcement on all businesses, land owners, and their equipment and land. This Act provides an effective "informer system" for citizens to squeal on their neighbors and/or employers. It also creates a body corporate to be known as the Environmental Financing Authority to have the power to acquire private property (real or personal) by whatever means and to also sell or lease said property. It also set forth that if the States desired to assume the enforcement duties of the federal government that it--the State--must enact enabling legislation which must be approved by the federal government.

20 October, 1972

PUBLIC LAW 95-512, 92nd Congress, H.R. 14370 -- FEDERAL---STATE REVENUE SHARING


"To . . . authorize Federal collection of State individual income taxes, and for other purposes." The primary function of P.L. 92-512 is to provide that, "after January 1, 1974, if two or more States request it of the U.S. government, and at the option of the individual States, all State taxes may be collected and administered by the federal government." (The decision is irreversible.) It further provides a "ceiling and floor" for State Income Taxes, and states that no State may thereafter alter its tax structure without first obtaining permission of the federal government. It further provides for the manner in which State and local "boundary changes, and government reorganization" could be handled.

Under this Act, state and county governments will, in time, wither for lack of tax funds, representative government will die (although the trappings of a republican form of government may be retained to fool the people), and dictatorial control over people and property will be imposed upon once free Americans.

Standard Federal Regions

The ten standard Federal Regions were established by OMB (Office of Management and Budget) Circular A-105, "*Standard Federal Regions*," in April, 1974, and required for all executive agencies. In recent years, some agencies have tailored their field structures to meet program needs and facilitate interaction with local, state and regional counterparts. The OMB must still approve any departures, however.

- Region I: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
- Region II: New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands
- Region III: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia
- Region IV: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee
- Region V: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin
- Region VI: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas
- Region VII: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska
- Region VIII: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming
- Region IX: Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada (American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands)
- Region X: Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington



The White House
Office of the Press Secretary
For Immediate Release
January 11, 2010

President Obama Signs Executive Order Establishing Council of Governors

Executive Order will Strengthen Further Partnership Between the Federal and State and Local Governments to Better Protect Our Nation

The President today signed [an Executive Order \(attached\)](#) establishing a Council of Governors to strengthen further the partnership between the Federal Government and State Governments to protect our Nation against all types of hazards. When appointed, the Council will be reviewing such matters as involving the National Guard of the various States; homeland defense; civil support; synchronization and integration of State and Federal military activities in the United States; and other matters of mutual interest pertaining to National Guard, homeland defense, and civil support activities.

The bipartisan **Council will be composed of ten State Governors who will** be selected by the President to serve two year terms. In selecting the Governors to the Council, the White House will solicit input from Governors and Governors' associations. Once chosen, the Council will have no more than five members from the same party and **represent the Nation as a whole.**

Federal members of the Council include the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, the Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs and Public Engagement, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs, the U.S. Northern Command Commander, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. The Secretary of Defense will designate an Executive Director for the Council.

The Council of Governors will provide an invaluable Senior Administration forum for exchanging views with State and local officials on strengthening our National resilience and the homeland defense and civil support challenges facing our Nation today and in the future.

The formation of the Council of Governors was required by the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act which stated, "The President shall establish a bipartisan Council of Governors to advise the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the White House Homeland Security Council on matters related to the National Guard and civil support missions." (NDAA FY2008, Sec 1822)

President **Barack Obama (Region V)** announced today that he plans to appoint Oklahoma Gov. Brad Henry to the council of governors created by the White House last month.

The council will help coordinate state and federal efforts pertaining to the National Guard, homeland defense and civil support activities.

"I am pleased that these governors of exceptional experience have agreed to join the Council of Governors," Obama said. "This bipartisan team strengthens the partnership between our state governments and the federal government when it comes to ensuring our national preparedness and homeland defense. I look forward to working with them in the years ahead."

Vermont Gov. **James H. Douglas (Region I)** and Washington Gov. **Chris Gregoire (Region X)** will co-chair the council.

Other members are:

Arizona Gov. **Janice K. Brewer (Region IX)**; Puerto Rico Gov. **Luis G. Fortuño (Region II)**; Virginia Gov. **Robert F. McDonnell (Region III)**; Missouri Gov. **Jeremiah W. (Jay) Nixon (Region VII)**; Maryland Gov. **Martin O'Malley (Region III)**; North Carolina Gov. **Beverly Eaves Perdue (Region IV)**; and South Dakota Gov. **Michael Rounds (Region VIII)**.

Constitution for the Newstates of America

A CONSTITUTION FOR THE NEWSTATES OF AMERICA

Review by Dr. Peter David Beter, political economist, author and lecturer (deceased).

In 1964, the writing of a new constitution for America began, at a tax-exempt foundation with the misleading name, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

The people who took it upon themselves to write this new constitution on our behalf were, of course, not elected representatives, or in any other way our representatives. As a tax-exempt foundation, they were able to do political work on what amounts to a subsidy taken from your taxes, but you and I were never asked if we wanted a new constitution written. Indeed, only a very tiny fraction of the people in the United States even know that it exists: it has been made known to practically no one except a select category of influential people whose views and interest generally coincide with those of the people who wrote it. The American people as a whole are still in the dark about it, and this situation is deliberate. It is therefore truly a "secret" constitution.

This model constitution took ten years to write, drawing upon the efforts of more than 100 people. A preliminary version was published in 1970 and given exposure in limited circles. But, in 1974, an essentially final version was quietly published in a book entitled THE EMERGING CONSTITUTION by Rexford G. Tugwell (Harper & Row, \$20), the man who directed the formulation of the new constitution. It is the fortieth draft. During most of the time that their constitution was being written, the Center for Study of Democratic Institutions was lavishly funded to the tune of \$2,500,000 annually.

DR. BETER'S CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Certain powerful forces hoped to celebrate our nation's Bicentennial in 1976 by replacing the freedoms guaranteed in our present Constitution with their own dictatorship - a cleverly disguised dictatorship. It has been made to superficially resemble the government that we have now, so that we will not recognize it for what it is - until too late. They are using every propaganda trick at their command to make us lower our guard. And they are about to put us all in a condition of economic desperation to persuade us to accept their cleverly disguised dictatorship.

Our U.S. Constitution, according to the Preamble, is intended to provide for justice, domestic tranquillity, common defense and general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty not only to ourselves, but to our posterity. These were the goals that shaped our Constitution. And this is the Constitution that enabled America to become a great nation of free people.

TWENTY-FIVE YEAR CONSTITUTION

The Newstates of America Constitution has a Preamble, too - it mentions not one of the objectives of our present Constitution. Instead of "justice and domestic tranquillity", the new constitution seeks only "good order" without defining what that means. The very first words are "So that we may join in common endeavors" - and the body of the new constitution makes it clear that this means an end to individual endeavors. Their new constitution expressly states to be good only for a prescribed period of 25 years: our posterity is left to fend for itself. No reference is made in the Preamble to our defense or general welfare.

Worst of all: the matter of liberty - so central to our present Constitution - is totally ignored in the Preamble of the new one, which seeks only, "an adequate and self-repairing government". The emphasis throughout their new constitution is on the government - not on the people. "Adequate" turns out to mean: too powerful to be challenged. And "self-repairing" means that the laws and governmental structures can be continually changed and shifted to permit anything our rulers wish to do.

Before I explore some of the details of their secret new constitution, let me give you a bird's-eye view: Article I is divided into two parts defining "Rights" and "Responsibilities." It turns out that some of our present rights disappear outright, and practically all of the rest become conditional and fragile, able to be terminated on the whim of the government. The responsibilities, however, which are obligations of the citizen to the government, are absolute and unconditional.

TEN FEDERAL REGION NEWSTATES

Article II defines what are called the "Newstates". The 50 states we have now become 10 in number. It is no accident that our federal government for the past several years has managed its outlying activities through ten federal regions. These 10 new states will be completely subservient to the federal government and creatures of it.

PREAMBLE

So that we may join in common endeavors, welcome the future in good order, and create an adequate and self-repairing government - we, the people, do establish the Newstates of America, herein provided to be ours, and do ordain this Constitution whose supreme law it shall be until the time prescribed for it shall have run.

ARTICLE I

Rights and Responsibilities

A. Rights

SECTION 1. Freedom of expression, of communication, of movement, of assembly, or of petition shall not be abridged except in declared emergency.

SECTION 2. Access to information possessed by governmental agencies shall not be denied except in the interest of national security; but communications among officials necessary to decision making shall be privileged.

SECTION 3. Public communicators may decline to reveal sources of information, but shall be responsible for hurtful disclosures.

SECTION 4. The privacy of individuals shall be respected; searches and seizures shall be made only on judicial warrant; persons shall be pursued or questioned only for the prevention of crime or the apprehension of suspected criminals, and only according to rules established under law.

SECTION 5. There shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, color, origin, or sex. The Court of Rights and Responsibilities may determine whether selection for various occupations has been discriminatory.

SECTION 6. All persons shall have equal protection of the laws, and in all electoral procedures the vote of every eligible citizen shall count equally with others.

SECTION 7. It shall be public policy to promote discussion of public issues and to encourage peaceful public gatherings for this purpose. Permission to hold such gatherings shall not be denied, nor shall they be interrupted, except in declared emergency or on a showing of imminent danger to public order and on judicial warrant.

SECTION 8. The practice of religion shall be privileged; but no religion shall be imposed by some on others, and none shall have public support.

SECTION 9. Any citizen may purchase, sell, lease, hold, convey, and inherit real and personal property, and shall benefit equally from all laws for security in such transactions.

SECTION 10. Those who cannot contribute to productivity shall be entitled to a share of the national product; but distribution shall be fair and the total may not exceed the amount for this purpose held in the National Sharing Fund.

SECTION 11. Education shall be provided at public expense for those who meet appropriate tests of eligibility.

SECTION 12. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. No property shall be taken without compensation.

SECTION 13. Legislatures shall define crimes and conditions requiring restraint, but confinement shall not be for punishment; and, when possible, there shall be preparation for return to freedom.

SECTION 14. No person shall be placed twice in jeopardy for the same offense.

SECTION 15. Writs of habeas corpus shall not be suspended except in declared emergency.

SECTION 16. Accused persons shall be informed of charges against them, shall have a speedy trial, shall have reasonable bail, shall be allowed to confront witnesses or to call others, and shall not be compelled to testify against themselves; at the time of arrest they shall be informed of their right to be silent and to have counsel, provided, if necessary, at public expense; and courts shall consider the contention that prosecution may be under an invalid or unjust statute.

B. Responsibilities

SECTION 1. Each freedom of the citizen shall prescribe a corresponding responsibility not to diminish that of others: of speech, communication, assembly, and petition, to grant the same freedom to others; of religion, to respect that of others; of privacy, not to invade that of others; of the holding and disposal of property, the obligation to extend the same privilege to others.

SECTION 2. Individuals and enterprises holding themselves out to serve the public shall serve all equally and without intention to misrepresent, conforming to such standards as may improve health and welfare.

SECTION 3. Protection of the law shall be repaid by assistance in its enforcement; this shall include respect for the procedures of justice, apprehension of lawbreakers, and testimony at trial.

SECTION 4. Each citizen shall participate in the processes of democracy, assisting in the selection of officials and in the monitoring of their conduct in office.

SECTION 5. Each shall render such services to the nation as may be uniformly required by law, objection by reason of conscience being adjudicated as hereinafter provided; and none shall expect or may receive special privileges unless they be for a public purpose defined by law.

SECTION 6. Each shall pay whatever share of governmental costs is consistent with fairness to all.

SECTION 7. Each shall refuse awards or titles from other nations or their representatives except as they be authorized by law.

SECTION 8. There shall be a responsibility to avoid violence and to keep the peace; for this reason the bearing of arms or the possession of lethal weapons shall be confined to the police, members of the armed forces, and those licensed under law.

SECTION 9. Each shall assist in preserving the endowments of nature and enlarging the inheritance of future generations.

SECTION 10. Those granted the use of public lands, the air, or waters shall have a responsibility for using these resources so that, if irreplaceable, they are conserved and, if replaceable, they are put back as they were.

SECTION 11. Retired officers of the armed forces, of the senior civil service, and of the Senate shall regard their service as a permanent obligation and shall not engage in enterprise seeking profit from the government.

SECTION 12. The devising or controlling of devices for management or technology shall establish responsibility for resulting costs.

SECTION 13. All rights and responsibilities defined herein shall extend to such associations of citizens as may be authorized by law.

ARTICLE II

The Newstates

SECTION 1. There shall be Newstates, each comprising no less than 5 percent of the whole population. Existing states may continue and may have the status of Newstates if the Boundary Commission, hereinafter provided, shall so decide. The Commission shall be guided in its recommendations by the probability of accommodation to the conditions for effective government. States electing by referendum to continue if the Commission recommend otherwise shall nevertheless accept all Newstate obligations.

SECTION 2. The Newstates shall have constitutions formulated and adopted by processes hereinafter prescribed.

SECTION 3. They shall have Governors, legislatures, and planning, administrative, and judicial systems.

SECTION 4. Their political procedures shall be organized and supervised by electoral Overseers; but their elections shall not be in years of presidential election.

SECTION 5. The electoral apparatus of the Newstates of America shall be available to them, and they may be allotted funds under rules agreed to by the national Overseer; but expenditures may not be made by or for any candidate except they be approved by the Overseer; and requirements of residence in a voting district shall be no longer than thirty days.

SECTION 6. They may charter subsidiary governments, urban or rural, and may delegate to them powers appropriate to their responsibilities.

SECTION 7. They may lay, or may delegate the laying of, taxes; but these shall conform to the restraints stated hereinafter for the Newstates of America.

SECTION 8. They may not tax exports, may not tax with intent to prevent imports, and may not impose any tax forbidden by laws of the Newstates of America; but the objects appropriate for taxation shall be clearly designated.

SECTION 9. Taxes on land may be at higher rates than those on its improvements.

SECTION 10. They shall be responsible for the administration of public services not reserved to the government of the Newstates of America, such activities being concerted with those of corresponding national agencies, where these exist, under arrangements common to all.

SECTION 11. The rights and responsibilities prescribed in this Constitution shall be effective in the Newstates and shall be suspended only in emergency when declared by Governors and not disapproved by the Senate of the Newstates of America.

SECTION 12. Police powers of the Newstates shall extend to all matters not reserved to the Newstates of America; but preempted powers shall not be impaired.

SECTION 13. Newstates may not enter into any treaty, alliance, confederation, or agreement unless approved by the Boundary Commission hereinafter provided.

They may not coin money, provide for the payment of debts in any but legal tender, or make any charge for inter-Newstate services. They may not enact ex post facto laws or ones impairing the obligation of contracts.

SECTION 14. Newstates may not impose barriers to imports from other jurisdictions or impose any hindrance to citizens' freedom of movement.

SECTION 15. If governments of the Newstates fail to carry out fully their constitutional duties, their officials shall be warned and may be required by the Senate, on the recommendation of the Watchkeeper, to forfeit revenues from the Newstates of America.

ARTICLE III

The Electoral Branch

SECTION 1. To arrange for participation by the electorate in the determination of policies and the selection of officials, there shall be an Electoral Branch.

SECTION 2. An Overseer of electoral procedures shall be chosen by majority of the Senate and may be removed by a two-thirds vote. It shall be the Overseer's duty to supervise the organization of national and district parties, arrange for discussion among them, and provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office. While in office the Overseer shall belong to no political organization; and after each presidential election shall offer to resign.

SECTION 3. A national party shall be one having had at least a 5 percent affiliation in the latest general election; but a new party shall be recognized when valid petitions have been signed by at least 2 percent of the voters in each of 30 percent of the districts drawn for the House of Representatives. Recognition shall be suspended upon failure to gain 5 percent of the votes at a second election, 10 percent at a third, or 15 percent at further elections.

District parties shall be recognized when at least 2 percent of the voters shall have signed petitions of affiliation; but recognition shall be withdrawn upon failure to attract the same percentages as are necessary for the continuance of national parties.

SECTION 4. Recognition by the Overseer shall bring parties within established regulations and entitle them to common privileges.

SECTION 5. The Overseer shall promulgate rules for party conduct and shall see that fair practices are maintained, and for this purpose shall appoint deputies in each district and shall supervise the choice, in district and national conventions, of party administrators. Regulations and appointments may be objected to by the Senate.

SECTION 6. The Overseer, with the administrators and other officials, shall:

- a. Provide the means for discussion, in each party, of public issues, and, for this purpose, ensure that members have adequate facilities for participation.
- b. Arrange for discussion, in annual district meetings, of the President's views, of the findings of the Planning Branch, and such other information as may be pertinent for enlightened political discussion.
- c. Arrange, on the first Saturday in each month, for enrollment, valid for one year, of voters at convenient places.

SECTION 7. The Overseer shall also:

- a. Assist the parties in nominating candidates for district members of the House of Representatives each three years; and for this purpose designate one hundred districts, each with a similar number of eligible voters, redrawing districts after each election. In these there shall be party conventions having no more than three hundred delegates, so distributed that representation of voters be approximately equal.

Candidates for delegate may become eligible by presenting petitions signed by two hundred registered voters. They shall be elected by party members on the first Tuesday in March, those having the largest number of votes being chosen until the three hundred be complete. Ten alternates shall also be chosen by the same process.

District conventions shall be held on the first Tuesday in April. Delegates shall choose three candidates for membership in the House of Representatives, the three having the most votes becoming candidates.

b. Arrange for the election each three years of three members of the House of Representatives in each district from among the candidates chosen in party conventions, the three having the most votes to be elected.

SECTION 8. The Overseer shall also:

a. Arrange for national conventions to meet nine years after previous presidential elections, with an equal number of delegates from each district, the whole number not to exceed one thousand.

Candidates for delegates shall be eligible when petitions signed by five hundred registered voters have been filed. Those with the most votes, together with two alternates, being those next in number of votes, shall be chosen in each district.

b. Approve procedures in these conventions for choosing one hundred candidates to be members-at-large of the House of Representatives, whose terms shall be coterminous with that of the President. For this purpose delegates shall file one choice with convention officials. Voting on submissions shall proceed until one hundred achieve 10 percent, but not more than three candidates may be resident in any one district; if any district have more than three, those with the fewest votes shall be eliminated, others being added from the districts having less than three, until equality be reached. Of those added, those having the most votes shall be chosen first.

c. Arrange procedures for the consideration and approval of party objectives by the convention.

d. Formulate rules for the nomination in these conventions of candidates for President and Vice-Presidents when the offices are to fall vacant, candidates for nomination to be recognized when petitions shall have been presented by one hundred or more delegates, pledged to continue support until candidates can no longer win or until they consent to withdraw. Presidents and Vice-Presidents, together with Representatives-at-large, shall submit to referendum after serving for three years, and if they are rejected, new conventions shall be held within one month and candidates shall be chosen as for vacant offices.

Candidates for President and Vice-Presidents shall be nominated on attaining a majority.

e. Arrange for the election on the first Tuesday in June, in appropriate years, of new candidates for President and Vice-Presidents, and members-at-large of the House of Representatives, all being presented to the nation's voters as a ticket; if no ticket achieve a majority, the Overseer shall arrange another election, on the third Tuesday in June, between the two persons having the most votes; and if referendum so determine he shall provide similar arrangements for the nomination and election of candidates.

In this election, the one having the most votes shall prevail.

SECTION 9. The Overseer shall also:

- a. Arrange for the convening of the national legislative houses on the fourth Tuesday of July.
- b. Arrange for inauguration of the President and Vice-Presidents on the second Tuesday of August.

SECTION 10. All costs of electoral procedures shall be paid from public funds, and there shall be no private contributions to parties or candidates; no contributions or expenditures for meetings, conventions, or campaigns shall be made; and no candidate for office may make any personal expenditures unless authorized by a uniform rule of the Overseer; and persons or groups making expenditures, directly or indirectly, in support of prospective candidates shall report to the Overseer and shall conform to his regulations.

SECTION 11. Expenses of the Electoral Branch shall be met by the addition of one percent to the net annual taxable income returns of taxpayers, this sum to be held by the Chancellor of Financial Affairs for disposition by the Overseer.

Funds shall be distributed to parties in proportion to the respective number of votes cast for the President and Governors at the last election, except that new parties, on being recognized, shall share in proportion to their number. Party administrators shall make allocations to legislative candidates in amounts proportional to the party vote at the last election.

Expenditures shall be audited by the Watchkeeper; and sums not expended within four years shall be returned to the Treasury.

It shall be a condition of every communications franchise that reasonable facilities shall be available for allocations by the Overseer.

ARTICLE IV

The Planning Branch

SECTION 1. There shall be a Planning Branch to formulate and administer plans and to prepare budgets for the uses of expected income in pursuit of policies formulated by the processes provided herein.

SECTION 2. There shall be a National Planning Board of fifteen members appointed by the President; the first members shall have terms designated by the President of one to fifteen years, thereafter one shall be appointed each year; the President shall appoint a Chairman who shall serve for fifteen years unless removed by him.

SECTION 3. The Chairman shall appoint, and shall supervise, a planning administrator, together with such deputies as may be agreed to by the Board.

SECTION 4. The Chairman shall present to the Board six- and twelve-year development plans prepared by the planning staff. They shall be revised each year after public hearings, and finally in the year before they are to take effect. They shall be submitted to the President on the fourth Tuesday in July for transmission to the Senate on September 1 with his comments.

If members of the Board fail to approve the budget proposals by the forwarding date, the Chairman shall nevertheless make submission to the President with notations of reservation by such members. The President shall transmit this proposal, with his comments, to the House of Representatives on September 1.

SECTION 5. It shall be recognized that the six-and twelve-year development plans represent national intentions tempered by the appraisal of possibilities. The twelve-year plan shall be a general estimate of probable progress, both governmental and private; the six-year plan shall be more specific as to estimated income and expenditure and shall take account of necessary revisions.

The purpose shall be to advance, through every agency of government, the excellence of national life. It shall be the further purpose to anticipate innovations, to estimate their impact, to assimilate them into existing institutions, and to moderate deleterious effects on the environment and on society.

The six- and twelve-year plans shall be disseminated for discussion and the opinions expressed shall be considered in the formulation of plans for each succeeding year with special attention to detail in proposing the budget.

SECTION 6. For both plans an extension of one year into the future shall be made each year and the estimates for all other years shall be revised accordingly. For nongovernmental activities the estimate of developments shall be calculated to indicate the need for enlargement or restriction.

SECTION 7. If there be objection by the President or the Senate to the six- or twelve-year plans, they shall be returned for restudy and resubmission. If there still be differences, and if the President and the Senate agree, they shall prevail. If they do not agree, the Senate shall prevail and the plan shall be revised accordingly.

SECTION 8. The Newstates, on June 1, shall submit proposals for development to be considered for inclusion in those for the Newstates of America. Researches and administration shall be delegated, when convenient, to planning agencies of the Newstates.

SECTION 9. There shall be submissions from private individuals or from organized associations affected with a public interest, as defined by the Board. They shall report intentions to expand or contract, estimates of production and demand, probable uses of resources, numbers expected to be employed, and other essential information.

SECTION 10. The Planning Branch shall make and have custody of official maps, and these shall be documents of reference for future developments both public and private; on them the location of facilities, with extension indicated, and the intended use of all areas shall be marked out.

Official maps shall also be maintained by the planning agencies of the Newstates, and in matters not exclusively national the National Planning Board may rely on these.

Undertakings in violation of official designation shall be at the risk of the venturer, and there shall be no recourse; but losses from designations after acquisition shall be recoverable in actions before the Court of Claims.

SECTION 11. The Planning Branch shall have available to it funds equal to one-half of one percent of the approved national budget (not including debt services or payments from trust funds). They shall be held by the

Chancellor of Financial Affairs and expended according to rules approved by the Board; but funds not expended within six years shall be available for other uses.

SECTION 12. Allocations may be made for the planning agencies of the Newstates; but only the maps and plans of the national Board, or those approved by them, shall have status at law.

SECTION 13. In making plans, there shall be due regard to the interests of other nations and such cooperation with their intentions as may be approved by the Board.

SECTION 14. There may also be cooperation with international agencies and such contributions to their work as are not disapproved by the President.

ARTICLE V

The Presidency

SECTION 1. The President of the Newstates of America shall be the head of government, shaper of its commitments, expositor of its policies, and supreme commander of its protective forces; shall have one term of nine years, unless rejected by 60 percent of the electorate after three years; shall take care that the nation's resources are estimated and are apportioned to its more exigent needs; shall recommend such plans, legislation, and action as may be necessary; and shall address the legislators each year on the state of the nation, calling upon them to do their part for the general good.

SECTION 2. There shall be two Vice-Presidents elected with the President; at the time of taking office the President shall designate one Vice-President to supervise internal affairs; and one to be deputy for general affairs. The deputy for general affairs shall succeed if the presidency be vacated; the Vice-President for internal affairs shall be second in succession. If either Vice-President shall die or be incapacitated, the President, with the consent of the Senate, shall appoint a successor. Vice-Presidents shall serve during an extended term with such assignments as the President may make.

If the presidency fall vacant through the disability of both Vice-Presidents, the Senate shall elect successors from among its members to serve until the next general election.

With the Vice-Presidents and other officials the President shall see to it that the laws are faithfully executed and shall pay attention to the findings and recommendations of the Planning Board, the National Regulatory Board, and the Watchkeeper in formulating national policies.

SECTION 3. Responsible to the Vice-President for General Affairs there shall be Chancellors of External, Financial, Legal, and Military Affairs.

The Chancellor of External Affairs shall assist in conducting relations with other nations.

The Chancellor of Financial Affairs shall supervise the nation's financial and monetary systems, regulating its capital markets and credit-issuing institutions as they may be established by law; and this shall include lending institutions for operations in other nations or in cooperation with them, except that treaties may determine their purposes and standards.

The Chancellor of Legal Affairs shall advise governmental agencies and represent them before the courts.

The Chancellor of Military Affairs shall act for the presidency in disposing all armed forces except militia commanded by governors; but these shall be available for national service at the President's convenience.

Except in declared emergency, the deployment of forces in far waters or in other nations without their consent shall be notified in advance to a national security committee of the Senate hereinafter provided.

SECTION 4. Responsible to the Vice-President for Internal Affairs there shall be chancellors of such departments as the President may find necessary for performing the services of government and are not rejected by a two-thirds vote when the succeeding budget is considered.

SECTION 5. Candidates for the presidency and the vice-presidencies shall be natural-born citizens. Their suitability may be questioned by the Senate within ten days of their nomination, and if two-thirds of the whole agree, they shall be ineligible and a nominating convention shall be reconvened. At the time of his nomination no candidate shall be a member of the Senate and none shall be on active service in the armed forces or a senior civil servant.

SECTION 6. The President may take leave because of illness or for an interval of relief, and the Vice-President in charge of General Affairs shall act. The President may resign if the Senate agree; and, if the term shall have more than two years to run, the Overseer shall arrange for a special election for President and Vice-President.

SECTION 7. The Vice-Presidents may be directed to perform such ministerial duties as the President may find convenient; but their instructions shall be of record, and their actions shall be taken as his deputy.

SECTION 8. Incapacitation may be established without concurrence of the President by a three-quarters vote of the Senate, whereupon a successor shall become Acting President until the disability be declared, by a similar vote, to be ended or to have become permanent. Similarly the other Vice-President shall succeed if a predecessor die or be disabled. Special elections, in these contingencies, may be required by the Senate.

Acting Presidents may appoint deputies, unless the Senate object, to assume their duties until the next election.

SECTION 9. The Vice-Presidents, together with such other officials as the President may designate from time to time, may constitute a cabinet or council; but this shall not include officials of other branches.

SECTION 10. Treaties or agreements with other nations, negotiated under the President's authority, shall be in effect unless objected to by a majority of the Senate within ninety days. If they are objected to, the President may resubmit and the Senate reconsider. If a majority still object, the Senate shall prevail.

SECTION 11. All officers, except those of other branches, shall be appointed and may be removed by the President. A majority of the Senate may object to appointments within sixty days, and alternative candidates shall be offered until it agrees.

SECTION 12. The President shall notify the Planning Board and the House of Representatives, on the fourth Tuesday in June, what the maximum allowable expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year shall be.

The President may determine to make expenditures less than provided in appropriations; but, except in declared emergency, none shall be made in excess of appropriations. Reduction shall be because of changes in requirements and shall not be such as to impair the integrity of budgetary procedures.

SECTION 13. There shall be a Public Custodian, appointed by the President and removable by him, who shall have charge of properties belonging to the government, but not allocated to specific agencies, who shall administer common public services, shall have charge of building construction and rentals, and shall have such other duties as may be designated by the President or the designated Vice-Presidents.

SECTION 14. There shall be an Intendant responsible to the President who shall supervise Offices for Intelligence and Investigation; also an Office of Emergency Organization with the duty of providing plans and procedures for such contingencies as can be anticipated.

The Intendant shall also charter nonprofit corporations (or foundations), unless the President shall object, determined by him to be for useful public purposes. Such corporations shall be exempt from taxation but shall conduct no profitmaking enterprises.

SECTION 15. The Intendant shall also be a counselor for the coordination of scientific and cultural experiments, and for studies within the government and elsewhere, and for this purpose shall employ such assistance as may be found necessary.

SECTION 16. Offices for other purposes may be established and may be discontinued by presidential order within the funds allocated in the procedures of appropriation.

ARTICLE VI

The Legislative Branch

(The Senate and the House of Representatives)

A. The Senate

SECTION 1. There shall be a Senate with membership as follows: If they so desire, former Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Principal Justices, Overseers, Chairmen of the Planning and Regulatory Boards, Governors having had more than seven years' service, and unsuccessful candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency who have received at least 30 percent of the vote. To be appointed by the President, three persons who have been Chancellors, two officials from the civil services, two officials from the diplomatic services, two senior military officers, also one person from a panel of three, elected in a process approved by the Overseer, by each of twelve such groups or associations as the President may recognize from time to time to be nationally representative, but none shall be a political or religious group, no individual selected shall have been paid by any private interest to influence government, and any association objected to by the Senate shall not be recognized. Similarly, to be appointed by the Principal Justice, two persons distinguished in public law and two former members of the High Courts or the Judicial Council. Also, to be elected by the House of Representatives, three members who have served six or more years.

Vacancies shall be filled as they occur.

SECTION 2. Membership shall continue for life, except that absences not provided for by rule shall constitute retirement, and that Senators may retire voluntarily.

SECTION 3. The Senate shall elect as presiding officer a Convener who shall serve for two years, when his further service may be discontinued by a majority vote. Other officers, including a Deputy, shall be appointed by the Convener unless the Senate shall object.

SECTION 4. The Senate shall meet each year on the second Tuesday in July and shall be in continuous session, but may adjourn to the call of the Convener. A quorum shall be more than three-fifths of the whole membership.

SECTION 5. The Senate shall consider, and return within thirty days, all measures approved by the House of Representatives (except the annual budget). Approval or disapproval shall be by a majority vote of those present. Objection shall stand unless the House of Representatives shall overcome it by a majority vote plus one; if no return be made, approval by the House of Representatives shall be final.

For consideration of laws passed by the House of Representatives or for other purposes, the Convener may appoint appropriate committees.

SECTION 6. The Senate may ask advice from the Principal Justice concerning the constitutionality of measures before it; and if this be done, the time for return to the House of Representatives may extend to ninety days.

SECTION 7. If requested, the Senate may advise the President on matters of public interest; or, if not requested, by resolution approved by two-thirds of those present. There shall be a special duty to note expressions of concern during party conventions and commitments made during campaigns; and if these be neglected, to remind the President and the House of Representatives that these undertakings are to be considered.

SECTION 8. In time of present or prospective danger caused by cataclysm, by attack, or by insurrection, the Senate may declare a national emergency and may authorize the President to take appropriate action. If the Senate be dispersed, and no quorum available, the President may proclaim the emergency, and may terminate it unless the Senate shall have acted. If the President be not available, and the circumstances extreme, the senior serving member of the presidential succession may act until a quorum assembles.

SECTION 9. The Senate may also define and declare a limited emergency in time of prospective danger, or of local or regional disaster, or if an extraordinary advantage be anticipated. It shall be considered by the House of Representatives within three days and, unless disapproved, may extend for a designated period and for a limited area before renewal.

Extraordinary expenditures during emergency may be approved, without regard to usual budget procedures, by the House of Representatives with the concurrence of the President.

SECTION 10. The Senate, at the beginning of each session, shall select three of its members to constitute a National Security Committee to be consulted by the President in emergencies requiring the deployment of the armed forces abroad. If the Committee dissent from the President's proposal, it shall report to the Senate, whose decision shall be final.

SECTION 11. The Senate shall elect, or may remove, a National Watchkeeper, and shall oversee, through a standing committee, a Watchkeeping Service conducted according to rules formulated for their approval.

With the assistance of an appropriate staff the Watchkeeper shall gather and organize information concerning the adequacy, competence, and integrity of governmental agencies and their personnel, as well as their continued usefulness; and shall also suggest the need for new or expanded services, making report concerning any agency of the deleterious effect of its activities on citizens or on the environment.

The Watchkeeper shall entertain petitions for the redress of grievances and shall advise the appropriate agencies if there be need for action.

For all these purposes, personnel may be appointed, investigations made, witnesses examined, post audits made, and information required.

The Convener shall present the Watchkeeper's findings to the Senate, and if it be judged to be in the public interest, they shall be made public or, without being made public, be sent to the appropriate agency for its guidance and such action as may be needed. On recommendation of the Watchkeeper the Senate may initiate corrective measures to be voted on by the House of Representatives within thirty days. When approved by a majority and not vetoed by the President, they shall become law.

For the Watchkeeping Service one-quarter of one percent of individual net taxable incomes shall be held by the Chancellor of Financial Affairs; but amounts not expended in any fiscal year shall be available for general use.

B. The House of Representatives

SECTION 1. The House of Representatives shall be the original lawmaking body of the Newstates of America.

SECTION 2. It shall convene each year on the second Tuesday in July and shall remain in continuous session except that it may adjourn to the call of a Speaker, elected by majority vote from among the Representatives-at-large, who shall be its presiding officer.

SECTION 3. It shall be a duty to implement the provisions of this constitution and, in legislating, to be guided by them.

SECTION 4. Party leaders and their deputies shall be chosen by caucus at the beginning of each session.

SECTION 5. Standing and temporary committees shall be selected as follows:

Committees dealing with the calendaring and management of bills shall have a majority of members nominated to party caucuses by the Speaker; other members shall be nominated by minority leaders. Membership shall correspond to the parties' proportions at the last election. If nominations be not approved by a majority of the caucus, the Speaker or the minority leaders shall nominate others until a majority shall approve.

Members of other committees shall be chosen by party caucus in proportion to the results of the last election. Chairmen shall be elected annually from among at-large members.

Bills referred to committees shall be returned to the house with recommendations within sixty days unless extension be voted by the House.

In all committee actions names of those voting for and against shall be recorded.

No committee chairman may serve longer than six years.

SECTION 6. Approved legislation, not objected to by the Senate within the allotted time, shall be presented to the President for his approval or disapproval. If the President disapproves, and three-quarters of the House membership still approve, it shall become law. The names of those voting for and against shall be recorded. Bills not returned within eleven days shall become law.

SECTION 7. The President may have thirty days to consider measures approved by the House unless they shall have been submitted twelve days previous to adjournment.

SECTION 8. The House shall consider promptly the annual budget; if there be objection, it shall be notified to the Planning Board; the Board shall then resubmit through the President; and, with his comments, it shall be returned to the House. If there still be objection by a two-thirds majority, the House shall prevail. Objection must be by whole title; titles not objected to when voted on shall constitute appropriation.

The budget for the fiscal year shall be in effect on January 1. Titles not yet acted on shall be as in the former budget until action be completed.

SECTION 9. It shall be the duty of the House to make laws concerning taxes.

1. For their laying and collection:

a. They shall be uniform, and shall not be retroactive.

b. Except such as may be authorized by law to be laid by Authorities, or by the Newstates, all collections shall be made by a national revenue agency. This shall include collections for trust funds hereinafter authorized.

c. Except for corporate levies to be held in the National Sharing Fund, hereinafter authorized, taxes may be collected only from individuals and only from incomes; but there may be withholding from current incomes.

d. To assist in the maintenance of economic stability, the President may be authorized to alter rates by executive order.

e. They shall be imposed on profit making enterprises owned or conducted by religious establishments or other nonprofit organizations.

f. There shall be none on food, medicines, residential rentals, or commodities or services designated by law as necessities; and there shall be no double taxation.

g. None shall be levied for registering ownership or transfer of property.

2. For expenditures from revenues:

a. For the purposes detailed in the annual budget unless objection be made by the procedure prescribed herein.

b. For such other purposes as the House may indicate and require the Planning Branch to include in revisions of the budget; but, except in declared emergency, the total may not exceed the President's estimate of available funds.

3. For fixing the percentage of net corporate taxable incomes to be paid into a National Sharing Fund to be held in the custody of the Chancellor of Financial Affairs and made available for such welfare and environmental purposes as are authorized by law.

4. To provide for the regulation of commerce with other nations and among the Newstates, Possessions, Territories; or, as shall be mutually agreed, with other organized governments; but exports shall not be taxed; and imports shall not be taxed except on recommendation of the President at rates whose allowable variation shall have been fixed bylaw. There shall be no quotas, and no nations favored by special rates, unless by special acts requiring two-thirds majorities.

5. To establish, or provide for the establishment of, institutions for the safekeeping of savings, for the gathering and distribution of capital, for the issuance of credit, for regulating the coinage of money, for controlling them media of exchange, and for stabilizing prices; but such institutions, when not public or semipublic, shall be regarded as affected with the public interest and shall be supervised by the Chancellor of Financial Affairs.

6. To establish institutions for insurance against risks and liabilities, or to provide suitable agencies for the regulation of such as are not public.

7. To ensure the maintenance, by ownership or regulation, of facilities for communication, transportation, and others commonly used and necessary for public convenience.

8. To assist in the maintenance of world order, and, for this purpose, when the President shall recommend, to vest jurisdiction in international legislative, judicial, or administrative agencies.

9. To develop with other peoples, and for the benefit of all, the resources of space, of other bodies in the universe, and of the seas beyond twelve miles from low-water shores unless treaties shall provide other limits.

10. To assist other peoples who have not attained satisfactory levels of well-being; to delegate the administration of funds for assistance, whenever possible, to international agencies; and to invest in or contribute to the furthering of development in other parts of the world.

11. To assure, or to assist in assuring, adequate and equal facilities for education; for training in occupations citizens may be fitted to pursue; and to reeducate or retrain those whose occupations may become obsolete.

12. To establish or to assist institutions devoted to higher education, to research, or to technical training.

13. To establish and maintain, or assist in maintaining, libraries, archives, monuments, and other places of historic interest.

14. To assist in the advancement of sciences and technologies; and to encourage cultural activities.

15. To conserve natural resources by purchase, by withdrawal from use, or by regulation; to provide, or to assist in providing, facilities for recreation; to establish and maintain parks, forests, wilderness areas,

wetlands, and prairies; to improve streams and other waters; to ensure the purity of air and water; to control the erosion of soils; and to provide for all else necessary for the protection and common use of the national heritage.

16. To acquire property and improvements for public use at costs to be fixed, if necessary, by the Court of Claims.

17. To prevent the stoppage or hindrance of governmental procedures, or of other activities affected with a public interest as defined by law, by reason of disputes between employers and employees, or for other reasons, and for this purpose to provide for conclusive arbitration if adequate provision for collective bargaining fail. From such finding there may be appeal to the Court of Arbitration Review; but such proceedings may not stay the acceptance of findings.

18. To support an adequate civil service for the performance of such duties as may be designated by administrators; and for this purpose to refrain from interference with the processes of appointment or placement, asking advice or testimony before committees only with the consent of appropriate superiors.

19. To provide for the maintenance of armed forces.

20. To enact such measures as will assist families in making adjustment to future conditions, using estimates concerning population and resources made by the Planning Board.

21. To vote within ninety days on such measures as the President may designate as urgent.

ARTICLE VII

The Regulatory Branch

SECTION 1. There shall be a Regulatory Branch, and there shall be a National Regulator chosen by majority vote of the Senate and removable by a two-thirds vote of that body. His term shall be seven years, and he shall preside over a National Regulatory Board. Together they shall make and administer rules for the conduct of all economic enterprises.

The Regulatory Branch shall have such agencies as the Board may find necessary and are not disapproved by law.

SECTION 2. The Regulatory Board shall consist of seventeen members recommended to the Senate by the Regulator. Unless rejected by majority vote they shall act with the Regulator as a lawmaking body for industry.

They shall initially have terms of one or seventeen years, one being replaced each year and serving for seventeen years. They shall be compensated and shall have no other occupation.

SECTION 3. Under procedures approved by the board, the Regulator shall charter all corporations or enterprises except those exempted because of size or other characteristics, or those supervised by the Chancellor of Financial Affairs, or by the Intendant, or those whose activities are confined to one Newstate.

Charters shall describe proposed activities, and departure from these shall require amendment on penalty of revocation. For this purpose there shall be investigation and enforcement services under the direction of the Regulator.

SECTION 4. Chartered enterprises in similar industries or occupations may organize joint Authorities. These may formulate among themselves codes to ensure fair competition, meet external costs, set standards for quality and service, expand trade, increase production, eliminate waste, and assist in standardization. Authorities may maintain for common use services for research and communication; but membership shall be open to all eligible enterprises. Nonmembers shall be required to maintain the same standards at those prescribed for members.

SECTION 5. Authorities shall have governing committees of five, two being appointed by the Regulator to represent the public. they shall serve as he may determine; they shall be compensated; and he shall take care that there be no conflicts of interest. The Board may approve or prescribe rules for the distribution of profits to stockholders, allowable amounts of working capital, and reserves. Costing and all other practices affecting the public interest shall be monitored.

All codes shall be subject to review by the Regulator with his Board.

SECTION 6. Member enterprises of an Authority shall be exempt from other regulation.

SECTION 7. The Regulator, with his Board, shall fix standards and procedures for mergers of enterprises or the acquisition of some by others; and these shall be in effect unless rejected by the Court of Administrative Settlements. The purpose shall be to encourage adaptation to change and to further approved intentions for the nation.

SECTION 8. The charters of enterprises may be revoked and Authorities may be dissolved by the Regulator, with the concurrence of the Board, if they restrict the production of goods and services, or controls of their prices; also if external costs are not assessed to their originators or if the ecological impacts of their operations are deleterious.

SECTION 9. Operations extending abroad shall conform to policies notified to the Regulator by the President; and he shall restrict or control such activities as appear to injure the national interest.

SECTION 10. The Regulator shall make rules for and shall supervise marketplaces for goods and services; but this shall not include security exchanges regulated by the Chancellor of Financial Affairs.

SECTION 11. Designation of enterprises affected with a public interest, rules for conduct of enterprises and of their Authorities, and other actions of the Regulator or of the Board may be appealed to the Court of Administrative Settlements, whose judgments shall be informed by the intention to establish fairness to consumer and competitors and stability in economic affairs.

SECTION 12. Responsible also to the Regulator, there shall be an Operations Commission appointed by the Regulator, unless the Senate object, for the supervision of enterprises owned in whole or in part by government. The commission shall choose its chairman, and he shall be the executive head of a supervisory staff. He may require reports, conduct investigations, and make rules and recommendations concerning surpluses or deficits, the absorption of external costs, standards of service, and rates or prices charged for services or goods.

Each enterprise shall have a director, chosen and removable by the Commission; and he shall conduct its affairs in accordance with standards fixed by the Commission.

ARTICLE VIII

The Judicial Branch

SECTION 1. There shall be a Principal Justice of the Newstates of America; a Judicial Council; and a Judicial Assembly. There shall also be a Supreme Court and a High Court of Appeals; also Courts of Claims, Rights and Duties, Administrative Review, Arbitration Settlements, Tax Appeals, and Appeals from Watchkeeper's Findings. There shall be Circuit Courts to be of first resort in suits brought under national law; and they shall hear appeals from courts of the Newstates.

Other courts may be established by law on recommendation of the Principal Justice with the Judicial Council.

SECTION 2. The Principal Justice shall preside over the judicial system, shall appoint the members of all national courts, and, unless the Judicial Council object, shall make its rules; also, through an Administrator, supervise its operations.

SECTION 3. The Judicial Assembly shall consist of Circuit Court Judges, together with those of the High Courts of the Newstates of America and those of the highest courts of the Newstates. It shall meet annually, or at the call of the Principal Justice, to consider the state of the Judiciary and such other matters as may be laid before it.

It shall also meet at the call of the Convener to nominate three candidates for the Principal Justiceship whenever a vacancy shall occur. From these nominees the Senate shall choose the one having the most votes.

SECTION 4. The Principal Justice, unless the Senate object to any, shall appoint a Judicial Council of five members to serve during his incumbency. He shall designate a senior member who shall preside in his absence.

It shall be the duty of the Council, under the direction of the Principal Justice, to study the courts in operation, to prepare codes of ethics to be observed by members, and to suggest changes in procedure. The Council may ask the advice of the Judicial Assembly.

It shall also be a duty of the Council, as hereinafter provided, to suggest constitutional amendments when they appear to be necessary; and it shall also draft revisions if they shall be required. Further, it shall examine, and from time to time cause to be revised, civil and criminal codes; these, when approved by the Judicial Assembly, shall be in effect throughout the nation.

SECTION 5. The Principal Justice shall have a term of eleven years; but if at any time the incumbent resign to be disabled from continuing in office, as may be determined by the Senate, replacement shall be by the senior member of the Judicial Council until a new selection be made. After six years the Assembly may provide, by a two-thirds vote, for discontinuance in office, and a successor shall then be chosen.

SECTION 6. The Principal Justice may suspend members of any court for incapacity or violation of rules; and the separation shall be final if a majority of the Council agree.

For each court the Principal Justice shall, from time to time, appoint a member who shall preside.

SECTION 7. A presiding judge may decide, with the concurrence of the senior judge, that there may be pretrial proceedings, that criminal trials shall be conducted by either investigatory or adversary proceedings, and whether there shall be a jury and what the number of jurors shall be; but investigatory proceedings shall require a bench of three.

SECTION 8. In deciding on the concordance of statutes with the Constitution, the Supreme Court shall return to the House of Representatives such as it cannot construe. If the House fails to make return within ninety days the Court may interpret.

SECTION 9. The Principal Justice, or the President, may grant pardons or reprieves.

SECTION 10. The High Courts shall have thirteen members; but nine members, chosen by their senior justices from time to time, shall constitute a court. The justices on leave shall be subject to recall.

Other courts shall have nine members; but seven, chosen by their seniors, shall constitute a court.

All shall be in continuous session except for recesses approved by the Principal Justice.

SECTION 11. The Principal Justice, with the Council, may advise the Senate, when requested, concerning the appropriateness of measures approved by the House of Representatives; and may also advise the President, when requested, on matters he may refer for consultation.

SECTION 12. It shall be for other branches to accept and to enforce judicial decrees.

SECTION 13. The High Court of Appeals may select applications for further consideration by the Supreme Court, of decisions reached by other courts, including those of the Newstates. If it agree that there be a constitutional issue it may make preliminary judgment to be reviewed without hearing, and finally, by the Supreme Court.

SECTION 14. The Supreme Court may decide:

- a. Whether, in litigation coming to it on appeal, constitutional provisions have been violated or standards have not been met.
- b. On the application of constitutional provisions to suits involving the Newstates.
- c. Whether international law, as recognized in treaties, United Nations agreements, or arrangements with other nations, has been ignored or violated.
- d. Other causes involving the interpretation of constitutional provisions; except that in holding any branch to have exceeded its powers the decision shall be suspended until the Judicial Council shall have determined whether, in order to avoid confrontation, procedures for amendment of the Constitution are appropriate.

If amendatory proceedings are instituted, decision shall await the outcome.

SECTION 15. The Courts of the Newstates shall have initial jurisdiction in cases arising under their laws except those involving the Newstate itself or those reserved for national courts by a rule of the Principal Justice with the Judicial Council.

ARTICLE IX

General Provisions

SECTION 1. Qualifications for participation in democratic procedures as a citizen, and eligibility for office, shall be subject to repeated study and redefinition; but any change in qualification or eligibility shall become effective only if not disapproved by the Congress.

For this purpose a permanent Citizenship and Qualifications Commission shall be constituted, four members to be appointed by the President, three by the Convener of the Senate, three by the Speaker of the House, and three by the Principal Justice. Vacancies shall be filled as they occur. The members shall choose a chairman; they shall have suitable assistants and accommodations; and they may have other occupations. Recommendations of the commission shall be presented to the President and shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives with comments. They shall have a preferred place on the calendar and, if approved, shall be in effect.

SECTION 2. Areas necessary for the uses of government may be acquired at its valuation and may be maintained as the public interest may require. Such areas shall have self-government in matters of local concern.

SECTION 3. The President may negotiate for the acquisition of areas outside the Newstates of America, and, if the Senate approve, may provide for their organization as Possessions or Territories.

SECTION 4. The President may make agreements with other organized peoples for a relation other than full membership in the Newstates of America. They may become citizens and may participate in the selection of officials. They may receive assistance for their development or from the National Sharing Fund if they conform to its requirements; and they may serve in civilian or military services, but only as volunteers. They shall be represented in the House of Representatives by members elected at large, their number proportional to their constituencies; but each shall have at least one; and each shall in the same way choose one permanent member of the Senate.

SECTION 5. The President, the Vice-Presidents, and members of the legislative houses shall in all cases except treason, felony, and breach of the peace be exempt from penalty for anything they may say while pursuing public duties; but the Judicial Council may make restraining rules.

SECTION 6. Except as otherwise provided by this Constitution, each legislative house shall establish its requirements for membership and may make rules for the conduct of members, including conflicts of interest, providing its own disciplines for their infraction.

SECTION 7. No Newstate shall interfere with officials of the Newstates of America in the performance of their duties, and all shall give full faith and credit to the Acts of other Newstates and of the Newstates of America.

SECTION 8. Public funds shall be expended only as authorized in this Constitution.

ARTICLE X

Governmental Arrangements

SECTION 1. Officers of the Newstates of America shall be those named in this Constitution, including those of the legislative houses and others authorized by law to be appointed; they shall be compensated, and none may have other paid occupation unless they be excepted by law; none shall occupy more than one position in government; and no gift or favor shall be accepted if in any way related to official duty.

No income from former employments or associations shall continue for their benefits; but their properties may be put in trust and managed without their intervention during continuance in office. Hardships under this rule may be considered by the Court of Rights and Duties, and exceptions may be made with due regard to the general intention.

SECTION 2. The President, the Vice-Presidents, and the Principal Justice shall have households appropriate to their duties. The President, the Vice-President, the Principal Justice, the Chairman of the Planning Board, the Regulator, the Watchkeeper, and the Overseer shall have salaries fixed by law and continued for life; but if they become members of the Senate, they shall have senatorial compensation and shall conform to senatorial requirements.

Justices of the High Courts shall have no term; and their salaries shall be two-thirds that of the Principal Justice; they, and members of the Judicial Council, unless they shall have become Senators, shall be permanent members of the Judiciary and shall be available for assignment by the Principal Justice.

Salaries for members of the Senate shall be the same as for Justices of the High Court of Appeals.

SECTION 3. Unless otherwise provided herein, officials designated by the head of a branch as sharers in policymaking may be appointed by him with the President's concurrence and unless the Senate shall object.

SECTION 4. There shall be administrators:

- a. for executive offices and official households, appointed by authority of the President;
- b. for the national courts, appointed by the Principal Justice;
- c. for the Legislative Branch, selected by a committee of members from each house (chosen by the Convener and the Speaker), three from the House of Representatives and four from the Senate.

Appropriations shall be made to them; but those for the Presidency shall not be reduced during his term unless with his consent; and those for the Judicial Branch shall not be reduced during five years succeeding their determination, unless with the consent of the Principal Justice.

SECTION 5. The fiscal year shall be the same as the calendar year, with new appropriations available at its beginning.

SECTION 6. There shall be an Officials' Protective Service to guard the President, the Vice-Presidents, the Principal Justice, and other officials whose safety may be at hazard; and there shall be a Protector appointed

by and responsible to a standing committee of the Senate. Protected officials shall be guided by procedures approved by the committee.

The service, at the request of the Political Overseer, may extend its protection to candidates for office; or to other officials, if the committee so decide.

SECTION 7. A suitable contingency fund shall be made available to the President for purposes defined by law.

SECTION 8. The Senate shall try officers of government other than legislators when such officers are impeached by a two-third vote of the House of Representatives for conduct prejudicial to the public interest. If Presidents or Vice-Presidents are to be tried, the Senate, as constituted, shall conduct the trial. Judgments shall not extend beyond removal from office and disqualification for holding further office; but the convicted official shall be liable to further prosecution.

SECTION 9. Members of legislative houses may be impeached by the Judicial Council; but for trials it shall be enlarged to seventeen by Justices of the High Courts appointed by the Principal Justice. If convicted, members shall be expelled and be ineligible for future public office; and they shall also be liable for trial as citizens.

ARTICLE XI

Amendment

SECTION 1. It being the special duty of the Judicial Council to formulate and suggest amendments to this Constitution, it shall, from time to time, make proposals, through the Principal Justice, to the Senate. The Senate, if it approve, and if the President agree, shall instruct the Overseer to arrange at the next national election for submission of the amendment to the electorate. If not disapproved by a majority, it shall become part of this Constitution. If rejected, it may be restudied and a new proposal submitted.

It shall be the purpose of the amending procedure to correct deficiencies in the Constitution, to extend it when new responsibilities require, and to make government responsible to needs of the people, making use of advances in managerial competence and establishing security and stability; also to preclude changes in the Constitution resulting from interpretation.

SECTION 2. When this Constitution shall have been in effect for twenty-five years the Overseer shall ask, by referendum, whether a new Constitution shall be prepared. If a majority so decide, the Council, making use of such advice as may be available, and consulting those who have made complaint, shall prepare a new draft for submission at the next election. If not disapproved by a majority it shall be in effect. If disapproved it shall be redrafted and resubmitted with such changes as may be then appropriate to the circumstances, and it shall be submitted to the voters at the following election.

If not disapproved by a majority it shall be in effect. If disapproved it shall be restudied and resubmitted.

ARTICLE XII

Transition

SECTION 1. The President is authorized to assume such powers, make such appointments, and use such funds as are necessary to make this Constitution effective as soon as possible after acceptance by a referendum he may initiate.

SECTION 2. Such members of the Senate as may be at once available shall convene and, if at least half, shall constitute sufficient membership while others are being added. They shall appoint an Overseer to arrange for electoral organization and elections for the offices of government; but the President and Vice-Presidents shall serve out their terms and then become members of the Senate. At that time the presidency shall be constituted as provided in this Constitution.

SECTION 3. Until each indicated change in the government shall have been completed the provisions of the existing Constitution and the organs of government shall be in effect.

SECTION 4. All operations of the national government shall cease as they are replaced by those authorized under this Constitution.

The President shall determine when replacement is complete.

The President shall cause to be constituted an appropriate commission to designate existing laws inconsistent with this Constitution, and they shall be void; also the commission shall assist the President and the legislative houses in the formulating of such laws as may be consistent with the Constitution and necessary to its implementation.

SECTION 5. For establishing Newstates boundaries a commission of thirteen, appointed by the President, shall make recommendations within one year. For this purpose the members may take advice and commission studies concerning resources, population, transportation, communication, economic and social arrangements, and such other conditions as may be significant. The President shall transmit the commission's report to the Senate. After entertaining, if convenient, petitions for revision, the Senate shall report whether the recommendations are satisfactory but the President shall decide whether they shall be accepted or shall be returned for revision.

Existing states shall not be divided unless metropolitan areas extending over more than one state are to be included in one Newstate, or unless other compelling circumstances exist; and each Newstate shall possess harmonious regional characteristics.

The Commission shall continue while the Newstates make adjustments among themselves and shall have jurisdiction in disputes arising among them.

SECTION 6. Constitution of the Newstates shall be established as arranged by the Judicial Council and the Principal Justice.

These procedures shall be as follows: Constitutions shall be drafted by the highest courts of the Newstates. There shall then be a convention of one hundred delegates chosen in special elections in a procedure approved by the Overseer. If the Constitution be not rejected it shall be in effect and the government shall be constituted. If it be rejected, the Principal Justice, advised by the Judicial Council, shall promulgate a Constitution and initiate revisions to be submitted for approval at a time he shall appoint. If it again be rejected he shall promulgate another, taking account of objections, and it shall be in effect. A Constitution, once in effect, shall be valid for twenty-five years as herein provided.

SECTION 7. Until Governors and legislatures of the Newstates are seated, their governments shall continue, except that the President may appoint temporary Governors to act as executives until succeeded by those regularly elected. These Governors shall succeed to the executive functions of the states as they become one of the Newstates of America.

SECTION 8. The indicated appointments, elections, and other arrangements shall be made with all deliberate speed.

SECTION 9. The first Judicial Assembly for selecting a register of candidates for the Principal Justiceship of the Newstates of America shall be called by the incumbent Chief Justice immediately upon ratification.

SECTION 10. Newstates electing by referendum not to comply with recommendations of the Boundary Commission, as approved by the Senate, shall have deducted from taxes collected by the Newstates of America for transmission to them a percentage equal to the loss in efficiency from failure to comply.

Estimates shall be made by the Chancellor of Financial Affairs and approved by the President; but the deduction shall not be less than 7 percent.

SECTION 11. When this Constitution has been implemented the President may delete by proclamation appropriate parts of this article.

President Obama Signs Executive Order Establishing Council of Governors

Executive Order will Strengthen Further Partnership Between the Federal and State and Local Governments to Better Protect Our Nation

The President today signed an Executive Order (attached) establishing a Council of Governors to strengthen further the partnership between the Federal Government and State Governments to protect our Nation against all types of hazards. When appointed, the Council will be reviewing such matters as involving the National Guard of the various States; homeland defense; civil support; synchronization and integration of State and Federal military activities in the United States; and other matters of mutual interest pertaining to National Guard, homeland defense, and civil support activities.

The bipartisan Council will be composed of ten State Governors who will be selected by the President to serve two year terms. In selecting the Governors to the Council, the White House will solicit input from Governors and Governors' associations. Once chosen, the Council will have no more than five members from the same party and represent the Nation as a whole.

Federal members of the Council include the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, the Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs and Public Engagement, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs, the U.S. Northern Command Commander, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. The Secretary of Defense will designate an Executive Director for the Council.

The Council of Governors will provide an invaluable Senior Administration forum for exchanging views with State and local officials on strengthening our National resilience and the homeland defense and civil support challenges facing our Nation today and in the future.

The formation of the Council of Governors was required by the Fiscal Year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act which stated, "The President shall establish a bipartisan Council of Governors to advise the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the White House Homeland Security Council on matters related to the National Guard and civil support missions." (NDAA FY2008, Sec 1822)

The Most Powerful Man In The World?



The "Black" Pope Count Hans Kolvenbach—The Jesuit's General

by RICK MARTIN

So, you thought you were pretty well informed by now about all of the main players on the "conspiracy" playing field? You've maybe been hearing for years about (or bumped into on your own) the various elements of society who control our world from behind the scenes.

You've gotten familiar with the role played by, for instance, the Khazarian Zionists (who invented the word "Jew" to disguise their adopted heritage, as distinguished from the biblical Judeans), or the role played by the Banksters (banking gangsters) controlling the economies of the world, by the CFR (Council on Foreign Relations), the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderbergers, the Committee of 300 (the 17 wealthiest so-called "elite" families)—the Rothschild's in England and Rockefellers in America and Bronfman's in Canada, and on and on, comprising the physical power structure of the New World Order puppets under the direction of darkly motivated, other-dimensional "master deceivers" commonly known as Lucifer or Satan and their "fallen angel" cohorts.

While all of those details contribute to understanding the Larger Picture, what you are about to read fills in a most important Missing Link in this entire structure. And I don't mean a little side issue; I mean a link so central—yet so well hidden from general public view, and for so long—that even the most studied of "conspiracy theory" scholars probably have not put together much of the information that is going to be presented here.

To call the following outlay "controversial" and "sensitive" is about as mild an understatement of the truth of the matter as can be made! This missing link changes the entire slant of the entire playing field!

After months of anticipation and weeks of preparation, I was finally able to speak with *Vatican Assassins* author Eric Jon Phelps on Tuesday, March 14. There was simply no other way to cover Eric's historic masterpiece spanning, literally, five centuries, than to just ask questions covering huge spans of time and major historical events. It took us almost four hours to accomplish the task, yet we could easily have gone on for another forty.

We here at *The SPECTRUM* are simply unwilling to reduce the importance of this work by presenting it in a too distilled fashion. In fact, in order to share this material with at least some of the pertinent backup, Eric has granted us permission to print (directly after the interview) several excerpts from his soon-to-be-published book which will help you in understanding certain aspects of this magnificently important and broad-sweeping story. The missing link is surely a central link.

Let's call this story the "Jesuit-Vatican connection" to the unfolding New World Order agenda. You make up your own mind just how absolutely central, yet well hidden, has been this link! There's a good reason the secret Vatican library is so extensive and yet remains so intact from outside intrusion, despite the many others who would like to possess such a collection of information detailing much "censored" data about our true, otherworldly cultural heritage.

When one reads a work like *Vatican Assassins*, one can't help but reflect back on the purposely "adjusted" and watered down and boring moments in high school history class. Meanwhile, the *true* history of what has gone on is dynamic and full of calculated intrigue.

In this business, I've heard and read a lot of things. But when I had to pick my jaw up off the floor during the reading of certain historical portions in Eric's book—well, let me just say that Truth certainly is stranger, and far more interesting, than the many fictions we've been led to believe are historical fact. And yet The Truth does fit together like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle.

This book SHOULD be a best-seller, but it is hardly likely to achieve such general attention—considering how well controlled and censored is the publishing business. Thus is the reason for our lengthy presentation of this most astonishing and critically important material here in *The SPECTRUM*.

We are in a time of Truth being revealed from all directions. And there is probably no more fundamental, mind-rattling, and previous notions-shattering example of that than what is being presented here. The interview is directly followed by a number of pertinent excerpts from Eric's eye-opening book—which will be available July 1.

[Editor's note: It should be noted up-front that the information presented below is the studied opinion of Eric Jon Phelps. We here at The SPECTRUM find much about his presentation of his historical research which meshes with and expands upon Truth which has been presented by many other authors in these pages and elsewhere. And that is good; Truth is Truth is Truth, and should all mesh.

However, for the peace of mind of our unique readership—which typically has cultivated a more aware spiritual perspective than the general public—we do not want to give the impression that we agree with (or wish to promote) some collateral aspects of Eric's presentation having to do with his personal "religious" convictions. The focus of those convictions follows a much more biblically conventional (literal) path—in stark contrast to the unconventional, questioning, wide-angle vision of his historical material.

Generally such opinions are simply allowed to stand on their own—for you to sort and interpret as you see fit—rather than being singled-out to be addressed editorially. However, in this case, the practical side of Eric's stated religious convictions include the condoning of some degree of violence (or violent protest) and use of armaments. And such convictions are very much the opposite of our philosophical position—for many reasons, not the least of which is the obvious Adversarial bait-and-entrapment which would result from choosing what we would consider to be low-frequency responses to schoolroom Earth's current challenges.

Yet, if the perceptive reader penetrates "between the lines" thoughtfully, there is glimpsed a recurring commendable spiritual message in Eric's commentary—of "Have the courage to speak The Truth" and "God helps those who help themselves"—which we certainly DO agree with wholeheartedly and have long supported enthusiastically.

We are in the time of the Great Awakening on this planet. The Light of Truth, intensifying with each passing moment, is nudging many to step forward and share what they know. Will such ones follow that nudge or continue to hide in fear? The answer to that question is perhaps the most important aspect of schoolroom Earth's relentless testing at this critical time.

One last-minute footnote before beginning this interview: The Arts & Entertainment (A&E) cable television channel just started to air—on Easter Sunday evening!—a new two-hour documentary called: The Vatican Revealed. Tape it so you can study it carefully; within the lines of dialog and some of those people chosen for commentaries are many, many clues to the true power of the Vatican over world affairs. It would, of course, be much more revealing to watch the A&E program AFTER having read and digested the following.]

Martin: Before we begin, let me say a few words. The topic of your book is so comprehensive and covers, literally, all aspects of global control by the Jesuits, dating back to 1540. I would like to begin our conversation with a very important point of clarification so that our readers have something to hold onto while reading the historical narrative we are about to present. Let me also add that your book is one of the most compelling, dynamic, genuinely educational historical documents I have ever read. I want to tell you, I am impressed!

You, literally, link every major global conflict and political assassination to the hands of the Jesuit Order. The Jews, as with many other groups you mention, have been the unwitting pawns in this Jesuit Agenda.

Today, the present. I'm going to start here, and then we're going to go way back in time and work our way up. But, I want to start HERE because it will give a foundation for going back in time.

Today, who is the Superior General of the Jesuits, the so-called "Black Pope" [*black here refers to hidden, evil activities, not to race or color*] who gives the orders to the actual Pope. Is it still Jean-Baptist Janssens?

Phelps: Janssens, Frenchman. No, he passed away in 1964. Then Pedro Arrupe came to power. Then, after Arrupe died, in 1988, I believe, the present Jesuit General is Count Hans Kolvenbach. [*See photo nearby.*] I call him Count Hans Kolvenhoof.

Martin: Let's discuss this position of "General" and, in addition, who is this person, Count Hans Kolvenbach? Who does he serve? What are his origins? Where does he hail from?

Phelps: The present General is a Dutchman, his nationality is Dutch.

Martin: Where is he? Physically, where is he?

Phelps: He resides in Rome, at the headquarters of the Jesuits, called the Church of Jesu. So, the Jesuit General resides in Rome at, what I just called, the Jesuit headquarters.

Martin: The Church of Jesu, is that near the Vatican?

Phelps: It's not far from the Vatican, right. It's in the same general area. It's headquarters of the Knights of Malta.

Martin: Is it part of Vatican City, proper?

Phelps: Right, I believe, yes it is.

Martin: Where does Satan fit into this picture, and what is the ultimate goal of the Jesuits, the so-called Society of Jesus?

Phelps: The Jesuit General, and the other high Jesuit Generals, they are sorcerers. They are Luciferians, and they worship what they would call Lucifer. They do not believe in Satan. They believe in Lucifer.

Now, according to Alberto Rivera, he was invited—because he was a top Jesuit at the time in the late '60s—he was invited to a "Black Mass" in Spain where there were quite a few top Jesuit Generals present. And he called it a "Black Mass". Well, when you're involved in a "Black Mass", you're involved in the worship of Lucifer, all dressed in their black capes and so on.

Martin: I'm fascinated by Count Hans Kolvenbach because nobody in the world knows who this person is. I've never heard the name.

Phelps: Let me just tell you that you can see his picture and his top Jesuits—just a second and I'll get the book. The name of the book is called *Jesuits: A Multi-Biography*, by Jean Lacoutre, and that is available, usually, in the bookstores. It was published in 1995.

Jean Lacoutre is a Frenchman. He was a communist, is a communist. On the last page of the pictures in it, that is right adjacent to page 343, you see Peter Hans Kolvenbach. He's the Jesuit General, and he looks like just a very evil individual. There's a Black man, who's a high Jesuit, he's a 29 Superior Jesuit with his cosmopolitan General staff. One of the General staff looks like Ben Kingsley of *Shindler's List*. There are six White men, and one Black man. And that's his General staff.

Martin: What is the process of choosing a successor General?

Phelps: The High Jesuits elect him, and he's elected for life—unless he becomes a "heretic".

Martin: And the so-called "High Jesuits" represent what group?

Phelps: I would say that they're the "professed", the high 4th Degree. When a Jesuit is professed, he is under the *Jesuit Oath*; he is under the "Bloody Oath" that I have in my book.

Martin: Do we have permission to reprint that *Oath* in our paper?

Phelps: Of course, absolutely.

Martin: One of my questions has to do with the *Oath* and it's similarity to the *Protocols Of The Learned Elders Of Zion*, and I wrote that question before I got back to the *Protocols* portion of your book.

Phelps: The Jesuits obviously wrote the *Protocols* because they have carried out every protocol in that little handbook. They have carried everything out. And, Alberto Rivera says—and he was a Jesuit—he was greatly maligned, not helped at all by the Apostate, Protestants, and Baptists in this country; he was helped, somewhat, by Jack Chick. Jack Chick published his story in six volumes, titled *Alberto I, II, III, IV, V, & VI*.

Alberto Rivera says that it was Jews aligned with the Pope who published the *Protocols*. Well, I tend to feel that it was just the Jesuits themselves because they, and they alone, were the ones who were able to bring this to pass.

They're the ones in the government. They're the ones behind professional sports. The owner of the Pittsburgh Steelers is a Knight of Malta. The owner of the Detroit Lions is a Knight of Malta. All your top owners of these ball clubs, for the most part, are Knights of Malta, getting the people whooped up in this hoopla over games and sports, while they're busy creating a tyranny. So, that was one of the things in the *Protocols*—that they would create "amusements".

Another one they used was Walt Disney, 33rd-degree Freemason—Disneyworld, Disneyland. Another one was Milton Hersey, with Hersey Park. They create all of these amusements and games and pastimes to get the people drunk with pleasure, while they're busy overthrowing the Protestant form of government.

Martin: Where does Las Vegas factor into all of this?

Phelps: Las Vegas, well, for the most part, is controlled by the Mafia. But all the high Mafia families are Roman Catholic, and they are ALL subordinate to the Pope or to the Cardinal of New York, which is Cardinal O'Connor—because the Commission, the Mafia Commission resides in New York.

Frank Costello was a member of the Mob Commission, and he was intimate, personal friends with Knight of Malta, Hollywood mogul, Joe Kennedy. And that has not changed.

So, the High Knights are good, dear brothers with the High Mafia Dons—the Gambinos, the Lucchese, the Columbos, all of them. And *they* control Hollywood, not the Jews. It's only Jews who are front-men who are involved in Hollywood and working for the Mafia and for the Cardinal, just like in politics it would be Arlen Specter. Arlen Specter was Spelly's [*Cardinal Spellman's*] Jew in the assassination [*of President Kennedy*], and he would never say a word about it.

Martin: Now, as we go through here, if there's anything that you don't want me to print, please let me know because, literally, I'm going to print everything we say in this conversation.

Phelps: That's fine, that's fine with me because it needs to be said.

Martin: Let's get back to Count Hans Kolvenbach. I want to shine the spotlight on this guy for just a little bit here. Let's talk about him. What does he do? Who is he? Let's talk about his position as "General". How do they exercise this control over the Pope? Does the Pope know he's a pawn?

Phelps: Ok, one question at a time. So, which question do you want me to deal with?

Martin: Let's just shine the light right on the Count.

Phelps: The Jesuit General, ok.

Martin: Let's start there, and you tell me everything you want to tell me about that position.

Phelps: The Jesuit General is the absolute, complete, and total dictator and autocrat of the Order. When he speaks, his provincials move. The provincials are his major subordinates. There are around 83 provincials right now.

As I understand it, the Jesuit Order has divided the world into 83 regions. Ok? For each region, there is a Jesuit provincial. There are 10 provincials in the United States. There is one for Central America. There is one for Ireland. They've divided up the world into these provinces.

So it's old Babylonian provincial government, centered in Nebuchadnezzar or the Jesuit General himself; so it's strictly a Roman form of government where all the states or provinces are subordinate to this worldwide sovereign.

The Jesuit General exercises full and complete power over the Order. He meets with his provincials. When they decide to start a war or an agitation, he gets the information from the provincial of that country, how best to go about this, the demeanor of the people, and then he uses legitimate grievances to foam an agitation—like the 1964 Civil Rights Movement. That was ALL a Jesuit agitation, completely, because the end result was more consolidation of power in Washington with the 1964 Civil Rights Act that was written by [*the longtime President of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend*] Theodore Hesburgh.

The Jesuit General rules the world through his provincials. And the provincials then, of course, rule the lower Jesuits, and there are many Jesuits who are not "professed", so many of the lower Jesuits have no idea what's going on at the top. They have no concept of the power of their Order.

It's just like Freemasonry. The lower have no idea that the High Shriner Freemasons are working for the Jesuit General. They think that they're just doing works and being good people. But the bottom line is that the high-level Freemasons are subject, also, to the Jesuit General because the Jesuit General, with Fredrick the Great, wrote the High Degrees, the last 8 Degrees, of the Scottish Rite Freemasonry when Fredrick protected them when they were suppressed by the Pope in 1773.

So, you have the alignment with the Jesuit Order and the most powerful Freemason they had in the craft, Fredrick the Great, during their suppression. That is an irrefutable conclusion. And then, when you see the Napoleonic Wars, the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars carried out by Freemasonry, everything Napoleon did, and the Jacobins, whatever they did, completely benefited the Jesuit Order.

It's to this end that Alexander Dumas wrote his *The Count Of Monte Cristo*. The Count is the Jesuit General. Monte=Mount, Cristo=Christ. The Count of the Mount of Christ. Alexander Dumas was talking about the Jesuit General getting vengeance when the Jesuits were suppressed, and many of them were consigned to an island, three hours sailing, West, off the coast of Portugal. And so, when the Jesuits finally regained their power, they punished all of the monarchs of Europe who had suppressed them, drove them from their thrones, including the Knights of Malta from Malta, using Napoleon.

And Alexander Dumas, who fought for the Italian patriots in 1848, to free Rome from the temporal power of the Pope, wrote many books and one of the books was to expose this, and that was *The Count Of Monte Cristo*.

So, when you read that book, bear in mind that it's really a satire on the Jesuit Order regaining their power in France. The Count of Monte Cristo has an intelligence apparatus that can't be beat. Well, that's the Jesuit Order.

But the Count doesn't get what he really ought to have, or his last wish, and that's the love of woman. He gains back all of his political power; he gains back everything he lost; but he doesn't have the love of a woman. And THAT is the Jesuit Order. They have no women. They have no love of a woman. Because to have a wife, to have a woman, means you have an allegiance to your wife and family, and you cannot obey the General. That's why they will NEVER be married, and that's one of the great KEYS to their success.

They can betray a nation and walk away. They can betray all the Irish Catholics getting on the *Titanic*, and walk away. They can betray us in Vietnam and walk away. They can betray us every time we go to the hospital and get radiated and cut and drugged, and walk away, because it's "for the greater glory of God"—Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam: the greater glory of the god who sits in Rome.

Martin: What is the ULTIMATE goal of the Jesuits?

Phelps: Their ultimate goal is the rule of the world, with the Pope of their making, from Solomon's rebuilt Temple in Jerusalem. That's their ultimate goal.

Martin: And why is Solomon's Temple rebuilt so important?

Phelps: Because the Jesuits have always wanted that. When Ignatius Loyola first started the Order, one of the first things he did was, he wanted to go to Jerusalem and set up the Jesuit headquarters there. So, he went there, he tried to do it and failed, came back, went to school, started his Latin studies, etc. Maybe it might be a good idea to just review a little bit about Ignatius Loyola.

Martin: Yes.

Phelps: Ok, Ignatius Loyola was a Spanish soldier, and he was wounded at a battle between the French and the Spanish, and his leg was shattered. Well, the French General, because Loyola was very brave in conflict, ordered his own doctors to attend Loyola. So they set the leg and sent him back to his home—which, of course, he was royalty to the Counsel of Loyola in Spain, in the area of the Basques.

Loyola, through his series of desiring to regain his leg—it had healed improperly, so he made a rack where he would stretch the leg, with severe, horrible, awful pain—and trying to stretch this leg to get it back to normal shape, he endured awful, terrible pain. He had it rebroken, again, a couple of times and it still did not heal properly, so he had a perpetual limp. He could no longer be the courtier among women, and as a result, he went into this depression, and he then had this vision of the saints, etc., etc., and he wrote his spiritual exercises.

I will stop at the spiritual exercises, just for a minute, but I'll take up from there. Loyola then wanted to form an army, but when this happened with his spiritual exercises, those spiritual exercises would be basic training for all of his Jesuits. That's what they will ALL go through. That's what every Jesuit goes through today.

One of the maxims of the spiritual exercises is that if my superior says "black is white and white is black", then that's the way it is. That is in his spiritual exercises. That is what is quoted in *JFK*, when Kevin Costner is telling his people: "Hey, people, we've got to start thinking like the CIA. Black is white and white is black." That was a Jesuit giveaway that the Jesuits produced that movie, because they're quoting Ignatius Loyola in that movie from his spiritual exercises.

So, Loyola had an indomitable will. He had a will of steel, and he set his mind to regain back what the Papacy had lost to the Reformation. And so, he went to the Pope, and the Pope in 1540 then created the Jesuit Order. But this man is a soldier, he's a lawyer, and he put together a legion of soldiers and warriors to get back what Rome had lost, as well as institute a World Government for the Pope, from Jerusalem. This was in 1540.

He started the Order in 1536. He was arrested by the Inquisition, and he was released, and he went to the Pope; he threw himself at the feet of the Pope. He would be completely at his service. The Pope chartered him, and that Pope was Pius III. The Pope chartered them, created the Jesuit Order; now he has Papal protection, and they began their awful history of deeds of blood. And war after war after war after war, they're all attributed to the Jesuit Order in some way. Catholic nobles, with lots of money, donated castles and schools and money to the Jesuit Order.

Virtually everything they own has been given to them or stolen by them. Of course, they stole all of the fortunes of the Jews in World War II. They stole all their gold, all their assets and everything, whenever they went into a country. What's just been released is NOTHING compared to what they've taken.

In Edmond Paris's book, printed by Ozark Publications, called *The Vatican Against Europe*, it gets into great detail of what they did. It calls it—the last 30 years of war is all attributable to the Jesuits, their massacres of the Serbs and Jews, etc. But Edmond Paris did not understand that the Jesuit General—and this is one of the most important points I want to make about Von Kolvenbach—**the Jesuit General is in complete control of the international intelligence community; that's the CIA, the FBI, the KGB, the Israeli Mossad, the German BND, the British SIS. The Jesuit General is in COMPLETE CONTROL of the entire intelligence apparatus—FBI, every bureaucratic agency in this country, all of it; he is in complete control of it.**

So, whenever he wants to find something out about an individual, they put in the Social Security number, and everything from all of the intelligence apparatus kicks-in and he and his provincials can review everything about that man. Credit cards, you name it, everything that's attached to Rome's social security number, which FDR put upon us in 1933 with the help of Spellman; at the time, I believe he was Archbishop, or maybe it was Cardinal Hayes—but Rome was behind FDR in putting him in office.

The couple of things that he did was implement social insecurity, the income tax, and recognizing Joseph Stalin's bloody Jesuit USSR government. So, with the giving of us the Social Security number, that is Rome's number—that's why I refuse to use it—and that's why they want everybody using it for everything: driver's license, tax return, credit card, everything you do, that number is you and that number is Rome's number.

Martin: Let me just back-up here for a minute. What comes to mind is Louis Freeh, head of the FBI.

Phelps: Roman Catholic, good altar boy. Probably a Knight of Columbus; I can't prove it. But anybody with that kind of power has got to be a Knight of Columbus.

And the Knights of Columbus implement Jesuit politics. And Louis Freeh was the one behind the Waco atrocity and the Oklahoma City bombing atrocity. And his top sniper was a Japanese Roman Catholic named Lon Horiuchi.

So, it's Roman Catholics in control, Knights in control of the FBI, who carried out all of this killing. And those two men, Louis Freeh and Lon Horiuchi are personally accountable to Cardinal O'Connor of New York. And Cardinal O'Connor of New York is the most powerful Cardinal in the country. He is the military vicar. And that's why Bush kissed his fanny for going to Bob Jones, because Cardinal O'Connor is the King of the American Empire. And he rules his Empire from that Palace, St. Patrick's Cathedral, "the little Vatican".

Martin: And is he in contact, do you think, with Kolvenbach?

Phelps: Of course. O'Connor himself is not a Jesuit, but the Jesuits are like the SS of the Catholic Church. They maintain order.

And the ones closest to him who maintain order are the Jesuits of Fordham University. Now, one of them—the head of Fordham University, I believe he is an Irishman, is also a member of the CFR [*Council on Foreign Relations*]. And I have that right here in the Annual Report of the CFR of 1993. Those Jesuits at Fordham maintain semblance and rule over the Cardinal in New York. And, of course, the powerful Jesuits of Fordham include Avery Dulles and John Foster Dulles, one of the writers of the book on the Second Vatican Council.

Martin: Let's back-up now, let's go back. What's the Council of Trent?

Phelps: The Council of Trent was the response of Rome to the Protestant Reformation. Remember—the Protestant Reformation brought us all of the political liberty that we know of today. There's no such thing as national sovereignty without the Reformation. There's no such thing as private rights without the Reformation. There's no such thing as the Law of Nations, as we know of it today, of Montesquieu and the others, without the Reformation.

So, when the Reformation came with their doctrines of salvation by grace through faith alone, and that there was no need for the priesthood to go to Heaven—that all we need is salvation in Christ, and *Romans 1:17*: the righteous shall live by faith. When the Reformation came, it completely stripped Rome of its spiritual power. The priests were no longer wanted because the people were getting the word of God in a *Bible*, specifically in Holland, England, and Germany. And so, with these great revivals breaking forth and the Reformation happening, nations were breaking away from the power of the Pope. The Holy Roman Empire was breaking up. Charles V, the Emperor, resigned and became a monk and a gardener. So, the Lord was moving mightily in breaking the power of the Holy Roman Empire, started by Charlemagne and the Pope.

Well, this was not good for Rome because they were losing lots of money. The nations were not paying "Peter's pence" anymore, which today we call "foreign aid" in this country. And so the Pope was very upset about his.

What's he going to do? These nations are breaking away from us; they're not under our temporal or spiritual power; and it's very important to remember that the Pope claims two powers—spiritual and temporal—and with the breaking of his spiritual power, he then lost his temporal power. In other words, he no longer had the ability to rule the people through the king of the country, because the king was breaking away, like Henry VIII.

So, Henry VIII broke away from the Roman Church and formed the Church of England; he no longer was subject to the Pope. This was happening in England, in Germany, in Holland, and other places.

As a result of this, the Devil raised up Ignatius Loyola with his demonisms, his "spiritual exercises" and—because Loyola had been a member of the Spanish Alumbrados, which is what we call the Illuminati today, and he used the Jesuit Order to attempt to regain back what had been taken by the Reformation—what the Lord had done through Luther, Calvin, and Knox. And, by the way, Luther,

Calvin, and Knox—none of those men died violent deaths. They all lived to older age and died peacefully, amidst the power of the Jesuit machinations.

The Council of Trent consists of 25 Sessions. Those 25 Sessions accurse and condemn all the doctrines of the Reformation. It condemns anybody who does not believe that the literal Jesus Christ is in the host [*holy communion bread*], and that his literal blood is in the wine. That's called transubstantiation. Anybody who does not believe that is an accursed anathema. Anybody who believes that their salvation is outside the Catholic Church is accursed anathema. Anybody who believes in justification by grace through faith—*anathema, accursed*. Anybody who believes that the Pope is not the vicar of Christ—*accursed, anathema*. You see, all of these doctrines were being put forth as a result of reading the *Bible*, which produced the Reformation, and so the Jesuits accursed everything that the Reformers were preaching. This is all in Law called the Council of Trent.

In the 4th Session, which is probably the most important Session, the Jesuits condemn freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of conscience. So, no man has the right to choose his own religion; no man has the right to publish what he feels is the truth; and no man has the right to freedom of conscience.

Those rights were secured by our Baptist/Calvinist forefathers in the *First Amendment*. The man who wrote the *First Amendment* was James Madison, who was a Baptist/Calvinist, and he was told by that Baptist/Calvinist in Virginia, Doc. John Leland: "If you don't secure all those rights, Virginia will not ratify the *Constitution*." Virginia was a Baptist/Calvinist state.

So, we have a warfare between the Council of Trent and the doctrines of the Reformation, particularly as outlined by John Calvin in his *Institutes Of The Christian Religion*. Calvin [1536] wrote the *Institutes Of The Christian Religion*, he finished it when he was 27, and he dedicated it to the King of France. And because the Jesuits so hated him, he was driven from France and he resided in Geneva to the day of his death, when he became Governor of Geneva. It's Calvin and his *Institutes Of The Christian Religion* vs. Loyola and his Council of Trent, if you want it sewed-up in two major documents.

Martin: Council of Trent was what year?

Phelps: From 1545-1563, eighteen years. And Trent is a little town in Italy. So, it was a Council that took place in the town of Trent, Italy.

The Presbyterian Westminster Confession And Faith that was finished in 1648, after the 30 Years War, is another extension of Calvin's *Institutes*, and is what the Church of Scotland and the Covenanters went by when they resisted the powers of Rome and England. That document is a major document, and it's not the new *Westminster Confession*, it's the old one of 1648, where they called the Pope the man of sin, that Roman Anti-Christ, and they also denounced anti-Christian tyranny.

And that it is their duty, to use what they call "the sword of the spirit", which is the Word of God, which we read in *Ephesians, Chapter 6*, and "the sword of just defense"—the gun, the sword.

So, us Calvinists believe that there is a time for peace and a time for war, and we do not refuse to go to the battlefield when it's necessary. It was the Calvinists who gave us our political liberty in England with Cromwell. He was a Calvinist and an independent Baptist. It was Calvinists in Holland who gave the Dutch their political liberty, with William of Orange, and later his son, Prince Maurice, and then later, in our great country, when it was Washington, the Freemason who did not go into that Masonic Lodge that last 30 years of his life—in his own words—who was a Baptist and a Calvinist. He was baptized in the First Baptist Church of New York by one of his captains, Pastor Gano, all surrounded by Calvinists.

That's why they didn't surrender at Valley Forge; that's why, when they were naked, when they went through the snow, barefoot, they endured that because they were *Bible*-believing Calvinists and they refused to submit to the tyranny of King George, who was controlled by the Jesuits.

And that is the soul of our country. If we lose that soul, we've lost everything. And those very same Baptists, in the *Second Amendment*, secured their right to bear arms, because they secured the right, the "sword of just defense". And the "sword of the spirit" is contained in the *First Amendment*, the right to have the *Bible* never taken from them. The two swords of Calvinism are secured in the *First* and *Second Amendments*. Without those first two *Amendments*, all the others are nothing.

Martin: Well, I got to my question #2. So, let's go to #3 of the seventy. (*laughter*)

How does Shriner Freemason President Harry Truman's signing into law of the Emergency War Powers Act of 1950 factor into the Jesuit Agenda?

Phelps: First of all, Harry Truman, who the Japanese called "Dirty Harry"—when they heard the movie *Dirty Harry* came out, they thought it was a movie about Harry Truman, according to my Japanese pastor friend, Daniel Fuji, who has passed away.

Harry Truman was put in office by the Jesuits, the Pensergast Democratic machine in Missouri. Harry Truman takes over after FDR's murder, because he was murdered in the home of Bernard Baruch. When he did that, he then finished up the war with the hoax called the dropping of the nuclear bombs, to purposely create this greater hoax called the Cold War, that would enable the Vatican to knock over country after country after country, and replace the leaders with dictators, subordinate to the Pope. That was the purpose of the Cold War.

And so, when Harry Truman in 1950 signed into law the Emergency War Powers Act, the Cold War was in full force. They were building bomb shelters, etc. So the nation was in kind of a frenzy.

When he signed this into law, it put the whole country under military or martial law, and that's when the flags in every courtroom, state and federal, began to be changed. And every state flag and every U.S. flag is now trimmed in gold fringe. And whenever you see a flag trimmed in gold fringe, that means that it is the flag of the Commander-in-Chief. Now, if it's the state flag, it means that's the flag of the governor, as Commander-in-Chief. And if it's the federal flag, or the national flag, more correctly, it's the flag of the Commander-in-Chief in Washington.

So, all your courts are nothing more than courts of military rule. They all proceed with summary procedures. The jury has no power of jury nullification. And they are simply enforcing the laws of the Empire, which I call 14th Amendment America, which is a military-style, King of England-style country. The courts are nothing more than courts of the king's bench, as you can see in Blackstone's Commentaries.

And the banks, as you walk into every bank, they all have a flag trimmed in gold fringe. The bank is what England would call, in Blackstone's day, the king's bank. So, we have the king's bank, and we have the king's bench. And it's run according to military rule, according to Berkheimer's great work *Military Rule And Martial Law*, published in 1914.

When Harry Truman did this, there was a consummation of a great plan to put us under the Emergency War Powers Act and, actually, a war rule. "Daylight savings time" is what was called "war time". This country only went to daylight savings time during World War II, and they called it, at that time, war time. So, nothing's changed. We've never gone back to not turning back our clocks. We're still on war time. The income tax is a war tax. It was called a victory tax in 1942.

So, people are paying a war tax, they're under war time, they're under an emergency war powers act, and the courts are war courts.

Martin: Regarding the assassination of President John Kennedy, which could take this entire interview, you say that the assassination was ordered by the Jesuit General, executed by Pope Paul VI, and carried out by the "American Pope", Francis Cardinal Spellman—who, in turn, used the Knights of Malta, Shriner Freemasons, Knights of Columbus, and Mafia Dons, including the FBI and CIA, to carry out the order from Rome. Would you explain why you believe your particular theory on the assassination to be an accurate representation of the facts?

Phelps: Sure. Alright, number one: The powers that be are properly outlined [*in his book*], and proven through two centuries of showing how it's all been put together. Now, as to why, I will be conservative and stick with Fletcher Prouty's reasons, that he outlined in his *JFK* and also his other book called *The Secret Team*.

The reason why Kennedy was assassinated was he wanted to end the Vietnam War, and he wanted to end the rule of the CIA. That begets two questions: Did Rome want the Vietnam War? And, did Rome control the CIA? The answer is yes on both counts.

We know, on its face, that the Vietnam War was called "Spelly's War"—Cardinal Spellman's war. He went over to the warfront many times and he called the American soldiers the "soldiers of Christ". The man who was the Commander of the American forces was a Roman Catholic, CFR member, possibly a Knight of Columbus, I don't know, but he was General William Westmoreland.

So, Westmoreland was Cardinal Spellman's agent to make sure that war was prosecuted properly. And another overseer of Westmoreland was Cardinal Spellman's boy, Lyndon Baines Johnson. Lyndon Baines Johnson was a 33rd-degree Freemason. He was also part of the assassination, with J. Edgar Hoover, another 33rd-degree Freemason.

And Johnson went to Cardinal Spellman's death at St. Patrick's Cathedral, and the picture can be seen in Cooney's work *The American Pope*. So, Johnson was completely at the beck and call of Cardinal Spellman through Cartha DeLoach, the 3rd-in-control of

the FBI. According to Curt Gentry, in his *Hoover: The Man And The Secrets*, DeLoach had a phone at his bedside direct to Johnson, and Johnson could call him anytime. DeLoach was a Knight of Malta, subject to Spellman.

Spellman wanted the Vietnam War, why? Spellman was controlled by the Jesuits of Fordham. Why did the Jesuit General want the Vietnam War? The people of Vietnam, the Buddhists, were unconvertible. They would not convert to Catholicism. They didn't need Rome.

There had been a Jesuit presence in Vietnam for centuries, so it had been decided that about a million or so Buddhists would have to be "purged". They would later continue this purge of Cambodia, with Pol Pot, and the purge is yet for Thailand. It was a purging of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam of all these Buddhists, just like they purged the Buddhists of China with Mao Zedong, because Mao Zedong was completely controlled by the Jesuits. So, they wanted the Vietnam War.

The other thing is that Rome is in control of the drug trade. The Vatican controls all of the drug trade—all of the heroin, all of the opium, all of the cocaine, everything going around in Columbia.

Columbia has a concordat with the Pope. A concordat is a treaty with the Pope. Hitler had a concordat. Mussolini had a concordat. Franco had a concordat. They want to set up a concordat here, which was the reason for Reagan formally recognizing the sovereign state of Vatican City in 1984. The greatest traitor we ever had was Ronald Reagan.

So, they had a concordat. Columbia has a concordat. Do you think that drugs running out of Columbia, with a country that has a concordat with Rome, is not controlled by Rome? If Rome didn't want the drug trade out of Columbia, they'd end the concordat. The whole drug trade is run by high Mafia families out of the country of Columbia, subject to the Jesuit General.

And the Jesuit General ran the Opium trade, a couple of centuries ago, out of China. They ran the silk trade, the pearl trade. The movie *Shogun* is but a slight scratching of the surface of the Jesuit "black ships" that trafficked in all of this silk and pearls and gold and opals and everything they could pull out of the East, including opium.

The Vietnam War was to consolidate and control this huge massive drug-trade that would inundate every American city with drugs, being brought in by the CIA with their Air America, and then distributed by the Trafficante family throughout the United States—Santos Trafficante out of Miami.

So we have the Mafia and the CIA working together in the drug trade. We have the Mafia and the CIA working together in the assassination of Kennedy.

The first reason why the Jesuit General [*at that time, Jean-Baptist Janssens*] wanted Kennedy out of the way was because he was going to end the Vietnam War.

The second reason is, he wanted to end the reign of the CIA, because the CIA had betrayed him in the person of McGeorge Bundy, by not giving the cover to the Cuban patriots to retake Cuba from that Roman Catholic, Jesuit-trained, grease-ball bastard—he was a bastard, his father was a Nazi—Fidel Castro.

Kennedy was betrayed by the CIA at the Bay of Pigs invasion, which sacrificed all the patriots on the shores of the Bay of Pigs there, so Castro had no real opposition. This was the same tactic, used by the CIA and the KGB at the top, working together with Angleton controlling it, in the Hungarian Revolution, when the CIA fomented that revolution, and then betrayed all of those patriots into the hands of the Soviet army and KGB, which infuriated certain top CIA officials.

It's the same tactic: you raise up a revolution and you sacrifice the men who truly want to resist. When that happened, when McGeorge Bundy stopped the air cover of the Bay of Pigs invasion, that ended that resistance to Castro and it enthroned him into power. And, of course, it was meant to be by the Jesuits because they HAD trained him. So now Kennedy looks bad. He's got egg all over his face. What does he want to do? He signs a Memorandum, according to Fletcher Prouty, and takes all of the power away from the CIA, and gives it to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The CIA was built by the Knights of Malta. One of the founders of the CIA was "Wild" Bill Donovan, an Irish Roman Catholic, who are the most fanatical, and his brother was a Dominican priest, Vincent. So, the CIA was founded by this high Roman Catholic, the first head, to solidify the Catholic or the Vatican control of it.

I'm not against the Catholic people; I'm against Rome's hierarchy. The American Catholic people know NOTHING of what's going on. And if they did, there would be a march on St. Patrick's tomorrow morning. So, as I'm against the hierarchy, I'm showing that Kennedy was against the Vietnam War, and he was going to do away with the CIA.

Well, the Jesuits had brought in all of their top Nazi SS soldiers into the CIA because the Jesuits were using the SS to kill the Jews in Europe. When the Einsatzgruppen went into Russia, the Jesuits followed with the SS and purged Western Russia of all its Jews. That's why Stalin deliberately killed 40,000 of his best officers. That's why he kicked out his best generals, purged them, because he wanted to make sure that the Red Army would lose with the advance of the German army, because following that would come the SS and purge Russia of the Jews that Stalin so hated. And by the way, justice is often poetic because Stalin's daughter married a Jew.

Now, the CIA was composed of the SS. The CIA now was an arm—and the intelligence arm—of the Vatican. The Knights of Malta were throughout. Casey was a Knight of Malta. Angleton was a Knight of Malta. The Knights were through and through. Angleton manned the "Vatican desk", and that is a desk within the CIA that has a direct link to the Vatican.

So, Kennedy wanted to end this "intelligence community". That was the end of him.

Thus for anyone attempting to end the CIA, and attempting to end the Vietnam War, and also because he attacked the Jesuits' Federal Reserve Bank by printing United States Notes, they got rid of him. They killed our only Roman Catholic president.

And it's another piece of poetic justice that a Roman Catholic—not Protestants, like Harry Truman, FDR, and others—it's a Roman Catholic who truly sought to resist the temporal power of the Pope in this country. And in many ways, even though Kennedy was, in fact, a socialist and communist, at least he resisted the temporal power of the Pope. And for that we should be thankful and remember his name.

But what have they done to his name? They've slammed it. They drag it into the dirt. Every time you see it on TV, they parade before you his womanizing, which I don't deny, but my goodness, can't we give him some credit where credit is due? That's why they got rid of John F. Kennedy.

And then, of course, as soon as he's assassinated, John McCone, the head of the CIA, the following day goes to the White House and they reverse Kennedy's Memorandum of reversing the Vietnam War and make a full-scale, carte blanche war.

The CIA then is tremendously and heavily funded, because it was a CIA war. And there they tried all of their new technology, their anti-gravity machines, their men who they're trying to make like the "million-dollar man". They tried out all their new technology in Vietnam. It was a great experimental theater, and Kennedy knew this. He knew it, and he knew that the American people had no idea what was going down, and he still tried to resist it, against his father's warnings. Because his father was the most powerful Knight of Malta in the Empire.

Martin: Any theories on why they took out junior?

Phelps: Yes. According to Tom Kuncle, in his publication, John F. Kennedy, Jr. wanted to find his father's real killers, and he had the power to publish the conclusion. So, they took him out right away. They would not allow that to happen.

Martin: Why haven't you been taken out?

Phelps: Because I am immortal—until the Lord is done with me. I am a Calvinist and a Baptist, and we believe in the sovereignty of God. And as long as we are operating in His Will, they cannot touch us, regardless of their power.

Martin: Which is why we're having this conversation.

Phelps: Which is why we're having the conversation. Don't think for one moment they're not tapping this phone. They know this. The issue is here. We're talking about a providential, sovereign God who wishes to move, using second causes, men, just as the Devil does.

The Devil always uses second causes, men. So, it's one group of men vs. another group of men, and one path leads to evil, and the true, almighty God leads to goodness.

The problem is, with us, there are very few men who want to believe God anymore. Nobody believes He can deliver anymore. It's just a handful of us who say: "Well, we're going to do His Will; we're going to trust Him in His Power."

And like the Hebrews getting ready to be thrown into the fiery furnace of Nebuchadnezzar, our God is able to deliver us. We're going to tell the truth!

Martin: Let's see here. I can throw away a lot of these questions. So much of it seems, in a way, irrelevant to our current times because there's so much going on now. But, good grief! I was just stunned to read in your book of all the historical things that have happened as a result of these evil people. You dedicated the book to four Roman Catholics who, I'm sure, no one has ever heard of: Charles Chiniquy, Jeremiah Crowley, Emmett McLaughlin, and Alberto Rivera. Why them?

Phelps: Because those Roman Catholic men were priests; they left the priesthood and told the truth about what was really happening. And all four of them, except one, I think Emmett McLaughlin, paid with their life. Chiniquy was the great exposé of the Jesuit assassination of President Lincoln, when he wrote his masterpiece *Fifty Years In The Church Of Rome* in 1886. He proves that Lincoln was assassinated by the Jesuits, and that it was covered-up by our government at the time.

Jeremiah Crowley: that priest was a great Irishman who came here and, seeing the corruption of the Archdiocese in Chicago, that it was so corrupt, he left it and exposed it. And, of course, he later came to Christ and became a *Bible*-believer, which they would call a Protestant. Protestants today don't believe the *Bible*. Protestantism of today is an empty shell, it's nothing. But, back then, in 1912, they believed the *Bible*.

Crowley, then, exposed many things, and one of the things he exposed, that helped me with this, was that he warned that the Jesuits, with their Knights of Columbus—which, he says, the Knights of Columbus, named after Columbus, who he tells us was a Spanish Jew and a pirate and a deflowerer of young girls—that Columbus was no Christian.

He has a tremendous section in his book on Columbus. That the purpose of the Knights of Columbus was to fulfill Jesuitical politics, and part of those politics was to restore the temporal power of the Pope because, you remember, the Pope had lost that in 1870 and they wanted to get it back. And they got it back with Mussolini in 1929.

Well, in the book that Crowley wrote in 1912, he says that Taft and Teddy Roosevelt were all cow-towing to the Pope and the Cardinals of New York. And he said they're going to use our military to restore the Pope's temporal power around the world.

And THAT was absolutely correct. That *is* American foreign policy. And the Council of Trent is the American foreign policy of today. That's what's going on in Serbia and Bosnia. It's the Council of Trent—the Jesuits using the American Air Force to bomb those orthodox people to smithereens. But, that was Crowley's great contribution.

Next, Emmett McLaughlin wrote several books. He wrote *The People's Padre*; he wrote *Crime And Immorality In The Catholic Church*, showing that Catholic nations are more lawless and more criminal than Protestant nations, and he proved it with statistics from the jails.

Emmett McLaughlin also wrote another book called *The Assassination Of Abraham Lincoln*, where he, again, shows that Lincoln was assassinated by the Jesuits. So, Emmett McLaughlin came out of the Catholic Church. To my knowledge, he never was born again. He never was saved, but he did tell the truth. He married a nun, and lived a virtuous and honorable life after he left.

The last one was, of course, Alberto Rivera, who was greatly hated by the Vatican because he was a very high Jesuit who came out and, in the late '60s, about 1969, exposed the power of Rome in the ecumenical movement, that Rome controlled Kathryn Kuhlman; that Rome controlled Billy Graham; that Rome controlled, virtually, our government—Ronald Reagan.

Reagan, when he took the Oath of Office, faced the obelisk, indicating that this country will ultimately have a concordat. So, Alberto Rivera converted to Christ, wonderfully, and he started a ministry called The Anti-Christ Information Center, out of Los Angeles.

They tried to kill him five times. A dentist jammed a needle up between his teeth, trying to give him an infection in the brain. When he passed out, about a year or so later, they couldn't figure it out. Everybody was praying for him. And this was discovered when he went to another dentist. He had it removed.

He was pushed in front of a subway train. They tried five times to kill the man, and finally he died, I believe, of cancer, in a hospital, about three years ago. But these four wonderful, great, Catholic priests did their best to expose the power of Rome and its attempts to destroy our sovereign, Protestant, *Bible*-believing nation. And so, to them, I dedicate it.

Martin: What compelled you to write this book? What started it for you?

Phelps: I was always taught to be a patriot, a patriot first and foremost—America first, and everybody else second. Later, when I came to know the Lord, at 17, I realized the *Bible* taught the same thing—that the Lord had instituted nations. The Lord never instituted world governments; that's always the result of the Devil's working.

So, being a patriot and a nationalist—believing in national sovereignty—I was saved at 17, went into the Air Force, was garrisoned in a nuclear weapons area for three years in Germany, came back and started to go to *Bible* college.

When I went to *Bible* college, the issue of the *King James* came up, as far as it being an archaic version. And that's what I used and I had never given it a thought. Well, some were using NIV, some NASB, and I thought: "Well, maybe it's just a modern version of what I have here." And I thought: "Well, if they want to use that, that's fine, but I'll use the *King James*."

I found that the underlying Greek text for the *King James*, the *Textus Receptus*, was the Greek text of the Reformation. It represents 95% of the existing manuscripts that we have today. The Greek text that underlies all these other versions—there's a Westcott and Hort Greek text, which I then discovered was really a conspiracy to adulterate the *Textus Receptus* in England, led by Brooke Foss Westcott and Anthony Hort, who were Maryolitors, Mary-worshippers.

Later, I found out that they had invited Cardinal Newman to sit in on the revision committee. Well, Cardinal Newman was a traitor to the Anglican Church, with his Track 90, which blew-off the Anglican Church. He then left England and he was then a Cardinal by Pius IX.

So, here we have Cardinal Newman, and E. B. Pusey, had been invited to sit on this revision committee, the end result being a Greek text that had been produced that was pro-Jerome's Latin *Vulgate*. Jerome's Latin *Vulgate* is the basis for the Jesuit's *Reheims-Douay* text, that was put out in 1582, that was attempting to rival William Tyndale's English text, which later became the *King James Version* of 1611.

So now I see this awful Jesuit hand in my *Bible* college, attempting to deprive me of the Word of God, the authorized version of 1611, in its present edition of 1769. Now I thought "Well, here the Jesuits are, what else have they done?" And the next thing I was led to was the Lincoln assassination. And I can remember reading Burke McCarty's *The Suppressed Truth About The Assassination Of Abraham Lincoln*, and weeping in the back room, when I was in college.

Martin: For me, one of the most compelling portions of your book was the series of revelations about Lincoln. I was stunned by that.

Phelps: That's what they did. Remember, Lincoln was not going to go along with the 14th Amendment. He wanted those Southern states to re-enter the Union on the same footing that they had left, which would have left us with a federal Republic as Washington had established it. This the Jesuits would not allow. It would be converted into an Empire. The states would be subordinate provinces to Washington. And the 14th Amendment would accomplish this with the reversion of citizenship. And Lincoln was re-elected, and he was ready to end this, and that's why they killed him. Kennedy was ready to implement his things; they would not let him be re-elected.

Martin: This is a total aside. Have you ever come across *The Jefferson Bible*?

Phelps: *The Jefferson Bible*—and maybe you know this—is Matthew, Mark, and Luke. And Thomas Jefferson, being the Deist, being the pagan that he was, cut out all the supernatural from those three gospels. Jefferson was a Deist; he was involved with the French Freemasons who were involved in the French Revolution, and he was not here at the writing of our Protestant *Constitution*. So, the Lord put him out of the picture. Jefferson was just used to help with the Revolution—because the Lord does use the unGodly for good things. But Jefferson copied much of the *Declaration Of Independence* from the *Mechlenburg Declaration*, written by Calvinistic Presbyterians of North Carolina, when they seceded, when that county of Mechlenburg seceded from the Colonies.

Martin: Never heard of it.

Phelps: Yes, you'll find it in Presbyterian writings. You can find it from D. James Kennedy; he has a thing on it. And Jefferson copied, at the end: "...and to this end we devote our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

That was copied directly from the *Mechlenburg Declaration*. Jefferson was a plagiarist; he was a high Freemason; and he was out of here at the time of the writing of our *Constitution*. And the reason why the people of Virginia did elect him to office was because he was a State's Rights man. He wanted limited powers in Washington, and that was a good thing. And when Jefferson was elected, he

undid everything the king-president John Adams did, with his Alien & Sedition Laws, because John Adams wanted to be a king, and Jefferson undid it, and Jefferson got two terms for that.

Martin: I'm looking at some things that are a little further back now. The *Secreta Monita*. What's the significance of that?

Phelps: The Secret Instructions [*excerpts at the end of this interview*] are the handbooks that are given to the professed Jesuits, those under extreme oath. [*The oath is presented in full at the end of this interview.*] And it tells them how to conduct their plans, subjugating peoples and nations to the Jesuit General, and thus, to the temporal power of the Pope. It tells how they are to deceive. It shows how they are to swindle rich widows out of their fortunes, like they did with Astor's second wife who survived the Titanic catastrophe. It shows their general approach on how to do things.

This particular book cannot be known, and if it's ever published, they will deny it's existence. But when you see the works that the Jesuits have done, it's in complete agreement with the *Secreta Monita*.

There is a very interesting section in Edwin R. Sherwin's book *The Engineer Core Of Hell*, written in 1886 I believe—another suppressed work. It's usually in the archives of all the older libraries back here. And he shows how this *Secreta Monita* was discovered in South America by a Mason, and the Mason managed to escape to a lodge after being shot. He turned the *Secreta Monita* over to the lodge, and then these certain Freemasons saw the *Secreta Monita*. There are certain low-level Freemasons who believe that the Jesuit Order is their enemy, so that's why it was taken to the lodge and then published. But the high-level Masons, of course, work with them. The *Secreta Monita* was discovered once that way. It was published in Holland. Then, in 1857, reprinted by England.

Martin: *Pascal's Provincial Letters* had a devastating impact on exposing the Jesuits. Why?

Phelps: Blaise Pascal was a Huguenot, a French Calvinist. So here we have another fearless man. He doesn't fear death; he's going to tell the truth. So Blaise Pascal wrote a series of letters that were written to and from provincials, and he wrote them in a satirical manner, that of course excited that wonderful French mind. The French, of course, came to the conclusion that this was absolutely the truth, and then they moved to suppress the Jesuits again. But his *Provincial Letters* are considered a classic. Blaise Pascal also wrote some other great works, too.

Martin: Pope Ganganelli-Clement XIV abolished the Order entirely in 1773, and was murdered as a result.

Phelps: Correct; he was poisoned.

Martin: The Order was similarly abolished 39 times from different kingdoms throughout Europe. It doesn't take a genius to figure out that something was terribly wrong with this group!

Phelps: Right. Are all those people bigots? Are all those people brainwashed bigots and fanatical Protestants who abolished the Jesuit Order?

You find the greatest resistance to the Jesuits in Catholic countries, by Catholic monarchs. And that's why the Roman Catholic monarchs and nobility of today don't dare resist them. The Kennedys won't touch them. The monarchs of Europe won't touch them. The Hapsburgs won't touch them, because the Jesuits have vindicated their power in the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars—well, then they went to suppress the Jesuits again in Europe and they were, for the most part, kicked-out of Europe in the 1800s. All the nations of Europe banned them. Germany banned them in 1872. And so, World War I and II, the second Thirty Years War, was pay-back for this. And ever since then, nobody touches them.

Pope Ganganelli abolished the Jesuits with a Papal Bull; the Jesuits call it a "brief". It is not a brief; it is in the Library of the Bulls, and it is called *Dominic Ac Redemptor Nostor*. That is the name of a bull. And when he abolished them, he abolished them forever—that they were not to talk about their abolition, that they were not to teach. He confiscated all of their wealth and land and property. For the most part, the Dominicans took it over, which is why the Dominicans had their penis cut off during the French Revolution. That's what the Jacobins did to them. It was payback by the Jesuits: "You don't dare take our property from us, boy. And you don't dare take Inquisition from us." Jacobins killed nearly every Dominican in France.

Martin: Why was the assassination of William of Orange so significant?

Phelps: Williams of Orange was the father of religious liberty. William of Orange is the man who gave the Jews the freedom to come to Amsterdam. And the Jews called Amsterdam, "the new Jerusalem". William of Orange was a Catholic to begin with. Remember

when he was in the forest, hunting with the king of France, and the king of France lay bare to him their plans to destroy all the Protestants in Holland, William kept silent. And that's why he was called "William the taciturn" or "William the silent".

So, he harbored all of this in his heart, and he went back to Holland determined that he would deliver the Calvinists and the Protestants from this annihilation. William went to Germany with his German wife, and he, according to Motley in his *The Dutch Republic*, raised an army of Germans and they did not succeed in liberating Holland. And so, it was the Dutch themselves who joined William of Orange in an attempt to liberate the country, which they ultimately did as the "wild beggars of the sea".

So, William was a great inspiration. He delivered flight from the seige of the fanatical Roman Catholic Spanish, lead by the Jesuits, when the Lord providentially delivered and sent a strong wind over the dikes, and flooded the whole area, and flooded the Spanish soldiers.

And then, after that happened, He sent another strong West wind and blew the water back over the dikes. This is a historical fact! Why don't we hear this in history? For the same reason we don't hear when Louis XIV brought his army across the river into Holland to kill all those Dutch, in 1672, right around there, that the river, right where the army was crossing, thawed out, and the whole French army went to the bottom of the river, as a result of the prayers of those Protestants of Holland. We're not taught that either!

The assassination of William of Orange was probably the second most significant act of Jesuit dominance, next to the murder of Coligny at St. Bartholomew's Massacre. Because it was first St. Bartholomew's massacre, and then the murder of William of Orange. And, of course, William of Orange was shot by a Jesuit-controlled assassin, Balthazar Girard, in his own house. And the last words of William, of course, were: "God be merciful to these poor people."

Martin: What is the Royal Institute of International Affairs?

Phelps: The Royal Institute of International Affairs is the same as the American Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). The Royal Institute runs England and the British Empire, what was once the extension of the British, just as the CFR runs our country. They're sister organizations.

Martin: Where are they based?

Phelps: They're based in London.

Martin: And who is their head; do you know?

Phelps: I don't know right now. The John Birch Society wrote a lot about that, and they did expose the CFR and the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Allan Stang has written a lot about that.

Martin: What was the "Gunpowder Plot" of 1605?

Phelps: The Gunpowder Plot of 1605 was the Jesuits attempt to destroy what William Howitt—and Howitt was the great writer who wrote *A Popular History Of Priestcraft*, 1835—he said it was a Jesuit attempt to destroy our Great King Solomon, King James I, along with the entire Protestant Parliament. Because remember, Elizabeth I had expelled the Jesuits from her empire, and if they were ever caught they were to be drawn and quartered.

After she died, the conspiracy went on there that went on with William Cecil. They named Mary Queen of Scott's son as the King of England, rather than Elizabeth's son, because Elizabeth had a son who was the Earl of South Hampton, Wriothesley, and that was the son of Edward Devere, who we know as William Shakespeare.

There was no William Shakespeare. The man was Edward Devere. He ran the Globe Theater. He was the Lord Great Chamberlain to Queen Elizabeth, and he secretly had a son who was the Third Earl of South Hampton. He was the rightful heir to the thrown, not King James VI of Scotland.

You can find all this documented in two great works: the first is called *Shakespeare Identified* and the author is Looney. The explosion of that book is called *This Star Of England*, written by Carlton and Dorothy Ogborn, in 1952, and it's a 1200-page work, and in it they explain all the plays of Shakespeare, and that they are, in the words of Hamlet: "A brief abstract and chronicle of the times." Nothing but history.

And then there's another book, *Wasn't Shakespeare Someone Else?*, written by Tweeny, and in that book he evaluates the 150 sonnets. In those sonnets Edward Devere put his name: Vere or Uvre or Vere—he puts his name in acrostics throughout all the sonnets. And the last couple sonnets he puts his name in double acrostics. It's amazing, showing that he wrote the sonnets.

Martin: Why were the Jesuits so upset about the Edict of Nantes, and what was it's significance?

Phelps: Ok, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—it can be spelled Nantes or Nantz. Anyway, the Edict of Nantes was put forward by King Henry IV. King Henry IV was a Roman Catholic, but he converted to Protestantism and he became a Huguenot. But he was not allowed to take the throne of France until he renounced his Protestantism. So, for the sake of the kingdom, he renounced his Protestantism, and in 1610, I believe, issued forth the Edict of Nantes.

The Edict of Nantes guaranteed religious freedom to all the French. That included the Protestant, Calvinist, Huguenots, which of course included those who would have followed Admiral Coligny, who the Jesuits murdered with that she-wolf, Catherine de Medici. With the Edict of Nantes we have religious liberty in France. This cannot be. France is a cornerstone of Jesuit power, so it cannot allow this to be in place. The Council of Trent condemns it, because it's freedom of conscience.

So, after they murder Henry IV with Ravaillac, when they stabbed him through his heart, according to Sully in his memoirs, they murdered Henry IV for this, and also for attempting to reinforce the Dutch. They then, in 1685—when the Beatles are singing about the "Sun King" in their "white" album, they're singing about Louis XIV. And that's telling you that the Beatles are Jesuit-controlled. The Sun King, Louis XIV who reigned, who rules over France for, I believe, 60 years, he, because of his Jesuit confessor, Pere La Chaise, revokes the Edict of Nantes, and with that, no more religious freedom in France.

And then they sent their French dragons out and beheaded and killed every Huguenot they could find, driving 500,000 Frenchmen out of the country, the wealth of France, the manhood of France, all left for Holland and England. That destroyed France. From then on, France became a nothing nation.

The French Revolution could never have happened had not the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes taken place. Because now, there's no *Bible* in France. And to this day, the French have never published a French version of the *Textus Receptus*. Number one, all French *Bibles* have been produced in foreign countries, when they've been translated from the Greek *Textus Receptus* into French; France has never done it. That shows the Jesuit power over France to this day.

And the French have probably been the most manly, the strongest, the most gracious, the most determined in kicking the Jesuits out of their country. They've kicked them out, to my knowledge, three times—and again, they come back, foment wars, kill off the rulers, etc. Drive Eugene Sue into exile; he dies of a broken heart. Drive Calvin into exile; he can never return to France. All the great Frenchmen are driven into exile.

So we have, as American patriots, we have a great camaraderie for the French. They helped us in our American Revolution. And why did they help us? Because they've been expelled from France. Why did Spain help us? Why did they help finance our Revolution? The Jesuits had been expelled from Spain. So payback came for Spain and France, for helping this heretic, Protestant nation come into existence, with the Napoleonic Wars, when they killed Louis XVI and drove the Bubons from the Spanish throne. That was payback.

Martin: For 30 years of war, from 1618-1648, you state that the Jesuits, through Ferdinand II, killed-off 10 million people. That's quite a statement.

Phelps: That statement comes from Ridpath's *History Of The World*, published in 1899. And that is his encyclopedia of his history of the world. That was common knowledge in 1899. The 30 Years War was hell on Earth for Europe. Two-thirds of Germany was brought back to Rome. It was leveled, plundered, and destroyed.

Wallenstein and Tilly were the fanatical Roman Catholic generals who raped, pillaged, and plundered everything in their path. But the Lord raised up certain great generals like Gustavus Adolphus from Sweden. He was called the "Snow King" and he was the one who ultimately, he paved the way for the victory of the 30 Years War.

But without that Protestant victory of the 30 Years War, the peace of Westphalia, which the Pope was not invited to, there would have been no modern era as we know it today. According to any historian, the modern era begins in 1648. That is when the 80 Year War in Holland ended with Spain. That is when the 30 Years War ended with Ferdinand II and the Protestants of Germany, and Sweden, and so-on.

1648 is the wonderful year in which the Modern Era began, when inventors could go to Germany and say: "Well, you know, maybe the Earth isn't flat." And maybe Leeuwenhoek could invent the microscope in Holland, and now, later on, James Clerk Maxwell, who was a *Bible*-believing, Protestant Presbyterian, he can write his treatise called *Electricity And Magnetism*, the father of what we know today about electricity and magnetism. Now, science can blossom and bloom. Now we can have literature. Now we can have great writers, like Sir Walter Scott, who writes great works like *Ivanhoe* and *Peveiril Of The Peak*. Now we can have Charles Dickens, another Protestant, who writes *A Tale Of Two Cities*, one of London and the other of Rome. We have great literature surfacing as a result of the Modern Era.

But the Jesuits, in their determination to destroy the Reformation and the Modern Era and bring us back to the Dark Ages, seek to reverse the effects of the Modern Era, and thus, what was brought about by the 30 Years War. And to know the 30 Years War is to understand the second 30 Years War, which started in 1914 and ended in 1945.

Martin: In 1639, the Jesuits were also expelled from Japan. Apparently the Jesuits never forgot that.

Phelps: They never forgot it. For over 200 years they have been expelled. And remember the words of Lincoln: "The Jesuits never forget nor forsake."

So, payback time was coming for Japan. The Emperor had expelled them, so that dynasty was targeted. Ultimately, the Emperor would be destroyed or his dynasty would end. And so payback time was the mass fire-bombings by the American Air Force, financed by the Jesuits, as the Jesuits own Lockheed, Boeing, McDonald-Douglas, and Grumman, and they used their B-29 to firebomb Japan to smithereens. You can get the fact that the Jesuits control these aircraft companies from Avro Manhattan's *The Vatican Billions*.

Martin: I'm trying to get a little more current here, but some of this older stuff is also so fascinating, I'm going back and forth here. Our readers are just going to have to be a little flexible in their reading. (*laughter*)

Phelps: Right.

Martin: In 1649 there was the Irish Massacre. What was it, and let's discuss the hatred between the Protestants and Catholics in Ireland, as a result of the Irish Massacre.

Phelps: Ok. Of course, we believe in freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom of the press. That is an outgrowth of Protestantism, because all Protestants were defending their right to believe the *Bible* in the face of Rome's expectations to believe the priests and the decrees of the Popes.

Many of the Irish were born-again. They came to know the Lord. Much preaching was done up there. In fact, Patrick, of St. Patrick's Day, was no Catholic. He was a Protestant. And so, he was a great Protestant preacher of Ireland, and many, many Irish came to know the Lord. And their point of location was primarily in the North, in Northern Ireland, which today is Ulster, Belfast, etc.

Well, the Jesuits, in fulfilling their Bloody Oath that we are making and waging relentless war on all Protestants, and all political liberals, they hatched-out the plot to kill all the Irish Protestants in Ireland with the O'Neil family. And I wonder if that O'Neil family was related to Tip O'Neil?

In 1641, the massacre began, carried out by Roman Catholic nobles and the mobs in Ireland. When they started that massacre, it continued from 1641 to 1649. The massacre ended when they killed 150,000, but they still taught the Catholic children to kill the Protestant children. So, Irish Protestants were being massacred, enmasse, for 8 years.

This is NEVER told whenever anybody is ever talking about Oliver Cromwell, when Cromwell came up with his Puritan Army and ended that, when he took Drogheda, and killed every living thing in Drogheda—men, women, children, animal, everything.

Ones say: "Oh, the beast Oliver Cromwell. Look what he did to Drogheda!" What about those beasts killing those Irish Protestants for 8 years, bashing out the brains of the little babies, smashing them up against the walls like they did, led by the priests?

This was just like they did in Croatia with the Serbs in World War II, when they gouged-out the eyes of all the Serbians, where one particular priest had 23 kilos worth of eyes. They were doing the same thing to the Irish Protestants.

So, when Cromwell came up, and it was vengeance for the Irish Massacre, and the Irish Massacre was NOT started by the Protestants, it was started by the Jesuits according to *Fox's Book Of Martyrs*. And you can find the whole narration there, which was a classic that all Englishmen used to read with the *King James Bible*.

Martin: Do you believe that Great Britain is truly Protestant-controlled, Jewish-controlled, or Jesuit-controlled?

Phelps: Jesuit-controlled.

Martin: Why?

Phelps: Well, let's go back. To understand today we have to go back to the Napoleonic Wars.

When Napoleon came to power, he was brought to power in Corsica. When the Jesuits were suppressed, one of their main outposts during their suppression was the Isle of Corsica. The Jesuits, remember, had finished the High Rites of Freemasonry with Frederick the Great, and then used their French Freemason Napoleon to execute their vengeance.

However, the Jesuits were also protected during their suppression in England. A very wealthy landowner—and you can find this in Ridpath's *History Of The World*—gave his wonderful, beautiful estate Stonyhurst to the Jesuit Order. And from then on, the Jesuits received protection by King George III, and you will find that in Mitchell's *The Jesuits*. Mitchell is an English historian.

Ok, so the Jesuits are now protected by King George III. Well, they're going to uphold his throne. The Jesuits use the English army and navy in the resistance of Napoleon, as both sides are controlled, so that the Jesuits can control the outcome.

The end result is that, after Napoleon accomplishes everything that the Jesuits want him to do—the expulsion of the Knights of Malta, the driving of the Roman Catholics from their throne, imprisoning the Pope for 5 years, etc.—Napoleon is then ordered to abandon his army in the snows of Russia, killing all of those French and German patriots, so that there are very few patriots left in Europe to resist the tyranny coming in France with Louis XVIII, who the Jesuits will put back on the throne.

Louis XVIII was in exile, in England, in King George's own parlor, waiting for the end of the Napoleonic Wars. So, the Jesuits put Louis XVIII back on the throne. He readmitted the Jesuits, started the Inquisition, just like they did with Ferdinand VII when they restored him to power in Spain after the Napoleonic Wars.

And where do these monarchs get their protection? From King George III. King George was used by the Jesuits to restore their power in Europe, after the Napoleonic Wars, after they punished the Pope and the monarchs.

So, it's been, really, from 1795, right around there, that the Jesuits have controlled England. They've controlled the Knights, they've controlled the King. All throughout the 18th century, now, England will never go to war with France again. England will side with the French during the Crimean War. England will be on the side of the French during World Wars I & II. England and France are together, both controlled by the Jesuits—even though France is predominantly a Catholic country, and when England was, at least on its face, a Protestant country. Why should both be working together, both having the same foreign policy. Why? Because the Jesuits control both countries.

When Rothschild sent that note, via Roost, into London, saying that Napoleon had won the Battle of Waterloo, that's when the stocks plummeted, and all the Jesuits bought all the stocks up, there in London, and got control of the Bank of England. The Jesuits then made London their commercial center of the world, and Rome their religious center, aiming that one day Jerusalem would be both.

So now the Jesuits are in control of England. After the Napoleonic Wars, we have the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and guess who's there? All the representatives of King George. England is represented at the Congress of Vienna, the settlement after the Napoleonic Wars. If England was truly Protestant, they would have never went there. Now the Jesuits are in control of England throughout the 1800s, and they use the British Empire to further the power of the Pope. England has been under Rome's control, the Pope's control, since, at the very latest, 1850. And I say since 1795.

Martin: Let's talk about Elizabeth II.

Phelps: Elizabeth II is a wicked, evil queen. She is the head of the Knights of Malta in England. She curtsies to the Lord Mayor in Old London, and she goes and visits the Jesuits of Stonyhurst and kisses their derrières. She has complete allegiance to the Jesuits of Stonyhurst, and will do anything they tell her to do, or they'll get rid of her just like they got rid of all the rest of the monarchs in Europe.

Martin: So you see her as a pawn.

Phelps: She's just a pawn, sure. She's nothing. Remember, White men rule the world. Evil, White, sodomite, homosexual men rule the world, and these are the High Jesuits, with their High Knights of Malta and High Freemasons, they rule. And these women who are involved are just pawns in their game, like the queen, the queen of Holland, just to give the appearance that these nations have a sovereign monarch, when in fact, they're just tools.

England has done some awful, terrible things, but all of the things that they have done increase and benefit the Jesuit Order. They never resisted Napoleon III. Napoleon III was a fanatical Roman Catholic Freemason, subject to the Jesuits, who was the King of France for 18 years, second Empire. England never resisted him. They fought with him in the Crimean War. And Napoleon III dedicated all of his ships to the Virgin Mary. England has been on the side of the Jesuits since 1815, no later. So, that means that the British Secret Service is totally working for Rome, all throughout the 1800s.

Martin: How did the Jesuits regain control of the Vatican in 1814?

Phelps: Remember that they were in control of Napoleon. A Jesuit by the name of Abbie Sieyes—you can find him, again, in Ridpath's *History Of The World*—Abbie Sieyes was a Jesuit-trained individual, and I believe he was a Jesuit. He was on the Directory, and he was also on the Consulate; he was the second counsel. Napoleon was the first; he was the second. He was the advisor and director of Napoleon. Abbie Sieyes, being the Jesuit that he was, ordered Napoleon to imprison the Pope for 5 years, and he did! So, the Pope was in prison for 5 years until 1814, when he restored the Jesuit Order. The Pope, prior to that, was killed. They brought him over the mountains of the Alps, and he died through that debacle.

The Jesuits thoroughly humiliated the papacy. They used their French soldiers to overturn St. Peter's chair, and they found, written in Arabic: "There is no other God but Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet." And THAT is what is under St. Peter's chair today. That was stolen from some kalif during the Crusades.

So, they completely intimidated the Pope and showed their power. The Pope then restored them with a Papal Bull, calling upon the vengeance of the Apostles Peter and Paul, blah, blah, blah, for anyone who would ever suppress the Jesuit Order ever again. When the Jesuits were "reinstalled" in all their power, that's when they were in control of the Pope, and from then on they have been.

Any Pope who resists them gets punished or murdered. And all the Popes know it. When Pius IX wanted a liberal constitution for the Italian people in 1849, all of the Italians were delighted. Here is a liberal Pope; he's going to give us constitutional rights; we're going to have a constitution.

The Jesuits raised up a revolution with Garibaldi and their Freemasons, and drove Pius IX from his throne. He had to stay in Gaeta for about a year. When he returned to Rome, under the protection of Napoleon III's French army—actually, it was the republic's army that would later be his "army of the empire"—but they returned with a French army, protecting the Pope, he became the most fanatical absolutist, pursuant to the wishes of the Jesuits.

So, Pius IX was punished. But the Popes who don't obey, like, what was it, *In God's Name*, the Pope who was murdered after 33 days, when he didn't go along with the Jesuit Order, they ended his life.

[*Editor's note: Eric is here referring to the very well researched and deeply insightful 1984 Bantam Books gem (that's very hard to find, for "some" reason!) by David A. Yallop, called In God's Name, which details the author's thorough investigation into the murder of Pope John Paul I the night of September 28-29, 1978 after John Paul had been digging into the massive web of corruption surrounding the Vatican Bank. For all of you who look for clues, note well the choosing of day 33 since his election for the execution of the murder.*]

When you steal from the Vatican, like the Cardinal did at the PII Lodge, they killed him (Kalvi), and they hanged the other guy, beginning with the admiralty jurisdiction, at their first bridge of the sea. So they have their assassins everywhere to carry out orders. They are machines. They are the perfect "Manchurian Candidates" and they will kill popes, cardinals, presidents, kings, and kaisers, to maintain Jesuit power. They are utterly ruthless—just like they said they would be in the *Protocols*: "We are merciless."

Martin: As you look around the world today, who do you see opposing them?

Phelps: It's interesting. I have a friend who makes quite a few trips to Haiti. I told her about the Jesuits. She got to questioning a few people, and she found that Papa Doc had expelled the Jesuits from Haiti.

Martin: No kidding?

Phelps: That's right. Isn't it interesting, his son was also driven from power and the guy put in his place, I believe it was Aristide, is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and a complete pawn of the Pope and the Jesuit Order—for which reason, when those Haitians wanted to drive Aristide from his power, this filthy, Jesuit-controlled government in Washington put an embargo against Haiti, wrecking the country. See how the U.S. government uses its military, political, and financial power to maintain the temporal power of the Pope? And that's not only in Haiti; it's everywhere. Russia is another example.

Martin: Don't you see, coming up soon in Israel, some of these powers coming head-to-head over the rebuilding of Solomon's Temple? Don't you see some conflicts with the powers that be?

Phelps: Which powers are you talking about?

Martin: I don't know; there seem to be so many involved.

Phelps: We first have to remember the creation of the nation of Israel. World War I prepared the land for the people. World War II prepared the people for the land. World War III, the battle of Armageddon, will "prepare the people for their messiah"—with national repentance and realizing that "Jesus, the messiah, is the savior and will deliver them".

The present government of Israel was set up by the High Masonic Rothschild-controlled Jews, and Rothschild has had an alliance with the Jesuit General since 1876, with Adam Weishaupt. This is the very same Rothschild powers who betrayed the Jews into the hands of the Nazis, killing many Jews all throughout Europe, betraying their own Jewish people. These are the very same powers who run the nation of Israel today.

I read a very interesting paragraph by Mark Lane in his book *Plausible Denial* when he tells about a Jew in Israel who wrote about certain criminal Jews, involved with the Nazis, who are now with the Mossad, something along those lines. The man who wrote the article was gunned-down in front of his home.

So, Rome controls the Israeli government. It controls the Israeli government through the Mossad.

Who trained the Mossad? Reinhard Gehlen.

We find that fact in Loftus' work *The Secret War Against The Jews* in most telling, telling detail.

So what do we have? We have high-level treason and betrayal of the Jewish race; that is there in Israel today, by their own leaders, who are loyal to Rome and the Jesuit Order. And to show this, we have a great big Rockefeller edifice in Jerusalem; we have an ophthalmology center in Jerusalem run by the Knights of Malta. There's nothing but Knights of Malta, high-level Freemasonry, and the Jesuit Order running all of Israel.

So what's going to happen, I believe, with the Dome of the Rock is, that has got to be removed—somehow, someway. It's on the Temple site; it has to be removed.

If I was the Jesuit General, I would make—somehow, someway—American bombers do it. Because I want to create universal hatred for this nation of the United States, because in the United States there are more Protestants and more Jews than any country in the world, and "we've" got to kill all those people. So what better way than to create a Jihad, a Moslem fanatical attack against the United States, coupled with a Chinese invasion from the East. That's what I think is going to happen.

The Jews are not going to destroy that Temple site because, if they do, Rome will destroy their efforts of rebuilding the Temple.

Because, if Moslems control all of Jerusalem, that Temple will never be rebuilt. It has to stay in Jewish hands—because the Jews, and rightfully so, need their own homeland. They're entitled to the nation. And they haven't had their own Temple of worship. They are rightfully entitled to that.

But what they don't know is that they are being used by the Jesuits to rebuild their own Temple, that they would love to have rebuilt, for the Pope, so he can sit there and be the man of sin, the Anti-Christ of the *Book of Daniel*, Chapter 9. That's what I see coming for Israel.

The assassination of Rabin? He wanted to give away too much. He probably wanted to give away some of Jerusalem. The Jesuits will never allow that. So, his bodyguards just step aside and the Mossad kills him. And nothing more is ever heard.

Rome's—the Jesuit General's—international intelligence community carries out all high-level assassinations, kills anybody who's against their program. And Cromwell knew this, back in his day, and that's why he protected himself—160 of his finest "ironsides" as his bodyguards, and no one got to him.

So anybody who's going to resist the Jesuit Order has to be doing it as a matter of a "religious" conviction—being protected by God and good men who are loyal to Him. If it's simply political, with a hired Secret Service, you can forget it.

Martin: Let's go back to St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York. Why is that so significant? You talk about the American Pope. Again, that person is?

Phelps: Cardinal O'Connor.

Martin: Now, what is his role in the United States?

Phelps: Ok, remember first that this title "American Pope" was gotten from Conney's work. John Conney wrote *The American Pope*, I believe in 1988, so a lot of this information is from that document.

The American Pope is the Cardinal of New York. He is the most powerful Cardinal in the United States. He is what's called "the military vicar".

The military vicar is in command of all of the military orders within the United States, they being the Knights of Malta and the Knights of Columbus. He is also in command, and privately, of "the Commission" because Cardinal Spellman was an intimate of Joe Kennedy, and Joe Kennedy was an intimate of Frank Costello.

We also see that it was Cardinal Spellman who enabled "Lucky" Luciano to be released from the prison in New York, to return to Italy in 1946. And this was because of the Luciano Project that I mentioned in my book. But Lucky Luciano, his Mafia on the East Coast, worked in conjunction with the U.S. Navy, supposedly to protect the Eastern seaboard from German U-boat attack.

So, as payback? Cardinal Spellman releases Lucky Luciano—that filthy, wicked, evil, heartless spiritual bastard, who compelled young girls into prostitution, probably one of the cruelest things any man could do. He is released and sent back to Rome.

When the Kennedy assassination comes up, the Cardinal needs a favor. After all, he's released Luciano. So now the Mafia gets to participate: Jack Ruby, Carlos Marcello, Santos Trafficante, all the High Dons participate. Why? Because that Cardinal in New York controls the Commission.

And that Commission, you know what it controls? All of the trucking, all the supermarkets, it's power is beyond our wildest imagination, second only to the Knights of Malta. And, of course, they all control the Federal Reserve Bank.

The Cardinal controls the Federal Reserve Bank through the Council on Foreign Relations. The Council on Foreign Relations belongs to the Cardinal. Spellman was not a member of it, during his day, but two of the most powerful members were Knights of Malta: Henry Luce and J. Peter Grace, and also William F. Buckley, to this day. William F. Buckley is indeed one of my enemies, because I name him, and he is a powerful multi-billionaire who participated in the Kennedy assassination, just like Iacocca, another Knight. Both of those men are subject to Cardinal O'Connor and will do ANYTHING he says.

Martin: Do you know who is head of the Knights of Malta, now?

Phelps: Yes; his name is Flynn. He took over when Grace died in '93. Flynn is head of the American branch. The head of the worldwide branch, the international Knights of Malta, is Andrew Bertie; he's an Englishman. And you can find that in the *National Catholic Reporter*, when you go after their various articles on the Knights of Malta.

Martin: Do the Knights of Malta actually meet, actually hold meetings with the Jesuits?

Phelps: Oh, sure. Remember that Alexander Haig is a powerful Knight of Malta. His brother is a Jesuit.

So, sure they have meetings. The High Knights of Malta, who meet in their palace on Aventin Hill, in Rome, of course, meet with the Jesuit General, and so on. And Count von Hoensbroech, who was a German Noble who became a Jesuit for 14 years—he wrote a two-

volume work called *Fourteen Years A Jesuit*. His father was a Knight of Malta. Yes, the Jesuits work in conjunction and have regular meetings with the Knights of Malta.

The Knights control the money. The Knights control the banks. They control the Bank of Canada, Federal Reserve Bank, Bank of England; they control the banking. They were the ones who were behind the sinking of the Titanic, with the creation of the White Star Line, J.P. Morgan and others.

Martin: Alan Greenspan, then, would be?

Phelps: Alan Greenspan is a Jew, probably a Freemason, because he is the leader of the Temple called the "Federal Reserve Bank" and they always put Jews in the forefront—so that they can blame all of what they do on the Jewish race in this country, to create an anti-Semitism everywhere, just like Charles Coughlin, the radio Jesuit priest of the '30s did.

Greenspan, Bloomenthal, Warburg, and all those Jews need to be publicly rebuked, because they are creating the mass genocide of the Jewish race in the United States. The Jews are being blamed right now for the foreign policy in Bosnia. Madeline Albright—she's a Jew—they're blaming her for what's going on in Serbia. I've got a good Serbian friend who blames her. I said she's just a pawn of the Jesuit CFR. Don't blame the Jewish people. It's these Jewish "pawns" who are loyal to the Pope and the Jesuits who are doing this.

The Zionists—the Jesuits are the Great Zionists. They control all of the historical High Zionists—Theodor Herzl, David Ben-Gurion, Golda Meir. Zionism is a Masonic term, coined by the Jesuits. They are the rulers; they are the Protocols; they are the Elders of Zion. So the Zionists are, indeed, evil and wicked; but they are controlled by Rome. The Jews are not all Zionists.

I remember when I went to Jerusalem and Israel in 1976, and a lady said to this particular man that I had met: "You're more of a Zionist than we are!" And I thought: "What does that mean? I don't understand that."

I only later understood why Yasser Arafat says he doesn't hate the Jews; he can't stand the Zionists. And I'm thinking: "What's the difference?" I, later, learned that there is a great difference between those Zionists and the other Jews. The Orthodox Jews can't stand the Zionists.

So what's the difference? The Zionists are socialist communists, controlled by Rome. They are atheists, just like the Jesuits, although they're being used to rebuild the nation of Israel. They are the enemies of the Jewish people, per se.

There's no conflict going on in the Middle East. There's no conflict going on with the Arab nations. All of the Arab nations are under the command of Masonic kings or iotollas. Saddam Hussein is no enemy of George Bush; they're both brothers, brothers of the lodge. That whole thing was set up to kill off a whole bunch of Arabs for the protection of the Zionist state of Israel.

Martin: Well, Bush and Saddam were business partners. We've covered that in recent past issues of our newspaper.

Phelps: Sure. That's why they never killed Saddam. They could have easily killed him. The CIA can kill anybody they want to. They could have easily killed Saddam and got out. They could use their own Arab agents in there. Saddam was a very important tool.

Martin: Still is.

Phelps: Still is, sure. They keep the Arab peoples and nations at bay by controlling them through their leaders. Or, when they start to get out of control in their Moslem fanaticism, they then foment a war and kill off a whole bunch of them. Make sense?

Martin: There was a statement you made in your book about the Jesuits controlling the Nation of Islam, and that was almost a surprising statement to read. I would think that someone like Louis Farrakhan would be pretty adamant.

Phelps: Yeah, he would hate me for that one. Well, let's think a little bit here:

Chicago is ruled by the Archbishop of Chicago, a Cardinal. It was Cody; I don't know who it is now. Do you think anything goes down in Chicago without the Cardinal's approval?

Where was the Nation of Islam founded? Chicago.

Where is Louis Farrakhan's—that murderer's—mansion? Chicago. He lives like a king.

What does he hand out? He hands out the *Protocols Of The Learned Elders Of Zion* to all of deluded Black Nation of Islam people, so that they can hate the Jews, just like the Klu Klux Klan.

That's right. Those three little tidbits, right there, prove that the Nation of Islam is totally under Jesuit control. They are going to be used to foment anarchy and agitation, because they have an army called "the fruit of Islam", and they have millions of rounds stored in all the major cities—guns stored everywhere, so that they can start the race war. And when that happens, you see, then the brothers in Washington can implement Martial Law, suspend the *Constitution*, and now the Jesuits have what they want.

So, they use these Blacks in the North, who hate the White people, for their own destruction, for the destruction of the Black people themselves. And the Nation of Islam is part of that.

When I was in the Air Force, and in jail for about 10-15 days, about 10 years ago, the Nation of Islam was paramount, or tried to be paramount, there. All the Blacks in jail become Moslems. It's a "hate the White man" religion. Every White man is a White, blue-eyed Devil. And they're playing—the Zodiac killer, back in California many years ago, all Moslems. So it's a "hate the White man" religion, designed to foment agitation and unrest.

Martin Lucifer King was intimately involved with them. The only problem is, Malcolm X got on to it. He realized he was being used and he separated from it. Then he ceased to be an agitator.

Martin: Malcolm X was way ahead of his time.

Phelps: Yeah. Malcolm X was a good guy.

Martin: Yes, he was.

Phelps: Malcolm X, even though he was used by the Jesuits, because he hated the *King James Bible*, he was a great agitator. When he went to Mecca, he changed.

Martin: Yes, he did.

Phelps: And when he came back, he stopped being an agitator. He stopped hating the White man. He started to set up the African-American Movement. And as a result, he was assassinated by the high leaders of the FBI and the Nation of Islam.

And what do they both have in common? High-level Shriner Freemasonry.

And so, we have the Masons in control of the Nation of Islam and the Klu Klux Klan—one agitating Blacks, and the other agitating Whites, to the glory of the Jesuit Order. The other Civil Rights Movement had the Jesuits behind that—with LaFarge. Jesuit LeFarge was a great mover and shaker of the Civil Rights Movements. And that agitation resulted in amalgamation, race-mixing, the destruction of a White race and a Black race, producing a nation of hybrids that cannot maintain free government.

That is what they proposed to do in the first Reconstruction, but it failed; so they succeeded in the second Reconstruction in the '60s. The Jesuits are masters of the races. They know their strengths and their weaknesses.

The only race who successfully resisted the Jesuit Order is the White, Anglo-Celtic, Saxon race, with a *Bible* in one hand and a gun in the other. And so they've got to take the *Bible* away, they've got to take the gun away, and they've got to destroy that race. And that's what they are essentially doing here. I know that's a racist statement, but I'm sorry, it's just the way it is. That's history, and that's what they're doing.

The "Black" Pope

Count Hans Kolvenbach—The Jesuit's General

Pt. 2

Martin: The relationship between Communism and Freemasonry. Where do the Jesuits fit into Communism and Freemasonry?

Phelps: Let's, first of all, look at the relationship of Jesuitism to Communism. The Jesuits perfected the tenets of Communism on their reductions in Paraguay, for 150 years, from 1600-1750.

Martin: What is a reduction?

Phelps: A reduction is a commune. In Israel they would call it a kibbutz. In Joseph Stalin's Russia they would call it a commune. In New York they call it a village. In France, Paris, they called it a commune. It's communal living where everybody is equal in their finances, in the labors; you have no great, no small, no rich, no poor—everybody is small, and everybody is poor, and everybody is controlled by a dictator. That's the essence of Communism.

The Jesuits, on the reductions in Paraguay, which were the communes, had a central bank, and it was "each according to their ability and each according to their need". And so, the Guarani Indians that were the subjects—and there were some 200,000 of these South American Indian natives who were slaves of the Jesuits, putting their goods into world commerce and trade. They were living under the tenets of Communism, perfected by the Jesuits, as outlined in Plato's *Republic* and Sir Thomas Moore's *Utopia*. The Jesuits perfected it on their reductions.

With that, they then introduced Communism in 1848 through Karl Marx. They tutored him in the British Museum, according to Alberto Rivera, an ex-Jesuit.

So Marx, the Jewish Freemason, was to be the one to put forward this Communism for the world, so that Communism would look like a Jewish brain-child, so that Communism could be blamed on the Jews. Well, what's not told is that the Jews involved in the implementing of Communism were Masonic Jews. Karl Marx was a 33rd-degree Freemason, a worshipper of Lucifer, whose father wanted nothing to do with him, because his father was a Baptist preacher.

Jewish Freemasonry, controlled by the Jesuits, implemented Communism in Russia. Lenin, the half-Jew, was a Freemason. That civil war that took place from 1917-1922, for 5 years, was given the appearance that it was primarily Yiddish. I mean, they're on the streets of Russia talking Yiddish; they had Yiddish signs; and it was wanted to give the impression to the world that this revolution was of Jewish origin.

For 10 years after the revolution, the Jews fared very well, but in 1922, Joseph Stalin, that great Jew-hater, who was educated by Jesuits in Georgia—which was a country south of Russia and, therefore, the Emperor's banning of the Jesuits from Russia, his Ukase, did not reach to Georgia. So the Jesuits stayed in Georgia, trained Joseph Stalin, brought him in after the Revolution, and made him Secretary of the Communist Party in 1922, until he died in 1953.

The Jesuits used Freemasonry and, of course, Stalin was also a brother Freemason. They used Freemasonry to implement Communism in Russia, and from there, China, and from there, throughout the world.

When Germany had their revolution after World War I, their Communist revolution—remember, they requested an armistice—they had never been beaten on the field of battle.

The Germans were foisted into that war; they never started World War I. It was started by France and Russia and England, for the purpose of destroying Germany, because Germany had expelled the Jesuits. During that war, the Germans requested an armistice to stop this Communist revolution in Germany.

And who lead the revolution? The German Freemasons.

According to the Kaiser, in his memoirs, it was German Freemasonry that got him off his throne and deposed him. He had to go into exile in Holland. He wrote his memoirs in 1935.

So the relationship between Jesuitism, Communism and Freemasonry we see evolving and expanding from the 1600s to the ultimate achievement in the Bolshevik Revolution.

In my book, I parallel the French Revolution and the Bolshevik Revolution, and they are identical. It was French Freemasonry that caused the French Revolution and the Jacobins, and it was the Freemasons in Russia, with Bolsheviks, who caused the Russian Revolution, with their Bolsheviks, leading and ending in Joseph Stalin. In France, it ended with Napoleon; in Russia, it ended with Stalin. And so, that's the relationship there.

Martin: Why was Eugene Sue so significant?

Phelps: Eugene Sue wrote his masterpiece *The Wandering Jew*, and in that masterpiece he weaves a fantastic story from India to England to France, of the power of the Jesuit Order and their attempt to destroy the Rennepont family, a French Huguenot Protestant family, and acquire a fortune that's due to be inherited by the members of that family on a certain day, at a certain time, in a certain year.

Well, that fortune is held, in trust, by a Jew, for which reason the book is named *The Wandering Jew*. It tells of the power of the Jesuit Order in that book, and how the Jesuits mercilessly killed all these members of the Rennepont family so they could not inherit their fortune.

The only one, I believe, they didn't kill was a priest, whose name was Gabriel, who was a decent and a righteous Catholic priest who repudiated the Jesuit Order. He ordered the Jew to burn all the securities, that totaled something like \$212 million, that would have rightfully been this French family's.

So, the Jesuits didn't get it, nor did the French family get it. It's written with such drama and feeling that you cannot put this book down. It was translated into many different languages. As a result, the French, and other nations, had their French Revolution, the second French Revolution of 1848. But because it was not led by Godly men, it benefited the Jesuits.

Whenever you have a revolution led by unGodly men, it's just like a man who's on a horse, trying to be pushed off the horse, and as he's pushed off, another dictator takes his place. That's exactly what happened in France, and Italy, and the nations who were involved in that second French Revolution.

But Eugene Sue had motivated the people of France to expel the Jesuits, and they were finally expelled in 1880 by a French Freemason, in the 3rd Republic, Leon Gambetta. So, they're all Freemasons who resist them, but they pay with their lives, like Garfield, like Gambetta, Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt really didn't resist them; he just was killed by them.

Martin: Again, I'm jumping around.

Phelps: Ok.

Martin: What was Operation Mongoose?

Phelps: Operation Mongoose was purely "black ops" in the words of Fletcher Prouty. Of course, Fletcher Prouty I consider the authority on what Operation Mongoose was. Operation Mongoose was to "give the appearance" of resistance to Castro's government by attacking Cuba but, in effect, solidified his reign there. That's what it ultimately produced. And that's what the Knights and the CIA ultimately wanted. Ok?

The agreement that Kennedy made over the Cuban missile crisis in 1962—first of all, there was no missile crisis. There's no such thing as nuclear war. There's no such thing as a nuclear attack. That's all a hoax. It's just as much a hoax as going and landing on the Moon. It's a hoax.

Nuclear war, that fear, was the basis for the Cuban missile crisis. And out of that hoax, Kennedy strikes a secret deal with Khrushchev that, if you keep the missiles out of Cuba, we won't bother Castro anymore. Well, that's what the Jesuits wanted anyway. They wanted to solidify Castro in power.

So that whole theatrical performance solidified Castro's power in Cuba. And the question is: Why would the Jesuits create this fanatical power in Cuba, run down the Cuban people, put them in poverty, imprison them at random, create a living hell down there, drive out the Mafia—the Mafia could no longer have their casinos in Havana?

Why would the Mafia give up their casinos? For the international drug trade to be developing out of Vietnam.

Therefore, if the Mafia is leaving, and we don't have a bunch of American tourists going down to Cuba anymore, and Cuba is really a secret country—the *Bible* is not allowed there, missionaries are not allowed in, obviously under Jesuit control, Castro was trained by Jesuits—what's the purpose of Cuba under Castro?

It's purpose is as a landing base for foreign invasion. They have hundreds of vehicles, underground, in underground caves there, ready for a massive invasion to the East Coast, primarily the South. Because the last of the Protestants in this country are in the South.

Cuba will always be under a dictator and will never go back to freedom, because it is to be a landing base. And you know what? It could very well be a landing base for a Jihad that the Moslems will foment against us, because they'll come right across from Africa to Cuba, get reinforced, and then go landing into Florida, with all their 5th-Column Cubans in Florida and Miami right now. Sounds wild, but—

Martin: That's a sobering thought.

Phelps: Yes, it is. Sounds wild, but I'm telling you, all the geography is in place. However, they can't pull this all off until they get your guns. So that's why they're constantly creating these gun issues—people shooting people, the Columbine High School bit—to justify the confiscation of all the guns. And when that happens, then they can do what they want to do.

Martin: There are a lot of strong Americans out there.

Phelps: The only problem is this: they're not united and they can't be lead. Americans are leaderless because they do not follow. They all think their opinions are equal, and they're not. I would follow General Patton anywhere. I wouldn't question an order of his. We don't have men like that today, for the most part, because we don't have leaders like that today.

Martin: I found your account of Patton's assassination fascinating, also your speaking of the Jesuits' poisoning of him.

Phelps: A member of the OSS came out in the *Spotlight* [newspaper] and said that. His name was Zapata, that agent. He said he was given a contract on Patton for \$10,000. He didn't kill him, but he knows the guy who did. So, Patton was murdered, and General Vlasov was murdered, and both of them hated the Jesuits' "Grand Inquisitor", Joseph Stalin. They would have united together to eradicate Russia of that dictator, but the Jesuits would not have it because Russia is theirs. They must control the Orthodox Church to bring it back to Rome. That's why they got rid of the Romanoffs.

Martin: Patton's take-out was ordered by "Wild" Bill Donovan? Did I read that?

Phelps: That's right. Wild Bill Donovan was the head of the OSS at the time. And if you get Anthony K. Brown's *The Last Hero*, it's on Wild Bill Donovan. He is in the Vatican at the end of his life, in a picture, walking in the Vatican to receive one of the highest medals from the Pope, for a "lifetime" of intelligence service to the Vatican. That is in *The Last Hero* and the picture is mesmerizing. I want to put it in my book.

The OSS is nothing but an arm of the CIA and the Vatican, and that's why they took out Kenedy. They kill all the generals who don't "play ball".

Martin: Let's talk about the CIA and the FBI some more. What can you tell me about their relationship to Count von Kolvenbach?

Phelps: Well, based upon the past, if the CIA and the FBI carried out the assassination under Spellman, and Janseens was the Jesuit General then, the same power structure is in place. So, von Kolvenbach, through his Knights of Malta and Jesuits, control the FBI and CIA. And his liaison of control is now Cardinal O'Connor in New York.

Martin: Some time ago, with Gunther Russbacher and others, there was talk about a split in the CIA, of different factions. Some even say there is a third faction in the CIA that has split off. What's your opinion about factional divisions within the CIA?

Phelps: I think it's true. I know that Angelton was the mole. Angelton was the one who betrayed all those CIA agents in Russia, in which the vast majority of them were killed, when he gave all that information to that KGB kingpin on a farm in New York, in a van, stuffed with all the highest, top secret CIA documents. Ok?

Colby comes along as the Director of the CIA—I know his brother, he lives nearby me—Colby comes along as the Director of the CIA and what does he do? He fires Angelton. Bad news for Colby.

Martin: Yeah, it was.

Phelps: They filled him up with lead. Eric Timm, he was also against Angelton; he was history. That's all told in Anthony K. Brown's work *Treason In The Blood*. There's a whole little chapter on Eric Timm and some of the other guys in the CIA who were against Angelton. They all died. So there's a faction in the CIA that knows that something is rotten in Denmark, and they don't quite know what it is. Hopefully, they'll read my book and see that the CIA is just an arm of the Jesuit Order and Knights of Malta, carrying out the Council of Trent and the Pope's temple power, and will REVOLT, and start to tell the truth themselves.

It's the same way in the FBI. My father lectured at the FBI Academy. He wanted to be in the FBI, but his parents were Communists, so he was not let in by J. Edgar Hoover. But the FBI has low-level agents who wonder just what's going on. A lot of them didn't approve of what happened in Waco.

They need to come out and tell the truth. This whole "house of cards"—and that's what it is, this is not an undefeatable, invincible monster—it's a house of cards; it plays on FEAR. If men would tell the truth, and come out and tell what they know, and not be afraid, this whole house of cards would crumble. That's what they need to do.

Martin: Who is Avery Dulles?

Phelps: Avery Dulles is the son of John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, I believe, under Eisenhower. Avery Dulles is a Jesuit, and he was the nephew of the head of the CIA during the Kennedy assassination, who was Allan Dulles. And Allan Dulles was a Freemason, also called "the gentleman spy" in the book *The Gentleman Spy*.

Martin: What was Angelton's role in the Kennedy assassination?

Phelps: Angelton was the one who was to "investigate" it on the part of the CIA. *(laughter)*

Angelson also, I believe, was liaison to the Warren Commission—no, that was Dulles. But Angelton and Dulles were working together on that, because Angelton was the Chief of Counter-Intelligence and he manned the Vatican Desk, and he manned the Israeli Desk.

See how they're maintaining the Zionists in power, with the Israeli Desk? So, they saved Israel's hide in the '73 war, because Kissinger almost lost it for them. Alexander Haig gave them, the Israelis, those anti-tank missiles, and got them in their hands before the Egyptians got into Israel and disabled them. That was Alexander Haig, Knight of Malta, for which reason he was also the Supreme Allied Commander for NATO, promoted over 260 of his peers.

Martin: Do you know anything about Haig's statement "I'm in charge now!" Do you remember that?

Phelps: Yeah, I do. I don't know all of the implications, but I'm sure it fits in with him being, in fact, in charge in the Nixon White House.

Martin: Ok, I want to go back to the Kennedy assassination, and I'm going to just mention some names: Clay Shaw, Jim Garrison, J. Peter Grace, Henry Luce, E. Howard Hunt, John McCone. Why are they so important to this story?

Phelps: Give me one and we'll start with one.

Martin: Let's start with Clay Shaw.

Phelps: Clay Shaw was a Knight of Malta. He was the head of the international trade mart in New Orleans. Roman Catholic, homosexual, multi-millionaire, lived lavishly, etc. Clay Shaw was the personal friend of David Ferry. David Ferry was a CIA agent, and was also a pilot for Carlos Marchello—the CIA and the Mafia together. Clay Shaw also was a friend of Lee Oswald, and Garrison proves it.

Here we have Clay Shaw, who was in the CIA. It was admitted by Richard Helms that Clay Shaw was a "contract agent" for the CIA, and the highest security involved in the Kennedy assassination, because he gets an attorney for Dean Andrews who's subpoenaed by Garrison. So, if Clay Shaw is involved, he's a Knight of Malta, he's high CIA, and he can't go down.

That's why the court was packed. The judge was biased against Garrison. The defense of Shaw was unlike any before. There was a guy behind, whispering to the defense attorney. That's not allowed in a courtroom defense.

Shaw HAD to be found innocent, because if he was found guilty, now the CIA is going down. Now we're going to have a revolution. So, Clay Shaw had to be found not guilty.

But it wasn't many years after that, he died under suspicious conditions and never had an autopsy. He died of lung cancer. But he's part of the brotherhood, and the Jesuits are very powerful in New Orleans.

Martin: John McCone.

Phelps: John McCone was a very powerful industrialist, and one who was part of the military-industrial complex, before he became the head of the CIA. He later went on to become part of, I believe, ITT.

John McCone was another Knight of Malta, head of the CIA, and participated in the Kennedy assassination by virtue of him being its head. And he's Knight of Malta.

Angelton is a Knight of Malta. Henry Luce is a Knight of Malta. William F. Buckley is a Knight of Malta. And William F. Buckley then ran the *National Review*—and what does he do? He blames Oswald as the lone assassin.

Where was the picture concocted, for Oswald, as though his head is put on this body that's not his? It was concocted, probably, I believe, in the *Time-Life* Building, when they did that, because *Time-Life* has a whole bunch of CIA agents in it. And, remember, *Time-Life* is right across the street from St. Patrick's Cathedral, where Cardinal Spellman was ruling from.

So, Spellman was overseeing the whole thing, with Henry Luce. And, if you get *Luce And His Empire*, there is a picture in there of Cardinal Spellman, Luce, Grace, Clare Boothe Luce, and Dean Rusk, on the 1963, 4-year anniversary of *Time* magazine in the Waldorf Astoria, only months before the Kennedy assassination. And there's Dean Rusk, the architect of the Vietnam War, according to the words of his own son.

Ok, who's the other one? Howard Hunt. Howard Hunt is a CIA agent, of course.

He said he was never in Dallas the day of the assassination, but Mark Lane proved that he was. Thank God for Mark Lane. Here's another Jew getting in the way of the Vatican. Just like Daniel Ellsberg—here's another Jew getting in the way of the Vatican's Vietnam War.

You see Jews who are getting in the way of the Vatican, and the Jesuits are furious about it. So here's Mark Lane; he's openly defeated William F. Buckley in court before; now he proves that Howard Hunt is a CIA agent, in Dallas the day of the assassination.

The jury came forward with that verdict, and who is Howard Hunt? Howard Hunt is a personal friend of Henry Luce, a correspondent for *Time-Life*. He's a personal friend of William F. Buckley. He goes to one of Buckley's parties at the New York Yacht Club. He knows them both. He knows two of the High Knights.

And guess what? Guess what Howard Hunt is called? He's called "Knight". (*laughter*)

I wonder what he was—Knight of Columbus, or whatever. But he's involved with the brotherhood.

So he was there on the day of the assassination, intimate with Luce and Buckley. Just as the chart says on my web page. And by the way, your readers need to look at my <http://www.vaticanassassins.org/> web page.

Martin: I'm going to mention a few more names.

Phelps: Oh, J. Peter Grace we forgot. J. Peter Grace was the head of the Knights of Malta in 1963. He is the head of W. R. Grace, and he's one of the largest shipping tycoons in the world, in control of all the shipping in South America. Grace is a powerful man, or was a powerful man.

Martin: Has anyone filled his shoes?

Phelps: Yes, Flynn is head of the Knights of Malta now, down in Florida where their new office is. They moved from New York to Florida, I think Boca Raton. They have 11 Knights of Malta on the W. R. Grace board.

And, of course, guess who owns Taco Bell? W. R. Grace.

So now we see W. R. Grace involved in the poisoning of America with fast-food chains, so everybody gets heart disease, clogged arteries, so they can go to bypass surgery and further enrich the medical profession, while carrying out their medical inquisition. Isn't that clear? So not only are they going to kill all of the American people, but they're going to make billions doing it.

Martin: I'm sure they're laughing all the way to the bank.

Phelps: They sure are. And where Grace did his banking, W. R. Grace, they did their banking at Chemical Bank in New York. Guess who runs Chemical Bank? Knights of Malta.

Martin: Jim Garrison was a very brave guy.

Phelps: Yes, he was. He lost his marriage. He lost his children. He suffered greatly through this, doing what he did.

Martin: Ok, I want to talk about the movie *JFK*. You mention the Jesuits, in control of Time-Warner, produced Oliver Stone's movie *JFK*. What was the reason for this? To just further cement, subliminally in the minds of the American people, their absolute power?

Phelps: I think that might be part of it. But, I think it's a test. It's a test: tell the American people the truth to see what they will do about it. And they did nothing.

And that was the end of Garrison, or Kevin Costner's speech, in the courtroom, when he said "It's up to you." And he looks directly into the camera. So, he's looking at us.

That was a call to do something about it. It's a test. What will we do? And you know what was done? Nothing. The men in power, the men in the know, the men who could have said something, did nothing. So that was the purpose of the movie.

Meanwhile, they interweave all these Jesuit subliminals all throughout the movie: "Black is white, white is black"—when Garrison is at the restaurant, talking to his people—that's Ignatius Loyola. David Ferry shows pictures of his Catholic uniform there, and Satan pictures in his apartment, all very much Jesuitism.

There were a couple of other things I noticed that I can't quite remember. Oh, they had a subliminal "study the past". It goes on there, it's on a building or something, "study the past". And they said: "It's like Caesar; he's not in the loop." Well, Caesar was murdered by those close to him. And the ones who murdered Caesar were the priests of Rome. There's all kinds of subliminals in that movie which point to the power of the Jesuit Order, all over. The assassination—right after they take his body out of Parkland Hospital, they've got the cross on it, the crucifix. That is a very unique, Jesuit crucifix.

When I was at a Jesuit retreat in Redding one day, I just wanted to walk through the place. I wanted to see where these sinners rule from, so I thought I would walk through the place and check out the rooms. It just so happened that the Jesuits were on the second floor, by themselves. So I went to the first floor and the third floor, and looked into the rooms. They were little, tiny rooms, and on

every bed is a crucifix with a crucified person on it. It's not the Jesus Christ of the *Bible*; it's their Jesus Christ. And that's the same exact crucifix that was put on the coffin, in the movie, when they're shipping the coffin out.

And get a load of this: the guy who came to give Kennedy the Last Rites, Oscar Hubert, his superior was the Bishop of Dallas, by the name of Thomas Gorman. Bishop Thomas Gorman was a Knight of Malta, answerable directly to Cardinal Spellman.

Martin: Let's talk about Cardinal Spellman. Who was he? Why was he so important? You say, in the book, he really was the man behind it.

Phelps: Right.

Martin: Why do you say that?

Phelps: Cardinal Spellman was, first, very much involved in politics all of his life. Remember, he was trained by the Jesuits at Fordham. He was trained by Jesuits at the American College in Rome. When he came back here, he was taken care of by Nicholas Brady and his wife, multi-billionaires in control of Union Carbide, and various banks, multi-multi-billionaires.

Spellman was part of getting FDR into office, although I believe Cardinal Hayes was the Cardinal. Guess who FDR names as his international agent, during World War II? Francis Spellman. Francis Spellman was throughout the war-front during World War II, going to and from the Vatican, the Allied Army, etc. And, with that, he built a huge network of contacts. He, also, of course, had contacts with the mob.

So, by the time of the Kennedy assassination, we have Cardinal Spellman here, who helped the Nazis get into the United States, with the FBI.

I met one of those Nazis about 6 months ago. I call him Pete. He showed me his Nazi SS overcoat, which is a beautiful overcoat—I'd love to have it. And it was the FBI who brought all of these High Nazis in and resettled them, and gave them money to settle.

Who did that? Francis Spellman, by helping those criminals escape the theater of Europe so that they could not be prosecuted. It's called the "Vatican Ratline" that Loftus writes about in his *Unholy Trinity*.

So, Spellman is involved in getting the SS out, helping the Ustasis. Spellman is involved in this whole second 30 Years War of the Vatican in Europe, outlined by Edmond Paris in his *Vatican Against Europe*.

And so, he is in a perfect place to carry out the assassination. He has contacts with the Knights of Malta in England, with the Knights he controls in America; he has his Jesuit contacts who trained him at Fordham and Rome; he was a personal friend of Pius XII during the war.

He was a personal friend of the secret cold-warrior, Montini, Pius VI. So he is the perfect man, with all of the connections, to carry it out. He has contacts with the CIA, the Knights from the CIA, the Knights from the FBI, in the person of Carthe DeLouthe, who still lives. He had contacts with high-level Freemasonry, with people like J. Edgar Hoover and their raving against Communism, Communism, Communism—international, Godless, Jew Communism.

He and Hoover are bosom, probably bed, partners. And so, Spellman is in a place to be in control of the CIA, the FBI, the Mafia, and through Freemasonry, the Dallas Police Department—like they control every major city's P.D. And so he carries it out.

And then he's also in control of the press, in control of *Time* and *Life*, with Henry Luce, so the press never gets it. He's in control of CBS, with a man named Frank Shakespeare, who was the head of CBS at the time.

So you think Walter Cronkite is going to tell us the truth? No way. He's in control of CBS, NBC, ABC. They have stocks in it, for heaven's sake. So, there's no way the story's getting out. And he's in control of the CIA to hit and kill anybody who wants to come out and tell the truth, which is why there's over a hundred dead witnesses over the last 30 years.

That's why they took out Fensterwald, in 1992, outlined in the book by that CIA agent *First Hand Knowledge*, by Morrow. He was a CIA agent. He was in on the Kennedy assassination. He completely outlines it in his book, and he tells of that relationship of the CIA to killing Fensterwald. He dedicates his book to Fensterwald.

So, how's it getting out? This is only getting out by fearless preachers, who preach the Word of God, and aren't afraid of telling the truth politically, trusting God that He will move and do His part, now that we've done our part.

Martin: FBI Director Hoover, Earl Warren, Gerald Ford, Johnson—Jesuit tools?

Phelps: Jesuit tools. All 33rd-Degree Freemasons. And remember, the Council of the 33rd Degree is located in Washington. They control all of the Shriners in this country. Washington is controlled by the Jesuits from Georgetown.

The capital of the United States is at Georgetown University, not the White House.

And if you go into the president's office at Georgetown, you will see a picture of Bill Clinton, kneeling at the grave of Timothy Healy [*past president of Georgetown*], while the present president, Donovan, who is on the Walt Disney Board, is standing behind him.

I wanted that picture; I wanted a copy of that picture. Those people threw me out of that office. They would not let me have a copy of it. I sent another person, a lady, up there. They would not give it to her. I want that picture, for my book, of Bill Clinton kneeling at the grave of these Jesuits. Can't get it. But if you go in the president's office, it's there.

Georgetown is the capital. They control all Freemasonry. In fact, if you go to Maryland, they've got the great big lodge across from a great big Jesuit institution, in Baltimore—a great huge Shriner Lodge is across the street from a Jesuit University. And they're enemies?

Martin: I want to talk about Bill Clinton in a minute, but before we get to him, who is Cartha DeLoach?

Phelps: Cartha DeLoach—his sir name was Deke. He was the 3rd-in-command of the FBI at the time of the Kennedy assassination. Cartha DeLoach was the real head of the FBI. Hoover was a wimp. His queer buddy, Tolson, who was nothing, was second in command.

So Hoover and Tolson were just figure-heads. The real head of the FBI was Cartha DeLoach, the Knight of Malta, Roman Catholic, subject to Cardinal Spellman.

Cartha DeLoach fabricated evidence, covered-up evidence in the FBI, in the Kennedy assassination. That was proven by Jim Garrison. Cartha DeLoach went on to retire. He went on to work for a huge industry corporation called PepsiCo, which the Knights of Malta control, and which have ranches in Communist China, which they set up. And he still lives.

Cartha DeLoach wrote a book called *Hoover's FBI*. You can get it at the bookstores. In that book he tells about the Secret Service, the FBI, and the Jesuits.

Martin: Why do you refer to the Kennedy assassination as the "Achilles' Heel" of the Jesuits?

Phelps: Because, if it's ever known that the Jesuits killed our first Roman Catholic President, if the Roman Catholics of Northeastern America ever find that out, and ever believe it, the Jesuits are finished here.

This country is the keystone to implementing the temporal power of the Pope around the world. If this country would expel the Jesuits, and we get back our national sovereignty, and we started to be self-governing once again, we would have our liberty, and the Jesuits would be out, and we would begin to experience REAL financial prosperity, and real living.

So, if that is known that the Jesuits are the ones behind it, that Rome carried this out, the Catholics of the Northeast would have a revolution. We would have another revolution because American Roman Catholics are not like Catholics in any other country: they think. They have their own opinion. They believe in freedom of conscience. They believe they have the right to express themselves.

Catholics in Poland don't believe that. Catholics in Italy wouldn't dare believe that. But the Catholics here do. They have a lot of Protestant principles. They don't really comprehend this whole idea of universal, world-wide temporal power of the Pope. They think it's just a religion.

But, if those Catholics in New York, if those two million Roman Catholics knew that Spellman was behind it, and O'Connor has covered it up, we'd have a revolution! Because it's the Roman Catholics, unfortunately, who only do anything about things. The Protestants don't do anything. They're all a bunch of wimps, a bunch of cowards. They don't do anything.

It's the Roman Catholics who apparently have built our major cities. They built our skyscrapers. They're the great steel workers. They're the ones, apparently, with the guts enough to bring about a change. The only problem is, they're unGodly because they don't know the Lord. They don't read the *Bible*. They don't know Christ. They're not born-again. If they would get born-again, and come to know Christ, with their determination and their resistance to tyranny, we'd have another Reformation. And a lot of people's heads would be going on trial, and to the block, for treason.

Martin: I'm going to go back, now. How did the *Protocols Of The Learned Elders Of Zion*, authored, according to you, by the Jesuits, further the Jesuit Agenda?

Phelps: Ok. To answer that, we probably ought to look at the different *Protocols*. Now, to my mind, I believe there's 20 or 30 *Protocols*; I can't quite remember. But the *Protocols* further the agenda of the Jesuit Order in that Russia would be taken and, in the fall of Russia, in the Bolshevik Revolution, two major things would happen: The Romanoff dynasty would be removed. Now, of course, the Czar was not killed at Ekaterinburg; we know that from the book *The File On The Czar*. We know that his daughter died in the state of Virginia [not very long ago]. We know his son, Alexi, became a member of the KGB, later came to New York, and he put out what was called *The White Paper*. The Royal Family was not killed, because they were Knights of Malta.

So, the Knights of Malta took the Royal Family out, faked their death, and then after they had taken the Romanoffs out, the Orthodox Church no longer had a protector, because Church and State are one in Russia.

Now the Jesuits were free, with their Bolsheviks, to kill-off the Orthodox leadership that was anti-Rome. That's why they killed 5,000 priests and nuns, during the revolution, of the Orthodox Church. They just beheaded all the anti-Catholic, anti-Pope leadership of the Orthodox Church.

They got rid of the Romanoffs, and then the next thing they did, they began to purge Russia of its Protestants, in general. They purged it of its Lutherans; they burned down the Lutheran Church; imprisoned the Baptists; sent them off to Siberia. They even destroyed two Jewish communities during the '20s, which we're not told.

The Jews fared well for 10 years, until the purges of Stalin in the '30s. But the Jesuits accomplished the killing-off, the getting rid of the Romanoff dynasty and their protectorate of the Orthodox Church, the beheading of the Orthodox Church, so they could bring Orthodox Moscow back to Rome. And remember, Moscow is considered the "Third Rome". The first is Rome; the second is Constantinople; the third is Moscow. And you can find this, you can find the Jesuit alliance with the Bolsheviks in a book called *Descent Into Darkness* by a priest named Zatko, who taught at Notre Dame University in the '60s.

And so the Jesuits were given formal re-entry into Russia in 1922, after the Bolshevik Revolution and Civil War, and from then on—the Russian College was erected in Rome in 1929, so they could prepare Russian Jesuits to rule Russia. And that's what they've done, and they've ruled through the KGB, just like they rule this country through the CIA and the FBI.

The *Protocols* outline this. Remember, the *Protocols* were discovered in Russia, and translated by an Englishman, Marsden. But what it also did—because then they set-up the huge gulag system, the huge concentration camp system, that gave the Jesuits practice to do this in Europe.

But their great accomplishment was, in the process of pulling all of this off, they blamed it on the Jews, and in so doing, justified in the eyes of the European people the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe—because it's the Jews who did this in Russia! The Jews killed all the Christians in Russia! The Jews sent them off to Siberia! After all, wasn't Trotsky a Jew? Wasn't Lenin a Jew? It's all the Jews! So, they fell for the bait.

So they blamed it all on the Jews, purged Europe of its Jews, so Europe is primarily Roman Catholic now. It's a Roman Catholic block, and it will be the army of the Anti-Christ, with its European Union.

The Jews, then, were forced out of the nations to Israel. And remember, during World War II, when the Jews tried to escape and they were desperate to get out of Germany, do you think Jew-controlled Russia would let the Jews in? If the Jews really controlled Russia, they could have gone right into Russia. They were not allowed. Stalin would not allow any Jews to go into Russia. Churchill would not allow any Jews to go into England. And that criminal, FDR, would not allow any Jews to come into America. They were not allowed to escape.

They were either to be killed or funneled down through Israel, to be killed by the Mufti, that was working with the SS, Eichmann. Loftus is right. There is a secret war against the Jews, and all of the intelligence communities are waging it.

And the Jews don't perceive it because their Rabbis, the majority of their Rabbis, are traitors. I talked to a Rabbi in Lancaster County and I told him to look out for the Jesuit Order. He says "Oh, they're some of my best friends!" Well, that explains it. The Rabbis betray their own people at the hand of these inquisitors. And that's what they did in World War II, and they're going to do it here.

Martin: Let's talk about Garfield and McKinley. Why were they assassinated?

Phelps: I think Garfield was assassinated on a monetary issue; he was resisting the banking plans of the Jesuits. He was a radical, red Republican, too, you know, so they got rid of their own. I'm not familiar with all of the details. All I know is Burke McCarty in the book *The Suppressed Truth About The Assassination Of Lincoln* named McKinley and Garfield as other victims of the Jesuit Order. And had the Lincoln assassination been solved, that would never have happened. The other important issue is that Garfield was a Freemason. So, they assassinate their own Freemasons, when they want to.

Martin: Going back to Lincoln, who was John Surratt?

Phelps: John Surratt was the young man, 20 years old, who called time outside of Ford's Theater. He was mastermind of the assassination. John Surratt was helped by the priests of Washington to escape Washington, went up into Canada, was taken care of and housed by the priests, by the Bishop of Montreal, and then he was ferried across the ocean in *The Peruvian*, in a steamer called *The Peruvian*, and he went to, I believe, Ireland, then into England, then he went to Rome, to the Pope's Vatican there. He joined the Zouave army, and he was stationed in Alexandria, Egypt, until he was found and arrested.

In 1867, he was brought back and stood trial in Washington. There a woman was involved in the picking of the jury, and a High Roman Catholic was put on it. And because it's no murder to kill a heretic, the jury was hung in the first trial and Surratt went free. And he was also free in the second trial, because there were two trials. He died in 1914, I believe, at the age of 72, and they gave him, of course, a very, very, pompous funeral, a High Requiem Mass that are usually only given for priests and nuns. Evidently, he deserved it.

Of course, John Wilkes Booth, he was never killed. Corbett never killed Booth in the barn. Booth escaped Washington with a password, according to Finis Bates' work *The Escape And Suicide Of John Wilkes Booth*. He escaped to Kansas, and on his death bed confessed to his physician that he was John Wilkes Booth who shot Lincoln. And he escaped with the help of a Masonic password. So just like there was a patsy for the Lincoln assassination, there was a patsy for the Kennedy assassination.

Martin: Why is April 15th so significant?

Phelps: (*laughter*) Well, April 15 was the day that Lincoln called out troops on the South. It was the day that Lincoln died. He was shot on the 14th and died on the 15th. It's the day that the Titanic was sunk. And it's the day all the *14th Amendment* citizens of this empire, like the good serfs that they are, go to confession once a year and confess to the government with their tax returns. Beware the Ides of April. (*laughter*)

Martin: Let's talk about the Cold War. Why did that come about?

Phelps: We had the end of World War II. We had the purging of the Jews and the Protestants, for the most part. The British Empire was destroyed, it's wrecked, which was essentially the empire that the Gospel went to China with. Modern missions were founded on the British Empire.

So, that Protestant Empire, even though it was controlled by Rome, was done. We have America in huge financial debt, out of isolationism. We have a Russia that's taken over by the Jesuits, through Joseph Stalin. Of course, the great beneficiary of World War II was Russia—Russia was the only country that won. But the Jesuits are not finished with their purgings and their installings of dictators loyal to the Pope, around the world. I mean, they pretty much have South America. They pretty much have Africa. But they don't have the East, and the Orthodox nations, and the Buddhist nations.

So, the purpose of the Cold War was to kill millions of these heretic, orthodox Buddhists, and to install in their country dictators that will carry out the Inquisition, who are loyal to the Pope.

One of those dictators was Joseph Stalin. And he was given the nuclear device in 1943 by the U.S. government, by the U.S. army. And you can find that in *The Unseen Hand* by Ralph Epperson. He did a lot of good documentation.

So, they gave him the bomb. I shouldn't call it "the bomb" because they gave him the nuclear device so that he could detonate it and create the illusion that Russia now has nuclear capability, when a wheel-barrow was a great invention in Russia.

I mean, the Russian soldiers, when they went into Germany and they found toilets, they were dipping their bread in the toilets and eating their bread out of toilets. In Russia they were just savages. They didn't have technology; they had nothing. All the technology they ever got was given by Vatican-controlled Western corporations, whose inventors were Protestants.

So, the Cold War has to continue under Stalin. And we have to divide up the world into two factions, so we're going to put Roman Catholic NATO on one side, and we're going to put Communist-controlled Warsaw Pact on the other.

But in the process of so doing, they put Protestant East Germany under Communism to purge the Protestants of East Germany out of the country. That's why they sent them to Siberia. They put Protestant-Lutheran Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia under Communism, so they deported them all to Siberia. They put the Mennonites of Russia further under Communism, deporting them to Siberia. They deported the Baptists of Russia to Siberia, because they could only do—wimpy, gimpy, powerless, Russian army that it was—we could easily have beat it into the ground, if it had not been financed and supported and built by Henry Ford and Western corporations.

So, wimpy, gimpy Russia has this nuclear device, right? And oh, if we decide to go to war with Russia, well, we might get bombed! There's mutual, assured destruction. So to keep that from happening, we won't fight 'em, and we'll let them purge the world of all its Protestants. That's the purpose of the Cold War.

The Cold War then went into China, and the U.S. 7th Fleet, according to the Birch Society, and they're right about this, blocked Chiang Kai-Shek from being able to go into China and take over the country. So, Mao Se-Dung could get in control, get in power, and then carry out his inquisition against the land owners, against the Buddhists, against all the Protestant missionaries who were in China—just like the good Jesuit pawn that he was.

And, of course, the intimidation idea was that you can't go to China—why, there's millions of people there! Meanwhile, the Japanese whipped the Chinese to death in their war with China, when the Japanese went in. The Chinese had no technology. They had no organized army. They were easy to beat.

But the idea we were sold was: Oh no—China is a great, powerful nation, and now they even have the bomb! Stalin gave them a bomb, so we can't fight them anymore. So we won't do anything to them, while they're murdering 50 million people. And remember the "baby-boomers" of the United States, we would have fought the world. We would have rid the world of tyranny, had we had leadership that would have led us to that. But we had this farce, called the nuclear, mutual assured destruction. We had this farce called the dropping of the bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Whatever it was, it wasn't dropping nuclear bombs—and Edwin Corley does a pretty good job in his *The Jesus Factor*, in trying to tell you what else it was.

And so, we have this nonsense Cold War, which enables Rome to put up all their dictators, their Communist dictators, all of them loyal to the Pope—including Ho Chi Minh. Ho Chi Minh had a secret deal with Pope John XXIII, and he was under the advice of a Roman Catholic Bishop all throughout the war.

The purpose of the Cold War was to carry out the Council of Trent, and to tie the hands of the American Protestants; and it was also used to unite the Protestants and Catholics of America against Communism. Protestants and Catholics should unite on nothing. We are different. The Catholics have a final authority—that's the Pope. The Baptists and Protestants should have a final authority—that's the *Bible*. We don't unite on anything. We don't agree on anything. We don't agree on America's national purpose, so we don't unite. We're not uniting with abortion; we're not uniting with Communism; we don't unite against the Black or the Civil Rights Movement.

You see, all these things were used to unite Catholics and Protestants together here, so that, ultimately, Rome would be in control of all the Protestant denominations through the National Council of Churches and the Royal Council of Churches. And that's what they got. They took Princeton; they took Dartmouth College. All the great Protestant Universities are now in the hands of the Masons and the Jesuits. Harvard has a Jesuit House. They're controlled. And so, wherever they control education, they control the politics. And they control the education in China, Russia, all the Communist countries. Now that they have all of the dictators installed all throughout the world, they don't need the Cold War anymore. So now they can proceed with their next agenda, and that's the unification of Europe, the building up of Russia, and the destruction of the Western Empire. And that's their next agenda.

Martin: How do you see that unfolding?

Phelps: What's that?

Martin: The destruction of the Western Empire.

Phelps: As far as the actions of overthrowing the government and having a tyranny, is that what you mean?

Martin: Right. What do you see life like here in the next 5 or 10 years?

Phelps: It's hard to put a date on it; it's hard to put a year on it. But I would say it's going to continually become more and more a matter of "central power" in Washington. You're going to have less and less power in the Congress. And one of these days, the Congress is going to be closed. And all we're going to have is a Commander-in-Chief. We're going to have some form of absolutism, with the President becoming now a dictator.

Martin: Do you think George Bush, Jr. will be that person?

Phelps: He could be. I won't say he will be, but he could be. It will be someone like him—with complete allegiance to Rome, just like his father. His grandfather helped set up the CFR. His uncle is a Knight of Malta. It will be someone like him.

And he WILL be the next President. They've already chosen him in the College of Cardinals. Everything else is a show. Jesuit-trained Buchanan is a show. Roman Catholic McCain is a show. The Black Roman Catholic Keyes is a show, although he tickles me. He advocates abolition of the *14th Amendment*. If that happens, what are the Black people going to do? They're not citizens; they have no rights! Dred Scott comes into play. He's a fake.

So, what I see is more and more centralization of power in the hands of the President. The Supreme Court is just a rubber stamp. He becomes the king. The courts are nothing more than the courts of the king's bench. The Federal Reserve Bank will remain in power. Everything will be monitored and controlled by Washington, unless some of God's men start trusting God and get in control of the state and cause it to secede. The only answer to this is state secession, leaving this Union—it's not a Union, it's an Empire—leaving the Empire that began in 1868, assuming national sovereignty, once again. And the first state that would do this, I'm moving there. Because I don't want to see the FBI anymore. I don't want to see the CIA. I don't want to see any of these national bureaucracies anymore.

Martin: Montana seems close. Arizona seems close.

Phelps: Well, when they do it, I'll move there. But that's what would happen if things continue as they are. We'll have race war. We're going to have the Moslems fighting the Klu Klux Klan. Whites siding with the Whites; the Blacks siding with the Blacks. It's going to be a blood-bath everywhere. And that will justify Martial Law, and the military, and the whole nine yards, and also foreign occupation; we're going to have that too. And you know how foreigners are in a foreign country. They rape the women. They couldn't care less about the social strata of the country. They have no mercy on the people. They have a foreign tongue. And that's what they'll do. And that's all the more reason for a state to secede.

I've advocated that Pennsylvania should secede for the last 15 years. We have our own deep-water ports; we have our own agriculture; we have our own heavy industry; we have coal; we have everything we need to be a sovereign nation. We don't need this Empire anymore. The only problem is, Pennsylvania is COMPLETELY controlled by the Jesuits.

Every major city is under their control. And so, the place is slated for destruction—all the Mennonite and Amish counties of Southeastern Pennsylvania. Everything else is Catholic: Pittsburgh, Scranton, Philadelphia, Harrisburg—all Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic people, too, will also be sacrificed. They will be killed too. Let them not think that they're going to be delivered because the Jesuits run the show. According to the Jesuit *Molina*, in the tape I just sent you, it is lawful to kill—and they will kill as many Roman Catholics as necessary to bring this plan to fruition.

Martin: Define the Jesuit term: Universal Absolutism.

Phelps: Define it? That means worldwide, universal, over every nation, absolute power. Absolutism is their great doctrine, that absolute power resides in the hands of the General. He is limited by no constitution. He is limited by no law.

This is the Great Doctrine of Divine Right, the Divine Right of Kings that was so fought against by the Calvinists. We Bible-believing Calvinists believe in the Rule of Law. The Law is king. Rutherford's "Lex Rex". The Jesuits believe the king is the law—Louis XIV: "I am the law". So, it's going to be a universal, world-wide king who, himself, is the law. All authority will be in him, as he rules the world from Jerusalem, as the Beast.

Martin: Are we talking about the present Pope, or are we talking about Count von Kolvenbach?

Phelps: I'm saying that what's in position now will ultimately bring in the future Pope, whoever he is, and whatever it may be, as a Universal Absolutist—the Universal Monarch of the World, in Jerusalem.

Martin: Symbolic? Or you're saying literal?

Phelps: I'm saying that will literally happen. There will be a Pope, who will be killed; he will receive a mortal wound. And this is going to happen in the 70th week of *Daniel*. He will receive a mortal wound, according to *Revelation 13*.

This is the Beast, and he will come back to life. He comes back to life, mid-trip, at the very time that Satan and his angels are cast out of Heaven by Michael and his angels. At this time, Satan goes and he indwells the Beast, this Pope. Now he comes back to life, just like Christ. He was dead; now he's resurrected.

And what is he going to do? He's going to destroy the Catholic Church. He's going to destroy the Vatican; and he's going to go down in Jerusalem and demand to be worshipped as God, for three and a half years.

That's why the Vatican is indestructible. No one can destroy the Vatican. All the armies in the world couldn't destroy it. It has been determined that it will be destroyed by the Anti-Christ. And he, alone, can do it.

That's why, when the Yugoslavians wanted to mount an air attack against the Vatican in World War II, a bunch of clouds came over the airport and they couldn't take off, because they were going to bomb the Vatican. The world will not allow that to happen. The Vatican will only be destroyed by the man of sin, the Beast, the coming Universal Monarch, the ex-Universal Pope.

The Vatican has the most extensive library in the world, the most priceless and extensive library. It goes for miles, underground, in the Vatican.

Martin: Wouldn't you love to go in there.

Phelps: I would love to. Talk about finding sunken treasure.

Martin: We've almost covered it. I almost don't want to dilute this conversation with the FDA and AMA. Let's talk about them just briefly.

Phelps: Ok. World War II, produced of course by Rome, caused the Nazi experiments on the people in the concentration camps—the Jews, the Gypsies, the Socialists, primarily the Jews. But they experimented with things like fluoride. They experimented with things like EDTA chelation, which is THE treatment of choice for anybody with heart disease. They experimented with poisons. They experimented with surgeries. They experimented with all kinds of things on these people. They also experimented with vaccinations and immunizations.

There's a book called *The Nazi Doctors*. Everything that was learned by them was integrated into the American Medical Association, after the war. That's why we all have our municipal water supplies fluoridated. That's why they're all chlorinated, because chlorine decreases oxygen, and therefore causes cancer, because cancer grows in an anaerobic state—it's a virus, converting cells into mutants that are anaerobic.

Ok. All of Europe is using ozone to clean their water supplies. Here they use chlorine. They want us with cancer. And how do we get cancer? With the vaccinations and immunizations, where they inject us with live viruses, like the hepatitis vaccine—every one of them has the HIV virus, SV-40.

What they're doing is what they learned in Nazi Germany. They implemented here and they continue their research in the CIA. There's a two-tape set called *The CIA And The Virus Makers* which show how the CIA helped to create the HIV virus and various other viruses. They get into Robert Gallo, the world's foremost virologist.

Robert Gallo is a Jesuit. He's a Roman Catholic, Italian, the world's foremost virologist—and yet not controlled by the Brotherhood, by the Company? Ridiculous. He's under their control! He's doing all the research, and he doesn't want to be blamed for it—as the WONDERFUL Jew, Len Horowitz, proved. Again, we've got Jews getting in the way—Jews blowing their cover.

Martin: I've interviewed Len many times. He's a very courageous guy.

Phelps: Great guy. And he's right on target. And he hits the Knights of Malta in his book *Emerging Viruses: AIDS & Ebola*. He was a great encouragement to me when I saw him do that, when I read his book.

So, hey, let's just take it the whole way. Let's just go right to the Jesuit Order. And what the Jesuits did with the Cold War, with their Inquisition in the East, they carry out with their war on the American people in the West, with their Medical Inquisition—cut, burn, and drug. And that's what it is.

Personally, I have my own home where I use ozone oxygen. I use ultraviolet blood irradiation. I can show you how ultraviolet blood irradiation incapacitates Lupus. It destroys Hepatitis. It destroys Meningitis. It destroys HIV.

This is a very simple procedure; I do it every day. It can easily be done by any medical doctor, and they won't do it. Because, when you kill off the virus, you don't have the diseases. You are thwarting what they wanted to do with their vaccinations and immunizations.

That's why they want to make a law. That's why that filthy Ted Kennedy, that Knight of Columbus, wants all these vaccinations and immunizations—when it should be a religious tenet of everyone: "It's against my religious convictions to put foreign pathogens into my bloodstream. It's going to make me sick by the time I'm 40. It's going to give me plaque build-up and heart-disease. I'm not going to do it."

In the meantime, they're suppressing all the things that reverse it: soft lasers, hyperbaric chambers, ultraviolet blood irradiation, oxygen ozone, north-pole magnetic therapy. All the things working together that would easily reverse it, they suppress, and consider it a crime. Make sense?

Martin: Rife technology.

Phelps: When I was in the office of my friend, William, in Maryland, he told me that he had a guy from NSA [*National Security Agency*] come in and talk to him about his blood irradiation, and told him: "I think that it would be wise for you to stop this."

Now, this guy who runs the clinic there in Maryland is an ex-Navy Seal. He's no pushover. So he says to the NSA guy: "Well, why do you say that?"

And the NSA guy said: "You know how Royal Rife died? We put poison on his tooth-brush."

This guy was from NSA. So, that was a threat. Well, now, some people get scared, and some people get upset, angry. William is one of those guy who gets upset and angry, and it furthers him that much harder.

So, mysteriously, the head of the Ultraviolet Blood Irradiation Foundation died, about 3 or 4 months ago, in his apartment, with no autopsy. So they almost destroyed the foundation, but now he is in the process of securing capital—and he will, I'm sure, very shortly, and it's going to be untouchable. The machines will be put out and it will have UVC and UVA to do the blood, and we're going to kill-off all the viruses in the bloodstream. And we're going to teach the medical doctors how to do it. We'll provide the machines for them. And we're going to end this tyranny. And we'll also educate them—no more vaccinations and immunizations.

There are only two things I'm a member of in this country: one is the national anti-vaccine society, and the other is Gun Owner's of America. Those are the only two organizations that are really worth supporting. If you get the vaccinations away from the people, they're not going to be sick. And if you maintain guns in the hands of the people, they can still use them against the tyrants. And if they go to church and read the *Bible*, they'll have all the spiritual zest and zeal to do it.

Martin: We haven't even talked about Nikola Tesla in this conversation.

Phelps: Yeah. He was deliberately thwarted by the FBI, all his papers stolen in 1943. J.P. Morgan destroyed him. J.P. Morgan was one of the kingpins in the Titanic sinking.

Nikola Tesla was a wonderful man. He came here for freedom. He was a Serbian Orthodox—a curse to Rome. The father of A.C. current. He developed a whole system of Universal Power, that we would need no coal or any of that. So, one of my other goals is to perfect the electromagnetic motor. When my book gets out, then I will be working with some men in perfecting electromagnetic motors, and they will be out, without a patent, privately.

Martin: We're just about there. Let's talk about Bill Clinton. How do you see Bill Clinton in relationship to the Jesuits? And how do you see Al Gore? What can our readers glean from what you're saying about their power base?

Phelps: Well, we must remember: where did Bill Clinton come from? How did he become Governor? His father was a powerful political figure, because his mother was nothing. So, he came from nothing to being something, through some powerful political figure, probably the Kennedys.

It's rumored that John Kennedy was his father; could be. In any event, Clinton was trained by the Jesuits of Georgetown. He was the class president of his junior year, I believe. His senior year, he was not re-elected because the student body said he was "too close to the Jesuit faculty".

So, he was groomed by the Jesuits to be a powerful political leader. He was put in place in Arkansas, runs that scam there, while he's Governor, in the drug trade, belonging to Rome, working with Reagan in the drug trade, and Bush. Then he's made President.

Remember the picture of him at Georgetown, kneeling at the grave of Timothy Healy? That says it all. He is the complete and total pawn of the Jesuit Order ruling from Georgetown University. He does anything they want him to do. He hasn't resisted a thing.

That's why he's untouchable. He can commit any crime. He can do any act of evil, and never be prosecuted, because they'll call on traitors like Arlen Specter to vindicate him. And, of course, Arlen Specter was Spelly's Jew in the Kennedy assassination—evil, wicked, lifetime Senator from Pennsylvania, which shows me that there are no elections anymore. Nobody voted for Arlen Specter who I know. He's a gun-grabber. So, they made him a life-time Senator. They made Teddy Kennedy a lifetime Senator.

Bill Clinton is completely at their beck and call. He will get out of office. He will live happily ever after, unless he starts talking. If he starts talking, he's done. He is NOT a Baptist. He is loyal to the Jesuit Order.

Martin: Ok, let's talk about God and His Agenda.

Phelps: As I understand the *Bible*, I believe we are in what's called the Dispensation of Grace. I'm a dispensationalist. Now, there are those who say that dispensationalism was a brain-child of the Jesuits. Could be, could be Jesuits were involved with that. But I believe the *Bible* teaches this, because God deals with men in different ways, at different times.

He commands Abraham to sacrifice a lamb, but not me. We don't do that now. He commands Noah to build an ark. We don't do that now. He commands Moses to receive the Law of Sinai. We're not under the Law; it's for the Nation of Israel. He commanded his son to announce that the Davidic kingdom was ready to be established on Earth—repent, for the Kingdom is at hand. The Kingdom, promised to David, is about to be established, and that's why they called him Son of David.

And now we live in the Dispensation of Grace, called the present Evil Age, of *Galatians, Chapter 1:4*, and the Dispensation of Grace of *Ephesians, Chapter 3*. During this particular period of time, this stewardship, the Gospel says that the Lord Jesus Christ died for the sins of our world; he was buried and rose again.

And God commands all men, everywhere, to repent and believe on His name that they might be saved. But there is no other name under Heaven whereby we must be saved, save the name of Jesus. During this time, this good news of forgiveness of sin and free pardon, and we can be with the Lord for eternity, is going to every nation, Jews and Gentile. And during this Dispensation of Grace, Jews and Gentiles are regarded as one, in the body of Christ, when they're saved.

Now, according to *Romans, Chapter 11*, there is what is called the "fullness of the Gentiles". There is a fullness that is a predetermined amount of people who are going to be saved. We call them "the elect". We call ourselves the elect of the Lord.

Now when that elect, that predetermined number, is saved, then God will begin to deal with the nations and Israel, once again. And that will begin, according to *Daniel, Chapter 9*, when the Prince shall come, shall confirm a covenant with many for one week. That is the 70th week of *Daniel*. The first 69 weeks have been fulfilled, from the decree, to rebuilding Jerusalem, to Messiah the Prince, the day Christ declared himself the Messiah of Israel, was 69 weeks of years. After that the Messiah would be cut-off, and Jerusalem would be destroyed. That is the gap between the 69th and the 70th week. The temple is not destroyed; the city is not destroyed; the Messiah is not cut-off, during the 69th or the 70th week. There's a gap between those two weeks, and that gap has gone to nearly 2,000 years. In the year 2032, it will be 2,000 years. Because Christ was crucified in 32 A.D.

Ok, during this dispensation, God is saving Jews and Gentiles out of all nations and placing them in the body of Christ, by the power of His Holy Spirit, as the Gospels preached. When the predetermined number comes to fruition, then the Lord will take out his *Bible*-believing church, and everybody else is left to go through what is called "the time of Jacob's trouble", in the *Book of Jeremiah*, or the Great Day of the Lord—the 7-year tribulation, talked about in the *Book of Revelation, Chapter 4-19*.

That 7-year tribulation will be when the Lord begins to judge this world for its rejection of the Messiah, and for their sins, having not been taken care of, not having been saved; although there will be many people saved during this time.

The Jews will be tremendously persecuted. The vast majority of them will be murdered, and there will be a remnant who will repent at the end of the Tribulation, at which time the Messiah will come and they will look upon him, whom they pierced, and weep because they will realize that the one who is going to save them from all these Gentile armies pouring into Israel, is the very one they crucified.

When the Lord Jesus destroys all the Gentile armies, he will then set up the Davidic Kingdom that he came to set up—the born-again nation of Israel.

Can a nation be born in a day? *Isaiah, Chapter 66*—they will be born-again, they will inherit all the promises, and Christ will sit down in the Kingdom with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, just like he talked about, and he will eat the fruit of vine again. Because he said: "I will not eat this henceforth, til ye say, 'Blessed is he that come in the name of the Lord' until I eat it anew with you in the Kingdom." Then he will drink wine; he will eat the fruit of the vine; he will break bread; and he will be Messiah, King of the World at that time, ruling the world from Jerusalem.

So, what we have coming is more unbelief, more persecution, less faith, less manhood, less guts, and we have more persecution from the Jesuit Order, more monetary control. We have another scenario of the World Government, under the Pope from Jerusalem, and that's what the Jesuits want. And, ultimately, God in His providence, has allowed for 42 months for that to happen: 1260 days.

So that's what I see coming. But what I believe is, I don't believe that the doctrine of the coming Anti-Christ should be used as fatalism—that we should: "Well, that's coming, so we can't do anything about it. The bastards are coming to take us out."

That's an excuse to cowardice. We need to do our duty. We need to resist evil in ourselves and around us, and as long as we have breath. And part of resisting that evil is resisting the Jesuit Order. It's resisting anti-Christian tyranny. It's resisting absolutism. It's resisting criminals who are in your government.

We have a civil responsibility, and that's to make sure government punishes evil and rewards good. And when it doesn't punish evil anymore, it's no government. We don't know allegiance to it anymore. We withdraw our allegiance, and we assume our own sovereign power.

And that's exactly what the Covenanters did with Scotland when they withdrew their allegiance from, what was it, King James II, or Charles II; they withdrew their allegiance and the English settled there and, ultimately, many of those Covenanters were killed. But in the glorious Revolution of 1688, they got their liberty.

Another thing is, all these men—they want to win right now. They want to do something and experience the win. We have no guarantee of that. Why not just say the way it is, resist the tyranny, and if we get killed in the process, then praise God—I mean, isn't Heaven a little better than this place? What's the big fear? All these men do not know the Lord, as far as trusting Him in the midst of a storm. They're full of fear; they're full of terror; and they're all afraid to die.

So, hopefully, with the true preaching of the Gospel—and ultimately there will be some preachers who will arise who will encourage us to do right and not fear death, and to resist these powers of evil—hopefully that will begin to change and there will be men who will call for secession, and states will begin to leave this Union, like Chechnya, and these others, and then the Lord will intervene for us.

If we honor Him, He'll honor us. If we fight for His causes, He'll bless us. And we need to stop looking at the odds. We've always been outnumbered. We've always been outgunned. And that's the way God likes it, because then, when we win, obviously He did it.

So that's what I see for the future, and I see there's a great vacuum right now that needs to be filled. And it can be filled with the men of God telling the truth, or it can be filled with Jesuits advocating everybody give-up, lay down their guns, and submit to this New World Order, under the Pope.

The question is: What are YOU, dear reader, going to do?

* * *

* * *

The following are direct excerpts from the forthcoming book by Eric Jon Phelps called Vatican Assassins.

The Jesuits – 1540

Their Purpose And Oath

The purpose of the Jesuit Order, formally established by the Pope in 1540, is to destroy the Protestant Reformation. They call it the Counter-Reformation. Nicolini of Rome wrote:

"The Jesuits, by their very calling, by the very essence of their institution, are bound to seek, by every means, right or wrong, the destruction of Protestantism. This is the condition of their existence, the duty they must fulfill, or cease to be Jesuits." [*Footprints of the Jesuits*, R. W. Thompson, 1894]

Extract from Jesuit's Oath

To this end the professed Jesuits have obligated themselves with an oath, part of which was published in 1899, and reads:

"I do now renounce and disown my allegiance as due to any heretical King, Prince or State, named Protestant, or liberals, or obedience to any of their laws or magistrates or officers.

"I do further declare that the doctrine of the churches of England and Scotland, of the Calvinists, Huguenots, and other of the name Protestant or Liberals, to be damnable, and they themselves to be damned who will not forsake the same.

"I do further declare that I will help, assist and advise all or any of His Holiness' agents, in any place where I shall be, in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, England, Ireland or America, or in any other kingdom or territory I shall come to, and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestant or liberal doctrines, and to destroy all their pretended powers, legal or otherwise." [*Errors of the Roman Catholic Church*, 15 Contributors, 1894]

* * *

In 1981, one of our heroes, Alberto Rivera, disclosed the oath he took as a professed Jesuit. We read:

Ceremony Of Induction And Extreme Oath Of The Jesuits

(Given to a Jesuit of minor rank when he is to be elevated to a position of command.)

Superior Speaks:

"My son, heretofore you have been taught to act the dissembler among the Roman Catholics to be a Roman Catholic, and to be a spy even among your own brethren: to believe no man, to trust no man. Among the reformers, to be a reformer; among the Huguenots (French Protestants) to be a Huguenot; among the Calvinists, to be a Calvinist; among the Protestants (those who protest and disagree with the Roman Catholic institution), generally to be a Protestant: and obtaining their confidence to seek even to preach from their pulpits, and to denounce with all the vehemence (violent emotion) in your nature our Holy Religion and the Pope; and even to descend so low as to become a Jew among the Jews, that you might be enabled to gather together all information for the benefit of your order as a faithful soldier of the Pope.

"You have been taught to insidiously plant the seeds of jealousy and hatred between states that were at peace, and incite them to deeds of blood, involving them in war with each other, and to create revolutions and civil wars in communities, provinces and countries that were independent and prosperous, cultivating the arts and the sciences and enjoying the blessings of peace;

"To take sides with the combatants and to act secretly in concert with your brother Jesuit who might be engaged on the other side, but openly opposed to that with which you might be connected;

"Only that the church might be the gainer in the end in the conditions fixed in the treaties for peace, and that the ends justify the means.

"You have been taught your duty as a spy, to gather all statistics, facts and information in your power from every source: to ingratiate yourself into the confidence of the family circle of Protestants and heretics of every class and character, as well as that of the merchant, the banker, the lawyer, among the schools and universities, in parliament and legislatures, and in the judiciaries and councils of State, and to 'be all things to all men', for the Pope's sake, whose servants we are unto death.

"You have received all your instructions heretofore as a novice (one who has no training), a neophyte (a newly ordained priest), and have served as a coadjutor (worked as a helper), confessor and priest, but you have not yet been invested with all that is necessary to command in the army of Loyola and in the service of the Pope.

"You must serve the proper time as the instrument and executioner as directed by your superiors; for none can command here who has not consecrated (made secret or holy) his labors with the blood of the heretic; for 'without the shedding of blood no man can be saved.'

"I, _____, now, in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul and all the saints and sacred hosts of heaven....

"I, furthermore, promise and declare that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage relentless war, secretly and openly, against all heretics, Protestants and Liberals, as I am directed to do.

"That when the same cannot be done openly, I will secretly use the poisoned cup, the strangulation cord, the steel of the poniard (a dagger) or the leaden bullet, regardless of the honor, rank, dignity, or authority of the person or persons, whatever may be their condition in life, either public or private, as I at any time may be directed so to do by any agent of the Pope or superior of the brotherhood of the holy faith, of the Society of Jesus." [*Double-Cross: Alberto, Part 2*, 1981]

* * *

In addition to the Oath, the Jesuits have a guidebook entitled *Secreta Monita*. To the author's knowledge it has only been disclosed to the world twice: once in the 1600s and once in the 1800s. Because of the magnitude of its contents as it relates to our subject, *The Secret Instructions Of The Jesuits* (1857) is reprinted in its entirety [in *Vatican Assassins*].

[Due to the length of this material, we here at *The SPECTRUM* will only present a few excerpts and chapter headings, but this should be sufficient to give you a pretty good idea of what is contained within them. For the full presentation, refer to *Vatican Assassins*. The portions you are about to read have not, to our knowledge, been printed in any modern-day newspaper.

What you are about to read, *The Secret Instructions Of The Jesuits*, was first published in 1669 by the venerable and learned Dr. Compton, Bishop of London. In *Vatican Assassins* we read:]

His arguments on their authenticity, and his character as a scholar and divine, are a sufficient guarantee that he would never have given his name and influence to sustain a work of dubious authority, or calculated to mislead the public.

We have only to add that the last American edition, published at Princeton, and this one which we publish, are taken from the translation which was published in London in 1723, and dedicated to Sir Robert Walpole, who was afterwards Lord Orford, and who had the high honor of being prime minister of George I and George II.

THE SECRET INSTRUCTIONS OF THE JESUITS

Chapter 1: How the Society must behave themselves when they begin any new foundation.

V. At their first settlement, let our members be cautious of purchasing lands; but if they happen to buy such as are well situated, let this be done in the name of some faithful and trusty friend. And that our poverty may be the more colorable gloss of reality, let the purchases, adjacent to the places wherein our colleges are founded, be assigned by the provincial to colleges at a distance; by which means it will be impossible that princes and magistrates can ever attain to a certain knowledge what the revenues of the Society amount to.

VI. Let no places be pitched upon by any of our members for founding a college but opulent cities; the end of the Society being the imitation of our blessed Saviour, who made his principal residence in the metropolis of Judea, and only transiently visited the less remarkable places.

VII. Let the greatest sums be always extorted from widows, by frequent remonstrations of our extreme necessities.

VIII. In every province, let none but the principal be fully apprised of the real value of our revenues; and let what is contained in the treasury of Rome be always kept as an inviolable secret.

Chapter II: In what manner the Society must deport, that they may work themselves into, and after that preserve a familiarity with princes, noblemen, and persons of greatest distinction.

I. Princes, and persons of distinction every where, must by all means be so managed that we may have their ear, and that will easily secure their hearts; by which way of proceeding, all persons will become our creatures, and no one will dare to give the Society the least disquiet or opposition.

II. That ecclesiastical persons gain a great footing in the favor of princes and noblemen, by winking at their vices, and putting a favorable construction on whatever they do amiss, experience convinces; and this we may observe in their contracting of marriages with their near relations and kindred, or the like. It must be our business to encourage such, whose inclination lies this way, by leading them up in hopes, that through our assistance they may easily obtain a dispensation from the Pope; and no doubt he will readily grant it, if proper reason be urged, paralleled cases produced, and opinions quoted which countenance such actions, when the common good of mankind, and the greater advancement of God's glory, which are the only end and design of the society, are pretended to be the sole motives to them.

V. Above all, due care must be taken to curry favor with the minions and domestics of princes and noblemen; whom by small presents, and many offices of piety, we may so far byass, (bias) as by means of them to get a faithful intelligence of the bent of their master's humors and inclinations; thus will the Society be better qualified to chime in with their tempers.

VII. Princesses and ladies of quality are easily to be gained by the influence of the woman of their bed-chamber; for which reason we must by all means pay particular address to these, for thereby there will be no secrets in the family but what we shall have fully disclosed to us.

XV. Finally,—Let all with such artfulness gain the ascendant over princes, noblemen, and magistrates of every place, that they may be ready at our beck, even to sacrifice their nearest relations and most intimate friends, when we say it is for our interest and advantage.

Chapter III: How the Society must behave themselves towards those who are at the helm of affairs, and others who, although they be not rich, are notwithstanding in a capacity of being otherwise serviceable.

I. All that has been before mentioned, may, in a great measure, be applied to these; and we must also be industrious to procure their favor against every one that oppose us.

II. Their authority and wisdom must be courted for obtaining several offices to be discharged by us; we must also make a handle of their advice with respect to the contempt of riches; though at the same time, if their secrecy and faith may be depended on, we may privately make use of their names in amassing temporal goods for the benefit of the Society.

Chapter IV: The chief things to be recommended to preachers and confessors of noblemen.

VI. Immediately upon the death of any person of post, let them take timely care to get some friend of our Society preferred in his room; but this must be cloaked with such cunning and management as to avoid giving the least suspicion of our intending to usurp the prince's authority; for this reason (as has been already said) we ourselves must not appear in it, but make a handle of the artifice of some faithful friends for effecting our designs, whose power may screen them from the envy which might otherwise fall heavier upon the Society.

Chapter V: What kind of conduct must be observed towards such religious persons as are employed in the same ecclesiastical functions with us.

Chapter VI: Of proper methods for inducing rich widows to be liberal to our Society.

I. For the managing of this affair, let such members only be chosen as are advanced in age, of a lively complexion and agreeable conversation; let these frequently visit such widows, and the minute they begin to show any affection towards our order, then is the time to lay before them the good works and merits of the society. If they seem kindly to give ear to this, and begin to visit our churches, we must by all means take care to provide them confessors by whom they may be well admonished, especially to a constant perseverance in their state of widowhood, and this, by enumerating and praising the advantages and felicity of a single life: and let them pawn their faiths, and themselves too, as a security that a firm continuance in such a pious resolution will infallibly purchase an eternal merit, and prove a most effectual means of escaping the otherwise certain pains of purgatory.

IV. Care must be taken to remove such servants particularly as do not keep a good understanding with the Society; but let this be done by little and little; and when we have managed to work them out, let such be recommended as already are, or willingly would become our creatures; thus shall we dive into every secret, and have a finger in every affair transacted in the family.

Chapter VII: How such widows are to be secured, and in what manner their effects are to be disposed of.

I. They are perpetually to be pressed to a perseverance in their devotion and good works, in such manner, that no week pass in which they do not, of their own accord, lay somewhat apart out of their abundance for the honor of Christ, the blessed Virgin, or their patron saint; and let them dispose of it in relief of the poor, or in beautifying of churches, till they are entirely stripped of their superfluous stores and unnecessary riches.

XIII. Let the confessors take diligent care to prevent such widows as are their penitents, from visiting ecclesiastics of other orders, or entering into familiarity with them, under any pretence whatsoever; for which end, let them, at proper opportunities, cry up the Society as infinitely superior to all other orders; of the greatest service in the church of God, and of greater authority with the Pope, and all princes; and that it is the most perfect in itself, in that it discards all persons offensive or unqualified, from its community, and therefore is purified from that scum and dregs with which these monks are infected, who, generally speaking, are a set of men unlearned, stupid, and slothful, negligent of their duty, and slaves to their bellies.

XIV. Let the confessors propose to them, and endeavor to persuade them to pay small pensions and contributions towards the yearly support of colleges and professed houses, but especially of the professed house at Rome; not let them forget the ornaments of churches, tapers, wine, and things necessary in the celebration of the sacrifice of mass.

XV. If any widow does in her life-time make over her whole estate to the Society; whenever opportunity offers, but especially when she is seized with sickness, or in danger of life, let some take care to represent to her the poverty of the greatest number of our colleges, whereof many just erected have hardly as yet any foundation; engage her, by a winning behavior and inducing arguments, to such a liberality as (you must persuade her) will lay a certain foundation for her eternal happiness.

XVI. The same art must be used with princes and other benefactors; for they must be wrought up to a belief, that these are the only acts which will perpetuate their memories in this world, and secure them eternal glory in the next.

Chapter VIII: How widows are to be treated, that they may embrace religion, or a devoted life.

Chapter IX: Of increasing the revenues of our Colleges.

XV. Let the confessors be constant in visiting the sick, but especially such as are thought to be in danger; and that the ecclesiastics and members of other orders may be discarded with a good pretence, let the superiors take care that when the confessor is obliged to withdraw, others may immediately succeed, and keep up the sick person in his good resolutions. At this time it may be advisable to move him by apprehensions of hell, and at least of purgatory; and tell him, that as fire is quenched by water, so sin is extinguished by acts of charity; and that alms can never be better bestowed than for the nourishment and support of such who by their calling profess a desire to promote the salvation of their neighbor.

XVI. Lastly, let the women who complain of the vices of ill-humor of their husbands, be instructed secretly to withdraw a sum of money, that by making an offering thereof to God, they may expiate the crimes of their sinful help-mates, and secure a pardon for them.

Chapter X. Of the private rigor of discipline in the Society.

Chapter XI. How our members are unanimously to behave towards those who are expelled from the Society.

I. Since those that are dismissed, do frequently very much prejudice the Society by divulging such secrets as they have been privy to; their attempts must therefore be obviated in the following manner. Let them be prevailed upon, before they are dismissed, to give it under their hands, and swear that they never will, directly or indirectly, either write or speak any thing to the disadvantage of the Order; and let the superiors keep upon record the evil inclinations, failings and vices, which they, according to the custom of the Society, for discharge of their consciences, formerly confessed: this, if ever they give us occasion, may be produced by the Society, to the nobility and prelates, as a very good handle to prevent their promotion.

VIII. Let the misfortunes, and unlucky accidents which happen to them, be immediately published; but with entreaties for the prayers of good Christians, that the world may not think we are hurried away by passion: but, among our members, let these things, by all means, be represented in the blackest colors, that the rest may be the better secured.

Chapter XII. Who should be kept, and favored in the Society.

Chapter XIII. How to pick out young men to be admitted into the Society, and in what manner to retain them.

V. Let them be allured, by little presents, and indulgence of liberties agreeable to their age; and, above all, let their affections be warmed with spiritual discourses.

VI. Let it be inculcated, that their being chosen out of such a number, rather than any of their fellow-collegiates, is a most pregnant instance of divine appointment.

VII. On other occasions, but especially in exhortations, let them be terrified with denunciations of eternal punishment, unless they accept of the heavenly invitation.

VIII. The more earnestly they desire admission into our Society, the longer let the grant of such favor be deferred, provided at the same time they seem steadfast in their resolution; but if their minds appear to be wavering, let all proper methods be used for the immediate firing of them.

Chapter XIV. Of reserved cases, and causes of dismissal from the Society.

Chapter XV. Of our conduct towards nuns and female devotees.

[It is noted in the pre-publication copy of *Vatican Assassins* from which these excerpts are being extracted that one of the pages is missing from this section of the instructions.]

Chapter XVII. Of the methods of advancing the Society.

I. Let our members chiefly endeavor at this, always to act with humanity, even in things of trifling moment; or at least to have the outward appearance of doing so; for by this means, whatever confusions may arise in the world, the Society of necessity will always increase and maintain its ground.

VII. The favor of the nobility and superior clergy, once got, our next aim must be to draw all cures and canonships into our possession, for the more complete reformation of the clergy, who wheretofore lived under certain regulation of their bishops, and made considerable advances towards perfection. And lastly, let us aspire to abbacies and bishoprics, the obtaining which, when vacancies happen, will very easily be effected, considering the supineness and stupidity of the monks; for it would entirely tend to the benefit of the church, that all bishoprics, and even the apostolical see, should be hooked into our hands, especially should his holiness ever become a temporal prince over all. Wherefore, let no methods be untried, with cunning and privacy, by degrees, to increase the worldly interests of the Society, and then, no doubt, a golden age will go hand in hand with an universal and lasting peace, and the divine blessing of consequence attend the catholic church.

VIII. But if our hopes in this should be blasted, and since offences of necessity will come, our political schemes must be cunningly varied, according to the different posture of the times; and princes, our intimates, whom we can influence to follow our councils, must be pushed on to embroil themselves in vigorous wars one with another, to the end, our Society (as promoters of the universal good of the world,) may on all hands be solicited to contribute its assistance, and always employed in being mediators of public dissensions; by this means the chief benefices and preferments in the church will, of course be given to us by way of compensation for our services.

IX. Finally, the Society must endeavor to effect this at least, that having got the favor and authority of princes, those who do not love them at least fear them.

* * *

JESUIT POWER

The Society of Jesus was thenceforth recognized as the chief opposing force of Protestantism. The Order became dominant in determining the plans and policy of the Rowish Church. The brotherhood grew and flourished. It planted its chapters first in France, Italy and Spain, and then in all civilized lands. The success of the Order was phenomenal. It became a power in the world. It sent out its representatives to every quarter of the globe. Its solitary apostles were seen shadowing the thrones of Europe. They sought, by every means known to human ingenuity, to establish and confirm the tottering fabric of Rome, and to undermine the rising fabric of Protestantism. They penetrated to the Indus and the Ganges. They traversed the deserts of Thibet, and said, "Here am I," in the streets of Peking. They looked down into the silver mines of Peru, and knelt in prayer on the shores of Lake Superior. To know all secrets, fathom all design, penetrate all intrigues, prevail in all counsels, rise above all diplomacy, and master the human race, — such was their purpose and ambition. They wound about human society in every part of the habitable earth, the noiseless creepers of their ever-growing plot to retake the world for the Church, and to subdue and conquer and extinguish the last remnant of opposition to her dominion from shore to shore, from the rivers to the ends of the earth." [*Ridpath's Universal History*, John Clarke Ridpath, 1899]

* * *

The Jesuits are the true authors of socialist-communism. The economic system of the Dark Ages was feudalism consisting of the few rich landowners and the many poor peasants. It was a sin to make a profit by anyone other than the feudal lords. Thus, if the world is to be returned to the Dark Ages, the Protestant middle class must be destroyed. Socialist-communism accomplishes this, having yielded its bitter fruit in both Great Britain and the United States. The great deception is that the Jews are the authors of communism. (After all, is not Zionism Jewish communism?) The facts are that the Jesuits used their Masonic Jews to introduce it in 1848 and again in 1917 with the Bolshevik Revolution.

The Jesuits then moved their Shriner Freemason FDR to recognize Russia's bloody government in 1933. The Jesuits then financed Russian communism with their Knights of Malta on Wall Street. This enabled Joseph Stalin to carry out the purges of the Thirties.

Having deceived the world into believing communism was of Jewish origin, the Jesuits then used Hitler to implement "the Final Solution to the Jewish Question"—pursuant to the evil Council of Trent. The result was the mass murder of European and Russian Jewry at the hands of the Jesuit-controlled SS.

At the close of the Second Thirty Years War (1648) the Jesuits, with their Vatican Ratline, helped top Nazis to escape to South America. And where in South America? To the old dominion where socialist-communism had been perfected by the Jesuit fathers—to the nation of Paraguay.

The Jesuits entered Paraguay in the early 1600s, sent by the kings of Spain and Portugal. They established their supremacy over the natives called "Guarani Indians" and did not allow them to mix with the Spanish or Portuguese. It was among this people that the Jesuits established their communes called "reductions".

* * *

THE JESUITS — 1776

The Jesuits, now formally suppressed by the Pope, were allied with Frederick the Great of Prussia and Catherine of Russia. The Jesuit General was in control of Scottish Rite Freemasonry and now sought an alliance with the Masonic House of Rothschild in England. To accomplish this he chose a Jesuit who was Jewish by race—Adam Weishaupt. Weishaupt was a brilliant instructor of Canon Law—the evil Council of Trent—at a Jesuit university in Bavaria. We read:

"From the Jesuit College of Ingolstadt is said to have issued the sect known as 'the Illuminati of Bavaria' founded by Adam Weishaupt. Its nominal founder, however, seems to have played a subordinate though conspicuous role in the organization of this sect." [*Occult Theocracy, Lady Queenborough*, originally published in 1933]

On May 1, 1776, the Order of the Illuminati was officially founded in the old Jesuit stronghold of Bavaria. The Company would now use the Jewish House of Rothschild to finance the French Revolution and the rise of Napoleon the Freemason with his Jesuit-trained advisor, Abbe Sieyes. In spite of the historical writings of the Jesuit Abbe Barruel, who blamed the Rothschilds and Freemasonry for the Revolution, it was the Society of Jesus that used these very tools to carry out the Revolution and punish the monarchs who dared to expel the Jesuits from their dominions. The Jesuits, having been expelled from the Spanish Empire, found refuge in Corsica. From there they raised up their great avenger, Napoleon Bonaparte.

* * *

Lately, it was George Washington who was so beloved by France's General Lafayette. During the Revolution our great chieftain took the "boy General" under his wing for which cause the Frenchman named his eldest son, George Washington Lafayette. With this same endearing love the Roman Catholic Lafayette warned:

"It is my opinion that if the liberties of this country, the United States of America, are destroyed, it will be by the subtlety of the Roman Catholic Jesuit priests, for they are the most crafty, dangerous enemies of civil and religious liberty. They have instigated most of the wars of Europe."

* * *

Napoleon was captured by the English and banished to the island of St. Helena. There, his *Memoirs* were written which accurately described his masters, the Jesuits:

"The Jesuits are a military organization, not a religious order. Their chief is a general of an army, not the mere father abbot of a monastery. And the aim of this organization is: POWER. Power in its most despotic exercise. Absolute power, universal power, power to control the world by the volition of a single man. Jesuitism is the most absolute of despotisms: and at the same time the greatest and most enormous of abuses...."

"The general of the Jesuits insists on being master, sovereign, over the sovereign. Wherever the Jesuits are admitted they will be masters, cost what it may. Their society is by nature dictatorial, and therefore it is the irreconcilable enemy of all

constituted authority. Every act, every crime, however atrocious, is a meritorious work, if committed for the interest of the Society of the Jesuits, or by the order of the general." [*Fifty Years In The Church Of Rome*, Charles Chiniquy, 1968, reprinted from the 1886 edition, quoting *Memorial Of The Captivity Of Napoleon At St. Helena*, General Montholon]

* * *

The Knights of Malta and the Jesuits work together!

(Truth seeker, this may seem irrelevant now, but it is important for you to be aware of this connection. As we shall see, the Knights financed Lenin and Hitler from Wall Street, also using their Federal Reserve Bank headed by Masonic Jews, Warburg in particular.) The Knights negotiated the Concordat (a Papal treaty) between the Pope and Hitler in the person of Franz Von Papen. They also helped top Nazis to escape to North and South America after World War II in the persons of James Angleton and Argentina's President Juan Peron.

In America, the Knights, with their OSS, later the CIA, were behind "Operation Paperclip". After World War II, top Nazis and scientists were illegally secreted into the United States. Many were placed in the top-secret military installation in Tonopah, Nevada known as "Area 51". The perfection of the Nazis' anti-gravity aircraft (flying saucers) was to be completed there, among other secret technologies. "Operation Paperclip" was overseen by America's most powerful Knight of Malta, J. Peter Grace. J. Peter Grace was subject to the Jesuit-trained Archbishop Spellman, as the American headquarters for the Knights was and is St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York.

* * *

1816 – JOHN ADAMS

Our founding Fathers knew of the Jesuit intrigue directed at the new Protestant Republic of these United States of America. In 1816, John Adams wrote to President Jefferson:

"Shall we not have regular swarms of them here, in as many disguises as only a king of the gypsies can assume, dressed as painters, publishers, writers, and schoolmasters? If ever there was a body of men who merited eternal damnation on Earth and in Hell it is this Society of Loyola's." [*The New Jesuits*, George Riemer, 1971]

* * *

PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN

A personal friend of Professor Morse believed his warning of this Jesuit conspiracy. He was President Abraham Lincoln. We read:

"The Protestants of both the North and South would surely unite to exterminate the priests and the Jesuits, if they could learn how the priests, the nuns, and the monks, which daily land on our shores, under the pretext of preaching their religion...are nothing else but the

emissaries of the Pope, of Napoleon III, and the other despots of Europe, to undermine our institutions, alienate the hearts of our people from our *Constitution*, and our laws, destroy our schools, and prepare a reign of anarchy here as they have done in Ireland, in Mexico, in Spain, and wherever there are any people who want to be free." [*Fifty Years In The Church Of Rome*, Charles Chiniquy, 1968, reprinted from the 1886 edition]

* * *

The Jesuits — 1868-1872

This new nation would be a centralized republic with the President exercising powers of an absolute monarch. The old Federal Republic of Washington would be converted into a huge centralized Empire, with the ten planks of the Masonic *Communist Manifesto* replacing the *Ten Commandments* of Moses.

In order to accomplish this, the *Constitution* had to be amended—"by hook or by crook". It would be amended in accordance with the Masonic cry of both French Revolutions. "Liberty" would be the *Thirteenth Amendment*. "Equality" would be the *Fourteenth Amendment*. "Fraternity" would be the *Fifteenth Amendment*. We now will examine the Fourteenth Amendment, as it was the coup d'etat.

* * *

THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN

Even though he acted the tyrant in keeping Maryland from seceding and raised the Army of the Potomac to "put down the rebellion", there is evidence that he had a change of heart. Accordingly to many, Lincoln was converted to Christ after viewing the battlefield at Gettysburg. He later joined the Presbyterian Church in Washington and had several spiritual conversations with his close friend and converted priest, Charles Chiniquy. We read:

"I will repeat to you what I said at Urbana, when for the first time you told me your fears lest I would be assassinated by the Jesuits: Man must not care where and when he will die, provided he dies at the post of honor and duty. But I may add, today, that I have a presentiment that God will call me to Him through the hand of an assassin. Let His will, and not mine, be done! The Pope and the Jesuits, with their infernal Inquisition, are the only organized powers in the world which have recourse to the dagger of the assassin to murder those whom they cannot convince with their arguments or conquer with the sword.... It seems to me that the Lord wants today, as He wanted in the days of Moses, another victim.... I cannot conceal from you that my impression is that I am that victim. So many plots have already been made against my life, that it is a real miracle that they have failed, when we consider that the great majority of them were in the hands of skillful Roman Catholic murderers, evidently trained by Jesuits. But can we expect that God will make a perpetual miracle to save my life? I believe not. The Jesuits are so expert in those deeds of blood, that Henry IV said that it was impossible to escape them, and he became their victim, though he did all that could be done to protect himself. My escape from their hands, since the letter of the Pope to Jeff Davis has sharpened a million daggers to pierce my breast, would be more than a miracle." [*Fifty Years In The Church Of Rome*, Charles Chiniquy, 1958, originally published in 1886]

[Further along:]

Of the Jesuit hand in Lincoln's murder we read:

"I feel safe in stating that nowhere else can be found in one book the connected presentation of the story leading up to the death of Abraham Lincoln, which was instigated by the "black" pope, the General of the Jesuit Order, camouflaged by the "white" pope, Pius IX, aided, abetted and financed by other "Divine Righters" of Europe, and finally consummated by the Roman Hierarchy and their paid agents in this country and French Canada on "Good Friday" night, April 14, 1865, at Ford's Theatre, Washington, D.C." [*The Suppressed Truth About The Assassination Of Abraham Lincoln*, Burke McCarty, 1973, originally published in 1924]

* * *

THE JESUITS — 1945-1990

The Great and Terrible Second Thirty Years' War was now over. Europe, Russia, North Africa, China, and Japan were "a universal wreck" thanks to the Company of Jesus. Millions of "heretics" had been "extirpated" pursuant to the *Jesuit Oath* and the Council of Trent. Unlike the Treaty of Westphalia ending the First Thirty Years' War, the agents of the Jesuits controlled the negotiations at Yalta and Potsdam ending the second Thirty Years' War.

It was time to apply the Jesuits' Hegelian Dialectic worldwide. It would be known as "the Cold War". The thesis and antithesis would be "the Free World in the West" verses "the Communist Block in the East". The American Empire would head the West, and the Russian Empire would lead the East. Both sides would be financed by the Jesuits' International Banking Cartel centered in London and New York—the Federal Reserve and Chase-Manhattan Banks in particular.

The synthesis would be the destruction of the American Empire through the so-called "ending of the Cold War". The illusion of ending the Cold War would legally enable Rome's Corporate Monopolies, federated together in New York City under the leadership of the Council on Foreign Relations, to give Russia and China high technology and financial backing. The giving of these necessities would perfect the War Machines of both economically communist and politically fascist giants for the purpose of invading North America, it containing the majority of the world's Protestants, Baptists, and Jews. It is for these reasons that the financial might of Hong Kong was given to Red China, along with an American Naval Base in Long Beach, California. It is for these reasons that the Panama Canal, built with American blood, sweat, tears and Yellow Fever, was given away to Panama to be manned by Chinese soldiers imperiling the American navy. It is for these reasons that the Jesuits in control of Washington have established nationwide gun registration for the purpose of nationwide gun confiscation just as they did in Hitler's Germany. It is for these reasons that the Jesuits, with their international corporations managed by the Knights of Malta, have financed and continue to build both the Russian and Chinese War Machines, while influencing American Presidents to close down scores of military installations across the country. These facts spell invasion—massive invasion by millions of foreign soldiers, with no God and no mercy. And if the Jesuits can manage to blow-up the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem and blame the American Empire for it, the Arabs will declare a holy war against "the great Satan". The private wealth of Americans using International Business Corporations with bank accounts in the Bahamas will be seized just as they were in Castro's Cuba. (The Knights have moved all their wealth into European banks denominated in Franks and Marks as well as Eurodollars, thereby escaping the coming American economic catastrophe.)

Meanwhile, as the Jesuits, with their American dictator's internal police (FEMA) and foreign invaders, are "extirpating" "the execrable race" of American "heretics" and "liberals", the European nations will be driven to lay down their historic differences and unify.

This unification will restore the Holy Roman Empire, for which reason the Jesuits are rapidly rebuilding Rome. When the smoke clears, China will control the East, Russia will control the North, and a unified R.C. [*Roman Catholic*] Europe will control the West. The Pope's International Intelligence Community will see to it that Jerusalem is declared an international city with Solomon's rebuilt Temple in her midst. World government will ensue and the Jesuits' "blessed despotism" of the Dark Ages will have arrived, with the Pope being the Universal Despot of the World, so appropriately described in the *Protocols Of The Elders Of Zion*, while being the World Authority of *The Documents Of Vatican II*.

The Jesuits — 1963

THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

"It is of faith that the Pope has the right of deposing heretical and rebel kings. Monarchs so deposed by the Pope are converted into notorious tyrants, and may be killed by the first who can reach them.

"If the public cause cannot meet with its defense in the death of a tyrant, it is lawful for the first who arrives, to assassinate him." [Defensio Didei, Jesuit Suarez, Book VI. C 4, Nos. 13, 14]

Freed remembers what apparently passes for polite conversation when men such as Colby and Cline get together. "It was quite bizarre" Freed said, "for the subject they chose was, 'When is it acceptable to assassinate a head of state?' Colby presented what he said was a theological and philosophically sound approach. The Catholic Church, he said, had long since wrestled with this question and had, to Colby's mind, emerged with a sound concept: "It is acceptable" he said, "to assassinate a tyrant." [Plausible Denial, Mark Lane, 1991, p. 85]

"A conspiracy is rarely, if ever, proved by positive testimony. When a crime of high magnitude is about to be perpetrated by a combination of individuals, they do not act openly, but covertly and secretly. The purpose formed is known only to those who enter into it. Unless one of the original conspirators betray his companions and give evidence against them, their guilt can be proved only by circumstantial evidence...and circumstances can not lie." [Special Judge Advocate John A. Bingham, quoted in *The Trial Of The Conspirators*, Washington, 1865]

This chapter will examine the forest, not the trees. The hundreds of works covering the assassination can be reduced to a few simple facts. These facts viewed in the context of the previous chapters lead us to the "Lion" in his "Den of Iniquity" that had the power to execute Kennedy's murder and successfully cover it up. That Lion was the Cardinal of New York and his Den of Iniquity was St. Patrick's Cathedral, "the Little Vatican", and home base of the American Branch of the Knights of Malta. From the death of Cardinal Spellman in 1967 until now (1999), the succeeding "Lions" having kept the assassination covered-up were: Cardinal Cooke (himself a Knight of Malta) and Cardinal O'Connor, a former Navy Chaplain during Spellman's Vietnam War, and presently the Archbishop of New York.

Knowing that President Kennedy was not going to escalate the Vietnam War, the Intelligence Community began to prepare for his assassination. Roman Catholic Lee Oswald was chosen to be a patsy.... As a CIA agent, he had been sent to Soviet Russia by Allen Dulles in 1959, supposedly as a defector. Knowing that the CIA (OSS) and the KGB (NKVD) had worked together during WW-II, Oswald apparently took a vacation for nearly two years. During that time he married a Russian whose uncle was a Colonel in the KGB.

When he returned to the American Empire in 1962, he associated with CIA agents Howard Hunt, Frank Sturgis, David Ferrie, Guy Banister, Count George DeMohrenschildt, and Clay Shaw. Oswald was CIA, and related to a Jesuit. Emmanuel Josephson tells us:

"An interesting angle is presented by the Lee Oswald involvement. His cousin is reported to be a Jesuit priest. And it is a matter of record that Lee Oswald was invited to address the Jesuit college in Springhill, Alabama, on the subject of his activities, two weeks before the Kennedy Assassination. The Jesuit involvement closely parallels that in the Lincoln Assassination." [The Federal Reserve Conspiracy And Rockefeller's, Emanuel M. Josephson, 1968]

Jim Garrison clearly proved the CIA was involved in the assassination through Clay Shaw. He writes:

"...we discovered Shaw's extensive international role as an employee of the CIA. Shaw's secret life as an Agency man in Rome, trying to bring Fascism back to Italy, was exposed in articles in the Italian press.... To me among the most significant revelations were...the

confirmation by both Victor Marchetti and Richard Helms that Clay Shaw had been an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency." [*On The Trail Of The Assassins*, Jim Garrison, 1991]

And who was the Director of the CIA in 1963? It was Knight of Malta John McCone. Prior to that McCone had been a defense contractor who had formally headed the Atomic Energy Commission. Later in 1970, he was a board member of ITT while remaining a CIA consultant. Marchetti tells us:

"[The] ITT board member who later admitted to a Senate investigative committee that he had played the key role in bringing together CIA and ITT officials was John McCone, director of the CIA during the Kennedy administration and, in 1970, a CIA consultant." [*The CIA And The Cult Of Intelligence*, Victor Marchetti, 1975]

Cardinal Spellman's soldier, John McCone, Director of the CIA, participated in the Kennedy assassination.

Jim Garrison and others have proved that the FBI was also involved in the assassination. He writes:

"I already had concluded that parts of the local Dallas law enforcement establishment were probably implicated in the assassination or its cover-up. But now I saw that the highly respected FBI was implicated as well." [*On The Trail Of The Assassins*, Jim Garrison, 1991]

Cardinal Spellman had two agents in the FBI. The first was the Shriner Freemason and brother-Cold Warrior, J. Edgar Hoover. According to Loftus, Hoover had cooperated with the Vatican Ratlines resettling Nazi war criminals in the Northeast. Why would he not cooperate with Spellman now? How could he refuse?

More importantly, Spellman's key man in the FBI was Knight of Malta, Cartha DeLoach. As the third in command, DeLoach was in a position to supervise the assassination and suppress evidence. Garrison proved DeLoach did in fact suppress evidence.

After the assassination we see a telling relationship between Johnson and DeLoach. DeLoach was known as Johnson's man in the FBI and the President would call him any time of the day. Curt Gentry writes:

"Lyndon Johnson couldn't sleep. Late at night he had his aide, Marvin Watson, telephone the DeLoach bedroom. The president had suddenly become convinced that the murder of his predecessor had been a conspiracy and wanted more information from the FBI." [*J. Edgar Hoover: The Man And The Secrets*, Curt Gentry, 1991]

This is the Cartha DeLoach who had signed a five-year contract with Lee Iacocca's Ford Mercury in connection with the series, "The FBI". Both DeLoach and Iacocca were Knights of Malta, subject to Cardinal Spellman during the Kennedy assassination. Later DeLoach went on to be a director of PepsiCo. And according to Col. Prouty, that company also participated in Kennedy's assassination. We read:

"Nixon was in Dallas with a top executive of the Pepsi-Cola Company, Mr. Harvey Russel, the general counsel. Nixon was a legal counsel to that corporation. That top executive's son has told of Nixon's presence in Dallas at the time of the assassination, and Russell has confirmed the accuracy of his son's account. Later, sometime after the shooting, Nixon was driven to the Dallas airport by a Mr. DeLuca, also an official of the Pepsi-Cola Company. In addition, the son of another Pepsi-Cola executive was in Dallas at that time and had dinner with Jack Ruby, Oswald's killer, the night before JFK was murdered." [*JFK: The CIA, Vietnam, And The Plot To Assassinate John F. Kennedy*, Col. L. Fletcher Prouty, 1992]

DeLoach, Iacocca, and the Knights of Pepsi, now PepsiCo, all worked together.

At the time of the assassination in Dallas, the Catholic priest, Oscar Shubert, was sent from Holy Trinity Catholic Church in Dallas to administer "Last Rites" for the President. Knowing that Kennedy's wounds were wounds of entry, he reported everything to his superior. Shubert's superior was the Bishop of Dallas, then The Most Reverend Thomas Kiely Gorman, DD. According to Martin Lee's article entitled "Who Are The Knights Of Malta?" appearing in the October 14, 1983 edition of the *National Catholic Reporter*, Thomas K. Gorman was a Knight of Malta. Being a brother Knight he reported directly to Cardinal Spellman, and kept him apprised of what was happening in Dallas.

At the time of the assassination in Dallas, roughly 12:30 P.M. in the afternoon, all the telephones went dead in Washington, D.C. for about 30 minutes. How could this have happened? Someone at ITT had to be responsible, as it served the Washington area. In 1963, one of the VIPs of ITT was Francis D. Flanagan. You guessed it. Flanagan was a Knight. Later, McCone, with his brother knights, coordinated a deal between the CIA and ITT to better work together.

The author knows there were several Knights of Columbus involved in the Kennedy assassination. They were working for the FBI in particular. But the only notable Knight who was involved was Senator Edward Kennedy in that, through his silence, he was consenting to his brother's murder. Maybe this is what has driven the perpetual Senator from Massachusetts to his ruined alcoholic life. Let us take a few moments to pray for the Senator that he might have a change of heart, that he would tell all, and that we might protect him. For he too was subject to the power of Cardinal Spellman.

Lastly we know that the Mafia was involved in the Kennedy assassination. The Mafia, CIA, FBI, and Office of Naval Intelligence has been working together throughout World War II. Jack Ruby was a mafioso and David E. Scheim makes it perfectly clear in his *Contract On America* that the Mob had at least two motives: the Kennedy brothers assault on Organized Crime and the loss of the Mob's gambling paradise in Cuba.

But those were not the reasons. The Mafia Dons were promised that they would make more money than Havana could ever produce, through the explosion of the international drug trade made possible by the Vietnam War. If they helped eliminate Kennedy, Johnson would escalate the war and, thereby, the drug trade. The CIA would bring the drugs in from the Golden Triangle, distribute them to the Mafia families, and both would profit.

More importantly, the Mafia's Commission had a favor to repay. Cardinal Spellman, through FDR, had arranged the release of "Lucky" Luciano because of "Operation Underworld" mentioned in the previous chapter. Now the Cardinal needed a favor. If refused, Spellman could use the entire intelligence community which he had helped to organize, to eliminate any mob boss. If agreed to, new gambling centers would open up, Atlantic City in particular.

Clearly, if the President was removed, everybody would acquire more power and wealth, the intelligence community would become more absolute, and the Cardinal would be even more respected by his peers in Rome. The rest is history.

Later, in 1964, for the first time in history, the Pope of Rome set foot in *Fourteenth Amendment* America. Cardinal Spellman had performed well and was rewarded by a visit from his Master, fellow Cold Warrior and Vatican Ratline handler, Cardinal Montini, who was now Pope Paul VI.

There is yet another reason for the removal of President Kennedy. He wanted to arm Israel. Loftus writes:

"In September 1962 Kennedy decided to supply Israel with defensive ground-to-air missiles capable of stopping aircraft, but not the Egyptian offensive missiles. It was the first arms sale by the U.S. Government to Israel.... Kennedy promised the Israelis that as soon as the 1964 election was over, he would break the CIA 'into a thousand pieces and scatter it to the winds'.... With Kennedy's assassination in November 1963, the Israelis lost the best friend they had in the White House since Truman departed." [*The Secret War Against The Jews*, John Loftus, 1994]

And why did the Vatican's Jesuits not want any arms sales to Israel at this time? Why did the Jesuit-controlled President Johnson turn his back as the Egyptian army moved up through the Sinai desert to prepare its assault on Israel in 1967? Because the attack upon Israel had to be provoked. That attack was provoked by the Jesuits' International Intelligence Community through Egypt falsely perceiving the weakness of the Israeli army and the supposed abandonment of Israel by the American Empire.

The six-day war, engineered by Knight of Malta James Angleton, had one primary purpose: the taking of Jerusalem along with the Temple Mount. The apparent lack of military hardware on the part of Israel provoked the planned attack by Egypt. Therefore, Israel launched a preemptive strike and, in six days, the holy city was in the hands of Rome's Zionist government.

Had Kennedy armed Israel, the Egyptians would never have been emboldened to maneuver for war. With no provoked war, there would have been no Israeli attack. With no Israeli attack, Jerusalem would never have been taken by the Zionists, controlled by the Jesuits' Mossad. With Jerusalem in Arab hands, the Zionists could never rebuild Solomon's Temple—unknown to them—for the Jesuits' "infallible" Pope "Who opposeth and exalted himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so he is God sitteth in the temple of God [Solomon's rebuilt temple], showing himself that he is God." [*II Thes 2:4*]

It is safe to say that the Jesuit General, using the Pope with his most powerful Cardinal in the American Empire, assassinated President John F. Kennedy in 1963.

For it was Cardinal Spellman, "the American Pope" in command of his soldiers, the Knights of Malta, who oversaw the assassination.

And it was the Knights of Malta, using the Central Intelligence Agency, who aided in the actual assassination of the President. Those Knights were: CIA Director, John McCone, CIA officers William F. Buckley, and Henry Luce.

In 1963, both William F. Buckley and Henry Luce were personal friends of CIA agent Howard Hunt. We read from Mark Lane's *Plausible Denial* on page 270, concerning *Time* and *Life* magazines, of which Henry Luce was the owner:

"I (Howard Hunt) had them typed up on a typewriter (fabricated official cables), and they were xeroxed, and the xeroxes were eventually shown to a person of Mr. (Charles) Colson's confidence, and in *Time* and *Life*." Hunt, after swearing that he had never been involved in a disinformation effort to embarrass Kennedy, had now testified that he had merely sought to doctor and create evidence to prove that Kennedy was a murderer.

Again in *Plausible Denial* we read of Hunt's connection with pompous William F. Buckley, Jr. on page 207:

"(G. Gordon) Liddy completed his testimony perfectly, stating that while he no longer associated with Hunt, he did see him last, he recalled, when both men demonstrated their support for another former CIA officer, William F. Buckley, as Buckley celebrated the anniversary of his television show at the New York Yacht Club."

Dear truth seeker, Hunt was close to both powerhouses, Buckley and Luce. Hunt was also working with two of his fellow criminals in the future Watergate scandal, G. Gordon Liddy (Jesuit-trained) and Chuck Colson.

And in 1985, it was Mark Lane who proved in Miami's federal court that Hunt was in Dallas the day President Kennedy was murdered. Therefore, the conclusion was obvious. The CIA, with its agent, E. Howard Hunt, had killed the President. In the words of the jury's forewoman, Leslie Armstrong, found on the inside cover and page 322 of *Plausible Denial*, we read:

"Mr. Lane was asking us to do something very difficult. He was asking us to believe that John Kennedy had been killed by our own government. When we examined the evidence (for 65 minutes) we were compelled to conclude that the CIA had indeed killed President Kennedy." Hunt had been part of it, and that evidence, so painstakingly presented, should now be examined by the relevant institutions of the United States Government, so that those responsible for the assassination might be brought to justice.

Maniacal World Control Thru The Jesuit Order Well-Hidden Soldiers Of Satan

No political event or circumstance can be evaluated without the knowledge of the Vatican's part in it. And no significant world situation exists in which the Vatican does not play an important explicit or implicit role. — Avro Manhattan, "Protestant" Knight of Malta, English Historian and Agitator, 1960, *The Vatican And World Politics*.

The Jesuits offer the world at large a system of theology by which every law, Divine and human, may be broken with impunity, and by which the very Bulls of Popes may be defied. It is a ghastly religion; it is a religion to be abhorred by all honest and honorable men. — M. F. Cusack, Converted Nun of Kenmare, 1896, *The Black Pope*.

The Jesuits laugh at us; and during their hilarity, the rattlesnake is coiled at our feet, climbing to strike us in the heart. — Edwin A. Sherman, American Shriner Freemason, Friend of Charles Chiniquy, 1883, *The Engineer Corps Of Hell*.

You could call Eric Jon Phelps a controversial author. We know him as a consummate researcher, a beloved friend, and a gentleman who lives his truth. Our readers will know him best as my interviewee in our now infamous May 2000 issue of *The SPECTRUM*—the issue that is known far and wide as the "Black Pope" paper.

Eric is also the author of the blockbuster book *VATICAN ASSASSINS*, an incredibly well researched historical manuscript which shows the reader, in astonishing detail, where the TRUE diabolical power and control of this planet resides—at least that controlling layer which is in the physical dimension.

VATICAN ASSASSINS likewise acquaints the reader with a number of priceless old documents and historical manuscripts that "certain ones" have done their very best to remove from almost all of the world's library shelves. Most of these documents are so rare that just getting these back into public access and circulation is a great service to all students of history thirsty for The Truth.

There has been so much interest in what Eric has to say that we decided to revisit a number of issues and ask him to answer some dangling questions. After all, the kind of connections which Eric makes are an entire level deeper than what we are used to hearing in the “conspiracy theory” arena. Moreover, we have noted, with some degree of surprise and “unveiling” over the past year or so, just who all have come forward to attack Eric’s work—groundlessly and hysterically (but never to his face). These ones know who they are and have, by their unprofessional and irrational actions, convincingly revealed just who they really work for, while pretending to be presenters of Truth!

While it was my intent to focus the majority of the conversation on the present day, there were some unresolved issues from the past that likewise required clarification. On June 18, 2001, I had an opportunity to sit down with Eric Phelps, face-to-face, and prevail upon him to answer a few key questions. Let’s see what he has to say.

Martin: Our last interview—the “Black Pope” issue of The SPECTRUM—went around the world a few times. It’s also been on the Internet for quite some time. The manuscript of VATICAN ASSASSINS has been distributed, but still no book. What’s happening with the book? Why is it taking so long to come out in book form?

Phelps: The reason why it has taken a year to finalize the book is because there were several historical mistakes that were corrected by some of the readers of the manuscripts, the first and second manuscripts.

There was a Japanese individual named Toichi [Ryu] who corrected me on some of the Japanese history regarding the Emperors and the Shogans, for which I thanked him and made the necessary changes.

There were a few other similar changes that I had to make with regard to dates, places, and sometimes; just a polishing-up of the manuscript, so that it’s ready now.

We had one individual who was a Jesuit for 10 years. He got out of the Jesuit Order. He read the manuscript. He greatly approved of it. And he sent us a list of corrections, which we incorporated into the manuscript. So, there have been many people who have added their polishing touches to it, for which I am thankful.

[Editor’s note: Wisdom Books & Press (877) 280-2866 is accepting advance orders for VATICAN ASSASSINS, the 700-page book, which should be completed by the second or third week in July. The cost for this huge volume is only \$34.95, which includes a gift CD-ROM containing 13 rare books mostly “missing” from the world’s library shelves.]

Martin: I would like to concentrate this conversation largely on the present day. But, before we get to the present, I would ask you to, once and for all, clarify something for our readers who may be still confused about The Protocols Of The Learned Elders Of Zion.

There have been many sources and many reciting's of The Protocols. They’ve been called a fraud. They’ve been called a forgery, which means that there was a document that preceded it that it had to be based on. Everyone seems to point to the Jews, or the Khazars, as the authors of The Protocols, and yet your research indicates otherwise.

Who, in your opinion, authored The Protocols Of The Learned Elders Of Zion?

Phelps: Cardinal Bea was the confessor of Pope Pius XII (Hitler’s Pope), a very powerful Jesuit and Cardinal within the Vatican. According to Alberto Rivera, when speaking with Cardinal Bea, Cardinal Bea said to him that The Protocols were written by Jews loyal to the Pope.

I do not believe Jews wrote The Protocols. I do not believe Alberto Rivera was told the whole story, because he did not have a “need to know”. Withholding information has always been standard procedure for the Jesuits.

I believe men who were loyal to the Pope wrote The Protocols, and the men who were loyal to the Pope who wrote The Protocols were the Jesuits, according to Leo Lehmann—the ex-Irish Catholic priest who became converted to Christ and set-up the mission there in New York City, Converted Catholics For Christ. He said that the Jesuits wrote The Protocols, and that this is no new attempt of deception, based on their document that they wrote concerning their attack on the Jansenists, which was called The Secrets Of The Elders Of Bourg-Fontaine.

So, the Jesuits wrote The Protocols like they wrote The Secrets Of The Elders Of Bourg-Fontaine, and the language of The Protocols is identical to The Secret Meeting At Cheiri [1825].

However, I have a quotation from a very brilliant and Godly, born-again, Bible-believing, Irish Roman Catholic priest I referred to a moment ago. He wrote a book entitled *Behind The Dictators*, first written in 1942, and there were two editions after that. I have the 1945 edition. Dr. Leo Lehmann says that the Jesuits wrote *The Protocols*. But before I get into that, I would just like to read to you who Dr. L. H. Lehmann was.

“He was born in Dublin, Ireland, and received his primary education there from the nuns and Christian brothers. He began his study for the priesthood at Mungret College, Limerick, and at All Hallows College, Dublin. In 1918, he went to finish his theological studies at the University of Propaganda Fide in Rome, where he was ordained a priest in 1921. He later studied at New York University from which he received the degree of M.A.

“After four years as a priest in Cape Town, South Africa, Dr. Lehmann was recalled to Rome to continue negotiations at the Vatican courts concerning a legal case in which he had been engaged, while a student in Rome, on behalf of many American bishops and priests against the Jesuits. He later returned to South Africa, but was transferred to the United States in 1927 and appointed pastor in Gainesville, the university city of Florida. Dr. Lehmann is now director of Christ’s Mission in New York City and Editor-In-Chief of *The Converted Catholic* magazine.”

So, here is a born-again, Bible-believing man who had been an Irish priest, who had run-ins with the Jesuits, who knew EXACTLY what they were all about. When you’re involved in litigation within the Vatican, you know the law. And you know the history of who you are opposing.

Here is what he had to say about the origin of *The Protocols*. This is found in his book, *Behind The Dictators*, on page 15:

“Although first published in Russia in 1903, *The Protocols Of [The Learned Elders Of] Zion* had their origin in France and date from the Dreyfus Affair, of which the Jesuits were the chief instigators. They were planned also first to take effect in France, by the overthrow of the ‘Judaic-Masonic’ government of the French Republic. But the discovery of the gigantic fraud of Leo Taxil, who had been openly supported by the Jesuits, the concluding of the Franco-Russian alliance, along with the Vatican’s difficulties with the French government at that time, made it more opportune to have them appear first in Russia.

“These Protocols of supposedly Jewish leaders are not the first documents of their kind fabricated by the Jesuits.

“For over a hundred years before these Protocols appeared, the Jesuits had continued to make use of a similar fraud called *The Secrets Of The Elders Of Bourg-Fontaine* against Jansenism—an anti-Jesuit French Catholic movement among the secular clergy.”

Phelps: I might also add that the Jansenists were what we would call, really, Catholic Calvinists. They believed in the sovereignty of God. They believed in justification by faith. They believed in many Biblical doctrines, and therefore the Jesuits hated them and later got the Pope to issue a Bull against them.

The Jesuits so hated the Jansenists, of which Blaise Pascal was one, that they concocted this document, *The Secrets Of The Elders Of Bourg-Fontaine*, against them.

Martin: What year was this?

Phelps: This was in the 1600s, I believe, in France. It may have been the late 1600s, because Blaise Pascal wrote his *Provincial Letters* in the later 1600s.

[Editor’s note: Eric brings to our attention a VERY interesting person here, much like the great Nikola Tesla of a few hundred years later. Blaise Pascal, 1623-62, was a great mathematician, physicist, theologian, and man-of-letters, born in Clermont-Ferrand, France. In 1647 he invented a calculating machine, and later the barometer, the hydraulic press, and the syringe. Until 1654 he spent his time between mathematics (remember Pascal’s triangle and other intriguing mathematical and geometric discoveries?) and the social round in Paris, but a mystical experience that year led him to join his sister, who was a member of the Jansenist convent at Port-Royal, where he defended Jansenism against the Jesuits in *Lettres Provinciales*, 1656-7.]

Now, I’ll go back to my reading:

“The analogy between the two forgeries is perfect—the secret assemblage in the forest of Bourg-Fontaine; the plan of the ‘conspirators’ to destroy the Papacy and establish religious tolerance among all nations; the alleged plot against Throne and Altar, and the setting up of a world-government in opposition to the Catholic Church. There is the same dramatization of the negative pole of the

historic evolution of the world, in order to bring out, by contrast, the positive Christian [Catholic] pole, around which all conservative forces—the monarchy, the aristocracy, the army, the clergy—must gather to save the world from Satan’s onslaught.”

Phelps: Is this not identical to The Protocols? Except in The Protocols, it’s Communism. Both documents want a world government, under someone other than the Pope. So, it betrays the Jesuit hand throughout, in The Protocols, based upon The Secrets Of The Elders Of Bourge-Fontaine; and furthermore, after this document, The Secrets Of the Elders of Bourge-Fontaine, the next major document that we have is Leone’s The Jesuit Conspiracy—The Secret Plan Of The Order, which was published in 1848.

In this document, Jesuit Leone was 19 years old and a novitiate in Cheiri, Italy, where he, when he was snooping around in a back room, became trapped when Jesuit General Roothaan and his provincials came in another room and he listened to this conversation between the General and his provincials—in the mid-1830s, around 1834—and while he was hiding, he was taking notes.

They betray that the Jesuit General was intent upon setting-up a World Government by controlling the Roman Catholic hierarchy, the Pope, all the monarchies, and thus all the governments of the world. And that is in Leone’s great work, The Jesuit Conspiracy, published in 1848.

It was published in several languages. It went all throughout Europe, which contributed to the people rising-up against the power of the Jesuits in 1848, with the Second French Revolution. But that revolution was controlled, the leadership of it was controlled, and the end result was more power for the Jesuit Order in Europe.

Martin: You mention that The Protocols were an outgrowth of the Dreyfus Affair [1890s]. And prior to that we have the Council of Trent [twenty-five sessions of the Council of Trent from 1545-1563]. Can you put this in perspective?

Phelps: Ok. The Jesuits were busy creating Jewish hatred in Germany and in France in the late 1800s. There was a man referred to in Ridpath’s Universal History Of the World—I only found this here—he called his work “the solution to the Jewish question”. Hitler came along, later, and had the FINAL solution to the Jewish question. So, they were fomenting anti-Jewish hatred in Germany, and they were fomenting anti-Jewish hatred in France.

Martin: Who are they?

Phelps: The Jesuits. The Jesuits were fomenting this in both countries because, at this time, the Jesuits had been expelled from Germany in 1872, and they had been expelled from France in 1880. So now they’re going to go after the Jews through their agents in these two countries.

In France, they started the Dreyfus Affair, and that was in the 1890s. The Dreyfus Affair had several purposes. It was to create anti-Semitism—anti-Jewish hatred in France.

I hate to use the word anti-Semitism. There are many Semites other than Jews. And it was also calculated to create war with Germany, because Captain Dreyfus was accused of treason in handing secrets over to the German government. It was all a frame.

He was completely framed. He was sent to Devil’s Island for 10 years, and suffered the horrible tortures of Devil’s Island for that period of time. And then, later, when he was brought back, he was vindicated and found “not guilty”, and the Jesuits were blamed for having done this. So this became universally known in France, which ultimately caused the Jesuits to be expelled, again, in 1901.

The Dreyfus Affair is a major European conspiracy with the Jesuit hand, against the Jews, attempting to foment a war between France and Germany. Because, remember, the French hated the Germans as a result of the trouncing that they got in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. And they wanted vengeance for that.

So, we play on the people’s vengeance, create this issue between Germany and France, we use the Jews to do it so we can get some anti-Jewish fervor going, which ultimately manifests itself in 1942 with the Vichy government in France, when they help the Nazis round-up all the Jews in France and send them to Auschwitz.

And it’s at that time, in 1942, in the Petain, that the Jesuits were formally readmitted into France. That’s the significance of the Dreyfus Affair.

Martin: And what is the significance of the Council of Trent in relation to all of these?

Phelps: The Council of Trent puts heretics—which us Bible-believers are, all Protestants and all Jews—puts all of us under more than 100 curses because of what we believe:

We believe in justification by faith.

“Accursed be all who believe in justification by faith.”

We believe that Baptism is simply an outward sign of salvation, and that it is not necessary for salvation.

“Accursed be all those who believe that.”

We believe that, when we eat of the Lord’s supper, the bread and the wine are NOT the literal body and blood of Christ, as the Council of Trent teaches, therefore we are accursed because we do not believe in transubstantiation.

And we also believe that man has a right to his own judgment. He has a right to read the Bible and make his own decisions as to what it means; that the Bible should be in the language of the people, because this the foundation of freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press.

All of these things in the 4th session of the Council of Trent are condemned, anybody who believes in: freedom of speech, and freedom of conscience, and freedom of the press.

So, those maxims of the Council of Trent are brought into The Protocols when The Protocols condemn freedom of conscience; they condemn freedom of the press; they condemn national governments and national sovereignty.

You see, Bible-believers, we believe in national sovereignty.

We do not believe in World Government.

We believe America should be governed by Americans.

We believe Japan should be governed by Japanese, etc.

We do not believe, we do not want, a European Union.

We do not want a combination of governments under Centralized Government.

We believe in national sovereignties, which is the reason why the South seceded and left the United States, because they wanted to set-up their own national sovereignty; it was a Protestant maxim upon which they acted.

Ok, so Trent effects The Protocols. Trent effects The Secrets Of The Elders Of Bourge-Fontaine. Trent effects The Secret Plan, written by Leone in 1848. And hence, now we have the doctrines of Communism effecting Marx and his Communist Manifesto, because Marx was tutored in the British Museum BY JESUITS.

Martin: Who was behind the Council of Trent, The Secret Plan, etc. Who were the men behind these, historically?

Phelps: Well, Diego Laynez went on to be the Jesuit General after Loyola; Laynez was the second Jesuit General. He was the MASTER-MIND of the Council of Trent. Laynez was a Jesuit by allegiance, and a Jew by race. This is very important. And it’s the result of Laynez being a Jew, when this was brought to light in 1593, that the Order passed a statute that NO JEW COULD EVER BE IN THE JESUIT ORDER AGAIN. This is VERY important. This is why Weishaupt was not a Jew. It was against the constitutions of the Order for a Jew to be in the Order.

Martin: And what relation does Weishaupt have to all of this?

Phelps: Weishaupt was the promoter of the Illuminati, with the House of Rothschild, for the punishment of the Catholic monarchs of Europe, and the Pope, for suppressing the Jesuit Order.

So, Weishaupt did not act alone. Weishaupt was under the supervision, at least initially, of Jesuit General Ricci, who died in 1775 in Italy. Weishaupt was under orders.

Martin: Who is Jesuit General Roothaan?

Phelps: Jesuit General Roothaan was the General of the Society from the 1830s to the mid-1850s. Jesuit General Roothaan was the one who oversaw The Secret Plan At Chieri, of which Leone overheard and then wrote about.

Martin: So this is KEY to what we are talking about?

Phelps: Extremely key.

Martin: And who is Peter Beckx?

Phelps: Peter Beckx was the Jesuit General in the late 1800s and early 1900s. He was the one who gave the order and oversaw the sinking of the Titanic.

Martin: Let's talk about that now. Why have you drawn the historical conclusion that the Jesuits sank the Titanic?

Phelps: Because they benefited. And they were present, on site, on the ship, prior to its sinking. When we have a powerful organization that is working together, such as the Jesuit Order, and the power that they had prior to their suppression, and that they had never changed, and they are still working toward a World Government under the Pope, we look for the Jesuit Order in these national crises that arise—and in this issue, the Titanic.

We must ask the question: Even though we can't place where they are at the moment, did the Jesuit Order benefit from this? And the answer is: Yes, they did.

They benefited because it paved the way for the establishment of the Federal Reserve Bank, which they own and control, by proxy, through the Knights of Malta, with their various trusts and so on. They never own anything outright; they always own it through a trusted third party.

How do we know that the Jesuits control the Federal Reserve Bank? Because the Federal Reserve Bank was used to finance the second "Thirty Years War"—from 1914 to 1945—in which everything that transpired fell out for the benefit of the Vatican, everything.

Then, of course, when we discover that the most powerful man in Ireland, the Jesuit Provincial Francis M. Browne, was on the Titanic taking pictures of all those who would be going down. And then, right before it departs Queenstown, Ireland, to set out for the North Sea, "the lucky priest departed off the ship" in the words of Martin Sheen, who narrated *Secrets Of The Titanic*.

It was more than luck; it was planned that way. Martin Sheen has been to the Jesuit Novitiate at St. Jacques, in Warnersville, Pennsylvania. Martin Sheen is a bosom buddy of the Jesuits.

The men who went down were wealthy Jews who were resisting the establishment of a centralized bank in America, particularly John Jacob Astor, who was a personal friend of Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis. And Brandeis greatly resisted the establishment of the central bank.

Martin: Astor, Guggenheim, and Straus were three Jewish men who went down with the Titanic. Why do you focus so much of your attention on Astor?

Phelps: Astor was the wealthiest Jew in the world, some say the wealthiest man in the world. But he was, most definitely, the wealthiest Jew. He did not have more money than the Pope. But he was the wealthiest man in the world and he was using his wealth NOT in accord with the Jesuit Order.

Now, later, his son, John Jacob Astor IV, became part of the money trust, which can be found on the Internet; and so the Jesuits had access, now, to the Astor fortune. They control it now. But, at that time, they got rid of Astor because they wanted his fortune, and they wanted to end his resistance to the establishment of a national bank. And they do this pursuant to The Secret Instructions, that they will take the fortunes of widows and other people who resist them.

And that is what they did in Eugene Sue's *The Wandering Jew*. That story revolves around a French Protestant family, the Renneponsts, and the Jesuits killing-off every member of the Rennepont family, so that they can have the fortune when it would be opened up at a certain day, at a certain time in Paris. And the man who held the fortune in trust was a Jew. So, that's why they got rid of Astor.

Martin: What was that quote from the movie *JFK* about the Titanic?

Phelps: I believe Oliver Stone was overseen by the Jesuits, who control Hollywood. And, therefore, a lot of the lines were authored by Jesuits.

One of the lines authored by the Jesuits was when Garrison was sitting at the table and he said: "People, we've got to start thinking differently. We've got to start thinking like the CIA. White is black, and black is white."

That is DIRECTLY from Ignatius Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises*. [Ignatius Loyola was the founder of the Jesuit Order in 1540.] When he tells the people that they believe the hierarchical Catholic Church and believe white is black and black is white, if the hierarchy says so. That's right out of the *Spiritual Exercises*.

Well then, when one of the associates, Bill, of Garrison's staff, is approached by an FBI agent, and the FBI agent is trying to win him over to their side, that FBI agent says: "There's going to be millions of people who are going to die. Besides, you've got to get away from Garrison. He's going down with the Titanic."

That is a clue, right there, that the same men who were behind the Kennedy assassination, attempting to frustrate Garrison's investigation, were the same men who sunk the Titanic.

Martin: I'm looking at the front-page headline from a little-known rag-sheet, and the current headline that I'm reading says: "Khazarian Zionists Are The Anti-Christ." Now, what can you explain to our readers about who might be behind such a headline, and what is the AGENDA of such a headline?

[Editor's note: Some of you readers who may be familiar with the publication should know that Rick is referring to the June 13, 2001 issue of the CONTACT newspaper.]

Phelps: We know that the Jesuits, in their agendas, hate the Jews.

And you add: "Eric, you say that the Jesuits set up Zionist Israel."

The Jesuits control the Masonic Jewish Zionists who control Zionist Israel. They HATE the Jewish race. And when I speak of Jews, I'm not speaking of Judaism. I'm not speaking of their evil religion, that openly and notoriously rejects Jesus as the Messiah; even Josephus realized Jesus was the Messiah.

I'm talking about the RACE. And when I'm speaking of the Jewish race, I'm speaking of the descendants of Jacob, through his 12 sons, and their physical descendants. That's what I mean when I speak of the Jews.

Many, many Orthodoxes today believe there is no such thing as the Jewish race. They are in error about that, because in Romans IX, X, & XI, it speaks specifically about the Jewish race, that Christ was a Jew; that Christ spoke in John, Chapter IV, we know whom we worship for salvation is of the Jews.

So, he identified himself as a Jew. The Apostle Paul identified himself as a Hebrew of Hebrews, an Israelite, etc. So the terms Jew, Israelite, and Hebrew are all synonymous terms; they are the physical, racial descendants of Jacob. And, therefore, the Abraham covenant and promises apply to them, and they have not been fulfilled to this day. They are in the great diaspora—they are in the great dispersion.

And so, Satan, not wanting them to inherit these promises, has set-out to destroy the Jewish race any way he possibly can. And his greatest tool in the destruction of the Jewish race is the Jesuit Order.

Martin: Are you saying that this headline that I just read to you has an agenda behind it?

Phelps: Absolutely.

Martin: And what is that agenda?

Phelps: The agenda is to create world-wide anti-Jewish fury, in every nation of the world, so as to drive all the Jews back to Israel for their final annihilation when the Jesuits bring in the armies of the Earth and when the anti-Christ, the risen Pope, brings in the armies of the Earth in his last, mad attempt to destroy all of the Jews, so that they cannot inherit the promises given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Martin: If there is an intelligence community behind this publication, it's easy enough to draw the conclusion, from what you're saying, that the Jesuits, who control the intelligence community, would be specifically behind this agenda to foment hate and agitation against the Jewish race.

Phelps: Absolutely. Especially the American Jews, because there are more American Jews, here in this country, than there are in Israel. And one of their agendas in the next 10-20 years is to create anti-Jewish fury, and to drive the American Jews back to Israel, killing millions of them, as well, here, because they're planning to bring their Roman Catholic Fascist dictator to power—just like they did with Hitler in Germany; just like they did with Stalin in Russia; just like they did with Franco in Spain; just like they did with Mussolini in Italy. They have the same exact agenda here. They're going to do it through the Republican, "New Right" party, of which George Bush is now the head.

Martin: At one point, you made a comment privately concerning the Right-Wing militia movement possibly being influenced with another agenda. Can you talk about that?

I'll just say up-front that this is going to strike at the heart of many people's belief system. And some may have difficulty with what you say.

Phelps: The Right-Wing militia groups—the posse comitatus, etc., Ku Klux Klan, the Minutemen, they all have one thing in common: they all hate the Jews. That puts up a flag for me. And if they all hate the Jews, that tells me that they have been imbibed, or indoctrinated, with hatred for the Jews. They all hate the Jews; and as an aside, so do the Black Moslems [Muslims]. Louis Farrakhan openly hands-out The Protocols Of The Learned Elders Of Zion and blames all our problems, and all the Black man's problems, on the Jews.

So, the Right-Wing posse comitatus groups are all controlled by the Jesuits because they are all anti-Jew, and they have NOTHING TO SAY ABOUT THE JESUIT ORDER. NOTHING!

Martin: Wouldn't you say that most of the groups just don't have a clue about the Jesuit Order?

Phelps: Not their leadership. A lot of these groups have Catholics in them. There's not a Catholic around who doesn't know the power of the Jesuit Order, in their educational power, and the power of government.

We have Drinin in Congress; we have McLaughlin who was writing speeches for Nixon for \$35,000 a year. We have Jesuits all throughout the government. There's not any intelligent Roman Catholic who's involved in these Right-Wing Movements who doesn't know the power of the Jesuits.

THEY DON'T WANT TO TALK ABOUT THEM. JUST LIKE THE PRESS WON'T TALK ABOUT THEM.

So, this Timothy McVeigh thing—is that what we're leading to?

Martin: Well, no, but go ahead.

Phelps: This Timothy McVeigh thing—here's another Irish Roman Catholic sacrificed, just like Kennedy, for the sake of attempting to create a national backlash or agitation against the Right-Wing Movement people, because a lot of the Right-Wing Movement people are true patriots who want their liberty; they want to maintain their guns; they want freedom to educate their children as they wish; they're decent people, but they are not aware that the leadership is controlled by the Vatican.

So, the Jesuits in control of Clinton fomented the Oklahoma City bombing to justify going after these Right-Wing, conservative, many of them Bible-believing, people in this movement, for their round-up and extermination. But it didn't quite work.

So, they imploded the building. They got rid of Timothy McVeigh. That whole execution could have been stayed with one phone call from the Archbishop of New York to the Bishop of Oklahoma City, and he wouldn't do it.

That was the purpose of the Oklahoma City bombing, the creation of anti-Right-Wing feeling. And the people at the top, controlling the Right-Wing organizations, will betray their own people, just exactly as the White Russians were betrayed during the Communist Revolution from 1917-1922.

Their own leadership will betray them—just as Hitler betrayed his armies to the East, cut-off supplies, would not allow them to take Moscow, froze them in the snows of Russia; just as Napoleon betrayed his armies in the East, abandoned 250,000 men; that's exactly what's going to be done to our Right-Wing patriotic people who are the only bulwark against tyranny in this country today.

Martin: We're almost to the present day. But, before we get to the present day, let's stop for a minute, once again, and talk about JFK's assassination. I'm going to mention a few names, and then let's talk about the Jesuit influence behind that assassination and the reasons why.

John McCone, head of the CIA; Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York; Henry Luce; Carthe DeLouche; and E. Howard Hunt. Why are these names important? What are their relationships? And WHY would you point the finger at someone like the Archbishop of New York, Cardinal Spellman, of all people, to place the responsibility for the JFK assassination directly at the Vatican? How can you justify that?

Phelps: We know we're looking at a conspiracy, so we ask the question, again: Who benefits? Who benefited from the death of JFK? Well, we know, according to the works of the great Fletcher Prouty, JFK was going to end the Vietnam War in 1965. We also know that JFK was going to end the reign of the CIA, and all of their military, covert operations were going to be handed-over to the Army Chiefs of Staff. Therefore, the CIA benefited, and those who wanted the Vietnam War benefited.

We now must ask the question: Who wanted the Vietnam War? Well, we know that many factions did, but we see, openly and in our face, Cardinal Spellman wanted the Vietnam War. Cardinal Spellman's man in Vietnam was Diem. Diem was a fascist Roman Catholic, persecuting the Buddhists. And his brother was head of the Secret Police. So, Diem was Cardinal Spellman's man in Vietnam. Diem was assassinated because Kennedy withdrew the CIA representative out of Saigon.

The other thing is, Cardinal Spellman, throughout the Vietnam War, would travel over there at the war-front and he'd call the soldiers the "soldiers of Christ", according to Avro Manhattan, in his great work Vietnam: Why Did We Go? So, Cardinal Spellman wanted the Vietnam War, and if Cardinal Spellman wanted the Vietnam War, the Pope wanted the Vietnam War, and if the Pope wanted the Vietnam War, the Black Pope wanted the Vietnam War, the Jesuit General.

Martin: Who was?

Phelps: Jean Baptiste Janssens. He died in 1964. From 1964 to 1983 or so, it was Pedro Arrupe.

Martin: So you're saying that Janssens had an agenda.

Phelps: Jean Baptist Janssens had an agenda, and that agenda was to annihilate as many Buddhists as possible, because the Buddhists have always been the enemies of the Jesuits. When the Jesuits took Japan in 1873, what did they do? They outlawed, they made it so that the government of Japan would not support the Buddhist religion anymore. Buddhism has ceased to be the state religion. So they've always been the enemy of the Buddhists.

The other thing about the Vietnam War is that it created a \$220 billion dollar debt for the American people, and that debt was incurred by the Congress, who borrowed that money from the Jesuits' Federal Reserve Bank.

So the Jesuits made big money. They killed lots of "heretics". They preserved the CIA.

Because, remember: the CIA was initially founded and set-up by one particular man, Reinhard Gehlen, who was a Nazi General, who was Hitler's most sinister General. And so, he incorporated all of the Nazi intelligence apparatus into the CIA in the West. It was also incorporated into the KGB in the East. They were called "Freedom Fighters"; they were really working for the KGB, these SS, Nazi men. If the Jesuit General controlled the KGB, he controls the CIA.

Kennedy was getting in the way. Kennedy also did not want the voucher system for public schools, of which George Bush is a great promoter. The Vatican wants the American taxpayer to pay for Catholic schools because, remember, Roman Catholicism, left to itself, without government support, crumbles. It has nothing to offer. There is no freedom of speech, no freedom of press.

THE CATHOLIC PEOPLE DON'T OWN ONE SQUARE FOOT OF CHURCH PROPERTY. THEY DON'T OWN ONE BRICK OF THEIR CHURCHES. IT'S ALL OWNED BY THE HIERARCHY.

They are simply to obey their hierarchy, and in America that's not good enough. Catholic people don't want that in America. Catholic people, for the most part, enjoy freedom of press, and freedom of speech, and freedom to make a profit; all of those things the Vatican does not want. A case in point is all of South America and Central America.

Martin: Well, why do you think—other than the fact that there have been 100-200 people killed who knew anything about the JFK assassination—why do you think it's never come out?

Phelps: Because the American branch of the Knights of Malta, of which McCone was a member, Henry Luce was a member, William F. Buckley was a member, Lee Iacocca was a member, Cartha DeLoach of the FBI was a member, etc. They control the press! And they controlled CBS, at that time, with a man named Frank Shakespeare, who was a Knight of Malta. The Knights control ABC, CBS, and NBC, and Time/Life; that's why Time/Life attempted to destroy the Zapruder film.

I might also add, throughout the publication of "The Black Pope" interview we did back in May 2000, and my first two manuscripts since that time, there has not been one Roman Catholic who has emailed me, or attempted to contact me in any way, denying that Cardinal Spellman did this; not one. But we have several clandestine Jesuits who are in complete agreement, and who admit that this is exactly what was done.

Martin: Let me ask you about Opus Dei. We've been accused of hiding Opus Dei in the background as being the real power behind the Vatican, and therefore, the power over the Jesuits. Have we conspired to withhold the mention of Opus Dei in our discussions?

Phelps: No. Opus Dei is a subordinate organization to the Pope, who is in control of the Knights of Malta, and therefore there are Knights of Malta in Opus Dei.

The Jesuits control Opus Dei through the hierarchy of the Pope and through the Knights of Malta. Opus Dei is composed of prominent Roman Catholic businessmen and politicians who have given themselves over to "God's work"—that's what Opus Dei means—for making the Pope the Universal Monarch of the world, ruling the world from Solomon's rebuilt temple in Jerusalem.

An example of this is the former head of the FBI, Louis Freeh, was a member of Opus Dei.

And so, we now understand the Waco incident, where those White Protestants were killed; it was the work of the Opus Dei. And we also have to remember that the sharpshooter, one of them there, was a Japanese Roman Catholic, Lon Horiuchi.

But Opus Dei is determined to create a World Government under the Pope. Opus Dei was created in the 20th Century, whereas the Knights of Malta were created in the 11th Century, and the Jesuits were created in the 16th Century, in 1540, with Ignatius Loyola.

So, the super-secret society of the Jesuit Order, in control of the Knights of Malta, were in existence nearly 500 years before Opus Dei. Opus Dei, like the Knights of Columbus, is a subordinate organization to the Jesuit Order.

Martin: Ok, now that we have some of these things put temporarily to rest—until the book comes out!—let's talk about the present day.

There are a few things happening that everyone needs to be aware of and concerned about. I'll just mention a few countries, and then we can begin: Israel, Cuba, China, North Africa, and Japan. What's happening with our relationship with these countries? How are we going to be sucked-in to a conflict? And what are the ramifications going to be? Lines in the sand are being drawn, alliances are being created between powerful nations, and why should we be concerned about that?

That's a big question.

Phelps: That's a big question. I'll try to deal with a piece at a time, if I may.

I'm going to start with the 14th Amendment American Empire that was established in 1868 after the Jesuit Order destroyed the Federal Republic or the Confederate Republic of sovereign nation states that Washington established in 1789.

The Jesuits have used the 14th Amendment American Empire to restore the temporal power of the Pope over all nations around the world for the last 100 years. And that's why they have garrisoned American troops throughout the world. That's why they have laid upon us an iniquitous and sinful federal income tax, with which they finance these crusades around the world.

So, their American Empire has served them well in the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope around the world, especially over Orthodox Russia, Buddhist China, Buddhist Japan, South and Central America through the CIA; this is the purpose for the British and America Empires. They used the British Empire in the 19th Century to do this, and they used the American Empire in the 20th Century to do this. So they take the most powerful Protestant empires, and the wealthiest, harness their governments, and use such for their own purposes.

Alright, now that America has been used for its purpose, it is time to destroy it. And we must remember that America is the haven for the Jews of the world, which the Jesuits have accursed; it is the haven for Bible-believing Protestants, called "heretics", who the Jesuits have accursed; and it is the haven for peoples of many, many different races who simply want to have some liberty in life, which are called "liberals", which the Jesuits have accursed.

The United States is a refugee nation, made up of many, many nationalities now. We are no longer a White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant nation, as we were. We are composed of a host of different nationalities, with a host of religious beliefs, and thus this nation has been fragmented and agitated and is a disconcerted mess, with no real national purpose anymore.

The Jesuits have fired-up the Negro agitation of the Civil Rights Movement. They continue to fire that up with Hollywood, with such movies as *Roots*, etc.

They don't tell the whole story of Malcolm X. He was an agitator to begin with. When he came back from Mecca, he changed his story and denounced the Nation of Islam, along with the Ku Klux Klan, stating that "they both had the same paymasters". And he was absolutely right. They have agitated and broken apart this country, so we have no more national purpose.

The next thing that they've done, they've disarmed us. They've closed-down over 100 military bases. We have no domestic defense. The foreigners, the Mexicans come across the borders by the thousands, and the major corporations hire them, and they do their work for them, which is all illegal. It should be punished by law. But we have no punishment by law in this country anymore.

So we have the reign of crime. We have all of these illegal immigrants. We have the destruction of the White race. When this nation ceases to be White, it will cease to be great, because there is not a nation in the world that's a nation of color that can compete on the international scale of business and trade and commerce; they can't do it.

A nation that was once White, but is now a nation of color, is Cuba. Cuba used to be a prosperous, beautiful place, but now, with all the amalgamation and inter-racial marriage, it's 95% Black; it's under a Roman Catholic, Jesuit-trained Dictator named Fidel Castro; and it is a miserable place to live. And that is EXACTLY what this country is going to be like if it continues on the track it is now on.

The Jesuits have determined to destroy this American Empire that they have used for the last 100 years. So what they are doing now is, they are going to break apart the Empire.

And how are they doing this? Well, one of the things they've done is they've created this issue where an American submarine hit this Japanese fishing boat, killing all the Japanese on the boat, I believe, and the skipper was court-martialed. But nonetheless, it was a deliberate act of murder, because with that kind of technology on a submarine, you just don't hit a boat. And you just don't have some civilian driving the submarine either. That's ridiculous. So they are creating agitations with nations like Japan, with this incident.

They're creating deliberate agitation with nations like China, with the bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade. They're creating agitations with China, Japan, which will ultimately result in Japan and China uniting. With the military power of China, with the economic power of Japan—when already Hong Kong has been given to China, which now, because of that financial might, China is able to take control of the Panama Canal; they control the canal locks through Hutchen Wimpoa, a Chinese corporation. They are now building the largest shipping dock in the world in the Bahamas, owned by the Red Chinese. The Red Chinese now have the Long Beach Naval Station, which is now Cosco.

So they are in a position now to be able to establish a beach-head when they invade.

The thing is: Does China have the fleet to do it? No, China doesn't have the fleet right now to do it, but Russia does. Russia has the largest merchant marine fleet in the world. And we are very much deceived into thinking that China and Russia are enemies. They are not enemies; they work together. They are controlled by the same Jesuit Order. The Jesuits run Peking; they also run Moscow. They run the dictator of China and they run the dictator of Russia. It doesn't matter who he is. It doesn't matter what their names are. The Jesuits control them, and if they resist them, they're out! Just like in the United States.

So, they're breaking apart the American Empire. They're creating a huge coalition of Oriental nations for our invasion.

Now, let's talk about Africa. There are 700,000, as I understand it, Chinese troops in Somalia. Chuck Colson, one of the conspirators in the Kennedy assassination and the Watergate cover-up, is now the false Bible-believer, the false Protestant. He's working for the Jesuits because the head of his prison fellowship is a Roman Catholic.

Colson now is being used to try to get an American military force into the Sudan to save these Black Christians, who in fact are Black Roman Catholics. If that is accomplished, if that is done, we are now going to have a large military force in the Sudan, and there's a large military force in Somalia. What do you think it would take for those two military forces to clash?

And if those military forces clash, we will have an escalation in Africa, which I believe is what the Jesuits want. Because, if that happens, there can be a surgical strike into Jerusalem for the blowing-up of the Dome of the Rock. The Moslems, the Muftis, have known that was the intent of the Zionists for years, the blowing of the Dome of the Rock, so that Solomon's Temple can be rebuilt. And you can find this information in Pierre van Paassen's great work, written in 1939, called Days Of Our Years. So, with this coalition with the 14th Amendment American forces against the Chinese forces in Africa, this could happen.

Now, what would happen as a result of the destruction of the Dome of the Rock? Well, the Moslems regard the Dome of the Rock as the third most important holy place in their religion. They would call for a Jihad against "The Great Satan", the United States. And with a Jihad, a Holy War, against the United States, they would then go across Africa to West Africa. There will probably be a coalition of ships ready at that time, to be ferried across the Atlantic Ocean into Cuba. And Cuba will be the landing base, the staging base for the invasion of the Protestant American South, the last real Protestant bastion of liberty in the world.

Remember: according to the Koran, it is no murder to kill a Christian; in fact, it is a virtuous act.

So, here we'd have all of these Moslem troopers, millions of Moslem troopers will be landing in Miami, landing in New Orleans, landing in the South of the United States, coupled with a Cuban military force, coupled with, probably, also a Chinese military force coming from the West Coast, and coming up through the Panama Canal to unite with them in the attack of the American South. With the blood bath that will ensue, this whole coalition of nations: China, Russia, Cuba, the Arabs, they will carry out the destruction and annihilation of this North American population, WHICH INCLUDES CANADA; it definitely includes Canada.

It is for this reason, because the government is controlled by the Jesuits, the government of the United States is seeking our total disarmament and the abolition of all gun ownership. This is why the Jesuit Conference, for years, has been anti-gun-ownership, meaning handguns, rifles, and shotguns.

So, to have the American people completely disarmed, our military cut way down, we have no Navy any more, really, to speak of; we have no Army—it's a totally demoralized Army, with this forced integration; and we have Black supremacy in the Army.

I was there, in Germany, for 3 years. I watched it with my own eyes. So, we have a demoralized American Army that doesn't know what to fight.

Martin: Let me just jump-in here to say that Bush is beefing-up the military, reversing what was done previously by Clinton. How can you say we have a weak Army when we're about to spend billions beefing up our defenses? Is this just a show?

Phelps: That's just a show. Because the Jesuits who controlled Clinton are the same Jesuits who control Bush. And remember, we were already scaling-down with Carter and Reagan and Ford.

And so, this whole idea of re-armament, it might be for some super-system of preventing missiles from coming in, an anti-ballistic missile system, but that's ridiculous, because we know there is no such thing as universal nuclear war. We have no evidence that incoming nukes can detonate a specific target.

We don't know EXACTLY what transpired at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but they have contorted that into the hoax of thermo-nuclear war, which I do not believe can happen. Bruce Cathie doesn't believe it can happen; William Cooper doesn't believe it can happen;

and other physicists don't believe it can happen. Other physicists don't believe it's possible, which now limits us to a standing army of men who know how to fight, which we do not have. We don't have it anymore.

So, with all of these hordes of invaders coming in, and a disarmed population, it would be a piece of cake. Remember that Spain was invaded by 4 million Moslem troopers. They landed in the Canary Islands, and from the Canary Islands they then invaded Spain, and they were led by a Roman Catholic Archbishop who was backing Franco! This is in the 1930s.

If they did it in the '30s, won't they do it now? And if they used Moslems to kill Orthodox Serbians just recently, in the 1990s, wouldn't they use Moslems to kill Protestant Americans? If they used Moslems to kill Roman Catholic Spanish, wouldn't they do the same thing here? Sure they would. So that's what is happening in the United States.

Martin: What just happened in Europe with Bush going over there and theoretically being given a hard time by the European community? What do you see happening in Europe right now?

Phelps: Well, not believing the press is our first maxim of reading.

Remember, a unified Europe is a Vatican brainchild. That all originated with the Jesuits in the Vatican for the reuniting of the Holy Roman Empire, which our friend Leo Lehmann said is exactly what the Jesuits wanted in 1942—a reunited Holy Roman Empire with a Catholic Germany at it's core.

Martin: And you base all of your conclusions just on this one person?

Phelps: No, no, no, no—this is a certain topic, and he adds to the color we're given.

Martin: I know that, but I asked the question that way because not all of our readers will be aware of the extent of the bibliography supporting the contentions of your research in VATICAN ASSASSINS.

Phelps: Ok. The Jesuits want a unified Europe. The Bible-believers of England are greatly resisting it, but the Jesuit-controlled Tony Blair will, ultimately, bring England into that Union. And Bush is helping to co-ordinate that, because the Federal Reserve Bank, the largest bank in the world, is one of the greatest contributors, or players, in international trading.

Martin: Are you saying that Alan Greenspan is a pawn of the Jesuit Order?

Phelps: Absolutely. Alan Greenspan is a Masonic Jewish Zionist and a pawn of the Jesuit Order. And the Jesuits are very careful to have visible Jews at the head of the Federal Reserve System so they can blame all the evils of the Federal Reserve Bank on the Jews.

We're never told, for example, that the head, right now, of the most powerful Federal Reserve Bank—because there are 12 of them—in New York is a man named McDonough. He's an Irish Roman Catholic. He's a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. He's a friend, a bosom-buddy of O'Hare, who is the President and Jesuit of the 4th Vow of Fordham University.

Why are we not told that about the Federal Reserve Bank? It's always Jews, Jews, Jews. Jews are just pawns. They've always been the bankers for the Pope. The Masonic Jewish bankers are the bankers for the Pope. And before the Rothschild's, it was the Fuggers.

Martin: Who are the College of Cardinals who choose the Pope?

Phelps: The College of Cardinals is REALLY the Roman Senate. The Pope is really the Caesar. And so this military Caesar is elected by Roman Senators, as to who will be their leader for World Government under the 7th Roman Caesar, who's yet to come. And so, the ones who do the electing are the Cardinals.

Martin: Now, those who see the current Pope see a very frail man. Has he served well? Is that why he's been allowed to stay on so long?

Phelps: He's done very well. He's served the Jesuit Order perfectly. This supposed rift between him and Arrupe, and suppressing the Jesuits with their Liberation Theology in Central America, is all for public consumption. That Pope is completely emasculated with regard to the power of the Jesuit Order.

The Jesuit Order has proven its power with the Napoleonic Wars, the killing of Pope Pius VI, the imprisoning of Pius VII, the restoration by Pius VII.

THE JESUIT ORDER IS OMNIPOTENT WHEN IT COMES TO THE PAPACY, AND THEY ARE THE ONES IN POWER.

Just like Hitler fashioned his Third Reich around the Papacy, the Secret Police or the SS were modeled after the Jesuits, and the Jesuits are the Secret Police of the Vatican Empire. They keep things in order. Without the Jesuit Order, the Vatican and the Papacy and the hierarchy would fall apart.

Martin: Who issued the Papal Bull suppressing the Jesuit Order?

Phelps: Pope Clement XIV.

Martin: Let's talk about that.

Phelps: Pope Clement XIV was a Franciscan. His name was Ganganelli. He was elected Pope due to the influence of the Bourbon monarchs—the Bourbon King of Spain, the Bourbon King of France, and the Braganzas of Portugal. Those insisted that a Pope would be brought to power who would suppress the Jesuit Order, because the Jesuits were busy making billions in South America, and never gave a dime to the Portuguese King and the Spanish King.

Martin: How were they making money in South America?

Phelps: They were making money in South America with their Reductions.

Martin: What are Reductions?

Phelps: Reductions are like communes; they're like a Kibbutz in Israel or a commune in Russia.

Martin: And what years are we talking about.

Phelps: We're talking between 1600-1750, roughly 150 years of these Reductions, where these Garani Indians were putting hides and tallow and clocks and the Paraguay herb and many, many commodities into international shipping and trade—which the Jesuits shipped all around the world with their "Black Ships", and had HUGE commercial profits with which they started banks in Europe and then funded wars. And one of the projects that they funded were the Napoleonic Wars.

Martin: This Pope, Ganganelli, suppressed the Jesuits with a Papal Bull?

Phelps: That's right. Dominus Ac Redemptor. That was the Bull. That is its formal name.

Martin: What is a Bull?

Phelps: A Bull is a legal document that the Pope speaks within his most powerful method of speaking. It's sealed with "the seal of the fishman". A "brief" does not have that seal. A brief is a less powerful document; it can be overruled with a Bull.

Martin: So, this Pope, in 1773, issued the Bull eliminating the Jesuit Order forever?

Phelps: Forever! After a 4-year investigation of all their intrigues, of all their power, of all their wealth, of all their buildings, everything, after a 4-year investigation they were abolished by Clement XIV. And, remember, Clement XIII was about to do the same thing when, the night before, he was poisoned.

So, Clement XIV was brought to power then and, after a 4-year investigation, he suppresses them. And when he did so, he said: "This suppression will be my death."

Martin: And it was.

Phelps: And it was—14 months later, he died. He was poisoned by the Jesuits with a poison called Aquetta.

It's a slow poison that caused his intestines to have terrible, terrible pain. And when he was embalmed, the intestines exploded and they could not have an open-casket for viewing this Pope. The flesh fell off of his fingers; his fingernails turned black; his skin turned black; all his hair fell out; so they decided they could not have an open display of the Pope in his garb. So they had a closed casket.

Martin: So, this Papal Bull, which was a PERMANENT dismantling of the Jesuit Order, was later overruled?

Phelps: Right.

Martin: Now, how can a permanent disbanding of the Order be overruled at all?

Phelps: The Jesuits came out and said this was not a Bull. Even though, according to Thompson in his *Footprints Of The Jesuits*, and according to Cusack's *The Black Pope*, even though they said it was a Bull, and Thompson said it was in the Library of the Bulls in Rome, even though it's a Bull, the Jesuits came out and said it was a brief. And, therefore, Pope Pius VII, upon their restoration, he instituted a Bull restoring the Jesuits, which "overruled the brief". That's what they teach.

BUT THE FACT IS, THEIR SUPPRESSION WAS A BULL, AND THEIR [contrived] RESTORATION WAS A BULL.

Martin: Ok, we're jumping all over the place here, but we're just going to go with the flow. How did the Jesuits, in England, issue their instructions to the Queen? Where is their seat of power in England, specifically?

Phelps: I believe their seat of power in England is Stonyhurst University. An English Lord, Thomas Well, gives Stoneyhurst to the Jesuits in, I believe, 1795—about the time of the French Revolution and just before the Napoleonic Wars.

Stonyhurst became their seat, their fortress from which they would control England. And they were brought into England and helped at that by King George III. King George was the bosom-buddy of the Jesuits. And the English monarchs have been their bosom-buddy ever since. King George reigned for quite a few years; I believe he reigned for nearly 40 years. And Victoria enjoyed the very same thing; she ruled from 1837-1901.

So, through the rule of George and Victoria, they completely controlled England through Stonyhurst. Today they run England through the Royal Institute for International Affairs. And the Cardinal, who they rule through, is the Archbishop of Westminster.

So, they have the Archbishop of Westminster in England, and they have the Archbishop of New York in the United States. They rule England through Stonyhurst. They rule the United States through Georgetown and Fordham. They rule England through the Royal Institute for International Affairs. They rule the United States through the Council on Foreign Relations.

It's an identical system in both countries because it is an Empire. It is a Vatican Empire. That's how they rule.

In Russia, they rule Moscow through the Patriarch of the Armenian Church. So, the Patriarch is like the Archbishop in London and New York. And it's the Patriarch, there in Moscow, who oversees the KGB and the inquisition there, called the gulag. Agagianian was the Patriarch who was appointed a Cardinal by Pope Pius XII, the very same year, 1946, that Cardinal Spellman was made Cardinal for the American Empire.

Martin: How does the Mafia figure into all of this?

Phelps: The Mafia is run by Italian Roman Catholics, Sicilians primarily. And the Mafia takes care of all organized crime. They took care of the booze, before it was legalized. They took care of prostitution, the drug running, gun running, all the crime is organized by the Vatican, through the Mafia families—the five Mafia families of New York.

It's interesting that the Mafia Commission out of New York is in the same location, and not far from, the Archbishop of New York. So the Archbishop is very close to his mob bosses.

Spellman used his mob bosses in the invasion of Sicily, using Lucky Luciano, called Operation Underworld. Here's Spellman working with Lucky Luciano for a "successful Naval invasion" of Sicily, for which reason he is influential and causes the release of Lucky Luciano in 1946 to go back to Italy. So we have the relationship of Cardinal Spellman and the mob. And if Cardinal Spellman had that power, every Cardinal afterward has the same power. They don't lose any power.

Now, one of the most obvious connections between the Archbishop of New York and the mob is Frank Sinatra. Frank Sinatra was a good bosom friend with Gambino. Gambino was murdered with a vaccination, with a flu shot. They wanted him out of the way, so they murdered him with a flu shot. Frank Sinatra was also a Knight of Malta, who is subject, then, to the Archbishop of New York. So, you have the Archbishop controlling the Knights of Malta. Frank Sinatra is one of them, and Frank Sinatra is a good friend of a mafia don.

Martin: Let's talk about Princess Diana. Do you think the Jesuits were behind her take-out?

Phelps: Absolutely, because the Jesuits control the British Secret Service.

Martin: Let's talk about Princess Diana. Why was she a threat to the Jesuits?

Phelps: She was a threat in that if she had married a Moslem, Dodi Fayed, that would have overturned the Throne of England, because she still had rights through her children. Because her sons would one day occupy the British throne, and if she is alive with a Moslem Prince as a husband, we have a problem in England. Because everybody knows that the Queen Mother, really, has a lot of control over the King. And there would have been an Islamic, Arab influence on the Queen, who would influence her son, who would be King, who is now Prince.

Martin: So you think that the powers that be, within the Jesuit Order, knew that she was pregnant with Dodi's child?

Phelps: I believe so; and that's why they got rid of her—absolutely. And they sent a message to all the other British nobility by saying: "If you do this, we're going to do the same thing to you." Furthermore, they buried her in the cemetery, on the Windsor property, where only dogs are buried. She's buried with dogs.

Martin: What kind of symbolism is that?

Phelps: Because she was a "Moslem dog" in their eyes.

Martin: In the recent June, 2001 issue of *The SPECTRUM*, we shared an article from Sherman Skolnick in which he not only mentions the Jesuits, but he talks about the incredible financial influence, and power, and control in California and elsewhere by the Japanese Mafia, called the Yakuza. Is there any relationship between the Yakuza and the Jesuits?

Phelps: Absolutely. The Jesuits control the Yakuza. To understand this, we have to go back in the history of Japan. Japan had, wonderfully and righteously, expelled the Jesuits from their Empire around 1619, give or take a few years. The Jesuits were forbidden to ever enter Japan!

The Japanese, then, kicked-out the Portuguese; they kicked-out the Spanish. The only ones who could ever trade with Japan were the Dutch, the Protestant Dutch. Well, when the Jesuits were beginning to get control of our country, they got control of Polk. And Polk was responsible for the sending of Commodore Perry to Japan.

Martin: What year?

Phelps: 1853-1854. He then opens up Japan to international trade. So now "foreigners" can enter into Japan. Foreigners then began an agitation and a revolution in Japan. The reigning Emperor of Japan, who was a young man about 35, wanted to get rid of the Jesuits and these foreign powers, so he was assassinated.

According to Ryu Ohta, my friend in Japan, the Japanese had been taught that he was killed by Sassoon House—the Jews. But the Emperor was really killed by the Jesuits, because the son of this Emperor later went on to rule Japan from 1873 to 1912, and this Emperor was the grandfather to Hirohito.

This Emperor was a young boy at the time he came to power. He ruled for all those years. The Jesuits during that time dis-established the Buddhists as a state religion, and made tremendous inroads in power in Japan, controlling the Dynasty, because they were going to use Japan to foment a war with the United States for the purpose of eliminating as much Buddhism as they could from the Far East, and weakening the American Protestants, and many other purposes, such as killing off Protestant missionaries in the Far East—whereas the Japanese Army never persecuted the Catholic missionaries. And this is according to the Jesuits' own magazine *America*, written and published in 1943 or 1944.

This is where the Jesuits got their power over the Emperor, and thus the Yakuza. So now, the Jesuits have that power, they maintain that power. They maintained power over Hirohito. And thus, they have power over the Yakuza today, in Japan and California.

Martin: There was a book written many years ago called Tai Pan. Now, would a Tai Pan, symbolically, be the equivalent of the Black Pope?

Phelps: Sure. It's a Secret Society. It's a Japanese Secret Society that really rules.

Martin: Theoretically they would rule independently.

Phelps: They rule together with the Monarch.

Martin: Which would be the real Black Pope?

Phelps: The Black Pope. Remember, the Black Pope is in control of the Monarch of Japan.

Martin: We need to explain to our readers that the Jesuit Order is NOT a religious order, it is a MILITARY ORDER.

Phelps: It is a military order. When they dawn religious garb to get into a country to talk about Christ and God and so forth, they really want to capture the power and wealth of every country, to submit every country to the temporal, Earthly, political power of the Pope.

Martin: I don't want to get too far off-subject here, but would you say "As with the Jews, so with the Yakuza"?

Phelps: Correct. As with the Masonic Jewish Zionists, so with the Masonic Yakuza. They're all Masonic. Masonry unites all religions into one.

Martin: And behind the scenes the Jesuits are pulling the strings?

Phelps: Pulling the strings because they wrote all of the Masonic rites.

Martin: For our Masonic scholars out there, on what do you base that?

Phelps: We know that, according to several citations I reference in the book VATICAN ASSASSINS, the Jesuits wrote the first 25 degrees of the Scottish Rite Freemasonry, from the College of Clermont, which was changed to the College of Louis LeGrand, in Paris, France.

Martin: What year?

Phelps: 1754. That is a fact. The Jesuits wrote those rites.

Martin: Do you have any names behind that?

Phelps: Oh, I believe Chevalier Ramsey was, Chevalier de Bonneville was one. Remember the Bonneville automobile, and Pontiac? Those were Jesuits. And we have Adam Weishaupt, who was a Jesuit, who was a Mason. And it was the Rothschild Luciferians. So we have many dovetails of the Jesuits being Freemasons.

And we know, according to our hero Alberto Rivera, that Pedro Arrupe was a Mason, and Pedro Arrupe was a Jesuit General. Pedro Arrupe was a Mason AND in the Communist Party of Spain when he was a Jesuit General.

So, we also know that the Jesuits were involved in the writing of the last 8 degrees of Scottish Rite Freemasonry, with Fredrick the Great in Prussia, while Fredrick protected the Jesuits and gave them the ability to live in his country, while they were being suppressed by the Pope.

Martin: Let's circle back around to the Yakuza. According to Skolnick, the Yakuza own many, many businesses in this country, many, many banks are owned and controlled in California and elsewhere by the Yakuza. Now, are you saying that's just a front?

Phelps: They're just a front, like any other Mafia, like the Italian Mafia, which is the foremost Mafia in organized crime.

Martin: Which J. Edgar Hoover said "Didn't exist."!

Phelps: Which he said didn't exist. It's all baloney. It is just a front. They hold the property, they hold the money for the Vatican.

Martin: So the Yakuza would be the 3rd trusted party that we talked about?

Phelps: That's right, they're the 3rd trusted party. And I tend to also believe that there is some kind of hand involved in the murder of Bruce Lee with this. Bruce Lee was not going along with the Catholic Church.

Martin: And he was giving away secrets.

Phelps: He was giving away martial arts secrets, and so on, and he was not going along with the Vatican. Remember, he had a rift with Hollywood, and most of his films were made in Hong Kong.

Martin: And his son was also killed not long ago.

Phelps: His son was then killed on a movie-making set also. So his son knew something. And evidently, just like Jackie Kennedy, Linda Lee doesn't open her mouth. So there are two murders here that the Secret Societies are involved in.

Martin: You don't talk too much about Bobby Kennedy. Has your research uncovered any names behind Bobby Kennedy's assassination?

Phelps: Well, we know that Officer Thane Eugene Cesar really pulled the trigger, shot him in the back of the head with a twenty-two. And Officer Cesar was an employee for Lockheed Corporation. The Jesuits, according to Avro Manhattan, control Lockheed.

So, just as Lee Iacocca dispatches his security chief to drive the bullet-ridden limousine of Kennedy from Washington to Cincinnati to get repaired, even so, some Knight of Malta in charge of Lockheed Corporation, I don't know who it was, dispatches Officer Cesar to be a guard of Robert F. Kennedy—who then, in turn, shoots and kills him. And Sirhan was a scapegoat, just like Oswald was a scapegoat.

Martin: What do you have to say about Earl Warren?

Phelps: Earl Warren was in the hands of the Jesuits when he was the governor of California. Earl Warren was one of the sinister individuals behind that evil and terrible Japanese concentration camp system. That was his brainchild. He was behind the anti-Jap agitation in World War II.

The Japanese are decent, law-abiding, peaceful people, for the most part. They had all their farms taken from them. They were in control of all of the produce, and they had it all stolen from them by Roman Catholic, Knight of Malta-controlled corporations—just as was done to the American Indian. They went into their burial grounds and stole all their gold, and used their missions to send it back to Rome.

So, Earl Warren was a part of this. He was a good boy, so they named him and put him on the Supreme Court. He was the Chief Justice.

He was a 33rd-degree Freemason involved in the Kennedy assassination, forced amalgamation, forced race-mixing with the Supreme Court decision in 1966, forced integration with the Brown vs. The Board Of Education in 1954.

Martin: I'm going to ask you now a very important question, one that will be on the minds of many people: Why should our readers not feel that you are merely substituting the word JESUITS for JEWS in terms of fomenting hatred and animosity toward Jesuit people? Why is that not so?

Phelps: Well, first of all, there's a tremendous difference between the Jesuit Order and the Jewish race.

We don't know exactly who the Jewish race is. I sure don't know. I think only God knows who it is. But it's a civilization of people who are engaged in commerce and trade, and they have cultures, they have communities.

Jesuits are an army. They're soldiers. They're under oath. When you become professed of the 4th Degree, they give you The Secret Instructions.

According to another gentleman, he says there's a degree beyond the 4th Degree, where it's absolute Luciferianism. This is according to Jim Arrabito, who died mysteriously in a plane crash in Alaska on September 2, 1990. Jim Arrabito was one of the chief guys in the Seventh Day Adventists, and he was a master of Jesuit history. You can get his videos, *Secrets Of The Jesuits*, from L.L.M. Productions.

But anyway, the difference between the Jews and the Jesuits is strictly—one is a people, and one is an Order determined to subvert all nations to the jurisdiction of the Pope.

And, in light of the documents that I provide with the book version of *VATICAN ASSASSINS*—I have over 4,000 pages on CD-ROM, with four distinct different histories showing the history of the Order—that's exactly what they were doing then, and that's exactly what they're doing now.

Martin: So what's different about what you're saying? Rather than just being another wild conspiracy theory, it's your position that you've really proven that this is a fact, and not fantasy?

Phelps: Other men have proven the fact. I just reiterate what they've said.

If you read *The Black Pope*, by Cusack, she says the very same thing. She was a nun, a converted nun to Christ in 1896.

Martin: And why is she so important?

Phelps: Because she was a nun intimately involved with priests, and especially Jesuits, prior to her conversion to Christ. She would know; she was on the inside.

Martin: Why is that book so important?

Phelps: Because it has been suppressed and stolen out of every library in the world! There is only one in existence that I know of, that's publicly accessible, and that is in the British Museum.

It's also accessible on the CD-ROM included with the book *VATICAN ASSASSINS*, for those of your readers who would like it. But, other than that, it's a suppressed document. Griesinger, Thompson, Cusack, Nicolini—those are the four major histories of the Jesuit Order, and all four are on the CD-ROM [along with a number of other rare and otherwise “missing” research documents].

Martin: So you're saying that the time-lines that you put forth, and the conclusions that you draw, are really based on historical experts over the last two centuries? This is not just your position?

Phelps: Absolutely. I'm standing on the shoulders of giants, as a little cricket. These people are brilliant and Godly. Nicolini, an Italian Roman Catholic, converted to Christ, involved in the Italian Revolution of 1848, had to flee for his life, was in exile in England, and there he wrote his great *History Of The Jesuits*, warning England that if the Jesuits sought to destroy England under Elizabeth, they would surely do the same thing under Victoria.

Martin: And they have.

Phelps: And they have. We have the great Theodor Griesinger, who was the great German who wrote *The Jesuits* as a history told by the German people—823 pages of meticulous documentation of all their doings in all the countries. And he was the one, I learned, who said the Jesuits could very well be planning a second Thirty-Years War, another Thirty-Years War. And he wrote that, the second edition was in 1873.

[Editor's note: And remember that the second bloody and diabolical “Thirty-Years War” did indeed happen, between 1914 and 1945, as Eric mentioned earlier in this interview in conjunction with financing it through the setting up of the Federal Reserve Bank fraud.]

So, these learned people have made quite clear and quite evident the purpose and power of the Jesuit Order.

We haven't had anybody in the 20th Century write an extensive history of what they've accomplished from 1900-2000. I would hope that somebody who knows these histories, who knows grammar and spelling and is able to write nice prose (unlike myself) would be able to do this, and write a real modern history of this. Ridpath came close to it, but he ended his work in the mid-1850s, with his Ridpath's Universal History [Of The World]. We have not had a significant historian do this modern work for us.

Martin: And why is that?

Phelps: Because these Jesuits have all these colleges and universities bought and paid for! And these universities won't get grants if they start to expose the Jesuit Order.

Now, with all these "hate crime" laws, anything truthfully said about the Jesuit Order will generate attempts to contort it into some kind of a hate crime, which is NOT what we're doing. We are merely telling the truth.

Martin: What is your solution to the Jesuit problem in America? What would you like to see, ultimately, happen in this country?

Phelps: In this country, what I would like to see happen is exactly what happened in England in the 16th Century, when several Jesuits left the Order. They were intelligent, powerful Jesuits, involved in the conspiracy to overthrow England.

They told the powers-that-be about what they were supposed to do, and as a result, the government of England expelled the Jesuits from their dominions, because they were regarded as traitors and conspirators in the overthrow of legitimate government—of self-rule, of nationalism; a country should be ruled by its own people.

The solution here would be the expulsion of the Jesuit Order, that they would be outlawed and banned.

There would be period of grace where certain Jesuits could come forward, tell what they know. But why would the Jesuits want to do that when this government is controlled by the Council on Foreign Relations, which is controlled by the Jesuits? The government is controlled by the Jesuits through the mob and high-level Freemasonry.

Martin: Proposing the expulsion of the Jesuits, the difference between that and racial persecution, such as with the Jews, yours is based on treason, which is a lawful conclusion based on your research concerning what their true aims and objectives are—namely, the overthrow of this government.

Phelps: The usurping of this government, the controlling of this government for their own purposes. And then using this government, with a coalition of other governments they control, for the annihilation of the "heretic" and "liberal" population of this country, pursuant to the Council of Trent, that every Pope swears upon his coronation to uphold.

Martin: Thank you so much for taking this time to clarify these many points about the Jesuit Order. Our readers will really appreciate this as you offer much food for both thought AND action!

Note: The following is extracted from the July 10, 2001 issue of The SPECTRUM newspaper. Permission is hereby granted to anyone to quote The SPECTRUM in whole or in part, so long as full credit of this source is given, including contacting address and phone number. The SPECTRUM, P.O. Box 1567, Tehachapi, CA 93581; phone: 1-877-280-2866 toll-free; and see our www.TheSpectrumNews.org website.

NOTE: On the second ballot of the thirty-fifth General Congregation (GCXXXV) of the Society of Jesus, Adolfo Nicolás was elected as the Order's thirtieth Superior General on January 19, 2008, succeeding the Dutch Fr. Peter Hans Kolvenbach. His election was immediately relayed to Pope Benedict XVI, who confirmed him in the post.

THE PROTOCOLS OF THE LEARNED ELDERS OF ZION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface
Introduction
Who are the Elders?

Protocol I	The Basic Doctrine
Protocol II	Economic Wars
Protocol III	Methods of Conquest
Protocol IV	Materialism Replace Religion
Protocol V	Despotism and Modern Progress
Protocol VI	Take-Over Technique
Protocol VII	World-Wide Wars
Protocol VIII	Provisional Government
Protocol IX	Re-education
Protocol X	Preparing for Power
Protocol XI	The Totalitarian State
Protocol XII	Control of the Press
Protocol XIII	Distractions
Protocol XIV	Assault on Religion
Protocol XV	Ruthless Suppression
Protocol XVI	Brainwashing
Protocol XVII	Abuse of Authority
Protocol XVIII	Arrest of Opponents
Protocol XIX	Rulers and People
Protocol XX	Financial Programme
Protocol XXI	Loans and Credit
Protocol XXII	Power of Gold
Protocol XXIII	Instilling Obedience
Protocol XXIV	Qualities of the Ruler

PREFACE

(Translated by Victor E. Marsden)

The author of this translation of the famous Protocols was himself a victim of the Revolution. He had lived for many years in Russia and was married to a Russian lady. Among his other activities in Russia he had been for a number of years a Russian Correspondent of the **MORNING POST**, a position which he occupied when the Revolution broke out, and his vivid descriptions of events in Russia will still be in the recollection of many of the readers of that Journal. Naturally he was singled out for the anger of the Soviet.

On the day that Captain Cromie was murdered by Jews, Victor Marsden was arrested and thrown into the Peter-Paul Prison, expecting every day to have his name called out for execution. This, however, he escaped, and eventually he was allowed to return to England very much of a wreck in bodily health. However, he recovered under treatment and the devoted care of his wife and friends. One of the first things he undertook, as soon as he was able, was this translation of the Protocols.

Mr. Marsden was eminently well qualified for the work. His intimate acquaintance with Russia, Russian life and the Russian language on the one hand, and his mastery of a terse literary English style on the other, placed him in a position of advantage which few others could claim. The consequence is that we have in his version an eminently readable work, and though the subject-matter is somewhat formless, Mr. Marsden's literary touch reveals the thread running through the twenty-four Protocols. It may be said with truth that this work was carried out at the cost of Mr. Marsden's own life's blood.

He told the writer of this Preface that he could not stand more than an hour at a time of his work on it in the British Museum, as the diabolical spirit of the matter which he was obliged to turn into English made him positively ill.

Mr. Marsden's connection with the **MORNING POST** was not severed by his return to England, and he was well enough to accept the post of special correspondent of that journal in the suite of H.R.H., the Prince of Wales on his Empire tour. From this he returned with the Prince, apparently in much better health, but within a few days of his landing he was taken suddenly ill, and died after a very brief illness.

May this work be his crowning monument! In it he has performed an immense service to the English-speaking world, and there can be little doubt that it will take its place in the first rank of the English versions of "THE PROTOCOLS of the Meetings of the **LEARNED ELDERS OF ZION**."

INTRODUCTION

Of the Protocols themselves little need be said in the way of introduction. The book in which they are embodied was published by Sergyei Nilus in Russia in 1905. A copy of this is in the British Museum bearing the date of its reception, August 10, 1906. All copies that were known to exist in Russia were destroyed in the Kerensky regime, and under his successors the possession of a copy by anyone in Soviet land was a crime sufficient to ensure the owner's of being shot on sight. The fact is in itself sufficient proof of the genuineness of the Protocols. The Jewish journals, of course, say that they are a forgery, leaving it to be understood that Professor Nilus, who embodied them in a work of his own, had concocted them for his own purposes.

Mr. Henry Ford, in an interview published in the **New York WORLD**, February 17th, 1921, put the case for Nilus tersely and convincingly thus: "The only statement I care to make about the **PROTOCOLS** is that they fit

in with what is going on. They are sixteen years old, and they have fitted the world situation up to this time. **THEY FIT IT NOW.**" Indeed they do!

The word "Protocol" signifies a precis gummed on to the front of a document, a draft of a document, minutes of proceedings. In this instance, "Protocol" means minutes of the proceedings of the Meetings of the Learned Elders of Zion. These Protocols give the substance of addresses delivered to the innermost circle of the Rulers of Zion. They reveal the converted plan of action of the Jewish Nation developed through the ages and edited by the Elders themselves up to date. Parts and summaries of the plan have been published from time to time during the centuries as the secrets of the Elders have leaked out.

The claim of the Jews that the Protocols are forgeries is in itself an admission of their genuineness, for they **NEVER ATTEMPT TO ANSWER THE FACTS** corresponding to the **THREATS** which the Protocols contain, and, indeed, the correspondence between prophecy and fulfillment is too glaring to be set aside or obscured. This the Jews well know and therefore evade.

The presumption is strong that the Protocols were issued, or reissued, at the First Zionist Congress held at Basle in 1897 under the presidency of the Father of Modern Zionism, the late Theodore Herzl. There has been recently published a volume of Herzl's "Diaries," a translation of some passages which appeared in the **JEWISH CHRONICLE** of July 14, 1922.

Herzl gives an account of his first visit to England in 1895, and his conversation with Colonel Goldsmid, a Jew brought up as a Christian, an officer in the English Army, and at heart a Jew Nationalist all the time. Goldsmid suggested to Herzl that the best way of expropriating the English aristocracy, and so destroying their power to protect the people of England against Jew domination, was to put excessive taxes on the land. Herzl thought this an excellent idea, and it is now to be found definitely embodied in Protocol VI!

The above extract from Herzl's **DIARY** is an extremely significant bit of evidence bearing on the existence of the Jew World Plot and authenticity of the Protocols, but any reader of intelligence will be able from his own knowledge of recent history and from his own experience to confirm the genuineness of every line of them, and it is in the light of this **LIVING** comment that all readers are invited to study Mr. Marsden's translation of this terribly inhuman document. And here is another very significant circumstance.

The present successor of Herzl, as leader of the Zionist movement, Dr. Weizmann, quoted one of these sayings at the send-off banquet given to Chief Rabbi Hertz on October 6, 1920. The Chief Rabbi was on the point of leaving for HIS Empire tour of H.R.H., the Prince of Wales. And this is the "saying" of the Sages which Dr. Weizmann quoted: "A beneficent protection which God has instituted in the life of the Jew is that He has dispersed him all over the world." (**JEWISH GUARDIAN**, Oct. 8, 1920.) Now compare this with the last clause of but one of Protocol XI. "God has granted to us, His Chosen People, the gift of dispersion, and from this, which appears to all eyes to be our weakness, has come forth all our strength, which has now brought us to the threshold of sovereignty over all the world."

The remarkable correspondence between these passages proves several things. It proves that the Learned Elders exist. It proves that Dr. Weizmann knows all about them. It proves that the desire for a "National Home" in Palestine is only camouflage and an infinitesimal part of the Jew's real object. It proves that the Jews of the world have no intention of settling in Palestine or any separate country, and that their annual prayer that they may all meet "Next Year in Jerusalem" is merely a piece of their characteristic make-believe. It also demonstrates that the Jews are now a world menace, and that the Aryan races will have to domicile them permanently out of Europe..

WHO ARE THE ELDERS?

This is a secret which has not been revealed. They are the Hidden hand. They are not the "Board of Deputies" (the Jewish Parliament in England) or the "Universal Israelite Alliance" which sits in Paris. But the late Walter Rathenau of the Allgemeiner Electricitaets Gesellschaft has thrown a little light on the subject and doubtless he was in possession of their names, being, in all likelihood, one of the chief leaders himself. Writing in the WIENER FREIE PRESSE, December 24, 1912, he said: "Three hundred men, each of whom knows all the others, govern the fate of the European continent, and they elect their successors from their entourage."

In the year 1844, on the eve of the Jewish Revolution of 1848, Benjamin Disraeli, whose real name was Israel, and who was a "damped," or baptized Jew, published his novel, CONINGSBY, in which occurs this ominous passage: "The world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes." And he went on to show that these personages were all Jews.

Now that Providence has brought to the light of day these secret Protocols all men may clearly see the hidden personages specified by Disraeli at work "behind the scenes" of all the Governments. This revelation entails on all white peoples the grave responsibility of examining and revising AU FOND their attitude towards the Race and Nation which boasts of its survival over all Empires.

Notes I. - "Agentur" and "The Political." There are two words in this translation which are unusual, the word "AGENTUR" and "political" used as a substantive, AGENTUR appears to be a word adopted from the original and it means the whole body of agents and agencies made use of by the Elders, whether members of the tribe or their Gentile tools. By "the Political" Mr. Marsden means, not exactly the "body politic" but the entire machinery of politics.

Notes II - The Symbolic Snake of Judaism. Protocol III opens with a reference to the Symbolic Snake of Judaism. In his Epilogue to the 1905 Edition of the Protocols, Nilus gives the following interesting account of this symbol: "According to the records of secret Jewish Zionism, Solomon and other Jewish learned men already, in 929 B.C., thought out a scheme in theory for a peaceful conquest of the whole universe by Zion.

As history developed, this scheme was worked out in detail and completed by men who were subsequently initiated in this question. These learned men decided by peaceful means to conquer the world for Zion with the slyness of the Symbolic Snake, whose head was to represent those who have been initiated into the plans of the Jewish administration, and the body of the Snake to represent the Jewish people - the administration was always kept secret, EVEN FROM THE JEWISH NATION ITSELF. As this Snake penetrated into the hearts of the nations which it encountered it undermined and devoured all the non-Jewish power of these States.

It is foretold that the Snake has still to finish its work, strictly adhering to the designed plan, until the course which it has to run is closed by the return of its head to Zion and until, by this means, the Snake has completed its round of Europe and has encircled it - and until, by dint of enchaining Europe, it has encompassed the whole world. This it is to accomplish by using every endeavor to subdue the other countries by an ECONOMIC CONQUEST.

The return of the head of the Snake to Zion can only be accomplished after the power of all the Sovereign of Europe has been laid low, that is to say, when by means of economic crises and wholesale destruction effected everywhere, there shall have been brought about a spiritual demoralization and a moral corruption, chiefly with the assistance of Jewish women masquerading as French, Italians, etc.. These are the surest spreaders of licentiousness into the lives of the leading men at the heads of nations.

A map of the course of the Symbolic Snake is shown as follows: - Its first stage in Europe was in 429 B.C. in Greece, where, about the time of Pericles, the Snake first started eating into the power of that country. The second stage was in Rome in the time of Augustus, about 69 B.C.. The third in Madrid in the time of Charles V, in A.D. 1552. The fourth in Paris about 1790, in the time of Louis XVI. The fifth in London from 1814 onwards (after the downfall of Napoleon). The sixth in Berlin in 1871 after the Franco-Prussian war. The seventh in St. Petersburg, over which is drawn the head of the Snake under the date of 1881. [This "Snake" is now being drawn through the Americas and in the United States of America, it is been partially identified as the "Counsel on Foreign Relations" (C.F.R.) and the "Tri-Lateral Commission"].

All these States which the Snake traversed have had the foundations of their constitutions shaken, Germany, with its apparent power, forming no exception to the rule. In economic conditions, England and Germany are spared, but only till the conquest of Russia is accomplished by the Snake, on which at present [i.e., 1905] all its efforts are concentrated. The further course of the Snake is not shown on this map, but arrows indicate its next movement towards Moscow, Kieft and Odessa. It is now well known to us to what extent the latter cities form the centuries of the militant Jewish race. Constantinople is shown as the last stage of the Snake's course before it reaches Jerusalem. (This map was drawn years before the occurrence of the "Young Turk" - i.e., Jewish - Revolution in Turkey). den.

Notes III. - The term "Goyim," meaning Gentile or non-Jews, is used throughout the Protocols and is retained by Mr. Mars.

PROTOCOLS OF THE MEETINGS OF THE LEARNED ELDERS OF ZION

PROTOCOL No. 1

1.Putting aside fine phrases we shall speak of the significance of each thought: by comparisons and deductions we shall throw light upon surrounding facts.

2. What I am about to set forth, then, is our system from the two points of view, that of ourselves and that of the GOYIM [i.e., non- Jews].

3. It must be noted that men with bad instincts are more in number than the good, and therefore the best results in governing them are attained by violence and terrorization, and not by academic discussions. Every man aims at power, everyone would like to become a dictator if only he could, and rare indeed are the men who would not be willing to sacrifice the welfare of all for the sake of securing their own welfare.

4. What has restrained the beasts of prey who are called men? What has served for their guidance hitherto?

5. In the beginnings of the structure of society, they were subjected to brutal and blind force; after words - to Law, which is the same force, only disguised. I draw the conclusion that by the law of nature right lies in force.

6. Political freedom is an idea but not a fact. This idea one must know how to apply whenever it appears necessary with this bait of an idea to attract the masses of the people to one's party for the purpose of crushing another who is in authority. This task is rendered easier of the opponent has himself been infected with the idea

of freedom, SO-CALLED LIBERALISM, and, for the sake of an idea, is willing to yield some of his power. It is precisely here that the triumph of our theory appears; the slackened reins of government are immediately, by the law of life, caught up and gathered together by a new hand, because the blind might of the nation cannot for one single day exist without guidance, and the new authority merely fits into the place of the old already weakened by liberalism.

GOLD

7. In our day the power which has replaced that of the rulers who were liberal is the power of Gold. Time was when Faith ruled. The idea of freedom is impossible of realization because no one knows how to use it with moderation. It is enough to hand over a people to self-government for a certain length of time for that people to be turned into a disorganized mob. From that moment on we get internecine strife which soon develops into battles between classes, in the midst of which States burn down and their importance is reduced to that of a heap of ashes.

8. Whether a State exhausts itself in its own convulsions, whether its internal discord brings it under the power of external foes - in any case it can be accounted irretrievably lost: **IT IS IN OUR POWER**. The despotism of Capital, which is entirely in our hands, reaches out to it a straw that the State, willy-nilly, must take hold of: if not - it goes to the bottom.

9. Should anyone of a liberal mind say that such reflections as the above are immoral, I would put the following questions: If every State has two foes and if in regard to the external foe it is allowed and not considered immoral to use every manner and art of conflict, as for example to keep the enemy in ignorance of plans of attack and defense, to attack him by night or in superior numbers, then in what way can the same means in regard to a worse foe, the destroyer of the structure of society and the commonweal, be called immoral and not permissible?

10. Is it possible for any sound logical mind to hope with any success to guide crowds by the aid of reasonable counsels and arguments, when any objection or contradiction, senseless though it may be, can be made and when such objection may find more favor with the people, whose powers of reasoning are superficial? Men in masses and the men of the masses, being guided solely by petty passions, paltry beliefs, traditions and sentimental theorems, fall a prey to party dissension, which hinders any kind of agreement even on the basis of a perfectly reasonable argument. Every resolution of a crowd depends upon a chance or packed majority, which, in its ignorance of political secrets, puts forth some ridiculous resolution that lays in the administration a seed of anarchy.

11. The political has nothing in common with the moral. The ruler who is governed by the moral is not a skilled politician, and is therefore unstable on his throne. He who wishes to rule must have recourse both to cunning and to make-believe. Great national qualities, like frankness and honesty, are vices in politics, for they bring down rulers from their thrones more effectively and more certainly than the most powerful enemy. Such qualities must be the attributes of the kingdoms of the GOYIM, but we must in no wise be guided by them.

MIGHT IS RIGHT

12. Our right lies in force. The word "right" is an abstract thought and proved by nothing. The word means no more than: Give me what I want in order that thereby I may have a proof that I am stronger than you.

13. Where does right begin? Where does it end?

14. In any State in which there is a bad organization of authority, an impersonality of laws and of the rulers who have lost their personality amid the flood of rights ever multiplying out of liberalism, I find a new right - to attack by the right of the strong, and to scatter to the winds all existing forces of order and regulation, to reconstruct all institutions and to become the sovereign lord of those who have left to us the rights of their power by laying them down voluntarily in their liberalism.

15. Our power in the present tottering condition of all forms of power will be more invincible than any other, because it will remain invisible until the moment when it has gained such strength that no cunning can any longer undermine it.

16. Out of the temporary evil we are now compelled to commit will emerge the good of an unshakable rule, which will restore the regular course of the machinery of the national life, brought to naught by liberalism. The result justifies the means. Let us, however, in our plans, direct our attention not so much to what is good and moral as to what is necessary and useful.

17. Before us is a plan in which is laid down strategically the line from which we cannot deviate without running the risk of seeing the labor of many centuries brought to naught.

18. In order to elaborate satisfactory forms of action it is necessary to have regard to the rascality, the slackness, the instability of the mob, its lack of capacity to understand and respect the conditions of its own life, or its own welfare. It must be understood that the might of a mob is blind, senseless and unreasoning force ever at the mercy of a suggestion from any side. The blind cannot lead the blind without bringing them into the abyss; consequently, members of the mob, upstarts from the people even though they should be as a genius for wisdom, yet having no understanding of the political, cannot come forward as leaders of the mob without bringing the whole nation to ruin.

19. Only one trained from childhood for independent rule can have understanding of the words that can be made up of the political alphabet.

20. A people left to itself, i.e., to upstarts from its midst, brings itself to ruin by party dissensions excited by the pursuit of power and honors and the disorders arising therefrom. Is it possible for the masses of the people calmly and without petty jealousies to form judgment, to deal with the affairs of the country, which cannot be mixed up with personal interest? Can they defend themselves from an external foe? It is unthinkable; for a plan broken up into as many parts as there are heads in the mob, loses all homogeneity, and thereby becomes unintelligible and impossible of execution.

WE ARE DESPOTS

21. It is only with a despotic ruler that plans can be elaborated extensively and clearly in such a way as to distribute the whole properly among the several parts of the machinery of the State: from this the conclusion is inevitable that a satisfactory form of government for any country is one that concentrates in the hands of one responsible person. Without an absolute despotism there can be no existence for civilization which is carried on not by the masses but by their guide, whosoever that person may be. The mob is savage, and displays its savagery at every opportunity. The moment the mob seizes freedom in its hands it quickly turns to anarchy, which in itself is the highest degree of savagery.

22. Behold the alcoholic animals, bemused with drink, the right to an immoderate use of which comes along with freedom. It is not for us and ours to walk that road. The peoples of the GOYIM are bemused with alcoholic liquors; their youth has grown stupid on classicism and from early immorality, into which it has been inducted by our special agents - by tutors, lackeys, governesses in the houses of the wealthy, by clerks and others, by our

women in the places of dissipation frequented by the GOYIM. In the number of these last I count also the so-called "society ladies," voluntary followers of the others in corruption and luxury.

23. Our countersign is - Force and Make-believe. Only force conquers in political affairs, especially if it be concealed in the talents essential to statesmen. Violence must be the principle, and cunning and make-believe the rule for governments which do not want to lay down their crowns at the feet of agents of some new power. This evil is the one and only means to attain the end, the good. Therefore we must not stop at bribery, deceit and treachery when they should serve towards the attainment of our end. In politics one must know how to seize the property of others without hesitation if by it we secure submission and sovereignty.

24. Our State, marching along the path of peaceful conquest, has the right to replace the horrors of war by less noticeable and more satisfactory sentences of death, necessary to maintain the terror which tends to produce blind submission. Just but merciless severity is the greatest factor of strength in the State: not only for the sake of gain but also in the name of duty, for the sake of victory, we must keep to the programme of violence and make-believe. The doctrine of squaring accounts is precisely as strong as the means of which it makes use. Therefore it is not so much by the means themselves as by the doctrine of severity that we shall triumph and bring all governments into subjection to our super-government. It is enough for them to know that we are too merciless for all disobedience to cease.

WE SHALL END LIBERTY

25. Far back in ancient times we were the first to cry among the masses of the people the words "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," words many times repeated since these days by stupid poll-parrots who, from all sides around, flew down upon these baits and with them carried away the well-being of the world, true freedom of the individual, formerly so well guarded against the pressure of the mob. The would-be wise men of the GOYIM, the intellectuals, could not make anything out of the uttered words in their abstractedness; did not see that in nature there is no equality, cannot be freedom: that Nature herself has established inequality of minds, of characters, and capacities, just as immutably as she has established subordination to her laws: never stopped to think that the mob is a blind thing, that upstarts elected from among it to bear rule are, in regard to the political, the same blind men as the mob itself, that the adept, though he be a fool, can yet rule, whereas the non-adept, even if he were a genius, understands nothing in the political - to all those things the GOYIM paid no regard; yet all the time it was based upon these things that dynastic rule rested: the father passed on to the son a knowledge of the course of political affairs in such wise that none should know it but members of the dynasty and none could betray it to the governed. As time went on, the meaning of the dynastic transference of the true position of affairs in the political was lost, and this aided the success of our cause.

26. In all corners of the earth the words "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," brought to our ranks, thanks to our blind agents, whole legions who bore our banners with enthusiasm. And all the time these words were canker-worms at work boring into the well-being of the GOYIM, putting an end everywhere to peace, quiet, solidarity and destroying all the foundations of the GOYA States. As you will see later, this helped us to our triumph: it gave us the possibility, among other things, of getting into our hands the master card - the destruction of the privileges, or in other words of the very existence of the aristocracy of the GOYIM, that class which was the only defense peoples and countries had against us. On the ruins of the eternal and genealogical aristocracy of the GOYIM we have set up the aristocracy of our educated class headed by the aristocracy of money. The qualifications for this aristocracy we have established in wealth, which is dependent upon us, and in knowledge, for which our learned elders provide the motive force.

27. Our triumph has been rendered easier by the fact that in our relations with the men, whom we wanted, we have always worked upon the most sensitive chords of the human mind, upon the cash account, upon the cupidity, upon the insatiability for material needs of man; and each one of these human weaknesses, taken

alone, is sufficient to paralyze initiative, for it hands over the will of men to the disposition of him who has bought their activities.

28. The abstraction of freedom has enabled us to persuade the mob in all countries that their government is nothing but the steward of the people who are the owners of the country, and that the steward may be replaced like a worn-out glove.

29. It is this possibility of replacing the representatives of the people which has placed at our disposal, and, as it were, given us the power of appointment.

Protocol No. 2

1. It is indispensable for our purpose that wars, so far as possible, should not result in territorial gains: war will thus be brought on to the economic ground, where the nations will not fail to perceive in the assistance we give the strength of our predominance, and this state of things will put both sides at the mercy of our international AGENTUR; which possesses millions of eyes ever on the watch and unhampered by any limitations whatsoever. Our international rights will then wipe out national rights, in the proper sense of right, and will rule the nations precisely as the civil law of States rules the relations of their subjects among themselves.

2. The administrators, whom we shall choose from among the public, with strict regard to their capacities for servile obedience, will not be persons trained in the arts of government, and will therefore easily become pawns in our game in the hands of men of learning and genius who will be their advisers, specialists bred and reared from early childhood to rule the affairs of the whole world. As is well known to you, these specialists of ours have been drawing to fit them for rule the information they need from our political plans from the lessons of history, from observations made of the events of every moment as it passes. The GOYIM are not guided by practical use of unprejudiced historical observation, but by theoretical routine without any critical regard for consequent results. We need not, therefore, take any account of them - let them amuse themselves until the hour strikes, or live on hopes of new forms of enterprising pastime, or on the memories of all they have enjoyed. For them let that play the principal part which we have persuaded them to accept as the dictates of science (theory). It is with this object in view that we are constantly, by means of our press, arousing a blind confidence in these theories. The intellectuals of the GOYIM will puff themselves up with their knowledge and without any logical verification of them will put into effect all the information available from science, which our AGENTUR specialists have cunningly pieced together for the purpose of educating their minds in the direction we want.

DESTRUCTIVE EDUCATION

3. Do not suppose for a moment that these statements are empty words: think carefully of the successes we arranged for Darwinism, Marxism, Nietzsche-ism. To us Jews, at any rate, it should be plain to see what a disintegrating importance these directives have had upon the minds of the GOYIM.

4. It is indispensable for us to take account of the thoughts, characters, tendencies of the nations in order to avoid making slips in the political and in the direction of administrative affairs. The triumph of our system of which the component parts of the machinery may be variously disposed according to the temperament of the peoples met on our way, will fail of success if the practical application of it be not based upon a summing up of the lessons of the past in the light of the present.

5. In the hands of the States of to-day there is a great force that creates the movement of thought in the people, and that is the Press. The part played by the Press is to keep pointing our requirements supposed to be indispensable, to give voice to the complaints of the people, to express and to create discontent. It is in the Press

that the triumph of freedom of speech finds its incarnation. But the GOYIM States have not known how to make use of this force; and it has fallen into our hands. Through the Press we have gained the power to influence while remaining ourselves in the shade; thanks to the Press we have got the GOLD in our hands, notwithstanding that we have had to gather it out of the oceans of blood and tears. But it has paid us, though we have sacrificed many of our people. Each victim on our side is worth in the sight of God a thousand GOYIM.

PROTOCOL No. 3

1. To-day I may tell you that our goal is now only a few steps off. There remains a small space to cross and the whole long path we have trodden is ready now to close its cycle of the Symbolic Snake, by which we symbolize our people. When this ring closes, all the States of Europe will be locked in its coil as in a powerful vice.

2. The constitution scales of these days will shortly break down, for we have established them with a certain lack of accurate balance in order that they may oscillate incessantly until they wear through the pivot on which they turn. The GOYIM are under the impression that they have welded them sufficiently strong and they have all along kept on expecting that the scales would come into equilibrium. But the pivots - the kings on their thrones - are hemmed in by their representatives, who play the fool, distraught with their own uncontrolled and irresponsible power. This power they owe to the terror which has been breathed into the palaces. As they have no means of getting at their people, into their very midst, the kings on their thrones are no longer able to come to terms with them and so strengthen themselves against seekers after power. We have made a gulf between the far-seeing Sovereign Power and the blind force of the people so that both have lost all meaning, for like the blind man and his stick, both are powerless apart.

3. In order to incite seekers after power to a misuse of power we have set all forces in opposition one to another, breaking up their liberal tendencies towards independence. To this end we have stirred up every form of enterprise, we have armed all parties, we have set up authority as a target for every ambition. Of States we have made gladiatorial arenas where a lot of confused issues contend.... A little more, and disorders and bankruptcy will be universal....

4. Babblers, inexhaustible, have turned into oratorical contests the sittings of Parliament and Administrative Boards. Bold journalists and unscrupulous pamphleteers daily fall upon executive officials. Abuses of power will put the final touch in preparing all institutions for their overthrow and everything will fly skyward under the blows of the maddened mob.

POVERTY OUR WEAPON

5. All people are chained down to heavy toil by poverty more firmly than ever. They were chained by slavery and serfdom; from these, one way and another, they might free themselves. These could be settled with, but from want they will never get away. We have included in the constitution such rights as to the masses appear fictitious and not actual rights. All these so-called "Peoples Rights" can exist only in idea, an idea which can never be realized in practical life. What is it to the proletariat laborer, bowed double over his heavy toil, crushed by his lot in life, if talkers get the right to babble, if journalists get the right to scribble any nonsense side by side with good stuff, once the proletariat has no other profit out of the constitution save only those pitiful crumbs which we fling them from our table in return for their voting in favor of what we dictate, in favor of the men we place in power, the servants of our AGENTUR ... Republican rights for a poor man are no more than a bitter piece of irony, for the necessity he is under of toiling almost all day gives him no present use of them, but the other hand robs him of all guarantee of regular and certain earnings by making him dependent on strikes by his comrades or lockouts by his masters.

WE SUPPORT COMMUNISM

6. The people, under our guidance, have annihilated the aristocracy, who were their one and only defense and foster- mother for the sake of their own advantage which is inseparably bound up with the well-being of the people. Nowadays, with the destruction of the aristocracy, the people have fallen into the grips of merciless money-grinding scoundrels who have laid a pitiless and cruel yoke upon the necks of the workers.

7. We appear on the scene as alleged saviours of the worker from this oppression when we propose to him to enter the ranks of our fighting forces - Socialists, Anarchists, Communists - to whom we always give support in accordance with an alleged brotherly rule (of the solidarity of all humanity) of our SOCIAL MASONRY. The aristocracy, which enjoyed by law the labor of the workers, was interested in seeing that the workers were well fed, healthy, and strong. We are interested in just the opposite - in the diminution, the KILLING OUT OF THE GOYIM. Our power is in the chronic shortness of food and physical weakness of the worker because by all that this implies he is made the slave of our will, and he will not find in his own authorities either strength or energy to set against our will. Hunger creates the right of capital to rule the worker more surely than it was given to the aristocracy by the legal authority of kings.

8. By want and the envy and hatred which it engenders we shall move the mobs and with their hands we shall wipe out all those who hinder us on our way.

9. WHEN THE HOUR STRIKES FOR OUR SOVEREIGN LORD OF ALL THE WORLD TO BE CROWNED IT IS THESE SAME HANDS WHICH WILL SWEEP AWAY EVERYTHING THAT MIGHT BE A HINDRANCE THERETO.

10. The GOYIM have lost the habit of thinking unless prompted by the suggestions of our specialists. Therefore they do not see the urgent necessity of what we, when our kingdom comes, shall adopt at once, namely this, that IT IS ESSENTIAL TO TEACH IN NATIONAL SCHOOLS ONE SIMPLE, TRUE PIECE OF KNOWLEDGE, THE BASIS OF ALL KNOWLEDGE - THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE STRUCTURE OF HUMAN LIFE, OF SOCIAL EXISTENCE, WHICH REQUIRES DIVISION OF LABOR, AND, CONSEQUENTLY, THE DIVISION OF MEN INTO CLASSES AND CONDITIONS. It is essential for all to know that OWING TO DIFFERENCE IN THE OBJECTS OF HUMAN ACTIVITY THERE CANNOT BE ANY EQUALITY, that he, who by any act of his compromises a whole class, cannot be equally responsible before the law with him who affects no one but only his own honor. The true knowledge of the structure of society, into the secrets of which we do not admit the GOYIM, would demonstrate to all men that the positions and work must be kept within a certain circle, that they may not become a source of human suffering, arising from an education which does not correspond with the work which individuals are called upon to do. After a thorough study of this knowledge, the peoples will voluntarily submit to authority and accept such position as is appointed them in the State. In the present state of knowledge and the direction we have given to its development of the people, blindly believing things in print - cherishes - thanks to promptings intended to mislead and to its own ignorance - a blind hatred towards all conditions which it considers above itself, for it has no understanding of the meaning of class and condition.

JEWS WILL BE SAFE

11. THIS HATRED WILL BE STILL FURTHER MAGNIFIED BY THE EFFECTS of an ECONOMIC CRISES, which will stop dealing on the exchanges and bring industry to a standstill. We shall create by all the secret subterranean methods open to us and with the aid of gold, which is all in our hands, A UNIVERSAL ECONOMIC CRISES WHEREBY WE SHALL THROW UPON THE STREETS WHOLE MOBS OF WORKERS SIMULTANEOUSLY IN ALL THE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE. These mobs will rush

delightedly to shed the blood of those whom, in the simplicity of their ignorance, they have envied from their cradles, and whose property they will then be able to loot.

12. "OURS" THEY WILL NOT TOUCH, BECAUSE THE MOMENT OF ATTACK WILL BE KNOWN TO US AND WE SHALL TAKE MEASURES TO PROTECT OUR OWN.

13. We have demonstrated that progress will bring all the GOYIM to the sovereignty of reason. Our despotism will be precisely that; for it will know how, by wise severities, to pacificate all unrest, to cauterize liberalism out of all institutions.

14. When the populace has seen that all sorts of concessions and indulgences are yielded it, in the same name of freedom it has imagined itself to be sovereign lord and has stormed its way to power, but, naturally like every other blind man, it has come upon a host of stumbling blocks. IT HAS RUSHED TO FIND A GUIDE, IT HAS NEVER HAD THE SENSE TO RETURN TO THE FORMER STATE and it has laid down its plenipotentiary powers at OUR feet. Remember the French Revolution, to which it was we who gave the name of "Great": the secrets of its preparations are well known to us for it was wholly the work of our hands.

15 Ever since that time we have been leading the peoples from one disenchantment to another, so that in the end they should turn also from us in favor of that KING-DESPOT OF THE BLOOD OF ZION, WHOM WE ARE PREPARING FOR THE WORLD.

16. At the present day we are, as an international force, invincible, because if attacked by some we are supported by other States. It is the bottomless rascality of the GOYIM peoples, who crawl on their bellies to force, but are merciless towards weakness, unsparing to faults and indulgent to crimes, unwilling to bear the contradictions of a free social system but patient unto martyrdom under the violence of a bold despotism - it is those qualities which are aiding us to independence. From the premier- dictators of the present day, the GOYIM peoples suffer patiently and bear such abuses as for the least of them they would have beheaded twenty kings.

17. What is the explanation of this phenomenon, this curious inconsequence of the masses of the peoples in their attitude towards what would appear to be events of the same order?

18. It is explained by the fact that these dictators whisper to the peoples through their agents that through these abuses they are inflicting injury on the States with the highest purpose - to secure the welfare of the peoples, the international brotherhood of them all, their solidarity and equality of rights. Naturally they do not tell the peoples that this unification must be accomplished only under our sovereign rule.

19. And thus the people condemn the upright and acquit the guilty, persuaded ever more and more that it can do whatsoever it wishes. Thanks to this state of things, the people are destroying every kind of stability and creating disorders at every step.

20. The word "freedom" brings out the communities of men to fight against every kind of force, against every kind of authority even against God and the laws of nature. For this reason we, when we come into our kingdom, shall have to erase this word from the lexicon of life as implying a principle of brute force which turns mobs into bloodthirsty beasts.

21. These beasts, it is true, fall asleep again every time when they have drunk their fill of blood, and at such time can easily be riveted into their chains. But if they be not given blood they will not sleep and continue to struggle

PROTOCOL No. 4

1. Every republic passes through several stages. The first of these is comprised in the early days of mad raging by the blind mob, tossed hither and thither, right and left: the second is demagogy from which is born anarchy, and that leads inevitably to despotism - not any longer legal and overt, and therefore responsible despotism, but to unseen and secretly hidden, yet nevertheless sensibly felt despotism in the hands of some secret organization or other, whose acts are the more unscrupulous inasmuch as it works behind a screen, behind the backs of all sorts of agents, the changing of whom not only does not injuriously affect but actually aids the secret force by saving it, thanks to continual changes, from the necessity of expanding its resources on the rewarding of long services.

2. Who and what is in a position to overthrow an invisible force? And this is precisely what our force is. GENTILE masonry blindly serves as a screen for us and our objects, but the plan of action of our force, even its very abiding-place, remains for the whole people an unknown mystery.

WE SHALL DESTROY GOD

3. But even freedom might be harmless and have its place in the State economy without injury to the well-being of the peoples if it rested upon the foundation of faith in God, upon the brotherhood of humanity, unconnected with the conception of equality, which is negated by the very laws of creation, for they have established subordination. With such a faith as this a people might be governed by a wardship of parishes, and would walk contentedly and humbly under the guiding hand of its spiritual pastor submitting to the dispositions of God upon earth. This is the reason why **IT IS INDISPENSABLE FOR US TO UNDERMINE ALL FAITH, TO TEAR OUT OF THE MIND OF THE "GOYIM" THE VERY PRINCIPLE OF GOD-HEAD AND THE SPIRIT, AND TO PUT IN ITS PLACE ARITHMETICAL CALCULATIONS AND MATERIAL NEEDS.**

4. In order to give the GOYIM no time to think and take note, their minds must be diverted towards industry and trade. Thus, all the nations will be swallowed up in the pursuit of gain and in the race for it will not take note of their common foe. But again, in order that freedom may once for all disintegrate and ruin the communities of the GOYIM, we must put industry on a speculative basis: the result of this will be that what is withdrawn from the land by industry will slip through the hands and pass into speculation, that is, to our classes.

5. The intensified struggle for superiority and shocks delivered to economic life will create, nay, have already created, disenchanted, cold and heartless communities. Such communities will foster a strong aversion towards the higher political and towards religion. Their only guide is gain, that is Gold, which they will erect into a veritable cult, for the sake of those material delights which it can give. Then will the hour strike when, not for the sake of attaining the good, not even to win wealth, but solely out of hatred towards the privileged, the lower classes of the GOYIM will follow our lead against our rivals for power, the intellectuals of the GOYIM.

PROTOCOL No. 5

1. What form of administrative rule can be given to communities in which corruption has penetrated everywhere, communities where riches are attained only by the clever surprise tactics of semi-swindling tricks; where looseness reigns: where morality is maintained by penal measures and harsh laws but not by voluntarily accepted principles: where the feelings towards faith and country are obligated by cosmopolitan convictions? What form of rule is to be given to these communities if not that despotism which I shall describe to you later? We shall create an intensified centralization of government in order to grip in our hands all the forces of the community. We shall regulate mechanically all the actions of the political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will withdraw one by one all the indulgences and liberties which have been permitted by the GOYIM, and our kingdom will be distinguished by a despotism of such magnificent proportions as to be at any moment and in every place in a position to wipe out any GOYIM who oppose us by deed or word.

2. We shall be told that such a despotism as I speak of is not consistent with the progress of these days, but I will prove to you that is.

3. In the times when the peoples looked upon kings on their thrones as on a pure manifestation of the will of God, they submitted without a murmur to the despotic power of kings: but from the day when we insinuated into their minds the conception of their own rights they began to regard the occupants of thrones as mere ordinary mortals. The holy unction of the Lord's Anointed has fallen from the heads of kings in the eyes of the people, and when we also robbed them of their faith in God the might of power was flung upon the streets into the place of public proprietorship and was seized by us.

MASSES LED BY LIES

4. Moreover, the art of directing masses and individuals by means of cleverly manipulated theory and verbitage, by regulations of life in common and all sorts of other quirks, in all which the GOYIM understand nothing, belongs likewise to the specialists of our administrative brain. Reared on analysis, observation, on delicacies of fine calculation, in this species of skill we have no rivals, any more than we have either in the drawing up of plans of political actions and solidarity. In this respect the Jesuits alone might have compared with us, but we have contrived to discredit them in the eyes of the unthinking mob as an overt organization, while we ourselves all the while have kept our secret organization in the shade. However, it is probably all the same to the world who is its sovereign lord, whether the head of Catholicism or our despot of the blood of Zion! But to us, the Chosen People, it is very far from being a matter of indifference.

5. FOR A TIME PERHAPS WE MIGHT BE SUCCESSFULLY DEALT WITH BY A COALITION OF THE "GOYIM" OF ALL THE WORLD: but from this danger we are secured by the discord existing among them whose roots are so deeply seated that they can never now be plucked up. We have set one against another the personal and national reckonings of the GOYIM, religious and race hatreds, which we have fostered into a huge growth in the course of the past twenty centuries. This is the reason why there is not one State which would anywhere receive support if it were to raise its arm, for every one of them must bear in mind that any agreement against us would be unprofitable to itself. We are too strong - there is no evading our power. THE NATIONS CANNOT COME TO EVEN AN INCONSIDERABLE PRIVATE AGREEMENT WITHOUT OUR SECRETLY HAVING A HAND IN IT.

6. PER ME REGES REGNANT. "It is through me that Kings reign." And it was said by the prophets that we were chosen by God Himself to rule over the whole earth. God has endowed us with genius that we may be equal to our task. Were genius in the opposite camp it would still struggle against us, but even so, a newcomer is no match for the old-established settler: the struggle would be merciless between us, such a fight as the world has never seen. Aye, and the genius on their side would have arrived too late. All the wheels of the machinery of all States go by the force of the engine, which is in our hands, and that engine of the machinery of States is - Gold. The science of political economy invented by our learned elders has for long past been giving royal prestige to capital.

MONOPOLY CAPITAL

7. Capital, if it is to co-operate untrammled, must be free to establish a monopoly of industry and trade: this is already being put in execution by an unseen hand in all quarters of the world. This freedom will give political force to those engaged in industry, and that will help to oppress the people. Nowadays it is more important to disarm the peoples than to lead them into war: more important to use for our advantage the passions which have burst into flames than to quench their fire: more important to eradicate them. THE PRINCIPLE OBJECT OF OUR DIRECTORATE CONSISTS IN THIS: TO DEBILITATE THE PUBLIC MIND BY CRITICISM; TO

LEAD IT AWAY FROM SERIOUS REFLECTIONS CALCULATED TO AROUSE RESISTANCE; TO DISTRACT THE FORCES OF THE MIND TOWARDS A SHAM FIGHT OF EMPTY ELOQUENCE.

8. In all ages the people of the world, equally with individuals, have accepted words for deeds, for THEY ARE CONTENT WITH A SHOW and rarely pause to note, in the public arena, whether promises are followed by performance. Therefore we shall establish show institutions which will give eloquent proof of their benefit to progress.

9. We shall assume to ourselves the liberal physiognomy of all parties, of all directions, and we shall give that physiognomy a VOICE IN ORATORS WHO WILL SPEAK SO MUCH THAT THEY WILL EXHAUST THE PATIENCE OF THEIR HEARERS AND PRODUCE AN ABHORRENCE OF ORATORY.

10. IN ORDER TO PUT PUBLIC OPINION INTO OUR HANDS WE MUST BRING IT INTO A STATE OF BEWILDERMENT BY GIVING EXPRESSION FROM ALL SIDES TO SO MANY CONTRADICTORY OPINIONS AND FOR SUCH LENGTH OF TIME AS WILL SUFFICE TO MAKE THE "GOYIM" LOSE THEIR HEADS IN THE LABYRINTH AND COME TO SEE THAT THE BEST THING IS TO HAVE NO OPINION OF ANY KIND IN MATTERS POLITICAL, which it is not given to the public to understand, because they are understood only by him who guides the public. This is the first secret.

11. The second secret requisite for the success of our government is comprised in the following: To multiply to such an extent national failings, habits, passions, conditions of civil life, that it will be impossible for anyone to know where he is in the resulting chaos, so that the people in consequence will fail to understand one another. This measure will also serve us in another way, namely, to sow discord in all parties, to dislocate all collective forces which are still unwilling to submit to us, and to discourage any kind of personal initiative which might in any degree hinder our affair. THERE IS NOTHING MORE DANGEROUS THAN PERSONAL INITIATIVE: if it has genius behind it, such initiative can do more than can be done by millions of people among whom we have sown discord. We must so direct the education of the GOYIM communities that whenever they come upon a matter requiring initiative they may drop their hands in despairing impotence. The strain which results from freedom of actions saps the forces when it meets with the freedom of another. From this collision arise grave moral shocks, disenchantments, failures. BY ALL THESE MEANS WE SHALL SO WEAR DOWN THE "GOYIM" THAT THEY WILL BE COMPELLED TO OFFER US INTERNATIONAL POWER OF A NATURE THAT BY ITS POSITION WILL ENABLE US WITHOUT ANY VIOLENCE GRADUALLY TO ABSORB ALL THE STATE FORCES OF THE WORLD AND TO FORM A SUPER-GOVERNMENT.

In place of the rulers of to-day we shall set up a bogey which will be called the Super-Government Administration. Its hands will reach out in all directions like nippers and its organization will be of such colossal dimensions that it cannot fail to subdue all the nations of the world.

PROTOCOL No. 6

1. We shall soon begin to establish huge monopolies, reservoirs of colossal riches, upon which even, large fortunes of the GOYIM will depend to such an extent that they will go to the bottom together with the credit of the States on the day after the political smash...

2. You gentlemen here present who are economists, just strike an estimate of the significance of this combination! ...

3. In every possible way we must develop the significance of our Super-Government by representing it as the Protector and Benefactor of all those who voluntarily submit to us.

4. The aristocracy of the GOYIM as a political force, is dead - We need not take it into account; but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us from the fact that they are self-sufficing in the resources upon which they live. It is essential therefore for us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best attained by increasing the burdens upon landed property - in loading lands with debts. These measures will check land- holding and keep it in a state of humble and unconditional submission.

5. The aristocrats of the GOYIM, being hereditarily incapable of contenting themselves with little, will rapidly burn up and fizzle out.

WE SHALL ENSLAVE GENTILES

6. At the same time we must intensively patronize trade and industry, but, first and foremost, speculation, the part played by which is to provide a counterpoise to industry: the absence of speculative industry will multiply capital in private hands and will serve to restore agriculture by freeing the land from indebtedness to the land banks. What we want is that industry should drain off from the land both labor and capital and by means of speculation transfer into our hands all the money of the world, and thereby throw all the GOYIM into the ranks of the proletariat. Then the GOYIM will bow down before us, if for no other reason but to get the right to exist.

7. To complete the ruin of the industry of the GOYIM we shall bring to the assistance of speculation the luxury which we have developed among the GOYIM, that greedy demand for luxury which is swallowing up everything. WE SHALL RAISE THE RATE OF WAGES WHICH, HOWEVER, WILL NOT BRING ANY ADVANTAGE TO THE WORKERS, FOR, AT THE SAME TIME, WE SHALL PRODUCE A RISE IN PRICES OF THE FIRST NECESSARIES OF LIFE, ALLEGING THAT IT ARISES FROM THE DECLINE OF AGRICULTURE AND CATTLE-BREEDING: WE SHALL FURTHER UNDERMINE ARTFULLY AND DEEPLY SOURCES OF PRODUCTION, BY ACCUSTOMING THE WORKERS TO ANARCHY AND TO DRUNKENNESS AND SIDE BY SIDE THEREWITH TAKING ALL MEASURE TO EXTIRPATE FROM THE FACE OF THE EARTH ALL THE EDUCATED FORCES OF THE "GOYIM."

8. IN ORDER THAT THE TRUE MEANING OF THINGS MAY NOT STRIKE THE "GOYIM" BEFORE THE PROPER TIME WE SHALL MASK IT UNDER AN ALLEGED ARDENT DESIRE TO SERVE THE WORKING CLASSES AND THE GREAT PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY ABOUT WHICH OUR ECONOMIC THEORIES ARE CARRYING ON AN ENERGETIC PROPAGANDA

PROTOCOL No. 7

1. The intensification of armaments, the increase of police forces - are all essential for the completion of the aforementioned plans. What we have to get at is that there should be in all the States of the world, besides ourselves, only the masses of the proletariat, a few millionaires devoted to our interests, police and soldiers.

2. Throughout all Europe, and by means of relations with Europe, in other continents also, we must create ferments, discords and hostility. Therein we gain a double advantage. In the first place we keep in check all countries, for they will know that we have the power whenever we like to create disorders or to restore order. All these countries are accustomed to see in us an indispensable force of coercion. In the second place, by our intrigues we shall tangle up all the threads which we have stretched into the cabinets of all States by means of the political, by economic treaties, or loan obligations. In order to succeed in this we must use great cunning and penetration during negotiations and agreements, but, as regards what is called the "official language," we shall keep to the opposite tactics and assume the mask of honesty and complacency. In this way the peoples and governments of the GOYIM, whom we have taught to look only at the outside whatever we present to their notice, will still continue to accept us as the benefactors and saviours of the human race.

UNIVERSAL WAR

3. We must be in a position to respond to every act of opposition by war with the neighbors of that country which dares to oppose us: but if these neighbors should also venture to stand collectively together against us, then we must offer resistance by a universal war.

4. The principal factor of success in the political is the secrecy of its undertakings: the word should not agree with the deeds of the diplomat.

5. We must compel the governments of the GOYIM to take action in the direction favored by our widely conceived plan, already approaching the desired consummation, by what we shall represent as public opinion, secretly promoted by us through the means of that so-called "Great Power" - THE PRESS, WHICH, WITH A FEW EXCEPTIONS THAT MAY BE DISREGARDED, IS ALREADY ENTIRELY IN OUR HANDS.

In a word, to sum up our system of keeping the governments of the goyim in Europe in check, we shall show our strength to one of them by terrorist attempts and to all, if we allow the possibility of a general rising against us, we shall respond with the guns of America or China or Japan.

PROTOCOL No. 8

1. We must arm ourselves with all the weapons which our opponents might employ against us. We must search out in the very finest shades of expression and the knotty points of the lexicon of law justification for those cases where we shall have to pronounce judgments that might appear abnormally audacious and unjust, for it is important that these resolutions should be set forth in expressions that shall seem to be the most exalted moral principles cast into legal form. Our directorate must surround itself with all these forces of civilization among which it will have to work. It will surround itself with publicists, practical jurists, administrators, diplomats and, finally, with persons prepared by a special super-educational training IN OUR SPECIAL SCHOOLS. These persons will have consonance of all the secrets of the social structure, they will know all the languages that can be made up by political alphabets and words; they will be made acquainted with the whole underside of human nature, with all its sensitive chords on which they will have to play. These chords are the cast of mind of the GOYIM, their tendencies, short-comings, vices and qualities, the particularities of classes and conditions. Needless to say that the talented assistants of authority, of whom I speak, will be taken not from among the GOYIM, who are accustomed to perform their administrative work without giving themselves the trouble to think what its aim is, and never consider what it is needed for. The administrators of the GOYIM sign papers without reading them, and they serve either for mercenary reasons or from ambition.

2. We shall surround our government with a whole world of economists. That is the reason why economic sciences form the principal subject of the teaching given to the Jews. Around us again will be a whole constellation of bankers, industrialists, capitalists and - THE MAIN THING - MILLIONAIRES, BECAUSE IN SUBSTANCE EVERYTHING WILL BE SETTLED BY THE QUESTION OF FIGURES.

3. For a time, until there will no longer be any risk in entrusting responsible posts in our State to our brother-Jews, we shall put them in the hands of persons whose past and reputation are such that between them and the people lies an abyss, persons who, in case of disobedience to our instructions, must face criminal charges or disappear - this in order to make them defend our interests to their last gasp.

PROTOCOL No. 9

1. In applying our principles let attention be paid to the character of the people in whose country you live and act; a general, identical application of them, until such time as the people shall have been re-educated to our

pattern, cannot have success. But by approaching their application cautiously you will see that not a decade will pass before the most stubborn character will change and we shall add a new people to the ranks of those already subdued by us.

2. The words of the liberal, which are in effect the words of our masonic watchword, namely, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," will, when we come into our kingdom, be changed by us into words no longer of a watchword, but only an expression of idealism, namely, into "The right of liberty, the duty of equality, the ideal of brotherhood." That is how we shall put it, - and so we shall catch the bull by the horns ... DE FACTO we have already wiped out every kind of rule except our own, although DE JURE there still remain a good many of them. Nowadays, if any States raise a protest against us it is only PRO FORMA at our discretion and by our direction, for THEIR ANTI-SEMITISM IS INDISPENSABLE TO US FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF OUR LESSER BRETHREN. I will not enter into further explanations, for this matter has formed the subject of repeated discussions amongst us.

JEWISH SUPER-STATE

3. For us there are not checks to limit the range of our activity. Our Super-Government subsists in extra-legal conditions which are described in the accepted terminology by the energetic and forcible word - Dictatorship. I am in a position to tell you with a clear conscience that at the proper time we, the law-givers, shall execute judgment and sentence, we shall slay and we shall spare, we, as head of all our troops, are mounted on the steed of the leader. We rule by force of will, because in our hands are the fragments of a once powerful party, now vanquished by us. AND THE WEAPONS IN OUR HANDS ARE LIMITLESS AMBITIONS, BURNING GREEDINESS, MERCILESS VENGEANCE, HATREDS AND MALICE.

4. IT IS FROM US THAT THE ALL-ENGULFING TERROR PROCEEDS. WE HAVE IN OUR SERVICE PERSONS OF ALL OPINIONS, OF ALL DOCTRINES, RESTORATING MONARCHISTS, DEMAGOGUES, SOCIALISTS, COMMUNISTS, AND UTOPIAN DREAMERS OF EVERY KIND. We have harnessed them all to the task: EACH ONE OF THEM ON HIS OWN ACCOUNT IS BORING AWAY AT THE LAST REMNANTS OF AUTHORITY, IS STRIVING TO OVERTHROW ALL ESTABLISHED FORM OF ORDER. By these acts all States are in torture; they exhort to tranquility, are ready to sacrifice everything for peace: BUT WE WILL NOT GIVE THEM PEACE UNTIL THEY OPENLY ACKNOWLEDGE OUR INTERNATIONAL SUPER-GOVERNMENT, AND WITH SUBMISSIVENESS.

5. The people have raised a howl about the necessity of settling the question of Socialism by way of an international agreement. DIVISION INTO FRACTIONAL PARTIES HAS GIVEN THEM INTO OUR HANDS, FOR, IN ORDER TO CARRY ON A CONTESTED STRUGGLE ONE MUST HAVE MONEY, AND THE MONEY IS ALL IN OUR HANDS.

6. We might have reason to apprehend a union between the "clear-sighted" force of the GOY kings on their thrones and the "blind" force of the GOY mobs, but we have taken all the needful measure against any such possibility: between the one and the other force we have erected a bulwark in the shape of a mutual terror between them. In this way the blind force of the people remains our support and we, and we only, shall provide them with a leader and, of course, direct them along the road that leads to our goal.

7. In order that the hand of the blind mob may not free itself from our guiding hand, we must every now and then enter into close communion with it, if not actually in person, at any rate through some of the most trusty of our brethren. When we are acknowledged as the only authority we shall discuss with the people personally on the market, places, and we shall instruct them on questings of the political in such wise as may turn them in the direction that suits us.

8. Who is going to verify what is taught in the village schools? But what an envoy of the government or a king on his throne himself may say cannot but become immediately known to the whole State, for it will be spread abroad by the voice of the people.

9. In order to annihilate the institutions of the GOYIM before it is time we have touched them with craft and delicacy, and have taken hold of the ends of the springs which move their mechanism. These springs lay in a strict but just sense of order; we have replaced them by the chaotic license of liberalism. We have got our hands into the administration of the law, into the conduct of elections, into the press, into liberty of the person, BUT PRINCIPALLY INTO EDUCATION AND TRAINING AS BEING THE CORNERSTONES OF A FREE EXISTENCE.

CHRISTIAN YOUTH DESTROYED

10. WE HAVE FOOLED, BEMUSED AND CORRUPTED THE YOUTH OF THE "GOYIM" BY REARING THEM IN PRINCIPLES AND THEORIES WHICH ARE KNOWN TO US TO BE FALSE ALTHOUGH IT IS THAT THEY HAVE BEEN INCULCATED.

11. Above the existing laws without substantially altering them, and by merely twisting them into contradictions of interpretations, we have erected something grandiose in the way of results. These results found expression in the fact that the INTERPRETATIONS MASKED THE LAW: afterwards they entirely hid them from the eyes of the governments owing to the impossibility of making anything out of the tangled web of legislation.

12. This is the origin of the theory of course of arbitration.

13. You may say that the GOYIM will rise upon us, arms in hand, if they guess what is going on before the time comes; but in the West we have against this a maneuver of such appalling terror that the very stoutest hearts quail - the undergrounds, metropolitans, those subterranean corridors which, before the time comes, will be driven under all the capitals and from whence those capitals will be blown into the air with all their organizations and archives.

PROTOCOL No. 10

1. To-day I begin with a repetition of what I said before, and I BEG YOU TO BEAR IN MIND THAT GOVERNMENTS AND PEOPLE ARE CONTENT IN THE POLITICAL WITH OUTSIDE APPEARANCES. And how, indeed, are the GOYIM to perceive the underlying meaning of things when their representatives give the best of their energies to enjoying themselves? For our policy it is of the greatest importance to take cognizance of this detail; it will be of assistance to us when we come to consider the division of authority of property, of the dwelling, of taxation (the idea of concealed taxes), of the reflex force of the laws. All these questions are such as ought not to be touched upon directly and openly before the people. In cases where it is indispensable to touch upon them they must not be categorically named, it must merely be declared without detailed exposition that the principles of contemporary law are acknowledged by us. The reason of keeping silence in this respect is that by not naming a principle we leave ourselves freedom of action, to drop this or that out of it without attracting notice; if they were all categorically named they would all appear to have been already given.

2. The mob cherishes a special affection and respect for the geniuses of political power and accepts all their deeds of violence with the admiring response: "rascally, well, yes, it is rascally, but it's clever! ... a trick, if you like, but how craftily played, how magnificently done, what impudent audacity!"...

OUR GOAL - WORLD POWER

3. We count upon attracting all nations to the task of erecting the new fundamental structure, the project for which has been drawn up by us. This is why, before everything, it is indispensable for us to arm ourselves and to store up in ourselves that absolutely reckless audacity and irresistible might of the spirit which in the person of our active workers will break down all hindrances on our way.

4. WHEN WE HAVE ACCOMPLISHED OUR COUP D'ETAT WE SHALL SAY THEN TO THE VARIOUS PEOPLES: "EVERYTHING HAS GONE TERRIBLY BADLY, ALL HAVE BEEN WORN OUT WITH SUFFERING. WE ARE DESTROYING THE CAUSES OF YOUR TORMENT - NATIONALITIES, FRONTIERS, DIFFERENCES OF COINAGES. YOU ARE AT LIBERTY, OF COURSE, TO PRONOUNCE SENTENCE UPON US, BUT CAN IT POSSIBLY BE A JUST ONE IF IT IS CONFIRMED BY YOU BEFORE YOU MAKE ANY TRIAL OF WHAT WE ARE OFFERING YOU." ... THEN WILL THE MOB EXALT US AND BEAR US UP IN THEIR HANDS IN A UNANIMOUS TRIUMPH OF HOPES AND EXPECTATIONS. VOTING, WHICH WE HAVE MADE THE INSTRUMENT WHICH WILL SET US ON THE THRONE OF THE WORLD BY TEACHING EVEN THE VERY SMALLEST UNITS OF MEMBERS OF THE HUMAN RACE TO VOTE BY MEANS OF MEETINGS AND AGREEMENTS BY GROUPS, WILL THEN HAVE SERVED ITS PURPOSES AND WILL PLAY ITS PART THEN FOR THE LAST TIME BY A UNANIMITY OF DESIRE TO MAKE CLOSE ACQUAINTANCE WITH US BEFORE CONDEMNING US.

5. TO SECURE THIS WE MUST HAVE EVERYBODY VOTE WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF CLASSES AND QUALIFICATIONS, in order to establish an absolute majority, which cannot be got from the educated propertied classes. In this way, by inculcating in all a sense of self-importance, we shall destroy among the GOYIM the importance of the family and its educational value and remove the possibility of individual minds splitting off, for the mob, handled by us, will not let them come to the front nor even give them a hearing; it is accustomed to listen to us only who pay it for obedience and attention. In this way we shall create a blind, mighty force which will never be in a position to move in any direction without the guidance of our agents set at its head by us as leaders of the mob. The people will submit to this regime because it will know that upon these leaders will depend its earnings, gratifications and the receipt of all kinds of benefits.

6. A scheme of government should come ready made from one brain, because it will never be clinched firmly if it is allowed to be split into fractional parts in the minds of many. It is allowable, therefore, for us to have cognizance of the scheme of action but not to discuss it lest we disturb its artfulness, the interdependence of its component parts, the practical force of the secret meaning of each clause. To discuss and make alterations in a labor of this kind by means of numerous votings is to impress upon it the stamp of all ratiocinations and misunderstandings which have failed to penetrate the depth and nexus of its plotting. We want our schemes to be forcible and suitably concocted. Therefore WE OUGHT NOT TO FLING THE WORK OF GENIUS OF OUR GUIDE to the fangs of the mob or even of a select company.

7. These schemes will not turn existing institutions upside down just yet. They will only effect changes in their economy and consequently in the whole combined movement of their progress, which will thus be directed along the paths laid down in our schemes.

POISON OF LIBERALISM

8. Under various names there exists in all countries approximately one and the same thing. Representation, Ministry, Senate, State Council, Legislative and Executive Corps. I need not explain to you the mechanism of the relation of these institutions to one another, because you are aware of all that; only take note of the fact that each of the above-named institutions corresponds to some important function of the State, and I would beg you

to remark that the word "important" I apply not to the institution but to the function, consequently it is not the institutions which are important but their functions. These institutions have divided up among themselves all the functions of government - administrative, legislative, executive, wherefore they have come to operate as do the organs in the human body. If we injure one part in the machinery of State, the State falls sick, like a human body, and ... will die.

9. When we introduced into the State organism the poison of Liberalism its whole political complexion underwent a change. States have been seized with a mortal illness - blood poisoning. All that remains is to await the end of their death agony.

10. Liberalism produced Constitutional States, which took the place of what was the only safeguard of the GOYIM, namely, Despotism; and A CONSTITUTION, AS YOU WELL KNOW, IS NOTHING ELSE BUT A SCHOOL OF DISCORDS, misunderstandings, quarrels, disagreements, fruitless party agitations, party whims - in a word, a school of everything that serves to destroy the personality of State activity. THE TRIBUNE OF THE "TALKERICS" HAS, NO LESS EFFECTIVELY THAN THE PRESS, CONDEMNED THE RULERS TO INACTIVITY AND IMPOTENCE, and thereby rendered them useless and superfluous, for which reason indeed they have been in many countries deposed. THEN IT WAS THAT THE ERA OF REPUBLICS BECAME POSSIBLE OF REALIZATION; AND THEN IT WAS THAT WE REPLACED THE RULER BY A CARICATURE OF A GOVERNMENT - BY A PRESIDENT, TAKEN FROM THE MOB, FROM THE MIDST OF OUR PUPPET CREATURES, OR SLAVES. This was the foundation of the mine which we have laid under the GOY people, I should rather say, under the GOY peoples.

WE NAME PRESIDENTS

11. In the near future we shall establish the responsibility of presidents.

12. By that time we shall be in a position to disregard forms in carrying through matters for which our impersonal puppet will be responsible. What do we care if the ranks of those striving for power should be thinned, if there should arise a deadlock from the impossibility of finding presidents, a deadlock which will finally disorganize the country? ...

13. In order that our scheme may produce this result we shall arrange elections in favor of such presidents as have in their past some dark, undiscovered stain, some "Panama" or other - then they will be trustworthy agents for the accomplishment of our plans out of fear of revelations and from the natural desire of everyone who has attained power, namely, the retention of the privileges, advantages and honor connected with the office of president. The chamber of deputies will provide cover for, will protect, will elect presidents, but we shall take from it the right to propose new, or make changes in existing laws, for this right will be given by us to the responsible president, a puppet in our hands. Naturally, the authority of the presidents will then become a target for every possible form of attack, but we shall provide him with a means of self-defense in the right of an appeal to the people, for the decision of the people over the heads of their representatives, that is to say, an appeal to that some blind slave of ours - the majority of the mob. Independently of this we shall invest the president with the right of declaring a state of war. We shall justify this last right on the ground that the president as chief of the whole army of the country must have it at his disposal, in case of need for the defense of the new republican constitution, the right to defend which will belong to him as the responsible representative of this constitution.

14. It is easy to understand them in these conditions the key of the shrine will lie in our hands, and no one outside ourselves will any longer direct the force of legislation.

15. Besides this we shall, with the introduction of the new republican constitution, take from the Chamber the right of interpolation on government measures, on the pretext of preserving political secrecy, and, further, we

shall by the new constitution reduce the number of representatives to a minimum, thereby proportionately reducing political passions and the passion for politics. If, however, they should, which is hardly to be expected, burst into flame, even in this minimum, we shall nullify them by a stirring appeal and a reference to the majority of the whole people ... Upon the president will depend the appointment of presidents and vice-presidents of the Chamber and the Senate. Instead of constant sessions of Parliaments we shall reduce their sittings to a few months. Moreover, the president, as chief of the executive power, will have the right to summon and dissolve Parliament, and, in the latter case, to prolong the time for the appointment of a new parliamentary assembly. But in order that the consequences of all these acts which in substance are illegal, should not, prematurely for our plans, upon the responsibility established by use of the president, WE SHALL INSTIGATE MINISTERS AND OTHER OFFICIALS OF THE HIGHER ADMINISTRATION ABOUT THE PRESIDENT TO EVADE HIS DISPOSITIONS BY TAKING MEASURES OF THEIR OWN, for doing which they will be made the scapegoats in his place ... This part we especially recommend to be given to be played by the Senate, the Council of State, or the Council of Ministers, but not to an individual official.

16. The president will, at our discretion, interpret the sense of such of the existing laws as admit of various interpretation; he will further annul them when we indicate to him the necessity to do so, besides this, he will have the right to propose temporary laws, and even new departures in the government constitutional working, the pretext both for the one and the other being the requirements for the supreme welfare of the State.

WE SHALL DESTROY

17. By such measure we shall obtain the power of destroying little by little, step by step, all that at the outset when we enter on our rights, we are compelled to introduce into the constitutions of States to prepare for the transition to an imperceptible abolition of every kind of constitution, and then the time is come to turn every form of government into OUR DESPOTISM.

18. The recognition of our despot may also come before the destruction of the constitution; the moment for this recognition will come when the peoples, utterly wearied by the irregularities and incompetence - a matter which we shall arrange for - of their rulers, will clamor: "Away with them and give us one king over all the earth who will unite us and annihilate the causes of disorders - frontiers, nationalities, religions, State debts - who will give us peace and quiet which we cannot find under our rulers and representatives."

19. But you yourselves perfectly well know that TO PRODUCE THE POSSIBILITY OF THE EXPRESSION OF SUCH WISHES BY ALL THE NATIONS IT IS INDISPENSABLE TO TROUBLE IN ALL COUNTRIES THE PEOPLE'S RELATIONS WITH THEIR GOVERNMENTS SO AS TO UTTERLY EXHAUST HUMANITY WITH DISSENSION, HATRED, STRUGGLE, ENVY AND EVEN BY THE USE OF TORTURE, BY STARVATION, BY THE INOCULATION OF DISEASES, BY WANT, SO THAT THE "GOYIM" SEE NO OTHER ISSUE THAN TO TAKE REFUGE IN OUR COMPLETE SOVEREIGNTY IN MONEY AND IN ALL ELSE.

20. But if we give the nations of the world a breathing space the moment we long for is hardly likely ever to arrive.

PROTOCOL No. 11

1. The State Council has been, as it were, the emphatic expression of the authority of the ruler: it will be, as the "show" part of the Legislative Corps, what may be called the editorial committee of the laws and decrees of the ruler.

2. This, then, is the program of the new constitution. We shall make Law, Right and Justice (1) in the guise of proposals to the Legislative Corps, (2) by decrees of the president under the guise of general regulations, of orders of the Senate and of resolutions of the State Council in the guise of ministerial orders, (3) and in case a suitable occasion should arise - in the form of a revolution in the State.

3. Having established approximately the MODUS AGENDI we will occupy ourselves with details of those combinations by which we have still to complete the revolution in the course of the machinery of State in the direction already indicated. By these combinations I mean the freedom of the Press, the right of association, freedom of conscience, the voting principle, and many another that must disappear for ever from the memory of man, or undergo a radical alteration the day after the promulgation of the new constitution. It is only at the moment that we shall be able at once to announce all our orders, for, afterwards, every noticeable alteration will be dangerous, for the following reasons: if this alteration be brought in with harsh severity and in a sense of severity and limitations, it may lead to a feeling of despair caused by fear of new alterations in the same direction; if, on the other hand, it be brought in a sense of further indulgences it will be said that we have recognized our own wrong-doing and this will destroy the prestige of the infallibility of our authority, or else it will be said that we have become alarmed and are compelled to show a yielding disposition, for which we shall get no thanks because it will be supposed to be compulsory ... Both the one and the other are injurious to the prestige of the new constitution. What we want is that from the first moment of its promulgation, while the peoples of the world are still stunned by the accomplished fact of the revolution, still in a condition of terror and uncertainty, they should recognize once for all that we are so strong, so inexpugnable, so super-abundantly filled with power, that in no case shall we take any account of them, and so far from paying any attention to their opinions or wishes, we are ready and able to crush with irresistible power all expression or manifestation thereof at every moment and in every place, that we have seized at once everything we wanted and shall in no case divide our power with them ... Then in fear and trembling they will close their eyes to everything, and be content to await what will be the end of it all.

WE ARE WOLVES

4. The GOYIM are a flock of sheep, and we are their wolves. And you know what happens when the wolves get hold of the flock?

5. There is another reason also why they will close their eyes: for we shall keep promising them to give back all the liberties we have taken away as soon as we have quelled the enemies of peace and tamed all parties....

6. It is not worth to say anything about how long a time they will be kept waiting for this return of their liberties....

7. For what purpose then have we invented this whole policy and insinuated it into the minds of the GOY without giving them any chance to examine its underlying meaning? For what, indeed, if not in order to obtain in a roundabout way what is for our scattered tribe unattainable by the direct road? It is this which has served as the basis for our organization of SECRET MASONRY WHICH IS NOT KNOWN TO, AND AIMS WHICH ARE NOT EVEN SO MUCH AS SUSPECTED BY, THESE "GOY" CATTLE, ATTRACTED BY US INTO THE "SHOW" ARMY OF MASONIC LODGES IN ORDER TO THROW DUST IN THE EYES OF THEIR FELLOWS.

8. God has granted to us, His Chosen People, the gift of the dispersion, and in this which appears in all eyes to be our weakness, has come forth all our strength, which has now brought us to the threshold of sovereignty over all the world.

9. There now remains not much more for us to build up upon the foundation we have laid.

PROTOCOL No. 12

1. The word "freedom," which can be interpreted in various ways, is defined by us as follows -

2. Freedom is the right to do what which the law allows. This interpretation of the word will at the proper time be of service to us, because all freedom will thus be in our hands, since the laws will abolish or create only that which is desirable for us according to the aforesaid program.

3. We shall deal with the press in the following way: what is the part played by the press to-day? It serves to excite and inflame those passions which are needed for our purpose or else it serves selfish ends of parties. It is often vapid, unjust, mendacious, and the majority of the public have not the slightest idea what ends the press really serves. We shall saddle and bridle it with a tight curb: we shall do the same also with all productions of the printing press, for where would be the sense of getting rid of the attacks of the press if we remain targets for pamphlets and books? The produce of publicity, which nowadays is a source of heavy expense owing to the necessity of censoring it, will be turned by us into a very lucrative source of income to our State: we shall law on it a special stamp tax and require deposits of caution-money before permitting the establishment of any organ of the press or of printing offices; these will then have to guarantee our government against any kind of attack on the part of the press. For any attempt to attack us, if such still be possible, we shall inflict fines without mercy. Such measures as stamp tax, deposit of caution-money and fines secured by these deposits, will bring in a huge income to the government. It is true that party organs might not spare money for the sake of publicity, but these we shall shut up at the second attack upon us. No one shall with impunity lay a finger on the aureole of our government infallibility. The pretext for stopping any publication will be the alleged plea that it is agitating the public mind without occasion or justification. I BEG YOU TO NOTE THAT AMONG THOSE MAKING ATTACKS UPON US WILL ALSO BE ORGANS ESTABLISHED BY US, BUT THEY WILL ATTACK EXCLUSIVELY POINTS THAT WE HAVE PRE-DETERMINED TO ALTER.

WE CONTROL THE PRESS

4. NOT A SINGLE ANNOUNCEMENT WILL REACH THE PUBLIC WITHOUT OUR CONTROL. Even now this is already being attained by us inasmuch as all news items are received by a few agencies, in whose offices they are focused from all parts of the world. These agencies will then be already entirely ours and will give publicity only to what we dictate to them.

5. If already now we have contrived to possess ourselves of the minds of the GOY communities to such an extent the they all come near looking upon the events of the world through the colored glasses of those spectacles we are setting astride their noses; if already now there is not a single State where there exist for us any barriers to admittance into what GOY stupidity calls State secrets: what will our positions be then, when we shall be acknowledged supreme lords of the world in the person of our king of all the world

6. Let us turn again to the FUTURE OF THE PRINTING PRESS. Every one desirous of being a publisher, librarian, or printer, will be obliged to provide himself with the diploma instituted therefore, which, in case of any fault, will be immediately impounded. With such measures THE INSTRUMENT OF THOUGHT WILL BECOME AN EDUCATIVE MEANS ON THE HANDS OF OUR GOVERNMENT, WHICH WILL NO LONGER ALLOW THE MASS OF THE NATION TO BE LED ASTRAY IN BY-WAYS AND FANTASIES ABOUT THE BLESSINGS OF PROGRESS. Is there any one of us who does not know that these phantom blessings are the direct roads to foolish imaginings which give birth to anarchical relations of men among themselves and towards authority, because progress, or rather the idea of progress, has introduced the conception of every kind of emancipation, but has failed to establish its limits All the so-called liberals are

anarchists, if not in fact, at any rate in thought. Every one of them in hunting after phantoms of freedom, and falling exclusively into license, that is, into the anarchy of protest for the sake of protest

FREE PRESS DESTROYED

7. We turn to the periodical press. We shall impose on it, as on all printed matter, stamp taxes per sheet and deposits of caution- money, and books of less than 30 sheets will pay double. We shall reckon them as pamphlets in order, on the one hand, to reduce the number of magazines, which are the worst form of printed poison, and, on the other, in order that this measure may force writers into such lengthy productions that they will be little read, especially as they will be costly. At the same time what we shall publish ourselves to influence mental development in the direction laid down for our profit will be cheap and will be read voraciously. The tax will bring vapid literary ambitions within bounds and the liability to penalties will make literary men dependent upon us. And if there should be any found who are desirous of writing against us, they will not find any person eager to print their productions in print the publisher or printer will have to apply to the authorities for permission to do so. Thus we shall know beforehand of all tricks preparing against us and shall nullify them by getting ahead with explanations on the subject treated of.

8. Literature and journalism are two of the most important educative forces, and therefore our government will become proprietor of the majority of the journals. This will neutralize the injurious influence of the privately-owned press and will put us in possession of a tremendous influence upon the public mind.... If we give permits for ten journals, we shall ourselves found thirty, and so on in the same proportion. This, however, must in no wise be suspected by the public. For which reason all journals published by us will be of the most opposite, in appearance, tendencies and opinions, thereby creating confidence in us and bringing over to us quite unsuspecting opponents, who will thus fall into our trap and be rendered harmless.

9. In the front rank will stand organs of an official character. They will always stand guard over our interests, and therefore their influence will be comparatively insignificant.

10. In the second rank will be the semi-official organs, whose part it will be to attack the tepid and indifferent.

11. In the third rank we shall set up our own, to all appearance, off position, which, in at least one of its organs, will present what looks like the very antipodes to us. Our real opponents at heart will accept this simulated opposition as their own and will show us their cards.

12. All our newspapers will be of all possible complexions - aristocratic, republican, revolutionary, even anarchical - for so long, of course, as the constitution exists.... Like the Indian idol "Vishnu" they will have a hundred hands, and every one of them will have a finger on any one of the public opinions as required. When a pulse quickens these hands will lead opinion in the direction of our aims, for an excited patient loses all power of judgment and easily yields to suggestion. Those fools who will think they are repeating the opinion of a newspaper of their own camp will be repeating our opinion or any opinion that seems desirable for us. In the vain belief that they are following the organ of their party they will, in fact, follow the flag which we hang out for them.

13. In order to direct our newspaper militia in this sense we must take special and minute care in organizing this matter. Under the title of central department of the press we shall institute literary gatherings at which our agents will without attracting attention issue the orders and watchwords of the day. By discussing and controverting, but always superficially, without touching the essence of the matter, our organs will carry on a sham fight fusillade with the official newspapers solely for the purpose of giving occasion for us to express

ourselves more fully than could well be done from the outset in official announcements, whenever, of course, that is to our advantage.

14. THESE ATTACKS UPON US WILL ALSO SERVE ANOTHER PURPOSE, NAMELY, THAT OUR SUBJECTS WILL BE CONVINCED TO THE EXISTENCE OF FULL FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND SO GIVE OUR AGENTS AN OCCASION TO AFFIRM THAT ALL ORGANS WHICH OPPOSE US ARE EMPTY BABBLERS, since they are incapable of finding any substantial objections to our orders.

ONLY LIES PRINTED

15. Methods of organization like these, imperceptible to the public eye but absolutely sure, are the best calculated to succeed in bringing the attention and the confidence of the public to the side of our government. Thanks to such methods we shall be in a position as from time to time may be required, to excite or to tranquilize the public mind on political questions, to persuade or to confuse, printing now truth, now lies, facts or their contradictions, according as they may be well or ill received, always very cautiously feeling our ground before stepping upon it.... WE SHALL HAVE A SURE TRIUMPH OVER OUR OPPONENTS SINCE THEY WILL NOT HAVE AT THEIR DISPOSITION ORGANS OF THE PRESS IN WHICH THEY CAN GIVE FULL AND FINAL EXPRESSION TO THEIR VIEWS owing to the aforesaid methods of dealing with the press. We shall not even need to refute them except very superficially.

16. Trial shots like these, fired by us in the third rank of our press, in case of need, will be energetically refuted by us in our semi-official organs.

17. Even nowadays, already, to take only the French press, there are forms which reveal masonic solidarity in acting on the watchword: all organs of the press are bound together by professional secrecy; like the augurs of old, not one of their numbers will give away the secret of his sources of information unless it be resolved to make announcement of them. Not one journalist will venture to betray this secret, for not one of them is ever admitted to practice literature unless his whole past has some disgraceful sore or other.... These sores would be immediately revealed. So long as they remain the secret of a few the prestige of the journalist attacks the majority of the country - the mob follow after him with enthusiasm.

18. Our calculations are especially extended to the provinces. It is indispensable for us to inflame there those hopes and impulses with which we could at any moment fall upon the capital, and we shall represent to the capitals that these expressions are the independent hopes and impulses of the provinces. Naturally, the source of them will be always one and the same - ours. WHAT WE NEED IS THAT, UNTIL SUCH TIME AS WE ARE IN THE PLENITUDE POWER, THE CAPITALS SHOULD FIND THEMSELVES STIFLED BY THE PROVINCIAL OPINION OF THE NATIONS, I.E., OF A MAJORITY ARRANGED BY OUR AGENTUR. What we need is that at the psychological moment the capitals should not be in a position to discuss an accomplished fact for the simple reason, if for no other, that it has been accepted by the public opinion of a majority in the provinces. 19. WHEN WE ARE IN THE PERIOD OF THE NEW REGIME TRANSITIONAL TO THAT OF OUR ASSUMPTION OF FULL SOVEREIGNTY WE MUST NOT ADMIT ANY REVELATION BY THE PRESS OF ANY FORM OF PUBLIC DISHONESTY; IT IS NECESSARY THAT THE NEW REGIME SHOULD BE THOUGHT TO HAVE SO PERFECTLY CONTENTED EVERYBODY THAT EVEN CRIMINALITY HAS DISAPPEARED ... Cases of the manifestation of criminality should remain known only to their victims and to chance witnesses - no more.

PROTOCOL No. 13

1. The need for daily forces the GOYIM to keep silence and be our humble servants. Agents taken on to our press from among the GOYIM will at our orders discuss anything which it is inconvenient for us to issue

directly in official documents, and we meanwhile, quietly amid the din of the discussion so raised, shall simply take and carry through such measures as we wish and then offer them to the public as an accomplished fact. No one will dare to demand the abrogation of a matter once settled, all the more so as it will be represented as an improvement ... And immediately the press will distract the current of thought towards, new questions, (have we not trained people always to be seeking something new?). Into the discussions of these new questions will throw themselves those of the brainless dispensers of fortunes who are not able even now to understand that they have not the remotest conception about the matters which they undertake to discuss. Questions of the political are unattainable for any save those who have guided it already for many ages, the creators.

2. From all this you will see that in seeming the opinion of the mob we are only facilitating the working of our machinery, and you may remark that it is not for actions but for words issued by us on this or that question that we seem to seek approval. We are constantly making public declaration that we are guided in all our undertakings by the hope, joined to the conviction, that we are serving the common weal.

WE DECEIVE WORKERS

3. In order to distract people who may be too troublesome from discussions of questions of the political we are now putting forward what we allege to be new questions of the political, namely, questions of industry. In this sphere let them discuss themselves silly! The masses are agreed to remain inactive, to take a rest from what they suppose to be political (which we trained them to in order to use them as a means of combating the GOY governments) only on condition of being found new employments, in which we are prescribing them something that looks like the same political object. In order that the masses themselves may not guess what they are about WE FURTHER DISTRACT THEM WITH AMUSEMENTS, GAMES, PASTIMES, PASSIONS, PEOPLE'S PALACES.... SOON WE SHALL BEGIN THROUGH THE PRESS TO PROPOSE COMPETITIONS IN ART, IN SPORT IN ALL KINDS: these interests will finally distract their minds from questions in which we should find ourselves compelled to oppose them. Growing more and more disaccustomed to reflect and form any opinions of their own, people will begin to talk in the same tone as we because we alone shall be offering them new directions for thought ... of course through such persons as will not be suspected of solidarity with us.

4. The part played by the liberals, utopian dreamers, will be finally played out when our government is acknowledged. Till such time they will continue to do us good service. Therefore we shall continue to direct their minds to all sorts of vain conceptions of fantastic theories, new and apparently progressive: for have we not with complete success turned the brainless heads of the GOYIM with progress, till there is not among the GOYIM one mind able to perceive that under this word lies a departure from truth in all cases where it is not a question of material inventions, like a fallacious idea, serves to obscure truth so that none may know it except us, the Chosen of God, its guardians.

5. When, we come into our kingdom our orators will expound great problems which have turned humanity upside down in order to bring it at the end under our beneficent rule.

6. Who will ever suspect then that ALL THESE PEOPLES WERE STAGE-MANAGED BY US ACCORDING TO A POLITICAL PLAN WHICH NO ONE HAS SO MUCH AS GUESSED AT IN THE COURSE OF MANY CENTURIES?

PROTOCOL No. 14

1. When we come into our kingdom it will be undesirable for us that there should exist any other religion than ours of the One God with whom our destiny is bound up by our position as the Chosen People and through whom our same destiny is united with the destinies of the world. We must therefore sweep away all other forms of belief. If this gives birth to the atheists whom we see to-day, it will not, being only a transitional stage,

interfere with our views, but will serve as a warning for those generations which will hearken to our preaching of the religion of Moses, that, by its stable and thoroughly elaborated system has brought all the peoples of the world into subjection to us. Therein we shall emphasize its mystical right, on which, as we shall say, all its educative power is based.... Then at every possible opportunity we shall publish articles in which we shall make comparisons between our beneficent rule and those of past ages. The blessing of tranquility, though it be a tranquility forcibly brought about by centuries of agitation, will throw into higher relief the benefits to which we shall point. The errors of the GOYIM governments will be depicted by us in the most vivid hues. We shall implant such an abhorrence of them that the peoples will prefer tranquility in a state of serfdom to those rights of vaunted freedom which have tortured humanity and exhausted the very sources of human existence, sources which have been exploited by a mob of rascally adventurers who know not what they do.... USELESS CHANGES OF FORMS OF GOVERNMENT TO WHICH WE INSTIGATED THE "GOYIM" WHEN WE WERE UNDERMINING THEIR STATE STRUCTURES, WILL HAVE SO WEARIED THE PEOPLES BY THAT TIME THAT THEY WILL PREFER TO SUFFER ANYTHING UNDER US RATHER THAN RUN THE RISK OF ENDURING AGAIN ALL THE AGITATIONS AND MISERIES THEY HAVE GONE THROUGH.

WE SHALL FORBID CHRIST

2. At the same time we shall not omit to emphasize the historical mistakes of the GOY governments which have tormented humanity for so many centuries by their lack of understanding of everything that constitutes the true good of humanity in their chase after fantastic schemes of social blessings, and have never noticed that these schemes kept on producing a worse and never a better state of the universal relations which are the basis of human life....

3. The whole force of our principles and methods will lie in the fact that we shall present them and expound them as a splendid contrast to the dead and decomposed old order of things in social life.

4. Our philosophers will discuss all the shortcomings of the various beliefs of the "GOYIM," BUT NO ONE WILL EVER BRING UNDER DISCUSSION OUR FAITH FROM ITS TRUE POINT OF VIEW SINCE THIS WILL BE FULLY LEARNED BY NONE SAVE OURS WHO WILL NEVER DARE TO BETRAY ITS SECRETS.

5. IN COUNTRIES KNOWN AS PROGRESSIVE AND ENLIGHTENED WE HAVE CREATED A SENSELESS, FILTHY, ABOMINABLE LITERATURE. For some time after our entrance to power we shall continue to encourage its existence in order to provide a telling relief by contrast to the speeches, party program, which will be distributed from exalted quarters of ours.... Our wise men, trained to become leaders of the GOYIM, will compose speeches, projects, memoirs, articles, which will be used by us to influence the minds of the GOYIM, directing them towards such understanding and forms of knowledge as have been determined by us.

PROTOCOL No. 15

1. When we at last definitely come into our kingdom by the aid of COUPS D'ETAT prepared everywhere for one and the same day, after definitely acknowledged (and not a little time will pass before that comes about, perhaps even a whole century) we shall make it our task to see that against us such things as plots shall no longer exist. With this purpose we shall slay without mercy all who take arms (in hand) to oppose our coming into our kingdom. Every kind of new institution of anything like a secret society will also be punished with death; those of them which are now in existence, are known to us, serve us and have served us, we shall disband and send into exile to continents far removed from Europe. IN THIS WAY WE SHALL PROCEED WITH THOSE "GOY" MASONS WHO KNOW TOO MUCH; such of these as we may for some reason spare will be

kept in constant fear of exile. We shall promulgate a law making all former members of secret societies liable to exile from Europe as the center of rule.

2. Resolutions of our government will be final, without appeal.

3. In the GOY societies, in which we have planted and deeply rooted discord and protestantism, the only possible way of restoring order is to employ merciless measures that prove the direct force of authority: no regard must be paid to the victims who fall, they suffer for the well-being of the future. The attainment of that well-being, even at the expense of sacrifices, is the duty of any kind of government that acknowledges as justification for its existence not only its privileges but its obligations. The principal guarantee of stability of rule is to confirm the aureole of power, and this aureole is attained only by such a majestic inflexibility of might as shall carry on its face the emblems of inviolability from mystical causes - from the choice of God. **SUCH WAS, UNTIL RECENT TIMES, THE RUSSIAN AUTOCRACY, THE ONE AND ONLY SERIOUS FOE WE HAD IN THE WORLD, WITHOUT COUNTING THE PAPACY.** Bear in mind the example when Italy, drenched with blood, never touched a hair of the head of Sulla who had poured forth that blood: Sulla enjoyed an apotheosis for his might in him, but his intrepid return to Italy ringed him round with inviolability. The people do not lay a finger on him who hypnotizes them by his daring and strength of mind.

SECRET SOCIETIES

4. Meantime, however, until we come into our kingdom, we shall act in the contrary way: we shall create and multiply free masonic lodges in all the countries of the world, absorb into them all who may become or who are prominent in public activity, for these lodges we shall find our principal intelligence office and means of influence. All these lodges we shall bring under one central administration, known to us alone and to all others absolutely unknown, which will be composed of our learned elders. The lodges will have their representatives who will serve to screen the above-mentioned administration of MASONRY and from whom will issue the watchword and program. In these lodges we shall tie together the knot which binds together all revolutionary and liberal elements. Their composition will be made up of all strata of society. The most secret political plots will be known to us and fall under our guiding hands on the very day of their conception. **AMONG THE MEMBERS OF THESE LODGES WILL BE ALMOST ALL THE AGENTS OF INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL POLICE** since their service is for us irreplaceable in the respect that the police is in a position not only to use its own particular measures with the insubordinate, but also to screen our activities and provide pretexts for discontents, ET CETERA.

5. The class of people who most willingly enter into secret societies are those who live by their wits, careerists, and in general people, mostly light-minded, with whom we shall have no difficulty in dealing and in using to wind up the mechanism of the machine devised by us. If this world grows agitated the meaning of that will be that we have had to stir up in order to break up its too great solidarity. **BUT IF THERE SHOULD ARISE IN ITS MIDST A PLOT, THEN AT THE HEAD OF THAT PLOT WILL BE NO OTHER THAN ONE OF OUR MOST TRUSTED SERVANTS.** It is natural that we and no other should lead MASONIC activities, for we know whither we are leading, we know the final goal of every form of activity whereas the GOYIM have knowledge of nothing, not even of the immediate effect of action; they put before themselves, usually, the momentary reckoning of the satisfaction of their self- opinion in the accomplishment of their thought without even remarking that the very conception never belonged to their initiative but to our instigation of their thought

GENTILES ARE STUPID

6. The GOYIM enter the lodges out of curiosity or in the hope by their means to get a nibble at the public pie, and some of them in order to obtain a hearing before the public for their impracticable and groundless fantasies:

they thirst for the emotion of success and applause, of which we are remarkably generous. And the reason why we give them this success is to make use of the high conceit of themselves to which it gives birth, for that insensibly disposes them to assimilate our suggestions without being on their guard against them in the fullness of their confidence that it is their own infallibility which is giving utterance to their own thoughts and that it is impossible for them to borrow those of others.... You cannot imagine to what extent the wisest of the GOYIM can be brought to a state of unconscious naivete in the presence of this condition of high conceit of themselves, and at the same time how easy it is to take the heart out of them by the slightest ill-success, though it be nothing more than the stoppage of the applause they had, and to reduce them to a slavish submission for the sake of winning a renewal of success.... **BY SO MUCH AS OURS DISREGARD SUCCESS IF ONLY THEY CAN CARRY THROUGH THEIR PLANS, BY SO MUCH THE "GOYIM" ARE WILLING TO SACRIFICE ANY PLANS ONLY TO HAVE SUCCESS.** This psychology of theirs materially facilitates for us the task of setting them in the required direction. These tigers in appearance have the souls of sheep and the wind blows freely through their heads. We have set them on the hobby-horse of an idea about the absorption of individuality by the symbolic unit of COLLECTIVISM.... They have never yet and they never will have the sense to reflect that this hobby-horse is a manifest violation of the most important law of nature, which has established from the very creation of the world one unit unlike another and precisely for the purpose of instituting individuality

7. If we have been able to bring them to such a pitch of stupid blindness is it not a proof, and an amazingly clear proof, of the degree to which the mind of the GOYIM is undeveloped in comparison with our mind? This it is, mainly, which guarantees our success.

GENTILES ARE CATTLE

8. And how far-seeing were our learned elders in ancient times when they said that to attain a serious end it behooves not to stop at any means or to count the victims sacrificed for the sake of that end.... We have not counted the victims of the seed of the GOY cattle, though we have sacrificed many of our own, but for that we have now already given them such a position on the earth as they could not even have dreamed of. The comparatively small numbers of the victims from the number of ours have preserved our nationality from destruction.

9. Death is the inevitable end for all. It is better to bring that end nearer to those who hinder our affairs than to ourselves, to the founders of this affair. **WE EXECUTE MASONS IN SUCH WISE THAT NONE SAVE THE BROTHERHOOD CAN EVER HAVE A SUSPICION OF IT, NOT EVEN THE VICTIMS THEMSELVES OF OUR DEATH SENTENCE, THEY ALL DIE WHEN REQUIRED AS IF FROM A NORMAL KIND OF ILLNESS** Knowing this, even the brotherhood in its turn dare not protest. By such methods we have plucked out of the midst of MASONRY the very root of protest against our disposition. While preaching liberalism to the GOY we at the same time keep our own people and our agents in a state of unquestioningly submission.

10. Under our influence the execution of the laws of the GOYIM has been reduced to a minimum. The prestige of the law has been exploded by the liberal interpretations introduced into this sphere. In the most important and fundamental affairs and questions, **JUDGES DECIDE AS WE DICTATE TO THEM**, see matters in the light wherewith we enfold them for the administration of the GOYIM, of course, through persons who are our tools though we do not appear to have anything in common with them - by newspaper opinion or by other means Even senators and the higher administration accept our counsels. The purely brute mind of the GOYIM is incapable of use for analysis and observation, and still more for the foreseeing whither a certain manner of setting a question may tend.

11. In this difference in capacity for thought between the GOYIM and ourselves may be clearly discerned the seal of our position as the Chosen People and of our higher quality of humanness, in contradistinction to the

brute mind of the GOYIM. Their eyes are open, but see nothing before them and do not invent (unless perhaps, material things). From this it is plain that nature herself has destined us to guide and rule the world.

WE DEMAND SUBMISSION

12. When comes the time of our overt rule, the time to manifest its blessing, we shall remake all legislatures, all our laws will be brief, plain, stable, without any kind of interpretations, so that anyone will be in a position to know them perfectly. The main feature which will run right through them is submission to orders, and this principle will be carried to a grandiose height. Every abuse will then disappear in consequence of the responsibility of all down to the lowest unit before the higher authority of the representative of power. Abuses of power subordinate to this last instance will be so mercilessly punished that none will be found anxious to try experiments with their own powers. We shall follow up jealously every action of the administration on which depends the smooth running of the machinery of the State, for slackness in this produces slackness everywhere; not a single case of illegality or abuse of power will be left without exemplary punishment.

13. Concealment of guilt, connivance between those in the service of the administration - all this kind of evil will disappear after the very first examples of severe punishment. The aureole of our power demands suitable, that is, cruel, punishments for the slightest infringement, for the sake of gain, of its supreme prestige. The sufferer, though his punishment may exceed his fault, will count as a soldier falling on the administrative field of battle in the interest of authority, principle and law, which do not permit that any of those who hold the reins of the public coach should turn aside from the public highway to their own private paths. FOR EXAMPLES OUR JUDGES WILL KNOW THAT WHENEVER THEY FEEL DISPOSED TO PLUME THEMSELVES ON FOOLISH CLEMENCY THEY ARE VIOLATING THE LAW OF JUSTICE WHICH IS INSTITUTED FOR THE EXEMPLARY EDIFICATION OF MEN BY PENALTIES FOR LAPSES AND NOT FOR DISPLAY OF THE SPIRITUAL QUALITIES OF THE JUDGES.... Such qualities it is proper to show in private life, but not in a public square which is the educationally basis of human life.

14. Our legal staff will serve not beyond the age of 55, firstly because old men more obstinately hold to prejudiced opinions, and are less capable of submitting to new directions, and secondly because this will give us the possibility by this measure of securing elasticity in the changing of staff, which will thus the more easily bend under our pressure: he who wishes to keep his place will have to give blind obedience to deserve it. In general, our judges will be elected by us only from among those who thoroughly understand that the part they have to play is to punish and apply laws and not to dream about the manifestations of liberalism at the expense of the educational scheme of the State, as the GOYIM in these days imagine it to be.... This method of shuffling the staff will serve also to explode any collective solidarity of those in the same service and will bind all to the interests of the government upon which their fate will depend. The young generation of judges will be trained in certain views regarding the inadmissibility of any abuses that might disturb the established order of our subjects among themselves.

15. In these days the judges of the GOYIM create indulgences to every kind of crimes, not having a just understanding of their office, because the rulers of the present age in appointing judges to office take no care to inculcate in them a sense of duty and consciousness of the matter which is demanded of them. As a brute beast lets out its young in search of prey, so do the GOYIM give to them for what purpose such place was created. This is the reason why their governments are being ruined by their own forces through the acts of their own administration.

16. Let us borrow from the example of the results of these actions yet another lesson for our government.

17. We shall root out liberalism from all the important strategic posts of our government on which depends the training of subordinates for our State structure. Such posts will fall exclusively to those who have been

trained by us for administrative rule. To the possible objection that the retirement of old servants will cost the Treasury heavily, I reply, firstly, they will be provided with some private service in place of what they lose, and, secondly, I have to remark that all the money in the world will be concentrated in our hands, consequently it is not our government that has to fear expense.

WE SHALL BE CRUEL

18. Our absolutism will in all things be logically consecutive and therefore in each one of its decrees our supreme will be respected and unquestionably fulfilled: it will ignore all murmurs, all discontents of every kind and will destroy to the root every kind of manifestation of them in act by punishment of an exemplary character.

19. We shall abolish the right of cessation, which will be transferred exclusively to our disposal - to the cognizance of him who rules, for we must not allow the conception among the people of a thought that there could be such a thing as a decision that is not right of judges set up by us. If, however, anything like this should occur, we shall ourselves cassate the decision, but inflict therewith such exemplary punishment on the judge for lack of understanding of his duty and the purpose of his appointment as will prevent a repetition of such cases I repeat that it must be born in mind that we shall know every step of our administration which only needs to be closely watched for the people to be content with us, for it has the right to demand from a good government a good official.

20. OUR GOVERNMENT WILL HAVE THE APPEARANCE OF A PATRIARCHAL PATERNAL GUARDIANSHIP ON THE PART OF OUR RULER. Our own nation and our subjects will discern in his person a father caring for their every need, their every act, their every inter-relation as subjects one with another, as well as their relations to the ruler. They will then be so thoroughly imbued with the thought that it is impossible for them to dispense with this wardship and guidance, if they wish to live in peace and quiet, THAT THEY WILL ACKNOWLEDGE THE AUTOCRACY OF OUR RULER WITH A DEVOTION BORDERING ON "APOTHEOSIS," especially when they are convinced that those whom we set up do not put their own in place of authority, but only blindly execute his dictates. They will be rejoiced that we have regulated everything in their lives as is done by wise parents who desire to train children in the cause of duty and submission. For the peoples of the world in regard to the secrets of our polity are ever through the ages only children under age, precisely as are also their governments.

21. As you see, I found our despotism on right and duty: the right to compel the execution of duty is the direct obligation of a government which is a father for its subjects. It has the right of the strong that it may use it for the benefit of directing humanity towards that order which is defined by nature, namely, submission. Everything in the world is in a state of submission, if not to man, then to circumstances or its own inner character, in all cases, to what is stronger. And so shall we be this something stronger for the sake of good.

22. We are obliged without hesitation to sacrifice individuals, who commit a breach of established order, for in the exemplary punishment of evil lies a great educational problem.

23. When the King of Israel sets upon his sacred head the crown offered him by Europe he will become patriarch of the world. The indispensable victims offered by him in consequence of their suitability will never reach the number of victims offered in the course of centuries by the mania of magnificence, the emulation between the GOY governments.

24. Our King will be in constant communion with the peoples, making to them from the tribune speeches which fame will in that same hour distribute over all the world.

PROTOCOL No. 16

1. In order to effect the destruction of all collective forces except ours we shall emasculate the first stage of collectivism - the UNIVERSITIES, by reeducating them in a new direction. THEIR OFFICIALS AND PROFESSORS WILL BE PREPARED FOR THEIR BUSINESS BY DETAILED SECRET PROGRAMS OF ACTION FROM WHICH THEY WILL NOT WITH IMMUNITY DIVERGE, NOT BY ONE IOTA. THEY WILL BE APPOINTED WITH ESPECIAL PRECAUTION, AND WILL BE SO PLACED AS TO BE WHOLLY DEPENDENT UPON THE GOVERNMENT.

2. We shall exclude from the course of instruction State Law as also all that concerns the political question. These subjects will be taught to a few dozen of persons chosen for their preeminent capacities from among the number of the initiated. THE UNIVERSITIES MUST NO LONGER SEND OUT FROM THEIR HALLS MILK SOPS CONCOCTING PLANS FOR A CONSTITUTION, LIKE A COMEDY OR A TRAGEDY, BUSYING THEMSELVES WITH QUESTIONS OF POLICY IN WHICH EVEN THEIR OWN FATHERS NEVER HAD ANY POWER OF THOUGHT.

3. The ill-guided acquaintance of a large number of persons with questions of polity creates utopian dreamers and bad subjects, as you can see for yourselves from the example of the universal education in this direction of the GOYIM. We must introduce into their education all those principles which have so brilliantly broken up their order. But when we are in power we shall remove every kind of disturbing subject from the course of education and shall make out of the youth obedient children of authority, loving him who rules as the support and hope of peace and quiet.

WE SHALL CHANGE HISTORY

4. Classicism as also any form of study of ancient history, in which there are more bad than good examples, we shall replace with the study of the program of the future. We shall erase from the memory of men all facts of previous centuries which are undesirable to us, and leave only those which depict all the errors of the government of the GOYIM. The study of practical life, of the obligations of order, of the relations of people one to another, of avoiding bad and selfish examples, which spread the infection of evil, and similar questions of an educative nature, will stand in the forefront of the teaching program, which will be drawn up on a separate plan for each calling or state of life, in no wise generalizing the teaching. This treatment of the question has special importance.

5. Each state of life must be trained within strict limits corresponding to its destination and work in life. The OCCASIONAL GENIUS HAS ALWAYS MANAGED AND ALWAYS WILL MANAGE TO SLIP THROUGH INTO OTHER STATES OF LIFE, BUT IT IS THE MOST PERFECT FOLLY FOR THE SAKE OF THIS RARE OCCASIONAL GENIUS TO LET THROUGH INTO RANKS FOREIGN TO THEM THE UNTALENTED WHO THUS ROB OF THEIR PLACES WHO BELONG TO THOSE RANKS BY BIRTH OR EMPLOYMENT. YOU KNOW YOURSELVES IN WHAT ALL THIS HAS ENDED FOR THE "GOYIM" WHO ALLOWED THIS CRYING ABSURDITY.

6. In order that he who rules may be seated firmly in the hearts and minds of his subjects it is necessary for the time of his activity to instruct the whole nation in the schools and on the market places about this meaning and his acts and all his beneficent initiatives.

7. We shall abolish every kind of freedom of instruction. Learners of all ages have the right to assemble together with their parents in the educational establishments as it were in a club: during these assemblies, on holidays, teachers will read what will pass as free lectures on questions of human relations, of the laws of examples, of the philosophy of new theories not yet declared to the world. These theories will be raised by us to

the stage of a dogma of faith as a traditional stage towards our faith. On the completion of this exposition of our program of action in the present and the future I will read you the principles of these theories.

8. In a word, knowing by the experience of many centuries that people live and are guided by ideas, that these ideas are imbibed by people only by the aid of education provided with equal success for all ages of growth, but of course by varying methods, we shall swallow up and confiscate to our own use the last scintilla of independence of thought, which we have for long past been directing towards subjects and ideas useful for us. The system of bridling thought is already at work in the so-called system of teaching by OBJECT LESSONS, the purpose of which is to turn the GOYIM into unthinking submissive brutes waiting for things to be presented before their eyes in order to form an idea of them.... In France, one of our best agents, Bourgeois, has already made public a new program of teaching by object lessons.

PROTOCOL No. 17

1. The practice of advocacy produces men cold, cruel, persistent, unprincipled, who in all cases take up an impersonal, purely legal standpoint. They have the inveterate habit to refer everything to its value for the defense and not to the public welfare of its results. They do not usually decline to undertake any defense whatever, they strive for an acquittal at all costs, caviling over every petty crux of jurisprudence and thereby they demoralize justice. For this reason we shall set this profession into narrow frames which will keep it inside this sphere of executive public service. Advocates, equally with judges, will be deprived of the right of communication with litigant; they will receive business only from the court and will study it by notes of report and documents, defending their clients after they have been interrogated in court on facts that have appeared. They will receive an honorarium without regard to the quality of the defense. This will render them mere reporters on law-business in the interests of justice and as counterpoise to the proctor who will be the reporter in the interests of prosecution; this will shorten business before the courts. In this way will be established a practice of honest unprejudiced defense conducted not from personal interest but by conviction. This will also, by the way, remove the present practice of corrupt bargain between advocacy to agree only to let that side win which pays most.....

WE SHALL DESTROY THE CLERGY

2. WE HAVE LONG PAST TAKEN CARE TO DISCREDIT THE PRIESTHOOD OF "GOYIM," and thereby to ruin their mission on earth which in these days might still be a great hindrance to us. Day by day its influence on the peoples of the world is falling lower. FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE HAS BEEN DECLARED EVERYWHERE, SO THAT NOW ONLY YEARS DIVIDE US FROM THE MOMENT OF THE COMPLETE WRECKING OF THAT CHRISTIAN RELIGION: as to other religions we shall have still less difficulty in dealing with them, but it would be premature to speak of this now. We shall act clericalism and clericals into such narrow frames as to make their influence move in retrogressive proportion to its former progress.

3. When the time comes finally to destroy the papal court the finger of an invisible hand will point the nations towards this court. When, however, the nations fling themselves upon it, we shall come forward in the guise of its defenders as if to save excessive bloodshed. By this diversion we shall penetrate to its very bowels and be sure we shall never come out again until we have gnawed through the entire strength of this place.

4. THE KING OF THE JEWS WILL BE THE REAL POPE OF THE UNIVERSE, THE PATRIARCH OF THE INTERNATIONAL CHURCH [The Antichrist??].

5. But, IN THE MEANTIME, while we are reeducating youth in new traditional religions and afterwards in ours, WE SHALL NOT OVERTLY LAY A FINGER ON EXISTING CHURCHES, BUT WE SHALL FIGHT AGAINST THEM BY CRITICISM CALCULATED TO PRODUCE SCHISM

6. In general, then, our contemporary press will continue to CONVICT State affairs, religions, incapacities of the GOYIM, always using the most unprincipled expressions in order by every means to lower their prestige in the manner which can only be practiced by the genius of our gifted tribe

7. Our kingdom will be an apologia of the divinity Vishnu, in whom is found its personification - in our hundred hands will be, one in each, the springs of the machinery of social life. We shall see everything without the aid of official police which, in that scope of its rights which we elaborated for the use of the GOYIM, hinders governments from seeing. In our programs ONE-THIRD OF OUR SUBJECTS WILL KEEP THE REST UNDER OBSERVATION from a sense of duty, on the principle of volunteer service to the State. It will then be no disgrace to be a spy and informer, but a merit: unfounded denunciations, however, will be cruelly punished that there may be development of abuses of this right.

8. Our agents will be taken from the higher as well as the lower ranks of society, from among the administrative class who spend their time in amusements, editors, printers and publishers, booksellers, clerks, and salesmen, workmen, coachmen, lackeys, et cetera. This body, having no rights and not being empowered to take any action on their own account, and consequently a police without any power, will only witness and report: verification of their reports and arrests will depend upon a responsible group of controllers of police affairs, while the actual act of arrest will be performed by the gendarmerie and the municipal police. Any person not denouncing anything seen or heard concerning questions of polity will also be charged with and made responsible for concealment, if it be proved that he is guilty of this crime.

9. JUST AS NOWADAYS OUR BRETHERN, ARE OBLIGED AT THEIR OWN RISK TO DENOUNCE TO THE KABAL APOSTATES OF THEIR OWN FAMILY or members who have been noticed doing anything in opposition to the KABAL, SO IN OUR KINGDOM OVER ALL THE WORLD IT WILL BE OBLIGATORY FOR ALL OUR SUBJECTS TO OBSERVE THE DUTY OF SERVICE TO THE STATE IN THIS DIRECTION. 10. Such an organization will extirpate abuses of authority, of force, of bribery, everything in fact which we by our counsels, by our theories of the superhuman rights of man, have introduced into the customs of the GOYIM.... But how else were we to procure that increase of causes predisposing to disorders in the midst of their administration? Among the number of those methods one of the most important is - agents for the restoration of order, so placed as to have the opportunity in their disintegrating activity of developing and displaying their evil inclinations - obstinate self-conceit, irresponsible exercise of authority, and, first and foremost, venality.

PROTOCOL No. 18

1. When it becomes necessary for us to strengthen the strict measures of secret defense (the most fatal poison for the prestige of authority) we shall arrange a simulation of disorders or some manifestation of discontents finding expression through the co-operation of good speakers. Round these speakers will assemble all who are sympathetic to his utterances. This will give us the pretext for domiciliary prerequisites and surveillance on the part of our servants from among the number of the GOYIM police....

2. As the majority of conspirators act of love for the game, for the sake of talking, so, until they commit some overt act we shall not lay a finger on them but only introduce into their midst observation elements It must be remembered that the prestige of authority is lessened if it frequently discovers conspiracies against itself: this implies a presumption of consciousness of weakness, or, what is still worse, of injustice. You are aware that we have broken the prestige of the GOY kings by frequent attempts upon their lives through our agents, blind sheep

of our flock, who are easily moved by a few liberal phrases to crimes provided only they be painted in political colors. WE HAVE COMPELLED THE RULERS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THEIR WEAKNESS IN ADVERTISING OVERT MEASURES OF SECRETE DEFENSE AND THEREBY WE SHALL BRING THE PROMISE OF AUTHORITY TO DESTRUCTION.

3. Our ruler will be secretly protected only by the most insignificant guard, because we shall not admit so much as a thought that there could exist against him any sedition with which he is not strong enough to contend and is compelled to hide from it.

4. If we should admit this thought, as the GOYIM have done and are doing, we should IPSO FACTO be signing a death sentence, if not for our ruler, at any rate for his dynasty, at no distant date.

GOVERNMENT BY FEAR

5. According to strictly enforced outward appearances our ruler will employ his power only for the advantage of the nation and in no wise for his own or dynastic profits. Therefore, with the observance of this decorum, his authority will be respected and guarded by the subjects themselves, it will receive an apotheosis in the admission that with it is bound up the well-being of every citizen of the State, for upon it will depend all order in the common life of the pack....

6. OVERT DEFENSE OF THE KIND ARGUES WEAKNESS IN THE ORGANIZATION OF HIS STRENGTH.

7. Our ruler will always be among the people and be surrounded by a mob of apparently curious men and women, who will occupy the front ranks about him, to all appearance by chance, and will restrain the ranks of the rest out of respect as it will appear for good order. This will sow an example of restraint also in others. If a petitioner appears among the people trying to hand a petition and forcing his way through the ranks, the first ranks must receive the petition and before the eyes of the petitioner pass it to the ruler, so that all may know that what is handed in reaches its destination, that consequently, there exists a control of the ruler himself. The aureole of power requires for its existence that the people may be able to say: "If the king knew of this," or: "the king will hear it."

8. WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICIAL DEFENSE, THE MYSTICAL PRESTIGE OF AUTHORITY DISAPPEARS: given a certain audacity, and everyone counts himself master of it, the sedition-monger is conscious of his strength, and when occasion serves watches for the moment to make an attempt upon authority For the GOYIM we have been preaching something else, but by that very fact we are enabled to see what measures of overt defense have brought them to....

9. CRIMINALS WITH US WILL BE ARRESTED AT THE FIRST, more or less, well-grounded SUSPICION: it cannot be allowed that out of fear of a possible mistake an opportunity should be given of escape to persons suspected of a political lapse of crime, for in these matters we shall be literally merciless. If it is still possible, by stretching a point, to admit a reconsideration of the motive causes in simple crimes, there is no possibility of excuse for persons occupying themselves with questions in which nobody except the government can understand anything.... And it is not all governments that understand true policy.

PROTOCOL No. 19

1. If we do not permit any independent dabbling in the political we shall on the other hand encourage every kind of report or petition with proposals for the government to examine into all kinds of projects for the amelioration of the condition of the people; this will reveal to us the defects or else the fantasies of our subjects,

to which we shall respond either by accomplishing them or by a wise rebutment to prove the shortsightedness of one who judges wrongly.

2. Sediton-mongering is nothing more than the yapping of a lap- dog at an elephant. For a government well organized, not from the police but from the public point of view, the lap-dog yaps at the elephant in entire unconsciousness of its strength and importance. It needs no more than to take a good example to show the relative importance of both and the lap-dogs will cease to yap and will wag their tails the moment they set eyes on an elephant.

3. In order to destroy the prestige of heroism for political crime we shall send it for trial in the category of thieving, murder, and every kind of abominable and filthy crime. Public opinion will then confuse in its conception of this category of crime with the disgrace attaching to every other and will brand it with the same contempt.

4. We have done our best, and I hope we have succeeded to obtain that the GOYIM should not arrive at this means of contending with sedition. It was for this reason that through the Press and in speeches, indirectly - in cleverly compiled school- books on history, we have advertised the martyrdom alleged to have been accredited by sediton-mongers for the idea of the commonweal. This advertisement has increased the contingent of liberals and has brought thousands of GOYIM into the ranks of our livestock cattle.

PROTOCOL No. 20

1. To-day we shall touch upon the financial program, which I put off to the end of my report as being the most difficult, the crowning and the decisive point of our plans. Before entering upon it I will remind you that I have already spoken before by way of a hint when I said that the sum total of our actions is settled by the question of figures.

2. When we come into our kingdom our autocratic government will avoid, from a principle of self-preservation, sensibly burdening the masses of the people with taxes, remembering that it plays the part of father and protector. But as State organization cost dear it is necessary nevertheless to obtain the funds required for it. It will, therefore, elaborate with particular precaution the question of equilibrium in this matter.

3. Our rule, in which the king will enjoy the legal fiction that everything in his State belongs to him (which may easily be translated into fact), will be enabled to resort to the lawful confiscation of all sums of every kind for the regulation of their circulation in the State. From this follows that taxation will best be covered by a progressive tax on property. In this manner the dues will be paid without straitening or ruining anybody in the form of a percentage of the amount of property. The rich must be aware that it is their duty to place a part of their superfluities at the disposal of the State since the State guarantees them security of possession of the rest of their property and the right of honest gains, I say honest, for the control over property will do away with robbery on a legal basis.

4. This social reform must come from above, for the time is ripe for it - it is indispensable as a pledge of peace.

WE SHALL DESTROY CAPITAL

5. The tax upon the poor man is a seed of revolution and works to the detriment of the State which is hunting after the trifling is missing the big. Quite apart from this, a tax on capitalists diminishes the growth of wealth in private hands in which we have in these days concentrated it as a counterpoise to the government strength of the GOYIM - their State finances.

6. A tax increasing in a percentage ratio to capital will give much larger revenue than the present individual or property tax, which is useful to us now for the sole reason that it excites trouble and discontent among the GOYIM.

7. The force upon which our king will rest consists in the equilibrium and the guarantee of peace, for the sake of which things it is indispensable that the capitalists should yield up a portion of their incomes for the sake of the secure working of the machinery of the State. State needs must be paid by those who will not feel the burden and have enough to take from.

8. Such a measure will destroy the hatred of the poor man for the rich, in whom he will see a necessary financial support for the State, will see in him the organizer of peace and well-being since he will see that it is the rich man who is paying the necessary means to attain these things.

9. In order that payers of the educated classes should not too much distress themselves over the new payments they will have full accounts given them of the destination of those payments, with the exception of such sums as will be appropriated for the needs of the throne and the administrative institutions.

10. He who reigns will not have any properties of his own once all in the State represented his patrimony, or else the one would be in contradiction to the other; the fact of holding private means would destroy the right of property in the common possessions of all.

11. Relatives of him who reigns, his heirs excepted, who will be maintained by the resources of the State, must enter the ranks of servants of the State or must work to obtain the right to property; the privilege of royal blood must not serve for the spoiling of the treasury.

12. Purchase, receipt of money or inheritance will be subject to the payment of a stamp progressive tax. Any transfer of property, whether money or other, without evidence of payment of this tax which will be strictly registered by names, will render the former holder liable to pay interest on the tax from the moment of transfer of these sums up to the discovery of his evasion of declaration of the transfer. Transfer documents must be presented weekly at the local treasury office with notifications of the name, surname and permanent place of residence of the former and the new holder of the property. This transfer with register of names must begin from a definite sum which exceeds the ordinary expenses of buying and selling necessities, and these will be subject to payment only by a stamp impost of a definite percentage of the unit.

13. Just strike an estimate of how many times such taxes as these will cover the revenue of the GOYIM States.

WE CAUSE DEPRESSIONS

14. The State exchequer will have to maintain a definite complement of reserve sums, and all that is collected above that complement must be returned into circulation. On these sums will be organized public works. The initiative in works of this kind, proceeding from State sources, will blind the working class firmly to the interests of the State and to those who reign. From these same sums also a part will be set aside as rewards of inventiveness and productiveness.

15. On no account should so much as a single unit above the definite and freely estimated sums be retained in the State Treasuries, for money exists to be circulated and any kind of stagnation of money acts ruinously on the running of the State machinery, for which it is the lubricant; a stagnation of the lubricant may stop the regular working of the mechanism.

16. The substitution of interest-bearing paper for a part of the token of exchange has produced exactly this stagnation. The consequences of this circumstance are already sufficiently noticeable.

17. A court of account will also be instituted by us, and in it the ruler will find at any moment a full accounting for State income and expenditure, with the exception of the current monthly account, not yet made up, and that of the preceding month, which will not yet have been delivered.

18. The one and only person who will have no interest in robbing the State is its owner, the ruler. This is why his personal control will remove the possibility of leakages of extravagances.

19. The representative function of the ruler at receptions for the sake of etiquette, which absorbs so much invaluable time, will be abolished in order that the ruler may have time for control and consideration. His power will not then be split up into fractional parts among time-serving favorites who surround the throne for its pomp and splendor, and are interested only in their own and not in the common interests of the State.

20. Economic crises have been produced by us for the GOYIM by no other means than the withdrawal of money from circulation. Huge capitals have stagnated, withdrawing money from States, which were constantly obliged to apply to those same stagnant capitals for loans. These loans burdened the finances of the State with the payment of interest and made them the bond slaves of these capitals.... The concentration of industry in the hands of capitalists out of the hands of small masters has drained away all the juices of the peoples and with them also the States....

21. The present issue of money in general does not correspond with the requirements per head, and cannot therefore satisfy all the needs of the workers. The issue of money ought to correspond with the growth of population and thereby children also must absolutely be reckoned as consumers of currency from the day of their birth. The revision of issue is a material question for the whole world.

22. YOU ARE AWARE THAT THE GOLD STANDARD HAS BEEN THE RUIN OF THE STATES WHICH ADOPTED IT, FOR IT HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO SATISFY THE DEMANDS FOR MONEY, THE MORE SO THAT WE HAVE REMOVED GOLD FROM CIRCULATION AS FAR AS POSSIBLE.

GENTILE STATES BANKRUPT

23. With us the standard that must be introduced is the cost of working-man power, whether it be reckoned in paper or in wood. We shall make the issue of money in accordance with the normal requirements of each subject, adding to the quantity with every birth and subtracting with every death.

24. The accounts will be managed by each department (the French administrative division), each circle.

25. In order that there may be no delays in the paying out of money for State needs the sums and terms of such payments will be fixed by decree of the ruler; this will do away with the protection by a ministry of one institution to the detriment of others.

26. The budgets of income and expenditure will be carried out side by side that they may not be obscured by distance one to another.

27. The reforms projected by us in the financial institutions and principles of the GOYIM will be clothed by us in such forms as will alarm nobody. We shall point out the necessity of reforms in consequence of the disorderly darkness into which the GOYIM by their irregularities have plunged the finances. The first irregularity, as we shall point out, consists in their beginning with drawing up a single budget which year after

year grows owing to the following cause: this budget is dragged out to half the year, then they demand a budget to put things right, and this they expend in three months, after which they ask for a supplementary budget, and all this ends with a liquidation budget. But, as the budget of the following year is drawn up in accordance with the sum of the total addition, the annual departure from the normal reaches as much as 50 per cent in a year, and so the annual budget is trebled in ten years. Thanks to such methods, allowed by the carelessness of the GOY States, their treasuries are empty. The period of loans supervenes, and that has swallowed up remainders and brought all the GOY States to bankruptcy.

28. You understand perfectly that economic arrangements of this kind, which have been suggested to the GOYIM by us, cannot be carried on by us.

29. Every kind of loan proves infirmity in the State and a want of understanding of the rights of the State. Loans hang like a sword of Damocles over the heads of rulers, who, instead of taking from their subjects by a temporary tax, come begging with outstretched palm of our bankers. Foreign loans are leeches which there is no possibility of removing from the body of the State until they fall off of themselves or the State flings them off. But the GOY States do not tear them off; they go on in persisting in putting more on to themselves so that they must inevitably perish, drained by voluntary blood-letting.

TYRANNY OF USURY

30. What also indeed is, in substance, a loan, especially a foreign loan? A loan is - an issue of government bills of exchange containing a percentage obligation commensurate to the sum of the loan capital. If the loan bears a charge of 5 per cent, then in twenty years the State vainly pays away in interest a sum equal to the loan borrowed, in forty years it is paying a double sum, in sixty - treble, and all the while the debt remains an unpaid debt.

31. From this calculation it is obvious that with any form of taxation per head the State is baling out the last coppers of the poor taxpayers in order to settle accounts with wealth foreigners, from whom it has borrowed money instead of collecting these coppers for its own needs without the additional interest.

32. So long as loans were internal the GOYIM only shuffled their money from the pockets of the poor to those of the rich, but when we bought up the necessary person in order to transfer loans into the external sphere, all the wealth of States flowed into our cash-boxes and all the GOYIM began to pay us the tribute of subjects.

33. If the superficiality of GOY kings on their thrones in regard to State affairs and the venality of ministers or the want of understanding of financial matters on the part of other ruling persons have made their countries debtors to our treasuries to amounts quite impossible to pay it has not been accomplished without, on our part, heavy expenditure of trouble and money.

34. Stagnation of money will not be allowed by us and therefore there will be no State interest-bearing paper, except a one per-cent series, so that there will be no payment of interest to leeches that suck all the strength out of the State. The right to issue interest-bearing paper will be given exclusively to industrial companies who will find no difficulty in paying interest out of profits, whereas the State does not make interest on borrowed money like these companies, for the State borrows to spend and not to use in operations.

35. Industrial papers will be bought also by the government which from being as now a paper of tribute by loan operations will be transformed into a lender of money at a profit. This measure will stop the stagnation of money, parasitic profits and idleness, all of which were useful for us among the GOYIM so long as they were independent but are not desirable under our rule.

36. How clear is the undeveloped power of thought of the purely brute brains of the GOYIM, as expressed in the fact that they have been borrowing from us with payment of interest without ever thinking that all the same these very moneys plus an addition for payment of interest must be got by them from their own State pockets in order to settle up with us. What could have been simpler than to take the money they wanted from their own people?

37. But it is a proof of the genius of our chosen mind that we have contrived to present the matter of loans to them in such a light that they have even seen in them an advantage for themselves.

38. Our accounts, which we shall present when the time comes, in the light of centuries of experience gained by experiments made by us on the GOY States, will be distinguished by clearness and definiteness and will show at a glance to all men the advantage of our innovations. They will put an end to those abuses to which we owe our mastery over the GOYIM, but which cannot be allowed in our kingdom.

39. We shall so hedge about our system of accounting that neither the ruler nor the most insignificant public servant will be in a position to divert even the smallest sum from its destination without detection or to direct it in another direction except that which will be once fixed in a definite plan of action.

40. And without a definite plan it is impossible to rule. Marching along an undetermined road and with undetermined resources brings to ruin by the way heroes and demigods.

41. The GOY rulers, whom we once upon a time advised should be distracted from State occupations by representative receptions, observances of etiquette, entertainments, were only screens for our rule. The accounts of favorite courtiers who replaced them in the sphere of affairs were drawn up for them by our agents, and every time gave satisfaction to short-sighted minds by promises that in the future economics and improvements were foreseen Economics from what? From new taxes? - were questions that might have been but were not asked by those who read our accounts and projects.

42. You know to what they have been brought by this carelessness, to what pitch of financial disorder they have arrived, notwithstanding the astonishing industry of their peoples.

PROTOCOL No. 21

1. To what I reported to you at the last meeting I shall now add a detailed explanation of internal loans. Of foreign loans I shall say nothing more, because they have fed us with national moneys of the GOYIM, but for our State there will be no foreigners, that is, nothing external.

2. We have taken advantage of the venality of administrators and slackness of rulers to get our moneys twice, thrice and more times over, by lending to the GOY governments moneys which were not at all needed by the States. Could anyone do the like in regard to us? Therefore, I shall only deal with the details of internal loans.

3. States announce that such a loan is to be concluded and open subscriptions for their own bills of exchange, that is, for their interest-bearing paper. That they may be within the reach of all the price is determined at from a hundred to a thousand; and a discount is made for the earliest subscribers. Next day by artificial means the price of them goes up, the alleged reason being that everyone is rushing to buy them. In a few days the treasury safes are as they say overflowing and there's more money than they can do with. The subscription, it is alleged, covers many times over the issue total of the loan; in this lies the whole stage effect - look you, they say, what confidence is shown in the government's bills of exchange.

4. But when the comedy is played out there emerges the fact that a debit and an exceedingly burdensome debit has been created. For the payment of interest it becomes necessary to have recourse to new loans, which do not swallow up but only add to the capital debt. And when this credit is exhausted it becomes necessary by new taxes to cover, not the loan, BUT ONLY THE INTEREST ON IT. These taxes are a debit employed to cover a debit....

5. Later comes the time for conversions, but they diminish the payment of interest without covering the debt, and besides they cannot be made without the consent of the lenders; on announcing a conversion a proposal is made to return the money to those who are not willing to convert their paper. If everybody expressed his unwillingness and demanded his money back, the government would be hooked on their own files and would be found insolvent and unable to pay the proposed sums. By good luck the subjects of the GOY governments, knowing nothing about financial affairs, have always preferred losses on exchange and diminution of interest to the risk of new investments of their moneys, and have thereby many a time enabled these governments to throw off their shoulders a debit of several millions.

6. Nowadays, with external loans, these tricks cannot be played by the GOYIM for they know that we shall demand all our moneys back.

7. In this way in acknowledged bankruptcy will best prove to the various countries the absence of any means between the interest of the peoples and of those who rule them.

8. I beg you to concentrate your particular attention upon this point and upon the following: nowadays all internal loans are consolidated by so-called flying loans, that is, such as have terms of payment more or less near. These debts consist of moneys paid into the savings banks and reserve funds. If left for long at the disposition of a government these funds evaporate in the payment of interest on foreign loans, and are placed by the deposit of equivalent amount of RENTS.

9. And these last it is which patch up all the leaks in the State treasuries of the GOYIM.

10. When we ascend the throne of the world all these financial and similar shifts, as being not in accord with our interests, will be swept away so as not to leave a trace, as also will be destroyed all money markets, since we shall not allow the prestige of our power to be shaken by fluctuations of prices set upon our values, which we shall announce by law at the price which represents their full worth without any possibility of lowering or raising. (Raising gives the pretext for lowering, which indeed was where we made a beginning in relation to the values of the GOYIM.)

11. We shall replace the money markets by grandiose government credit institutions, the object of which will be to fix the price of industrial values in accordance with government views. These institutions will be in a position to fling upon the market five hundred millions of industrial paper in one day, or to buy up for the same amount. In this way all industrial undertakings will come into dependence upon us. You may imagine for yourselves what immense power we shall thereby secure for ourselves.

PROTOCOL No. 22

1. In all that has so far been reported by me to you, I have endeavored to depict with care the secret of what is coming, of what is past, and of what is going on now, rushing into the flood of the great events coming already in the near future, the secret of our relations to the GOYIM and of financial operations. On this subject there remains still a little for me to add.

2. IN OUR HANDS IS THE GREATEST POWER OF OUR DAY - GOLD: IN TWO DAYS WE CAN PROCURE FROM OUR STOREHOUSES ANY QUANTITY WE MAY PLEASE.

3. Surely there is no need to seek further proof that our rule is predestined by God? Surely we shall not fail with such wealth to prove that all that evil which for so many centuries we have had to commit has served at the end of ends the cause of true well-being - the bringing of everything into order? Though it be even by the exercise of some violence, yet all the same it will be established. We shall contrive to prove that we are benefactors who have restored to the rent and mangled earth the true good and also freedom of the person, and therewith we shall enable it to be enjoyed in peace and quiet, with proper dignity of relations, on the condition, of course, of strict observance of the laws established by us. We shall make plain therewith that freedom does not consist in dissipation and in the right of unbridled license any more than the dignity and force of a man do not consist in the right of everyone to promulgate destructive principles in the nature of freedom of conscience, equality and a like, that freedom of the person in no wise consists in the right to agitate oneself and others by abominable speeches before disorderly mobs, and that true freedom consists in the inviolability of the person who honorably and strictly observes all the laws of life in common, that human dignity is wrapped up in consciousness of the rights and also of the absence of rights of each, and not wholly and solely in fantastic imaginings about the subject of one's EGO.

4. One authority will be glorious because it will be all-powerful, will rule and guide, and not muddle along after leaders and orators shrieking themselves hoarse with senseless words which they call great principles and which are nothing else, to speak honestly, but utopian Our authority will be the crown of order, and in that is included the whole happiness of man. The aureole of this authority will inspire a mystical bowing of the knee before it and a reverent fear before it of all the peoples. True force makes no terms with any right, not even with that of God: none dare come near to it so as to take so much as a span from it away.

PROTOCOL No. 23

1. That the peoples may become accustomed to obedience it is necessary to inculcate lessons of humility and therefore to reduce the production of articles of luxury. By this we shall improve morals which have been debased by emulation in the sphere of luxury. We shall reestablish small master production which will mean laying a mine under the private capital of manufactures. This is indispensable also for the reason that manufacturers on the grand scale often move, though not always consciously, the thoughts of the masses in directions against the government. A people of small masters knows nothing of unemployment and this binds him closely with existing order, and consequently with the firmness of authority. For us its part will have been played out the moment authority is transferred into our hands. Drunkenness also will be prohibited by law and punishable as a crime against humanness of man who is turned into a brute under the influence of alcohol.

2. Subjects, I repeat once more, give blind obedience only to the strong hand which is absolutely independent of them, for in it they feel the sword of defense and support against social scourges.... What do they want with an angelic spirit in a king? What they have to see in him is the personification of force and power.

3. The supreme lord who will replace all now existing ruler, dragging in their existence among societies demoralized by us, societies that have denied even the authority of God, from whose midst breeds out on all sides the fire of anarchy, must first of all proceed to quench this all-devouring flame. Therefore he will be obliged to kill off those existing societies, though he should drench them with his own blood, that he may resurrect them again in the form of regularly organized troops fighting consciously with every kind of infection that may cover the body of the State with sores.

4. This Chosen One of God is chosen from above to demolish the senseless forces moved by instinct and not reason, by brutishness and humanness. These forces now triumph in manifestations of robbery and every kind

of violence under the mask of principles of freedom and every kind of violence under the mask of principles of freedom and rights. They have overthrown all forms of social order to erect on the ruins of the throne of the King of the Jews; but their part will be played out the moment he enters into his kingdom. Then it will be necessary to sweep them away from his path, on which must be left no knot, no splinter.

5. Then will it be possible for us to say to the peoples of the world: Give thanks to God and bow the knee before him who bears on his front the seal of the predestination of man, to which God himself has led his star that none other but Him might free us from all the before-mentioned forces and evils.

PROTOCOL No. 24

1. I pass now to the method of confirming the dynastic roots of King David to the last strata of the earth.

2. This confirmation will first and foremost be included in that which to this day has rested the force of conservatism by our learned elders of the conduct of the affairs of the world, in the directing of the education of thought of all humanity.

3. Certain members of the seed of David will prepare the kings and their heirs, selecting not by right of heritage but by eminent capacities, inducting them into the most secret mysteries of the political, into schemes of government, but providing always that none may come to knowledge of the secrets. The object of this mode of action is that all may know that government cannot be entrusted to those who have not been inducted into the secret places of its art....

4. To these persons only will be taught the practical application of the aforementioned plans by comparison of the experiences of many centuries, all the observations on the politico-economic moves and social sciences - in a word, all the spirit of laws which have been unshakably established by nature herself for the regulation of the relations of humanity.

5. Direct heirs will often be set aside from ascending the throne if in their time of training they exhibit frivolity, softness and other qualities that are the ruin of authority, which render them incapable of governing and in themselves dangerous for kingly office.

6. Only those who are unconditionally capable for firm, even if it be to cruelty, direct rule will receive the reins of rule from our learned elders.

7. In case of falling sick with weakness of will or other form of incapacity. kings must by law hand over the reins of rule to new and capable hands.

8. The king's plan of action for the current moment, and all the more so for the future, will be unknown, even to those who are called his closest counselors.

KING OF THE JEWS

9. Only the king and the three who stood sponsor for him will know what is coming.

10. In the person of the king who with unbending will is master of himself and of humanity all will discern as it were fate with its mysterious ways. None will know what the king wishes to attain by his dispositions, and therefore none will dare to stand across an unknown path.

11. It is understood that the brain reservoir of the king must correspond in capacity to the plan of government it has to contain. It is for this reason that he will ascend the throne not otherwise than after examination of his mind by the aforesaid learned elders.

12. That the people may know and love their king, it is indispensable for him to converse in the market-places with his people. This ensures the necessary clinching of the two forces which are now divided one from another by us by the terror.

13. This terror was indispensable for us till the time comes for both these forces separately to fall under our influence.

14. The king of the Jews must not be at the mercy of his passions, and especially of sensuality: on no side of his character must he give brute instincts power over his mind. Sensuality worse than all else disorganizes the capacities of the mind and clearness of views, distracting the thoughts to the worst and most brutal side of human activity.

15. The prop of humanity in the person of the supreme lord of all the world of the holy seed of David must sacrifice to his people all personal inclinations.

16. Our supreme lord must be of an exemplary irreproachable.

The Mind Conspirators

Saturday, September 04, 2010 – by [Nelson Hultberg](#)

More and more Americans today are coming to understand the terrible truth about our Federal Government -- that it seeks to dominate us as citizens, to mold us into a society of dutiful Stepford Wives totally beholden to the wishes of elite politicians, bureaucrats and bankers. Those who study history, independent of the public school system, understand that this state aggrandizement process has been under way for the past 100 years in America in one form or another, and that it is taking place because too many of our citizens sanction such dictatorial usurpation and actually work diligently for its implementation.

This process has resulted in the lion's share of our earnings being annually confiscated by these governmental elites and then redistributed to despicable projects of waste and war to further their dream of world collectivism. It has led to the shocking debasement of our currency and an endless escalation in the cost of staying alive. It has brought about the degeneration of our economy from a robust engine of industry and personal self-reliance to an effete conglomeration of bloated consumers subsisting on financial gimmickry and debt addiction. As a result, America, once a proud land of muscular factories and productive people, has become a stuporous society of shopping malls and welfare crybabies.

Why this process is taking place is one of the most disheartening questions in all of history. What follows is an attempt to show why and how it is unfolding. There are other reasons as to "why and how" than the ones given here. Tyranny's evolution is always a complex process with many forces coalescing to bring about freedom's demise. This essay, however, is a look into the two most important of those forces -- ideas and money.

A very popular and frightening science-fiction movie in 1956, called *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, is an apt metaphor for what is taking place in our country. In the movie starring Dana Wynter and Kevin McCarthy, a network of aliens is slowly and secretly taking over the bodies of the citizens of a small town by use of mysterious cadaver-like "pods" that are left in their backyards and basements. Once transformed into an alien, each citizen then tries to recruit the rest of his family and friends. It's absolutely chilling in its impact -- one of the great science-fiction movies ever.

Today's collectivists, working so assiduously to transform America, are like the aliens in that movie. They permeate our entire society and are after not our bodies, but the enslavement of our minds and souls. Ideological fallacies and moral inversions are the mysterious pods that these aliens leave in the cerebral backyards of our lives. They are aliens because they wish to destroy our system of natural liberty and limited government. And even though most of them believe what they are doing is right, they are far from innocent, for *they have chosen to blank out* on the horrendous ramifications of what they are doing.

Teaching a False Ideal

It begins in the school system. All modern authoritarian political movements have required recruitment of a disciplined, intellectual vanguard to proselytize the masses into accepting the authoritarian rule. This vanguard is recruited from the "best and brightest" minds of the nation involved. History shows how leading intellectuals of Europe used this strategy starting in the 1880's and 1890's to move Germany, Russia, and Italy into authoritarian political systems by the 1917-1930 period.

What history also shows is that the same thing has been going on in America for many decades, only on a more subtle level. The problem is that our media and our scholars lose their objectivity when analyzing their own

political system and the ideas used to promote it. Thus, history's lesson is ignored in order to further the recruitment of the American intelligentsia into promotion of collectivism.

Instead of being objective forums for the transmission of the values of civilization to the young, our colleges and universities have now become fervent breeding grounds for this statist recruitment process, in which the better students get swept up in the "false ideal" of collectivism. These better students then proceed out into the world to positions of intellectual, political and economic leadership, to proselytize the masses into this alleged ideal just as church missionaries used to go out into the world to spread the gospel. The difference being that the missionaries were spreading good, while today's collectivists are pushing fallacies.

Such a vision very subtly conveys the notion that mankind is capable of achieving an egalitarian world where there will be no poverty, no disparity of wealth, no prejudice, no ignorance, no wars -- in short a heaven on earth. The requisites for bringing about such a world are to eradicate the "dangerous workings" of the free-market through centralization of government power in Washington, and then eventually move to some form of world governing body. This is necessary because it is allegedly capitalism and man's drive for profits that are responsible for the strife, wars and poverty from which the world suffers. Western civilization, having been built upon capitalism and profit, must be razed and replaced with a new civilization that will usher in this heaven on earth.

It is a powerful futuristic vision that is subtly instilled into callow minds who lack the necessary sophistication to resist. Being young and prone to idealism, they perceive "political centralization and a one-world government" to be an ideal just as the students in Marx's day mistook his "dictatorship of the proletariat" as some sort of ideal. Thousands of highly intelligent students spring forth from this brainwash every year to enter the world and spread their newly learned convictions that capitalism and Western civilization are the "roots of all evil."

These "best and brightest" of our youth advance over the years into prominent careers as teachers, journalists, publishers, movie directors, ministers, politicians, bankers, and businessmen -- all the time working for and promoting the collectivization of our society. Yet they don't see themselves as working for anything dictatorial. They think the political centralization and [Keynesian](#) economics taught to them by their mentors will cure the evils and inequities of the world. When they push for more centralized government, more taxes, more regulations, and more "liquidity injections" from the Fed, they are working for what they think will be a more benign civilization. They think they are working for an "ideal."

As the great philosophers tell us, it is ideals that are the primary movers of men throughout history. Our tragedy is that we are educating one generation after another with "false ideals," and the evidence that would expose the falsity of those ideals is not allowed a respectable place in our public schools due to those schools' control by government bureaucracies and the statist viewpoint.

The New World Order

One of the most influential institutions resulting from this indoctrination process is what is called the Trilateral Commission. This is an international group of about 300 elite intellectuals, statesmen, bankers, and businessmen founded in 1973 by billionaire banker David Rockefeller as a spin off from the older Council on Foreign Relations (CFR).

The Council on Foreign Relations is like the Trilateral Commission, only larger; it is composed of about 4,000 prominent leaders in business, government, and education, etc. It was formed in the 1920s by a group of progressive intellectuals of Woodrow Wilson's era led by the openly acknowledged socialist, Edward Mandell

House, who was Wilson's chief advisor. Its official purpose was to coordinate America's foreign policy with other nations to create a more peaceful and orderly world.

The group today claims vague educational goals and the fomenting of more international co-operation as its purpose, but numerous public statements from its leaders indicate that its policies are clearly directed toward transforming U.S. sovereignty and national independence into some form of world government. It has, since the days of its inception, been patiently working for this goal, and its spin-off group, the Trilateral Commission, is doing likewise.

In his book, *With No Apologies*, the late U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater tells us that while David Rockefeller publicly launched the Trilateral Commission, the brains behind its formation was CFR member Zbigniew Brzezinski, whose 1970 book *Between Two Ages* set the tone for what is now referred to as a "New World Order," in which the major nations of the world -- the U.S., Europe, Japan, etc. -- link together to plan and direct the fortunes of the rest of the world. In short, Brzezinski condemns national sovereignty as outdated and unworkable, saying that we need to rewrite the American Constitution, and eliminate our system of federalism in favor of a more centralized government in Washington and eventually subordination to a world government. [1]

Here we have a profound demonstration of how ideas shape the unfolding of history. The Trilateral Commission and its parent, the Council on Foreign Relations, are the end results of many decades of ideological corruption in our colleges and universities beginning as far back as the late 19th century. The men of zeal who are inducted into the Trilateral Commission have been indoctrinated with false philosophical, political and economic theories that declare limited government and laissez-faire capitalism to be "chaotic, unworkable and morally wrong." These theories have their origin in the works of powerful collectivist thinkers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau, Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, and John Maynard Keynes.

The overwhelming majority of academics throughout the West have bought into these theories and have taught the Trilateral members in their youth this anti-individualistic conception of politics and economics. Is it any wonder then that the Trilateral members -- advancing in their careers and armed with the power of such views -- are driven to try and move humanity away from the "destructive evils of capitalism and limited government" by centralizing them under one rule. This is the nature of intellectuals; most of them will always attempt to further the cause of what they think to be politically and morally right.

Of course, it doesn't hurt the Trilateral members' motivation in all this that they see themselves as part of the leadership elite that is to organize, advise and run this future one-world government. Power has consumed men throughout history, and it is no different today. Its lure makes well-meaning men zealous and arrogant; it makes them believe that the Gargantua of government can be controlled once unchained from the bonds of the Constitution because it is in *their* "well-meaning hands."

"In my view," wrote Goldwater, "the Trilateral Commission represents a skillful, coordinated effort to seize control and consolidate the four centers of power -- political, monetary, intellectual and ecclesiastical....What the Trilaterals truly intend is the creation of a worldwide economic power superior to the political governments of the nation-states involved....As managers and creators of the system, they will rule the future." [2]

Former President Clinton's Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbot (a Trilateral member), succinctly expressed the organization's long range goal recently in *Time* magazine: "In the next century," he declared, "nations as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognize a single, global authority....National sovereignty wasn't such a great idea after all." [3]

Protectors of the Empire

In ancient Rome after the Republic had expanded into Empire, there evolved a super elite of ruthlessly skilled soldiers whose sole job was to look after the Emperor and protect him at all cost; it was called the Praetorian Guard, and its responsibility was to perpetuate the rule of the reigning despot in power, to guard him against all enemies, to use whatever means necessary to extend his power.

Goldwater likened the CFR and Trilateral Commission to a new Praetorian Guard for our age. The job of these highly influential academics, politicians, bankers, and businessmen is to insure the perpetuation of America's centralized state and pave the path for its merging into a World State by any means. "To accomplish this purpose," he writes, "they [mobilize] the money power of the Wall Street bankers, the intellectual influence of the academic community...and the media controllers represented in the membership of the CFR and the Trilateral." [4]

A very apropos analogy indeed. The combine of the CFR and the Trilateral Commission is a modern reincarnation of Caesar's corps of elite soldiers pledged to protect despotism -- not literally in terms of physical prowess as in Caesar's day, but much more sophisticatedly in terms of *intellectual and financial prowess*. The New World Order requires a new methodology of usurpation, and these ideological authoritarians have risen up to provide it in spades.

Their methodology has worked well for the past 75 years: Teach a subtle, socialistic serfdom to the more intelligent of our youth under the guise of an "ideal" society in which there will be no more poverty, hardship, and inequality in life if only we will construct a government that has a central bank with the ability to print money at will and is far reaching enough to control all the political-economic endeavors of man. Then sell this mess of pottage by throwing reason, history and the economic facts of reality down the memory hole.

The propagandistic "army of managers" that Aldous Huxley warned us about in *Brave New World* is now upon us. Such social engineers are the statist intellectuals in our high schools, colleges and grad schools. They have a powerful control over the minds of our best and brightest youth for 12 years, and they're turning them into the most dutiful of apparatchiks for a new world collectivism.

Sanity and Rationality Give Way

This then is one of the primary reasons for the disintegration of America over the past century. Philosophical fallacies and socialist falsifications of economics and history have gained sway in the school system to poison our citizens' minds against the American concept of freedom. Such fallacies have created a grossly distorted image for the man in the street about the way the world works. Freedom is now seen as inimical to human dignity. Creative entrepreneurship is portrayed as exploitation of the poor instead of their only hope. Gold is termed a "barbarous relic" instead of history's proven store of value. Wealth is thought of as a part of nature and static instead of created by free men and infinite.

All the values that sustain civilized life (freedom, strength of will, independence, honor) are endlessly denigrated in our schools and media. We are being conditioned to accept sloth as normalcy, servility as dignity, weakness of will as compassion, and government conveyed privilege as justice. The world of sanity and rationality gives way to regimental nightmares of Orwellian "newspeak" and "political correctness" in order for legions of middle-class sluggards to feel good about themselves while they live out their spiritually squalid lives queuing up to the entitlement troughs of the mega-state.

Pretty bubbleheads preen daily on our financial networks, playing the shill to Wall Street and Washington in order to lure unsuspecting Americans into buying insanely overvalued stocks. The great market exchanges, once prudent arenas of investment where the engine of capitalism traded value for value, have become sham casinos staggering under decades of massive Fed created debt and lurching into oblivion on the greater fool theory.

Mole-like men posture as intellectuals with a perspective that extends no further than the previous decade. We now can have freedom without risk, plenty without work, and hope without heartache. Such are the illusions of modernity's *short range mentalities*. Such is the fate of those who believe knowledge is numbers and truth a remnant of primitive times, that technology is a substitute for values and security more precious than liberty.

These are the irrational pretensions of our age. These monstrous absurdities, being promoted today as humane social policies, are the result of deeply flawed theoretical doctrines that have slowly permeated our academic community over the past 100 years -- doctrines such as Jean Jacques Rousseau's absolutism of the general will, which leads to majoritarian despotism; Karl Marx's labor theory of value, which leads to massive wealth redistribution; Auguste Comte's philosophy of positivism, which leads to moral relativism; Thorstein Veblen's organic concept of society, which leads to the eradication of individual rights; and John Maynard Keynes' inflationary monetary policy, which leads to the degenerate bankruptcy of our nation.

Such doctrines have produced what historian, Clarence Carson, calls a "collectivist curvature of the mind." It is this collectivist intellectual warp that is setting the stage for the coming dictatorship. Once the Mind Conspirators have worked their ideological venom into the brains of our youthful intelligentsia during their formative years, they have recruited in most instances a lifelong apparatchik for their cause. If that apparatchik is brilliant and ruthless, he will attempt to rise in government and banking circles. He will seek to join elite organizations such as the CFR and the Trilaterals. He will strive to move the country toward the "collectivist ideal" of a one-world government.

The Role of Conspiracy

Many people on the political right today subscribe to the idea that not only are the elitist CFR and Trilateral organizations conspiring to establish a world dictatorship, they themselves are orchestrated from behind the scenes by a smaller, more secret conspiracy of mega-bankers. As this article shows, I certainly agree that collectivist elites are working to move us toward a one-world government, that these elites dominate the banking industry and bureaucracies of the nation, and that much of what they do is secret. But the banking / bureaucratic elites of modern collectivism are only part of the problem. The collectivist movement is a multi-faceted phenomenon of many levels and groups all pushing for bigger and bigger government because it furthers their power, status and wealth.

Obviously there are numerous conspiracies that take place within this push for bigger government. For example: The Plunge Protection Team, a crypto faction of the Federal Government's Working Group on Financial Markets, secretly manipulates both the Dow and the price of gold. [5] The World Trade Center attack was surely more involved than the whitewashed accounting provided by the 9-11 Commission. [6] And the North American Union is not a means to better coordinate trade between Canada, America and Mexico; it is a deceptive scheme to take us toward regional government. [7]

Conspiracies abound throughout the West to expand political control and shrink freedom. It has been this way for thousands of years. Thus it is quite logical to assume that powerful bankers and bureaucrats are conspiring to move America into a one-world government? This is the nature of men in power. Only the naïve and ignorant believe otherwise. But as Ayn Rand pointed out in the 1960s, no country can be moved into a dictatorship simply by a "cabal of insiders." History does not move on a singular axis. Ideology plays a paramount role. This is why Marx said, "Corrupt the money *and the language*, and capitalism can be brought down."

The mega-bankers and bureaucrats are not the only deceivers here. There is another group in America working to destroy our system of freedom that is equally, if not more, important. As I have endeavored to show in this essay, it is the intellectuals in our school system. They have control over the minds of our youth from grade school through graduate school, and they are instilling into them an array of fallacies that is shocking and

disgusting. Thus we must not limit our diagnosis of why America is descending into a dictatorship simply to the intrigues of conspiratorial mega-bankers and bureaucrats.

Today's power elites are moving us into world government not just because of power lust and greed, but because of the *ideological worldview* that was laid down in their minds in their school years. It powerfully shapes their lives and makes them move in lockstep toward ever-increasing collectivism as they rise in their adult careers.

In other words, society is moved in much the same manner as the stock market. Just as there is a *sentiment* (i.e., an investor psychology) that moves prices up and down in the stock and commodity markets, there is also a sentiment or *zeitgeist* that permeates a society in any given era and moves its citizens one way or the other -- toward tyranny and corruption, or toward freedom and justice. The 20th century *zeitgeist* was world collectivism, and we are still mired deep in its thralls.

Financial and Ideological Conspiracy

What has resulted from this *zeitgeist* is that there are two factions of collectivist elites operating in the world today -- "political-financial" and "ideological." They both wish to bring about the end of national sovereignty and move all nations toward a one-world government to be run by endless streams of fiat money and political regimentation.

The *political-financial* elites dominate our society by means of a fascist banking cartel and the conveyance of privileges via Congress to large voting factions. The *ideological* elites dominate our university system by means of persuasive but false doctrines to mold the minds of our youth. Both of these elites believe that the Founders' constitutional system of free enterprise is unworkable, anachronistic, evil, exploitative, racist, and environmentally devastating. Thus in order to achieve a stable and just world, we must phase into a one-world government.

The political-financial elites do not overtly publicize their goal. They prefer to quietly smuggle our nation into a one-world government because they know there is too strong a tradition of freedom in America for her people to accept such a fate all at once. Thus it is implemented insidiously via deception, and therefore it is "conspiratorial." After all, these elite bankers, moguls, and bureaucrats do not divulge their true intentions to the people at large, and much of their activity is secret.

Good examples of the insidious and deceptive nature of their activities are found in the following three quotes by Richard N. Gardner, a member of the Kennedy and Carter administrations, and the infamous mega-banker, David Rockefeller:

Richard N. Gardner told the CFR in 1974: "In short, the house of world order will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down. It will look like a great booming, buzzing confusion, to use William James famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault." [8]

David Rockefeller had this to say in 1991: "We are grateful to *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *Time* magazine and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promises of discretion for almost forty years. It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subject to the bright lights of publicity during those years. But, the work is now much more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national autodetermination practiced in past centuries." [9]

Rockefeller also had this to say in 2002: "Ideological extremists...attack the Rockefeller family for the inordinate influence they claim we wield over American political and economic institutions. Some even believe we are part of a secret cabal working against the best interests of the United States, characterizing my family and me as 'internationalists' and of conspiring with others around the world to build a more integrated global political and economic structure -- one world, if you will. If that is the charge, I stand guilty, and I am proud of it." [10]

Our *political-financial* elites thus have a common objective of world government, which they are very patient and discreet about. This gives them a conspiratorial incarnation. Our *ideological* elites, are supposed to be open pursuers of the truth constructing Socratic forums for their students; but any rational observer soon realizes that this is not the case. Rabid sophistry abounds in the colleges today. Political correctness dominates. Most scholars openly teach world government as the ideal, but they do it in sophisticated form in unison with fellow colleagues. The fact that their sophistry is not consciously promoted does not make it any less deceptive. The youth under their influence are still corrupted. Thus theirs is a tacit conspiracy, rather than formally planned.

What is crucial to grasp from all this is that nefarious elites are indeed working to destroy a free, sovereign America; and the two main powers moving them toward such tyranny are FIAT MONEY and FALSE IDEOLOGY. Our politicians, corporate moguls and mega-bankers are driven toward world government because they lust relentlessly for wealth and power, but also because they have been taught that world government is the *ideal* for modern times. This agenda of world collectivism didn't just spring full blown in their heads. It was hatched in the school system. Our political-financial elites are first prepared by collectivist ideology in their formative years by their teachers and professors. Without this ideological preparation, there would be no pervasive political movement toward a New World Order. There was no widespread enthusiasm for world government in America during the 19th century because collectivism was not taught in the schools. Our scholars taught their students philosophical individualism and the legitimacy of national sovereignty.

The powerful banking interests such as the Rothschilds have always been pushing the envelope to acquire more wealth and power. Griffin's wonderful book, *The Creature from Jekyll Island*, shows this. The Rothschilds were manipulating politics 200 years ago in order to gain more than they had a right to gain via free enterprise. But they were only after more wealth and power in their specific societies (as most bankers throughout history have been). They were not after a one-world dictatorship. This is because "national sovereignty" was still part of the prevailing ideology taught in everyone's formative years. Once the views of Marx had gained sway by the turn of the 19th century, however, this all changed. After 1900, the ideology of the schools was dramatically altered; world collectivism became the ideal for which to strive. The "best and brightest," who went into banking and politics, now wanted more than just wealth and power in their respective societies. They wanted the ability to govern the world. And the collectivist ideology being taught by the scholars gave them the zealotry and belief that such conquest was vitally necessary.

Who Controls Whom?

Therefore in my opinion, it is a mistake to view the financial / banking conspirators as primary in this drama. Those who hold this view admit that intellectuals teach false ideals in the schools poisoning the minds of the "best and brightest" coming through the system; but in their eyes, our intellectuals long ago were bought off by the powerful corporate and banking elites of the latter 19th and early 20th centuries. Men such as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Mellon, and Henry Ford established prestigious foundations with billions of dollars to go toward grants to scholars who would teach the collectivist ethos. In this manner, the financial elites control and manipulate the intellectual elites into becoming their lackeys. They mold our scholars into salesmen for world collectivism. Thus the primary source of the evil taking over the world is the mega-bankers and corporate moguls whose reach stretches even into the hallowed halls of the academic arena.

This reasoning doesn't fly. Anyone who has a working knowledge of scholars knows that the *big creative minds* among them are moved by an all consuming desire for truth and the ideal. They would no more allow men like Rockefeller and Mellon to dictate that truth than they would allow witch doctors to perform surgery on them. The second line scholars (the popularizers) take their cue from the top scholars and mold their thinking accordingly. Thus it is this leadership of the top scholars that indoctrinates the second line scholars, who then indoctrinate the "best and brightest" students with the one-world ideal of collectivism.

From where do the top scholars get their motivation? From the super-minds of history -- the great philosophers, scientists, and economists. And super-minds like Isaac Newton, John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Adam Smith, Karl Marx, Auguste Comte, Ludwig von Mises, Albert Einstein and John Maynard Keynes do not bow and scrape before mega-bankers and corporate moguls. They revere the ideal of truth and seek it at all costs. They may grossly err in their discovery of it and plunge the world into terribly destructive fallacies (witness Marx and Keynes), but their motivation is cerebral rather than monetary.

Thus financial elites do not mold the intellectuals; the intellectuals mold the financial elites! The major foundations that the elites establish position themselves to be in line with the paradigms formed by the creators and super minds. "Second tier" scholars, of course, will often fashion their studies in ways to avoid biting the foundations' hands that feed them, but these intellectuals are not the creators, nor the super minds. They are the popularizers; they do not create new paradigms and visions. It is the big-picture thinkers who do that, and they are not for sale.

Refusal to accept this relationship between intellectual elites and financial elites stultifies our cause. Everyone caught up in the fight for freedom directs his efforts to the areas in which he feels most comfortable. Some will fight the ideas that are poisoning the minds of our youth, and some will fight the bankers who are corrupting the money and politics of our system. But it is crucial to understand the cause and effect process that determines what is really happening. We cannot reach our fellow citizens with the truth if we refuse to accept the "primacy of ideas." We don't all have to become experts in history, philosophy and economics to engage in this fight; but we do have to understand that *ideological matters come first* and learn as much as we can from the scholars of freedom in these fields. Failure to do this concedes the battle to the collectivist enemy who grasps such primacy very well and does not shirk from utilizing it.

The motive power behind history is the force moving all of us -- the ideas that are laid down in our minds during the all-important formative years of our youth. Tyranny cannot be brought about by political and monetary elites alone; it can only be brought about by first corrupting the minds and souls of the citizens when they are young. The intellectuals pave the way for the Hitlers and the Lenins.

The intrigues of politics and the conspiracies of elite bankers play a very important role in the torrent of history, but the grand directive of all their action is IDEOLOGY and the guiding ideals that it promotes. When this ideology is false, it leads to tyranny. When it is true, it leads to the Founding Fathers and America's original concept of freedom.

As the novelist Huxley profoundly put it, "It is in the light of our beliefs about the ultimate nature of reality that we formulate our conceptions of right and wrong; and it is in the light of our conceptions of right and wrong that we frame our conduct, not only in the relations of private life, but also in the sphere of politics and economics. So far from being irrelevant, our metaphysical beliefs are the finally determining factor in all our actions." [11]

End of America as a Sovereign Nation

To sum all this up, there are "two conspiracies" at work destroying the freedom of the West -- ideological and financial. Our drift into collectivist tyranny starts with the big thinkers of civilization such as Rousseau, Hegel, Comte, Marx, Keynes, etc. They create the tyrannical ethos, which then works its way through the academic arena to capture all levels of scholars, where it proceeds to poison each generation's "best and brightest" who then go out and become society's new power elites of mega-bankers, bureaucrats, and corporate moguls.

The goal of these intellectuals, and the power elites they spawn, is the cessation of America as a sovereign nation. The end of free enterprise and the Founders' constitutional system of liberty must naturally follow in order to complete their vision.

We have been overrun by alien Mind Conspirators who are turning America into a nation of sheep. Their nefarious ideas have, over the past 100 years, saturated all our important institutions -- from government, to the schools, to the churches, to Hollywood, to the media. These Mind Conspirators preach soothing words about the need for "stability, security and equality," but it is the same goal of all tyrannical collectivism throughout history -- the enslavement of man justified by irrational ideology and sophistry. The only difference is that it is much bigger in ambition today; its goal is world domination instead of just societal control.

My book, *The Conservative Revolution*, delves into this ideological stream of collectivism that is corrupting America and puts forth a revolutionary plan for a third political party that will stop the carnage and restore sanity to our country.

A gargantuan crash of prosperity and freedom now looms up ahead as a result of our financial and intellectual corruption. Out of the crash will come a new society. Our only hope for that new society lies in whether we, who have kept the faith of our fathers, can inform enough of our fellow citizens as to what the requisites of freedom truly are. If we can, then a rebirth of America will take place out of the crash. If not, then some variant of Orwell's nightmare will descend upon the world to enslave and stultify life for the upcoming centuries.

Notes

1. Barry M. Goldwater, *With No Apologies*, (New York: Berkely Books, 1980), p. 294.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 297-299.
3. Strobe Talbot, "The Birth of the Global Nation," *Time*, July 20, 1992, p. 70.
4. Goldwater, *op. cit.*, p. 300.
5. See Bill Murphy and Chris Powell at GATA, the Gold Anti-Trust Action Committee, www.gata.org. Also Nelson Hultberg, "Cornered Rats and the PPT," <http://www.afr.org/Hultberg/cornered.html>. And Nelson Hultberg, "Is the PPT an Urban Myth," <http://www.afr.org/Hultberg/urbanmyth.html>.
6. See Architects & Engineers for 911 Truth, www.AE911Truth.org.
7. See Eagle Forum's work on the NAU, www.eagleforum.org/topics/NAU.
8. Richard N. Gardner, "The Hard Road to World Order," *Foreign Affairs*, April 1974, p. 558.
9. David Rockefeller in an address to a meeting of The Trilateral Commission, Baden-Baden, Germany, June 6-9, 1991.
10. David Rockefeller, *Memoirs* (New York: Random House, 2002), p. 405.
11. Aldous Huxley, *Ends And Means: An Inquiry into the Nature of Ideals* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), p. 11.

The document below is an exact copy of the original document that Mr. John Nelson wrote on February 21, 1992 with the following exceptions:

- *Many statements have been made bold or italicized to call out their importance. The original document had neither bold nor italic text.*
- *Spelling errors have been corrected.*
- *A paragraph has been added to the original document and identifies itself as being such.*
- *Some of the references by this document to other documents are now hyperlinks to those other documents so you can review those other documents also if you want to.*

JOHN B. NELSON

**TO: The American National People,
The People Of The State Of Colorado,
U.S.A.**

February 21, 1992

DECLARATION OF CAUSE AND NECESSITY TO ABOLISH

AND

DECLARATION OF SEPARATE AND EQUAL STATION

I have enclosed **Senate Report No. 93-549**, 93rd Congress, 1st Session (1973), "Summary Of Emergency Power Statutes", consisting of 607 pages, which I believe you will find most interesting. The United States went "Bankrupt" in 1933 and was declared so by President Roosevelt by **Executive Orders 6073, 6102, 6111** and by **Executive Order 6260** on March 9, 1933 (See: **Senate Report 93-549**, pgs. 187 & 594), under the **"Trading with The Enemy Act"** (Sixty-Fifth Congress, Sess. I, Chs. 105, 106, October 5, 1917), and as codified at **12 U.S.C.A. 95a**. On May 23, 1933, Congressman, Louis T. McFadden, brought formal charges against the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank System, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Secretary of the United States Treasury for criminal acts. The petition for Articles of Impeachment was thereafter referred to the Judiciary Committee, and has yet to be acted upon (See: **Congressional Record**, pp. 4055-4058). Congress confirmed the Bankruptcy on June 5, 1933, and impaired the obligations and considerations of contracts through the "Joint Resolution To Suspend The Gold Standard And Abrogate The Gold Clause, June 5, 1933", (See: **House Joint Resolution 192, 73rd Congress, 1st Session**). The several States of the Union pledged the faith and credit thereof to the aid of the National Government, and formed numerous socialist committees, such as the "Council Of State Governments", "Social Security Administration" etc., to purportedly deal with the economic "Emergency." These Organizations operated under the **"Declaration of INTERdependence"** of January 22, 1937, and published some of their activities in **"The Book of the States."** The 1937 edition of the Book of the States openly declared that the people engaged in such activities as the Farming/Husbandry

Industry had been reduced to mere feudal "Tenants" on their Land. **Book Of The States, 1937, pg. 155.** This of course was compounded by such activities as price fixing wheat and grains **7 U.S.C.A. 1332**, quota regulations **7 U.S.C.A. 1371**, and livestock products **7 U.S.C.A. 1903**, which have been consistently below the costs of production, interest on loans and inflation of the paper "Bills of Credit", leaving the food producers and others in a state of peonage and involuntary servitude, constituting the taking of private property, for the benefit and use of others, without just compensation.

NOTE: The Council Of State governments has now been absorbed into such things as the "National Conference Of Commissioners On Uniform State Laws", whose Headquarters Office is located at 676 North St. Clair Street, Suite 1700, Chicago, Illinois 60611, and "all" being "members of the Bar", and operating under a **different "Constitution and By Laws"**, far distant from the depositories of the public Records, has promulgated, lobbied for, passed, adjudicated and ordered the implementation and execution of their purported "Uniform" and "Model" Acts and pretended statutory provisions, to "help implement international treaties of the United States or where world uniformity would be desirable." (See: **1990/91 Reference Book**, National Council Of Commissioners On Uniform State Laws, pg. 2). This is apparently what Robert Bork meant when he wrote "we are governed not by law or elected representatives but by an unelected, unrepresentative, unaccountable committee of lawyers applying no will but their own." (See: **The Tempting Of America**, Robert H. Bork, pg. 130). This association has been engaged in activities such as turning "Marriage" (licensed) into "International Private Law", through its International Liaisons, which meet at such places as the Hague Conferences (See: **Handbook Of Commissioners On Uniform State Laws**, 1966 Ed., pg. 156-157).

On April 25, 1938, the Supreme Court overturned the standing precedents of the prior 150 years concerning "common law," in the Federal Government.

"THERE IS NO FEDERAL COMMON LAW, AND CONGRESS HAS NO POWER TO DECLARE SUBSTANTIVE RULES OF COMMON LAW APPLICABLE IN A STATE, WHETHER THEY BE LOCAL OR GENERAL IN THEIR NATURE, BE THEY COMMERCIAL LAW OR A PART OF THE LAW OF TORTS" (See: **Erie Railroad Co. Vs. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64, 82 L.Ed. 1188**).

The Common Law is the fountain source of Substantive and Remedial Rights, if not our very Liberties (See: **Stephen, A Treaties On The Principles Of Pleading**, Introduction, Pg. 23; **Hemmingway, History Of Common Law Pleading As Evidence Of The Growth Of Individual Liberty And Power Of The Courts**, 5 Alabama Law Journal 1; **Swift vs. Tyson**, 16 Peters 1, 10 L.Ed. 865; **Constitution**, Article III, Section 2, Amendments VII, IX and X.)

The members and association of the Bar thereafter formed committees, granted themselves special privileges, immunities and franchises, and held meetings concerning the Judicial procedures, and further, to amend laws "to conform to a trend of judicial decisions or to accomplish similar objectives", including hodgepodging the jurisdictions of Law and Equity together, which is known today as "One Form Of Action." (See: **Constitution And By Laws**, Article 3, Section 3.3(c), 1990-91 Reference Book, supra, see also, **Colorado Methods of Practice**, West Pub., Vol. 4, pgs. 2-3, Authors Comments.)

NOTE: The enumerated, specified and distinct Jurisdictions established by the ordained Constitution (1789), Article III, Section 2, and under the Bill of Rights (1791), Amendment VII, were further hodgepodged and fundamentally changed in 1982 to include Admiralty Jurisdiction, which was once again brought inland.

"This is the **FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE** necessary to effect unification of **CIVIL** and **ADMIRALTY PROCEDURE**. Just as the 1938 Rules **ABOLISHED THE DISTINCTION** between **ACTIONS AT LAW** and **SUITS IN EQUITY**, this change would **ABOLISH THE DISTINCTION** between **CIVIL ACTIONS** and **SUITS IN ADMIRALTY.**" (**Federal Rules Of Civil Procedure**, 1982 Ed., pg. 17, also see, **Federalist**

Papers No. 83; Declaration Of Resolves Of The First Continental Congress; Oct. 14, 1774, Declaration Of Cause And Necessity Of Taking Up Arms; July 6, 1775, Declaration of Independence; July 4, 1776, Bennet vs. Butterworth, 52 U.S. 669.)

The United States thereafter entered the Second World War during which time the "League of Nations" was reinstated under pretense of the "United Nations" (See: **22 U.S.C.A. 287 et. seq.**), and the "Bank For International Settlements" reinstated under pretense of the "Bretton Woods Agreement" (See: **60 Stat. 1401, 22 U.S.C.A. 286 et. seq.**) as the "**International Monetary Fund**" (The Fund) and the **International Bank For Reconstruction And Development**" (The Bank).

The United States as a corporate body politic (artificial) came out of World War II in worse economic shape than when it entered, and in 1950 declared Bankruptcy and "Reorganization." The Reorganization is located in Title 5 of United States Codes Annotated. The "Explanation" at the beginning of 5 U.S.C.A. is most informative reading. The "Secretary of Treasury" was appointed as the "Receiver" in Bankruptcy. (See: **Reorganization Plan No. 26, 5 U.S.C.A. 903, Public Law 94-564**, Legislative History, pg. 5967). The United States went down the road and periodically filed for further Reorganization. Things and situations worsened, having done what they were Commanded NOT to do, (See: **Madison's Notes**, Constitutional Convention, August 16, 1787, **Federalist Papers No. 44**) and in 1965 passed the "**Coinage Act of 1965**" completely debasing the Constitutional Coin (gold & silver i.e. **Dollar**). (See: **18 U.S.C.A. 331 & 332, U.S. vs. Marigold, 50 U.S. 560, 13 L.Ed. 257**). At the signing of the Coinage Act on July 23, 1965, then President Lyndon B. Johnson stated in his Press Release that:

"When I have signed this bill before me, we will have made the first fundamental change in our coinage in 173 years. The Coinage Act of 1965 supersedes the Act of 1792. And that Act had the title: An Act Establishing a Mint and Regulating the Coinage of the United States...."

"Now I will sign this bill to make the first change in our coinage system since the 18th Century. To those members of Congress, who are here on this historic occasion, I want to assure you that in making this change from the 18th Century we have no idea of returning to it."

It is important to take cognizance of the fact that **NO Constitutional Amendment was ever obtained to FUNDAMENTALLY CHANGE, amend, abridge or abolish the Constitutional mandates, provisions or prohibitions, but due to internal and external diversions surrounding the Viet Nam War etc., the usurpation and breach went basically unchallenged and unnoticed by the general public at large, who became "a wealthy man's cannon fodder or cheap source of SLAVE LABOR."** (See: Silent Weapons For Quiet Wars, **TM-SW7905.1, pgs. 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13 & 56**). Congress was clearly delegated the Power and Authority to regulate and maintain the true and inherent "value" of the Coin within the scope and purview of Article I, Section 8, Clauses 5 & 6 and Article I, Section 10, Clause 1, of the ordained Constitution (1787), and further, under a corresponding duty and obligation to maintain said gold and silver Coin and Foreign Coin at and within the necessary and proper "equal weights and measures" clause (See also: **Bible, Dueteronomy, Chapter 25, verses 13 thru 16, Proverbs, Chapter 16, verse 11, Public Law 97-289, 96 Stat. 1211**).

Those exercising the Offices of the several States, in equal measure, knew such "De Facto Transitions" were unlawful and unauthorized, but sanctioned, implemented and enforced the complete debauchment and the resulting "governmental, social, industrial economic change" in the "De Jure" States and in United State of America (See: **Public Law 94-564**, Legislative History, pg. 5936, 5945, **31 U.S.C.A. 314, 31 U.S.C.A 321, 31 U.S.C.A. 5112, C.R.S. 11-61-101 C.R.S. 39-22-103.5 and C.R.S. 18-11-203**), and were and are now under the delusion that they can do both directly and indirectly what they were absolutely prohibited from doing (See: also, **Federalist Papers No. 44, Craig vs. Missouri**, 4 Peters 903).

In 1966, Congress being severely compromised, passed the "**Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966**", by which the entire taxing and monetary system i.e. "Essential Engine" (See: **Federalist Papers No. 31**) was placed under the Uniform Commercial Code. (See: **Public Law 89-719**, Legislative History, pg. 3722, also see; **C.R.S. 5-1-106**). The Uniform Commercial Code was of course promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners On Uniform State Laws in collusion with American Law Institute for the "**banking and business interests.**" (See: **Handbook Of The National Conference Of Commissioners On Uniform State Laws**. (1966) Ed. pgs. 152 &153). The United States being engaged in numerous United Nation conflicts, including the Korean and the Viet Nam Conflicts, which were under direction of the United Nations (See: **22 U.S.C.A. 287d**), and agreeing to foot the bill (See: **22 U.S.C.A. 287j**), and not being able to honor their obligations and rehypothecated debt credit, openly and publicly dishonored and disavowed their "Notes" and "Obligations" (**12 U.S.C.A. 411**) i.e. "**Federal Reserve Notes**" Through **Public Law 90-269, Section 2**, 82 Stat. 50 (1968) to wit:

"Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 15 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 391) is amended by striking 'and the funds provided in this Act for the redemption of Federal Reserve Notes'."

Things steadily grew worse and on March 28, 1970, then President Nixon issued **Proclamation No. 3972**, declaring an "emergency" because the Postal Employees struck against the de facto government(?) for higher pay, due to inflation of the paper "Bills of Credit." (See: **Senate Report No. 93-549**, pg. 596). Nixon placed the U.S. Postal Department under the control of the "Department of Defense." (See: **Department Of the Army Field Manual**, FM 41-10 (1969 ed.)).

"The System had been faltering for a decade, **but the bench mark date of the collapse is put at August 15, 1971.** On this day, then President Nixon reversed U.S. International Monetary Policy by officially declaring the non-convertibility of the "U.S. dollar" (the Federal Reserve Note (FRN)) into gold." (See: **Public Law 94-564**, Legislative History, pg. 5937 & **Senate Report No. 93-549**, Foreword, pg. III, **Proclamation No. 4074**, pg. 597, **31 U.S.C.A. 314** & **31 U.S.C.A. 5112**). On September 21, 1973, Congress passed **Public Law 93-110**, amending the Bretton Woods **Par Value Modification Act**, 82 Stat. 116, 31 U.S.C.A. 449, and reiterated the "Emergency", **12 U.S.C.A 95a**, and **Section 8 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act** of 1945 (**22 U.S.C.A 286f**), and which included "reports on foreign currency transactions." (Also See: **Executive Order No. 10033**). This act further declared in Section 2 (b) that:

"No provision of any law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and no rule, regulation, or order under authority of any such law, may be construed to prohibit any person from purchasing, holding, selling, or otherwise dealing with gold."

On January 19, 1976, Marjorie S. Holt noted for the record, a second "**Declaration Of INTERdependence**" and clearly identified the U.N. as a "**Communist**" organization, and that they were seeking both production and monetary control over the Union and People through International Organization promoting the "**One World Order.**" (See: **Congressional Record**, January 19, 1976, Extension of remarks; also see, **8 U.S.C.A. 1101 (40)**, **50 U.S.C.A. 781** & **783**).

The socio/economic situation worsened as noted in the Complaint/Petition, filed in the U.S. Court of Claims, Docket No. 41-76, on February 11, 1976, by 44 Federal Judges, Atkins et al. vs. U.S.. Atkins et al. complained that "As a result of inflation, the compensation of federal judges has been substantially diminished each year since 1969, causing direct and continuing monetary harm to plaintiffs...the real value of the "dollar" (FRN's) decreased by approximately 34.5 percent from March 15, 1969 to October 1, 1975....As a result, plaintiffs have suffered an unconstitutional deprivation of earnings", and in the prayer for relief claimed "damages for the constitutional violations enumerated above, measured as the diminution of his earnings for the entire period since March 9, 1969." It is quite apparent that the persons holding and enjoying Offices of Public Trust, Honor and/or Profit knew of the emergency emergent problem and sought protection for themselves, to the damage and injury of the People and Children, who were classified as "a club that has many other members" who "have

no remedy." And knowing that "heinous" acts had been committed, stated that they [judges/lawyers] would not apply the Law, nor would any substantive remedy be applied ("checked more or less, but never stopped") "until all of us [judges] are dead." Such persons Fraudulently swore an Oath to uphold, defend and preserve the sovereignty of the Nation and several Republican States of the Union, and breached the Duty to protect the People/Citizens and their Posterity from fraud, imposition, avarice and stealthy encroachment. (See: **Atkins et al. vs. U.S.**, 556 F.2d 1028, pg. 1072, 1074, **The Tempting of America**, supra, pgs. 155-159 also see, **5 U.S.C.A. 5305 & 5335**, **Senate Report No. 93-549**, pgs. 69-71, **C.R.S. 24-75-101**). This is verified in **Public Law 94-564**, Legislative History, pg. 5944, which states:

"Moving to a floating exchange rate for international commerce means private enterprise and not central governments bear the risk of currency fluctuations."

Numerous serious debates were held in Congress, including but not limited to, Tuesday, July 27, 1976 (See: **Congressional Record - House**, July 27, 1976), concerning the International Financial Institutions and its operations. Representative, Ron Paul, Chairman of the House Banking Committee, made numerous references to the true practices of the "International" financial institutions, including but not limited to, the conversion of 27,000,000 (27 million) in gold, contributed by the United States as part of its "**quota obligations**", which the International Monetary Fund (Governor-Secretary of Treasury) sold (See: **Public Law 94-564**, Legislative History, pg. 5945 & 5946), under some very questionable terms and concessions. (Also see: **The Ron Paul Money Book**, (1991), by Ron Paul, Plantation Publishing, 837 W. Plantation, Clute, Texas 77531).

On October 28, 1977 the passage of **Public Law 95-147**, 91 Stat. 1227 declared **most banking institutions, including State banks, to be under direction and control of the corporate "Governor" of the International Monetary Fund** (See: **Public Law 94-564**, Legislative History, pg. 5942, **United States Government Manual** 1990/91, pgs. 480-481). The Act further declared that:

"(2) Section 10(a) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 822a(b)) is amended by striking out the phrase 'stabilizing the exchange value of the dollar'..."

(c) The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States', approved June 5, 1933 (31 U.S.C. 463) shall not apply to obligations issued on or after the date of enactment of this section."

The International Organizations, Corporations and Associations, had refused to pay their debts and could not pay their debts, and determined that they could pass the loss of their non-redeemable, non-current notes, bonds and evidences of debt off on others, and thereby crown their fraud with success. (See: **Letter**, October 26, 1989 from Department of Treasury, Russell L. Munk, Assistant General Counsel (International Affairs), as recorded in the Office of Clerk and Recorder, Baca County, Colorado, at Book, **540** Page **364**). The de facto United States as Corporator, (**22 U.S.C.A. 286e**, et seq.) and "state" (**C.R.S. 24-36-104**, **C.R.S. 24-60-1301**, **Article IV(h)**) had declared "Insolvency." (See: **26 I.R.C. 165 (g)(1)**, **U.C.C 1-201 (23)**, **C.R.S. 39-22-103.5**, **Westfall vs. Braley. 10 Ohio 188, 75 Am. Dec. 509**, **Adams vs. Richardson, 337 S.W.2d 911** **Ward vs. Smith, 7 Wall 447**).

In 1980 Congress passed, among other things, **Public Law 96-221**, providing for the furtherance and expansion of the profligate rehypothecated debt pyramid scheme, and reduced the reserve requirements on "transaction accounts" to a minimum of 3% per centum to a maximum of 14 per centum (See: **Depository Institutions Deregulation And Monetary Control Act of 1980**, Section 103(b) (E)(2)).

"In the United States neither paper currency nor deposits have value as commodities. Intrinsically, a dollar bill is just a piece of paper. Deposits are merely book entries. Coins do have some intrinsic value as metal, but generally far less than their face amount...."

Compare this with the United States Constitution, which says: "No State shall make anything *but gold and silver coin* a tender in payment of debt..." and which also says: "Congress shall have the power to *coin money and regulate the value thereof...*" (Italics added for emphasis; this paragraph added to the original John B. Nelson document of February 21, 1992 on July 18, 1999 to reiterate what was stated previously in this document and to demonstrate, first hand, yet another way the Constitution is being usurped, in fact and *in intent*).

"In the absence of legal reserve requirements, banks can build up deposits by increasing loans and investments so long as they keep enough currency on hand to redeem whatever amounts the holders of deposits want to convert into currency. This unique attribute of the banking business was discovered several centuries ago. At one time, bankers were merely middlemen. They made profit by accepting gold and coins brought to them for safekeeping and lending them to borrowers. But they soon found that the receipts they issued to depositors were being used as money since whoever held them could go to the banker and exchange them for metallic money.

Then bankers discovered that they could make loans merely by giving borrowers their promises to pay (bank notes). In this way, banks began to create money. More notes could be issued than the gold and coin on hand because only a portion of the notes outstanding would be presented for payment at any one time. Enough metallic money had to be kept on hand, of course, to redeem whatever volume of notes was presented for payment.

Transaction deposits are the modern counter-part of bank notes. It was a small step from printing notes to making book entries to the credit of borrowers which the borrowers, in turn, could "spend" by writing checks, thereby "printing their own money." (See: **Modern Money Mechanics**, a workbook on deposits currency and bank reserves., 1982 Rev. Ed., **Federal Reserve Bank** of Chicago, P.O. Box 834, Chicago, Illinois 60690, pgs. 3 & 4).

Fifty nine (59) years is **NOT** "temporary." It's a permanent state of "Emergency", and was clearly instituted, formed and erected within the Union through gross usurpations, abridgments, malfeasance and breach of legal duties, and the continual contrivance, misrepresentation, conversion, fluctuations, **fraud** and avarice of the International Financial Institutions, Organizations, Corporations and Associations, including the **Federal Reserve**, their "**fiscal and depository agent**" **22 U.S.C.A. 286d**. This profligate practice has led to such "Emergency" legislation as the "**Public Debt Limit-Balance Budget And Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985**", **Public Law 99-177**, etc.

The government by becoming a corporator, (See: **22 U.S.C.A 286e**) lays down its sovereignty and takes on that of a private citizen. It can exercise no power which is not derived from the corporate charter (See: **The Bank of the United States vs. Planters Bank of Georgia**, 6 L. Ed. (9 Wheat) 244, **U.S. vs. Burr**, 309 U.S. 242). The real party in interest is not the dejure "United States of America" or "State", but "The Bank" and "The Fund." (**22 U.S.C.A 286**, et seq., **C.R.S. 11-60-103**). The acts committed under **fraud**, force and seizures are many times done under "**Letters of Marque and Reprisal**" i.e. "**recapture**." (See: **31 U.S.C.A. 5323**). Such principles as "*Fraud and Justice NEVER dwell together*" **Wingate's Maxims 680**, and "*A right of action cannot arise out of fraud.*" **Broom's Maxims** 297, 729; **Cowper's Reports** 343; 5 Scott's New Reports 558; 10 Mass. 276; 38 Fed. 800, are too high of a thought concept, as is "Due Process", "Just Compensation" and Justice itself. Honor is earned by honesty and integrity, not under false and fraudulent pretenses, nor will the color of the cloth one wears cover-up the usurpations, lies, trickery and deceits. When Black is fraudulently declared to be White, not all will live in darkness. As astutely observed by Will Rogers, "there are men running

governments who shouldn't be allowed to play with matches", and is as applicable today as Jesus' statements about Lawyers.

The contrived "emergency" has created numerous abuses and usurpations, and abridgments of delegated Powers and Authority. As stated in **Senate Report 93-549**:

"Since March 9, 1933, the United States has been in a state of declared national emergency. In fact, there are now in effect four presidentially proclaimed states of national emergency: In addition to the national emergency declared by President Roosevelt in 1933, there are also the national emergency proclaimed by President Truman on December 16, 1950, during the Korean conflict, and the states of national emergency declared by President Nixon on March 23, 1970, and August 15, 1971.

These proclamations give force to 470 provisions of Federal Law. These hundreds of statutes delegate to the President extraordinary powers, ordinarily exercised by the Congress, which affect the lives of American citizens in a host of all-encompassing manners. This vast range of powers, taken together, confer enough authority to rule the country without reference to normal constitutional process.

Under the powers delegated by these statutes, the President may: seize property; organize and control the means of production; seize commodities; assign military forces abroad; institute martial law; seize and control all transportation and communication; regulate the operation of private enterprise; restrict travel; and in a plethora of particular ways, control the lives of all American citizens." (See: Foreword, pg. III).

The "Introduction", on page 1, begins with a phenomenal declaration, to wit:

"A majority of the people of the United States have lived all of their lives under emergency rule. For 40 years, freedoms and governmental procedures guaranteed by the Constitution have in varying degrees been abridged by laws brought into force by states of national emergency..."

According to the research done in **16 American Jurisprudence, 2nd Edition**, Sections 71 and 82, no "emergency" justifies a violation of any Constitutional provision. Arguendo, "Supremacy Clause" and "Separation of Powers", it is clearly admitted in **Senate Report No. 93-549** that abridgment has occurred. The statements heard in the federal and state Tribunals, on numerous occasions, that Constitutional arguments are "immaterial", "frivolous" etc., is based upon the concealment, furtherance and compounding of the Frauds and "Emergency" created and sustained by the "Expatriated", **ALIENS of the United Nations and its Organizations, Corporations and Associations**. (See: **Letter**, Insight Magazine, February 18, 1991, pg. 7, Lowell L. Flanders, President, U.N. Staff Union, New York) **8 U.S.C.A. 1481** is one of the controlling statutes on expatriation, as is **22 U.S.C.A. 611, 612 & 613** and **50 U.S.C.A. 781**.

The Internal Revenue Service entered into a "service agreement" with the U.S. Treasury Department (See: **Public Law 94-564**, Legislative History, pg. 5967, **Reorganization Plan No. 26**) and the Agency for International Development, pursuant to **Treasury Delegation Order No. 91**. The Agency For International Development is an International paramilitary operation (See: **Department Of The Army Field Manual**, (1969) FM 41-10, pgs. 1-4, Sec. 1-7(b) & 1-6, Section 1-10(7) (c)(1), **22 U.S.C.A. 284**), and includes such activities as "Assumption of full or partial executive, legislative, and judicial authority over a country or area." (See: **FM 41-10**, pg. 1-7, Section 110(7)(c)(4)) also see, **Agreement Between The United Nations And The United States Of America Regarding The Headquarters Of the United Nations**, Section 7(d) & (8), 22 U.S.C.A 287 (1979 Ed.) at pg. 241). It is to be further observed that the "Agreement" regarding the Headquarters District of the United Nations was NOT agreed to (See: **Congressional Record - Senate, December 13, 1967, Mr. Thurmond**), and is **illegally in the Country in the first instant**.

The International Organizational intents, purposes and activities include complete control of "Public Finance" i.e. "control, supervision, and audit of indigenous fiscal resources; budget practices, taxation, expenditures of public funds, currency issues, and banking agencies and affiliates." (See: **FM 41-10**, pgs.2-30 thru 2-31, Section 251. Public Finance). This of course complies with "**Silent Weapons for Quiet Wars**" **Research Technical Manual TM-SW7905.1**, which discloses *a declaration of war upon the American people* (See: pg. 3 & 7), monetary control by the Internationalist, through information etc. solicited and collected by the Internal Revenue Service (See: **TM-SW7905.1** , pg. 48, also see, **22 U.S.C.A 286f** & **Executive order No. 10033, 26 U.S.C.A 6103 (k)(4)**) and who is operating and enforcing the seditious International program. (See: **TM-SW7905.1**, pg. 52). The 1985 Edition of the **Department Of Army Field Manual, FM 41-10** further describes the International "Civil Affairs" operations. At page 3-6 it is admitted that the A.I.D. is autonomous and under direction of the International Development Cooperation Agency, and at page 3-8 that the operation is "paramilitary." The International Organization(s) intents and purposes was to promote, implement,, and enforce a "**DICTATORSHIP OVER FINANCE IN THE UNITED STATES.**" (See: **Senate Report No. 93-549**, pg. 186).

It appears from the documentary evidence that the Internal Revenue Service Agents. etc., are "**Agents of a Foreign Principal**" within the meaning and intent of the "**Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.**" They are directed and controlled by the corporate "**Governor**" of "**The Fund**" a/k/a "**Secretary of Treasury**" (See: **Public Law 94-564**, supra, pg. 5942, **U.S. Government Manual 1990/91**, pgs. 480 & 481, **26 U.S.C.A 7701 (a)(11), Treasury Delegation Order No. 150-10**), and the corporate "Governor" of "The Bank" **22 U.S.C.A 286 & 286a**, acting as "information-service employees" **22 U.S.C.A. 611 (c)(ii)**, and have been and do now "solicit, collect, disburse or dispense" contribution [Tax-pecuniary contribution, Blacks Law Dic. 5th ed.], loans, money or other things of value for or in interest of such foreign principal **22 U.S.C.A 611(c)(iii)**, and they entered into agreements with a Foreign Principal pursuant to **Treasury Delegation Order No. 91** i.e. the "**Agency For International Development.**" (See: **22 U.S.C.A. 611 (c)(2)**). The Internal Revenue Service is also an agency of the **International Criminal Police Organization**, and solicits and collects information for **150 Foreign Powers**. (See: **22 U.S.C.A. 263a, The United States Government Manual**, 1990/91, pg. 385, see also, **The Ron Paul Money Book**, pg. 250 - 251). It should be further noted that Congress has appropriated, transferred, and converted vast sums to Foreign Powers (See: **22 U.S.C.A. 262c(b)**), and has entered into numerous foreign Taxing Treaties (conventions) (See: **22 U.S.C.A. 285g, 22 U.S.C.A. 287j**) and other Agreements, which are solicited and collected pursuant to **26 I.R.C. 6103(k)(4)**. Along with the other documentary evidence submitted herewith, this should absolve any further doubt as to the true character of the party. Such restrictions as "**For the general welfare and common defense of the United States**" (See: **Constitution** (1787), Article I, Section 8, Clause 1) apparently aren't applicable, and the fraudulent rehypothecated debt credit will be merely added to the insolvent nature of the continual "emergency", and the reciprocal socio/economic repercussions laid upon present and future generations.

Among other reasons for lack of authority to act, such as a Foreign Agents Registration Statement, **22 U.S.C.A. 612** and **18 U.S.C.A. 219 & 951**, military authority cannot be imposed into civil affairs. (See: **Department Of The Army Pamphlet 27100-70**, Military Law Review, Vol. 70). The **United Nations Charter**, Article 2, Section 7, further prohibits the U.N. from "intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state..." **Korea, Viet Nam, Ethiopia, Angola, Kuwait, etc., etc., are evidence enough of the "BAD FAITH" of the United Nations and its Organizations, Corporations and Associations**, not to mention the *seizing of two day care centers in the State of Minnesota by their agents, and holding the children as collateral/hostages for payment/ransom* of their fraudulent, dishonored, rehypothecated debt credit, worthless securities. Such is the "**Rule Of Law**" "**as envisioned by the Founders**" of the **United Nations**. Such is *Communist terrorism, despotism and tyranny*. **ALL WERE AND ARE OUTLAWED HERE.**

I hope this communication finds you well and mentally strong for the occasion. It is quite apparent that the "**Treasonous**" and "**Seditious**" are brewing up a storm of untold magnitude. Bush's public address of September 11, 1991 (See: **Weekly Compilation Of Presidential Documents**), should further qualify what is being said

here. He admitted "**Interdependence**" (See also: **Public Law 94-564**, Legislative History, pg. 5950), "**One World Order**" (See: also: **Extension Of Remarks**, January 19, 1976, Marjorie S. Holt, **8 U.S.C.A. 1101(40)**), affiliation and collusion with the Soviet Union Oligarchy (**50 U.S.C.A. 781**), **direction by the U.N.**, **22 U.S.C.A. 611**, etc. You might also find it interesting that **Treasury Delegation Order No. 92** (enclosed) states that the I.R.S. is trained under direction of the Division of "Human Resources" (U.N.) and the Commissioner (INTERNATIONAL), by the "Office Of Personnel Management." In the 1979 Edition of **22 U.S.C.A. 287**, The United Nations, at pg. 248, you will find **Executive Order No. 10422. The Office of Personnel Management is under direction of the Secretary General of the United Nations.** And as stated previously, the I.R.S. is also a member in a one hundred fifty (150) nation pact called the "International Criminal Police Organization", found at **22 U.S.C.A. 263a**. The "Memorandum & Agreement" between the Secretary of Treasury/Corporate Governor of "The Fund" and "The Bank" and the Office of the U.S. Attorney General would indicate that the *Attorney General and his associates are soliciting and collecting information for Foreign Principals.* (See: also, **The United States Government Manual 1990/91**, pg. 385, also see, **The Ron Paul Money Book**, supra, pg. 250, 251, **26 I.R.C. 7401**).

It is worthy of note that an Attorney/Representative is required to file a "**Foreign Agents Registration Statement**" pursuant to **22 U.S.C.A. 611(c)(1)(iv) & 612**, if representing the interests of a Foreign Principal or Power. (See: **22 U.S.C.A. 613, Rabinowitz vs. Kennedy**, 376 U.S. 605, 11 L. Ed. 2d 940, **18 U.S.C.A. 219 & 951**).

On January 17, 1980, the President and Senate confirmed another "Constitution", namely, the "**Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization**", found at **Senate, Treaty Document No. 97-19**, 97th Congress, 1st Session. A perusal of this Foreign Constitution should more than qualify the internationalist intents. The "Preamble", Article 1, "Objectives" and Article 2, "Functions", clearly evidences their intent to direct, control, finance and subsidize all "natural and human resources" and "agro-related as well as basic industries", through "dynamic social and economic changes" "with a view to assisting in the *establishment of a new international economic order.*" The high flown rhetoric is obviously of "**Communist**" origin and *intents*. An **unelected, unrepresentative, unaccountable oligarchy of expatriates and aliens**, who fraudulently claim in the Preamble that they intend to establish "rational and equitable international economic relations", yet openly declared that they no longer "stabilize the value of the dollar" nor "assure the value of the coin and currency of the United States" is purely *misrepresentation, deceit and fraud*. (See: **Public Law 95-147**, 91 Stat. 1227, at pg. 1229). This was augmented by **Public Law 101-167**, 103 Stat. 1195, which discloses massive appropriations of rehypothecated debt credit for the general welfare and common defense of other **Foreign Powers**, including "**Communist**" countries of satellites, International control of natural and human resources, etc., etc. A "**Resource**" is a claim of "**property**" and when related to people constitutes "*slavery.*"

It is now necessary to ask which Constitution they are operating under. The "**Constitution For The Newstates Of The United States**", which was located at Liberty Lobby, 300 Independence Ave., SE, Washington, D.C. 20003, was the subject matter of the book entitled "The Emerging Constitution" by Rexford G. Tugwell, which was accomplished under the auspices of the Rockefeller tax-exempt foundation called the "Center For The Study of Democratic Institutions." The People and Citizens of this Nation were forewarned against formation of "Democracies." "**Democracies have ever been the spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.**" (See: **Federalist Papers No. 10**, also see, **The Law**, Fredrick Bastiat, **Code Of Professional Responsibility**, Preamble). This Alien Constitution, however, has nothing to do with democracy in reality. *It is the basis of and for a despotic, tyrannical oligarchy.*

Article I, "Rights and Responsibilities", Sections 1 and 15 evidence their knowledge of the "emergency." The Rights of expression, communication, movement, assembly, petition and Habeas Corpus are all excepted from being exercised under and in a "declared emergency." The **Constitution for the Newstates of America**, openly declares, among other seditious things and delusions that "Until each indicated change in the government shall

have been completed the provisions of the existing Constitution and the organs of government shall be in effect" (See: Article XII, Section 3), "All operations of the national government shall cease as they are replaced by those authorized under this Constitution." (See: Article XII, Section 4). This is apparently what Burger was promoting in 1976, after he resigned as Supreme Court Justice and took up the promotion of a "Constitutional Convention." *No trial by jury is mentioned, "JUST" compensation has been removed, along with being informed of the "Nature & Cause of the Accusation". etc., etc.*, and every one will of course participate in the "democracy." This Constitution is but a reiteration of the **Communist Doctrines, intents and purposes**, and clearly establishes a *"Police Power" State, under direction and control of a self appointed oligarchy.*

Apparently the present operation of the **"de facto"** government is under **Foreign/Alien Constitutions, Laws, Rules and Regulations**. The *overthrow* of the **"essential engine"** declared in and by the ordained and established Constitution for the United States of America (1787), and by and under the **"Bill of Rights"** (1791) is obvious. The covert procedure used to implement and enforce these Foreign Constitutions, Laws, Procedures, Rules, Regulations, etc., has not, to my knowledge, been collected and assimilated nor presented as evidence to establish seditious collusion and conspiracy.

Fortunately and Unfortunately in my Land it is necessary to seek, obtain and present EVIDENCE to sustain a conviction and/or judgment. *Our patience and tolerance for those who pervert the very necessary and basic foundations of society has been pushed to insufferable levels.* They have "fundamentally" changed the form and substance of the de jure Republican form of Government, exhibited a willful and wanton disregard for the Rights, Safety and Property of others, evinced a despotic design to reduce my people to slavery, peonage and involuntary servitude, **under a fraudulent, tyrannical, seditious foreign oligarchy, with intent and purpose to institute, erect and form a "Dictatorship" over the Citizens and our Posterity.** They have completely debauched the de jure monetary system, *destroyed the Livelihood and Lives of thousands*, aided and abetted our enemies, *declared War upon us and our Posterity*, destroyed untold families and made homeless over 750,000 children in the middle of winter, afflicted widows and orphans, *turned Sodomites loose amongst our young*, implemented foreign laws, rules, regulations and procedures within the body of the country, *incited insurrection, rebellion, sedition and anarchy* within the de jure society, illegally entered our Land, taken false Oaths, entered into Seditious Foreign Constitutions, Agreements, Pactions, Confederations, and Alliances, and under pretense of "emergency", which they themselves created, promoted and furthered, formed a multitude of offices and retained those of alien allegiance to perpetuate their frauds and to eat out the substance of the good and productive people of our Land, and have arbitrarily dismissed and held mock trials for those who trespassed upon our Lives, Liberties, Properties and Families and endangered our Peace, Safety, Welfare and Dignity. The damage, injury and costs have been higher than mere money can repay. They have done what they were **COMMANDED NOT TO DO.** The time for just correction is **NOW!**

Sincere consideration of **"Presentment"** to a **Grand Jury** under the ordained and established Constitution for the United States of America (1787), Amendment V **is in order.** Numerous High Crimes and Misdemeanors have been committed under the Constitution for the United States of America, and Laws made in pursuance thereof, and under the Constitution for the State of Colorado, and the Laws made in Pursuance thereof, and against the Peace and Dignity of the People, including but not limited to, **C.R.S. 18-11-203** which defines and prescribes punishment for **"Seditious Associations"** which is applicable to the other constitutions, and the intents and professed purposes of their Organizations, Corporations and Associations. If the Presentment should be obstructed by the members of the Bar, **ARREST THEM.**

I could go on but the story is long! I hope this information and research is of assistance to you. Much remains to be uncovered and disclosed, as it is necessary and imperative to secure the Lives, Liberties, Property, Peace and Dignity of the people and our Posterity. Good Hunting and the Good Lord be with you in all your endeavors.

God Bless!

**John Nelson, Jure Soli,
Jure Sanguinis, Jure Coronea
c/o 14675 Co. Rd. 35.6
Mancos, Colorado, U.S.A.
Teste Meipso**

P.S. In addition, I am yet expecting a copy of the "Service Agreement", (T.D.O. 91). It was located in the Department of Treasury, office of the Assistant General Counsel, (International Affairs), Russell L. Munk, 1500 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20220. Efforts are being made to obtain a copy, but so far have been obstructed by the Bar. If anyone knows where and how a copy can be obtained please do so immediately, the documents are necessary and imperative. It ought to be most informative! By the way it's against the law for an insolvent to make a loan or to try to fraudulently collect thereon, (See: Neal et al. vs. Clark, 251 P.2d 903). It should be further noted that an "Alien" or "Denizen" cannot sit on a Jury (See: 3 Am. Jur. 2d ¶ 40), nor hold a Public Office. (Also see: 50 U.S.C.A. 781 (9) & 842), and any who have "Expatriated" (See: 8 U.S.C.A. 1481) are required to make application for "naturalization".

The "out of court", "ex parte", summary determinations upon matters in issue is purely "Administrative" procedure. (See: 1 Am. Jur. 2d ¶ 78). The jury, if any, is reduced to an "advisory jury" position, and is more than likely arrayed as a "homage" jury.

5 U.S.C.A 701-703 should be of interest concerning "Judicial Review" of Agency actions. It can be found in most States under such headings and Acts as the "Administrative Procedures Act" or the "Administrative Reorganization Act." (See: C.R.S. 24-4-106).

The de facto Federal/International chartered "Institutions", their Officers, Employees, Servants, Agents and Representatives are subject to and should be turned over to a Court of Law for prosecution, trial, and judgment according to Law. (See: Pope Mfg. Co. vs. Gormully, 144 U.S. 414, at pg. 419, also see, 22 U.S.C.A. 286g).

"FRAUD vitiates the most solemn Contracts, documents and even judgments." U.S. vs. Throckmorton, 98 US 61, at pg. 65.

I believe that the statement made in Cohen vs. Virginia, 6 Wheat 264, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821) is more than worthy of note:

"We [Courts] have no more right to decline the exercise of jurisdiction which is given, that to usurp that which is not given. THE ONE OR THE OTHER WOULD BE TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION." (Also see: U.S. vs Will, 449 US 200, 66 L.Ed.2d 392, at pg. 406).

DECLARATION

OF SEPARATE AND EQUAL STATION

WHEN IN THE COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS...WHENEVER ANY FORM OF GOVERNMENT BECOMES DESTRUCTIVE...WHEN A LONG TRAIN OF ABUSES AND USURPATIONS, PURSUING INVARIABLY THE SAME OBJECT, EVINCES A DESIGN TO REDUCE THEM UNDER ABSOLUTE DESPOTISM, IT IS THEIR RIGHT, IT IS THEIR DUTY..." Declaration of Independence, Enabling Act, Section 4.

"No political truth is of greater intrinsic value...The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may be justly pronounced the very definition of tyranny." Federalist Papers No. 47

"IF a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be. The functionaries of every government have propensities to command at will the liberties and property of their constituents. There is no safe deposit for these but with the people themselves; nor can they be safe with them without information." (The Writings Of Thomas Jefferson, Albert E. Bergh Ed., vol. 14 pg. 384.)

One cannot make agreements with Sodomites, Babylonians and/or satanics. **Their words, oaths or signatures are of no meaning or value**; their intent and purpose is to deceive, cheat, steal, lie, defraud and destroy. The seditious covert conspiracy and collusion of certain Organizations, Corporations and Associations to damage, injure, oppress, threaten, intimidate and enforce their fraudulent, foreign, socialist, Communist, "Democracy" and foist their delusions upon the Citizens and children of this Land, and to corrupt the de jure Public Offices established to accomplish the purposes set forth in the "Preamble" to the ordained and established Constitution is cause and necessity enough.

Once again finding our safety, happiness and liberties to be in imminent danger, it has become necessary and imperative to our Rights, Duties, Privileges, Immunities, Lives, Liberties and Property and that of our posterity, to declare our separate and equal station, and exercise our Right and Duty to *throw off and abolish the form and operation of the de facto, fraudulent, seditious "state."* (See: Constitution For The State Of Colorado, Article II, Section 2, Declaration of Independence (1776), Constitution For The United States Of America, Amendments IX and X, C.R.S. 24-60-1301, Article IV(h)).

Section 2. People may alter or abolish form of government - proviso. The people of this state have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves, as a free, sovereign and independent state; and to alter or abolish their constitution and form of government whenever they deem it necessary to their safety and happiness, provided, such change be not repugnant to the constitution of the United States.

- IT IS HEREBY DEEMED NECESSARY -

JURE CORONEA - TESTE MEIPSO

CREATOR

Man

The People

Government

Court

Person

The Declaration of Independence

1776

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. **That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.** That whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. --Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.*

He has refused his assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the state remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these states; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislature.

He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation:

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these states:

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing taxes on us without our consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury:

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses:

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule in these colonies:

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments:

For suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burned our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow citizens taken captive on the high seas to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare, is undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms: our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in attention to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends.

*We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these united colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent states, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, **we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.***

New Hampshire: Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple, Matthew Thornton

Massachusetts: John Hancock, Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry

Rhode Island: Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery

Connecticut: Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcott

New York: William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris

New Jersey: Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark

Pennsylvania: Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross

Delaware: Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean

Maryland: Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton

Virginia: George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Thomas Nelson, Jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton

North Carolina: William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn

South Carolina: Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton

Georgia: Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton

**My son, if sinners entice
thee, consent thou not.**

Proverbs 1:10 - King James Bible

A Public Declaration and Private Notice of

Immediate Withdraw of Consent

I, Kurtis Richard, a living soul of flesh, blood, and sound mind, born to a natural Mother and Father of the family Kallenbach on 19 September 1960, currently living upon the abundant, plentiful, and fertile soil of God's earth, hereby declare my full and complete renunciation, revocation, denouncement, and withdraw of consent - to the creation of, operation of, and participation in - the deceptive corporate STATE OF ILLINOIS, STATE, and UNITED STATES misrepresented as the twenty-first sovereign Union state, Illinois, and the united States of America.

This flesh and blood "Withdraw of Consent" applies to every fiction or action - foreign to God's Law - past, present, or future - includes but is not limited to: any unconscionable agreement, actionable fraud, deceptive legal obligation, hidden devise, contract, or novation relating to any public trustee, subject, citizen, resident, artificial person, individual, actor, employee, customer, vessel, wreck, corporate fiction, commercial entity, chattel property, debtor, legal term, legal fiction, charge, claim, proxy, trust, estate, status, standing, station, or any possible combination of carefully constructed words of art, CAPITIS DIMINUTIO MAXIMA, or other creative color or fiction of law misrepresentation of my true flesh and blood existence, intentionally designed to replace my private Life, Liberty, and Property, with man made public policy, corporate privileges and immunities, civil liberties, political statutes, and commercial liabilities, enforced through a villenous transfer of will by expilatio or the presumption of consent to any fictional State citizenship such as the STATE OF ILLINOIS, UNITED STATES, United Nations, or Crown.

All past, present, or future commercial, legal, or political participation within the STATE OF ILLINOIS, STATE, UNITED STATES, United Nations, and Crown, including any related subsidiary, franchise, political subdivision, or participatory corporate entity, shall be considered acts under duress, protest, and without prejudice until such a time as we, the men, women, and children non-immigrant strangers and non-resident aliens living upon the soil - who constitute the children of God - return to Nature's only true and just system of law - God's Law.

Additionally, this flesh and blood "Withdraw of Consent" includes but is not limited to:

- Any voter registration that results in the institution of a privileged political body or corporate government - foreign to God's Laws;***
- Any fictional or corporate diminishment of Man's natural physical existence and Lawful standing or status within or without the State - foreign to God's Laws;***
- Any forum whatsoever administrated by a fiction or an imposter - foreign to God's Laws;***
- Any fiction of law, corporate State, political subdivision, agency, franchise, subsidiary, entity, office, extension, department - foreign to God's Laws;***
- Any debt based, non-equitable, currency or negotiable instrument devoid of value, or any system of usury - foreign to God's Laws;***
- Any fictional encumbrance, trusteeship, contract, citizenship, suretyship, joint venture, impressment, employment, license, registration, certification, enrollment, entitlement, act, action, statute, or regulation - foreign to God's Laws;***

Let it be known that on this very Day, I, Kurtis Richard, a private Sui juris non-immigrant stranger, non-resident alien, bona fide man of sound mind and creation of God; one of the true physical inheritors of God's earth and unconditional sole steward of all that is my existence as a gift from God - seal by the blood of my own hand - the actions of political Expatriation, Purgatory Oath, and Withdraw of Consent, reclaiming the Rule of God's Law and the Laws of Nature and thus my God given unalienable Rights - and until the TRUTH is revealed to all others - a return to the founding principles of the unanimous Declaration of Independence, any possible protections available by the organic Illinois Constitution, organic Constitution for the united States of America, and Bill of Rights.

And that from this Day forward, any trespass upon God's creation, by any fictional creation of man, shall be rendered - ab initio - invalid, unlawful, NULL and void. I have never authorized by my own hand or blood, and by my own free will, consciously, and with full disclosure, consented to any man created status or fiction foreign to God's Law, such as that of the 14th Amendment UNITED STATES citizen. In fact, no man or woman of God, would ever knowingly agree to, assent to, authorize, or consent to - any fictional creation of man - over the Law and Rule of God. TO BE CLEAR, AS A MAN DESIGNATED TO BE AN INHERITOR, CUSTODIAN, AND STEWARD OF GOD'S EARTH - I WILL NEVER - BY CONSENT OR FORCE - BREAK THAT TRUST BY RELINQUISHING ANY OF MY LIABILITY, AUTHORITY, OR DOMINION TO A FICTIONAL REPRESENTATION OF MY EXISTENCE.

To this TRUTH, on this day, I do seal forever by the blood of my own hand.