

'I am not a public servant {officer or employee} and any claim to the contrary must be proved by payroll records and my alleged public servant {officer} title and sworn under penalty of perjury with full commercial liability for the person who swears to it.'

I'm not an officer or agent or employee of the government. I am not resident within the government and any claim to the contrary must be proved by payroll records. Prove that I'm being paid by the government to be a government employee. If you can't then your law doesn't apply to me.

Government has all the right in the world to make laws and rules regulating itself.

When they impose any of these rules and regulations beyond government upon any of us {private} they're breaching their fiduciary duty {as public officers and trustees of government}.

Public means government—private means non-government.

Howard Griswold Conference Call—Thursday, July 12, 2012

Partial

Howard Griswold Conference calls:

Conf call (talkshoe) 724-444-7444 95099# 1#

(non-talkshoe members must use the 1# after the pin number)

Thursday's at 8 p.m., Eastern Time.

Talkshoe mutes the phone lines

Note: there is a hydrate water call 8 PM, Eastern Monday's, 218-844-3388 966771#

Howard's home number: 302-875-2653 (between 9:30, a.m, and 7:00, p.m.)

All correspondence to:

Gemini Investment Research Group, POB 398, Delmar, Del. 19940

(do not address mail to 'Howard Griswold' since Howard has not taken up residence in that mailbox and since he's on good terms with his wife he isn't likely to in the foreseeable future.)Donations are accepted.

'I am not a public servant {officer or employee} and any claim to the contrary must be proved by payroll records and my alleged public servant {officer} title and sworn under penalty of perjury with full commercial liability for the person who swears to it.'

I'm not an officer or agent or employee of the government. I am not resident within the government and any claim to the contrary must be proved by payroll records. Prove that I'm being paid by the government to be a government employee. If you can't then your law doesn't apply to me.

Government has all the right in the world to make laws and rules regulating itself.

When they impose any of these rules and regulations beyond government upon any of us {private} they're breaching their fiduciary duty {as public officers and trustees of government}.

Public means government—private means non-government.

Your acceptance of anything that government offers you at any level in any way, shape or form is a consent to cooperate with them and to put yourself under their authority and control.

(unless you're a teacher or government worker or have contracted with the government with full disclosure, etc whereby you're not private anymore and you're resident within the government.)

You got to party to government to enjoy government's benefits, privileges and opportunities.

For reference:

Jersey City v. Hague, 115 Atlantic Reporter 2nd, page 8 (A 2nd)

Project for all:

Howard needs information on how to write a complaint for breach of the trust.

Hit the libraries!

He would appreciate any research help.

Start

{01:42:51.120}

[Howard] I've been doing some research lately trying to figure out what to do with a why this happened with Dave Donovan's Supreme Court petition for certiorari. Sometimes I think we do too much. I believe that's what happened in Dave's petition—we did too much. The question before the court that was presented in the writ of certiorari was does the United States government have any jurisdiction or authority in the territorial limits of the states? Now, the territorial limits of the states does not include the state. The state is the government and the federal government does have jurisdiction over the state governments because it's their parent corporation. That's what it was set up for by the state governments. It wasn't set up to control the American people. It wasn't set up really for the benefit of the American people in the way it was set up just for the purpose of protecting commerce and the American people in their property rights but not for financial benefit such as social security, welfare and jobs. That's not what its purpose was. It grew into that and it got into dealing with the American people, the private sector by creating these contract offers. In the case that we cited in Dave Donovan's case went back into, I think it was 1886—I believe it was 1886. Caha v. United States was the name of the case and Mr. Caha had apparently dealt with the United States government's land patent office. He petitioned for a land patent for a piece of land that the United States

government was selling out of the territory that it had purchased from France which was from Louisiana and Mississippi on up northward and northwestward all the way out to Oregon and Washington State known as the Louisiana purchase and they paid a lot of money for it. They had to get their money back. They didn't have a use for all that land so the United States government put it up for sale and all you had to do is make a contract with them. Well, that's what Mr. Cahal had done. He made a contract with them. Part of the deal required an affidavit of some kind and he lied on the affidavit and they caught him lying. They prosecuted him for perjury for lying on the affidavit and put him in jail. He appealed. The case went to the United States Supreme Court. The United States Supreme Court ruled that under normal circumstances the United States government's jurisdiction is located in Washington, D.C. and does not extend to the territorial limits of the states unless like Mr. Cahal you do business with the United States government. Boy, isn't that a revealing, absolutely revealing piece of information. Do you have a social security number? Yeah, you did business with the United States. Their jurisdiction now extends to you no matter where you are. That's what that case said. We don't have good sense. We have education. Education does not amount to intelligence, knowledge or good sense.

[Dave] That's what the long arm statutes are.

[Howard] Um huh. Exactly what they are. Well, we brought that case into this writ of certiorari. That was, like I said, 1886 I think it was—old case. And some ass hole lawyer of today's ilk would probably try to tell us that that case doesn't mean anything—it's too old. He wouldn't tell us why or how but it's too old. Well, we stopped that real short by listing a 2011 decision of the United States Supreme Court called *Bond v. United States* where they said that the United States government does not have any territorial jurisdiction within the territorial limits of the states over Mrs. Bond to prosecute her in any way because of their limited jurisdiction. Well, we cited these two cases and like I said sometimes we do more than we should. If you look at what a lawyer does, a lawyer rarely ever cites cases until they get into the motions and things of that nature. They don't cite the cases when they put in the complaint, the original complaint. They never cite anything except the complaint itself. They never cite anything on an appeal until they get into the appeal and start writing up the briefs and things like that. This is one of the reasons why so many petitions for certiorari are thrown out of the Supreme Court because lawyers don't even spell it out correctly but a few make it. And Mr. Donovan's case made it for a couple of weeks. Then the court looked at it and they said, 'no, we're not going to review this again.' Mr. Donovan's already answered his own question. And here's what they said in another case—another case, now, having nothing to do with Mr. Donovan at all but applying to Mr. Donovan's situation. "The judgment of the court of record whose jurisdiction is final is as conclusive on all the world as the judgment of this court would be. It is as conclusive on this court as it is on other courts. It puts an end to the inquiry concerning the facts by deciding it—*ex parte Watkins* at 3 Peter which is the first part of the US Reports at page 202 and cited again later on by *Schenckloth v. Bustamonte* at 412 United States Reports, page 218.

[Dave] It amounts to stare decisis.

[Howard] Right. 1973 this last case was. Now, 3 Peter is way back in the early 1800s when there were a number of different attorneys writing down the decisions of the United States court and publishing them before they started publishing under the name, United States Reports, which is where you find everything today. 412 United States Reports, page 218 was a 1973 decision that many years later, repeating the same thing. So whoever put this together, this little bit of information. Some lawyer finally did it, did the same thing that I do and showed the history of a subject matter being viewed in the same identical way. So, actually, even though Mr. Donovan and I were both a little bit upset when the court, the Supreme Court of the United States, first accepted his case for certiorari and then about five weeks later sent us a letter denying his writ of certiorari. Well, now I see why he denied it because we laid out the facts of cases that were already decided and establishing the facts which put an end to any necessary inquiry concerning those facts again. So, actually, Mr. Donovan won. Now, I don't know how many other people would be able to view it that way but I'm going to put this little bit of information from these cases in with Mr. Donovan's information to show why it is stare decisis—already decided that means—no reason to review it again. It's a done deal.

[Dave] So the US Court of Engineers is exactly guilty of contempt of court by failing to comply with the previous rulings anyway.

[Howard] Uh huh. And every one of these people are guilty of breach of their fiduciary duty. They knew, if they worked for government they knew or they should have known what the limitation of their jurisdiction is. This medical stupid thing, Obamacare, does not extend beyond Washington, D.C., the State of Blank, the City of Town of, county of Blank governments because that's the extent to which social security extends and Medicare is an offspring of social security so it only applies to government and government personnel because if anybody at any time since 1936 when they passed the stupid act would have ever bothered to look to see what it said, it was passed with the intention of applying only to federal government employees and a little bit later there was an amendment to it and the amendment extended it to state and local government employees. And ever since then there have not been any further amendments extending it to anybody else. It never applied to the private sector America. The corruption by attorneys of the meaning and intent of the law is what has brought all of this federal government shenanigans down upon the American people. I don't know what day it's going to happen but there is going to be one hell of a big hanging party one day when the people finally wake up and start to go after these lawyers. They're going to hang every damned one of them even though there might be a decent one because, just as I said about groups of people, they aren't all bad. Some of them have a good heart and they try to do their best, a few lawyers. Some of them are too stupid to know that they aren't doing the right thing and actually think they are doing the right thing and are not looking to harm anybody. Don't bend over backwards to harm people or to take advantage of them. So there are a few around that might be partly decent. The rest, they're nothing but scum. I think most of them know what they're doing and want to do it and they're taking advantage of people. They're stealing, they're looting the people of all their property. One day soon will be as Jack Bower said deserving of all the Karma that they get because

they have bought and paid for it by their conduct. I don't know how many people are starting now to put these breach of fiduciary duty cases together and nobody sent me one yet to review. Two people that I know that have filed them didn't send it to me to review. Somebody's written, I am told, I haven't had time to read it, a really powerful brief in support of it. I got to sit down, take time to read that. I've been so busy with so many other things I haven't had time to get into it. But even though somebody's written this, they put a lot of the stuff together that I talk about. They did a little research on their own which I certainly congratulate them for and thank them for because you can't expect any one person to do all of this. It can't fall entirely on my shoulders. I do definitely need help and greatly appreciate it when somebody puts out an effort like that and tries to help us. And when I read it over I'm going to find out how well he's helped us and I hope it's as dynamite as people are telling me it is. We need more people filing the complaints. Now that's the next move for Mr. Donovan to go after every one of these scum bag United States attorneys that have been involved in this, the head of and the little idiot that came out and bothered him on his property from the Army Corps of Engineers. And every judge all the way along the way from the US District Court and the magistrate at the US District court as well as the judge and the Court of Appeals judges in Philadelphia are all guilty of breach of their fiduciary duty. The only ones that aren't is the nine judges of the United States Supreme Court because they did the right thing. They said that they already put an end to this with the two cases that we cited and there are probably other cases that we didn't even come upon that may well have already established the same facts. No need for them to do it again. So they were right in what they did. But the lower courts, they weren't. This is going to be a massive case for Mr. Donovan to handle because there were quite a few US Attorneys involved, at least two judges and a magistrate in the district court. And I'm not sure but I think it's four or five judges in the court of appeals for the third circuit where he filed the appeal if we have to go ahead. Every one of them is going to have to get a lawyer and answer these questions and guess what, every one of the lawyers that they get to answer the question are going to be brought in for breach of their fiduciary duty because of the answer they gave claiming that this little idiot judge or this little idiot lawyer was just doing his job because his job was a breach of his duty and if the lawyer's backing him up and saying that that's alright and he should be allowed to do that then he's breaching his duty too. This thing could really grow into quite an amazing mess. I don't know if we can even handle it. There'll be so many different things coming in to be answered. Every one of their answers has to be answered back. Every one of their motions to dismiss will have to be answered back. It will grow into quite a messy thing. But Dave {Donovan} is going to follow through with doing this—go after every one of them. Dave looks at it two different ways. One of them is financially—hasn't got a thing to lose. And the other one is he's 81 years old. He doesn't have much time left. He hasn't got a thing to lose in going after them. So he's got nothing but something to gain, satisfaction that he upset their apple cart. And this is exactly what the rest of the American people got to get on the bandwagon to do, upset the apple cart of these evil people. Go after them because they're so evil. They are breaching their fiduciary duty for two reasons—one, dishonesty, second, disloyalty. They are not loyal to the good government and its constitution that was originally set up. And this is something that definitely has to be brought out. They were bringing this not for our own benefit but for the benefit of the protection of the good name of the government.

[Dave] They have to file an answer before they file a motion to dismiss. They can't just file a motion to dismiss, they haven't entered their appearance and answer first.

[Howard] That's another thing we're researching, this stuff about filing a notice of appearance. They seem to let them get away with that without doing it. They'll make you do it, an outsider, but the insiders {no}

[Dave] But their rules are...regardless.

[Howard] The rules apply to all of them. When they don't make them follow the rules then the judge should be disqualified.

[Dave] The motion to dismiss is not an answer. They got to file an answer first before they file their motion to dismiss.

[Howard] I don't think the rule says that. The idea of a motion to dismiss is delayed needing to answer until the motion to dismiss is determined by the court. Actually, this is all lawyereeze for making money. They created this motion to dismiss and then a request to the court for a hearing on the motion to dismiss just so that they could use up a lot of time and charge their client money. And most of the time they're going to lose if there is an adjudicable fact before the court because if there is such a thing the court cannot dismiss the case and it won't in most cases. Of course, we have some ignorant judges who will do anything, especially for money. An old friend of mine used to own a bar up in Baltimore. He had a big sign hanging on the wall. He said:

Here in Maryland we got the best judges money can buy.

I don't think he liked judges much. But it was quite true. We have the best judges that money can buy and it does buy them. But back to the point and the point is that the United States government has no jurisdiction of any kind within the territorial limits of the states. Territorial limits of the states means the area by that name, the place, not the corporate fiction state that's located in the capital and any of its little political subdivisions like town, city, county governments that they do have authority over. They have no authority over anything outside of government and the private sector. That would be the territorial limits of the states—no authority there to do anything—*Bond v. US* and *Caha v. US*. And like I said, there's probably more cases than that but that was the two that we're familiar with at the present time. It could well be stated in several other cases that we're unaware of and because it's stated in at least two, the court decided it has already decided these things. There's no need to revisit the issue concerning those facts. Any situation that any of you have where the state is bothering you in your private capacity, bothering your private property in any way, shape or form you have a breach of fiduciary duty case against the state in the state courts. Any situation where the United States government is bothering you in any way, shape or form you have an action against them because they don't have any authority in the territorial limits of the states to bring their federal law down upon you. It doesn't apply to you. So it's a breach of their

fiduciary duty. They're being dishonest and they're not being loyal to their government. The government is established by the Constitution. Look at the case of Barron v. the mayor and City Council of Baltimore brief. The name for that case is Barron v. Baltimore—1833 I think it was. The United States Supreme Court said that the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution and that Constitution applied to the government that it created and to no one else. Now, you might like that. You might be intelligent enough to recognize what that means. It set up the government. It applied to the government only. It did not give people Constitutional rights. Maybe you're smart enough to realize that or maybe you don't like the idea of that kind of an explanation of it because you think you have Constitutional rights. Well, that's because you've been deceived and misled by these leaders like lawyers, politicians, judges and some stupid patriot leaders who will tell you that you have Constitutional rights. Actually, the people have no such thing. The Constitution created rights and duties and restrictions on government and that's all it created. It didn't create any rights of any kind for people. People had natural inherent rights from property. All rights actually emanate from property. If there is no property as Thomas Jefferson once said—I think it was him—'there is no liberty because without property you cannot be at liberty to do what you want, you have to have property, property rights, in order to have liberty. And there is no life worth having without liberty. So property is the essence of liberty and life isn't it? Of course, we don't understand that. We think God gave us the life so it's a god-given right. These people with those kinds of beliefs ought to learn to read and go read the Bible. There's nothing in the Bible where God gave anybody any rights at all. Nothing, a whole list all through the Bible of duties that are laid upon us which I guarantee you we have been shirking in the responsibility of meeting but there's nothing in there about giving us any rights. He gave us a duty to protect the land, not a right to it but a duty to be here and protect it, to safeguard the land. We're not doing to well at that, are we? We're letting evil people control what's done with the land and destroying the land in so many ways including the rights in land are being destroyed by these contractual arrangements of registration that I keep talking about. You have to terminate them. Get out of dealing with government. I still think that even in a breach of fiduciary duty lawsuit case against somebody like IRS, social security involved in it that even though you got a social security number you were duped into it by some lawyer who did not tell you all the details and the facts so it was coerced upon you and coercion is one of your defenses to any claim that they have any right to you and your body and your labor. So I think you twist that into the argument against them on a breach of fiduciary duty lawsuit and put a stop to even when you're doing business with the government.

[Dave] Because any signature on any government contract or alleged contract is not valid. It's not your authorized signature because without intent you cannot have the capability to authorize anything. Because they failed to give you the full disclosure it's not your authorized signature which means it's an unauthorized signature and in law the definition of an unauthorized signature is a forgery and you cannot be held to a forgery.

[Howard] There's another way of looking at that, Dave. You're not authorized simply because you're not part of government and in order to be authorized by government to do something you would have to be part of government. They can't authorize somebody

that's not part of government to do something. That's why it's an unauthorized signature. I wasn't authorized to sign a social security application. I wasn't a government employee. I hadn't applied to become a government employee. So I had no authorization whatsoever to sign such a thing. But then again because the banks are all an instrumentality of the United States government I'm not an authorized person that's allowed to sign a check in a bank and yet how many times in life have most of us signed stupid little checks. I know I signed plenty of them in my life. I didn't know that I wasn't really authorized to do it. They let me because it gave the appearance that I was in government and that government could then control all of my conduct in life.

[Dave] Maybe that's why the signature line on checks is actually microprint and it's not a line at all. It's the words, 'authorized signature' in many, many, many writings so small you and I can't tell what it is but when you get a super magnifying glass you see that line on the checks. It's not a line, it's the microprint authorized signature so every time you sign it you're committing perjury because you're not authorized because you're signing that it is the authorized signature. {yeah, why don't you bring an x25 microscope with you when you sign things, dumbkoff?} You would have to be party to government to be authorized to sign it.

[Howard] Most of us are not.

[Dave] That's why the lying, thieving cheats have it in microprint so nobody can see that that's what the line that appears to be a line is actually...

[Howard] Now, you see where the dishonesty comes in of these government people like lawyers who duped you in to getting involved in these kinds of things through accountants and other little college morons that are trained to bring you into these situations by saying, 'oh, you got to have a bank account. That's the only way I can keep records of your income tax.' 'What income tax?' You only been led to believe that you got to pay an income tax because you signed up for social security when, in fact, it was them that made you sign up for social security. You probably wouldn't have done it if they didn't tell you, you had to do it. So they're dishonest. Well, there's your breach of fiduciary duty. This is so simple, disgustingly simple and disgustingly simple enough to prove an affidavit stating that you were not told the rest of the facts and the details about giving the appearance of being in government by signing up for such things and that you were coerced and intimidated that you couldn't continue to work if you didn't have a social security number when in fact you weren't working for the government and you weren't a government employee and had no intention of being a government employee.

By the way, that reminds me of something. This has been around for a little while. We're doing a little bit more checking into some of what this fellow said. But a fellow beat a traffic case in the State of Oregon with an affidavit and all he basically said in the affidavit was that he is the... Now, I disagree with part and agree with the other part. He said he was the executor and beneficiary. You don't want to be both. Executor means the same thing as trustee. Trustee has duties and responsibility far beyond and requiring much more detailed work to stay within the bounds of the law than a beneficiary has. A

beneficiary is a good position to be in. If the government is a trust—all these court cases say that government is a trust—that all government employees and officers are in a trustee position and as such they have a fiduciary duty to act with the highest level of honesty, integrity and good faith. If the court cases say that then aren't they telling us that the government is a trust? And for what benefit, for who? A trust has to be there for a reason and that is to hold property or protect property for someone and that someone involved in a trust is a beneficiary and there cannot be a trust without having two things, a trustee and a beneficiary. That's the essence of a trust. So, who are we? {We ain't nothing but a hound dog – if you doubt it, see Adask's win in court on that matter} Now, there's a bunch of morons trying to tell us that we're trustees by giving us labels and that's deceiving people, again, misleading either on purpose because they're evil or because they're too stupid to know the facts. The fact is either you are a trustee because you're part of government or if you're not part of government you're a beneficiary and what this fellow said was wrong that he was the executor and the beneficiary because you don't want to be in both positions. But anyway, the rest of what he said was he's the beneficiary of the legal person entity known as his capital letter name. Then he went into some statutes which we're checking on and tried to refer them to the Bond v. United States case that I just mention which is all about the Tenth Amendment that people have the right to reject federal law and the state legislature has the right to reject federal law. We don't have to accept federal law if we don't want to and that's what Bond upheld, that it couldn't be done unless we accepted it. The most important part of what he did, and probably the clincher, because everything else seems to be superfluous, he said, 'I am not a public servant and any claim to the contrary must be proved by payroll records and my alleged public servant title and sworn under penalty of perjury with full commercial liability for the person who swears to it.' It's almost the same thing that I've been saying. What he did was without listening to me and knowing any of the things that I've been teaching. I said to write an affidavit stating that you are not a resident agent of the state. I don't disagree with him saying that you're a public officer. I don't think public servant is the right term. That's not used in any statutory writings that I know of but public officer is used in statutory writings. So that's what they would recognize. So I would say that I'm not a public officer or employee. I'm not an officer or agent or employee of the government. I am not resident within the government any claim to the contrary must be proved, as he said here—very well done—by payroll records. Prove that I'm being paid by the government to be a government employee. If you can't then your law doesn't apply to me. Now, he stated none of the laws and court cases that we have talked about in the past such as Twining v. State of New Jersey, Chicago Railroad Company v. Number One School District of Yuma Country and Pierce v. New York. That's at least three cases that we're familiar with that the courts have said that the state government has all the right in the world to make laws and rules regulating itself – itself—maybe we don't understand the English language. Itself means just what it says for itself only, not for anything beyond the government. And when they impose any of these rules and regulations beyond government upon any of us they're breaching their fiduciary duty. This is getting to be so simple. It's disgustingly simple to understand but surprising enough for this young fellow who wrote this affidavit which I think is surprisingly weak the court responded with, 'the court has dismissed your case. You have no further obligation with the court regarding this citation.' It was a traffic citation. And then they

said, 'if you have any questions please call.' Which means what they're trying to do is dupe him into something if he'll call. Beware don't call them. Once they've told you to go away that you have no further responsibilities with them, stay the hell away—please listen to what they told you. Stay away, they will indeed try to trick you into some language, some wording or another that will be used against you.

[Dave] They want to re-contract.

[Howard] Yep, re-contract with you and it'll be used against you later on and say, 'well, he said that he lives in Ding-a-ling City, Dingbat State and that means he's part of us. He's under our authority.' Well, no, because you didn't know what the hell you were saying. You don't live in Ding-a-ling City, Dingbat State. You live in Ding-a-ling City, Dingbat State but not the corporate body politic thereof. Now if you can say it that way then they can't use it against you because you're talking about the place. They're talking about the fiction, the corporation. If you just use that name they'll apply it to the fiction corporation and say you're part of it. And so you have to be very, very careful with the things that you say and the things that you write. You are not a citizen of the state. Good God, please drop all that crap that's been going around the patriot community for years that you're a citizen of the State. You're not a citizen of the state unless you work for the state. You're not a resident of the state unless you work for the state. You're not a citizen of the United States or a US citizen unless you work for the US government. You're a private citizen, period, end of statement, private. That's all that's necessary and there is infrequent mention in some court cases of private citizen. And the reason it's infrequent is because it was a few times that the court pointed out that the jurisdiction of the government did not extend to the private citizen. Other than that there is no reason for government to mention the private citizen. No reason for the courts to bring it up unless there's a question of whether or not the government had authority over the private citizen. That's why you won't find much on it. We are private as long as we are not public. Public means government—private means non-government. Non-government is the majority of the people still although they have created this presumption of government connection by duping people into dealing with government and getting a birth certificate registration with the state, a social security registration with the Fed, an automobile and driver's license with the state. I've heard in recent years—now, this doesn't go back to when I was a kid in school but in the last twenty or twenty-five years if your child is going to go to school you have to produce a birth certificate to the school. Why? Well, to prove that your child is entitled to a public school education or a private licensed school education, licensed by government, because they're not entitled to it if they're not party to government. You got to party to government to enjoy government's benefits, privileges and opportunities. If you aren't party to government you're not entitled to any of those benefits, privileges and opportunities. Now, one of the other things that this fellow did in his affidavit was he said that he was waiving any compelled benefits. In other words he's not accepting it. What have I told you about consent and acceptance in our discussions in the past? Your acceptance of anything that government offers you at any level in any way, shape or form is a consent to cooperate with them and to put yourself under their authority and control. Don't accept, don't consent. Waive their compelled benefits and don't accept them. Waive any offer or benefit and tell them the things that are there for

the righteousness of the use of people I use naturally because that's what it's there for. The river is there for the government to protect for our benefit so that we can use it. Why would I accept the benefit of having a license from government to use that river to go fishing or boating? We have not stood up for what is right and have cooperated with the corruption of what's right by these scum that are in government for two centuries and thirty extra years I believe it is. We've just gone along slowly. Didn't start out real strong right away but it got stronger as the years went on agreeing to cooperate. \

[Dave] It's called capitulation.

[Howard] Um huh. Well, now is the time for a revolution. The only thing that's going to stop this is evidently as history has shown us a repeat of history, a revolution. That's the only thing but there's a possibility that we could stir it up terribly and either get it going faster or delay it a little bit by some of these breach of fiduciary duty lawsuits. And that would indeed be a revolution if enough people would bring those suits against enough government people. That would amount to a revolution without guns being necessary which I would prefer to see but I seriously doubt that that will work. I think that this is going to turn into one horrendous violent mess. I don't think government and these scum that are in it that have been stealing and getting away with it for so long are going to quit. I don't think they're going to give back what they stole. I know damn well they won't as far as the money goes. They stole all the value of gold and silver—stashed it away somewhere and they're not about to put it back in circulation despite any rhetoric that's out here that everything is going to be hunky dory. They're going to bring back real money. Everything will be straightened out. Yeah, well, you believe those kinds of people for a little while....

Victoria Cobb, President
Monday, July 16, 2012

Victory Alert: Governor Signs Historic Property Rights Bills

Earlier today, at a ceremonial bill signing in the historic old Senate chamber in Mr. Jefferson's Capitol, Governor Bob McDonnell signed two important pieces of legislation intended to enshrine in the Virginia Constitution the right to property as a fundamental right. One bill authorizes the placing of the proposed property rights constitutional amendment on the ballot for voter ratification this November and the other provides definitions of just compensation for lost access and profit in addition to the cost of land government takes through eminent domain.

Including private property rights in the constitution as a "fundamental right" carries extraordinary weight in the law and further safeguards the right. That is to say, these rights will reinforce in the constitution who the sovereign is – the people, not the government.

Governor McDonnell said the ceremony was scheduled for the historic room because it was a historic day. In 18th century legal terms, “Pursuit of happiness” was nomenclature for property. Virginia’s own George Mason, who inspired the Bill of Rights, could never have envisioned the abuses perpetrated by governments on citizens under the misreading of the Fifth Amendment. In fact, the Governor called the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2005 Kelo decision, which upheld governments’ ability to seize private property almost at will, one of its worst ever decisions.

Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli, who has led on this issue since his days as a state Senator, outlined the four reforms the constitutional amendment will provide for Virginians if ratified: government will be able to take private property only for a true public use and not for private gain (the Kelo decision allows this unless specifically prohibited by states), nor can it be used for “economic development” or to “increase the tax base” or any other such purpose. It also guarantees the expenses must be borne by the government, not the individual. If it is that important to the public to take someone’s land, the public must pay for it. It also prohibits the government from taking more land than is necessary and that the burden of proof must be on the condemner.

But the day was more than about the legalities. It pointed out the pain and heartbreak of Virginians who work hard to obtain a goal – a house, a business, a farm – and to obtain a share of the American dream, only to have it ripped away from them while government profits from their hard labor. That is every bit as fundamentally unjust as the proposed protections are fundamentally right. When government takes away property, it chips away at liberty. It is long overdue for this basic right to be placed in our constitution for permanent protection.

Also at the ceremony today were the patrons of the legislation: Senator Mark Obenshain (R-26, Harrisonburg), Delegate Rob Bell (R-58, Albermarle County) and Delegate Johnny Joannou (D-79, Portsmouth). All deflected credit to the many who have worked on this issue for years, and spoke of the greater good securing these rights will do for society now and for generations to come. In addition to thanking these outstanding patrons, Governor McDonnell, Attorney General Cuccinelli, thanks also goes to Lt. Governor Bill Bolling for his key tie-breaking vote this past year session when opponents thought they had killed the process through procedure to escape going on the record with a recorded vote.

The leaders in attendance graciously thanked the coalition that worked so hard and in tandem the last several years, including The Farm Bureau of Virginia, the Virginia Chapter of the National Federation of Independent Business, the Virginia Forestry Council, the Virginia Agribusiness Council, the Virginia Chapter of Americans for Prosperity, the Virginia Property Rights Coalition and The Family Foundation. We add our heartfelt thanks to all the hard work and dedication to our outstanding coalition partners.

Now, there is one more step: To ratify the constitutional amendment at the polls in November. The Family Foundation will work with the organizations above to ensure that Virginians are ready to Vote Yes! On Amendment One this November. Please start passing the word now about the importance of this vote by forwarding this e-mail and making reference to it on your social media sites, while we will update you throughout the campaign.

--

<http://geminiinvestmentsresearchgroup.wordpress.com/forms>

Check out: www.escapeharrassment.com

www.escape-tickets-IRS-court.org

Christian Walters (trusts) is on Mondays, Tuesdays and Saturdays at nine o'clock, Eastern Time. The number is 1-712-432-0075 and the pin is 149939# (9 PM EST). Wednesday's number is 1-724-444-7444 and the pin is 41875# (8 PM, Eastern) or tune in on Wednesday at Talkshoe.com at <http://www.talkshoe.com/talkshoe/web/talkCast.jsp?masterId=41875&cmd=tc>

"All" Howard's and GEMINI RESEARCH's information through the years, has Been gathered, combined and collated into 3 "Home-Study Courses" and "Information packages" listed at www.peoples-rights.com "Mail Order" DONATIONS And/or Toll-Free 1-877-544-4718 (24 Hours F.A.Q. Line) Dave DiReamer can be reached at: notaxman@dmv.com

Peoples-rights has a new book available from The Informer: Just Who Really Owns the United States, the International Monetary Fund, Federal Reserve, World Bank, Your House, Your Car, Everything—the Myth and the Reality. He'll take \$45 for the book to help with ads, but \$40 would be ok which includes shipping (\$35 barebones minimum) www.peoples-rights.com c/o 1624 Savannah Road, Lewes, Delaware 19958

Often you can find a transcript or a partial one for the week's call at the following website:

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/peoplelookingforthetruth>

Howard approves or disapproves all postings to this yahoo group. Send potential posting to Howard.

Note: questions to Howard are now submitted to Howard, preferably typed, to Gemini Research rather than fielded on the call live. It would be desirable to send a couple of bucks for mailing, copying and printing costs.

Extra legal help is available from the firm, Ketchum, Dewey, Cheatham and Howe.