Invisible Contracts

Admiralty Jurisdiction

by **George Mercier** [Pages 300-385]

Next, we turn now and address the legal procedures used to crack Protesting giblets when an invisible Federal taxation reciprocity contract has been layered on us from that heavy and overweight King we have in Washington, with the administration and enforcement of those invisible contracts falling under a very curt, short, accelerated, and abbreviated legal procedure called *Admiralty Jurisdiction*. I will be discussing two separate items under this section --

1. First, the legal procedure of *Admiralty Jurisdiction*, which is not necessarily related to taxation; and

2. A specific *Admiralty Taxation Contract* itself. Federal Judges do not call this contract an *Admiralty Contract*, but my use of this nomenclature occurs by reason of relational identification, because there are invisible financial benefits originating from the King that involve *Limitations of Liability*, which is characteristic of *Admiralty*.

The legal procedure known as *Admiralty Jurisdiction* applies in Federal areas concerning tax collection, because once a *Person* takes upon any one of the many invisible taxation contracts that the King is enriching his looters through, then *Admiralty Jurisdiction* as a relational procedure can be invoked by the Judiciary and the King's termites in the IRS to get what they want out of you: Your money.

Admiralty is a subdivision of King's Commerce such that all of King's Commerce that takes place over waterways and the High Seas (at least, such a geographical restriction of Admiralty to navigable waterways of all types is now only theoretical), is assigned to be government by a special set of grievance settlement and evidentiary rules, just custom tailored to Commerce of that nature... at least that was the case in the old days when Admiralty was once restricted to govern legitimate business transactions with the King out on the High Seas.

Back in the old days, back way early in England's history, our Fathers saw that the rules governing the settlement of grievances that occurred on land just didn't seem to fit right into grievances

that merchants had with each other on some Commerce that transpired out on the High Seas. A large portion of business involved the transportation of merchandise from one place to the next. For example, on land, goods that were damaged in transit for some reason were generally always recovered from the accident for valuation and insurance adjustment purposes, and eye witnesses were often present to describe how the damage happened, i.e., whether a gust of high winds came along, or some other carriage violated rights-of-way and caused the accident, or that thievery took place. In that way, fault and damages could be properly assigned to the responsible party. But transportation that crosses over water is very different, indeed. Whenever high gusts of squall wind came about on the High Seas as merchandise was being shipped from, say, England to India, then many ships were lost at sea. No one saw the ship sink, the merchandise is gone for good, the crew is gone as well, and months and years transpire in silence as a ship that was expected to arrive in a foreign port never appears. It could have been piracy, a Rogue Wave, or the weather, or that the captain and crew made off with the boat to the South Pacific, but in any event, there is no other party to be sued, and no one knows what happened (there were no radios then). In some cases, searching expeditions were sent out to look for the lost ship, and so years would pass between the initial sinking or stealing, and a declaration to the fact that was accepted by all interested parties.

Question: How do you assign negligence for damages out on the High Seas? No one saw anything happen; no one has any evidence that anything happened. Who was at fault, and why?

On land, assigning fault and making partial recovery by the responsible party is quite common, but not so out on the High Seas. So this special marine jurisdiction (and "jurisdiction" meaning here is simply a special set of rules) was developed organically, piece by piece and sometimes Case by Case, which grew and developed to limit liability exposure to the carrier and others, and also minimized the losses that could be claimed by forcing certain parties to assume risks they don't have to assume when merchandise is being shipped over land. Also, some of the other special rules applicable to grievances brought into a Court of Admiralty are that there is no jury in Admiralty -- never -- everything is handled summarily before a Judge in chronologically compressed proceedings. Also, there are no fixed rules of law or evidence (meaning that it is somewhat like an Administrative Proceeding in the sense that it is a free-wheeling evidentiary jurisdiction -- anything goes).[1]

And so when limitations of liability were codified this way into the King's Statutes, this was actually Special Interest Group legislation

to benefit insurance carriers.[2] Insurance company risk analysts are brilliant people, and they now know, like they have always known, exactly what they are doing at all times when sponsoring statutes that limit the amount of money they have to pay out in claims.[3]

And due to the extended time factors that were involved in the shipping of Commerce out on the High Seas in old England, rules regarding the timeliness of bringing actions into court, just never fit just right with a ship lost for months or years before the involved parties even knew about it. So something originated out on the High Seas known as *Double Insurance*; which is a general business custom, continuing to be in effect down to the present time, for carriers to purchase double the value on merchandise transiting in a marine environment (insuring Commercial merchandise in transit for twice their cash value), and this insurance doubling was later enforced by English statutes to be mandatory, due to the "inherent risks involved."[4]

Do you see the distinction in risk and procedure between Commerce transacted over the land and Commerce transacted over the High Seas? As we change the situs from land to water, everything changes in the ability to effectuate a judicial recovery for goods damaged in transit. And everything in Commerce comes into the Courtroom eventually, so setting down a variety of courtroom rules just custom tailored to marine business also developed in time, and properly so.

So in the right geographical place (meaning in the right risk environment), the application of special marine rules to settle Commercial grievances is quite appropriate. And insurance, i.e., the absorption of Commercial risk by an insurance underwriter in exchange for some cash premiums paid, has always been considered by the Judiciary to be an Admiralty transaction. In other words, even though the merchandise is not being shipped over water, and even though the business insurance policy has absolutely nothing to do with a marine environment or a physical High Seas setting, the issuance of the policy of insurance now attaches Admiralty Jurisdiction right then and there.[5]

And 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.

Anyone who is involved with Admiralty or Maritime activities are always Persons involved with Commercial activities that fall under the King's Commerce, but since Admiralty and Maritime are subdivisions of King's Commerce, the reverse is not always true, i.e., not everyone in King's Commerce is in Admiralty or Maritime. Admiralty Law Jurisdiction is a body of legal concepts, international in character, which has its own history of organic growth concurrent both within the parallel Anglo-American development of King's Equity and Common Law Jurisdictions, and in addition to organic growth from outside Anglo-American Law. Admiralty Law has been around for quite some time, and it very much does have its proper time and place. Admiralty Jurisdiction goes back quite farther than just recent English history involving the Magna Carta in 1215; it has its roots in the ancient codes that the Phoenicians used, and it appears in the Rhodesian Codes as well.

Generally speaking, Maritime Jurisdiction is the *it happened out on the sea* version of Common Law Jurisdiction and Jury Trials are quite prevalent; Admiralty Jurisdiction is the *it happened out on the sea* version of summary King's Equity Jurisdiction, and generally features non-Jury Trials to settle grievances (as Kings have a long history of showing little interest in Juries).[6] Just what grievance should lie under ordinary Civil Law, or should lie under Admiralty Jurisdiction is often disputed even at the present time, and has always been disputed.[7] Admiralty Jurisdiction is the *King's Commerce* of the High Seas, while Maritime Jurisdiction could be said to be the *Common Law* of the High Seas. If you and I (as private parties) entered into Commercial contracts with each other that has something to do with a marine setting, that would be a contract in Maritime. If you or I contract in Commerce with the King (such as shipping his guns across oceans), then such an arrangement would fall under Admiralty Jurisdiction. This distinction does not always hold true any more, as lawyers have greatly blurred the distinction by lumping everything into Admiralty.[8]

This is why Admiralty is the *King's Commerce* of the High Seas and navigable rivers and lakes (or at least, should be). A least, that is the way it used to be. Up until the mid-1800s here in the United States, very frequently merchants paid off each other in gold coins and company notes, i.e., there was no monopoly on currency circulation by the King then like there is today. So in the old days,

it was infrequent that the King had an involvement with private Maritime Commerce. And there was an easy-to-see distinction in effect back then between Maritime Jurisdiction contracts that involved private parties (or Maritime Torts where neither parties in the grievance are agencies or instrumentalities of Government) and Admiralty Jurisdiction, which applied to Commercial contracts where the King was a party. (Remember that Tort Law governs grievances between people where there is no contract in effect. So if a longshoreman fell on a dock and broke his leg, his suing the owner of the dock for negligence in maintaining the dock should be a Maritime Tort Action). However, today in the United States, all Commercial contracts that private parties enter into with each other that are under Maritime Jurisdiction, are now also under Admiralty: Reason: The beneficial use and recirculation of Federal Reserve Notes makes the King an automatic silent Equity third party to the arrangements.

In England, which has long been a jurisprudential structure encompassing Maritime and Admiralty Law, open hostility and tension has flared on occasion regarding the question of applying a marine based jurisdiction on land. During the reign of King Richard II, there was a confrontation between inland Equity Jurisdiction Courts and the assertion of normally sea based Admiralty Jurisdiction Courts. The confrontation resulted in a King's Decree being issued to settle the grievance. That Decree provided that:

> "The admirals and their deputies shall not meddle from henceforth of anything done within the realm, but only of a thing done upon the sea..."[9]

This Decree abated the encroachment grievance for the time being, but other encroachment questions arose later on, because the use of fee based summary Admiralty Jurisdiction raises revenue for the Judges, and is administratively quite efficient, and therefore all factors considered, the inherently expansive nature of Admiralty is quite strong, and as such, Decrees issued by Kings trying to limit the contours of Admiralty were simply tossed aside and soon forgotten. So now one meaningless Royal Decree was soon followed by another:

"...of all manner of contracts, pleas, and quarrels, and other things arising within the bodies of the counties as well by land as by [the edge of] water, and also by wreck of the sea, the admiral's court shall have no manner of cognizance, power, nor jurisdiction; but all such manner of contracts, pleas, and quarrels, and all other things rising within the bodies of counties, as well by land as by water, as afore, and remedied by the laws of the land, and not before nor by the admiral, nor his lieutenant in any wise."[10]

In the reign of King James the First, the disputed boundary controversies between the Courts of Common Law and the Admiralty Jurisdiction Courts continued on, and "even reached an acute stage."[11] We find in the second volume of Marsden's *Select Pleas in the Court of Admiralty*, and in Lord Coke's writings[12] that despite an agreement made in 1575 between the justices of the King's Bench and the judge of Admiralty, the judges of the Common Law Courts successfully maintained their right to prohibit suits in Admiralty upon contracts that were made on shore. (Notice who your friends are: Judges sitting over Common Law Courts). Other complaints of encroachment by Courts of Admiralty into land based grievances surfaced during the rule and reign of King Henry the Fourth.[13] So, Admiralty Jurisdiction is by its historical nature an expansive and adhesive Jurisdiction for Kings to use to accomplish their Royal revenue raising and administrative cost cutting objectives.

Our Founding Fathers also had an inappropriate assertion of this expansive Admiralty Jurisdiction thrown at them from the King of England, which was a strong contributing reason as to why the American Colonists felt that the King had lost his rightful jurisdiction to govern the Colonies.[14] Yes, King George was very much working American Colonial giblets through an Admiralty Cracker; and so Admiralty has had a long habitual pattern of making appearances where it does not belong, of creating confrontations, and of being used as a juristic whore by Kings functioning as Royal pimps: And all for the same identical purpose: To enrich the Crown and nothing else.

This concept of using Admiralty as a slick tool for Revenue Raising is an important concept to understand, as this procedure to raise revenue through an invisible Admiralty Contract is now surfacing in the United States in the very last place where anyone would think a marine based jurisdictional environment belongs: On your Internal Revenue Service's 1040 form, as I will explain later on.

What is important to understand here is not merely that there has been an expansive atmosphere of perpetual enlargement of the jurisdictional contours that characterize Courts of Admiralty that has been in effect for a long time in old English history, but what is important is why this state of expansion continuously took place:

> "The present obscure and irrational state of admiralty jurisdiction in America is the consequence of the long feud between the English common law and admiralty judges, clerks and marshals, who competed for jurisdiction by fees, not salaries, until 1840. They, therefore, competed

> for jurisdiction of profitable litigation between merchants, but were happy to escape unprofitable cases. In particular, the common law judges sought exclusive jurisdiction whenever a jury of vicinage could be empaneled."[15]

So the reason why King Richard II and the other Kings of England had to keep issuing out restraining Decrees, to hem in the Admirals with the ever-expanding jurisdiction that they were assuming, was because those admirals were financially compensated based on the number and types of Cases they accepted to rule on -- so they obviously accepted and asserted Admiralty Jurisdiction over the maximum number of Cases practically possible; and why should they care about "mere technical details" as to whether or not that grievance really belonged under Admiralty or not? Why should they concern themselves with the mere question of jurisdiction when the more important event of looting a Defendant was so imminent? Why should they concern themselves with the comities of limited inter-tribunal jurisdiction when an operation of banditry was so close at hand? What the old Admiralty Judges wanted was to savor, experientially, the conquest of financial enrichment, and with such fee compensated Courts, Admiralty Judges got what they wanted. Can't you just hear the old Admiralty Judge now:

> "Why, the Plaintiff brought this Case into my Court,
> I've got jurisdiction!"

Here in the 1980s in the United States, have you ever heard this same identical line when challenging some rubbery little Star Chamber Town Justice on a speeding ticket? That determined little Justice of the Peace wants just one thing from you: Your money. Like the Admiralty Courts of old England, his little Star Chamber is also fee based. And he represents everything curt, accelerated, and inconsiderate when ignoring your traffic infraction citation jurisdictional arguments that was also curt, accelerated, and inconsiderate when fee based Admiralty Courts assumed jurisdiction on Cases they had no business taking in 1300 A.D.

Those old Admiralty Courts wanted the self-serving financial enrichment that filing fees paid by Plaintiffs gave them. And so in seeking Admiralty Jurisdiction relief, Plaintiffs expected and got quick, fast, and summary relief. And being financially compensated the way they were, are you really surprised that Admiralty Jurisdiction Courts were simply expected by custom to be the shortest, curtest, most summary, and chronologically most abbreviated form of adjudication imaginable? Who has time for a Jury in Admiralty? I can just hear a poor fellow try to argue rights in an old Admiralty Court back then.

> "You want what? You want Due Process in this

> Court? You want your Magna Carta rights? Ha! [*snort*] This is Admiralty. Judgment entered in for the Plaintiff. Next Case."

Today in the United States, just like in those days of King Richard II, there is now an assertion of Admiralty and Maritime Law going on in places where it does not belong, and it is now trying to make an appearance where it has no business. Admiralty Jurisdiction has in many respects, "come ashore" and now "meddles" with much of our domestic "realm," as it currently affects almost every element of our inland Commercial society. Today's practice of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction is found not only in its appropriate home in that slice of business of King's Commerce that is going on out on the seas, but also on the navigable rivers of the United States, as well as world-wide off-shore well drilling activity. Admiralty Jurisdiction rules are used to settle claims and grievances regarding cargo, international conventions, financing, banking, insurance, legislation, navigation, hazardous substances from nuclear power plants, stevedoring (the unloading of a vessel at a port), and undersea mining and development. An examination of some Commercial contracts that aerospace defense contractors enter into with the Pentagon and each other (from general contractor to subcontractor) reveals slices of Admiralty very much now in effect. It is probable that Admiralty Jurisdiction will also surface sometime in the future to settle Tort claims arising out of the CIA's planting of ICBMs on the ocean floor up and down the East Coast in the 1960s under instructions from David Rockefeller, using that ship Howard Hughes built especially for this purpose, called the *Glomar Explorer*. Every few years since 1977, strange stories have appeared in the news regarding whales beaching themselves on American coasts. On February 6, 1977, a large number of whales began beaching themselves at Jacksonville, Florida for no apparent reason; commentators conjectured that the whales must have lost their sense of navigation. Soon, 120 whales had mysteriously beached themselves at Jacksonville.[16] NBC Television News reported that evening that no autopsies were going to be performed on the whales, but NBC was fed inaccurate information. When privately dissected by doctors who knew what to look for, those whales had empty stomachs [meaning that the whales had not eaten in a while and were sick], and also had heavy plutonium poisoning in their lungs, originating from one of the undersea missiles leaking plutonium, located on the seabed 290 miles ESE of Jacksonville, at 30 9.9' North and 77 8.44' West, which is one of those aging CIA underwater ICBM's sites. What the whales were up against was a fungus like infection that had interfered with their breathing, originating from the water-born plutonium; and when dragged out back to sea from the Jacksonville beaches, the whales

ed to the beach [negating the "loss of navigation" theories]. The whales preferred to die on the beach, rather than carry on life in their underwater agony. Those beached whales were collected and buried at the Giren Road Landfill in Jacksonville, Florida, but today, they should not be forgotten. Whales are mammals like you and me, and soon, rather than mammalian whales acting strange (like running up a stream, and refusing to go back into the ocean) and others trying to die by beaching themselves, people are next;[17] and municipal medical examiners performing autopsies are not oriented to perform plutonium toxicity density examinations in the cadavers they ponder over, so the real cause of strange behavior and death will likely be puzzling for a while.[18] But when correctly identified, the King's Admiralty Jurisdiction will be there to settle those impending claims, as the source of the Tort is juristic. There are a lot more numerous sources of plutonium now available to contaminate American drinking water supplies than just some aging undersea missiles, and whatever plutonium cannot slip into your drinking water by itself, will one day have the liberating assistance of a terrorist. And it is my conjecture that when the first hotel is built on the Moon or some other remote astral place, Admiralty Jurisdiction will be right there to make an appearance when the doors open.[19] Here in the contemporary United States, the very first Federal Court ever established by Congress, was a Court of Admiralty.[20]

And so the use and availability of Admiralty Jurisdiction is deemed very important to our King; and for the identical same reasons why Admiralty Jurisdiction organically grew into the most summary, shortest, and swiftest form of "Justice" imaginable in the old fee based Admiralty Courts: Because the King is financially enriched by the maximum number of assertions of Admiralty Jurisdiction that he can get. So likewise our King today is being financially enriched by his expansively asserting "Courts of Admiralty" where they rightly do not belong. Today in the United States, a King's Agent (some hard working private contracting Termite who works for the IRS) simply sends a letter to an Employer stating that a particular Employee's wage deductions are being disallowed, or this fine is being levied, and the Employer jumps instantly and sends the money into the IRS without even telling the Employee that the summary confiscation took place. No opportunity to be heard in opposition, no expectation of even being heard in opposition to the Notice, just summary confiscation. And the more the King confiscates without any Administrative Hearings preceding the confiscation, the richer the King gets, just like in the old fee based Admiralty Courts of old England -- so you can just forget about getting any Contested Case Administrative Hearing on a grievance with the IRS.

The reason why summary Admiralty Jurisdiction is of concern to us is because our King is using jurisdiction attachment rules applicable to an Admiralty Jurisdictional environment to us interior folks out here in the countryside where Admiralty Jurisdiction does not correctly lie. (The only ordinary land based folks who should properly be under King's *in personam* Admiralty Jurisdiction are Government Employees (Federal and state), Military Service personnel, and those who specifically contract into Admiralty Jurisdiction (such as Employees working for a Defense contractor with a Security Clearance, and private contractors hired by Government to perform law enforcement related work)). The King and the Princes are using Admiralty Jurisprudence reasoning to effectuate an attachment of Enfranchisement on Natural Persons, by virtue of all Citizens, so called, being made a Party to the 14th Amendment; well, that is the process by which Admiralty attaches, however the confluence of reasons why the King so attaches Admiralty all focuses on just one Royal objective: The King wants your money, and he is going to hypothecate you, and use invisible contracts in Admiralty to get what he wants.[21]

Most folks think that, well, the 14th Amendment just freed the slaves, or maybe something noble and righteous like that. Not so. Every single Amendment attached to the Constitution after the original Ten in the Bill of Rights, is in contravention to the original version of 1787 for one reason or another, and each of the *after Ten* were sponsored by people -- Gremlins, imps -- operating with *sub silentio* sinister damages intentions. Under the 14th Amendment, there now lies a state of Debt Hypothecation on the United States that all Enfranchised persons bear some burden of,[22] i.e., all citizens who are a Party to the 14th Amendment can be made personally liable for the payment of the King's debt. So now when the King comes along with his statutes and claims that, despite his own 14th Amendment, his Enfranchised subjects are now going to be limited in their liability profile exposure to national debt, important financial benefits are being conferred upon Citizens, and the King believes that Admiralty Jurisdiction, with all of its giblet cracking accoutrements, attaches right then and there.[23]

The King and the Prince are using twisted logic to justify this assertion of Admiralty Jurisdiction where it does not belong: Where it belongs is out on the High Seas where it came from. Royalty now believes that the legal environment of Limited Liability conferred on risk takers sufficiently replicates the original legal risk environment of Limited Liability that organically grew up out on the High Seas to be Admiralty Jurisdiction. Remember that Limited Liability itself is a legal trick of enrichment used by insurance companies as debtors to reduce the amount of money

they have to pay out on claims; yes, Limited Liability is a marvelous legal tool for the insurance companies to bask in. From the *Price-Anderson Act* that cuts nuclear power plant losses to the Warsaw Convention that cuts airplane crash losses,[24] from *Admiralty Limitations on Liability Act*[25] on marine shipping to medical doctors malpractice suits,[26] Limited Liability is nothing more than a brilliant wealth transfer instrument for Special Interest Groups to bask in, and all very neatly accomplished through the use of statutes.[27]

So in a limited sense, the legal environment of Admiralty Jurisdiction could be properly said to apply to any Commercial setting where a debtor owes money to other people as risk insurance, with the amount of debt payable by the risk insurance carrier being artificially lowered by statutory Limitations of Liability. The true origin of the adhesive attachment of *Admiralty Jurisdiction* (which is just legal procedure) lies in the existence of invisible contracts that are in effect, with the contracts being of such a maritime nature that grievances arising from them are settled pursuant to Admiralty Jurisdiction rules.

Let us be objective like an umpire or a judge for a moment, and stop thinking in terms of what we want and don't want for ourselves, so we can Open our Eyes to see what is really there, by trying to view things from the perspective of an adversary.[28] If we could lay aside, just for a moment, the presumption by many that judges are Fifth Column pinkos and are otherwise morons, and now examine the King's reasoning on Admiralty Jurisdiction attachment (that his Title 46 statutes have Limited the Liability that Enfranchised Persons have encumbered themselves into through the 14th Amendment), then unfortunately for Protesters, we find that there is some merit to the King's contentions, and the reason is because special financial benefits are being accepted by Enfranchised Persons, and so now an invisible contract is in effect, with the result being that if a grievance comes to pass on the contract, somewhat unpleasant Admiralty settlement rules will prevail.[29]

[When I was first told about the story of the 14th Amendment, I was told a story by numerous people and groups, who should know better, that parents can bind their offspring into Equity Jurisdiction relationships with Royalty; and I heard this same line of reasoning from numerous different sources. When I heard that line, I tossed it aside as a brazen piece of foolishness; the idea of having parents assign debt liability to their offspring by evidence of a Birth Certificate was then, and now remains, as utter foolishness. I was correct in my ideological rebuffment of that line of liability reasoning, as one person cannot bind another absent a grant of

agency jurisdiction. But later through a Federal Judge I realized that there are special financial benefits that persons documented as being politically Enfranchised at birth experience later on as adults when they are being shaken down for a smooth Federal looting; and it is this acceptance of benefits as adults, in the context of reciprocity being expected back in return, that attaches contract tax liability, and not the existence of a Birth Certificate document itself. This concept some folks propagate -- that we are locked into juristic contracts by our parents since it is the parents who have caused the Birth Certificate to be recorded -- is not correct: As a point of beginning, one person cannot bind another. But most importantly, all the Birth Certificate and correlative documents in the world will not separate a dime in taxation from you until such time as you, individually, and personally, have started to accept juristic benefits. The Law does not operate on paper; what is on paper is a statement of the Law, but that does not trigger the operation of the Law. All the documents with Royalty in the world will not separate a dime from you, until juristic benefits have been accepted by you out in the practical setting. In a sense, Birth Certificates can be properly construed as documents evidencing your entitlement to *Rights of Franchise*, if you decide to exercise those rights later on when you come of age, but the reciprocal taxation liability Enfranchised folks take upon themselves occurs by operation of contract -- the invisible contracts that quietly slip into gear whenever juristic benefits are being accepted: Now, here, today -- and by you, personally and individually. The relational status of your parents to Government, past and present, is an irrelevant factor *Birth Certificate Pushers* are incorrectly assigning significance to. Those who warned me of the adhesive Equity tentacles of the 14th Amendment were absolutely correct in their conclusory observations of the effects of the 14th Amendment, but they were incorrect in their views that liability singly attaches by reason of the existence of a Birth Certificate document that their parents caused to be created. By the time you are finished with this Letter, you will understand why written Documents, of and by themselves, mean absolutely nothing -- as it is the existence of Consideration [benefits] experienced or rejected out in the practical setting that attaches and severs liability, and the written Document or statement of the contract itself is unimportant for liability determination purposes -- and for good reasons: Because the Law operates out in the practical setting and not on paper, of and by itself; to say that the Law cannot operate except if on paper is to say in reverse that if there is no paper, there is no Law. Not understanding the significance of that Principle will render yourself prone to error in your thinking.][30]

Having your Debt Liability Limited by statute is a very real and

tangible benefit that inures to all such named Enfranchised debtors (imagine being an insurance company, and having to pay out only 80% of your claims -- you then get to pocket the 20% that the statutes restrained your policy holders from collecting); the fact that, in examining your own individual circumstances, you cannot assign any substantive financial significance to it isn't anything the King is going to concern himself with. And insurance companies are prime examples of the institutionalized use of this marvelous legal tool to enrich themselves, and they are also prime examples of just how really valuable a Limitation on Liability really is. Remember that when benefits are being accepted in the context of reciprocity being expected back in , then there lies a good tight contract. If, for example, you are an insurance company, and your average losses for claims under homeowner's policies is $100,000, and the King comes along and declares that henceforth, the maximum claim anyone can make in his Kingdom against an insurance company for damages experienced by homeowners is $95,000, then those insurance companies very much did experience a very real, legitimate cash benefit; and so it is now morally correct for the King to participate in taxing the profits the insurance companies made for this reason alone, as the King very much assisted in enriching those insurance companies by decreasing their cash expenditures. Neither it is immoral for the King to enact statutes that enrich some Gameplayers in Commerce while simultaneously perfecting the Enscrewment of others, as remember that entrance into the closed private domain of King's Commerce is purely voluntary.[31]

So do you see what a well worded statute can do? ...invisible political benefits accepted get converted into a gusher of cash for the King, to be used as a wealth transfer instrument by Special Interest Groups. The more numerous the number of wealth transfer instruments the King can create, the more he can correctly justify before the eyes of the Judiciary taxing certain Persons who financially benefit from the statutory *grab and give* scheme.[32]

In your Case as a benefit acceptant Enfranchised Person under the 14th Amendment, if your share of the National Debt is $250,000, and the King comes along and slices off $150,000 from that Debt, so your exposure is now $100,000, then did the King just give you a benefit? Certainly he did, and it is now morally correct for the King to participate in taxing the gain he participated in creating, just like he did with insurance companies. If in your business judgment throwing half of your annual income out the window to the King for these paltry artificial political debt liability limitations is just not worth the large percentage tax grab the King demands year in and year out without letup, then that is a business judgment you need to make; and that business question is not a question that

a Federal Judge can or should come to grips with in the midst of some Title 26 enforcement prosecution, after you previously accepted the King's Commercial benefits, and now for some philosophically oriented political reason, you don't feel like reciprocating by paying the invisible benefits that you previously received under an Admiralty contract.[33]

Here in New York State, the regional Prince in 1984 became the first American Prince to enact statutes requiring the use of seat belts by all motorists driving on *his* highways. This statute was openly announced as being designed to cut the hospital costs of accident victims (meaning, to limit the liability exposure of insurance company claims by reducing the amount of cash they spend on each hospitalization claim while collecting the same amount of annual motorist insurance premiums). Here in Rochester, New York, numerous insurance companies ran large newspaper advertisements at the time encouraging the enactment of the Seat Belt statute. I have examined the lobbyists' material that was distributed to State Legislators in 1984 on this issue; they were presented with an impressive array of the history of similar statutes enacted in over 90 foreign jurisdictions world wide to justify their proposed statute in New York State -- yes, where high-powered money is at stake, there will be high-powered research and documentation.

You may very well resent this *grab and give* environment that is designed to enrich the King while perfecting your Enscrewment in the practical setting, but if you do voluntarily participate in the Enrichment Game of King's Commerce, then your resentment for being cornered in on the *grab* side of this wealth transfer game, and your Tort Law arguments of unfairness centered around that resentment, means absolutely nothing to any judge at any time for any reason. But what if you are different? What if you don't voluntarily participate in Commerce? What if you filed timely objections, and have refused and rejected all Commercial benefits? Now what?

The reason why the King entertains this Admiralty "Limitation of Liability" Jurisdictional attachment reasoning goes back into the Civil War days of the 1800s, when a Special Interest Group, perhaps a bit overzealous, exerted strong controlling dominance in the Congress and announced that they had effectuated the ratification of the 14th Amendment, in order to "correct the injustice" from the Supreme Court's *Dred Scott* Case,[34] and its majestic restrainment on the Congress not to forcibly attach Equity Jurisdiction on individuals absent a Grant of Jurisdiction to do so (Citizenship is Equity Jurisdiction, and the casting of Blacks (or anyone else) into King's Equity Jurisdiction relational settings

without the requisite initiating Charter jurisdictional authority being there, is null and void). The reasoning the Supreme Court used to rule on in *Dred Scott* was quite correct; but unfortunately for political reasons, it caused its correct reasoning to be related to persons who are Blacks instead of persons carrying other minority demographic characteristics, such as blue eyes.[35] And so although the pronouncements of Law in *Dred Scott* are quite accurate, the factual setting was twisted around just enough to cause those poor downtrodden Blacks to be pictured on the wrong side of the practical issue, and so the *Dred Scott* Case became a tool used by politicians seeking a hot issue to enrich their own fortunes.[36] But substitute some other demographic feature of people for Blacks, and the *Dred Scott* Case would have been ignored.[37]

The *Dred Scott case* ruled that African races, even though freed as slaves by President Lincoln, and freed again from being slaves by the 13th Amendment, still could not be placed into that high and unique lofty political status called Citizen, with all of the rights, privileges, benefits and immunities that Citizens have: Because Congress was never given the Jurisdiction to do so, and the reason has to do with the original intentions of the Founding Fathers in 1787 to create a sanctuary for white Christians to live in without the uncomfortable tensions and frictions of society that always follow in the wake of forced relations with other people of strongly contrasting demographic characteristics. Although the 13th Amendment very much abolished slavery, it nowhere talks about Citizenship, which as a contract is something totally else, and which has very significant and important legal meanings since Citizenship attaches King's Equity Jurisdiction. Under this *Dred Scott Doctrine*, Blacks could not even become naturalized Citizens (i.e., the Congress could not enact statutory jurisdiction to grant Citizenship rights to Blacks that the original version of the Constitution specifically restrained and the 13th Amendment never reached into.) So the 14th Amendment came along, designed to change all that.[38]

Since politicians saw this *Dred Scott* Case as having very unique qualities to acquire maximum political mileage out of it due to the passionate public sentiments associated with it, the movement towards adapting the 14th Amendment to deal with those *utterly heinous* and *racist Supreme Court Justices* quickly acquired momentum; and having the powerful support that the 14th Amendment possessed, it was simply assumed that it would quickly pass Congress and be ratified by the States. Like statutory bills in Congress,[39] the 14th Amendment became loaded down with very interesting declarations on the Public Debt, that had

absolutely nothing to do with granting Blacks Citizenship rights -- seemingly the very reason for the 14th Amendment in the first place. Like the Panama Canal Treaties, Gremlins saw a unique window opening to perfect just one more turn of the screws. And those pronouncements on Public Debts and Enfranchised Citizens are the structured legal framework of the King to seek Citizenship contract liability as a partial justification to pay Income Taxes here in the 1980s. Remember that mere written documents, of and by themselves, do not create liability. Liability is always perfected in the practical setting; and it is your acceptance of the benefits of Enfranchisement (of which the Limited Liability of your share of the Public Debt is one such benefit), that gives rise to a taxing liability scenario, and not the unilateral debt declarations in the 14th Amendment itself.[40]

The actual legal validity of the ratification of the 14th Amendment is now disputed. The Utah Supreme Court once ruled that the ratification of the 14th Amendment was invalid and therefore the Bill of Rights was non-applicable in Utah.[41]

For more than a hundred years now, the courts have applied the 14th Amendment to pertinent Cases that have come before them. And although questions have been raised about both its language meaning and the legal correctness of its adaption process, Federal challenges to the Ratification of the 14th Amendment have always fallen on deaf ears. Its long time usage and the *Lateness of the Hour Doctrines* have caused the Supreme Court to accept the 14th Amendment as law.[42] Of and by itself, the 14th Amendment is an instrument that creates a great deal of litigation.[43]

Despite the disputed authenticity of the background factual setting permeating the Ratification Process of the 14th Amendment, the story of its alleged Ratification is indeed a strange and fascinating chapter in Constitutional history. It goes well beyond the natural confusion that would be expected on the heels of a great Civil War and the secondary political readjustments that followed the disruption of power relationships. The nature of the unique political conditions back then and the emerging attitudes of individuals to furnish the key elements in the factual setting relating to pure, raw physical force that the sponsors of the 14th Amendment pressured on Ratification-reluctant Southern States; and the same unique political conditions are now responsible for the first two assertions of an invisible layer of Admiralty Jurisdiction over us all.[44]

Patriots now have a position to take on this 14th Amendment: Do we want this 14th Amendment thing or not? On one hand, the 14th Amendment has been used by judges as their excuse to give us noble sounding, although largely milktoast, Due Process and other

wide-ranging rights that have been used as judicial intervention justification jurisdiction in such diverse factual settings like opening up Government law libraries to the public; chopping away at the lingering vestiges of Richard Dailey's Machine in Chicago; ordering the Tombs Prison in New York City closed; ordering affirmative action in the hiring of policemen; ordering school integration busing; denying retail business proprietors the discretion to select their own customers; and in Boston, Federal Judge Arthur Garrity actually took over administrative operations management of a portion of the local school district in an intervention effort to deal with that utterly heinous evil of racism. And it was through an operation of the 14th Amendment's *Incorporation Doctrine* that the entire Bill of Rights was made binding on your regional Prince by the Supreme Court (as the Bill of Rights was initially binding, by original intent, only on the King himself).[45]

And on the other hand, in an area of more direct interest to Gremlins, the 14th Amendment now spins an invisible stealthy web of an adhesive attachment of King's Equity Jurisdiction so strong and with benefits so invisible, that Black Widow Spiders would be humbled if they could ever appreciate their reduced Status in light of this new competition in the Jungle.

In a sense, what we want or do not want at the present time is unimportant, since we as Individuals are without jurisdiction to effectuate into the practical setting the corrective political remedies of annulling the 14th Amendment.

In *Fairchild vs. Hughes*,[46] the Supreme Court refused to consider the possibility of the illegitimacy of the Ratification of the 19th Amendment, and used as contributing justification the comparative example of the judicial recognition of the 15th Amendment by its long usage, regardless of arguments about its technical validity. In *Coleman vs. Miller*,[47] the Supreme Court did lightly review questions pertaining to the Ratification of the 14th Amendment, and of attempts by two States to rescind their previous Ratification of an Amendment as an example of their philosophy that such questions be deferred to "the political departments of government as to [whether or not the] validity of the adoption of the 14th Amendment has been accepted."[48]

Although the right of judges to nullify statutes was seemingly settled in *Marbury vs. Madison*,[49] the question of Judicial statutory annulment lingered on,[50] Judicial Review now continues down to the present day as a topical source of conversation, since the *Doctrine of Judicial Review* is often used as a legal tool to justify taking a philosophical position.[51]

Just as the low level question of statutory annulment by the

Judiciary continues on as a disputed jurisdictional item, so *a fortiori*[52] the higher question of actually annulling portions of the Constitution itself, due to technical Ratification procedures, is strongly disputed.[53]

Although that line of reasoning is facially defective if intended to apply universally to all circumstances [the right time to do the right thing is right now], there is some merit in the Supreme Court's desire that grievances of this nature are best settled by what they call the *Political Departments of Government*, under normal circumstances. However, when unlawful sources of jurisdiction are being used (such as nonexistent Constitutional Amendments) as justification to damage someone, then the *Alice in Wonderland* fantasy of gentlemanly interdepartmental political comities that the Supreme Court would prefer to intervene and settle the grievance, become inappropriate and unrealistic grievance settlement remedy tools; and by indifferently allowing fraudulent sources of jurisdiction to be thrown at someone as justifying Government Tort damages, the judiciary is diminishing its own stature.[54]

As for the holding of the Bill of Rights into binding effect on the States, in every single Supreme Court decision I have read involving the 14th Amendment Due Process Clause application, the Supreme Court could have equally justified the ruling based on the *Republican Form of Government Clause* in Article IV, Section 4, if they wanted to -- but they don't want to.

One of the receptive concerns one finds in the Supreme Court is their perceived lack of federal jurisdiction to intervene into, and overrule state proceedings -- This *Republican Clause* is a real sleeper as such a Grant of Supervisory Jurisdiction is inherent in its positive action mandates. Shifting to the meaning of the Clause itself: A Republic, properly understood, involves the restrainment of the use of Government by majorities to work Torts on minorities, as distinguished from Democracies where simple majority rule forces their will and their Torts on everyone else.[55]

What are Minority Rights? Those Rights are the Rights to be left alone and ignored by Government absent an infracted contract or a Tort damage.[56] And those rights are very appropriate to invoke when you are in the midst of a criminal prosecution, without any contract in effect, without any *mens rea*, and without Any *Corpus Delecti* damages being found anywhere; and it has to be this way since wisdom is not conferred upon majorities by virtue of their sheer collective aggregate numbers.[57]

I see a real germ of tyranny in theoretical Democracies.[58] Since everyone, even lobbyists for Special Interest Groups, belongs to one or more overlapping minority interest groups of some type, then attention to this *Republican Clause* by the Supreme Court

(and by us in our briefs) can accomplish far more than the less specific "Due Process" words in a sinister Amendment that carries negative and unattractive secondary enscrewment consequences along with it. But we are not the Supreme Court, so our knowledge and wisdom has to be filed away in abatement under *Hiatus Status*, pending our future ascension into the corridors of power.

There are several ways to cure the mischiefs of factions and their Torts; one is to remove its seminal point of causality [by the elimination of troublemakers, not permissible without creating more problems than were "solved"]; another way is to control the net practical effects of Majority Torts by creating a confederate Republic, consisting of several regional states, and then creating several layers of Juristic Institutions operating on narrow jurisdictional contours, and somewhat operating against each other to a limited extent; this is very similar to the structural configuration of the United States, with a federal layer operating *vis-a-vis* the regional States.[59]

By the way, the original version of the United States Constitution, which includes the first ten Amendments (the *Bill of Rights*), is organic just like a contract, and is subject to modification, annulment, and reversal by any subsequent Amendment.[60] Therefore, the general applicability of this *Republican Form of Government Clause* should be viewed cautiously, and should even be viewed in the light of possible non-applicability on any one Individual if any contaminating adhesive attachment of King's Equity or Admiralty Contract Jurisdiction is found operating on that Person. Therefore, the pleading of this Clause without correlative averments of Status pleading is to be discouraged, as multiple Amendments from the 11th to the 26th have quiet *Sub Silentio* lines of Admiralty Jurisdiction running through them which may very well vitiate the enforcement of the *Republic Form Clause*.[61]

Yet, nowhere in Amendments 11 to 26 do the words *Admiralty Jurisdiction* appear anywhere, just like nowhere on your IRS 1040 form do the words "Admiralty Jurisdiction governs this contract" appear anywhere: And they never will. Anglo-Saxon Kings have a long history of showing little practical interest in the financial health of their Subjects, and so any full disclosure of impending financial liability, that would give the Countryside something to think about in the nature of bugging out of the Bolshevik Income Tax system altogether, is the last thing that interests a King. So how do some of those Amendments accomplish such *Sub Rosa* objectives, when a light and quick reading makes the Amendments seem so facially reasonable? Remember that Admiralty Jurisdiction grew up in the old days quietly in the practical setting;

and it is there, today, out in the practical setting that Admiralty Jurisdiction is now roaring along. But Admiralty Jurisdiction is not a block of concrete or some grand monument like Mount Rushmore we can all look up at and plainly see; Admiralty is only legal reasoning, and so properly understood, Admiralty Jurisdiction is nothing more than a sequential set of ideas in the brains of Federal Judges. So in order to understand this line of Admiralty reasoning, we need to examine its natural operation and practical effects. Since

"...the purpose of an [Amendment or Jurisdiction] must be found in its natural operation and effect..."[62]

we now need to probe for the natural operation and effect of these *after Ten* Amendments. For an example of the real meaning behind the *after Ten* Amendments, let us momentarily consider just one of them: The 25th Amendment. What an Amendment this is. The closest draft to what is now the 25th Amendment was written in New York City in the Spring of 1963 by lawyers hired by Nelson Rockefeller for that purpose. Rockefeller family political strategists had previously concluded that Nelson Rockefeller's long-term Presidential ambitions were only marginally feasible in a conventional American election setting, and that a redundancy factor was therefore necessary to give Nelson the best possible chance he wanted to be President: That redundancy factor was a plan to circumvent that irritating Constitutional requirement that all Presidents be elected.

After Ike had a heart attack, Nelson Rockefeller proposed an appointment amendment to the Constitution in April of 1957, so that a person could become the President *by appointment*, without going through an election. The proposal was made through Nelson's nominee in the office of United States Attorney General, Herbert Brownell.[63]

Three weeks after President Kennedy was murdered in Dallas on plans previously approved by the Four Rockefeller Brothers,[64] Rockefeller legislative nominee Senator Birch Bayh introduced Nelson's 25th Amendment into the United States Senate,[65] and supervised its way through the procedures of Congress,[66] and ratification through the States were later effectuated in 1967 under lobbying by imp Herbert Brownell, Nelson's intimate.[67]

So it was planned by the Four Rockefeller Brothers to try and generate some circumstances so that a man could now come up the Presidential ladder, by appointment and unelected, through a succession of Presidents who left office prematurely for various different reasons.[68]

With the 25th Amendment tucked in under his belt, just two years

later circumstances to place Nelson into the White House were in full gear, and they soon blossomed into public view with what was known publicly as *Watergate*, as two CIA Agents posing as reporters for the *Washington Post* drove the story into the ground, acting on instructions to do so and under continuous advisory supervision. Nelson Rockefeller's plans to ascend into the Presidential corridors of power were contingent upon his successfully getting rid of both Spiro Agnew, as well as Richard Nixon -- a very difficult task.[69]

First, Spiro Agnew was gotten rid of by Attorney General Elliott Richardson, Nelson's friend, acting partially on some dirt Nelson had been holding on Spiro all along, and partially by Nelson's barking dogs in the news media; both *Time* and *Newsweek* ran overly dramatic articles on Spiro during the week of August 13th, 1973, signaling that he was then to be cut down fast.[70] After sicking the IRS on Spiro Agnew to go over every single purchase Spiro made for 6 years -- even checking out $16 of homespun cloth Spiro once bought,[71] Nelson arranged the ultimate incentive to have a resistant Spiro Agnew resign and get out of the way: By planning to kidnap Susan Agnew, Spiro's daughter.[72]

The day Spiro Agnew resigned [October 10, 1973], Nelson was quoted by the *New York Times* as being very well versed in the technical wording of the 25th Amendment -- as well he should be for the extreme central importance of that Amendment in his important plans for conquest.[73]

With Spiro out of the way, Nelson sent his dogs to get Richard Nixon. Nelson's barking dogs in the controlled major media had been busy getting their juices primed; they were waiting for a key feature article to appear in *Time Magazine*, which would call for Richard Nixon's resignation [the article had been written, and the accompanying photographs portraying a dejected Nixon, had been chosen almost a year before publication]. When the trigger article cue appeared, the dogs were turned loose, and the howling was heard around the world. ...And a vindictive Richard Nixon reluctantly left the White House.[74]

Now Nelson had the Vice-Presidency, but the Vice-Presidency wasn't Nelson's objective: He intensely longed for the day when he could officially hold, in public glory for the world to honor, jurisdictionally the same powers he had already been exercising practically in Washington since World War II through a succession of Presidential nominees -- but now it was going to be his turn.[75]

Following two assassination attempts in California on Gerald Ford by Lynette Fromme and Sara Jane Moore, a poisoning attempt, quiet staff suggestions that "...this might be a good time to move on," offerings of private employment, and then public demands

from Henry Kissinger that Gerald Ford resign, Vice President Nelson Rockefeller ran out of Aces to pull from his sleeve.[76]

Nelson's 25th Amendment had gotten him this far, into the Vice-Presidency, but it still wasn't the public spotlight of the Presidency that he had been craving for since he was a teenager.[77] On the eve of Jimmy Carter's Inauguration as David's nominee for President, Nelson made one final attempt to use his 25th Amendment to elevate himself into the Presidency via appointment, by using a slick legislative device related to the Electoral College and his Status as *President pro tem* of the United States Senate;[78] but under pressure from brother David, Nelson reluctantly backed off and let go.[79]

Two years later, when Nelson was shot to death in his forehead in his New York Townhouse on a Friday evening, his plans for using his 25th Amendment to assist him in accomplishing his political objectives died with him.[80]

Today, in reading the 25th Amendment, no where in it are there any words like *Nelson Rockefeller* or *Dallas* or *conquest* or *murder* or *Watergat*e or *Bob Woodward* appearing anywhere, yet an understanding of the real existential meaning of the 25th Amendment requires a contextual knowledge of the background factual setting that Rockefeller political conquest was then swirling in: A well-oiled vortex of kidnappings, torture, dismemberment, bribes, wholesale executions, murder, and intrigue.[81] Historians writing their views on the history and existential reasons for the 25th Amendment try to cast the Amendment's origin in historical light, by discussing the *Removal Clause* of Article II, Section 1, while leaving out any commentary about any Gremlins *extraordinaire* at work in the background, like Nelson Rockefeller, who stayed back in the shadows while directing the visible players in this 25th Amendment act.[82]

Likewise, a light and quick reading of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment also reveals seemingly noble and righteous purposes and lofty objectives that are designed to terminate, once and for all, that utterly heinous evil of gender based discrimination. The sponsors of the ERA, who circulate in the genre of leftists, Bolsheviks, statists, and socialists, etc., have grand enscrewment plans for the ERA, but you are the last person they intend to bring this information to.[83] A large number of other people who mean well also support it (or believe that they want to support it for the righteous goals it says it will accomplish).[84] For an ominous portrayal of what the ERA will accomplish on its mission in the United States, one need only to examine the practical effects of laws similarly worded in Europe and the Scandinavian Countries.[85] But the real objective and meaning of the Equal

Rights Amendment lies in another strata altogether: The Equal Rights Amendment was designed to harm and damage people -- and how it will accomplish that is quite subtle.[86]

Let us examine a favorite Patriot factual setting to see what happens when legal equality is forced on objects that belong, out in the practical setting, in their own class, free to commingle with other similar objects sharing the same approximate attributes, orientation, velocity, and dimensions. Why are bicycles, pedestrians, and buggies discouraged from using interstate highways where automobiles and huge semi's reign supreme at accelerated velocities? Because as a matter of practical concern, although, *arguendo*, each form of transportation is legally entitled to some right-of-way access, in the practical setting each form of transportation operates best in its own protected path and status, free from each other's unique requirements. Do railroads really belong on automobile highways? Even though both are particular forms of transportation that carry freight and people, by their nature they belong on separate tracks or paths. To have all forms use the same highway path, by legally forcing non-discrimination in effect between different forms of transportation ("It just isn't fair that I cannot use my bike on that highway!"), although initially it sounds legally impressive to get rid of discrimination, this actually creates hard damages out in the practical setting when high velocity vehicles weave their way around buggies and bicycles that non-discrimination legislation has forced into using the same track or status; bicycles and pedestrians belong on their own bicycle/pedestrian paths, sharing that path with transportation forms that operate under similar characteristics, and under similar velocity parameters. Not all particular forms of the same general classification belong in the same status or path, and when forced to cross over and commingle with each other, then damages occur. Customized legislation (or *discrimination* as some would characterize it by trying to cast an illicit derogatory inference on the subject even before the substance is addressed on its merits), providing for each particular form of transportation to operate in its own ideal tract and setting, at its own maximum velocity, prevents the damages that are caused by reason of improvidently commingling different particular forms. Correct *Principles of Nature*, however invisible, operate across all factual settings, transparent to the particular application vicissitudes then under discussion.[87] And just as men and women were designed by their Creator to operate at different velocities and accomplish different objectives down here, although both are mammalian vertebrates and share similar dimensions, forcing both particular genders into the same track and status to accomplish legal equality will actually secondarily create hard damages out in the practical

setting.[88]

Sorry, Gremlins, but each form of transportation should not be entitled to equality before the Law; as F.A. Hayek stated so well, forcing legal rights equality on material objects that operate best in different strata, always creates hard damages. And men and women are very different.[89]

One of the reasons why so many folks are sympathetic to the ERA, is that they know, and properly so, that women have been given the short end of the stick by having been denied political rights and enfranchisement in the past; and so now is the time to right all of that and give women full dignity rights. That, too, sounds high, noble, and righteous; but remember the highway transportation example I gave. The damages that are created by forcing particular forms of transportation to operate on the same track with each other, are not at all related to merely allowing men and women to have identical political relationships with the State. This means that there is a big difference in legally forcing particular forms to commingle with each other, as distinguished from allowing each form to politically commingle with the State passively, if and when they feel like it. Go back and read the ERA again, as it does not just merely allow passive gender political equality relationally with the State (which, of and by itself, is harmless and fine, and I approve of); but it also forces hard inter-gender track commingling out in the practical setting by jurisdictionally disabling distinctive customized legislation that restrains particular forms from crossing over into each other's paths and status. And therein lies the presently invisible sinister objective that the world's Gremlins want to see so much: Damages.[90]

Yes, the police powers of Government are very often called upon by Special Interest Groups to work Tortfeasance on others,[91] but legislators, however bought and purchased, will necessarily always have to cast their Tortfeasance in noble and righteous sounding rhetoric.[92]

But important for the moment, no words in the proposed Equal Rights Amendment itself lead anyone to suggest that someone as something possibly sinister planned, just like there were no words in the proposed 25th Amendment of 1963 that would lead anyone to believe that someone has something possibly sinister up his sleeves. Only a handful of people knew at the outset of the 25th Amendment that Nelson Rockefeller had grand sinister plans for that Amendment: Plans that involved creating damages by murder, if necessary.[93]

And as it is with those two Amendments, so it is with multiple other Amendments which were appended to the Constitution after our Founding Fathers left the scene and took their genius with

them: The real meaning of the "After Ten" Amendments are no where to be found on their face, so a quick light facial reading of any of the "After Ten" Amendments is to be discouraged.[94]

So this *Republican Form of Government Clause* appropriately applies to everything from Jury size to enlightenment on Jury Nullification, to a Jury of your Status peers, to taxing powers, to police powers, to statutes sponsored by Special Interest Groups: In any setting where Minority Rights are being hacked away at. All factors considered, I am opposed to the legal standing of the 14th Amendment. Opposition to the legal standing of the 14th Amendment will itself come with bitter opposition from Blacks -- as the termination of the 14th Amendment will strip Blacks of all law enforcement jobs and many elected Government positions where United States Citizenship is required, and additionally create a status stigma over them that is necessarily unpleasant for them. Yet, despite those uncomfortable secondary practical effects of terminating the 14th Amendment, such termination, if it ever occurred, would be just the right medicine, as a disciplinary measure, to shake the King into thinking twice before pulling anything like that off again; yes, a few good selectively placed judicial spankings can act like restrainment magic in preventing Royal Torts. After the Civil War ended, Union troops remained quartered in several Southern States until after they ratified the 14th Amendment: To perfect by naked physical duress what could not be perfected by arguments of reason and logic, political attraction, good common sense.[95]

Even so, Blacks do not have much substantive merit to their arguments that the termination of the 14th Amendment would be detrimental to them, as they try to deflect the termination of the 14th Amendment with their sweet sounding rhetoric of unfairness. Sending the Blacks back to Liberia, like was planned after the Civil War, isn't very likely right now (although that would be just the right medicine to get rid of racism in America, by getting rid of the irritant races). If the 14th Amendment was terminated tomorrow morning, the political climate today is such that it would be reenacted by the Congress and most States properly within a few weeks.[96]

And as for the Supreme Court, rather than believing like they do that they are being smart and clever by protecting the King when sweeping his dirty laundry under the carpet for him, they would be truly wise, in contrast, to explore the possibility that a few good public spankings once in a while are actually just the right medicine to reduce their own Case load by conveying the message to the King -- preventively -- that generous awards to remedy his Torts will be enforced by the Court, and that fraudulent

administrative announcements on Constitutional Amendment Ratifications by Secretaries of State will be annulled in due time.[97]

Admiralty Jurisdiction has a sister called Maritime Jurisdiction; and Maritime, like Admiralty, is a body of Law international in character, and is considered by Federal Judges to be the Law of all Nations.[98] In 1922, Justice Holmes of the United States Supreme Court had a few words to say about the reason why we are now burdened down with Maritime Jurisdiction:

"There is no mystic overlaw to which the United States must bow... However ancient may be the traditions of Maritime Law, it derives its power from having been accepted in the United States."[99]

Like the National acceptance of Maritime Jurisdiction by the Federal Judiciary, it is the individual acceptance of the benefits of King's Admiralty Jurisdiction by you that is your problem, and not the universal benign assertion of that Jurisdiction by the King that is your problem. Yes, Admiralty Jurisdiction is a jurisdiction skewed heavily to favor the King, and it very much operates in chronologically compressed giblet cracking Summary Proceedings. Yes, Admiralty has quite a reputation for being curt and abbreviated, and the curtness of Admiralty extends even into such areas as pleading itself.[100]

This silent benefit acceptance is what is partially responsible for the King's ability to throw his Special Interest Group criminal *Lex* at us: Without any express contract, without any *mens rea*, and without any *Corpus delecti* damages anywhere; that's right, no damages to be found anywhere, no evil State of Mind as a driving force in the mind of the actor, and seemingly, no contract: Just summary giblet cracking. The King is making an assertion of Admiralty Jurisdiction here against you, but it is an assertion only in the sense that it is a qualified assertion: The Judiciary exists to intervene and separate the King from you, after you have filed your *Notice of Severance* and *Waiver, Forfeiture,* and *Rejection of Admiralty Benefits* on the King, and have recorded a rescission ["Waiver and Rejection of Benefits"] derived from your Birth Certificate in your County Clerk's Office, and *Notice of Enfranchisement Benefits Forfeiture*, and *Notice of Status*, that you are a *Stranger to the Public Trust*.[101]

The word "Trust" itself means contract. However, the mere unilateral declarations by you of your relational Status *ex-contractu* means nothing by itself without a correlative substantive contract annulment termination; and by the end of this Letter you will see the correct contract annulment procedure. *Public Trust Contracts* are in effect automatically by your acceptance of juristic

benefits -- an acceptance that takes place, very properly, through your silence, as I will explain later; but getting out of Public Trust Contracts is a different story.[102] And the Contract remains in effect until you correctly attack the Contract substantively, such as through *Failure of Consideration* by the timely rejection of benefits.

The 14th Amendment story is a very long one, and that is another Letter. If you at all question the ability of that 14th Amendment to actually do all of this, then may I suggest that you consider the possibility of reading the 14th Amendment over very carefully, and ask yourself why questions of debt validity would be discussed in a Constitutional Amendment and not in statutes? Like the 16th Amendment, what words an Amendment contains actually spell a far different story than what a light quick reading of the Amendment actually conveys. The Judiciary of the United States has never applied the force of a Constitutional Amendment to a specific factual setting in a grievance presented to it that I can remember without a prior detailed analysis of the Amendment Clause's real meaning through successive cases; and I would suggest that we all follow similar detailed procedure. And as for debt collection, the Congress already had all of the necessary initiating jurisdiction in the original version of the Constitution of 1787 to borrow money and pay debts. What was different about the Civil War Era that prompted the *Radical Republicans*, so called, into placing that language into that Amendment?[103] (An examination of the *Dred Scott* Case may open your eyes).[104]

The severance of yourself away from the Admiralty Jurisdiction that the 14th Amendment creates for the King is by Rescission and a Notice of Public Record served on the King, Notifying him that your acceptance of his assertion of Admiralty Jurisdiction and his contemporary version of old Roman Civil Law on you is now terminated, and that all benefits he intends to offer on the good ship United States, particularly those benefits of Limited Debt Liability, are now declined, rejected, and waived. Remember that it is the *Waiver of Benefits* in the practical setting that terminates contract liability, and not the so-called *Notice of Rescission Contract*, *in rem* I hear talked about, which means absolutely nothing.[105]

Contracts do not dissolve themselves merely because you announce a Rescission to the world; contracts can only be unilaterally terminated by you for good reason, such as a required Operation of Nature that collapsed -- such as *Failure of Consideration* or default by the other Party, etc.[106]

Those last few words I just spoke are the Grand Key to effectuating a rescission that the Supreme Court will respect.

Remember the Pan Am jet leasing example and our friend the roofing contractor: You don't need a written contract on someone else to work him into an immoral position if the money is not handed over. So too you don't need any evidence of someone else's knowledge of the existence of the facial contract to extract money out of him as well. But you do need to show an acceptance of benefits. And when the King publishes a large volume of statutes that define statutory benefits, a good case can be made that liability exists, even in ignorance, under the *Ratification Doctrine* I will discuss later. And so those individuals who have filed a *Notice of Rescission of Contract, in rem* regarding their Birth Certificate are deceiving themselves, as that Rescission, of and by itself, means absolutely nothing. You missed altogether the one single most important feature that attaches liability to contracts: The acceptance of benefits out in the practical setting. Correctly written, those contract Rescissions many folks have been filing should emphasize that benefits are being waived, rejected, and forfeited, and no benefits are being accepted; and excessive attention to the existence of the facial Birth Certificate document itself, is in error. And it is the rejection of benefits that is the Grand Key to unlock an adhesive attachment of state taxation jurisdiction.[107]

I know of several criminal prosecutions where merely filing a clumsy Objection to the 14th Amendment in their local county recorder's office terminated the prosecution. In one Case, there was a pre-Trial dismissal; in others appeal was necessary, with the prosecution being sandbagged on appeal. In another Federal criminal Case, the Defendant was mysteriously released from pre-Trial commitment on his friend's Noticing the Court of his Status and Rescissions. (Even though his Rescissions were deficient in Waiving Benefits). That is just how powerful that 14th Amendment really is -- so much so that improperly prepared defense attacks have been summarily granted at the trial level occasionally to terminate prosecutions. But remember that absent an explicit appellate court ruling, lower Trial Magistrates will always rule inconsistently; so propagating legal suggestions based on a handful of isolated trial level victories is improper. The 16th Amendment story is not taught to Federal Judges in their seminars, and so in a similar way, there will be inconsistent Trial level rulings on 16th Amendment pleadings just as there is now inconsistent trial level rulings on the 14th Amendment, until such time as the High Lama in Washington settles the question [and they will settle it by affirming an Individual's liability attachment to the Internal Revenue Code of Title 26, while ignoring the 16th Amendment as being either necessary or as a source of jurisdiction, as I will explain later.]

So it is the acceptance of the benefits of Admiralty Jurisdiction by us that is responsible for this state of affairs, and not totally by the King's benign juristic aggression.[108] And if the contract calls for Admiralty Jurisdiction, and you are still experiencing Federal Benefits, the contract is still very much in effect, regardless of what unilateral declaration you announce to the world with your Birth Certificate document. Any snickering at Federal Judges for ruling adversely against us under a factual setting that skews off on a tangent favoring the King by virtue of multiple invisible contracts in effect is improvident; and any tongue-lashing administered by the Judge in such an adhesive Admiralty Jurisdiction environment is a fully earned account.

The invisible Birth Certificate Enfranchisement story, and the hairy tentacles of Admiralty and Equity Jurisdiction it attaches, is a long one (and that is another Letter, and further elucidation in this Letter is unwarranted), but the important realization is that none of this introductory information I have told you is to be found anyplace in the typical juristic sources of legislative or judicial pronouncements. The assertion, all across the United States, of such an Enfranchised jurisdiction without your knowledge and perhaps even alien to your desired Status, originates out in the practical setting, and it is also there in the practical setting that it will be terminated by you: Without any statutes saying you can, without Presidential certification saying you can, without New York news media approval saying you can, and without a Court ruling from a judicial tribunal differentiating criminal liability on Persons based on Public Trust Status grounds. None of those sources will ever tell you that contract termination can be perfected by Rescission and Waiver and Rejection of Benefits. It is only your own exploratory self-initiative that will terminate this adhesive attachment of King's Equity and Admiralty Jurisdiction taxing liability; and Federal Judges are correct in so attaching Title 26 liability to Enfranchised Persons accepting Citizenship benefits, benefits the King has created and offered. And your Status and your Benefit Waivers are very much a powerful practical instrument to use to rescind invisible Admiralty Contracts the King will never publicly admit to their existence... Only a tiny handful of words in a few Federal Appellate Courts cautiously speak about the significance of Admiralty Jurisdiction in a Tax Collection setting. I know of some Judges who only reluctantly talk about these concepts in their chambers, but clam up tight and refuse to talk about anything in their Court while on the record; almost as if they are afraid of being eaten alive by a super-sized Black Widow Spider. But the most important item of business is waiver, forfeiture, and rejection of benefits -- and to accomplish that, your explicit disavowal is required.[109]

Yet, that story of the relationship in effect between Admiralty Jurisdiction and the 14th Amendment is only the first layer of two layers of Admiralty Jurisdiction that the King has to justify picking your pockets clean. The second layer of Admiralty involves your acceptance of Social Security benefits. Very simply stated, Social Security is an insurance program with Premiums being paid into it, claims being paid out of it, and future retirement endowment benefits are being accepted.[110] Several private commentators have suggested that there is a close correlation between what is called *Tontine Insurance* and Social Security. Tontine Insurance is characterized as benefiting only the remaining survivors of the policy holders, i.e., no money is paid out to those Persons who die off. Thus, the Insurance Company pays out benefits to the survivors based on the Premium forfeitures that those who died (and got nothing) left behind. So the survivors are enriched based on maximizing the number of co-policy holders that have died off.[111] Think about that for a moment, because it fits Social Security straight down the line. In Social Security, if you die, your wife gets nothing (with a few dog bone exceptions), but rather what would have gone to you is simply given away (forfeited) to other Premium payers who haven't died yet.[112]

But the Congress does recognize Social Security as an insurance operation, and in Title 42, which contains the Social Security Act, there are numerous blunt references to Social Security to be structured as the insurance program that it is; such as:

Title II: "Federal Old Age... Insurance Benefits"

- Section 402(b): "Wife's insurance benefits"
- Section 415: "Computation of Primary Insurance"
- Section 423: "Disability Insurance Benefit Payments"
- Section 426(a): "Transitional provision... for hospital insurance benefits"

When the Congress created the Social Security program itself in the 1930s, the creation legislation specifically referred to their intention and desire to have Social Security be modeled around that collectivist welfare program of social insurance that its Gremlin sponsors wanted so much.

"The [Social Security] Board shall perform the duties imposed upon it by this Act and shall also have the duty of studying and making recommendations as to the most effective methods of providing economic security through social insurance, and as to legislation and matters of administrative policy concerning old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, accident compensation, and related [insurance] subjects."[113]

Social Insurance itself is commonly defined as an Insurance

program:

> "*Social Insurance*: A comprehensive welfare plan established by law, generally (compulsory) in nature, and based on a program which spreads the cost of benefits among the entire population rather than on individual recipients. The federal government began to use insurance programs in 1935 with the passage of the Social Security Act. The basic federal and state approaches to social insurance presently in use are: Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (i.e., social security); Medicare and Medicaid; unemployment insurance; and worker's compensation."[114]

If in fact Social Security is an Insurance Program at law, then the reason why the King has another invisible layer, a second layer, of Admiralty Jurisdiction to steam roll you over with, is because in the United States, going clear back to Day One, the Federal Judiciary has always considered grievances that were brought into their Court based on *Policies of Insurance*, to fall under the summary giblet cracking legal reasoning of Admiralty Jurisdiction:

> "My judgment accordingly is, that policies of insurance are within... the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States."[115]

In 1870, the Supreme Court of the United States reviewed in extended detail the history of Admiralty Jurisdiction as it relates to insurance contracts, and of the opinion of Judge Story in *Delovio*, and then affirmed *Delovio*; ruling that insurance policies are now to be considered without any dispute as being contracts within Admiralty Jurisdiction, and this remains true even though the contracts were written on land with no part or party to the contract having anything to do with a marine or High Seas physical setting.[116] So, it is the fact that Social Security is an Insurance Program that is the tie-in between that IRS 1040 form, and Admiralty Jurisdiction.[117]

No, that Social Security Number of yours is not "just a number" -- it is a Taxpayer Identification Number, just like that bank account of yours is not "just a checking account." The fact that so many other folks have these instruments does not reduce or diminish their legal significance in a Federal Courtroom. Just because you are surrounded by a very large number of fellow people who also have these multiple instruments does not mean that they lose their force or effect in Status declension to perfect an attachment of King's Equity Jurisdiction. The commingling of the passive national acceptance of these instruments, with an attitude that there

just must not be that much special significance to these instruments, is defective reasoning.

Remember the environment of risk that insurance underwriters encumber themselves with when writing insurance policies for merchandise that goes afloat on the High Seas: That is where Maritime (now Admiralty) Jurisdiction has formed and took root. Initially, "Policies of Assurance" grew out of *The Doctrine of Contribution and General Average*, which is found in the Codes of the ancient Rhodesians. By this doctrine, if any ship, cargo, or freight was lost, damaged, etc., then all of the remaining pool holders had to contribute their proportionate share of the loss. This division of loss naturally suggested a division of risk: First amongst those engaged in the same enterprise, and Second, amongst associations of ship owners and shipping merchants. So what we have here is mutual insurance.[118]

Once mutual insurance was accepted as a common business practice, it was made obligatory in Italy and Portugal,[119] and the next step up its ladder of organic development was that of insurance risk assumed upon a paid-in premium. Once insurers became acquainted with the risks and numbers involved with merchandise floating around on the High Seas, they then became willing to guaranty against damages for a small specific premium paid.[120]

So contemporary American legal reasoning is that, well, the risk environment of premium based insurance policies should be the same today as it was under the old days of marine based Maritime, because the legal grievance adjudication environment that insurance underwriters used to encumber themselves with back then is replicated over again today when anyone goes to an insurance company and asks them to assume some risk they don't feel like taking themselves. As you and I would perceive it, that line of comparative reasoning is not quite accurate, because folks today are forced into Social Security and automobile insurance they would not have bought if left to their own free will and business judgment, but state penal Special Interest Group motor vehicle statutes and clever Federal administrative rule making on Employers has changed all that -- but with virtually no one filing an Objection to their involuntary entrance into policies of insurance, Federal Judges had little choice but to obey the mandates of the Supreme Court, until such time as a different factual setting (regarding the involuntary application of Admiralty applied coercively) is presented to them.

Yes, very much, now you should see the fact that there is a strong relationship going on nowadays between the collection of Internal

Revenue and Social Security insurance premiums in the United States and Admiralty Jurisdiction. The IRS generally does not pursue folks for Tax Collection purposes without a Social Security Number having appeared somewhere, absent special circumstances ("*...get him*"); although remember that Social Security is only one of several King's Equity contracts most folks have with the King, and the IRS does not have to have a Social Security Number to go after someone. Through the unnecessarily expansive legal reasoning on Insurance policies, and through the historical custom of marine merchants, this Admiralty Jurisdiction which grew up out on the High Seas to govern the risk and risk-taking marine based grievances of merchants, and where it still belongs today, is now inland all over the United States.[121]

Yes, the King did acquire this envious enrichment machine (an enrichment machine that Kings and looters in other countries only wildly dream in fantasy about possessing for themselves) through the clever use of Admiralty Jurisdiction -- but never forget that before we badmouth the King for his Torts, first we examine our own circumstances. The one real reason why there are two separate layers of Admiralty Jurisdiction smothering us all today is because we gave the King the right to lay Admiralty on us like that, both individually and collectively. Yes, the King has a demon chokehold of Admiralty over most of us, but an even more honest assessment of the passing American scene today is that many folks out there want (that's right, *want*) Social Security. If you do no more than go around town and select a typical cross-profile of people at random, you will find that Social Security, so-called, isn't so badly thought of as many Patriots believe.[122]

So if you have voluntarily surrendered over your Social Security Number to your Employer, or to a bank, or to anyone else -- then not only have you accepted numerous statutory benefits that Employees and bank customers enjoy (that I discussed earlier), but the King also has you into both *Admiralty Jurisdiction*, and an *Admiralty Contract* on taxation, where Federal Judges routinely deal with defendants in contract defilement summarily along abbreviated lines that both skirt the fringes of Due Process and also largely get away with on Appeal. But you can get out of a contract in Admiralty the same way you can get out of any other contract you don't want *[failure of consideration*]. Yes, any poor soul that the King's Agents have dragged into a Federal Court for a Royal fleecing and a shake down, is in for curt process and abbreviated trouble. But remember I speak these words playfully and condescendingly down to the King: Patriots and Protesters are up to their necks in multiple invisible contracts that are in effect whenever benefits have been accepted (and when reciprocity is

expected in), and so the typical protesting Patriot, like Armen Condo and Irwin Schiff, putting up a good fight the way they do, is in error.

If that Waiver, Forfeiture, and Rejection of the benefits of Limited Liability that you experience under your Admiralty related Contract, as well as Social Security Benefits -- if that *Failure of Consideration* turns out to be just not good enough for the High Lama in Washington -- the Supreme Court -- then perhaps the time will have arrived to take seriously the timeless mandates of our Founding Fathers: And deal with an inappropriate assertion of Admiralty Jurisdiction by the King in terms that accelerate in velocity as they transverse down the barrel of a gun.[123]

Footnotes:

[1] In such a loose evidentiary arena, *Circumstantial Evidence* is generally considered the ultimate form of proof in Maritime and Admiralty litigation matters. Again, this is so by reason of the special factual setting that Admiralty grievances have their gestation in. For example, in Admiralty such factors as "seaman status" or unseaworthiness are generally not admitted and must be demonstrated through a series of logically connecting factors. The only way to demonstrate the existence of these factors and the conclusions that they have a significant meaning within the confines of Admiralty Law is through strong proof of circumstantial evidentiary chains leading to inferences of the various types of status. In *Cox vs. Esso Shipping* [247 F.2nd 629 (1957)], a seaman brought an action for Maritime Tort damages after he fell twenty feet to the deck of the ship. The maritime jury was not instructed that it was not Cox's duty to choose seaworthy equipment (which allegedly caused the fall) or to select good equipment from bad, but rather under *Admiralty Jurisprudence*, it was the duty of the shipowner to select good equipment from bad. By the trial court having improvidently instructed the jury along such a biased evidentiary skew, failure to explain the special assignments of negligence liability inherent in *Admiralty* mandated reversal on appeal. But it was *Circumstantial Evidence* that won the Case.

[2] The insurance companies never change their *modus operandi* in their very successful manipulative use of legislation to limit the amount of money they have to pay out on claims. For example, few people realize it, but here in the United States, up until the early 1950s there were no commercial nuclear power plants in operation, and none were going to be built. Reason: No insurance carrier wanted to underwrite and pay for the potential losses

involved if an accident occurred. The insurance companies knew that some day there would be problems surfacing with one of those nuclear plants -- insurance companies know risk and risk management better than anyone else on the fact of this Earth. So electric utilities who wanted to build nuclear plants, but could find no insurance carrier, acted in combination with insurance carriers in sponsoring the *Price-Anderson Act* in Congress, which limited the potential liability of Tort claims of a domestic nuclear accident to $500,000,000. [Remember that Tort claims are lawsuits between parties where there is no contract in effect between the parties to govern the grievance]. See the *Price-Anderson Act* today in Title 42, Section 2210. Had there been no *Price-Anderson Limitations of Liability Act*, there would be no Commercial nuclear power plants built in the United States. For a brief history of the development of nuclear power in the United States, see the Supreme Court in *Duke Power vs. Carolina Environmental Study Group*, 438 U.S. 59 (1978). The well-known involvement of the private insurance companies and their influence on the legislation bringing forth the *Price-Anderson Act* is discussed in *duke power*, starting at page 64, et seq.

[3] "The [Federal] Limitations of Liability Act has been applied to even small boats like outboard motorboats... but the law is... understood and [insurance] underwriters in particular know exactly what they are dealing with." - A report on *Admiralty Jurisdiction, United States as a Party; Federal Question Jurisdiction; Three Judge Courts*, [Part II] in Hearings held before the Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, United States Senate, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, discussing Senate Bill 1876, at page 697 (May, 1972).

[4] *Double Insurance* means collecting double the premium, but the number of ships lost at sea did not double, so the claims did not double. The insurance companys' lobbyists were busy behind that legislation, as they made their descent then on the Parliament in vulture formation, just like today. *Black's Law Dictionary* Defines *Double Insurance* as existing where:

> "...the same person is insured by several insurers separately in respect to the same subject and interest." - *Black's Law Dictionary*, Fifth Edition ["Double Insurance"].

This is a correct definition of what is known as *Double Insurance*, but that is not the *Double Insurance* once forced on Admiralty carriers in another era (and, of course, you just don't need to concern yourself with something illicit being pulled off by an insurance company).

[5] Such a seemingly expansive use of Admiralty Jurisdiction initially triggers an inquisitive attitude questioning such an expansive application of Admiralty. But the Judiciary is merely replicating the legal environment out on the High Seas that risk insurance was born in.

> "Polices of insurance are within the Admiralty Jurisdiction of the United States." - *Dulovio vs. Boit*, 7 Federal Cases 418, Case #3776, at page 444 (1815) [that Case also has a very extensive history of Admiralty Jurisdiction discussed in it].

Consider the words of Federal District Court Judge Pelag Sprague:

> "...I consider the jurisdiction of the Admiralty over polices of insurance, to be the settled law and practice of this Circuit." - *Younger vs. Glouser Marine*, affirmed on appeal, 2 Curt. C.C. 323; as cited in *Decisions of the... District Court of Massachusetts in Admiralty and Marine Causes*, 1841-1861 (1854).

[6] Trial by Jury has never, ever been a feature of prosecutions held under summary Admiralty Jurisdiction rules. See:

- *United States vs. Lavengeance*, 3 U.S. 297 (1796);
- *Whelan vs. The United States*, 11 U.S. 112 (1812);
- *The Sarah Case*, 21 U.S. 391 (1823).

[7] "...the precise scope of [American] admiralty jurisdiction is not a matter of obvious principle or of very accurate history." - Justice Holmes in *the Blackheath*, 195 U.S. 361 (1904).

[8] An exemplification of lawyers simply lumping everything into Admiralty would be a treatise that teaches lawyers how to do exactly just that: See a huge seven volume set of Admiralty Jurisdiction practice Law and Rules called *Benedict on Admiralty*, by Matthew Bender Publishers in New York City. (Kept current with frequent updates to subscribers).

[9] 13 *Richard* II, c.5. (1389)

[10] 15 *Richard* II, c.3. (1391)

[11] *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, Volume One ["High Court of Admiralty"], page 171 (1929 Edition).

[12] *Reports*, Part 13, page 51; and *Coke's Institutes*, Part IV, Chapter 22.

[13] This resulted in his statutes being modified to restrain the

expansion of the Admiralty Courts. See 2 *Henry* IV, c.11 (1400).

[14] In the *Declaration and Resolves of the First Continental Congress 1774*, we find the following words:

> "Whereas, since the close of the last war, the British parliament, claiming a power of right to bind the people of America by statute in all cases whatsoever, hath, in some acts expressly imposed taxes on them, and in others, under various pretenses, but in fact for the purpose of raising a revenue, hath imposed rates and duties payable in these colonies, established a board of commissioners with unconstitutional powers, and extended the jurisdiction of courts of Admiralty not only for collecting the said duties, but for the trial of causes merely arising within the body of the county." - *Journals of the First Continental Congress*, edited by W.C. Ford, Volume I, page 63 et seq.

[15] A report on *Admiralty Jurisdiction, United States as a Party; Federal Question Jurisdiction; Three Judge Courts* [Part II] in Hearings held before the Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, United States Senate, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, discussing Senate Bill 1876, at page 639 (May, 1972).

[16] See the *New York Times* ["Rescuers Head Whales Back from Florida Beach"], page 14 (February 7, 1977).

[17] Exploratory plutonium poisoning trials were conducted at the American Legion Convention in Philadelphia on July 21 to 24, 1976; and as expected by the Gremlins who administered the poisons through an atmospheric discharge, the symptoms that surfaced were of a flu-like nature [see ["20 Flu-Like Deaths in Penn Still A Mystery"] in the *New York Times* for August 4, 1976, page 1]. The *Times* article noted the puzzling sickness variation of what appeared to be a flu; but without possessing requisite background factual knowledge on the invisible high-powered toxicity involved, the medical doctors stumbled from one erroneous diagnostic conclusion to another [id., at 1].

[Also note the Government's selection of patriotic war veterans for their *Sub Rosa* plutonium poisoning tests, as opposed to some lesser sub-class of Americans, such as perhaps convicted felons serving life sentences without parole in a federal cage somewhere for heinous crimes committed, or perhaps irretrievably insane occupants of numerous mental hospitals scattered around the countryside. In other words, assume for the moment that you were

in charge of selecting the "test group"; would you select American war veterans innocently enjoying a convention gathering in Pennsylvania of their peers, who had previously put their lives on the line for "god and country," who had served their country honorably and patriotically? Furthermore, please note that somewhere, right now, the person or persons responsible for this atrocity, who are guilty of felonious murder in the First Degree (20 American Legion veterans were murdered), and/or who were accessories to this multiple murder, have yet to be brought to justice. Where is "America's Most Wanted" now?]

[18] Very few American doctors are skilled in recognizing the symptoms of atomic particulate plutonium poisoning; plutonium is not measurably radioactive in that it does not radiate ionizing electrons at a rate sufficient to trigger geiger counters. This type of radiation toxicity is easily misdiagnosed, and not just for medical reasons, but for political and *Lack of Judgment* reasons stemming from the manipulative withholding of public information on uncontrolled atmospheric plutonium distributions by Gremlins. The symptoms of such ionizing toxicity replicates closely the symptoms associated with a flu like illness, but since medical doctors are unaware of any public concern for radiation toxicity, the uncomfortable idea of a *Three Mile Island* scenario is tossed aside by the diagnosing physician, and the more comfortable but incorrect diagnosis of a hybrid flu-like illness is then substituted in its place. For a discussion on some of the uncontrolled atmospheric discharges of radioactive elements in the United States, see *The Medical Basis for Radiation Accident Preparedness* by Hubner and Fry, Editors [Elsevier-North Holland (1980)], which discusses publicly suppressed radiodines discharge "accidents" in 1974 and 1978 in New Jersey, and 1978 in Algeria. And it is my hunch that other similar radioactive incidents have also occurred worldwide, with knowledge of the existence of those events also being publicly sequestered. Bureaucratic Gremlins nestled in Juristic Institutions have also withheld public dissemination about radioactive atmospheric contamination originating from the now abandoned Central Core Vault of the United States Gold Bullion Depository located at Fort Knox Kentucky, which is leaking radioactive plutonium 239 that the Government improvidently stored there in 1968.

Folks placing reliance on Government for both radiation accident recovery assistance as well as deflecting the occurrence of the toxic poisoning event altogether ar exercising defective judgment -- individual responsibility is the correct management technique; and, as a point of beginning, factual knowledge is required. For beneficial advisory information in this area, see generally *Are You*

Radioactive? Protect Yourself by Linda Clark [Devin-Adair in Old Grenwich, Connecticut (1973); republished by Pyramid Publications in Moonachie, New Jersey (1974); republished by the Cancer Control Society in Los Angeles (1977)]. The isochronous dietary incorporation of potassium iodine is known to manifest great relief from radioactive poisoning, due to its "sponge" like effect in going after those determined little plutonium contaminates that home in on your thyroid gland; and this remains true even though some physicians, speaking through institutions sponsored by Gremlins, do not want you to take any such preventative measures [Dr. David Becker, et al., discourages such use in *The Use of Iodine as a Thyroidal Blocking Agent in the Event of a Nuclear Accident*, appearing in 252 Journal of the American Medical Association, at page 659 (August 2, 1984). For a story of the financial sponsorship of the American Medical Association in the late 1800s by Gremlin *extraordinaire* John Rockefeller, Sr., see Volume II of *World Without Cancer -- The Story of Vitamin* B17 by G. Edward Griffin [American Media, West Lake Village, California (1980)].]

[19] Admiralty Jurisdiction has a long term habit of "following" Government around when new conquests are made. When His Britannic Highness would conquer a foreign land, Consular Courts of Admiralty followed His Majesty's conquests to the far corners of the globe. While India was under British colonial rule, Vice-Admiralty Courts were established in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. Similarly in China, Japan and Turkey, while under British colonial rule, a layer of Admiralty Jurisdiction was smothered on them. Parliament enacted the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act in 1890 to automatically confer Admiralty Jurisdiction on Civil Jurisdiction Courts, where ever His Highness exercised his dynastic dominion.

[20] See *The First Federal Court* by Henry J. Bourguignon [American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia (1977)].

[21] When a Natural Person is "enfranchised," such a *Person* takes upon himself the status of a corporation, which isn't very much.

> "The corporation is an artificial creation of the state endowed with franchises and privileges of many kinds which the individual has not." - The Wisconsin Supreme Court in *The Income Tax Cases*, 148 Wisconsin 456, at 515 (1912).

However, the low status of corporations that numerous Patriots emphasize in status distinction arguments is actually not that important [meaning, you are not hitting the nail right on the head], because such a low relational status is only the net effect of having

accepted benefits the state created; and when benefits conditionally offered by the state are accepted by you, as a human being, then contracts are in effect and alleged status distinctions are irrelevant. This is the real meaning of "enfranchisement" -- a contract is in effect that is largely invisible -- because juristic benefits carrying taxation hooks on them were accepted by you. Some of the invisible juristic benefits that are automatic in corporations are:

> "The corporation,... enjoys under our laws many privileges separate and apart from simply doing business, such for instance as the legal status to sue and be sued in the Courts of our state, continuity of business without interruption by death or dissolution, transfer of property interests by the disposition of the shares of stock, advantages of business controlled and managed by corporate directors, and the general absence of individual liability, among others." - The Supreme Court of Louisiana in *Colonial Pipeline vs. Traigle*, 421 U.S. 100, at 106 (1974).

[22] To hypothecate means generally to pledge assets to someone else, without delivering either Title or possession of the asset. Debt Hypothecations are sometimes used when the collateral does not lend itself well to Title or possession security, such as borrowing a Certificate of Deposit to be held by a bank in your name, when the person who really owns the money has practical control over it (such as through his signature on the deposit card). In contrast, when borrowing money to finance a new car, the Title, so called, is normally mailed by your regional Prince to be in the possession of the first lien holder, so car loans are not considered to be Hypothecated Debts.

[23] An exemplary accoutrement of what Admiralty Jurisdiction can pull off that Common Law did not allow, was the summary seizure of property in criminal Cases, pending a posting of bail by the Defendant:

> "Historically, maritime attachment originated as a means of obtaining by attachment of the defendant's property the same security for payment of a judgment against the defendant's property which was obtained by the marshal's body arrest and holding to bail of the defendant's person. ... Just as when a defendant's body was arrested in personam, he was required to give bail in order to be released from the custody of the marshal, so when his body could not be found for such arrest *in personam*, his

> property was attached by the marshal and held to bail in the same way."

- A report on *Admiralty Jurisdiction, United States as a Party; Federal Question Jurisdiction; Three Judge Courts*, [Part II] in Hearings held before the Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, United States Senate, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, discussing Senate Bill 1876, at page 645 (May, 1972).

[24] The international *Warsaw Convention* of October, 1929 was ratified by the United States Senate in June of 1934. Section 21 of that Convention Limits the amount of money air carriers need concern themselves with on claims payments for Tort damages. And as International Law, it is binding on all courts in the United States.

[25] Title 46, Section 181 to 183.

[26] In the mid 1970s, medical doctors in California "went on strike" to protest high insurance premiums they paid for protection against on medical malpractice claims thrown at them for Tort damages they worked on their clients (such as being told to surgically cut out a defective left kidney, and the doctor takes out the right kidney on the operating table, thus leaving the poor patient with no kidneys -- surprisingly, mistakes like that are actually quite frequent, and doctors have no one to snicker at but themselves). Numerous state legislatures enacted statutory limitations on the amount of money trial courts could award for medical malpractice suits. In California, it was the *MICR Act* of 1975, but those statutory wealth transfer schemes were later declared to be unconstitutional [see *American Bank vs. Community Hospital*, 660 P.2nd 829 (California, 1983), and *Arneson vs. Olsen*, 270 N.W.2nd, 125 (North Dakota, 1978)].

[27] Limited Liability for Tort claims is very much a marvelous tool for insurance carriers to amass wealth through; but there is always a pathetic footnote to be told when Special Interest Groups reign supreme in the corridors of Legislatures. For a sad discussion on the legislative massaging by insurance company produced statutes mandating the Limited Liability of Tort claims for damages from airplane crashes, has relaxed both the level of safety interest by insurance carriers in the airplane products that they insure, as well as also diminishing economic incentives by the airlines themselves for safer operations (particularly in TCA's), see *Is this Any Way to Run an Airline?* by Robert Poole, 10 Reason Magazine 18 (January, 1979).

[28] Remember that throughout Life, in all factual settings, always try to evaluate the position of the other party with an open mind;

quite often we will find that the other party has a strong case and that there has been some error in our reasoning or standing. No, it is not an easy procedure to be objective; the snickering by a Protester of what is being viewed in the Courtroom [of a judge throwing one successive retortional snortation after another at the Protester, seemingly ventilating expressions of philosophical discomfort with the arguments and the position of defiance taken by the Protester] -- snickering at the judge is much easier than adopting the following procedure into our *modus operandi*: Maybe let us assume, just for a moment, that we are in fact not correct when trying to weasel out of *Willful Failure to File* and correlative traffic ticket scenarios where invisible contracts actually govern the grievance (as I will explain later). Rather than adopting the *Modus Operandi* of a Protester by the presumption he is right, and that the judge is a moronic Commie pinko philosophically opposed to the defiant political position being taken by the Protester, let us assume, just for a moment, that the expressions of judicial ensnortment being thrown at us might originate with something else. Maybe, just maybe, the snortations from on high are actually the final stages of judicial expressions of discontentment, with our own argument error, and the incorrect position we are taking, and might not originate with the political overtones associated with the philosophical position of our naked defiance --a defiance exhibited in areas very few people would dare to defy. Let us enlarge the basis of factual knowledge that we are using to exercise judgment on and to form conclusions with, by adopting a new *Modus Operandi:* By taking the judge's snortations under advisement at first, and asking ourselves a series of deep probing questions to try and enlarge the factual picture we are viewing. Let's try out this new *Modus Operandi* on the following news article. Like the scene in the Courtroom we will only initially accept what is presented to us as a point of beginning and take it in under advisement, and we will not arrive at a conclusion until after we have asked ourselves several deep probing questions: *"A Tank in the Parking Lot*"

> "Many obscure imports have made their way through Baltimore's port, but this one was a true rarity: a Soviet T-54 tank. It was discovered last week near Pier 10, perched on top of a flat bed trailer in the parking lot of a farm-supply company. Not quite sure just why the tank was there, a specially equipped unit of the Baltimore police force dismantled the T-54's two .250 caliber machine guns and carted them off for safekeeping while they searched for the owner. A call to nearby Fort Meade did nothing to clear up the mystery.

> Eventually, the truck driver responsible for the tank called the police to report two stolen machine guns.
>
> "The tank, of 1950s vintage, belong to the Egyptian army and had been transported to Baltimore on the U.S. barge *Lash Atlantico* on its way to Teledyne Continental Motors in Muskegon, Michigan for repairs and rebuilding. The driver parked the T-54 for more than a week while he went off in search of a special permit to transport the overweight load on Maryland's roads. In the end, the police returned the guns, and the tank continued its decades-long voyage from Moscow to Muskegon." - This news article on the tank was extracted verbatim in its full text from *Time Magazine* ["A Tank in the Parking Lot"], page 23 (May 6, 1985); That article is Copyright c 1985 Time-Life, Inc. Next to this news article, there appears a photograph of the huge tank, sitting on top of a tractor-trailer's flatbed.]

If in reading that news article while leafing through *Time Magazine* we adopted the *modus operandi* of Protesters, we would then exercise our judgment and come to our conclusions based largely on the information immediately presented to us in the news article; so, with this interesting story on how the Baltimore police quickly grabbed some guns from a tank on its way to Michigan -- we would conclude that, well, it is rather obvious that the police acted properly, decisively, boldly, and exercised good judgment in ing the guns to the tank after they straightened out everything. Gee, that was pretty good work on their part -- so let's turn the page and see what else is going on in the world.

...To most folks reading that article, that was the typical reaction; here is an old tank in Baltimore going through its foibles and headaches just trying to get to Michigan -- but it is also the same caliber of judgment that a Tax Protester exercises his decisions and conclusions on, digesting largely only that slice of factual information that is immediately presented to the Protester to feed his intellectual judgments and opinions. And the Tax Protester replicates the *modus operandi* of the general public by simply accepting the factual picture that is presented to them -- by the Protester in the ensnortment tornado of a Courtroom, and by the general public in the coziness of their living room reading some news article. In both settings, no probing or deeper questions were asked, and no hypothetical WHAT IF scenarios were entertained [hmmm, *what if* maybe the judge is right?]. And so as a result, the general American state of political ensleepment continues on, accepting comforting reassurances from news articles that the

police are alert, on their toes, and that all is well, and indifferent to the possibility that termites are running the house in Washington; just like the Protester continues on in argument error from one *Willful Failure to File* courtroom to a traffic ticket courtroom, indifferent to the possibility that invisible contracts govern the grievance and that he is not entitled to prevail for any reason [except for the several technical reasons protesters frequently win on, such as *Want of Jurisdiction*, the *Counsel Question*, etc., that are not related to the merits of the grievance itself].

...So let us now reread the story of the tank once again, but this time, things will be different --because this time we are going to start asking ourselves a few probing and razor sharp questions:

> 1. The first and only question that I would like to ask is: Why is a tank, manufactured in Russia, and now owned by Egypt, being freighted and transported halfway around the world -- shipped literally to the other side of the globe -- to have some mechanical work done on it; sent to a factory located in one of the most expensive hourly labor cost nations on Earth, sent to a factory that did not manufacture this tank; why is Egypt willing to spend the $20,000 or so to get the tank to Michigan, spend the big bucks to have the work done here, and then spend another $20,000 or so in freight to get the tank sent back to Egypt?

...That is the Question I want some answers to. Simple *common sense* is telling me that whatever mechanical and machining work that needs to be done, can be done in Egypt. Have you ever been to Alexandria or Cairo, Mr. May?

Even if you have not, you should still be ordinarily aware of the fact that Egypt has, at a minimum, *several hundred thousand* cars, trucks, and other motor vehicles on its streets, and that a very large pool of mechanical talent exists locally to repair and re-machine parts for all types of vehicles. Do people in Egypt send their Datsuns back to Japan to remachine the transmission? Does Frank May, living in New Jersey, send his *Mercedes-Benz* to Australia or South America for repairs? Even discontinued automobiles, such as *Studebakers*, *Pierce-Arrows*, and *Packards* are not sent to Australia for even total restoration jobs or mechanical work -- New Jersey has quite a pool of such shops right then and there. A *Mercedes-Benz* would never be sent to Australia from New Jersey, except for very special reasons, and ordinary mechanical work is not a special reason. The reason why such long voyages are not undertaken for work on heavy vehicles is because of the ridiculous

freight charges incurred, and simple lack of necessity to do so by reason of very competent local situs talent. So the Question is begging: Why did Egypt send that tank to the other side of the planet -- to Michigan -- for repairs? Let us say, just for a moment, that the tank talked about was a very highly complex machine that required the maintenance attention of specially factory trained experts [which was not the case with a tank out of the 1950s -- those tanks had no more back then than an engine, a unique transmission, and firing power]; great, let's say that technical expertise was required -- but that still does not answer the question: Why was that tank sent to Michigan for repairs instead of anywhere else in the Middle East or the Mediterranean Coast -- or even Russia itself where the tank was manufactured?

...We find the *answer* to this *Question* the same way that the Protester would find the Answer to his Question: Why is this judge snorting at me?

The Protester needs to ask himself a hypothetical Question: What if I am wrong for some reason I don't know of? But Protesters never ask that Question -- his tremendous volume of Tort Law arguments and of Case Law from another era is staggering and impressive, and the mere possibility that error might be present in the defiant position being taken, because of something invisible controlling the grievance that he is unaware of, is not even being considered. Unlike the Protester, we will now consider the possibility that factual elements governing Egypt's motive in sending that tank to the other side of the globe for repairs were not presented to us in that news article; and we will now consider the possibility that the factual picture presented to us is distorted slightly (although not necessarily intentionally by the news media's reporters who wrote the article).

...The reason why the tank was transported from one side of the planet to the other side, from Egypt to Michigan [if in fact the tank even originated in Egypt], the reason why someone was willing to spend those big bucks just to get the tank here, is because that Russian tank is on a special trip: On a one-way trip into the United States, and not for the cover story of its needing mechanical repairs. That tank will never leave the United States. When that tank is finally at its home somewhere in the United States, it will be hidden away in some barn, some warehouse, some garage, or some old industrial building converted into an *ad hoc* Russian military storage depot. This author has photographs of other Russian military hardware sitting inside American army bases; generally that hardware is stored behind fenced areas. The word sent around the base is that those Russian tanks "...were captured somewhere," when in fact they are literally brand new and are

stored here very much with not only Russian consent, but with Russian supervision as well.

This tank in *Time Magazine* is waiting for a great and grand Russian Day to appear, that long awaited Russian Day of conquest, when along with the other extensive hardware that has been slowly and quietly smuggled into the United States over a 20 to 30-year time period, it will be brought forth out into the open in some variation of a *Red Dawn* attack on the United States [a provoked attack based partially on military hardware already sitting at its final destination inside the United States], to bring about the great Bolshevik objective of merging the United States with Russia. Yes, Russian intellectual element of conquest are involved here, as the quick lock down of American military installations will be justified to the world at that time as being necessary to prevent a nuclear war -- when in fact the political sponsorship of a Patriot to the Presidency would accomplish the same thing under less intensive circumstances.

The Russian strategy for North American conquest, through the slow accumulation of a handful of tanks, personnel carriers, and jeeps each week, is a brilliant strategic move that the Bolshevik Gremlins are now controlling the American House in Washington want to see occur, even though those Gremlins in Washington are the very targets Russia is really going after. That's right, the tank described in that news article will never leave the United States -- until, at least, it has first been used offensively in military operations against the United States.

...Yes, that tank is on a one-way trip into the United States [if in fact it ever gets to Teledyne Continental]. See what happens when we accept information presented to us, and take it in under advisement, holding its acceptance out in abeyance as a point of reference, until we first ask ourselves some peripheral questions about it from several different view points? What happens when asking ourselves deeper questions than was presented to us, is that great Truths come forward to us, are appreciated by us, and our Eyes are Opened. This is a procedure that should be followed in all settings -- business, commerce, work, school, family life, everything -- and particularly in ecclesiastical settings, as we ask ourselves a sequence of the single most important Questions that could ever be asked down here:

Who am I? What am I doing here? Where am I going?

...The Answer is that you are literally, Mr. May, the offspring of Celestial Beings, and that a germ of Deity dwells within you -- *that is who you are*. You were brought forth into this world bristling full of Gremlins and their intrigues from the presence of your

Father in Heaven -- *that is what you are doing here*. The correct procedure to to Father's presence once again is to take seriously His advice He once gave you in the First Estate when we were all then speaking His angelic language: Enter into Covenants with me, be proven in all things, and a successively ever enlarging number of planets and offspring will be yours [remember that Contracts draw lines which enable behavior to be measured and tested against; Tort indicia places facts on continuum measuring the absence, presence, and extent of damages. I personally would not want to get involved with a God who was fixated on the mere absence of damages] -- *that is where you are going*. []

[29] "Trials [in Admiralty Jurisdiction]... take place without the intervention of a jury, and without any fixed rules of law or evidence. The rules on which offenses are to be heard and determined... are such rules and regulations as the President... shall prescribe. No previous presentment is required, nor any indictment charging the commission of a crime against the laws; but the trial must proceed on charges and specifications. The punishment will be --not what the law declares, but such as an [Admiral] may think proper..." -President Andrew Jackson in the *Congressional Globe*, 39th Congress, 1st Session, page 916 (February, 1866).

[30] For example, when benefits have been accepted in the context of reciprocity being expected in , then there lies a contract; and where no Consideration [benefits exchanged] is evident on the record, then the contract collapses in front of a judge (*Failure of Consideration*). To show you just how improper it is to rely on documents for anything of significance in the area of attaching liability, remember earlier, when I talked about the Taxable Franchise of Social Security, and of Justiciability, I spoke of an Affidavit [document] I filed admitting to an utterly heinous agricultural crime I had committed. But as I mentioned, the police could do nothing without any collaborating evidence obtained from out in the practical setting that a crime had in fact been committed. Yes, Nature does operate out in the practical setting, and to understand Nature is to understand the Law in all settings.

...Incidentally, when we shift from a worldly setting over to a Heavenly setting, nothing changes either. When entering into Contracts with Heavenly Father down here, it will be emphasized to you over and over again that the promissory Blessings [benefits] from On High contained within the Contract are conditional, and that the facial Contract itself that you just entered into means nothing; and that it is what you do with that Contract out in the practical setting that means everything.

[31] At least entrance should be and is theoretically so. This is why

that if, for any reason, the Supreme Court upholds the Income Tax grab on a properly document involuntary *de minimis* participant in King's Commerce (who timely waived, rejected and refused all Commercial and political benefits), then we will turn away from dealing with the King out of the barrel of a fountain pen, and start to deal with the King out of the barrel of a gun.

[32] "Does history repeat itself? Yes. Today, the term *security* is best defined in the promises of economic kings and politicians in the form of doles, grants, and subsidies made for the purpose of perpetuating themselves in public office, and at the same time depleting the resources of the people and the treasury of the nation. The word *security* is being used as an implement of political expediency, and the end results will be the loss of freedom, and temporal and spiritual bankruptcy. [Throughout this Letter, other examples will be presented showing how the violation of Principles will always produce adverse secondary consequences, with the true seminal point of causality remaining latent, elusive, and obscured]. We have those among us who are calling for an economic king, and the voice of the king replies in promises wherein the individual is guaranteed relief from the mandate given to Adam:

'In the sweat of thy face thou eat bread.'

> "Disobedience to this mandate involves the penalty of loss of free agency and individuality, and the dissolution of the resources of the individual. These economic rulers have advocated, and do practice, a vicious procedure called the *Leveling down Process* which takes from one man who has achieved and distributes to those who are not willing to put forth like effort. Taxation is the means through which this *Leveling down Process* is implemented. Taxes in the United States during the last decade have increased five hundred percent. If such increases continue, it will mean final confiscation of the property of the people.
>
> "A clear cut example of the promises of economic kings to the people, with all of the penalties involved, stands out in the case of Great Britain. Great Britain, with fifty years of rule over the Seas of the Earth, the Sun never setting on her Empire, finds herself now in a convulsion of spiritual, political, and temporal bankruptcy. She has a king, but he is merely a symbol of her past greatness; but the people, like those of Israel, cried for a new king, an economic king, and the king has responded with the rule of dictatorship, bringing deterioration to the character of the individual, loss of ambition, freedom, individual progress

through the right to work when and where he would, and regimentation. The people are forced to heed the call and feel the iron hand of the dictator. Above all, they have lost their free agency. The British people are but mere cogs in the great machine of socialism. The state is paramount; the citizen has been subdued. Their resources have been absorbed, the treasury of the government has been depleted, and had it not been for the generosity of this great republic, where a few of the fundamentals of freedom, personal initiative, and free enterprise remain, Great Britain would have been but a memory. Just as was in Israel, so would it be with Great Britain -- dissension, division, and communistic captivity.

"What does this mean to you and me? We have those among us, too, who over the years have cried for a controlled economy. We have those among us who give succor and support to such a plan, which plan of controlled economy involves the same theories and false philosophies that ruined Israel and are now destroying Great Britain. Economic kings have responded to the call of some people, promising them security against want for their votes. In the attempt to meet the desires of these people, the treasury of this great nation is being depleted, and it covers deficit spending with promissory notes. Expansion of this disastrous policy will deprive American citizens of their God-given freedom, the right to work when and where they will, freedom of speech, freedom of the press -- and who knows but what some day the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience may be taken away. It is destroying, and will continue to destroy, the very fundamentals upon which this nation and its people have found prosperity and genuine security. These are not idle words, but the counsel and the words of the Lord as they have been revealed to this nation through Prophets and the Founding Fathers of this great Republic. For one hundred and twenty years modern day Samuels have pleaded with the people to preserve the fundamentals of temporal and spiritual security by being obedient to the Gospel, through work, being thrifty and staying out of debt, and above all to conserve our resources to provide temporal security during periods of sickness, unemployment, and the days of old age. This people has been taught by the Prophets of God that to waste the bounties of Earth is a sin, and surely there is a penalty therefor. The Lord cannot bless an individual or a nation

with the bounties of the Earth and have that individual or nation deliberately and wantonly waste them, without the law of retribution of want and famine being imposed.

"Economic kings have advocated the doctrine that those in distress should be provided for abundantly with no obligations on the part of the recipients, but the Lord has revealed through his Prophets a great welfare plan which does not rob individuals in distress of their freedom, personal initiative, and the right to work. In the welfare program [of the Church] the individual is the objective, and through the generosity and cooperative efforts of the membership of the Church, the individual is assured of temporal security, not as a dole or a gift, but as a bridge to cover the gap of unemployment or illness until the individual can again stand on his own feet and work out his temporal security. It is required of him that during this period of assistance from the welfare program he shall give freely of his labor, if physically fit, in the production of the things he needs, and out of it becomes one of the independent sons of the Lord, having notably received but having also given." - Joseph B. Wirthlin in *Conference Reports*, at page 134 (April, 1950).

[33] If you have a Lease contract as a Tenant with your Landlord to occupy his premises and pay him rent, then is it correct and provident that you could withhold rent from him because one night you saw that Landlord of yours defile himself at a bar downtown by spending your money and his strength on a pair of harlots? No, it is not, and your excuses and arguments not to honor the Lease contract is foolishness and will be summarily ignored by all judges from your local justice courts clear up to the Supreme Court. What your Landlord does with his money after you give it to him through an operation of that Lease contract is his business and none of yours, and what the King does with his money once he has his hands on it is also his own business. [All Internal Income Tax Revenue collected is turned over to the Federal Reserve Board as payment on the National Debt]. The unfairness of the Landlord to demand and get high rents he doesn't really need, and then to turn around and throw the money out the window on harlots, just like the King throwing his money out the window to Poland and to looters throughout the rest of the world... this unfairness that eats and gnaws at you, is a Tort Law fairness rationalization, and has no business in a Leasehold Tenant Eviction proceeding in your local municipal court, and has no business in a *Willful Failure to File* action in a Federal District Court, as both are contract enforcement actions. Defenses and arguments made in a Contract Law judgment

setting are necessarily very narrowly construed; background factual elements not contained in the contract are relevant only to the extent that they influence a clause in the contract that is presented to a court for a ruling. And absent unusual circumstances, only the content of the contract is going to be discussed in any courtroom; just like only the content of your Contracts with Father will be discussed at the Last Day and rationalizations sounding in the Tort of *Equality* like this one will be ignored:

> "Oh, yes Father -- I accepted Jesus Christ, and I was just as good as anyone else."

[34] *Dred Scott vs. Sanford*, 60 U.S. 393 (1856).

[35] I once told a state judge that I was demanding my minority rights. He looked at me and snorted something, and so I quoted the state statute which granted a right given to generic minorities, without any qualification of just what a *minority* was. So I brought in some statistics to prove that people with blue eyes are a demographic minority in the United States, and that therefore I was redemanding my minority rights. [Those minority statutes of rights and special hand out grants are quite flaky; they are structurally improvident, bearing no intrinsic relationship to Nature, and are, and have always been, a Special Interest Group political payoff to either buy or retain votes, power, and money. But state statutes are not designed or intended to be conformal with Nature or manifest even a quasi-rational basis: Citizenship is like joining a Country Club, as I will explain in the next section on *citizenship*, so house rules that operate to favor some class of persons while harming others are largely viewed by the Federal Judiciary as being just part of the game (just like a Country Club's Board of Governors decision to name Tuesday as being *lady's day* on the back 18 holes; no, it isn't fair to you men when Tuesday is your only day off from work and you want to use the back 18 holes then, but the Tort of unfairness is not relevant as long as you are a *member*, because a contract is in effect).]

[36] See generally:

- Joseph James in *the Framing of the 14th Amendment* [University of Illinois Press, Urbana (1956)];
- Phillip Paludian in *A Covenant with Death* [University of Illinois Press, Urbana (1975)];
- Thomas Cooley in *Changes in the Balance of Governmental Powers, an Address to the Law Students at Michigan University* [Douglas and Company, Ann Arbor (March, 1878)];

˙Howard Graham in OUR *"Declaratory" Fourteenth Amendment*, 7 Stanford Law Review, at 3 (September, 1954).

[37] Abraham Lincoln was also dragged into this *Dred Scott* controversy; on June 26, 1857, Abraham Lincoln found himself divided on the *Dred Scott case* -- it was one of those difficult factual settings where no matter what was said or done, you could only be viewed as being wrong. He suggested on that day in Springville, Illinois that the rulings of the United States Court do not create binding obligations on the two political branches of Government. This was a risky philosophical position for Lincoln to take; *Dred Scott* effectively repudiated the Principles upon which Lincoln's new *Republican Party* rested; and Lincoln exposed himself to the charge of "attempting to bring the Supreme Court into disrepute among the people" [the charge was thrown at Lincoln by Steven A. Douglas in the course of his Fifth Debate with Abraham Lincoln on October 7, 1857]. See Gary Jacobson in *Abraham Lincoln on this Question of Judicial Authority: the Theory of a Constitutional Aspiration* in 36 Western Political Quarterly, at 52 (March, 1983). []

[38] Remember that pursuant to the *Merger Doctrine*, contracts we enter into today overrule contracts we entered into yesterday, since it is out of harmony with Nature that contracts cannot be altered, modified, or otherwise rescinded in the future by the consent of the Parties. This is why Constitutional Amendments can overrule whatever was written into the original Constitution of 1787 at an earlier time. []

[39] The Panama Canal Treaty ratification bill in the Senate in 1978, being sponsored by very powerful Rockefeller Cartel interests like it was, with people *in the know* knowing that it would most likely pass the Senate, quickly became loaded down with several hundred amendments that wouldn't pass by themselves. This legislative device is sometimes called *piggy-backing*. See *The Proposed Panama Canal Treaties -- a Digest of Information*, Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 95th Congress, 2nd Session (February, 1978); and *Panama Canal Treaties (Disposition of United States Territory*), in Parts 1,2,3,4 of Hearings before the Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 95th Congress, 1st Session (July, 1977). []

[40] Yes, the 14th Amendment, announced by its sponsors to have the high, noble, and righteous goal of reversing that bad, wicked, terrible, heinous and utterly evil *Dred Scott* Case, of overturning

those racist Supreme Court Justices, and giving those poor exploited and downtrodden Blacks their political rights, actually has a silent correlative sinister profile to it that now damages everyone, including Blacks. In 1978, every single member of the United States Senate knew that Rockefeller Cartel Gremlins were behind the Panama Canal Treaties, and knowing that, a pathetic majority went right ahead and voted for it anyway; just the political inveiglement surrounding the real objectives of the 14th Amendment was also known at the time it was being considered for Senate approval...

> "It is their deliberate purpose, tomorrow or next week, or a month hence, or as soon as they can, to make the Federal Constitution a different instrument from what it is now, and then, under somewhat latitudinarian expressions contained in this proposed fourteenth article of amendment to the Constitution... any kind of law the majority party here desire be... enacted into law." - Congressman Michael Kerr of Indiana, in the *Congressional Globe*, 40th Congress, 2nd Session, page 1973 (March, 1868). []

[41] See *Dyett vs. Turner*, 439 Pacific 266 (1968), and the numerous other cites therein; that State Tribunal later backed down and reversed itself by one vote. []

[42] See *Coleman vs. Miller*, 307 U.S. 433 (1939). []

[43] Felix Frankfurter once remarked that the 14th Amendment was the largest source of the Supreme Court's business. [See Felix Frankfurter in *John Marshall and the Judicial Function*, 69 Harvard Law Review 217, at 229 (1955).] []

[44] In his book entitled *The Ratification of the 14th Amendment* by Joseph James [Mercer University Press (1984)], the author names his 20 chapters after marine and maritime events, almost as if Mr. James is quietly warning his readers allegorically as a veiled presentation of what the 14th Amendment is really all about. The names range from *The Launching* and *Setting Sail to Troubled Southern Waters, Dangerous Passage,* and *Making for Port*. []

[45] After the Civil War, popular opinion in the Southern United States was running against the adoption of the 14th Amendment, on the grounds that the 14th Amendment would consolidate all power into Washington (which is exactly what happened, and which is exactly what some Gremlins wanted). See the *Cincinnati Commercial* for April 21, 1866, quoting the *Memphis Argus* and the *Charleston Courier* for April 2, 1866. The *Charleston Courier* had made the prophetic statement that the State Judiciaries would

be made subservient to Federal authority, and that the 14th Amendment would be conferring upon Congress "powers unknown to the original law of the country"; which is exactly what has happened. Yet, in reading the 14th Amendment, no where are State Judiciaries even mentioned. See generally *Does the Fourteenth Amendment Incorporate the Bill of Rights? The Original Understanding* by Charles Friedman, 2 Sanford Law Review at 5 (December, 1949). []

[46] 258 U.S. 126 (1922). []

[47] 307 U.S. 433 (1939). []

[48] "...the question of the efficacy of ratifications by State legislatures, in the light of previous rejection or attempted withdrawal, should be regarded as a political question pertaining to the political departments, with the ultimate authority in the Congress in the exercise of its control over the promulgation of the adoption of the amendment." - *Coleman vs. Miller*, 307 U.S. 433, at 450 (1938). []

[49] "...it is apparent that the framers of the Constitution contemplated that instrument as a rule for the government of courts, as well as that of the legislature. Why otherwise does it direct the judges to take an oath to support it?" - *Marbury vs. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803). []

[50] Twenty one years after *Marbury vs. Madison*, Chief Justice Marshall backed off slightly by making the following comment, which is astonishing by contrast:

> "Judicial power, as contradistinguished from the power of the laws, has no existence. Courts are the mere instruments of law, and can will nothing. When they are said to exercise a discretion, it is a mere legal discretion, a discretion to be exercised in discerning the course prescribed by law; and, when that is discerned, it is the duty of the Court to follow it." - *Osborne vs. Bank of United States*, 22 U.S. 738 (1824).

Although the Judiciary is given its own perpetual existence in Article III, in a sense Justice Marshall is correct, since it is the Legislature that ultimately holds the upper hand. The Legislature could, if it wanted to, repeal Article III altogether and shut down the Judiciary *in toto*, and appoint, perhaps, Committees of Congress to act in the capacity of what was once the Judiciary by individually considering Cases that come before them. []

[51] "...the Framers did not see the courts as the exclusive custodians of the Constitution. Indeed, because the document

posits so few conclusions it leaves to the more political branches the matter of adapting and vivifying its principles in each generation... The power to declare acts of Congress and the laws of the state null and void... should not be used when the Constitution does not [explicitly allow it]." - Attorney General Edwin Meese before the D.C. Chapter of the Federalist Society Lawyers Division, November 15, 1985, Washington, D.C. []

[52] *A fortiori* means "with the greater force," as one conclusion is compared with another. []

[53] A minority collection of four Supreme Court Justices once stated that:

> "[Article IV of the Constitution]... grants power over the amending of the Constitution to Congress alone. Undivided control of that process has been given by the Article exclusively and completely to Congress. The process itself is called "political" in its entirety, from submission until an amendment becomes part of the Constitution, and not subject to judicial guidance, control, or interference at any point." - *Coleman vs. Miller*, 307 U.S. 433, at 459 [Concurring Opinion] (1938). []

[54] "...the glory and ornament of our system which distinguishes it from every other government on the face of the earth is that there is a great and mighty [judicial] power hovering over the Constitution of the land to which has been delegated the awful responsibility of restraining all the coordinate departments of the Government within the walls of the great fabric which our fathers [built] for our protection and our immunity forever." - Chief Justice Edward White, in a speech shortly before he ascended into the corridors of judicial power; 23 *Congressional Record*, 6515 (1892). []

[55] "In a society under the forms of which the stronger faction can readily unite and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature, where the weaker individual is not as secured against the violence of the stronger..." - Alexander Hamilton, *The Federalist Papers*, Number 51. []

[56] "A majority taken collectively may be regarded as being whose opinions, and frequently whose interests, are opposed to those of another being, which is styled a minority. If it be admitted that a man, possessing absolute power, may misuse that power by wronging his adversaries, why should a majority not be held liable to the same reproach? Men are not apt to change their characters by agglomeration; nor does their patience in the presence of obstacles increase with the consciousness of their strength." -

Alexis de Tocqueville, 1 *Democracy in America*, at 249 [Arlington House (1965)]. []

[57] "Tyranny is not the only problem. Majorities do not necessarily have enough knowledge, insight, or expertise to assure wisest action... issues require expertise and understanding far beyond that which is possessed by the majority... The collective wisdom is not likely to be less fallible." -Bernard Siegan in *Economic Liberties and the Constitution*, at 273 [University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1980)]. []

[58] "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)]. []

[59] *The Federalist* Number 9 goes into this in greater detail. Not very well known is the fact that the dual shared contours of Federal/State legislative jurisdiction are sometimes in a state of tension, which frictional relationship has existed right from the start of the Union. While the Continental Congress was once meeting in Philadelphia on June 20, 1783, soldiers from Lancaster, Pennsylvania arrived in Philadelphia "...to obtain a settlement of accounts, which they supposed they had a better chance [to collect] at Philadelphia than at Lancaster." On the next day, June 21st:

> "The mutinous soldiers presented themselves, drawn up in the streets before the State House, where Congress had assembled. The executive council of the State, sitting under the same roof, was called upon for the proper interposition [to get rid of the soldiers]. President Dickerson came in [to the Hall of Congress], and explained the difficulty, under actual circumstances, of bringing out the [State] militia of the place for the suppression of the mutiny. He thought that, without some outrages on persons or property, the militia could not be relied on [to get rid of the mutineers]. General St. Clair, then in Philadelphia, was sent for, and desired to use his interposition, in order to prevail on the troops to to the barracks. His report gave no encouragement...
>
> "In the meantime, the soldiers remained in their position, without offering any violence, individuals only, occasionally uttering offensive words, and wantonly pointing their muskets to the windows of

> the Hall of Congress. No danger from premeditated violence was apprehended, but it was observed that spirituous drink, from the tippling-houses adjoining, began to be liberally served out to the soldiers, and might lead to hasty excesses. None were committed, however, and about three o'clock, the usual hour, Congress adjourned; the soldiers, though in some instances offering a mock obstruction, permitting the members to pass through their ranks. They soon afterwards retired themselves to the barracks. ...
>
> "The [subsequent] conference with the executive [of Pennsylvania] producing nothing but a repetition of doubts concerning the disposition of the militia to act unless outrage were offered to persons or property. It was even doubted whether a repetition of the insult to Congress would be sufficient provocation. During the deliberations of the executive, and the suspense of the committee, reports from the barracks were in constant vibration. At one moment, the mutineers were penitent and preparing submissions; the next, they were meditating more violent measures. Sometimes, the bank was their object; then the seizure of the members of Congress, with whom they imagined an indemnity for their offense might be stipulated." - Elliot, 5 *Madison Papers Containing Debates on the Confederation and Constitution*, at pages 92 et seq. [Washington, D.C. (1845)].

The harassment by the soldiers which had begun on June 20 continued across four days until June 24, 1783. On this date, the members of Congress now abandoned any hope that the State of Pennsylvania might disperse the soldiers, so the Congress removed itself from Philadelphia. General George Washington had learned of the uprising only on the same date at his headquarters at Newburgh, and reacting promptly, he dispatched a large contingent of his whole force to suppress this "infamous and outrageous Mutiny"; see 27 *Writings of Washington*, at page 32 [George Washington Bicentennial Commission, GPO (1938)]. But the news of his intended response arrived too late, as the Congress had by now packed their bags and left for Princeton, and traveled thereafter to Trenton, Annapolis, and New York City. There was not any repetition of the circumstances preceding the decision by Congress to leave Philadelphia, however, this incident was never forgotten by the Congress. A few months later on October 7, 1783, the Congress while meeting in Princeton adopted the following

Resolution:

> "That building for the use of Congress be erected on or near the banks of the Delaware, provided a suitable district can be procured on or near the banks of said river, for a federal town; and that the right of soil, and an exclusive or such other jurisdiction as Congress may direct, shall be vested in the United States." - 8 *Journals of Congress*, at 295.

Those mutineers contributed strongly to the feeling in Congress that the United States needed its own geographical district, exercising its own exclusive jurisdiction over it, and so when it acquired the District of Columbia, the Congress made sure that there were no lingering vestiges of State Sovereignty left to surface again under possibly unpleasant circumstances. George Mason of Virginia expressed his sentiments in July of 1878 that the new seat of the Federal Government, where ever that may eventually be, not be `in the city or place at which the seat of any State Government might be fixed,' because the establishment of the seat of Government in a State Capital would tend `to produce disputes concerning jurisdiction' and because the commingling of the two jurisdictions would tend to give `a provincial tincture' to the important national deliberations [see Jonathan Elliot, Editor, in 5 *Madison Papers Concerning Debates on the Confederation and Constitution*, at page 374].

Down to the present day, just what legislative jurisdiction the Congress does have in criminal matters is disputed; no doubt it can very much exercise criminal jurisdiction over all crimes so listed in the Constitution, and for all crimes that take place on land owned by the King. But where a crime has taken place in a building on leased land not owned by the King, the Congress probably does not have criminal jurisdiction, and must yield to the States for the administration of a spanking [but the criminal Defendant has to demand it; jurisdiction originates out of the barrel of a gun, and the King is not about to be a nice guy and just simply turn around and walk away from exercising recourse against an exhibition of defiance in his leased office spaces he provides to his termites]. Necessarily so when twin separate and distinct Juristic Institutions are making assertions of jurisdiction over the same geographical districts, tensions and frictions surface as the jurisdiction of one is slightly limited, and the jurisdiction of the other is specifically limited, and one is reaching outside of its appropriate contours. In 1954 an extensive study of the area of Federal-State jurisdiction was studied by an Inter-Departmental Committee under the

supervision of imp Herbert Brownell, United States Attorney General. Discussing in detail the legal relationship of the States to Federal Enclaves, the acquisition of legislative jurisdiction (by consent, by the Constitution, or on Federal Lands), Criminal Jurisdiction, and operations of State and Federal Jurisdiction over Residents without and within Federal Enclaves and other Federal Lands, the report gives a good profiling glimpse into the limited nature of Federal legislative jurisdiction. See *Report on the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal Areas Within the States* [GPO, Washington (April and June, 1956)]. []

[60] Remember the operation of the twin combination of the *Specificity Doctrine* and the *Laches Doctrine* as they blend together in a confluence to form the wider *Merger Doctrine*: That the most recently executed contract addendum applies first (the first being *merged* with the last), and the most *specific* contract wording also applies first (the most general being *merged* into the most specific). []

[61] In other words, plead that the implied appearance of Admiralty and Equity in the *after Ten* Amendments does not operate with derogation on your rights, by virtue of your previous successful decontamination away from that King's Equity Jurisdiction due to the absence of any *quid pro quo* equivalence proprietary to Admiralty having been accepted. []

[62] *William Truax vs. Mike Raich*, 239 U.S. 33, at 40 (1915). []

[63] The proposal appears in *Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on the Study of Presidential Inability of the House Committee on the Judiciary*, 85th Congress, First Session, Serial No. 3, at pages 7 and 8 (1957). For a good intellectual flavoring of Gremlin Herbert Brownell, see his views on that utterly obnoxious Fourth Amendment in *The Public Security and Wire Tapping* [39 Cornell Law Quarterly 195 (1954)]. When Herbert Brownell was nominated to be the Attorney General of the United States by Nelson Rockefeller, he was unaware of the fact that the Office of Patents was under the Attorney General's Office [See *Herbert Brownell, Jr. Attorney General Designate* in "Hearings Before the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate," 83rd Congress, First Session (GPO 1953)]. Herbert Brownell was on a mission for the Four Rockefeller Brothers, so pesky little details like administrative competence are unimportant. The next time you are in Washington, Mr. May, stop by the *Willard Hotel* on Pennsylvania Avenue on the east side of the White House; in the *Willard* is a restaurant called *the Occidental*. Hanging on the wall next to the coat room is a photograph of little Gremlin Herbert

Brownell; there is a radiant mystique about that photograph that is different... as if there was a Gremlin sparkle in his eyes... as if he was on the threshold of pulling off something grand... something big... something important. []

[64] Dallas was one of three cities where planning for the murder was considered. []

[65] *Senate Joint Resolution* 139, 88th Congress, Second Session (1964). []

[66] Senator Birch Bayh held the Chair of the Senate SubCommittee on Constitutional Amendments. See a Report authored by Birch Bayh entitled *Presidential Inability and Vacancy in the Office of the Vice-President*, Senate Report Number 1382, 88th Congress, Second Session (1964); this report includes many private views on the *absolute dire emergency need* for the 25th Amendment; views expressed by Nelson Rockefeller's nominees. []

[67] Occasionally, headaches surfaced during the *Rockefeller Ratification Operation* which Herbert Brownell coordinated. For example, in 1965 a law review article appeared which caused the Speaker of the Legislature of Arkansas to adjourn indefinitely his State's ratification vote on the proposed 25th Amendment. The article, entitled *Vice-Presidential Succession: a Criticism of the Bayh-cellar Plan* in 17 South Carolina Law Review 315 (1965) correctly noted that there was no big urgency for any new Constitutional machinery to fill a Vice-Presidential vacancy [but there very much was a big urgency on Nelson Rockefeller's part]. Herbert Brownell quickly got the situation under control, with the end result being that the State of Arkansas ratified the 25th Amendment on November 11, 1965 [see *The Twenty-fifth Amendment* by John Feerick ["Ratification"], at page 111 [Fordham University Press, New York (1976)]. []

[68] Nelson's water boys have spoken very highly of the 25th Amendment:

> "As this Nation celebrates the two-hundredth anniversary of its birth, we should take special note of one unique feature of our great constitutional experiment. Unlike almost any other Western democracy, the United States has never been faced with a serious crisis in the line of succession to the office of its chief executive and head of state. Our ability to avoid such a crisis throughout much of our earlier history was, perhaps, largely a matter of luck. Fortunately, we have never had to confront the prospect of a double vacancy in the offices of both

> President and Vice-President. Thus, one of two individuals specifically designated by the voters as President and next-in-line served in the office at all times." - Senator Birch Bayh in the Forward to *The Twenty-Fifth Amendment* by John Feerick [Fordham University Press, New York (1976)].

Notice the selection of words that imp Birch Bayh uses: *experiment, democracy* and *luck.* Down to the present day in 1985, had Nelson Rockefeller not used his recurring accessory instruments of murder and kidnappings to help him accomplish his political objectives, the "serious crisis" of dual vacancies his water boy Birch Bayh refers to would never have occurred in the first place; as fundamental Gremlin *modus operandi* always calls for having just the right medicine to remedy ailments they themselves create. []

[69] At a strategy meeting held in 1973 in Nelson's Washington offices at 2500 Foxhall Road, Nelson reiterated that he wanted Spiro to go first, before the final siege was laid on Richard Nixon. []

[70] Staying on top of an impending Presidential grab that was in the air, Senator Birch Bayh's SubCommittee issued on an informal Report on the history of the 25th Amendment Entitled *Review of the History of the 25th Amendment*, 93rd Congress, First Session, Senate Document #93-42 "Report of the SubCommittee on Constitutional Amendments to the Committee on the Judiciary" [GPO, October, 1973]. []

[71] Subpoenas were issued by the IRS to try and find something to get the goods on him. See the *New York Times* ["Tax Agents Compile Data on Net Worth of Agnew"], page 1 (October 7, 1973). []

[72] Susan Agnew received kidnapping threats against her while traveling in Brazil [see the *New York Times* ["Agnew's Daughter Quits Brazil After Report of Threat"], page 22 (August 30, 1973]. In that same article, reassurances were quickly presented that there was nothing to be concerned about, as those impressive Brazilian Federal Police, who must know everything, were quoted as denying the threat existed:

> "There was never any threat against her physical security, including kidnapping..." - *New York Times*, id., at page 22.

The following day, Brazilian Army Intelligence sources were quoted as saying that they were familiar with the threats, and spoke knowledgeably about the terrorist group who had been

making kidnapping preparations [see the *New York Times*["Miss Agnew Did Get Threat, Aide Says"], page 6 (August 30, 1973)]. With those threats in mind, Spiro Agnew brought Susan home to the United States quickly. Whether or not Susan Agnew was eventually kidnapped here in the United States as an inducement to her father to resign and get out of Washington is an unknown event Nelson Rockefeller would have more than loved to have pulled off. For all of the people Nelson and David Rockefeller have murdered, killed, mangled, distorted, mutilated, and tortured -- a playful little political kidnapping is the least that Nelson would have concerned himself with. The day Spiro resigned the Vice-Presidency, Susan Agnew was reported being at home in the Agnew residence [see the *New York Times* ["Shades Drawn at the Agnew's $190,000 Suburban Maryland Home"], page 33 (October 11, 1973)]. As is usual, the *New York Times* is playing cutesy by directing attention to economic values on irrelevant matters -- it was just as important for me to know the resale value of their home as it is for me to need know what color the Agnew's mailbox is. Gremlin journalists. []

[73] See "Rockefeller Said To Be Available" in the *New York Times*, page 33, October 11, 1973]. []

[74] A Gremlin once scratched the following ideas into his personal diary:

> "For him alone, winter seems to have arrived. He is being secretly undermined and is already completely isolated. He is anxiously looking for collaborators. Our mice are busily at work, gnawing through the last supports of his position."

Those words could have been written about the final days of Richard Nixon, but they were not; they were written by Paul Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda chief, during another Rockefeller grab for power from another era, 12 days before Chancellor Brunning was forced to resign on May 30, 1932. Franz von Papen was appointed to replace Brunning, and President von Hindenberg appointed Hitler to replace Papen on January 30, 1933. What Hitler did was to take advantage of a key weakness in the Weimar Republic Constitution that allowed for appointed executives, which created an open window for Gremlins to slip into office though, without the irritation and nuisance of an infeasible election. Young Nelson Rockefeller had recommended Hitler to his dad, John Rockefeller, Jr. in 1930 as an ideal man to be used for their purposes; Nelson had studied Hitler very closely and admired many of Hitler's traits, and so when Hitler had finally succeeded in acquiring his power and kingdom without the

nuisance of an election, Nelson quietly vowed to himself that he, too, would someday have his own appointment Amendment in the United States. []

[75] After Nelson had grabbed the Vice-Presidency, many people in Washington finally *opened their eyes* and realized that it was the Presidency all along that Nelson had wanted; and so a proposal was introduced into the United States Senate to modify Section 2 of the 25th Amendment [now that the real intent was visible]. This proposal would have changed Section 2 so that when an unelected Vice-President comes into the Presidency by way of appointment, and if there is more than one year remaining in the Presidential term, then a special national election would have to be held for the President and Vice-President to go through -- thus negating the *Presidential Office by Appointment* grab the 25th Amendment was designed to create. See *Examination of the First Implementation of Section Two of the 25th Amendment*, in Hearings before the 94th Congress, First Session (discussing Senate Joint Resolution 26); [GPO, 1975]. Unfortunately, Senator Birch Bayh still held the Chair of the SubCommittee on Constitutional Amendments, so the proposal died a quiet sandbagging. []

[76] For a while, a vindictive Richard Nixon spoke to Gerald Ford almost daily on the telephone, encouraging Ford not to resign. []

[77] In a sense, Richard Nixon was smart by appointing Gerald Ford President instead of Nelson Rockefeller to replace Spiro Agnew: Because having Nelson Rockefeller behind you as Vice-President is a good way to get yourself killed. Incidentally, Richard Nixon is quite familiar with the plans by the Rockefeller Brothers arranging to have Jack Kennedy murdered in Dallas; trying to keep the lid on that *Bay of Pigs* that was talked about constantly in the Watergate Tapes was the Kennedy Assassination. H.R. Haldeman discusses how the *Bay of Pigs* was the Kennedy Assassination; see *The Ends of Power* by H.R. Haldeman, at page 38 et seq. [New York Times Books, New York (1978)]. Many folks are a bit defensive about poor Richard Nixon, the way he was hounded out of office by all those barking dogs in the news media and all that... But how much sympathy should you give to a President who spent a considerable amount of time, while in Office, sequestering the conspiracy to murder a previous President -- a conspiracy that would expose not only his own sponsors, but himself as well? I would like to hear someone try and stick up for Richard Nixon with that in mind. Those who studied Richard Nixon in those days were puzzled in relating to his extreme motives in so tightly controlling every single little thing in the cover-up process, up and down the line. Numerous commentators stated that some political dirty trick does not justify such protracted and intense cover-up

supervision; nor does it justify E. Howard Hunt's demand for $2 million in bribe money to keep quiet about the *Bay of Pigs*. That is correct, some burglary that was already publicly out in the open does not justify all that: But the murder of an American President does. Yes, Richard Nixon's mind was fixated on his own involvement in a murder, not someone else's burglary. []

[78] The direct election of United States Senators by the 17th Amendment is a political enigma; here the States gave up an important source of power in the Congress for no reciprocating beneficial reason -- but Gremlins had a reason -- more direct control of the Congress, and bringing the United States down one more step lower to a degenerate Democracy status where Majoritarianism rules. And for similar reasons, in 1953, the Congress was again tempted by Gremlins --trying to rid the United States of the Electoral College, and structure a direct Presidential popular vote (*a la* democracies) when then allows for tighter Gremlin control [see *Abolition of Electoral College -- .Direct Election of President and Vice-president* in "Hearings Before a SubCommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate," 83rd Congress, First Session, discussing Senate Joint Resolutions 17, 19, 55, 84, 85, 95, 100 (June, July, August, 1953)]. Rockefeller Cartel nominee Senator Estes Kefauver urged the dismantling of the Electoral College [id., at page 14].

Even seemingly politically disinterested people have offered their two bits in support of abolishing the *Electoral College*:

> "...I have come before you today with one simple statement. This Republic could find itself in grave danger because of a fatal weakness in the process by which it elects our President." -Author James Michener in a Congressional Hearing *Direct Popular Election of the President and Vice-president of the United States*, SubCommittee on the Constitution, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 96th Congress, First Session, Senate Joint Resolution 28 (March, April, 1979).

James Michener cited some research he did into the Presidential elections of 1872 and 1968 as justification for his over-dramatization of the effects of retaining the *Electoral College* as he declared that the collapse of the Federal Government was a certainty --but never in this Hearing did author James Michener ever cite the Founding Fathers or explain why they incorporated such a juristic device in the first place. Like the *modus operandi* of Gremlins on a mission, to James Michener the past is irrelevant.

Socialists have gotten into the attack on the *Electoral College*; see

Aaron Wildavsky in *The Plebiscitary Presidency: Direct Election as Class Legislation* in 2 Commentaries (Winter, 1979). For a glimpse into what one of the Founders had to say about the *Electoral College*, see Donald Dewey in *Madison's Views on Electoral Reform* in Western Political Science Quarterly, at page 140 (March, 1962). []

[79] There was also internal Cartel division now working against Nelson's final power play in December of 1976, as numerous associates of Nelson issued advisories discouraging him from using this Presidential acquisition device; some of Nelson's strongest former supporters in the Cartel now no longer trusted Nelson's judgment explicitly like they had done so in the past, after the Four Brothers seriously bungled their handling of a Russian double cross in the Summer of 1976. []

[80] Henry Kissinger's murder of Nelson Rockefeller, a friend since 1955, through a college educated hit man in his 50's, was a power play that Henry thought he would succeed at; a grand power play Henry reasoned that the success of which would be probable, since surviving Rockefeller Family members should likely expect to have Henry fill the vacuum of power that would follow in Nelson's absence -- at least, that was the reasoning Henry was operating under. But Henry was also operating under the attractive primary inducement of Rothschild prompting, intelligence guidance, and background support in this murder -- people *seemingly* above double cross. But Henry ran out of time before he succeeded in consolidating his gains -- the promised Rothschild post-murder background support never materialized when Henry needed it most on that Monday evening, February 5, 1979. []

[81] The phrase *well-oiled* means that plans generally go on smoothly to completion without too much friction or distractions; the players possessing the magic of a *Midas Touch*. []

[82] Like a large volume of American historians, these 25th Amendment commentators do not write factually accurate information, as the mere omission of the dominate roles played by Nelson Rockefeller and his associates in the sponsorship of the 25th Amendment -- such a factual deficiency, *ipso facto*, nullifies the veracity of the remaining limited information that is presented. See:

- Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *On the Presidential Succession*, 89 Political Science Quarterly 475 (Fall, 1974);
- John D. Freerick, *The Proposed 25th Amendment to the Constitution*, Fordham Law Review (December, 1965);
- John D. Freerick, *The Vice-presidency and the Problems of*

Presidential Succession and Inability, 32 Fordham Law Review 457 (1964). []

[83] The way to pierce through all distraction arguments and get to the very bottom of Gremlin intrigue is not to search the present record for Gremlin sponsorship, which is often invisible at first, but rather to search the past record for similar acts that Gremlins sponsored, because time has a way of unravelling details that were once secret. The reason why examining the past as a strong testing methodology for determining Gremlin participation in the present setting is because Gremlins find it unnecessary to change, alter, amend, or modify their *modus operandi* from one successful conquest to the next, as they go about their work trying to run one civilization into the ground after another. And so as we turn around and examine the past, we very much find Gremlin intrigue in Russia starting in the pre-Revolutionary days of 1914, as the Gremlins were highly active in "liberating" or "emancipating" downtrodden women. For 743 documentary pages of political intrigue carried on by Gremlins in Russia working to "liberate" women from the clutches of some fictional and non-existent adversary, see the doctorate dissertation of Robert Drumm entitled *The Bolshevik Party and the Organization and Emancipation of Working Women, 1914 to 1921; Or a History of the Petrograd Experiment* [Columbia University (1977)] (Order Thesis Number 77-24,326 from University Microfilms in Ann Arbor, Michigan). []

[84] It is in the nature of people that once they have made a decision about something, folks often rearrange their logic to justify the end conclusion, ignoring divergent peripheral factual elements that make their unwanted appearance at random occurrences; just like folks will also enhance in their minds the worth of something they believe that either they or someone else has paid a price for, while ignoring conflicting factual items that would derogate the worth. See Leon Festinger in *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* [Row, Peterson Publishers, Evanston, Illinois (1957)] and Hal Arkes and John Garske in *Psychological Theories of Motivation* [Brooks/Cole Publishing, Monterey, California (1982)].

...Both behavioral operants are unfavorable intellectual habits that should not be allowed a domiciliary presence in our minds; it is difficult enough to acquire an enlarged basis of factual knowledge to exercise judgment on, and so tossing aside uncomfortable factual irritants is improvident. []

[85] Up until 1971, there had been some form of an equal feminine rights amendment introduced into each Congress since 1923. After the ERA lost its ratification journey through the states the first time

around, the Congress held new Hearings on the amendment to reexamine the likely impact of the ERA on the United States. For 1,900 pages of discussions on the contemplated impact, see *Hearings Before the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate*, 98th Congress, First and Second Sessions (from May, 1983 to May, 1984). For all of the 1,900 pages of distraction arguments presented to the Congress, none of the discussions focused in on Gremlin maneuverings with women's rights movements in other political jurisdictions around the world that have already gone to the dogs. []

[86] "From the fact that people are very different it follows that, if we treat them equally, the result must be inequality in their actual position, and that the only want to place them in an equal position would be to treat them differently. Equality before the law and material equality are therefore not only different but are in conflict with each other; and we can achieve either the one or the other, but not both at the same time." -F.A. Hayek in *The Constitution of Liberty*, as quoted by Joan Kennedy Taylor in 7 Libertarian Review 30, at 33 (December, 1978).

Author F.A. Hayek belongs to the Austrian School of Economics, which propagates reasoning in favor of pure *laissez-faire*. []

[87] Even the organic flourishment of dynastic families is contoured around the Law, a statement that I am sure would be shocking to Nelson and David Rockefeller. See *Law in the Development of Dynastic Families among American Business Elites: The Domestication of Capital and the Capitalization of Family*, by George Marcus, 14 Law and Society Review 859 (1980). []

[88] "The two sexes differ in structure of body, in the functions to be performed by each, in the amount of physical strength, in the capacity for long-continued labor, particularly when done standing, the influence vigorous health upon the future well-being of the race, the self-reliance which enables one to assert full rights, and in the capacity to maintain the struggle for subsistence. This difference justifies a difference in legislation and upholds that which is designed to compensate for some of the burdens which rest upon her." - *Muller vs. Oregon*, 208 U.S. 412, at 422 (1907). []

[89] "...history discloses the fact that women have always been dependent upon man. He established his control at the outset by superior physical strength, and this control in various forms, with diminishing intensity, has continued to the present. As minors, though not to the same extent, she has been looked upon in the courts as needing special care that her rights may be preserved...

Though limitations upon personal and contractual rights may be removed by legislation, there is that in her disposition and habits of life which will operate against a full assertion of those rights... Differentiated by these matters from the other sex, she is properly placed in a class by herself, and legislation designed for her protection may be sustained, even when like legislation is not necessarily for men, and could not be sustained." - *Muller vs. Oregon*, 208 U.S. 412, at 421 (1907). []

[90] "A doctrinaire equality, then, is the theme of the [Equal Rights] Amendment. And so women must be admitted to West Point on a parity with men; women must be conscripted for military service equally with men... girls must be eligible for the same athletic teams as boys in the public schools and state universities; Boston Boys' Latin School and Girls' Latin School must merge (not simply be brought into parity); life insurance commissioners may not continue to approve lower life insurance premiums for women (based on greater life expectancy) -- all by command of the Federal Constitution." - Paul Freund of Harvard University in *Hearings Before Subcommittee #4 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives*, page 611, 92nd Congress, First Session [Discussing House Joint Resolutions 35 and 208 "The ERA"] (March and April, 1971). []

[91] One classic example can be found in footnote 6 to *New Motor Vehicle Board vs. Orrin Fox*, which gives history to the California Automobile Franchise Act. In that Case, the Supreme Court reviewed a grab of the use of the police powers of the State of California -- by automobile dealers of all people -- to create a shared Commercial enrichment monopoly for themselves to feast on, through the use of penal statutes. We are told that:

> "Disparity in bargaining power between automobile manufacturers and their dealers prompted some 25 states to enact legislation to protect retail car dealers from perceived abusive and oppressive acts by the manufacturers... Among its other safeguards, the Act protects the equities of existing dealers by prohibiting manufacturers from adding dealerships to the market areas of its existing franchisees where the effect such intrabrand competition would be injurious to the existing franchisees and to the public interest." - *New Motor Board vs. Orrin Fox*, 439 U.S. 96, at 101 (1978).

Yes, if you would believe those poor little downtrodden California car dealers, why those evil and utterly heinous manufacturing vultures are just trampling all other their rights; whereas talking

about vultures -- those car dealers should be the *very last ones* to talk. Appropriate medicine for the automobile dealers would be to pull their thumbs out of their mouths, get rid of their corporate diapers, and have them start taking some responsibility for the contracts they enter into, and stop thinking in their typical enscrewment terms of how everything has always *gotta be their way* (in a business sense, that is great if they can get away with it). When negotiating with a car manufacturer refusing to give them an exclusive geographically assigned marketing district, then the car dealer should go negotiate with some other manufacturer; but car dealers want the Franchise itself much more than they want something derivative like protected marketing districts (which is only of secondary importance); so as usual, car dealers seek to excuse their own weakness and mistakes by calling on the guns and cages of the State to pick up their loose ends and throw Torts at car manufacturers [and denying manufacturers the ability to offer their Franchises with two prices: One with a protected district and one without -- is a Tort against the manufacturer]. If assigned and protected geographical districts were really all that important, prospective car dealers faced with such unfeasible proposed contract terms could simply turn around and go negotiate with some other manufacturer, even foreign manufacturers; thus leaving the uncompromising manufacturers with the decision to either assign exclusive districts, or in the alternative, face the consequences of not signing up any dealers. Who else is being damaged by politically restricting the geographical placement of car dealers? The car buying public is -- as a reduction in the number of automobile dealers can do absolutely nothing but constrict retail competition and raise prices. []

[92] *Rhetoric* is the artificial elegance of language. []

[93] Whenever Principles are violated, secondary damages follow later on its wake --but the surfacing of the secondary damages later on is so subtle as to render the true causal point of origin almost invisible. For example, let's say you are E. Howard Hunt, a career *cracker* for the CIA. Having finished your mission on the grassy knoll in Dealey Plaza in Dallas, having put in your honest days' labor by helping to murder Jack Kennedy, under the cover of being a railroad bum (an awfully clean looking bum), you turn around and leave the ambush scene. *Well, that was business.*

...Now it is nine years later, and now there has been another murder, but this time things are different. This time a chill travels up one side of your spine and down the other; this time things are unpleasant; this time the victim is your wife, Dorothy Hunt. On Friday, December 8, 1972, some 200 Federal Agents from the Chicago offices of the FBI and DEA had travelled out to Midway

Airport, in advance, to wait for a United Airlines Flight #553 to crash that afternoon; and they had brought with themselves machine guns and special orders from Washington. The plane had been rigged to self-generate an electrical blackout on arrival by having the bus bar stripped down and replaced with a filament that would break on flight descent; and the air traffic controllers were also standing by, ready to manufacture a crash --some of the most inhumane circumstances imaginable. On that flight was your wife, Dorothy, carrying $2 million in bribe money from CREP (Committee to Re-Elect the President); Dorothy had been sitting next to a sharp CBS newswoman, Michele Clark [as sharp as journalists go], and had been spilling the beans. When the firetrucks and ambulances arrived on the crash site, the jet (which had demolished a house), had already been cordoned off by a small army of Federal Agents, and while pleas and wailings for help by trapped passengers inside the jet could be heard at a distance by emergency personnel, Federal Agents brandishing machine guns physically restrained any help from reaching the jet. The local rescue squads were shocked at what they saw, but the Federal Agents were on a mission: To make sure that Dorothy Hunt and the CBS Newswoman she was talking to, as well as other troublesome people who were conveniently on board that were irritating to Attorney General John Mitchell, were thoroughly incinerated.

...Now let's say that you were E. Howard Hunt. *Question*: How would you have known that helping out the Four Rockefeller Brothers to murder Jack Kennedy in 1963 would directly lead to the murder of your own wife nine years later, as your supporting role in one Rockefeller *Presidential Removal Operation* organically grew into another? *Answer*: You would not have known -- secondary consequences are inherently latent and difficult to see. So when invisible *Principles of Nature* are violated [Would a *cracker* like E. Howard Hunt bother to concern himself with *principles*?], damages to yourself will always surface at a later time, with the true seminal point of causality also remaining largely invisible. And as we change settings, *Principles of Nature* never change; and the forced commingling of genders that the ERA will originate will in fact generate damages later on, with the true seminal source of the damages remaining largely obscured. If the ERA does promote *Principles of Nature* when forcing improvident inter-gender commingling, then could someone please explain to me where it does so. []

[94] "The first eleven Amendments to the Constitution of the United States were intended as checks or limitations on the Federal Government and had their origin in a spirit of jealousy on the part

of the States. This jealousy was largely due to the fear that the Federal Government might become too strong and centralized unless restrictions were imposed upon it. The [Civil] War Amendments marked a new departure and a new epoch in the constitutional history of the country, since they trench directly upon the powers of the States, being in this respect just the opposite of the early Amendments." - Horace Flack in *The Adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment*, at 8 [John Hopkins Press, Baltimore (1908)]. []

[95] The coordinated selected presence of Union and Confederate Troops in the South after the Civil War to deal with the New York City sponsored Carpetbaggers is something else. []

[96] The 26th Amendment under the incentive of light financial pressure by a Supreme Court ruling, sailed through the States in a few weeks. []

[97] "It is a wholesome sight to see `the Crown' sued and answering for its torts." - Maitland in 3 *Collected Papers, at 263 [Quoted by Harold Last in the Responsibility of the State in England*, 32 Harvard Law Review 447, at 470 (1919)]. []

[98] For a commentary on Maritime having an international flair to it, see the remarks of Gremlin Lord Mansfield, in 35 *Tulane Law Review*, at pages 116 to 118 (1960). []

[99] *The West Maid*, 257 U.S. 419, at 432 (1921). []

[100] "But in the Admiralty, as we have said, there are no technical rules of variance or deception. The court decrees upon the whole matter before it..." - *Dupont vs. Vance*, 60 U.S. 162, at 173 (1856). []

[101] "The end of the institution, maintenance, and administration of government is to secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it, and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the [benefit] of enjoying in safety and tranquility their natural rights. ... The body politic is formed by a voluntary association of individuals; it is a social compact [contract], by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good." - The Preamble of the 1780 Massachusetts Constitution, F.N. Thrope, editor, III *The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the United States*, at pages 1888, et seq. (GPO, Washington, 1907), 7 volumes. []

[102] The *Public Trust* is cited by judges as justification to throw penal *lex* at folks where there is no Tort indicia of *mens rea* or *corpus delecti* damages present in the factual setting, and neither is

there any specific contract that can be cited. For example, growing a Marijuana plant in your backyard, or gambling in your basement, offers no contractual infraction, no *mens rea*, and no *corpus delecti* damages anywhere; and the incarceration of Individuals under such a factual setting is an operation of *majoritarianism* to the extreme, and is supposed to be forbidden under the Constitution's *Republican Form of Government Clause*. Question: How do judges, who know all of that, circumvent the positive restrainments in the *Republican Clause*? The answer is best explained by way of analogy:

> "The State, on the other hand, has a substantial interest in protecting its citizens from the kind of abuse which [this Case is about]. ...our decisions permitting the exercise of state jurisdiction in tort actions based on violence or defamation have not rested on the history of the tort at issue [which falls clearly under Tort Law principles], but rather on the nature of the State's interest in protecting the health and well being of its citizens [which is an operation of indirect third party contract]." - *Farmer vs. Carpenters*, 430 U.S. 290, at 302 (1976).

Since the turning point in *Farmer* was the allowance of State jurisdiction to intervene where only some prospective or indirect damages existed to its Citizens under protective contract, then the criminalization of innocuous relationships that folks have with plants in their backyards and with policy slips in their basements is similar predicated on the interest of the State in protecting the health and well being of its Citizens from prospective or indirect damages -- and the fact that the State itself is unnecessarily creating damages where there were none before, is a question not relevant to the factual setting addressed. In this way, coming to grips with the direct question of identifying either hard damages or a contract is avoided, and is replaced by the Judiciary with the indirect milktoast question of possible prospective damages to Citizens [who are being protected under contract], by third parties. In this slick way, a violation of the *Public Trust* is referred to as incarceration justification -- but as is usual, it is an invisible contract that is to be found lying at the bottom of this circumvention of the Principles behind the *Republican Clause*. However, as surprising as it may sound, Government is not being placed in any special or privileged status here by the Judicature of the United States, as factually innocent third parties (like gamblers and Marijuana growers) are damaged via incarceration. In 17 Harvard Law Review at 171 (1903), there lies an article by James Ames entitled *Specific Performance for and Against Strangers to*

the Contract, wherein he discusses how third parties, interfering (or seeming to interfere) with the Commercial contract administration of others can be hauled into a Court and have an Injunction thrown at them -- then incarceration follows for continued disobedience. So the right of your regional Prince to throw penal *lex* at you without any *in personam* contract in effect and no Tort indicia damages, is no different from the recourse available to non-juristic Persons to throw their contract irritants into jail via a *Contempt Citation*. As is usual, it is ultimately a contract lying at the bottom of all of this. []

[103] The low profile background involvement of the *Radical Republicans* in working the 14th Amendment through the Congress is discussed in an article by Daniel Farber, Entitled *The Ideological Origins of the 14th Amendment*, 1 Constitutional Commentary 235 (1984). []

[104] Many times groups of people that hold special interest make their descent on Congress; some are under cover on missions for Gremlins, while others have the best of intentions. For example, one such group with the best of intentions surfaced in 1954 by proposing an amendment to the Constitution recognizing the authority, dominion, and laws of Jesus Christ. Citing Supreme Court rulings declaring that the United States was a Christian Republic, and other legal commentators like Kent, an impressive statement was made that irritated Jewish spokesmen [see *Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee of the Judiciary of the United States Senate*, 83rd Congress, Second Session, discussing Senate Joint Resolution 87 (May 13 and 17, 1954)]. However well meaning those folks were, the enactment of such a Constitutional amendment would have the Federal Government assume the role of Tortfeasor on *persons* antagonistic to Jesus Christ. So the placement of that proposed Christian Amendment on to a Juristic Institution's Charter, may have been improvident -- at that time. []

[105] Another legal definition of *waiver* is that a *waiver* is an intentional relinquishment of a known right. So, naturally, one who waives must intend to do so and must know of the existence of the right which he gives up. See generally *Insurance -- The Doctrines of Waiver and Estoppel* in 25 Georgetown Law Journal 437 (1937). []

[106] Yes, the Law does operate out in the practical setting -- it is out there where liability attaches, and it will also be found out where liability detaches, and not on paper as many Tax Protesters would like you to believe; our Father's Law is not predicated upon the existence on recent technological innovations like *ink and paper*. For example, Marriage Covenants entered into before a

judge -- signed, sealed, delivered, and possessing all of those correlative requisite legal indicia that characterize a juristic Civil Law Marriage mean absolutely nothing if the Marriage Covenant did not physically start by reason of cohabitation out in the practical setting. Common Law does not recognize the merely contractual marriage that took place *seemingly* by acknowledgement in front of a judge, but also requires cohabitation as a key indicia to deem the Marriage valid. Therefore, in *Milford vs. Worcester* [7 Massachusetts 48 (1810)], the wife was deemed not married. The *Worcester* Court relied in turn on an English case written by Lord Mansfield in *Morris vs. Miller* [4 Burr. 2059] stating that acknowledgement, cohabitation, and reputation are all key indicia to determine a Marriage's validity. [See generally, Stuart Stein in *Common Law Marriages*, 9 Journal of Family Law 271 (1969)]. []

[107] In the context of a discussion as to whether or not state revenue jurisdiction attached to a corporation, consider the following words:

> "...the simple but controlling question is whether or not the state has given anything for which it can ask ." - *Colonial Pipeline vs. Triaigle*, 421 U.S. 100, at 109 (1974). []

[108] And as the *quid pro quo* of taxation reciprocity expectations are being held binding because benefits were previously accepted, is applied to the King, so too does this *quid pro quo* also apply to the several regional Princes:

> "Accordingly, decisions of this Court, particularly during recent decades, have sustained non-discriminatory... state corporate taxes... upon foreign corporations... when the tax is related to a corporation's local activities and the State has provided benefits and protections for which it is justified in asking a fair and reasonable ." - *Colonial Pipeline vs. Triaigle*, 421 U.S. 100, at 108 (1974). []

[109] When discussing the attachment of liability to taxation statutes, the Supreme Court has very simple rules:

> "The question is whether... [General Motors accepted] consequent employment of the opportunities and protections that the State has afforded. ... The simple but controlling [taxation] question is whether the state has given anything for which it can ask ." - *General Motors vs. The State of Washington*, 377 U.S. 441 (1963).

And when the record shows that benefits have been accepted, then rightful liability does correctly attach, as reciprocity is expected back in and there lies a contract. []

[110] Therefore, contracts are in effect, right? The correct answer is partly yes and partly no. This Social Security is a hybrid. Although revenues extracted from the Countryside by the King on this Rockefeller wealth redistribution scheme originate under juristic contracts (or shall we say, justified by the imposition of contracts), however, when it comes time for the King to start to decide just where and when and to whom is he going to redistribute the loot to, now all of a sudden the contract is gone from the scene, and the political Tort question of fairness enters into the scene; and the reason is because Social Security does not conform with the contractual model of an Insurance Annuity policy:

> "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], whereby persons gainfully *employed*, and those persons who *employ* them, are taxed to permit the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled, and their dependents. Plainly the expectation is that many members of the present productive workforce will in turn become beneficiaries rather than supporters of the program. But each worker's benefits, though flowing from the contributions he made to the national economy while actively *employed*, are not dependent on the degree to which he was called up to support the system by taxation. It is apparent that the non-contractual interest of an *employee* covered by the Act cannot be soundly analogized to that of the holder of an annuity, whose right to benefits is bottomed on his contractual premium payments." - *Flemming vs. Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603, at 609 (1960).

The reason why Social Security does not replicate an Insurance Annuity in the classical sense is because, unlike Annuities, Social Security has:

> "...a clause reserving to it `[t]he right to alter, amend, or repeal any provision' of the Act. [Title 42, Section 1304]" - *Flemming*, id., at 611.

Annuity Policies do not have the right to pay out of the Annuity whatever the Insurance Company now feels like paying;

Insurance Companies cannot just drop the payments to zero or to a low level simply because they feel like it -- *because no one would buy that game* -- but Congress does have this right to make payout changes, because people who have paid into Social Security over the years did so knowing [or should have known] that their retirement benefits are indeterminate, that they have no recourse to sue the Congress if they do not approve of the payout level when they retire, and that the Congress retains the right to pay out nothing [if that day should ever come when the Congress feels like it]. And since Congress has the right to change the terms of the Social Security payout rates at its sole discretion, then payout schedules and the like [unlike Insurance Annuity contracts where everything is agreed upon exactly and set certain, up front], Federal Courts have been reluctant to:

> "...engraft upon the Social Security system a concept of `accrued property rights' [since that] would deprive it of the flexibility and boldness in adjustment to ever-changing conditions which it demands." - *Flemming*, id., at 610.

Since people entering into a participatory relationship with Social Security have no fixed, specific, or exactly known expectation of what their level of benefits might be in the future, Federal Courts have declined invitations to force the issuance of such benefit payments, and have declined invitations to declare that Social Security beneficiaries posses what Judges call *vested property rights* in Social Security [if you have a *vested property right* in something, you can force its surrender over to you]. The payout question is, quite reasonably, a purely *political question* (as Federal Judges would call it), for the Congress to decide. Yes, Judges did correctly characterize this one as being *political*. []

[111] Tontine Insurance has been analogized to contracts constituting a wagering operation, and therefore forbidden under the policy doctrine of gambling intolerance.

> "In support of their contention that the *dual-pay* policy does not offend against public policy as a wagering contract, respondent refers us to cases dealing with the Tontine or Semi-Tontine Plan of Insurance. Under such plan no accumulation of earnings are credited to the policy unless it remains in force for the Tontine period of a specific number of years. Thus, those who survive the period and keep their policies in force share in the accumulated fund. Those who die or who permit their policies to lapse during the period do not, neither do their

beneficiaries participate in such accumulation. ..."

"We have concluded that the *mortality endowment* provision of the *dual-pay* policy for the reasons herein stated, is a wagering contract." - *Commercial Traveler's Insurance Company vs. Carlson*, 137 Pacific 2nd 656, at 660 (1943). []

[112] As you can feel, insurance programs based on the Tontine Model are quite unfair and are actually degenerate, but coming down Lucifer's chain of command from Rockefeller Cartel Gremlins to their imp nominee Franklin D. Roosevelt like it did, and then blossoming out into the open public amid FDR's insincere orations, ceremonial pomp, and irritating little propositional lies, we really shouldn't be too surprised. A great man once had a few words to say about Principles, popularity, and political opportunities:

"Men are often asked to express an opinion on a myriad of Government proposals and projects. All too often, answers seem to be based not upon solid Principles, but upon the popularity of the specific Government program in question. Seldom are men willing to oppose a popular program if they themselves wish to be popular -- especially if they seek public office.

"Such an approach to vital political questions of the day can only lead to public confusion and legislative chaos. Decisions of this nature should be based upon and measured against certain basic Principles regarding the proper role of Government. If Principles are correct, then they can be applied to any specific proposal with confidence.

"Unlike the political opportunist, the true Statesman values Principles above popularity and works to create popularity for those political Principles which are wise and just.

"It is generally agreed that the most important single function of Government is to secure the rights and freedoms of individual Citizens. But, what are those rights? And what is their source? Until these questions are answered, there is little likelihood that we can correctly determine how Government can best secure them.

"Let us first consider the origin of these freedoms we have come to know as human rights. Rights are

either God-given as part of the divine plan or they are granted by Government as part of the political plan. Reason, necessity, tradition, and religious convictions all lead me to accept the Divine origin of these rights. If we accept the premise that human rights are granted by Government, then we must accept the corollary that they can be denied by Government. ...

"We should recognize that Government is no plaything. It is an instrument of force; and unless our conscience is clear that we would not hesitate to put a man to death, put him in jail, or forcibly deprive him of his property for failing to obey a given law, we should oppose the law. ...

"Once Government steps over this clear line between the protective or negative role into the aggressive role of redistributing the wealth through taxation and providing so-called "benefits" for some of the Citizens, it becomes a means for legalized plunder. It becomes a lever of unlimited power that is the sought-after prize of unscrupulous individuals and pressure groups, each seeking to control the machine to fatten his own pockets or to benefit his favorite charity, all with the other fellow's money, of course. Each class or special interest group competes with the others to throw the lever of Government power in its favor, or at least to immunize itself against the effect of a previous thrust. Labor gets a minimum wage. Agriculture gets a price support. Some consumers demand price controls. In the end, no one is much further ahead, and everyone suffers the burden of a gigantic bureaucracy and a loss of personal freedoms. With each group out to get its share of the spoils, such Governments historically have mushroomed into total welfare states. Once the process begins, once the Principle of the protective function of Government gives way to the aggressive or redistributive function, then forces are set in motion that drive the nation towards totalitarianism." - Ezra Taft Benson in *Conference Reports*, at page 17 ["Political Opportunists -- Origin of Human Rights -- Legalized Plunder"] (October, 1968). []

[113] *The Social Security Act*, 49 U.S. Statutes at Large, page 636 (August, 1935). []

[114] *Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th Edition. []

[115] Federal Judge Story, in *Delovio vs. Boit*, 7 Federal Cases, #3776, at page 444 (1815). []

[116] *Insurance Company vs. Dunham*, 78 U.S. 1 (1870). []

[117] "Polices of insurance are known to have been brought into England from a country that acknowledged the civil law [as distinguished from the Common Law]. This must have been the law of policies at the time when they were considered as contracts proper for the admiralty jurisdiction." - *Croudson vs. Leonard*, 8 U.S. 434, at 435 (1808). []

[118] This discussion is extracted from *Insurance Company vs. Dunham*, 78 U.S. 1, at 32 (1870). []

[119] *Insurance Company vs. Dunham*, id., at page 33. []

[120] *Insurance Company vs. Dunham*, id., at page 33. []

[121] Although Admiralty Jurisdiction may be designed, in its optimum sense, to rule over grievances originating out on the High Seas, the Supreme Court does not want Admiralty Jurisdiction to be so geographically restricted in its locus to water only:

> "The exclusive jurisdiction in admiralty cases was conferred on the national government, as closely connected with the grant of the commercial power [of Article I, Section 8]. The Admiralty court is a maritime court instituted for the purpose of administering the laws of the seas. There seems no ground, therefore, for restraining jurisdiction, in some measure, within the limit of the grant of the commercial power [the power to regulate Interstate Commerce]; which would confine it, in cases of contracts, to those concerning navigation and trade of the country upon the high seas and tidewaters with foreign countries..." - *New Jersey Steam vs. Merchants' Bank*, 47 U.S. 344, at 392 (1815).

In 1919, there appeared an article in Harvard Law Review, in a commentary written by the Editors, discussing the background history of how Admiralty Jurisdiction had once came ashore to find a home inland for a short time in England; but in America, when Admiralty came ashore at an early date, it stayed ashore:

> "In the fourteenth century, the jurisdiction of admiralty, which until that time had been extended to all cases partaking of a maritime flavor, was greatly curtailed by successive enactments. [Goldolphin, *A View of Admiralty Jurisdictio*n, c.12.

> See *Delovio vs. Boit*, 2 Gall. (C.C.) 398, 418]. Thereafter, the court could not take cognizance of a contract made on land, even if to be performed at sea. *Susano vs. Turner*, Noy, 67 *Craddock's Case*, 2 Brownl. & Gold 39. Nor if made at sea to be performed on land.
>
> *Bridgeman's Case*, Hobart II. These restrictions upon admiralty jurisdiction were rejected in the United States from an early date. *The Lottawanna*, 21 U.S. 558; *Waring vs. Clarke*, 5 U.S. 44]. The civil jurisdiction was made to depend, not as in matters of tort upon locality, but upon the subject matter of the contract, which must be essentially concerned with maritime services, transactions, or causalities." - *Admiralty -- Jurisdiction -- Test of Jurisdiction over Contract*s, 33 Harvard Law Review 853 (1919). []

[122] Yes, Social Security is quite popular today. No sooner had Social Security been enacted by the Congress, then both Republicans as well as Democratic Parties quickly endorsed the idea as a great thing:

> "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 benefited 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)].

...Here are the so-called *Democrats* gloating over Nelson Rockefeller's *Social Security Program,* and also the Republicans, who detected early and felt quite strongly the enormous vote pulling power of Social Security, they too quickly started drooling at the gibs for more of this wealth redistribution; like Gremlins,

Republican platform writers like to play cutesy by skirting the fringes of deception as they first state how opposed they are to FDR's Social Security, but then go right ahead and construct their own *Grab and Give* -- replicating in its entirety the structural contours of FDR's Social Security Program legally and practically. []

[123] "Tumult is from the disorderly manner of those assemblies, where things can seldom be done regularly; and war is that *decertario per vim*, or trial by force, to which men come when other ways are ineffectual. If the Laws of God and men are therefore of no effect, when the magistracy is left at liberty to break them, and if the lusts of those who are too strong for the tribunals of justice, cannot otherwise be restrained, then by sedition, tumults, and war, those seditions, tumults, and wars are justified by the Laws of God and men.

"I will not take upon me to enumerate all the cases in which this may be done, but content myself with three, which have most frequently given occasion for proceedings of this king.

"The first is, when one or more men take upon them the power and name of a magistracy, to which they are not justly called.

"The second, when one or more, being justly called, continue in their magistracy longer than the laws by which they are called do prescribe.

"And the third, when he or they, who are rightfully called, do assume power, though within the time prescribed, that the law does not give; or turn that which the law does not give, to an end different and contrary to that which is intended by it. ...

"He that lives alone might encounter such as should assault him upon equal terms, and stand or fall according to the measure of his courage and strength; but no valor can defend him, if the malice of his enemy be upheld by public power. There must therefore be a right of proceeding judicially or extra-judicially against all persons who transgress the laws; or else those laws, and the societies that should subsist them, cannot stand; and the ends for which governments are constituted, together with the governments themselves, must be overthrown. Extra-judicial proceedings, by sedition, tumult, or war, must take place, when the persons concerned are of such power, that they cannot be brought under the judicial. They who deny this deny all help against an usurping tyrant, or the perfidiousness of a lawfully created magistrate, who adds the crimes of ingratitude and treachery to usurpation. ...

"If this be not enough to declare the justice inherent in, and the glory that ought to accompany these works, the examples of

Moses, Aaron, Othniel, Ehud, Barak, Gideon, Samuel, Jephthah, Jehu, Jehoiada, the Maccabees, and other holy men raised up by God for the deliverance of his people from their oppressors, decide the question. They are perpetually renowned for having led the people by extraordinary ways to recover their liberties, and avenge the injuries received from foreign or domestic tyrants. The work of the Apostles was not to set up or pull down the civil state; but they so behaved themselves in relation to all the powers of the Earth, that they gained the name of pestilent, seditious fellows, disturbers of the people; and left it as an inheritance to those, who, in succeeding ages, by following their steps, should deserve to be called their successors; whereby they were exposed to the hatred of corrupt magistrates, and brought under the necessity of perishing by them, or defending themselves against them. And he who denies them the right does at once condemn the most glorious actions of the wisest, best, and holiest men that been in the world, together with the laws of God and man, upon which they were founded." - Algernon Sidney in *Discourses Concerning Government*, as quoted by Phillip Kurland and Ralph Lerner in *The Founder's Constitution* ["The Right of Revolution"], at 77 [University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1978); *Discourses Concerning Government* is a lengthy treatise first circulated in 1689].

# # #