

Search Sovereign Warrio [Search](#)

- [Wisevirgin](#)
- [Sign Out](#)

## [Sovereign Warriors](#)

A Virtual Island for Sovereigns

- [Main](#)
- [Invite](#)
- [My Page](#)
- [Members](#)
- [Videos](#)
- [Forum](#)
- [Events](#)
- [Blogs](#)
- [Chat](#)
- [Groups](#)
- [Leaderboards](#)
- [Photos](#)



Any and all information on this site is for educational purposes ONLY, and is NOT to be construed as legal advice..

- [All Blog Posts](#)
- [My Blog](#)
- [Edit Blog Posts](#)
- [Add](#)



## Are you a Banker?

- Posted by [Jaro](#) on December 7, 2011 at 5:30pm
- [Send Message](#) [View Blog](#)

It would appear that by statutory definition we all could be considered bankers, since we underwrite nation's Treasury and currency by our labor and property since 1933, when our real/lawful money was replaced by fiat currency. In other words, if we're CREDITORS of United States, we should be able to

issue notes against the obligation of the United States, i.e. PAY FOR PUBLIC DEBTS with our PRIVATELY-ISSUED NOTES, i.e. with our signature.

I mean if our private assets and property are being used to collateralize the obligations of the United States since 1933, we should have an account at the US Treasury against which to pay/setoff our public debts. Don't you think? I mean, all that one needs in order to issue legal tender, is an account with assets in it, against which to write promisory notes. And the only difference between checks and currency, is that currency is redeemable by bearer, not just one specified person.

BTW, note the difference between a bank and banker. One is an institution, the other a private person, so there's a difference between bank note and banker's note. So you don't need to own a bank in order to be a banker issuing banker's notes.

Page 7 of 15

"The legal statutory and professional definitions of "bank", "banking", and "banker" used in the United States Code and Code of Federal Regulations are not those commonly understood for these terms and have made the statutory definition of "Bank" accordingly:

UCC 4-105 PART 1 **"Bank" means a person engaged in the business of banking,"**

12CFR Sec. 229.2 Definitions (e) Bank means—"the term bank also includes any person engaged in the business of banking,"

12CFR Sec. 210.2 Definitions. (d)" Bank means any person engaged in the business of banking."

USC Title 12 Sec. 1813. –Definitions of Bank and Related Terms. – (1) Bank. – The term "bank" – (A) "means any national bank, State bank, and District bank, and any Federal branch and insured branch;"

Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, page 133, defines a "Banker" as,

**"In general sense, person that engages in business of banking. In narrower meaning, a private person.....; who is engaged in the business of banking without being incorporated.**

Under some statutes, an individual banker, as distinguished from a "private banker", is a person who, having complied with the statutory requirements, has received authority from the state to engage in the business of banking, while a private banker is a person engaged in banking without having any special privileges or authority from the state. "

NOTICE OF MEMORANDUM OF LAW POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL BILL OF EXCHANGE

**"Banking"- Is partly and optionally defined as "The business of issuing notes for circulation....., negotiating bills."**

Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, page 133, **defines "Banking":**

**"The business of banking, as defined by law and custom, consists in the issue of notes .....intended to circulate as money....."**

And defines a **"Banker's Note" as:**

**"A commercial instrument resembling a bank note in every particular except that it is**

**given by a private banker or unincorporated banking institution.”**

Federal Statute does not specifically define “national bank” and “national banking association” in those sections where these uses are legislated on to exclude a private banker or unincorporated banking institution.

It does define these terms to the exclusion of such persons in the chapters and sections where the issue and circulation of notes by national banks has been repealed or forbidden.

“In the absence of a statutory definition, courts give terms their ordinary meaning.

“Bass, Terri L. v. Stolper, Koritzinsky, 111 F.3d 1325, 7th Cir. Apps. (1996).

As the U.S. Supreme Court noted, “We have stated time and again that courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there.” See, e.g., *United States v. Ron Pair Enterprises, Inc.*, 489 U.S. 235, 241 -242 (1989); *United States v. Goldenberg*, 168 U.S. 95, 102 -103 (1897);

“The legislative purpose is expressed by the ordinary meaning of the words used.

“*Richards v. United States*, 369 U.S.1 (1962).

Therefore, as noted above, the legal definitions relating to ‘legal tender’ have been written by Congress and maintained as such to be both exclusive, where necessary, and inclusive, where appropriate, to **provide in its statutory definitions of legal tender for the inclusion of all those, who by definition of private, unincorporated persons engaged in the business of banking to issue notes against the obligation of the United States for recovery on their risk**, whose private assets and property are being used to collateralize the obligations of the United States since 1933, as collectively and nationally constituting a legal class of persons being a “national bank” or “national banking association” with the right to issue such notes against The Obligation of THE UNITED STATES for equity interest recovery due and accrued to these Principals and Sureties of the United States backing the obligations of US currency and credit; as a means for the legal tender discharge of lawful debts in commerce as remedy due them in conjunction with US obligations to the discharge of that portion of the public debt, which is provided for in the present financial reorganization still in effect and ongoing since 1933. [12 USC 411, 18 USC 8, 12 USC; ch. 6, 38 Stat. 251 Sect 14(a), 31 USC 5118, 3123. with rights protected under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, by the U.S. Supreme Court in *United States v. Russell* (13 Wall, 623, 627), *Pearlman v. Reliance Ins. Co.*, 371 U.S. 132, 136, 137 (1962), *The United States v. Hooe*, 3 Cranch (U.S.) 73 (1805), and in conformity with the U.S. Supreme Court 79 U.S. 287 (1870), 172 U.S. 48 (1898), and as confirmed at 307 U.S. 247 (1939).]

Views: 24

[Share Twitter](#)

Like 1

• [< Previous Post](#)



Comment by [Randy: Callison](#) 5 minutes ago

This is why Greg and Tracy Weiss were named as the creditors on their res judicata decision.

Comment




[Follow](#)– Email me when people comment

Add Comment

[RSS](#)

[Follow](#)– Email me when people comment

## Wisevirgin

[Sign Out](#)

- [Inbox](#)
- [Alerts](#)
- [Friends](#) – [Invite](#)
- [Settings](#)

432

redemption commercial strawman UCC-1 accept for value afv a4v



© 2011 Created by [Jaro](#). Powered by

[Badges](#) | [Report an Issue](#) | [Terms of Service](#)

[Sovereign Warriors Chat | 27 Online](#)

Follow the Road to  
REDEMPTION!  
Get out of the Matrix!  
Before it's too late...

[Site Search](#)  
powered by 