

The Kings, Popes and Parasites in Early American History

Interrogatories about the Constitution and American Law

By R.E. Sutherland, M.Ed./sciences

OBJECTIVE: If you do not know where you came from, then you certainly cannot know where you are going. It is time to review history and pull together some of the lesser known facts for edification and purification of what America was, is and chooses to become. Seek the Truth, and then you will become aware of the shackles on your ankles and the blinders on your eyes.

NOTE: This author has chosen to use well known academic sources for the concepts commonly taught at the high school level. As the answers become more complicated, the more analytical and legal sources will be used. This is an attempt to keep a difficult subject as simple as possible.

+++++

QUOTE: "The reason why [deception cannot be forced on an Individual] is because deception has to be first created, then conveyed, and then accepted by others – then only can deception succeed. Deception can only find fertility in a human mind to the extent that mind is receptive to it; similarly, in a sense, it actually takes two people to manufacture a successful lie: the first to utter the lie, and the second to accept it as such." –1985, Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier.

1. Who funded the grants for the land development in the original 13 Colonies?

ANSWER: There were several entities involved in exploring America, but the King of England was the point of contact. Other countries said that they had claim to lands; however, they were not clever enough to get the paperwork straight, nor were they strong enough to defend their legal Claim; hence, they lost both the legal and physical battle for occupation of America.

2. What were the names, founding dates, and connections to the King of England by the original 13 colonies?

[SOURCE: World Book Encyclopedia (WBE)]

ANSWER:

1067-Virginia - Charter by King to the Virginia Company of London

1620-Massachusetts - Charter granted by the King to the Puritans

1623-New Hampshire - King appointed Council of New England for settlement

1624-New York - Charter by King to Duke of York

1622-Connecticut - Charter by King to John Winthrop
1634-Maryland - Charter by King to Lord Baltimore
1636-Rhode Island - King granted "Charter of Rhode Island & Providence Plantations"
1638-Delaware - Charter by King to Duke of York
1643-Pennsylvania - Grant by King to William Penn
1653-North Carolina - Grant by King to Sir Robert Heath
1660-New Jersey - Grant by King to Duke of York
1670-South Carolina - Grant by King to Eight "Lords Proprietors"
1733-Georgia - Grant by King to a Corporation entitled: "Trustees for Establishing the Colony of Georgia in America"

3. Who owned the colonies?

ANSWER: The legal contracting documents for the colonies were of three types, but all of them were under the direction of the King of England:

- (a) royal - under the direct control of the King
- (b) proprietary-under the control of a Proprietor, an appointed by the King
- (c) corporate-under a charter obtained from the King of England by a company with stockholders. [SOURCE: WBE]

4. Did each colony have its own form of government?

ANSWER: Each colony had a governor and a legislature; however, the King of England appointed the governor over the royal colonies. In proprietary colonies, the King appointed the Proprietor, who appointed the governor. In Connecticut and Rhode Island the people elected the governor; however, Connecticut was under the Fundamental Orders until it received a royal charter in 1662 and Rhode Island was under the English charter of 1663, which served as its constitution. [SOURCE: WBE]

5. Did the colonies have laws?

ANSWER: The laws that were passed by any of the colonial legislatures had to be approved by the English government. Governors appointed by the King had the responsibility of carrying out his orders. The King expected them to enforce the laws of England, especially acts of Parliament that regulated colonial trade. [SOURCE: WBE]

6. Did Christopher Columbus discover and claim any of the original 13 colonies for Spain or Portugal?

ANSWER: No. Columbus traveled around the areas of Jamaica, Costa Rica, Panama, etc. [SOURCE: WBE]

7. What is a Commodity Exchange?

ANSWER: "Commodity exchanges are voluntary trade associations. They are called organized markets, because all members must follow certain trading rules. All business, for example, must be conducted on the trading floor within certain hours. Rules set the commission (fee) that may be charged in a transaction, and the time within which payment must be made." [SOURCE: WBE]

8. Did the colonies have connections to a Commodity Exchange in England?

ANSWER: Yes, It was called the Board of Trade (1621-1970)

QUOTE:

URL: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/>

"The 1621 Privy Council, directed by the King, 'to take into their consideration, the true causes of the decay of trade and scarcity of coin within the Kingdom and to consult the means for the removing of these inconveniences.' As a result a committee of inquiry was set up named 'The Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Foreign Plantations' (this is still the formal title of the 'Board of Trade') and this committee can be regarded as the germ of the Board of Trade."

"Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, trade matters remained the responsibility of Privy Council Committees. In 1696 William III set up a body of eight paid Commissioners 'for promoting the trade of our Kingdom and for inspecting and improving our plantations in America and elsewhere.'"

9. Does the word "plantation" mean a large farming enterprise?

ANSWER: No. The definition found in Burke on Conciliation of the Colonies stated, "Plantations—colonies; the plantings of a new society or race. The term is regularly so used in Acts and Charters, and has no reference whatever to cultivation of the soil."

10. Did the King of England operate on his own as a free agent in the creation of the colonies?

ANSWER: No. The King of England was bound to the Treaty of 1213. The following brief history explains who was actually in charge of the colonies.

QUOTE:

[INTRO: The King refused to accept Stephen Langton as the Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope Innocent III in 1208, and the King was excommunicated from the Catholic Church by the Pope for his disobedience to contractual agreements to the Crown. The Pope and the King owed money to the Crown bankers, so the Pope had to reign in a naughty King in order to avoid default to The Crown.]

"Faced with defeat by the forces aligned against him by the Vatican, King John ran for cover, and sought to regain the support of the Pope. He returned the title to his kingdoms of England and Ireland to the Pope, as vassals, swore submission and loyalty to him, accepted Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury, and offered the Pope a vassal's bond of fealty and homage, an annual tribute of 1,000 marks (equivalent to a bit more than 666 pounds sterling) and the return of the Church property he had seized when he had rebelled against it.

"Two months later, in July 1213, King John was: absolved of excommunication, at Winchester, by the return Arch Bishop of Canterbury Langton.

"Three months later, on October 3, 1213, King John ratified his surrender of his kingdoms to the Pope, who by virtue of his position as Vicar of Christ claims ownership of everything and everyone, on earth in the tradition of the Nazarene-Communist supercapitalist superdictatorship that is true fundamentalist Christianity.

"On April 21, 1214, the Pope, in Rome, formally accepted King John's surrender of his kingdoms and his pledge of vassal (together with the moneys paid in tribute); and three months later, in July 1214, Pope Innocent III raised the interdict against the English.

"Thus the Pope assured the English of 'access to Heaven,' from which they had been 'barred' by their king's opposition to the church's Nazarene, or Communist, totalitarianism and denial of civil rights to mankind."

[SOURCE: British Museum Publication G. R. C. Davis, entitled Magna Carta (211), and American Counsel of Christian Laymen: How Red is The Federal Counsel of Churches.]

11. Did the Treaty of 1213 actually affect the ownership of the colonies?

ANSWER: The Vatican owned the colonies, but let the King serve as the manager for the enterprise. The Vatican was busy fighting Crusades and expanding The Kingdom.

12. What did the Treaty of 1213 actually say?

ANSWER: The original Treaty of 1213 is located in the London Archives and is available to Ph.D.s; however, a copy of a translation has been made available. It remains in power to this day. It states:

QUOTE: "The King's Concessions of May 15, 1213 to the Pope—"We wish it to be known to all of you, through this our charter, furnished with our seal, that inasmuch as we had offended in many ways God and our mother the holy church, and in consequence are known to have very much needed the divine mercy, and can not

offer anything worthy for making due satisfaction to God and to the church unless we humiliate ourselves and our kingdoms: we, wishing to humiliate ourselves for Him who humiliated Himself for us unto death, the grace of the Holy Spirit inspiring, not induced by force or compelled by fear, but of our own good and spontaneous will and by the common counsel of our barons, do offer and freely concede to God and His holy apostles Peter and Paul and to our mother the holy Roman church, and to our lord pope Innocent and to his Catholic successors, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom Ireland, with all their rights and appurtenances, for the remission of our sins and of those of our whole race as well for the living as for the dead; and now receiving and holding them, as it were a vassal, from God and the Roman church, in the presence of that prudent man Pandulph, subdeacon and of the household of the lord pope Innocent, and his catholic successors and the Roman church, according to the form appended; and in the presence of the lord pope, if we shall be able to come before him, we shall do liege homage to him; binding our successors aid our heirs by our wife forever, in similar manner to perform fealty and show homage to him who shall be chief pontiff at that time, and to the Roman church without demur. Concessions of May 15, 1213 to the Pope." [END QUOTE]

13. Who were the members of the British Board of Trade?

ANSWER: The Board included agents of the King of England, members of the Privy Council (i.e., legislative bodies), and the Archbishop of Canterbury who represented the Church of England. [SOURCE: World Book Encyclopedia (WBE)]

14. Were Jews allowed on the Board of trade?

ANSWER: No. The Board refused to allow either the Lombards or the Jewish moneylenders onto their Board. They were segregated because their religious rules made them useful for the Board. The following quote is an excellent explanation.

QUOTE: The Federal Reserve Conspiracy and Rockefeller (1952)
By Emanuel Josephson

"Since commerce and money are the livelihoods of nations and their peoples, the control of money is the obvious key to the control of nations and the world. ...Rome's successor the Holy Roman Empire dissimulated its interest in money and its power. This was in accord with its professed tenets of Nazarene, theistic Communism.

"Under ecclesiastic Canon Law, even profits in business transactions were decreed to be the cardinal sin and capital offense of 'usury' As late as the sixteenth century, one hundred businessmen were burned at the stake in Geneva, as a penalty under Church law, for making profits in their business transactions. **Title to all wealth, as well as to the person and lives of all the earth, are claimed by the Church, on the ground that their ownership is divinely vested in the Pope as the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth.**

"Thus theistic, Nazarene Communism, and the 'modern' religion that goes by the name of Communism and is supposedly atheist, both are basically supercapitalist and both mask their grab for money and wealth.

"Title to all wealth was vested in the Church and in its champion 'knights,' who at the same time assumed the role of so-called 'protectors,' much like the present day labor leaders of their vassals whom they mercilessly enslaved and looted.

"Both Churchmen and lay knights used the despised Jews for the conduct of their usurious financial operations, in order to avoid 'sinning' and the death penalty that it involved. The Jews proved very useful and handy for that purpose. Their use was justified by their 'CHRISTIAN' masters in a manner that they were taught by their faith was incontrovertible. Jews were damned and doomed by their faith and their failure to accept the divinity of Jesus and the perversion of His teachings by the Jewish merchant, Saul of Tarsus, alias St. Paul, opined the Churchmen; and therefore, it was 'good work' to hasten them to damnation.

"This they did by forcing their Jewish serfs to engage, as their pawns, in the 'sin' and 'crime' of 'usury' by which was meant the charging of interest as well as loan sharking and engaging in profitable commerce, for their Christian, ecclesiastical bosses.

"Often the Churchmen barred the Jews, by their orders and laws, from engaging in any other vocation than those to which the stigma of usury was attached, especially loan-sharking, as their agents. This was a particular advantageous set up for the Churchmen. For if the Jew was merciful and failed to extract from the victims everything that they possessed (i.e., the last drop of blood), he was burned at the stake as a 'heretic.'

"On the other hand, if the Jew mercilessly followed orders of his priestly boss, was honest with his boss and amassed a fortune for him and for himself, there was nothing to bar his Christian master from exercising his cupidity and robbing his faithful loan-shark by charging him with the 'sin' of usury, confiscating the fortune he had made in his service, and with great hypocritical show of 'piety,' burn him at the stake—to ensure his salvation.'

"The victorious Lombard invaders of the Holy Roman Empire changed the financial situation in much the same manner as have the latter day Mafia extortioners and blackmailers. Seizing control of the Church, they gave themselves 'dispensation' to disregard the Canon Law on usury. They openly engaged in it from the very steps of the Vatican.

"Dispensation from the Canon on Usury was subsequently granted by the Vatican, in the 15th century, to the German Fuggers, the Rockefellers of that era. Their profits from commerce, usury and the sale of papal dispensations, as agents of the Vatican, grew rapidly, as did their 'payoff' to the church. They were heaped with Papal honors. Both their grasping greed and merciless loan-sharking earned for them

distrust and terror. When one of their number was elevated to the rank of Cardinal, the Churchmen feared that the Fuggers would reach out and steal the Vatican itself. They then decided that their Jewish pawn were more completely at their mercy, more amenable and safer.

"Trusteeship of the fortune of one of the wealthiest Christian rulers of Europe, whose confidence had been earned by honest and trustworthy dealings during the Napoleonic wars, is the source of the wealth and influence that the Rothschilds acquired in the first decades of the 19th century.

"Subsequently, after making a large loan to the hard pressed Vatican, that no Christian would consider making, they became the fiscal agents of the Vatican, received Papal decorations and preferments, and enforced the policies dictated by the Church. It was largely in this sense that they were 'international bankers.' And the policies dictated by them were in effect the policies dictated by the Church. They enforced those policies through their establishments in many lands.

"An amusing story is told of the earliest relations of the Rothschilds with the Vatican. The Vatican found itself short of ready cash after almost half a century of war waged on it for the Jesuit Order by one of its unordained members, Adam Weishaupt, to avenge its abolition, in 1773, as 'immoral and a menace to the Church and the Faith' by short lived Pope Clement XIV in his Papal breve Dominus Ac Redemptor.

"Weishaupt and his fellow Jesuits cut off the income to the Vatican by launching and leading the French Revolution; by directing Napoleon's conquest of Catholic Europe; by the revolt against the Church led by such priests as Father Hidalgo, in Mexico and Latin America; by eventually having napoleon throw Pope Pius VII in jail at Avignon until he agreed, as the price for his release, to reestablish the Jesuit Order. This Jesuit war on the Vatican was terminated by the Congress of Vienna and by the secret, 1822 Treaty of Verona. . .

"The Rothschilds sought to extend their financial and political dominion to the United States, for themselves primarily to serve their Vatican masters. The Vatican's interest in the U.S. Republic was clearly revealed in the Treaty of Verona, in which the Jesuit Order pledged itself, as the price of reestablishment, to destroy 'the works of Satan' that it had accomplished in setting up, by revolts, representative governments such as republics and so called 'democracies.'

"Senator Robert Owen pointed out, in the Senate, that the prime target to which the Vatican and the 'Holy Alliance' directed the subversive and destructive activities of the Society of Jesus is the United States, [See **Congressional Record, April 25, 1916**], as well as other republics in the Western Hemisphere. This plot, he related, was the target at which the Monroe Doctrine was directed.

"The Rothschild-Vatican cabal unsuccessfully attempted to gain control over the power of the purse in the U.S. through the First and Second Bank of the United

States. They were established under the emergency powers granted the President by the Constitution, as temporary institutions to tide the country through the periods of financial stress occasioned by the Revolutionary and 1812 Wars." [END QUOTE]

15. Did the original 13 colonies have a court system?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUOTE: "Encyclopedia of American History - "in 1697 the British Board of Trade, under the Navigation Act, established vice-admiralty courts in all the colonies. These courts had jurisdiction over Trade, ordinary maritime cases as well as prize. It even granted jurisdiction by the Act of 1722 over infringements concerning timber. These Admiralty courts, set up under the Townshend Acts, centered final control in America." [Source: The New History of America, by The Informer, page 4]

16. What were the types of jurisdiction assigned to the courts in the colonies?

ANSWER: Admiralty and maritime.

QUOTE: "Admiralty, by Benedict, 1850:

"Its necessary effect [the Act] was, however, to start the courts on that system of practice, and really to impose upon them, in admiralty and maritime cases, the civil law practice, as that under which they must continue to administer justice, even after the expiration of that act, until further provision could be made."

"Section 105–The Purpose of the Constitutional Grant–The Essential Harmony of the Maritime Law. **The grand purpose of the Constitution** was to unify the several states , the whole people, in their national, international, and interstate relations and all other purposes were subordinate and ancillary to this.

"Section 123 – The commission to the Governor as Vice-Admiral was very full, granting, in language so clear that it cannot be misunderstood, an admiralty jurisdiction as wide and beneficial as the most zealous supporters of the English Admiralty ever claimed for it."

17. What is the legal meaning of the word: "federal"?

ANSWER: The word "federal" simply put means "contract."

QUOTES: From The American College Dictionary, 1947:

"Federal – 1. Of or pertaining to a compact or a league, esp. a league between nations or states."

"Compact—an agreement between parties; a covenant; a contract."

NOTE: The more modern dictionaries are missing the original definitions as the university professors began to reshape society by gradually changing the definitions of words our students learn and use.

18. Did Commercial Contracts in the United States evolve from something else?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUOTE from Section 065, "Invisible Contracts," by George Mercier:

"Here in the United States, in a Commercial contract factual setting, the word 'covenant' is an Old English Law Merchant origin, and now means only a few clauses within a larger contract..."

19. Is there a difference between Government commerce and Private commerce in law?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUOTE from Section 387, "Invisible Contracts," by George Mercier:

"Admiralty Jurisdiction is the KING'S COMMERCE of the High Seas . . . But as for that slice of Commerce going 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."

20. Do Admiralty courts still exist today?

ANSWER: Yes, it is the United States Federal Court system.

QUOTE:

"This is the type of court that exists today and why we cannot bring a pure Article of the Bill of Rights argument into a contract [i.e., federal] court of the Law-Merchant in their civil law. As Benedict states at Section 5," ... The civil law was held to be the law of admiralty, and the course of proceedings in admiralty, closely resembled the civil law practice." All maritime revenue cases, whether State or United States, deals in contract. ...

[Source: The New History of America, by The Informer, page 5.]

QUOTE from Section 049, "Invisible Contracts," by George Mercier.

"In such administrative enforcement proceedings under grievances arising out of privileges and contracts that Congress created, Federal Judges are acting MINISTERIALLY as Legislative Court, **functioning as an extension of the agency for the King**, and not Judicially as an Article III Court acting like neutral and disinterested referees calling the shots as umpires between adversaries; and so some steps taken by the Judge acting MINISTERIALLY, to shorten the proceedings or otherwise silence the Defendant when irrelevant subject matter is being discussed, are largely non-reversible on appeal. In Northern Pipeline vs Marathon Pipe Line [458 U.S. 50 (1982)], the Supreme Court ruled that Congress can create non-Article

III LEGISLATIVE COURTS in three areas: Territorial Courts, Military Courts Martial, and in disputes involving privileges that Congress created in the first place [MARATHON, id., at pages 64 et seq.]. Participating in that closed private domain of King's [government] Commerce is very much accepting and benefiting from a privilege created by Congress.

QUOTE:

"A case in admiralty does not, in fact, arise under the Constitution or Laws of the United States."

American Ins. Co. V Canter, 1 Pet. 511, 545 (1828).

QUOTE: "We don't use the word constitution in this court," said the Aiken Federal Judge during a hearing for a Freedom of Information Act violation in the City of Aiken. This author was the Plaintiff, and was awarded damages for the failure of the city to give information per the FOIA, but no discussion about the constitutional merits of the case were allowed to be discussed..

21. The U.S. Constitution states in Article I, Section 8, "The Congress shall have Power . . . To borrow Money on the credit of the United States; . . . To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures". So, why is there also paper money if it is not constitutional?

ANSWER: It all began in 1751 with the English Parliament.

QUOTE from Source: The New History of America, by The Informer, page 7:

"In March of 1751, the British Board of Trade presented Parliament with a Restraining Act, which barred the Colonies, by law, from issuing paper money and letters of Credit. This gave the King's orders the validity of formal law. The Colonies didn't buy it, for it destroyed their control of the trade. You see, there was no gold or silver being mined in America. They had to rely on gold and silver from other countries. England had most of the gold.

"On July 10, 1754, the Confederacy was born because of this, so they could issue paper money, only on their joint order. Ben Franklin had long advocated this.

"In March of 1775, the Pennsylvania Assembly borrowed money and issued bills of Credit without authorization of either King or Governor. The Board of Trade tried another ploy and said that Gold and Silver have intrinsic value, and therefore, should be used by the Colonies. Because of 'them' issuing 'paper money' it 'ruins the Colonies,' so said the Tories.

"Now get this people, Franklin replied to the contrary saying that paper money served as a medium of exchange and credit had made possible the growth of the Colonies and their trade. He told the Board of Trade that the Tories argued that the paper money issued by the colonies was a dilution of their control of wealth.

"This explains why the federal government is denied the power to issue currency other than coin or to set up or charter banks. But they do it under 'emergency power.' This is why the present day private Federal Reserve System, counterpart of the British Board of Trade, runs this country today.

"Now you know why the Crown initiated the coin only clause in the Constitution, so the private bankers could control the paper credit. **Paper is NOT money.**"

QUOTE from Section 390, 'Invisible Contracts,' by George Mercier:

"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 reticulation of Federal Reserve Notes makes the King [government] an automatic silent Equity third party to the arrangements."

22. What other names were given to the British International Bankers in history?

ANSWER: They were called Fruggers, Knights Templar, Gisors, Tuscans, etc., and today they are called The Crown. [The Myth and The Reality, by The Informer, Page 6]

23. Legally DEFINE: Contract, Charter, Compact and Constitution?

ANSWER:

Contract: "An agreement between two or more persons which creates an obligation to do or not to do a particular thing... A legal relationship consisting of the rights and duties of the contracting parties; a promise or set of promises constituting an agreement between the parties that gives each a legal duty to the other and also the right to seek a remedy for the breach of those duties. [Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition]

Charter: "An instrument emanating from the sovereign power, in the nature of a grant, either to the whole nation, or to a class or portion of the people, to a corporation, or to a colony or dependency, assuring to them certain rights, liberties, or powers ... A charter differs from a constitution, in that the former is granted by the sovereign, while the later is established by the people themselves. [Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition]

Compact: "...A contract between parties, which creates obligations and rights capable of being enforced and contemplated as such between the parties, in their distinct and independent characters..." [Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition]

Constitution: " ... A charter of government deriving its whole authority from the governed. The written instrument agreed upon by the people of the Union, or a particular states, ... In a more general sense, any fundamental or important law or

edict; as the Novel Constitutions of Justinian; the Constitutions of Clarendon." [Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition]

24. Was the United States Constitution a charter, compact, constitution or contract?

ANSWER: It was a compact between the Vatican, who controlled the King of England, and the aristocrats of the thirteen colonies. [The New History of America, by The Informer, Page 20]

QUOTE: John C. Calhoun, in 1831 said, "The Constitution of the United States is, in fact, a compact, to which each State is a party." [SOURCE: The New History of America, by The Informer, page 20.]

QUOTE: Thomas Jefferson in 1789 stated, "To this compact each State acceded as a State, and is an integral party, its co-states forming, as to itself, the other party."

QUOTE: "Patrick Henry said he was 'no longer a Virginia, but an American.' He did not say he was an American citizen, because the compact merged all confederate states as if one, and you couldn't tell the difference." [SOURCE: The New History of America, by The Informer, Page 20]

QUOTE: "United States is a place within America and it is not a country. Also, what you were not told were the framers signed the Constitution as witnesses only. In law, that is an impossibility to witness a document no one signed ... The Constitution was not only never signed by anybody, but it was never delivered by anybody, or to anybody's agent or attorney. It can therefore be of no more validity as a contract, than can any other instrument that was never signed or delivered ... On general principles of law and reason, the oaths which these pretended agents of the people take 'to support the Constitution,' are of no validity or obligation. And why? For this, if for no other reason, viz., that they are given to nobody. There is no privity (as the lawyers say) –that is, no mutual recognition, consent, and agreement—between those who take these oaths, and any other persons." [SOURCE: The Myth and The Reality, by The Informer, pages 10-13]

25. In legal terminology, is there a difference between "We, the People" and "We, the people?"

ANSWER: Yes. In the phrase, "We, the People" the capitalized word makes it a proper noun, which means that "the People" was a specific group (i.e., the aristocrats). In the phrase, "We, the people" the common noun indicates that the phrase refers to people in a general sense. [The Myth and The Reality, by The Informer, Pages 25-26]

26. In 1776, who was "We, the People" referring to in the U.S. Constitution?

ANSWER: The "People" referenced by the Constitution were the wealthy aristocrats. All of the men held Grants and Charters with the King. They owed him, as well as The Crown, interest on the credit extended to them for planting the new society. They profited very well from their exports all over the world. [The Myth and The Reality, by The Informer, Page 23]

QUOTE: Patrick Henry said, " ... But, Sir, give me leave to demand, what right had they to say, 'We, the People? If the States be not the agents of this compact, it must be one great consolidated National Government of the people of all the states.'" [SOURCE: The Myth and The Reality, by The Informer, page25.]

27. Why did the aristocrats meet in secret to discuss the Constitution?

ANSWER: The Founding Fathers were in very big trouble. They were wealthy men, who had credit with the King via The Crown. They owed contractual debts, which the King expected them to pay. The Crown fronted the money for the King's enterprise, so the International Bankers would hold the King responsible for that debt, if the colonists refused to pay their debts. All were obligated to the King with written and signed contracts. The leaders in the colonies were held responsible for the rebellion (i.e., Revolutionary War). They were wealthy aristocrats, who also had large parcels of land, huge estates, and other revenue producing businesses back in the old country. The Vatican controlled King placed the wealthy aristocrats into a political 'checkmate'. The King sent them a choice. They could lose everything they owned in Europe, or they could quietly go along with a form of government that would allow the King to manipulate the future, on behalf of The Crown, for profit, and the aristocrats would go along with a lie to the people, which was to tell them they won the war. The wealthy men chose to deceive the public. They were told to Witness their agreement on the compact document to pledge that they would cooperate with the King. The compact was called "The Constitution for the United States", which is duly stated in paragraph number one of the document. [SOURCE: The Myth and The Reality, by The Informer, pages 22-24]

NOTICE the words "for the United, because these men did something on behalf of unsuspecting fellow countrymen. The public school system and elected officials have created a wonderful myth for us to believe about the derivation of the Constitution, but it was not an honorable meeting.

28. Who actually wrote the Constitution?

ANSWER: The Vatican along with The Crown drafted the constitution, and the King's agents delivered it to the aristocrats in America for witnessing. [SOURCE: The Myth and The Reality, by The Informer, Pages 22-27.]

29. How did the Constitution protect The Crown's investments in America?

ANSWER: Article VI of the Constitution states: "All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the Confederation..."

30. When did the United States actually come into existence?

ANSWER: The website for the Central Intelligence Agency states: "Britain's American colonies broke with the mother country in 1776 and were recognized as the new nation of the United States of America following the Treaty of Paris in 1783."

NOTICE: The USA was not official for seven years after the announced "victory" of the Revolutionary War.

31. What were the terms of the Treaty of Paris in 1783?

QUOTE:

The Ten Articles of the Treaty of 1783

Courtesy of the National Archives and Records Administration.

Preface. Declares the treaty to be "in the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity," states the bona fides of the signatories, and declares the intention of both parties to "forget all past misunderstandings and differences" and "secure to both perpetual peace and harmony."

Acknowledging the Thirteen Colonies to be free, sovereign and independent States, and that the British Crown and all heirs and successors relinquish claims to the Government, propriety, and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof;[2]

Establishing the boundaries between the United States and British North America (for an account of two strange anomalies resulting from this part of the Treaty, based on inaccuracies in the Mitchell Map—see Northwest Angle and the Republic of Indian Stream);

Granting fishing rights to United States fishermen in the Grand Banks, off the coast of Newfoundland and in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence;

Recognizing the lawful contracted debts to be paid to creditors on either side;

The Congress of the Confederation will "earnestly recommend" to state legislatures to recognize the rightful owners of all confiscated lands "provide for the restitution of all estates, rights, and properties, which have been confiscated belonging to real British subjects [Loyalists]";

United States will prevent future confiscations of the property of Loyalists;

Prisoners of war on both sides are to be released and all property left by the British army in the United States unmolested (including slaves);

Great Britain and the United States were each to be given perpetual access to the Mississippi River;

Territories captured by Americans subsequent to treaty will be returned without compensation;

Ratification of the treaty was to occur within six months from the signing by the contracting parties.

Spain received East and West Florida under the separate Anglo-Spanish peace agreement

[SOURCE: Wikipedia.com]

32. Who was the "most holy and undivided Trinity" that is mentioned in the declaration paragraph of the Treaty of 1783?

ANSWER: The Vatican, the King of England, and The Crown (i.e., international bankers). [SOURCE: The Myth and The Reality, by The Informer, Page 100]

33. What is the legal definition of the word "church"?

ANSWER: A simple definition of church would be that it is a business.

QUOTE: "Church--In its most general sense, the religious society founded and established by Jesus Christ, to receive, preserve, and propagate His doctrines and ordinances. It may also mean a body of communicants gathered into church order; body or community of Christians, united under one form of government by the profession of the same faith and observance of the same ritual and ceremonies; place where persons regularly assemble for worship; congregation; organization for religious purposes; religious society or body; the clergy or officialdom of a religious body." [Black's Law Dictionary]

34. What is the legal definition of the word "business"?

QUOTE: "... Enterprise in which person engaged shows willingness to invest time and capital on future outcome. Doggett v Burnet, 62 App.D.C. 103, 65 F.2d 191, 194." [Black's Law Dictionary]

35. Is the United States actually a church organization, an extension of the Vatican?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUOTE: "If North Carolina is only a geographical place in America in which the State resides along with you, who is supreme? Is not the State a corporate religion? Is the Lord a religion? I think not. Are there many religions in the State? To be recognized as a religion do not those religions have to register with the IRS/FED/STATE team to get a 501c-3 exemption? This goes against what the "government" preaches, that being, church and State separation. Government drones are hypocrites, because to be a church you must be controlled by the very State that boasts that church and State must not mix. This is where logical minds do not prevail in the masses and they have no reasoning or common sense. Who then is the master, if the State will not recognize the religion, if not licensed? So one religion controls all others through

license. Shades of merry ole England and the Crown that controlled all religions before the what, revolutionary war? But what if you are under another "church" called government? The Lord said he set His Church upon this Rock, meaning he set His GOVERNMENT upon this earth, NOT some church building or religion ... you can see why the State is telling you that they can't mix the Church (Government) of the Lord and the State's government (church?). How fatuous to believe we are free people and can worship the Almighty and follow His laws without the Crown interfering; paying taxes to a rogue IRS that cannot be proven to be created by the legislature and which operates through fear, extortion, threats, killings, jailing, seizures, suicides and the like to keep everyone in bondage to pay a tribute to the elite integrationists using England as a front since it too went bankrupt before the United States did in 1861. . . [The New History of America, by The Informer, Pages 16-17]

36. Was the U.S. Constitution "ratified" or "adopted"?

ANSWER: It was adopted.

QUOTE: [Preamble to the Bill of Rights – "THE Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution ..."

37. What is the difference between "ratified" and "adopted" in legal terminology?

ANSWER:

"Adopt. To accept, appropriate, choose, or select. To make that one's own (property or act) which was not so originally. To accept, consent to, and put into effective operation; as in the case of a constitution, constitutional amendment, ordinance, court rule, or by-law."

"Ratify. To approve and sanction; to make valid; to confirm; to give sanction to. To authorize or otherwise approve, retroactively, an agreement or conduct either, expressly or by implication."

[SOURCE: Black's Law Dictionary]

38. Why did the wealthy aristocrats choose to adopt the compact called "The Constitution for the United States", which was sent to them by the Vatican via the King of England on behalf of The Crown?

ANSWER: The King had the leaders of the colonies in a 'checkmate.' They owed him money.

QUOTE: "In March of 1775 the Pennsylvania Assembly borrowed money and issued bills of Credit without authorization of either King or [appointed] Governor." [The New History of America by The Informer, Page 7]

QUOTE from Our Enemy the State, by Albert J. Nock:

" ... More than half the delegates to the constitutional convention in 1787 were either investors or speculators in the public funds. Probably sixty percent of the values represented by these securities were fictitious, and were so regarded even by their holders.

QUOTE from The New History of America, by The Informer, Pages 31-33:

"They also had many land holdings and businesses in Europe ... Well, they won independence from the King until the King wanted all his money he invested in his British colonies, now called the confederate states. If the British Board of Trade was concerned in 1700 about losing wealth, then this was the time for them to take control of the situation. After all, paper money was being printed in just about every confederate state, thereby wiping out the Bank of England's control of the wealth. The Treaty of 1606 still existed, (see James Montgomery's work) so the King gave the ultimatum to the 'men.' ...

"America had no navy to defend the waters. It was dependent on the trading with foreign countries of Europe using British trading ships. America was not yet self sufficient. The King knowing this said to the men, I will seize all your property and business in England, under escheat. I will run a blockade on the ocean and allow no trading to be carried on. I will have total control in the amount of time your stores run out due to lack of trade. They knew it was just a matter of time for this to happen, so, they agreed to cut a deal.

"This deal was to make the confederation appear to be very frail so they could draft up a compact. This compact would suck in all the states in which the states would be forbidden to use their own paper money. The **corporate** States, which you did not create, were bound to pay their debts in silver, Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1. But, it cannot extend to the people, they can use anything they want. Now you can understand a little better what I stated near the beginning about the British Board of Trade controlling the whole works... As Patrick Henry stated, are you starting to 'Smell a Rat?'

" Is it any wonder why the 'We, the People' rushed to seal the deal between the King and themselves, leaving us the little people in the dark? This would allow the British Board of Trade to use its international banking cartel to again control the trade through the use of its paper notes. In exchange the King would solidify, by two more treaties, under the compact/agreement of the new Constitution, his hold on his property in America. England was very near bankruptcy and had to hold onto its holdings in America. Being business men, the 'We's' jumped at the offer and a **new**

constitution was formed. It was formed by "WE the People." Was the We the People the 75% of the people in America? No! The "We the People" were only those that drafted the Constitution, therefore the need for the capital P in People. ...

"So after all the smoke cleared the people had a new King and some vice-admirals called governors of each of the political subdivision. Those in power still ruled the 75% of the masses that didn't give a darn."

39. What are the divisions of American Jurisprudence?

ANSWER: There are two major divisions: Tort Law and Contract Law. [Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier. Section 013.]

QUOTE: In Section 018, Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier states:

"In general terms, both American Jurisprudence and **Nature** that it is modeled after are divided into actions that fall generally under Tort Law and Contract Law.... For a presentation of the history of the bifurcation of Law into Tort and Contract going back into 1200 A.D., see C.H.S. Fifoot in HISTORY AND SOURCES OF THE COMMON LAW, TORT AND CONTRACT; [Stevens and Sons, London (1949)].

40. What is the difference between Tort Law and Contract Law?

QUOTE: In Sections 018-021 , Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier states:

"Very simply, Contract Law applies to govern a settlement of a grievance whenever a contract is in effect. This means that only certain types of very narrow arguments are allowed to be plead in Contract Law grievances, since only the content of the contract is of any relevance in the grievance settlement ..."Commercial contracts are born, live and then die, in their own strata, without the Constitution offering any significant restraintment on Legislative intervention ...In contrast ... we have Tort Law. Think of Tort Law as being a Judgment Law to settle grievances between persons where there are damages, but without any contract in effect between the parties."

EXAMPLES of Contract Law: (1) Securities law, (2) Estate Inheritance law, (3) Quasi-Contracts, etc.

EXAMPLES of Tort Law: (1) Civil Rights, (2) Wrongful Death, (3) Product Liability, (4) Aviation law, (5) Personal Injury, (6) Accident Recovery, (7) Professional Malpractice, (8) Unfair Competition, (9) Admiralty and Maritime Torts, (10) Fraud and Anti-Trust actions, etc.

QUOTE: Wigmore, Select Cases on the Law of Torts, page vii (1912 states:

"Never did a Name so obstruct a true understanding of the Thing. To such a plight has it brought us that a favorite mode of defining a Tort is to declare merely that it is

not a Contract. As if a man were to define Chemistry by pointing out that it is not Physics or Mathematics."

41. What are the three main parts of a binding contractual agreement?

ANSWER: The three parts of a binding contract are: Offer, Acceptance, and Consideration.

Explanation: (1) An Offer must be made to someone else, (2) .the Offer must be voluntarily Accepted, and (3) if both parties "voluntarily give, exchange, perform, or promise one another something of value, then you've got Consideration. [SOURCE: Law for Dummies, by John Ventura, JD, Page 16]

QUOTE: In Section 013 of, Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier states:

" ... A perfect, well-rounded contract requires not only a promise and a Consideration, but a participation by each party in both of these elements ..." – Edward Bennett in Considerations Moving From Third Persons in 9 Harvard law Review 233, at 233 (1895).

QUOTE: In Section 001 of, Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier states:

"Whenever there is an exchange of benefits and there remains some lingering expectations of some duty between two parties, then an actual INVISIBLE CONTRACT is in effect ... as it is said that the duty owed back to the party initially transferring the benefits is RECIPROCAL in nature."

42. Is there a legal difference between "signing" and "witnessing" a document?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUOTE: "Sign –To affix one's name to a writing or instrument, for the purpose of authenticating or executing it, or to give it effect as one's act... To make any mark, as upon a document, in token of knowledge, approval acceptance, or obligation."

QUOTE: "Witness - In general, one who, being present, personally sees or perceives a thing; a beholder, spectator, or eyewitness... One who testifies to what he has seen, heard, or otherwise observed... A person attesting genuineness of signature to document by adding his signature... One who is called upon to be present at a transaction, or the making of a will... " [Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition]

43. Was The United States Constitution "signed" or was it "witnessed?"

ANSWER: Read the document. It states, "Done in Convention by the Unanimous Consent of the States present the Seventeenth Day of September in the Year of our

Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven and of the Independence of the United States of America the Twelfth in Witness whereof We have hereunto subscribed our Names, ..."

NOTE: Remember in Part 3, Item 25, one learned the difference between "We, the People" and "We, the people." The constitution was created for and witnessed by a specific body of men, and it **did not apply to the more general population**, which is clearly noted in the way it uses capital letters.

44. Did the men who "witnessed" The United States Constitution participating in the beginning of a "con job" for the colonists which continues today?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUOTE from Edmond Burke in March 22, 1775 with his Speech on Conciliation with America:

"... Let the colonies always keep the idea of their civil rights associated with your government—they will cling and grapple to you, and no force under heaven will be of power to tear them from their allegiance. But let it be once understood that your government may be one thing and their privileges another that these two things may exist without any mutual relation—the cement is gone, the cohesion is loosened and everything hastens to decay and dissolution. As long as you have the wisdom to keep the sovereign authority of this country as the sanctuary of liberty, the sacred temple consecrated to our common faith, wherever the chosen race and sons of England worship freedom, they will turn their faces toward you. The more they multiply, the more friends you will have, the more ardently they love liberty, the more perfect will be their obedience. Slavery they can have; they can have it from Spain; they may have it from Prussia. But until you become lost to all feeling of your true interest and your natural dignity, freedom they can have from none but you. This commodity of price, of which you have the monopoly. This is the true Act of Navigation, which binds to you the commerce of the colonies, and through them secures to you the wealth of the world. Deny them this participation of freedom, and you break that sole bond which originally made, and must still preserve, the unity of the empire... Let us get an American revenue as we have got an American empire. English privileges have made it all that it is; English privileges alone will make it all it can be."

45. What are the legal jurisdictions mentioned by the United States Constitution and what is involved in each?

ANSWER: Common Law, Equity Law, and Admiralty/Maritime Law. [Source: UCC Connection, by Howard Freeman, page 5]

Common Law. "In general, it is a body of law that develops and derives through judicial decisions, as distinguished from legislative enactments. The 'common law' is

all the statutory and case law background of England and the American colonies **before the American revolution.**" [Source: Black's Law Dictionary]

LAYMEN definition: There is no Compelled Law. Covers a damages. This is Criminal law.

Equity Jurisdiction. "In a general sense, the jurisdiction belonging to a court of equity.." [Source: Black's Law Dictionary]

LAYMEN definition: One is compelled to perform to the letter of any contract. This is CIVIL law.

Admiralty law and Maritime Law. Involves commerce on the High Seas and International Contracts. Involves Compelled Performance with Criminal Penalties.

46. Is there a difference between Admiralty Law and Maritime Law?

ANSWER: Yes.

(1) Admiralty Law. Commerce on the high seas that involves the King (i.e., government).

QUOTE: Admiralty is a subdivision of King's Commerce such that all of King's Commerce that takes place over waterways and the High Seas ... Is assigned to be governed 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.... 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 ... 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 gree-wheeling evidentiary jurisdiction–anything goes). SOURCE: Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier, Section 383]

(2) Law Merchant. "Commerce on the high seas that does not involve the King (i.e. government)."

QUOTE: "The system of law which particularly relates to marine commerce and navigation, to business transacted at sea or relating to navigation, to ships and shipping, to seamen, to the transportation of persons and property by sea, and to marine affairs generally. " [Black's Law Dictionary]

47. How did Admiralty Law become the jurisdiction in the Federal Courts?

ANSWER: Federal Reserve Notes

QUOTE: "Up until the mid-1800s here in the United States, very frequently merchants paid off each other in gold coins and company notes ... 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 ... and Admiralty Jurisdiction, which applied to Commercial contracts where the King was a party.... 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." [Source: Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier, Section 390]

QUOTE: "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... " [Source: Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier, Section 396]

48. How does one become financially entangled in the Admiralty Law system in the USA?

ANSWER: The Birth Certificate combined with the adult who performs Acceptance of Benefits.

QUOTE: "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... 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." [Source: Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier, Section 411]

QUOTE: "Remember that when benefits are being accepted in the context of reciprocity being expected back in return, then there lies a good tight contract." {Source: Invisible Contracts, by George Mercier, Section 412]

49. What is Statutory Law?

ANSWER: Codified Merchant Law.

QUOTE: Statutory Law. "That body of law created by acts of the legislature in contrast to constitutional law and law generated by decisions of courts and administrative bodies." [Source: Black's Law Dictionary]

QUOTE: "The word "colorable" means something that appears to be genuine, but is not. Maybe it looks like a dollar, and maybe it spends like a dollar, but if it is not redeemable for lawful money (silver or gold) it is "colorable." If a Federal Reserve Note is used in a contract, then the contract becomes a "colorable" contract. And "colorable" contracts must be enforced under a "colorable jurisdiction." So by creating Federal Reserve Notes, the government had to create a jurisdiction to cover the kinds of contracts, which use them. We now have what is called Statutory Jurisdiction, which is not a genuine Admiralty jurisdiction. It is "colorable" Admiralty Jurisdiction the judges are enforcing because we are using "colorable money." Colorable Admiralty is now known as Statutory Jurisdiction." [UCC Connection, by Howard Freeman, page 6]

50. What happened in 1938 that revolutionized American jurisprudence?

QUOTE from a judge to an attorney: "Name any decision of the Supreme Court after 1938 and I'll honor it, but all the decisions you read were prior to 1938, and I don't honor those decisions. Prior to 1938, the Supreme Court was dealing with Public Law; since 1938, the Supreme Court has dealt with Public Policy...." [UCC Connection, by Howard Freeman, page 3]

QUOTE by the attorney: "I found that 1938 was the year of the Erie Railroad v. Tompkins case of the Supreme Court. It was also the year the courts claim they blended Law with Equity. I read the Erie Railroad case ... The district court had decided on the basis of Commercial (Negotiable Instruments) Law: That this man was not under any contract with the Erie Railroad, and therefore he had no standing to sue the company ... This overturned a standing decision of over one hundred years ... In the Erie Railroad case, the Supreme Court ruled that all federal cases would be judged under the Negotiable Instruments Law. There would be no more decisions based on the Common Law at the federal level ... All our courts since 1938 were merchant Law courts and not Common Law courts." [UCC Connection, by Howard Freeman, page 4]

51. Why did the USA judges abandon Public Law and switch to Public Policy for decisions?

QUOTE from a Judge: "In 1938, all the higher judges, the top attorneys and the U.S. attorneys were called into a secret meeting and this is what we were told: America is a bankrupt nation—it is owned completely by its creditors. The creditors own the Congress, they own the Executive, they own the Judiciary and they own all the state

governments. Take a silent judicial notice of this fact, but never reveal it openly. Your court is operating in an Admiralty Jurisdiction—call it anything you want, but do not call it Admiralty." [UCC Connection, by Howard Freeman, page 4]

QUOTE from a Judge: "The reason they cannot call it Admiralty Jurisdiction is that your defense would be quite different in Admiralty Jurisdiction from your defense under the Common Law. In Admiralty, there is no court, which has jurisdiction unless there is a valid international contract in dispute. If you know it is Admiralty Jurisdiction, and they have admitted on the record that you are in an Admiralty Court, you can demand that the international maritime contract, to which you are supposedly a party, and which you supposedly have breached, be placed into evidence. No court has Admiralty/Maritime Jurisdiction unless there is a valid international maritime contract that has been breached. So you say, just innocently like a lamb, 'Well, I never knew that I got involved with an international maritime contract, so I deny that such a contract exists. **If this court is taking jurisdiction in Admiralty, then place the contract in evidence.** so that I may challenge the validity of the contract. What they would have to do is place the national debt into evidence. They would have to admit that the international bankers own the whole nation, and that we are their slaves." [UCC Connection, by Howard Freeman, page 5]

52. For what are the international bankers waiting if the nation is bankrupted?

QUOTE by an attorney: "But the bankers said it is not expedient at this time (i.e., 1980s) to admit that they own everything and could foreclose on every nation of the world. The reason they don't want to tell everyone that they own everything is that there are still too many privately owned guns. There are uncooperative armies and other military forces. So until they can gradually consolidate all armies into a World Army and all courts into a single World Court, it is not expedient to admit the jurisdiction the courts are operating under..." [UCC Connection, by Howard Freeman, page 5]