

GOING AFTER THE WRONG PEOPLE?

A TEST OF COMPREHENSION

BY THE INFORMER

This could be a once upon a time story but for the fact that it is true. I now present to those people who like proof, a great many proofs by writing to the location at the end of this treatise for the endnotes. For those that don't like cites but to read, I have deleted as much as I could and put them in the endnotes so as not to confuse you. I stated after writing the *New History of America* that you would get all the proofs, so much so that you would never doubt me again and probably hate that you asked for so much. This way it will please those who want the cites and those that don't want the cites. Trouble is you can't please everybody all the time, so this is my attempt to do so. My book, *The New History of America*, has the same amount of proofs but I did not include them because average Joe Sixpack wouldn't understand them.

This story starts around the 1830 era. The States and United States were getting ripped off by the banks where they deposited their money. This was called in history the great banking swindles. In order to protect themselves these, corporations, States and United States, decided to create their own Independent Treasury in 1840 under Van Buren's message, 5 Sept. 1837. However it was bitterly opposed by Henry Clay and Daniel Webster who were Whigs, a party devoted to Nationalist tendencies. The independent treasury bill, also known as the subtreasury or divorce bill, was introduced in the Senate where it passed. It incorporated the legal-tender amendment. This proviso called for a gradual reduction in the acceptance of notes of specie-paying banks in payment of government dues until 1841, when all payment should be made in legal tender. Oh, Oh, the governments are now violating their agreement back in 1783 with the Crown and violated the obligation in the Constitution that only the PRIVATE banks could issue paper money which were instituted as the first bank of the United States, which was run by foreign controlled stockholders of the British realm. These foreign stockholders are listed in the American Almanac and Repository for the year 1833, which was obtained from the University of Lewisburg. John Marshall, the Chief Justice of the supreme court is listed as having 3878 shares and the second largest foreign stockholder. He ruled against the constitution when ruling for the bank in the well known McCulloch case in Maryland. Conflict of interest runs rampant in "government" now and then doesn't it? Because the hard money would show the inflation of paper money, it had to be stopped to support the federal reserve note by the Crown operating through the internationalist bankers.

This Independent Treasury called for all government payments and disbursements to be made in hard money after June 30, 1843 and sub-treasuries were established in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, New Orleans, Washington and Charlestown. This Act was repealed when the Whig Party gained control of the country. When the Whigs were defeated in 1844, the Independent Treasury was reestablished in 1846¹. Every thing was as it should be because the Treasury now dealt in specie and tweaked the nose of the foreign banking cartel. As the saying goes, "you don't fool mother banking," when showing that paper was the cause of inflation and the cause for the banking swindles.

Enter the Rothschild/Vatican cabal that was kept from instituting the first Bank in the United States when Washington instituted the emergency powers clause of the constitution in 1791. At one time the King of England was controlled by the Vatican. The Vatican stated that the Magna Charta violates the tenets of the Church because possession of rights by anyone does so.² For those of you who think the International Bankers are behind all this, think again after reading the following. You better know history all the way back to the Bible and His Word before saying you know who pulls the purse strings. You so called "Christians" who read the *New History of America* know what I mean. This is taken from *Britannia: Sources of British History*.

KING JOHN's Concession of England and Ireland to the Pope.

In the matter of the election and installation of Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury, King John, in the words of Pope Innocent III, had by "impious persecution", tried to "enslave" the entire English Church. As a result, the pope laid on England an interdict (1208-14), a sort of religious "strike", wherein no religious service be performed for anyone, guilty or innocent. When this didn't work, the king, himself, was excommunicated. Caving-in under that pressure, John wrote a letter of concession to the Pope, hoping to have the interdict and the excommunication lifted (1213). John's concession which, in effect, made England a fiefdom of Rome, worked like a charm. The satisfied Pope lifted the yoke he had hung on the people of England and their king.

John, by the grace of God, king of England, lord of Ireland, duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, count of Anjou, to all the faithful of Christ who shall look upon this present charter, greeting. 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 own 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 other household of the lord pope, we perform and swear fealty for them to him our aforesaid 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 and our heirs by our wife forever, in similar manner to perform fealty and show homage to him who shall be chief pontiff at that time, and to the Roman church without demur. As a sign, moreover, of this our own, we will and establish perpetual obligation and concession we will establish that from the proper and especial revenues of our aforesaid kingdoms, for all the service and customs which we ought to render for them, saving in all things the penny of St. Peter, the Roman church shall receive yearly a thousand marks sterling, namely at the feast of St. Michael five hundred marks, and at Easter five hundred marks, seven hundred, namely, for the kingdom of England, and three hundred for the kingdom of Ireland, saving to us and to our heirs our rights, liberties and regalia; all of which things, as they have been described above, we wish to have perpetually valid and firm; and we bind ourselves and our successors not to act counter to them. And if we or any one of our successors shall presume to attempt this, whoever he be, unless being duly warned he come to his kingdom, and this senses, he shall lose his right to the kingdom, and this charter of our obligation and concession shall always remain firm.

Ok people, this was before the Magna Charta. The Magna Charta did not wipe this covenant out. It continued on until this present day. As far as they are concerned screw the Magna Charta. Why? Because of the Vatican\banker cabal that tried to setup the first bank of the United States. Back to the question at hand.

How does the King stop this act pulled against him? Becomes bed partners with the Rothschild/ Vatican cabal by calling on his covenant with the Vatican that you just read. See, what the King made with the people didn't change the contract with the Vatican. Just like when the Colonies made you, the man, Sovereign, and the King agreed by Treaty of 1783. It did not change the control of the colony/states by the King. So, with minor changes of the Independent Treasury during the Civil War, it remained the same until merged with the Federal Reserve System in 1913³. The federal reserve notes were used by the private banking cartel that operated in America. Even in 1890 the Congress spoke about, and acts were created wherein the federal reserve notes were mentioned. The creation of the Federal Reserve System was the inroad to get rid of the Independent Treasury. Most Board members of the Federal Reserve System were Americans who operated as front men for the internationalist's pulling the puppet strings. These federal reserve banks were empowered to rediscount the systems currency, commercial and agriculture paper of member banks, not the United States currency, and was to be based upon approved rediscounted paper deposited by member banks. Against such paper the reserve banks could issue Federal Reserve notes, which were accepted as government obligations, as part of the circulating money supply. Note, there is no mention of the United States Note because that was 100 percent backed by gold and silver. However, the Federal Reserve note had to be backed by only 40 percent of the gold and silver. Now we have two banking systems running side by side and causing great strife for the law-merchants. This was good for the average joe because he could depend on the Independent Treasury to accept his gold or silver for safe keeping and return 10 years later with a silver or gold certificate (a U.S. note) and redeem a 20 dollar U.S. note for 20 dollars of gold or silver. Not so with the Federal Reserve note, for if push came to shove he could obtain what was left after the obligation was paid by the United States on this bogus note which only needed to be backed by 40 percent gold or silver. See how the Crown via the private banking cartel is causing a problem. It's called the Hegelian theory. "Mother banking," as stated before will destroy you. It just took till 1921 to do it. The private federal reserve swindled the people's money in eight short years. When the banks couldn't pay the depositors when they wanted their own money back in 1929, they declared imperfect commercial international war on the people of America, when the Federal Reserve themselves had Roosevelt bring forth the Trading with the Enemy Act. This Act was rewritten in 1933 to include the people of America, where it had not done so before in 1917.

The Independent Treasury had a Secretary of Treasury and was named "the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States." Yes, he really existed because there was an honest to goodness United States Treasury. Enter now the problem solvers, the King in drag. They proceeded to abolish the United States Treasury in the year 1921 by the Act of 1920⁴. Now the fraud will be shown for what it is by, how do you say it; watch, for my tongue does not leave my mouth as it forks both ways of the white man, or something to that effect. In other words we are not dealing with people that we think we should be dealing with in the taxation scam. Anybody who has a 1992 CD ROM of the 50 Titles of the United States Code can pull all this material and much more. I am scraping the top portion to get you started. So here we go down the rabbit trail.

Under Independent Treasury, Title 31 USC 3322, "Historical and Revision notes; In subsection (a), before clause (1), the words 'Secretary of the Treasury' are substituted for 'Treasurer of the United States' because the of the source provisions restated in section 321 (c) of the revised title. . . . The words 'treasurer or' are omitted as obsolete because of the 1st-4th pars. under the heading 'Independent Treasury' in the Act of May 29, 1920 (ch. 214, 41 Stat. 654; also see 31 USC 3301 Historical Notes.

Ok, let us look at 41 Stat 654, which says, "Act May 29, 1920, abolished office of Assistant Treasurer at specified cities." Stat. 654 is the source for 12 USC 121. Now let us look at "section 321 (c)" in 41 Stat. Just as one would guess, that has been involved with the IRS over many years, alcohol.

41 Stat 321, source for 27 USC Sec 71 to 90a Omitted. CODIFICATION.

I will quote only two of the sections.

Section 81,⁵ related to withdrawal of alcohol produced at any industrial alcohol plant tax-free for denaturing, for use by any scientific university, for scientific research by any laboratory, or for use in any hospital or sanitarium, was incorporated in sections 3108 (a) and 3124 (a) of Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

Section 88,⁶ related to applicability of administrative provisions of internal revenue laws, was incorporated in section 3122 of Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

So let us look at "47 Stat. 1957" in Section 81, it states;
"49 Stat. 1957, related to extension of industrial alcohol laws to Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, was incorporated in section 3123 of Internal Revenue Code of 1939."

Now back to end note 4., which is the source law for 31 USC 1310. The Historical and Revision Notes state, "The word `official' is substituted for `officer' for consistency in the revised title. In clause (1), the word `Treasury' is substituted for `Treasurer of the United States' because of the source provisions restated in section 321 of the revised title and Department of the Treasury Order 229 of January 14, 1974 (39 F.R. 2280). The words `or of an assistant treasurer' in section 1 of the Act of June 23, 1874, are omitted as superseded by section 1 (1st par. under heading `Independent Treasury') of the Act of May 29, 1920 (ch. 214, 41 Stat 254."

Ok people now you know Mary Ellen Withrow is the "Treasury" because she is the "Treasurer of the United States," correct? So why is it stated in the Notes, "In subsection (c) (2), the word `Secretary' is substituted for `Treasurer" because of the source provisions restated in section 321 (c) of the revised title?" Simple there is no "secretary" that is the Secretary of the United States Treasury as there is no United States Independent Treasury anymore. Following the trail to this point you have;

WHAT ONCE WAS	IS NOW
Treasurer	"Secretary of the Treasury"
Treasurer of the United States	"Treasury"
Treasurer	"Secretary"

Read this until you have it firmly locked in your brain. The "Secretary" in the Internal Revenue Code is at present, Manual Diaz Faldana⁷, who, was the treasurer of Puerto Rico? He is the "Secretary of the Treasury of Puerto Rico." See, they don't tell you who is Secretary of what Treasury, do they? Fraud perhaps, but you didn't ask, did you? Are liars and thieves supposed to tell all? And all along you thought it was Robert Rubin or his predecessors because isn't he called Secretary of the Treasury? Don't presume anything when dealing with liars, thieves, profligates, cretins (all three branches of de facto usurpers) and the like. Now go back and tie in 41 Stat 321, 49 Stat. 1957 with Title 27, Title 26 and all other sections where the term "secretary" is used such as 6020 (b). Do not confuse the Secretary of treasury Robert Rubin with the Secretary of the Treasury Mary Ellen Withrow, (old Treasurer of the United States Treasury) or is it Manual Faldana, Secretary of Treasury of Puerto Rico? Rubin is Secretary of the treasury all right, but not of the United States. He is Secretary of treasury of the Federal Reserve/IMF. The agent of the United States that took place of the Independent Treasury through the Federal Reserve Act. That is why he has no subscribed oath of office under 5 USC 3331 and why he is paid by the International Monetary Fund/Bank found in 60 Stat 1401 et seq. Rubin is not the "Secretary" described in 26 USC 6301, is he? And neither is Mary Ellen Withrow who is also the Secretary of the Treasury according to the chart above. Now look at 26 USC 7401, and define the "secretary" so it does not conflict with the "secretary" in 26 USC 6301, defined in 27 CFR 250.11. Can the "secretary" in 7401 or

any other section be anyone other than the one defined in 6301? If it does, then provide to me the definition found in any regulation or statute for another "secretary," otherwise it would be "manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof" of what Congress had in mind when abolishing the Independent Treasury, and changing the definitions all around, huh? The Attorney General holds the Title of Alien Property Custodian and when they team up in 26 USC 7401, they both have to sign on the dotted line to prosecute you for what, Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms commercial crimes? How about contract crimes where you became a government employee receiving "Federal Wages?" I'll get to that around page 8.

Now let us see what happened to those real Treasury "officers" that were changed to "officials" in section 321 when the Independent Treasury was abolished. We go to;

Title 5 USC 5512, Historical and Revision notes. "In subsection (b), reference to the 'General Accounting Office' is substituted for 'accounting officers of the Treasury' on authority of the Act of June 10, 1921, ch 18, title III, 42 Stat. 23. Reference to the 'Attorney General' is substituted for 'Solicitor of the Treasury' and 'Solicitor' on authority of section 16 of the Act of March 3, 1933, ch 212, 47 Stat. 1517; section 5 of E.O. 6166, June 10, 1933; and section 1 of 1950 Reorg. Plan No. 2, 64 Stat. 1261."

What becomes apparent now is that the term Solicitor only deals with contracting parties and operates in Chancery court to which he represents the Treasury. There must be a contract. You have one with the government? No? better think again when we get to joint-venture. A solicitor can control the property in the interim during a case. Now there is a statute that declared the "attorney General" to become the "Alien Property Custodian." Before we get to that you will have to understand the functions of the Alien Property Custodian and why it is so critical to understand in reference to the above paragraph's dates dealing with the War Powers Act, so read Title 50 Appendix, Sec. 9. After reading this we now come to the meat of who is coming after you in conjunction with the Secretary of the Treasury of Puerto Rico by reading Part of ⁸"Attorney General". The term 'Attorney General' includes the Alien Property Custodian whose functions were transferred to the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 9788 (3 CFR 1943-1948 Comp., p.575) . . ." Please note the word "includes" is restrictive. This is proof that the word 'includes' is restrictive in all IRS code or statute where the word means is not used. You don't have to go any further than this for proofs.

⁹ "Trading With the Enemy Act. The term 'Trading With the Enemy Act' includes all amendments of such Act, and all orders, rules, and regulations issued or prescribed under such Act or any such amendment."

Now put 303.1-1 (d) " . . . charged with the liability for internal revenue tax in connection with such **property**." with 303.1-1 (g) "Property. The term 'property' includes **money**, . . ." Federal reserve notes are property to which a liability attaches under; ¹⁰ "Tax. The term 'tax' has the meaning stated in section 36(d) of the Trading With the Enemy Act as added by the Act of August 8, 1946."

¹¹ "Interest and Penalties. (a) Liability for interest and civil penalties. Under subsection (d) of section 36, of the Trading With the Enemy Act there is no liability for interest or penalty on account of any act or failure of the Attorney General."

¹² "Claims for refund or credit. "(a) Claims for refund or credit must be filed within the period prescribed by section 6511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as modified by section 36(c) of the Trading With the Enemy Act. . . ."

Hello Enemy of congress, are you listening yet. Are you comprehending that the control of the IRC is done by the Trading With the Enemy Act of congress?

Title 50¹³ PART I. PRESIDENT AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
SECTION 101. FUNCTIONS OF THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

(a) Except as provided by subsection (b) of this section, all functions vested by law in the Alien Property Custodian or the Office of Alien Property Custodian are transferred to the Attorney General and shall be performed by him or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of Justice as he may designate.

(b) The functions vested by law in the Alien Property Custodian or the Office of Alien Property Custodian with respect to property or interests located in the Philippines or which were so located at the time of vesting in or transfer to an officer or agency of the United States under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 1 et seq.), are transferred to the President and shall be performed by him or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies as he may designate.

PART II. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
SEC. 201. CONTRACT SETTLEMENT FUNCTIONS

(Repealed. Pub. L. 97-258, Sec. 5(b), Sept. 13, 1982, 96 Stat. 1068, 1085. Section transferred various contract settlement functions to the Secretary of the Treasury and abolished the Office of Contract Settlement.) **[So now the contract is with the Treasurer who was the Secretary of Treasury of the United States? Does it say Secretary of the Treasury of the United States? So it must be the Treasurer, see above who you are dealing with.]**

SEC. 202. NATIONAL PROHIBITION ACT FUNCTIONS

The functions of the Attorney General and of the Department of Justice with respect to (a) the determination of Internal Revenue taxes and penalties (exclusive of the determination of liability guaranteed by permit bonds) arising out of violations of the National Prohibition Act (see 27 U.S.C. note preceding Sec. 1) occurring prior to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, and (b) the compromise, prior to reference to the Attorney General for suit, of liability for such taxes and penalties, are transferred to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury: Provided, That any compromise of such liability shall be effected in accordance with the provisions of section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code (of 1939) (see 26 U.S.C. 7122). All files and records of the Department of Justice used primarily in the administration of the functions transferred by the provisions of this section are hereby made available to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for use in the administration of such functions."

Are they talking about "individual income taxes" here or ATF taxes? Want to know why you are licensed, AKA the SS#, to get a job or otherwise? It is due to the revamping of the War Powers Act of 1917 to make the people the enemy of the banking cartel. They charge (tax) you for the use of the military scrip, AKA federal reserve note, as it is a foreign bill of exchange. Here is but a small portion of which you will have to read it all. I told you I'm only scratching the surface and those of you that wanted cites to research here they are.

Sec. 3. Acts prohibited¹⁴
It shall be unlawful -

(a) For any person in the United States, except with the license of the President, granted to such person, or to the enemy, or ally of enemy, as provided in this Act (sections 1 to 6, 7 to 39, and 41 to 44 of this Appendix) to trade, or attempt to trade, either directly or indirectly, with, to, or from, or for, or on account of, or on behalf

of, or for the benefit of, any other person, with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that such other person is an enemy or ally of enemy, or is conducting or taking part in such trade, directly or indirectly, for, or on account of, or on behalf of, or for the benefit of, an enemy or ally of enemy.

Sec. 30. Attachment or garnishment of funds or property held by Custodian ¹⁵

Any money or other property returnable under subsection (b) or (n) of section 9 (section 9(b) or (n) of this Appendix) shall, at any time prior to such return, be subject to attachment in accordance with the provisions of the code of law for the District of Columbia, as amended, relating to attachments in suits at law and to attachments for the enforcement of judgments at law and decrees in equity, but any writ of attachment or garnishment issuing in any such suit, or for the enforcement of any judgment or decree, shall be served only upon the Alien Property Custodian, who shall for the purposes of this section be considered as holding credits in favor of the person entitled to such return to the extent of the value of the money or other property so returnable. Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the taking of actual possession, by any officer of any court, of any money or other property held by the Alien Property Custodian or by the Treasurer of the United States.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

Functions of Alien Property Custodian and Office of Alien Property Custodian, **except** those relating to property or interest in Philippines, vested in Attorney General. See notes set out under section 6 of this Appendix. emphasis added

WORLD WAR II ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

Reestablishment and termination of Office of Alien Property Custodian during World War II, see notes set out under section 6 of this Appendix.

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in title 28 section 2680.

There you have it people, the Attorney General is coming after your property and he has no interest or power over the Philippines, just you. Hey, file a tort action, it's right in 28 USC 2680. And there are other avenues located within this treatise to get remedy. The question to ask is, "What RIGHT do they have to bring the action in the first place, rather than, what claim do they have to bring?"

42 Stat. 23 created the General Accounting office which is not an agency by any stretch of the imagination.

It is an independent establishment . To prove it is not an agency read 5 USC 3132, and while you are at it pull 5 USC 4101, 4301, 4501, 5102, 5342, 5531, 5561 and 7511 for the definition of employee and who it is, and is not and 4701. 4701 describes "eligible." Here you will see if you are "eligible" to qualify for government employment, under 3401 of Title 26. If you think you have dependents that can be claimed under 26 USC 152, think again after reading Title 5 Appendix, Sec. 109 definitions. Are you a federal official? Another cite you should fully investigate is 5 USC Sec. 5921. "For the purpose of this subchapter -

- (1) 'Government' means the Government of the United States;
- (2) 'agency' means an Executive agency and the Library of Congress, but does not include a Government controlled corporation;
- (3) 'employee' means an employee in or under an agency and more specifically defined by regulations prescribed by the President; Reference to 'ambassadors, ministers, and officers of the Foreign Service under the Department of State' is omitted as included in the definition of 'employee'. Emphasis added

In the Historical notes this is more explicit; "In paragraph (3), the word 'employee' is substituted for **`individual in the civilian service'** in view of the definition of `employee' in section 2105." Further on in the notes you will find this:

"Section 522 of Pub. L. 86-707, Sept. 6, 1960, 74 Stat. 802. Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act, provided that:

'Notwithstanding any provision of this Act (enacting chapter 37 of former title 5 (now covered by this subchapter), amending other sections as shown in the Tables, and enacting provisions set out as notes under this section and section 912 of Title 26, Internal Revenue Code) and until such time as regulations are issued under this Act, employees shall continue to be paid allowances and differentials in accordance with rules and regulations issued pursuant to the laws in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act (Sept. 6, 1960) and such rules and regulations may be amended or revoked in accordance with the provision of such laws.'

By removing words such as ambassador, foreign counsel and others as surplusage, they can get away with calling anybody an employee because the definitive term was abolished. Also note the word "civilian service" does not mean you, unless you are the "eligible" working for the corporation called the United States or State because the other "service" is the military service. So "individual" is a term to describe an officer or employee of the government, NOT you from the private sector. Now go to 2105 of Title 5 and you will see that you, the average American is not described as an "employee." Oh darn it, now you have to go all the way back to 2 USC 60e, Title 5, Part III, Subpart D, Chapter 53, Subchapter III, to find the General Schedule Pay Rate of those to be taxed and the sections that apply in all 50 titles of the U.S. Codes. In there is 26 USC 7471, 9010 and 9040. Now we have to go to 22 USC 3310, FOOTNOTE 2, and that leads us to 5 USC 8334 (4) (A), federal wages. Gosh, does that mean that, 42 USC 1717, "assignment of benefits; execution, levy, etc., against benefits" apply to you under 26 USC 6331 (a) before (b), (c), (d) can apply? We have always said the reason they don't put Sec 6331 (a) on the notice of levy to your employer is fraud to cover their theft. They don't need it for one of their own because they are paying them out of the treasury.

Here is the proof. Now the cestui que trust they are operating has just dealt them a death blow under breach of fiduciary trust because the Constitution is nothing but a treaty obligation on the people in government, not you. Look also at 31 USC 1309 to see if you are working for an employer under 3401 (d) of Title 26 as an employee under 3401 (c) for this Social Security tax. Are you? A case for Joint-Venture would have to be proved to bring you into the subject matter jurisdiction. Now we are back to the "solicitor" and "Alien Property Custodian" and the "contract that you thought you didn't have. They already have jurisdiction over the subject matter because Congress gave the courts that much. A footnote in a case ¹⁷, "The now widely recognized legal concept of joint adventurers is of modern origin. It has been said to be purely the creature of the American courts. [Oh, not the legislature?] The early common law did not recognize the relationship of co-adventurers

unless the elements of a partnership were disclosed and proved. 30 Am Jur. page 676."

What this is saying is that the government does not have to prove you are in a joint-venture with them as a corporation, 28 USC 3002 (15). It is presumed you are since you claim "citizenship/ residency" and didn't object to the use of the international bill of exchange. That is the controlling fact, not that you are an employee or have wages and all the other collateral issues that haven't won in a coon's age. Ahh, but wait, you are forgetting something if you have read The New History of America and James Montgomery's three treatises on British Colony rule and the Reconstruction Acts of a De Facto congress that put you under military occupation since the act of March 7, 1867.

Under the War Powers act and military conquest under Lincoln, the states became federal agents because the states were nothing but "districts" under military rule of Congress that was a DE FACTO Congress calling us the enemy under "imperfect war." ¹⁸ YES, we are the enemy of the de factos, not the real Congress that went Sine Die back in 1789. Here is where the state income tax issue comes in ¹⁹. Also see Title 4 USC 111. 5 USC 5512 deals with "withholding of pay; individuals in arrears." This is where 26 USC 6331 (a) comes into play for all government workers and not you people. Also referencing to 60c-3 of Title 2 you will see at (c) (1) where the W-4 applies and who is to use it. Now you have the meat of the subject because this is what the term "covered employment" means, it is employment covered by federal employer or a corporation of a federal government, 28 USC 3002 (15). But wait, it gets better, so go pull and read these endnotes ²⁰. After reading these then remember 41 Stat. 321? Well at the end is 49 Stat 1964 related to the effect of act of June 26, 1936, which describes the duties and powers of the "Secretary of the Treasury." You all know by now who it is, don't we? This Stat is the source for 27 USC 202. You will love the Codification part where it states,

"Subsections (a) to (d) provided for the creation of a Federal Alcohol Administration as a division of the Treasury Department. [**Hey people, department, not united States Treasury as it was abolished**] By act June 26, 1936, ch. 830, title V, 49 Stat. 1964, however, those subsections were repealed and a new Administration created as an independent agency ²¹. The repealing act was to be effective when the new administrators authorized thereby were appointed. While the officers so authorized were never appointed and the repeal therefore never became effective, subsections (a) to (d) have been omitted in view of the Reorg. Plan No. III of 1940, set out in the Appendix to Title 5, Government Organization and Employees, which abolished the Administration and transferred its functions to the Secretary of the Treasury to be administered through the Bureau of Internal Revenue (now Internal Revenue Service)."

Don't you just love what the de facto's put in print for all to see? It's like leaving a 100 federal reserve note in plain sight and the thief never notices it. He goes for all the hiding places, as we do, and never finds what is out in plain sight.

So you think you have a good grasp on who is who? You better have because now go back and look at 41 Stat 654, which authorizes 12 USC sections 121, 419 and 467, among other Titles. A closer look at sec. 121 reveals that by statute law the Treasurer must redeem any note of any association, of which the Federal Reserve is, in United States Notes ²². So now we go to Sec. 467. Tell me if Robert Rubin or Mary Ellen Withrow is "the Secretary of the Treasury authorized to receive deposits of gold or of gold certificates or of Special Drawing Right certificates with the treasurer or any designated depository of the United States . . ."? First, tell me what Treasury are we talking about and then the name of the secretary? If need be go back and see all the substitutions for terms when the Independent Treasury of the United States was abolished such as in 31 USC 3322.

You have on hand in standard terminology the following;

1. Secretary of Treasury, Robert Rubin
2. Treasurer of the United States, Mary Ellen Withrow
3. Secretary of the Treasury, Manual Diaz Faldana, who the people have no knowledge he exists.

1. From the three above who is the "Secretary" described in 26 USC 6301 for he, "shall collect the taxes imposed by the internal revenue laws?"

2. Why do you write to Robert Rubin in a tax matter?

3. Which of the three above or none of the above, oversees all the accounting of the money of the United States?

4. Have you ever asked under 26 USC 7401 for the authorization papers signed by Manual Faldana to come after you for a civil action?

5. What about a criminal action?

6. Isn't the Attorney General a solicitor, which means there must be a contract for him to get involved in bringing you to trial? ATF business is a contract isn't it?

7. Doesn't the General Accounting Office have to report to the De Facto congress to account for all property given or taken by any officer of the United States and given to either the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States for accounting?

8. Why can't you go to the General Accounting Office²³ and demand to see where your specific property that was stolen has been properly accounted for by the GAO and that it was properly lodged with either the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States?

9. Isn't it possible that since the GAO is an independent instrumentality reporting only to de facto congress, that they are the next target to sue out for the response the IRS should have given you?

It might be for the following reason.

TITLE 10, Subtitle A, PART II, CHAPTER 55
Sec. 1084. Determinations of dependency

A determination of dependency by an administering Secretary under this chapter is conclusive. However, the administering Secretary may change a determination because of new evidence or for other good cause. The Secretary's determination may not be reviewed in any court or by the General Accounting Office, unless there has been fraud or gross negligence.

So here is another "court" you can go to besides "any court." There is certainly enough fraud to defraud you of your property, labor, for commercial paper of no substance therefore, no quid pro quo. The Appellate pleading in Bruun v Hanson, 103 F. 2d 685, not the case you pull from the library, is the kicker against them. There are a few people who have the entire case. Should you like a copy call A.C.P.H. at 704-369-0064.

10. On the federal reserve note there appears two signatures, one is the Treasurer of the United States, the other Secretary of the Treasury, correct?

11. Since the first is of the United States and the other is of a private banking concern, do we now have a foreign bill of exchange authorized by two separate entities?

12. Does this not then become an international bill of exchange, which operates all over the world wherein some countries use it as their medium of exchange as does Panama?

13. If the Treasurer of the United States signed the note, what earthly good reason would her Secretary have to sign it and in what authoritative capacity?

14. Wouldn't it be redundant and cause the "note" (military scrip) to fail all banking laws on being a valid "note?"

Under Military law the civil authorities have been given control over the collections of revenues²⁴.

1. Are revenues under maritime principles and subject to admiralty rules?
2. Are Admiralty rules controlled by the commander in chief of a nation?
3. Does The United States have a President who is the commander in chief?
4. Is it under treaty to collect debts for the British Crown?
5. Does there exist a blocking Code on the IMF/BMF for U.S./U.K Treaty?

The de facto congress has complete control over military rule, not the President of the corporation called the United States. This is evidenced by the veto of President Johnson's veto after Lincoln was killed. Congress put the people back under the military rule. Congress set the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. That's all it set up. It did not set up the Bureau of Internal Revenue. That fact has been brought to light so many times it's stale. In fact, not once, in all my research in Title 5, Government Organization, did the IRS, as an instrumentality, agency, or independent establishment ever rear its ugly head to be defined as such. A department of Treasury means just that, a department because there is no U.S. Treasury any more. But go back and look at page 4, 31 USC 1310 and WHAT ONCE WAS- NOW IS. Therefore, any U.S. Attorney is committing fraud when defending or acting as plaintiff party for the IRS, which is not a legal entity. Name the statute generated by Congress that authorizes a U.S. Attorney to defend or represent a private IRS flunky that is simply hired by a district director, and not as a valid United States Employee under 5 USC 2105? Then to make matters more complicated for them, ask the Secretary of State, Madeline Albright, to authenticate the record that she has issued a license for that attorney to practice his profession as does every other corporate profession. You might have fun with the States also, because the Supreme Court only issues certificates of "club" incompetence to an attorney and have no executive power to license any one or any profession as does the Executive under UCC Rules.

Since I have exposed the admiralty principles used by the government in the two cases cited in my writings²⁵ that stated the procedure must start out in Admiralty, then proceed to the civil side of Admiralty to complete the case, shows how Manual Faldana plays an important part. This Secretary of Treasury was created, and by the Jones Act (Puerto Rico) and 48 USC 1469a-1 says, "Full amounts to be covered into treasuries of Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands; reductions prohibited.", play a important part. The phrase "covered into" is controlling. Now for your homework, research this phrase "covered into," and "covered employment."

The real characters you should be addressing are; The "Secretary" of the Treasury of Puerto Rico, the Service Center Director, The Chief Collection officer, the Chief Assessment Officer, who are his "delegates," then the Treasurer of the United States, the Alien Property Custodian (Attorney General), the General Accounting Office Director, and finally Congress, the real criminal usurpers (de facto). Why have an alien property custodian? Because when the de facto congress in 1867 created an enemy, that is us the people, need to have enemies property taken it goes to the alien property custodian. Have I rung any bells yet or are the cobwebs so thick the fly can't escape? Bring charges against Congress, especially the one or two usurpers that services the "district" that the action takes place against you. Charge them with every crime you can that they are subject to in Title 18. After all it is they who are bound by those corporate laws not you. Did you take an oath to uphold their corporate obligation handed down by the Crown? Did you take an oath of allegiance to their corporate flag? You know, the allegiance that was concocted and put into practice in the very late 1890's, that none of the "Founding Fathers" would ever dream of pledging. Sure, you can defend your country without taking allegiance to a piece of cloth that represents a monarchy in sheep's clothing, while it is really collecting from the ignorant sheeple the debt it owes to the Crown by a treaty made long before you were born. I think you call that FRAUD of monumental proportions and a criminal act of their fiduciary capacity in administering a

Cestui Que Trust, the Constitution. Not to mention the real benefactors are sucking the life blood out of you through their fraudulent banking system by using inflatable paper to confiscate the hard money that the first real United States Treasury tried to avoid. How are some of you so called "patriots," for want of a better name, going to spread truth if you don't know the truth? For starters why don't you spread the word for people to buy and read *The New History of America* and James Montgomery's *British Colony I, II, & III*.

You want to get your property back? You have to go to the Alien Property Custodian under the following, if not predisposed to go to the Secretary of the Treasury of Puerto Rico.

50 USC APPENDIX - WAR AND NATIONAL DEFENSE Sec. 9
TITLE 50, APPENDIX
TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT OF 1917 ACT OCT

Sec. 9. Claims to property transferred to custodian; notice of claim; filing; return of property; suits to recover; sale of claimed property in time of war or during national emergency.

-STATUTE-

(a) Any person not an enemy or ally of enemy claiming any interest, right, or title in any money or other property which may have been conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien Property Custodian or seized by him hereunder and held by him [**that's the Attorney General**] or by the Treasurer of the United States, [**that's Mary Ellen Withrow**] or to whom any debt may be owing from an enemy or ally of enemy whose property or any part thereof shall have been conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien Property Custodian or seized by him hereunder and held by him or by the Treasurer of the United States may file with the said custodian a notice of his claim under oath and in such form and containing such particulars as the said custodian shall require; and the President, if application is made therefor by the claimant, may order the payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery to said claimant of the money or other property so held by the Alien Property Custodian or by the Treasurer of the United States, or of the interest therein to which the President shall determine said claimant is entitled: Provided, That no such order by the President shall bar any person from the prosecution of any suit at law or in equity against the claimant to establish any right, title, or interest which he may have in such money or other property. If the President shall not so order within sixty days after the filing of such application or if the claimant shall have filed the notice as above required and shall have made no application to the President, said claimant may institute a suit in equity in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such claimant resides, or, if a corporation, where it has its principal place of business (to which suit the Alien Property Custodian or the Treasurer of the United States, as the case may be, shall be made a party defendant), to establish the interest, right, title, or debt so claimed, and if so established the court shall order the payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery to said claimant of the money or other property so held by the Alien Property Custodian or by the Treasurer of the United States or the interest therein to which the court shall determine said claimant is entitled."

There is a lot more to this statute. I suggest you pull it and read it, especially all of you charged with 18 USC 371, which is listed in Benedict On Admiralty, as specifically a maritime (commercial Crime), look at 27 CFR 72.11. This Title continues to state;

CROSS REFERENCES

Conspiracy to defraud United States, see section 371 of Title 18, Crimes and Criminal Procedure.
Payment of taxes and expenses by Alien Property Custodian, see section 23 of this Appendix.

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 4, 12, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 44 of this Appendix; title 28 section 2680.

Is this Statute stating that those having this property of yours are committing a 371 crime if it is not reported? Does the Statutes apply to the corporate government officials, employees and the like, and NOT you, the slave to the system? Does this affect the IRS agent and those above him in command, all the way to the "Secretary" defined in 26 USC 6301? Could you go to the GAO and have them do an accounting of the property taken from you to see that it was reported and given to the Alien Property Custodian and the Treasurer of the United States? Think, people, think and use the brain the Lord Almighty gave you. Do you still want to be robbed again and again by a de facto congress and state legislators, the same as if a thief demanded money from you to only steal a little from you each year? And if you didn't he would seize your property as "booty" and sell it? That's exactly the type of usurpers you are living under and you give them your blessings to do it by voting for them as "your representatives." Read my *New History of America* and see what I mean. Your vote doesn't count one iota. The Electoral College votes as it sees fit to protect the usurpers. What do you do to usurpers? That's your choice. But don't continue to complain when you do no research. I don't want to hear that you have no time or that you are not educated enough. If I can do it, so can you. Collectively you can form groups. Collectively you have the time to be continually robbed, don't you? It makes me sick to hear people whine constantly and not do anything about it and then get mad at the researcher for trying when you love to be robbed day in and day out for your whole life with the lame excuse, "Oh, what would we do with out government we have to pay taxes?" Bah, Humbug! I told you I am only scratching the surface with this short treatise.

But here is the kicker that destroys the last paragraph. What if they come after you admitting that the USE of the private federal reserve scrip is what they are laying a tax upon? It's their private international bill of exchange isn't it? They flood the market with it don't they? Don't they have to recall some of it so it won't get out of hand so that you need two wheel barrows full of paper that has a number of 100 on it to buy one loaf of bread? I remember when bread was 15 cents a loaf and my dad saying that some day it will be a dollar a loaf. Of course, we, as kids just laughed it off. Gosh, never will it go that high, we thought, because if it did what will we have to pay for our 7 cent coke and nickel candy bar? Someone coined a phrase, "we came a long way baby," didn't we? In 1947 cigarettes were 20 cents a pack. What were your taxes then, compared to now

when you factor in income and inflation based on the 1939 standard. I think the dollar is worth 2 1/2 cents. So the nickel cone is today right on the 1939 Std. at around two bucks. Of course I never use the word "dollar" as it doesn't exist.

This is a factually correct treatise but has one failure. We have no courts with which to take our grievance. Remember we are under military rule of usurpers that control each and every court in this land under treaty with the Crown to pay their debt. Do you think for one moment that the head honcho of a Mafia would allow one of his straw bosses to get away without paying a debt when he didn't collect enough from the people he gets protection money from? Do you think that the people who pay protection money will be allowed to get away without paying the straw boss? What happens to the people when the straw boss is refused any more protection money? Beat up, property destroyed or even killed to set an example for others to pay so that he can pay the head honcho? What court of the Mafia do you think the one's paying protection could go to get relief? None? That's exactly what has happened to us. They control everything. They are the Tyrants spoken of in the 48 Hours program aired September 3, 1997 and why there are over 800 Militia Groups forming. But let me tell you the truth. The mass of asses don't give a damn and the Federal Mafia knows it and plows right on, knowing a dumbed-down populace will believe and fear the Mafia; still believing they are free and the Constitution will protect them. Not until enough people get trapped in a situation with the "law" that wakes them up, will anything be done to rid the usurpers from this land. Who ever thought that failing to sign a 1040 Form would amount to a felony conviction when the statutes specifically shows that one is not required to file anything unless they fit two categories of taxable activities. In which, they receive property of the government that is to be returned for the revenue privileged activity, and that does not mean expending ones life force, Labor, to only be compensated for what life diminishing force he lost. In other words there can be no restitution to a de facto group of tyrants that are protected by the most hated class of people known to the Lord Almighty when he spoke of them in Matthew, the lawyers, Pharisees and Scribes, for without them we would all live with justice and in more peace than ever before.

They continue to create absurd penalties that make one a felon that only in the last century were simple misdemeanors. Insatiable power comes from these profligates in making people felons for non violent malum prohibita crimes, that were reserved to Malum in se crimes. These are the bane of mankind and why you will not win in their courts on a large scale. For the Lord admonished us should we go to their courts. Usurpers have their de facto courts. Why don't we have our own grand juries and set up our own courts? Because it's been tried and they have the power to stop us because there are not enough people hurting enough to say STOP, we are the true sovereigns here, NOT the Corporate State of So & So. We have not been shown where we waived our sovereignty by any document. All right, let them produce it so you know how they usurped power. Think they ever will? If you said yes you are living in la la land of honey and spice and everything is nice fairy tale. As the black man said "Black Power," let us get together with "White Power" and then we would have enough "total Power" to oust the usurpers? That is why the usurpers have created racial strife. Divide and conquer. They have done a pretty good job, wouldn't you say? How many know enough of the real truth to turn their own laws against them? Has it been done yet? I rest my case on Lysander Spooner's statements which I will not restate as I have done over and over till I'm blue in the face and only a few will read it and understand. For those of you that want the endnote cites send a self addressed stamped envelope and 5 bucks, cash only to; A bar C, c/o 7055 Mountain Rd., Oxford (27565), North Carolina, U.S.A. Voluntary use of Zip is found in 1997 Domestic Mail Manual AO 10.1.2 Part D.

The Informer

ADDENDUM

This is an addendum to the Informer's Treatise of 9/2/97. It is to explain in more detail about the Charters and Declarations made after the Charter between the Vatican and the King of England after William the Conqueror took all the land from the English people, forever more, that they hold no land in allodium. The following is by James Montgomery and proves my dissertation and the quote immediately after Endnote 2.

"The two main issues as I see them in this paper are, one the 1213 Charter is still in effect. Two, the last sentence of the 1689 Bill of Rights proves the following:"

"That the Charters of the Colonies could never be overturned by a Declaration of Independence, or the 1787 treaty, otherwise known as the Constitution, I'm talking about the real subject matter, financial obligation. Title for the land could be transferred to the states and then ceded to the federal government under trust, but the contracted debt and obligation of the Colonial Charters, and the 1213 Charter could not be negated.

This why King Charles I said, the 1689 Bill of Rights would not free the kingdom from the obligation of the 1213 Charter.

This is why the United States Bank was given right of Charter in America. George Washington had no choice but to succumb to the Rothschild's point man, Hamilton. Talk about deja vu, I mean does this not sound familiar.

Our Bill of Rights was given to us, to give us the illusion of freedom. When the tax obligation of the Charters above marched along un-impeded and un-seen, by Americans and Britons alike. Read the Magna Charta again, they wanted the Pope's blessing for the 1215 Charter, this same Pope is the Pope in the 1213 Charter where England and Ireland were given to him. He could not just give back his land, because of other parties not yet born. The Pope let the barons presume they were free and gave his blessing to the 1215 Magna Charta, knowing to do so would in no way lawfully overturn the grant made to him in the 1213 Charter. Also, it is apparent, it was recognized as law that you could not even create a Charter, wherein you declared a previous grant or Charter null in void unless the relevant parties agreed.

How can a Charter be made void if parties to the Charter will never cease to be born, an heir can always be found. To prove this, again what did the new king Charles I do, even though the previous monarchy had come to an end, its obligations did not; this is why he had to included paragraph III, a clause to protect the other parties of an earlier Charter."

Endnotes

1. Aug. 6, 1846, ch.90, 90 Stat. 59
2. G.R.C. Davis; Magna Charta. Trustees of the British Museum. London 1965

3. The Owen-Glass Act
4. Act of May 29, 1920, (ch. 214 41 Stat 254)
5. Acts of Oct.28, 1919, ch 85, title III, sec. 11, 41 Stat 321; Aug 27, 1935, ch 740, sec. 18, 49 Stat 876; June 26, 1936, ch. 830, title III, sec. 329 (b), 49 Stat 1957.
6. Act Oct. 28, 1919, ch 85, title III, sec. 18, 41 Stat. 322.
7. Note 26 USC 6301 and 27 CFR 250.11, defines this "secretary."
8. 26 CFR 303.1-1 (b)
9. 26 CFR 303.1-1 (f)
10. 26 CFR 303.1-1 (j)
11. 26 CFR 303.1-6
12. 26 CFR 303.1-7
13. TITLE 5, APPENDIX, REORGANIZATION PLANS REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1947, 12 F.R. 4534, 61 STAT. 951, AS AMENDED ACT JUNE 30, 1949, CH. 288, TITLE VI, SEC. 602(A)(1), FORMERLY TITLE V, SEC. 502(A)(1), 63 STAT. 399, REDESIGNATED SEPT. 5, 1950, CH. 849, SEC. 6(A), (B), 64 STAT. 583; SEPT. 13, 1982, PUB. L. 97-258, SEC. 5(B), 96 STAT. 1068, 1085, Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, May 1, 1947, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945.
14. TITLE 50 APPENDIX TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT OF 1917 ACT OCT
15. (Oct. 6, 1917, ch. 106, Sec. 30, as added Mar. 10, 1928, ch. 167, Sec. 15, 45 Stat. 275.) TITLE 50 APPENDIX TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT OF 1917 ACT OCT
16. Title 5 USC 104; Title 5 USC 902 leading you to 902 (a) of former Title 5 and Title 60e-2(b) and all of 2 USC Chapter 4.
17. Porter v. Cooke, 127 F 2d 853 note 8
18. 78 Am Jur 2d WAR Secs. 2 thru 7 and 167; People v Mcleod, 1 hill 377, 25 Wend 483; Head, Money Cases, 112 U.S. 580, 28 L.ed. 798, 5 S. Ct 347; Fleming v Page, 50 U.S. 603, 13 L. ed. 236
19. 5 USC 5517, cross reference to 2 USC 60c-3, 60e-1a and 60e-1b and Title 37 Sec. 1007; 5 USC 5520 cross to Title 39 USC 410
20. 31 USC 702, 702 (d); 41 Stat. 254; 5 USC 5513, 49 Stat. 393; 5 USC 5561 (2); 5 USC 5531 (1), (4), (5), (6), (7); 2 USC 60e-1a at a (1), (2), (d) (1) & (B), (C) and (C) (2) and the codification; 2 USC 60e-1b; 2 USC 60c-3, (a) (1) thru (c).

21. Title 5 Appendix, Reorganization Plans, Reorg. Plan No III of 1940, Sec. 1 and 2. 54 Stat 1231, 54 Stat 231, as amended 72 Stat. 806; 96 Stat 1068, 1085
22. Source law, June 20, 1874, ch. 343, Sec. 3, 18 Stat. 123; Dec. 23, 1913, ch. 6, Sec. 20, 38 Stat 271; May 29, 1920, ch. 214, Sec. 1, 41 Stat 654.
23. 2 USC 478, 654; 5 USC 104, 902, 3132,4701, 5102, 5342, 5531, 7328; 15 USC 42, Note, judges are paid the same as these commissioners under civil service, so where is the article III judges?; 15 USC 637c; 26 USC 3304, 6050M; 31 USC 702, 703, 713, 771, 781, 3301.
24. 26 CFR Part 303, 303.1-1; 303.1-6; 303.1-7
25. 37 Federal Rules of Decision 564; 56 F.R.D. 459; and also U.S. Reports, Index to Admiralty Rules, Act of 23D of August, 1842, Chapter 188, 5 Stat. 516, Rules 23 to 32; The Cornell Law Quarterly, Vol X, No.4 June , 1925, How the Federal Courts Were Given Admiralty Jurisdiction, pg 460; Columbia Law Review, Vol. IX, No. 1 January 1909, Jurisdiction of The Admiralty in Cases of Tort; Benedict on Admiralty any Edition published by Matthew P. Bender.

ENDNOTES