CONTACT

THE PHOENIX PROJECT JOURNAL

GOD'S NEW MILLENNIUM

KNOWING TRUTH IS NOT ENOUGH—
SUCCESSFUL CHANGE REQUIRES ACTION

VOLUME 42, NUMBER 11 **NEWS REVIEW** **$ 3.00** **APRIL 7, 2004**

"Changing A World"

Is A Very Large Consideration

3/29/04—#1 (17-226)
MON., MAR. 29, 2004 1:01 P.M. YR 17, DAY 226
Manila, Philippines

RE: UPDATE ON STATE OF OUR UNION

THIS IS NOT "THE" UNION—
JUST OUR STAYIN' ALIVE REPORT

The email "server" (whatever that means) has been "down" more than "up" and so it goes. But the email doesn't.

Summer has HIT big time and is only outdone as to meltdown by Christmas and New Year's Day. AND, EJ did a terrible blunder today by finding a very large thermometer that does "degrees F" and, being somewhat without psychological brain-warp, did plaster it right on the table by our workspace. NOT SMART! With the aircon going the room is already down to 88 degrees—very definitely in the RED ALERT zone. That is pretty much OK, though, as we just got back from walkin' the streets where it was mid-90s and climbing. To you still in snow it probably sounds pretty much like that proverbial paradise looking for the tradewinds and palm trees.

FOUNDATION STATUS:

We understand we have all of the necessary forms RE-filed and somehow they were to get walked to the SEC today. Rush? Perish the thought! I am even amused at what is called the "rush hour" for that for sure is a dead stop wherever you happen to find yourself—middle of the street or elsewhere.

E.J. met yesterday with some people who have been here many times before and seem to have some role in down south places, like for instance The Swamp which keeps rolling up to attention as the Government and New Worlders try to rip it off because, as we have heard about "Swamp gases"—this Swamp oozes crude and seeps gas.

The people said that F. Ramos (yep, that one) had been in touch and told them to get their contracts in order (whatever that might mean) because something is afoot.

The "people" wanted us to somehow "do something" but we aren't sure exactly what. They were to meet with Ramos today so might get that squared around a little better. I never know whether or not to laugh or cry because the whole thing may be REAL or a total fabrication of some kind.

EJ has told them before now that they needed to get something working and quickly get it working through Petronas in Malaysia because of the "trench deuterium", etc., and everybody waits for some kind of magic. We have to remind them that the "magic" in this deal is right through Ramos' position in the Carlyle Group *et al*, Trilateral Commission.

That land was already deeded and approved by our own President Taft years ago and is in "Sultanate" territory where there are least four or five Sultans claiming to be THE King Sultan.

The point NOW appears to be a mad dash to get something swimming for political points and votes. The circus continues. Gosh, I can't tell a terrorist from a terrorist and VK doesn't make it any easier—since she says I am the terrorist.

VK DURHAM TRASHINGS

My goodness, I am sitting right here at my desk-keyboard (well, folding table) with a new set of trashings from VK sent this time from no less than SCOTLAND!

VK is again shouting that in her "Trust", "...calculated from May 1, 1875 to May 1, 1990 in the

(Continued on page 2)

CONTACT
P.O. Box 27800
Las Vegas, NV 89126

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
BAKERSFIELD, CA
PERMIT NO. 758

FIRST CLASS MAIL

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:

amount of $206,858,581,465,280,000,000.00 Gold…" sits in waiting for all you nice people, NESARA and other interested parties. She again reminds all of YOU (for she very definitely EXCLUDES those super-Ekkers, that "4 per cent of the December 28, 1988 notarized calculations of the U.S. Debt owned… is now held in safe keeping… for these states of the union adopting their X th Amendment rights once again."

She also claims that she did a "$6.5 TRILLION DOLLAR DEBT SWAP DEBT CONVERSION 'PAYMENT OF THE U.S. and LATIN AMERICAN AGREED UPON May 21, 2003".

She then claims that the Federal Reserve System, instead of complying with the Specific Terms-Conditions stated in the "DEBT SWAP-DEBT CONVERSION 'PAYMENT'..." somehow dumped all $6.5 TRILLION into the "stock markets" by June 16, 2003.

Oh never mind, I am too tired to even figure out the writing and much the less to manage such overwhelming concepts and money shifting. I believe it timely to refer former President Ramos and George Bush (also a co-Director of that Carlyle Group) to good old VK who, even after wasting $6.5 TRILLION, has that $206 PLUS quintillion now compounded with more interest for 14 years at 44%. I can't count it so you will have to use your own little calculator but it will take a Cray apparatus to calculate it now. VK claims George Bush to be a "calling" buddy with whom she has exchanged personal insults—so she certainly doesn't need us!

I think that the only reason I mention this here is that this time there is also posting ON Al Jazeerah (Islamic newspaper from Afghanistan or somewhere Islamic), of this incredible garbage.

I find myself wondering if that "a erection" proving Russell's death was from suffocation was actually a bad case of *rigor mortis*! Nobody claims it but her. Perhaps it might be noted, however, that wives are quite regularly choking their husbands within a breath of their lives and saving money on Viagra. Damn the torpedoes and brain damage, however.

INTELLIGENCE?

So, we continue to slog along hoping that the world doesn't end before we do and that we don't before we get this done. I wouldn't wish this task off onto my very worst enemy of whom we have accumulated quite a few along this trail. We do, however, treasure each and every one. Nobody in charge ever says "yes" but nobody has said "no", either. The dancing is interesting but I think Dick Clark is correct—nobody dares to simply outright LIE but rather calls it something more politically correct—like "interpretation is different" and "lack of intelligence…". It appears there is massive lack of "intelligence". Yes, me too.

God has warned us about pushing on wet noodles, wet strings and rivers and it seems wiser to let them flow or at the least pull the former two and get out of the way of the river. The alternative is to quit and most of our friends consider that an unacceptable option. I think it does make me a tad envious, however, of those who do have the choice to simply disconnect. And yes, I know, we too have "the choice" while here we are standing on the sinking rooftop breathing water. But, we did not yet get a life-ring, a rowboat, a speedboat or a raft so we keep paddling this old rooftop because there wasn't any canoe either. Send on and we're out of here!

By golly-gee, we actually now have met someone from the CIA and that is THE CIA. We seem to pass whatever tests ☺☺☺ abound and, frankly, I feel a whole lot more comfortable. As long as we can keep *CONTACT* going, we are always, it seems, in "contact" whereat the "watchers who count, watch". And, by the way, that does NOT include VK who is the most frequent inquiring watcher around. Everybody knows exactly what we are doing and even though that is unilateral we keep to the guidelines and law and it works pretty well most of the time.

Politics is hard to stay out of as to opinions because great impact is obvious as to "outcome" of elections here in May. All the while it appears the Middle East is in total meltdown. It is truly hard for me from time to time to even have a concept of what in the world we think we are doing—but, we ARE doing it!

If you interpret this letter as some kind of sad or depressed attitude, DON'T. Things are churning and each step has better footing than the last. We wish it would be faster and that we could just see everyone comfortably through whatever problems might be touching each—but that is not our prerogative under any circumstances anyway. And, I can only report on us so perhaps many of you are finding your way in success and growth about which we would surely like to hear. Certainly we can't be the only thing going? "Changing a world" is a very large consideration, it seems to me, and perhaps "too long" is a perception of each individual. How many lifetimes do we get? Well, we know the answer to that one—as many as it takes.

So be it, we just wanted to touch base for the days are filled to overflow with so many various things as to find it a bit difficult to sort.

Love to all and know that these old camels can handle another straw or two if we need to. God is good—even if He doesn't always seem "fair". Even "fair" is in the eye and mind of the beholder.

Make a good day… hope springs eternal.

D & E

Why Run Personal Public Notices???

4/1/04—#2 (17-229)
THU., APR. 1, 2004 7:25 A.M. YR 17, DAY 229
Manila, Philippines

RE: WHY WE MUST RUN NOTICES SEEMINGLY UNRELATED TO OUR PROGRAM AND BRINGING IN PERSONAL ASSOCIATIONS

WHO "OWES" WHAT TO WHOM?

Is one more time around the block too much? When queries are forthcoming and people care enough to ASK, it is sufficient "reason" to respond—but how much is too much and to whom do we simply give razors to cut our throats and bleed us to death? We do not consider ourselves to be so all-mighty important—nor should we—as to hold all keys to any kingdom including actually sheltering OUR OWN from assaults and damages. It is quite effectively "over" in that we allow that which is remarkably "off the wall" to stick like wet toilet paper wads and, too, testing the starch-cooked spaghetti by throwing them against the wall.

Where it IS important to the program, however, we will, just as instructed, respond to reasonable (or even more likely, unreasonable) input.

We have just recently, through *CONTACT*, received a scathing hit in the form of an open posted card accusing some of us of actually warping into greedy mercenaries. It was followed by a call in which it was stated that the party had talked with Mark Moore and that he had done the calling. So be it. This IS recent enough to note and respond. Part of the reason for recognizing the reasonableness of such response is that several are inquiring about Public Notices taking up such space in our precious and now limited paper for such things. THIS IS THE PROGRAM, readers. This is OUR PURPOSE and our communications at higher levels than our network of subscribers (although to us as people not as important as is each of you).

The most obvious question is why so much on Ron K. and for the response to that we can only ask you to look carefully at OUR DOCUMENTS bearing ours, in addition to Ron K's, signatures.

We have no recognition of relationships of one RK to anything particular or specific to Ron K. as presented by Mark M. in other capacities—WHERE, FRANKLY, MARK WAS MORE THAN OFF THE WALL.

Mark addressed a slamming letter of DECLARATION "TO" Ron K., which actually accused OUR EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT of being a criminal in full con-criminal intent, a thief, a liar and a cheat.

When we (E-E) did not respond in agreement with Mark, we were then trashed and accused of somehow ripping off everyone we ever touched. Mark had demanded an increase in income—to be instituted immediately. There were NO FUNDS available for an increase, the paper was already shut-down until we could determine and balance circumstances. Meanwhile we were again accused of not responding to the RK declaration even though it had NOTHING addressed TO US but was sent far and wide and even on our private and personal email address for private family and friends.

Then when there was objection from us we got a final blast on that same circuit and that AFTER asking that it not be used. Mark mailed out uncounted numbers of the documents and certainly saturated our own circle of immediately and most closely working friends.

Some of these parties immediately withdrew support from us, changed out their corporation agents and ceased contributing even to the paper publication.

This is not to be construed as our objecting to anyone making choices or carrying through with that which they feel is more secure—but our observation is not that they have secured anything but rather, severed the one connection which was the most important.

Ron K. has not, did not, and never shall own BCR (corporation agency-agent). At most he "managed" the operation because we had to have resident-agent protection and he had been our working person at Nevada Corporate Headquarters, whereat we had our very shirt and some corporations STOLEN, LAPSED and snatched from us.

Hey, it is fine, people. We have NEVER insisted that anyone do or use anything or anyone with whom they felt uncomfortable.

However, to suggest that WE HAVE A CON-SCAM-CRIMINAL as our working Executive Vice President in the most important ONE program on the globe today and that we are remiss in that "stupidity"—is truly unacceptable.

We allowed most of it to pass with a simple rebuttal to the accusations in that the information was simply NOT CORRECT.

Facts SPEAK and we certainly do NOT need to rehash anything here other than to give you reasonable response as to WHY the documents being run as notices are extremely important: This paper is the working paper here in our circumstances, those which are structured within the larger WHOLE picture, rebuttal to VK Durham's absurd nonsense AND to STOP the incredible continuing and disgusting speculations and accusations that somehow RK did do terrible things in his own personal relationships and regarding his child of about six years of age.

The raving went out that somehow RK had not only absconded, skipped town but, as well, kidnapped his own child and went into hiding. Somehow Mark did further his own opinion that with the information he now was convinced that his original opinion of RK was even worse than he had "declared".

We continued to be accused of not responding in detail to Mark and somehow that put us into a category of equally evil thieves using funds stashed and kept from others, like himself, for our "life-style" in the Philippines. In his accusations he used totally erroneous information from something confronted in 1994 and a case THROWN OUT OF COURT. Moreover, when he scattered the information and told people he had seen copies of the "statements" PERSONALLY—he did not even have a correct company name.

So, this is still fine with us for we have no intention to stay in the pit and take the rock-tossing with whimperings and bloodletting. Throw all ye will for we are ready to simply STEP OUT OF THE LINE OF FIRE and allow these adversaries to do that which they will.

We will not, however, stand aside and allow accusations to stand as if correct regarding THIS PROGRAM or any persons who serve. Executive Vice President says it better than we can better explain.

As to the last Public Notices regarding RK and the child in point—RK has not "run to" anywhere nor has he snatched HIS CHILD.

The point—PLEASE GET YOUR GLASS AND READ CAREFULLY: RK has 100% CUSTODY <u>without even visitation rights of the "mother</u>" who is a U.S. citizen and returned to Oklahoma to reside with her mother. She was deemed a danger to her child and the intent was to cause a minimum of one year's absence to see if rehabilitation could be forthcoming. It has not been successful in any way, shape or form.

Now, let us consider RK personally.

WE DO NOT KNOW WHERE HE IS—PERIOD. We do not NEED to know where he is located and would refuse the information were it offered.

Anything we have needed we have been able to get legally managed through electronic exchanges.

The paper layout is handled nicely by voluntary hands as we can print and we simply have to do without a formal "third party" News Desk for this interim time. We feel, from feedback, however, that almost all of you would rather have our news of our program ongoing than have us repeat news already scattered around, which can be gathered personally from the Internet or local news or other resources.

No, we are NOT going to share ALL of our information because that would be as truly stupid as anything we could do. It is not a "secret" but, good grief, we are NOT idiots.

So what have we as a "bottom line"?

It depends on what the focus might be.

We have no output from any products, i.e., Gaiandriana, etc. This will remain so until such time as other resources are available and preferably OUT OF COUNTRY.

That does indeed hurt several people but it would truly be nice if you who object would go to the parties responsible for the "just doing what is right" cause and complain or send them a bill or something for your now lack of income or jobs.

The same with the paper, *CONTACT*.

We publish when appropriate and the process of moving the operation IN TOTAL is remaining underway as soon as we can catch our breath.

The warehouse remains an albatross; all the Journals and other plans under way had to go on "hold" because, you guessed it, RK was doing the rearranging to help us shift and dig.

It is all being worked through and we are all learning a lot of lessons along the way to Heaven or Perdition. I guess the choice is in the eye of the traveler.

Will we go BACK to what was? NO!

How can we go back and pull the same blunders and call ourselves worthy? It is difficult at best because we end up feeling responsible for every last sparrow feather—AND THAT IS GOD'S JOB, not ours.

What we have really learned, however, is that EVERYTHING will ultimately be turned over to PROFESSIONAL, NON-ATTACHED business people WHO DO THEIR JOB and not argue over the hubcaps on the loaned car.

God provides that which we need and if we lose something—then, we really didn't need it after all, did we? Moreover, if we wish to preserve anything we need to attend it carefully, shield it most cautiously and leave nothing which can be assaulted.

I, Doris, am continually astounded that "everything" anyone wishes to dump gets dumped onto us. Wow! I will say that I am now equally amazed that, as people dumped, the dump became our TREASURE TROVE. While everyone involved in games ran like heck and dumped all the thieved (hot) goods—the cycle has now played its way in rotation over and over again to serve us very well indeed, personally. Part of that "service" is a total negation of responsibility for many things come before and to which we actually, but erroneously, felt responsible.

Now many people have run away-run away and in doing so have severed not only "ties" but any way to even longer "connect". This, while the little team grows ever closer and ever more dependable.

If, as some have declared, we are so evil as to have done the things of which we are accused—why would anyone expect more from us? Moreover, if someone has smashed the very apparatus which produces the milk and honey—how can anyone provide in the void produced from such destructive intent?

If you expected failure and loss and then demanded failure and loss—perhaps the outcome might well be failure and loss. We expect neither negative event and perhaps therein lies the very secret of success itself.

We have not expected "something for nothing" and we have been given such incredible gifts as to boggle all imaginings. But nothing was GIVEN to us as the prize of the "Lets make a deal"—but lots of lonely and hard work for old backs, brains and fingers. That in no wise means only "these two old folks".

What is left for "us" in the places of yesterday? Perhaps nothing save retribution as consequential for those who acted wrongly against us and "ours". That is "responsible", not revenge, for there is certainly NOTHING longer that we need of earthly thefts and from cheating liars. We can "pardon" but that which was thrust against OTHERS in order to damage us—is a responsibility to TRY AND MAKE RIGHT.

We can hope that this response regarding the questions about more personal "notices" suffices, for this program will evolve and our people will be provided protection against the slings and arrows over which they have no control.

You cannot blame an arrow for damaging a target—nor even the bow which thrusts the arrow—only the mind of the operator and intent of that mind can hold credit or responsibility. Scatter shooting is a terrible thing—think about it! Moreover, you can THINK about it until hell freezes but it is the actual ACTION that results in the damage inflicted—or the good gained. And always remember our lesson: TRUTH IS!

E-E

[EJ: As anticlimactic as it may prove to be, I should take this opportunity to make a very brief business report. The A/T Foundation has filed all of its appropriate papers that, per the attorney retained to make sure all of the t's were crossed and i's dotted, leaves very little room to dispute any of the Public Notices we have published on the subject. The court documents contain sworn testimony (see Page 9 of May 21, 2003 *CONTACT*) to the Central Bank's holding an inventory of 400,000 metric tons of gold. At the very least, GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION (GAIA) would now control 40% of 50% of that gold, i.e., 80,000 metric tons currently worth a bit over one trillion dollars. Sorry, I can't help comparing that with the $6 million Mark Moore fumes about our having stolen, wasted or stashed. In many ways this is the most exciting and gratifying time of our lives. Not many people, we fear, ever get to be so "alive" in the here and now as have we, and we are extremely grateful. We can sense, and sometimes even see, how Dad is drawing it together and it is exhilarating. There are bad times and disappointments (only about 3 today) and we yearn for a break and a trip home—but we are OK and we can "keep on keeping on".]

SYNOPSIS OF GEORGE MERCIER'S *INVISIBLE CONTRACTS*

PART FIVE OF A TWELVE-PART SERIES (Pages 229-299)

By Ron Kirzinger

WARNING: WHAT YOU ARE ABOUT TO READ IS HAZARDOUS MATERIAL. PLEASE DO NOT ACT ON THIS INFORMATION WITHOUT ACCEPTING FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR YOUR OWN ACTIONS.

THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT

Although the majority of people do not yet recognize the truth of this statement, countries in the Western (and Westernized) world have become politically fascist. Students of fascism recognize that it is a form of government dominated by large corporations. Thus, today's largest employers, the biggest corporations, are extensions of the government and every employment contract amounts to a contract with the government (the King). If it is the policy—not even the law—of the government to disallow employment to anyone who will not present a social security number, for instance, the larger corporations can be counted on to act on that policy and exclude any private individual from employment. This certainly can make life difficult for an individual desirous of achieving or retaining freedom.

In this chapter, Mercier considers the issue of attempting to retain one's inherent rights as an individual while working for a large corporation (or the government corporation itself).

A solution not entertained by Mercier is to avoid "employment" by refusing to work for "wages". May an individual not agree with another private individual to provide his services on a purely voluntary basis? And would it not be in the other party's best interests to see to it that such an individual is provided with his living needs to allow him to continue to provide such services, all without an "employment" contract? If a small corporation paid for such an individual's sustenance, thereby ensuring ongoing benefits to the corporation from his services, wouldn't such expenses be legitimate deductions for the corporation? And if the first party is paid no "money", what is there to tax—his necessary food, clothing or shelter? Perhaps the IRS collector would accept the food after it has passed through the individual's system?

Setting the foregoing deliberations aside for now, let's proceed with Mercier's answer for those who might try to retain status as nontaxpayer individuals while working for one of the larger corporations or government agencies. Be advised going in, however, that such entities are fictions of law and as such they truly can only interface with other fictions—legally speaking.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

[QUOTING:]

…(W)e will consider additional "points of attachment of King's Equity Jurisdiction on us all… (t)hrough the beneficial use of a taxable franchise like Social Security. A lot of folks don't realize it, but the presentation of a Social Security Number to your Employer is a contract with the King to pay taxes, and an acknowledgement of personal Status as a Taxpayer.

Question: How do you get out of this?

Answer: This is not an easy thing to do; clever administrative rule making forced on Employers has tightened Employers up—and they have the money we want. In an Employee/Employer relationship factual setting as a first step, it is first necessary to terminate all written attachments of King's Equity Jurisdiction you previously initiated with the King. **Some of the steps taken now in this section will not be appreciated until all of the invisible juristic contracts that the King is operating on have been correctively severed—so one has to read the entire Letter first, and then come back to this section.** But as for written attachments of King's Equity Jurisdiction relevant in an Employment factual setting, for most folks, this act transpired when they were a teenager and they signed a form and mailed it to Washington, and requested a Social Security Number. Pursuant to your administrative request, the King issued out a Number, and so now the contemporary beneficial use of that Social Security Number by you in an Employment setting creates a taxing liability; as the Federal judiciary considers participation in Social Security to be a taxable franchise, among other things. But that is only a small part of the story, and this rescission is only a point of beginning.

Second, terminate the acceptance and receipt of all benefits that otherwise inure to Social Security beneficiaries, because under Nature remember that no written contract is now necessary, or has ever been necessary, to extract money out of Social Security participants (unless the King in his statutes has explicitly limited himself to collect money only under written contracts for some reason). And in terms of attaching one's liability to contributing premium reciprocity to the King's Social Security handout *Largesse*, the mere rescission of the written Social Security contract, as is now prevalent among Patriots trying to get to the bottom of things is, of and by itself, irrelevant, and does not terminate any taxing liability (as I will explain later).

[In a footnote, Mercier makes the point that the proper party for service of notices of rescission is the Attorney General and concludes, "…omitting to serve the Attorney General in all Federal Administrative *Rescissions, Notices of Benefit Rejection,* and *Objections*, might be discouraged".]

The fundamental reason why *employees* are viewed universally by State and Federal judges as being taxable objects is because the *employee* is clothed with multiple layers of juristic contracts separate and apart from Social Security, by reason of the large array of juristic benefits the *employee* has accepted by his silence. Therefore, *employees* are in a commercial enrichment setting, *employees* are in business, and the gain experienced by *employees* is very much taxable, since the King participated in creating the financial gain the *employee* is experiencing. But now that you have been placed on Notice that a rightful moral liability does attach on your acceptance of the King's Employment scenario intervention by throwing invisible juristic benefits at Employees, when you first get hired on again with someone else, as another point of beginning, now let's change the factual setting a bit, and refuse to provide a Social Security Number.

After they threaten you with termination, as they eventually will do, then provide a number under your objection and over your protest, and notice of waiving and rejecting all benefits otherwise available to you as an Employee; not just retirement benefits, but the immediate environmental protection benefits all Employees experience (by the end of this section, you will see what the immediate benefits are that I am referring to). The objective behind this *Objection* is to make a *Statement*. That Objection should cite the King's forced third party relationship to the arrangements, and your Objection to his intervention against your will; his forcing you to accept his benefits that you now hereby waive, refuse, forfeit and forego; and then also claim that such an unwanted and forced relationship with the King violates relational *Principles of Nature* not permissible absent the existence of some other invisible contract you may not be aware of; and interferes with your *Right to Work* under the Fifth Amendment.

[In a footnote, Mercier spells out the importance of timely written objections: "As for the timeliness of objections, failure to object is automatically fatal, and failure to object timely is equally as fatal. The most important statement in this entire discussion on contracts is this: The bottom line on contract annulment is the *State of Mind* of the parties at the time of, and immediately prior to, the execution of the contract, since your fundamental argument is that you did not voluntarily enter into any contract with the King; and so now the very existence of the contract itself is disputed. If you want out of these contracts the King coerced you into by way of his clever administrative rule making on Employers by contracts, then your State of Mind at the time when benefits were first accepted, when the contract was initially entered into, has to be proven by you, through written, timely objections; otherwise, you lose."]

These *Objection* presentations are necessarily status oriented, as they define your non-involvement with trade, commerce, business, and industry—an involvement which if left uncountermanded, automatically infers a Contract Law factual setting in effect between your *employer*, yourself and the King. But if your new Status falls outside the boundary lines of King's Commerce (where all those who enter therein experience enrichment, created in part by the King's benefit), then there is an inherent *Right to Work* interest in the 14th Amendment as well (*Traux vs. Raich*, 229 U.S. 33 (1915)). [You might want to

be careful, however, invoking the 14th Amendment because it has been identified as the origin of today's statutory "citizen".]

Some ideas to consider and think about while creating your *Objection*, might be to state perhaps that the Social Security Number you are giving him is being done solely for the purpose of deflecting the otherwise imminent termination of your livelihood, and that the Social Security Number you are giving him was previously rescinded and is presently null and void (and that re-presentation of the number under *Protest, Objection* and *Rejection of Benefits* after its prior nullification does not reactivate it); and that you hereby waive, forfeit, forego, and will return where possible, any and all benefits that would otherwise inure to you as an Employee and as a participant in the Social Security retirement program, and that this Objection you are filing is a continuous one, and that any qualified acceptance of bank drafts taken in contemplation of exchange into hard currency is accepted for the administrative convenience of your Employer, and will be endorsed under protest, at law and not in equity, in the future; etc., does not change, alter, or diminish anything relative to your Status or the life of that Objection. Also noticed out should be statements concerning your non-involvement with Commerce; Status as Non-Taxpayer [Is there such a thing as non-taxpayer status? See note, next paragraph.]; rescission of the attachment of a special King's Equity Jurisdiction that uncontested Birth Certificates create under some limited circumstances; and Notice of prior Objections having been filed, objecting to the attachment of Equity Jurisdiction that otherwise lie to Holders in Due Course of circulating Federal Reserve equitable instruments that the King's Legal Tender Statutes have enhanced the value of, etc. This Objection, along with your Employer's threats, must all be in writing as a confrontation with the King is coming. (Your Employer will forward the Social Security Number to the IRS, who then in turn will simply assume that you are a Taxpayer, and reasonably so, based upon what little information they have). Since the IRS has some evidence that you are a Taxpayer, the burden then shifts to you to prove that yes, although the IRS does have my number, these are the reasons as to why I am not a Taxpayer. In such a confrontational setting, it ranges from possible to likely that your Employer will lie, have a convenient loss of memory, and otherwise not stick up for you when push accelerates to shove. Since the burden of proof to prove non-Taxpayer and non-Commercial Status now falls on you, depositions which would ordinarily be necessary from your Employer to prove that your Objections were made timely (with the questioning contained therein discussing the circumstances surrounding the surrendering of that Social Security Number to him), now becomes unnecessary. If the Employer's threats to terminate you, and your Objections and Rescissions are all down tight in writing, the factual setting is now undisputed, and depositions are unnecessary; so a little prevention here is important.

[**Does "nontaxpayer" status exist?** Apparently it does, as Mercier documents in a footnote: "...[A] nontaxpayer is outside the administrative system set up for the collection of a refund of overpaid taxes, and is not required to file a claim for refund to recover money taken from him... The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessments and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws..."—*Economy Heating vs. The United States*, 470 F.2nd 585, at 589 (1972) (sentences quoted out of order).

[For a nontaxpayer, for whom the large body of law subsequent to the 1930s is largely irrelevant, the following citation from a footnote could be quite useful: "The makers of our *Constitution* undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the government, **the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men**."—Justice Louis Brandeis in *Olmstead vs. United States*, 277 U.S. 436, at 478 (1927).]

As for the IRS, the only information they have is a name and your Social Security Number, so as a point of beginning, it is reasonable for them to simply proceed against you as if you are a Taxpayer; and agents trying to collect money for the King should not be viewed as some type of an enemy to kill (they are transient *ad hoc* adversaries, not enemies). Under normal circumstances, your Case can be won at the administrative level by requesting an Administrative Hearing and using Title 5 and the *Code of Federal Regulations* with *savoir faire*, and then taking your Case up the grievance ladder, one step at a time.

But just in case, get ready to speak your mind in front of the Supreme Court, if necessary. If physically flying yourself to Washington does not intrigue you, then you might consider paying the requested tax, as you have already lost.

[END QUOTING]

The commercial system within which almost all Westerners find themselves embedded is, of course, "voluntary"—if almost inescapable. As stated in *Revelations 13:17*: "So that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." So, how can one function without being in King's commerce and thus a "person subject to" the King's caprice? Can we expect the King's Courts to accept our declarations of personal sovereignty? That approach certainly did not work well for the likes of Leroy Schweitzer (of the Montana Freemen, who has disappeared since butting heads with the judicial system) or Roger Elvick (arrested in September 2003 for promoting the concept of "redemption")—at least not while they maintained contracts with the King by continuing to engage in the King's commerce.

At this point I am going to suggest that **anyone inside the King's Courts arguing (literally "pleading") for individual sovereignty has already lost**. The very act of proceeding in such a court ("at equity" instead of "at law") is, on the face of things, an attempt to obtain a *judicial benefit*—which, of course, derives from the King. Further, such courts can only deal with fictions-of-law, known as "persons". Thus, in my opinion, Mercier's suggestion of taking your case up to the Supreme Court for adjudication seems less than practical for anyone who would wish to be free and separate from the state-created, all-caps, strawman "person". The ONLY way to be truly free, as far as I can discern, is to avoid individual involvement in the King's commerce entirely. But while it is the stated purpose of this synopsis to explore the issue of personal freedom, Mercier is at this point addressing the narrower issue of whether or not it is possible to retain the status of *individual* (as opposed to statutorily-governed *person*) as an "employee". If this more finite goal is achievable on its own, without rescinding all contracts with the King (including the citizenship contract, for instance), I can see no way to achieve it other than what Mercier proposes.

At this point Mercier suggests taking a proactive approach: Rather than wait for problems to arise with the IRS or Social Security Administration, he suggests that the individual try to arrange for an administrative hearing of the issue. By obtaining a favorable administrative ruling of a "justiciable controversy", subsequent attacks on one's position can be "collaterally estopped".

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

[QUOTING:]

Now that this discussion has shifted over to the administrative adjudication of grievances with the King, I need to digress just a bit and discuss Principles relating to Demands for an Administrative Hearing. In an administrative adjudication, numerous people I know of have requested administrative hearings to discuss the want of jurisdiction that the King or a Prince was asserting generally in many different settings. As part of the strategy involved, failure by the state administrators to grant a hearing would later bar civil tax liability and even a criminal prosecution for the same *actus reus* later under the *Collateral Estoppel Doctrine*, which is an unwritten Common Law Principle….

…Correctly understood, these Administrative Law Demands are marvelous devices, which, if handled properly, can and will tie the King's and the Prince's giblets down tight: but they need to be viewed, understood, and plead, properly. These Administrative Law Demands many seek are the lesser administrative equivalent of a judicially sought Declaratory Judgment; and so all of the Natural Law requirements and indicia that apply to judicial Declaratory Judgments, also apply to Administrative Judgments. The most important indicia of which is that there must be a *Justiciable Controversy* at hand, i.e., some type of case or controversy, which if left unresolved will damage a person.

Justiciability is closely related to *Standing*, and both are indicia related to make sure that you are in fact entitled to the relief that you are seeking, and that there is in fact an actual grievance for the Law to operate on and for the Judiciary to rule upon. In *Justiciability* averments, you must establish that you have a personal stake in the outcome of the controversy, and that the dispute sought to be administratively adjudicated will be presented in an adversary context, and that the logical nexus between the Status we assert and the claim sought to be adjudicated are both present, along with the necessary degree of contentiousness. To your advantage, the *Justiciability Doctrine* has uncertain and shifting contours, and properly so, as it organically follows the Branches of the Majestic Oak.

To really understand the reasoning behind the judicial requirement for the presence of *Justiciability* in *Declaratory Judgments*, think of *Justiciability* as being like "tension" in effect between two adversaries. If the tension is not there, then the Judge (either a Judicial Judge, or an Administrative Law Judge) is not dealing with a grievance, he is actually dealing with a hypothetical factual setting that may or may not ever come to pass. If the Judge issued down an Order based upon such a hypothetical factual setting without the element of *Justiciability* in effect, the effect of that Order would be to work a Tort on the adverse Party the Order operates against; this Party did nothing, and in fact may have very well intended to do nothing; but now an Order exists declaring some reversed relational rights (meaning: one of the Parties no longer holds the upper hand). As viewed from a Judge's

perspective, the absence of that "distinct and palpable injury" of *Justiciability* renders the Case moot, because there is nothing for the Judge to do; and if anything was done by the Judge, a judicial Tort would be thrown at one of the parties for no more than an exchange of hypothetical factual settings between fictional adversaries. For example, if in fact the Law requires some simple positive act to be performed unilaterally by some Government official regardless of anything you do or don't do, then a proper remedy to compel performance would lie in *Mandamus*, where questions of the existence of the tension of *Justiciability* between adversaries is not relevant. And specifically referring to rebuffed Demands for Administrative Hearings, the correct medicine may actually lay in *Alternative Mandamus* (meaning: Grant the Hearing, or in the alternative, forfeit your jurisdiction, just the right medicine to deal with bureaucratic recalcitrance).

So merely sending a *Demand for an Administrative Hearing* to a state official to discuss their assertion of a regulatory jurisdictional environment on the public highways, without any specific Case or controversy being presented for adjudication, will later Collaterally Estop no one, as no averments of a *Justiciable Controversy* were made (Who is making an assertion of jurisdiction over you? What traffic cop or law enforcement person, and when? What did the traffic cop say? Where is the assignment of policing jurisdiction of that cop down through state statutes from the Legislature? What penal statute did he threaten you with? What does that statute say? (Go ahead and quote the statute, verbatim). Who is your adversary in the demanded Hearing? Where is your personal stake in the outcome of the demanded Hearing? If the Hearing is not granted, how will you be damaged? Those types of *Justiciability* averments have to be included in the body of your Demand for an Administrative Hearing; local Collateral Estoppel victories applied against such otherwise content deficient Administrative briefings will collapse under the scrutiny of sophisticated appellate judges who will examine your Administrative Law Demands from the perspective of trying to find fault with them, if your local District Attorney adversary should ever decide to give you a run for your money….

…Those are the types of factual averments of *Justiciability* that have to be plead in the body of a Demand for an Administrative Hearing, in order to present the administrators with a Case or Controversy that is ripe for a low level administrative settlement. If that Administrative Hearing Demand of yours was submitted to state administrators after a prosecution has begun, then Justiciability is obvious for all parties to see. However, Justiciability still has to be positively plead within the body of the Demand through sequentially presented factual averments, otherwise the Supreme Court won't know that a Justiciable Controversy was offered for a low level settlement.

Now, theoretically, the failure by your regional bureaucrats to grant the Hearing will later estop a magistrate presiding over criminal charges that were brought out of those circumstances that were offered to have been settled, and should have been previously settled, in a lesser administrative forum….

"SETTLE IT DOWN THERE"

…The Doctrine of settling grievances at the lowest possible level, of which Collateral Estoppel is a correlative Doctrine, is found replicating itself over and over again throughout Supreme Court rulings. This *Settle it at the Lowest Level Doctrine* surfaces in many places. For example, it is found:

1. In the Judicially created *Doctrines of Exhaustion, Primary Jurisdiction, Prior Resort,* and *Exclusive Jurisdiction*, all of which operate to send a grievance down to an administrative agency for different types of rulings for technical reasons, prior to initiating higher judicial intervention;

2. By having the parties first exhaust their lower state remedies in criminal appeals and civil actions prior to seeking higher Federal judicial intervention; this surfaces most frequently in petitions for federal restraining orders to block state criminal prosecutions, and petitions for *Habeas Corpus*;

3. By having parties seek the lowest possible level of a judicial forum first (i.e., the lowest state court possessing the requisite settlement jurisdiction, and the use of federal magistrates instead of District Court Judges to settle small single-Hearing oriented grievances);

4. By a statutory requirement that a lower final demand for money believed due and owing must first be made and precede the higher initiation of the judicial civil lawsuit;

5. By the delegated conferment by the Supreme Court of a Grant of automatic Concurrent Jurisdiction to every single state court in the United States, to hear and rule on Federal Constitutional questions, regardless of any state statutes that may appear to operate to the contrary; state courts also hold concurrent jurisdiction to hear a large volume of federal statutory based grievances;

6. By the mandates of the Supreme Court to all Federal Appellate Circuits not to interfere with or reverse any findings of facts made by Federal District Court Judges, absent very special circumstances (so that the disputed factual setting the grievance was cast in is settled at the lowest possible level);

7. And in the case of the Supreme Court having Original Jurisdiction, they will first send the Case to a lower regional District Court having Concurrent Jurisdiction by statute. (If this Concurrent Jurisdiction is wanting, then after accepting Original Jurisdiction on the Case, the Supreme Court will appoint a regional District Court Judge to be a Special Master to make findings of facts at that low level, which the Supreme Court will then audit and review as the sole appellate forum);

8. And this Doctrine is also expressed in the self-imposed mandates of the Supreme Court to settle grievances by use of a lower statutory construction if possible, rather than magnifying the settlement remedy by use of the higher Constitutional construction;

9. This Doctrine surfaces in the Supreme Court's refusal to consider ruling on arguments and reasoning that were not presented to a lower judicial forum first; and

10. The Supreme Court also wants lower Federal Tribunals to use lower state law to settle grievances, prior to using federal common (Case) law or federal statutes….

…All of those are examples of that *Settle it at the Lowest Possible Level First Doctrine*; and the Collateral Estoppel Doctrine, which operates to penalize the recalcitrant party that did not settle something at a lower level that was offered to them (as an incentive to avoid doing so again in the future), as applied to Administrative Law Demands, is a correct *Principle of Nature*. It is simply all over Nature and scientific method.

Let us assume that you are a Gameplayer in King's Commerce, so you are a Taxpayer; so if you have a grievance with your Employer regarding the premature withholding of money from your wages under disputed tax liability circumstances, try to settle it with him right then and there, before going up the ladder a step and invoking an Administrative Hearing with the IRS. If you do not try to settle it with your Employer, the letters going back and forth (proving the factual setting surrounding their threats and your objections) will be non-existent; which means that you either made no attempt to settle the grievance right then and there, or in the alternative, you accepted your Employer's last offer. That is the way sophisticated Federal Magistrates view the matter, and if you will but give that model but a few moments thought and imagination, then you too will arrive at the same conclusion: that the reason why you were later rebuffed by a Federal Magistrate is due to your own improper handling of the factual setting you presented to that Judge when prematurely asking for a Restraining Order of some type of tax refund suit. [I suggest that another fact to be presented up front in any such proceeding is the element of FRAUD, which vitiates contracts.] Then after exhausting your potential remedies with your Employer, always first ask for a Contested Case Administrative Hearing with the IRS before going up the ladder one more step and initiating a Judicial Complaint. As you go up the ladder one step at a time, one of the benefits you will be experiencing is finding your adversary making numerous technical mistakes, which when called by you will cause you to win for technical reasons; if you jump the gun like a lot of Tax Protestors do and head straight for the Federal District Courthouse to have it out with your Employer and the King, your grievance will likely have to be addressed solely on the presentment of poorly drafted pleadings and flaky merits (being up to your neck in invisible contracts), since by jumping the gun, no interlocutory steps were offered to your adversary to slip up on.

Any experienced person knows that people in any field, from business to law to engineering to medicine, in any field, always mess up; and IRS agents and the King's Attorneys in the Department of Justice in Washington mess up each and every single day, over and over again, just like everyone else. Therefore, by jumping the gun, skipping three steps on the ladder, although you may believe that the end result is closer, you are actually only damaging yourself. The sky never falls in because Principles are violated; only very subtle and difficult to detect secondary consequences surface later on in ways that make their seminal point of causation difficult to discern.

IS AN EMPLOYEE NECESSARILY "IN COMMERCE"?

In contrast, if you are not a Gameplayer in Commerce and have rejected all federal benefits, then as a non-Taxpayer you fall outside the procedural administrative mandates of the King's *lex,* and it is provident for you to go directly into the Judiciary.

Should you conclude that it would be provident to initially pursue Judicial Relief, then your requisite array of Status Averments form an integral and important part of the Pleadings, in order to document why you are not a Taxpayer and why you are somehow exempt from the Administrative ladder that applies to every one else. Even though you may not be a Taxpayer, there may be some technical advantages inuring to players who use the Administrative ladder, one step at a time, but the decisional turning point on whether to initially pursue administrative or judicial relief revolves around a purely status oriented question: Are you a Taxpayer or not? By the end of this Letter, you should be able to get a good feel as to the extent to which you have successfully removed yourself out from underneath the King's taxation thumb.

As for the *Justiciability* Question in Demanding Administrative Hearings, unless there is a Case or Controversy at hand, it is foolishness for Government

officials to discuss something at an Administrative Hearing that, if discussed, would neither settle nor adjudicate anything; so if your views are that their granting you the Hearing they don't want to give you would settle something, then that is part of your entitlement pleadings under *Standing* and *Justiciability*. In our specific instant case of an Employer, acting in an agency relationship to the King, withholding money from non-Taxpayers who are not involved with Commerce and experience no Federal benefits and is an "excepted subject", our *Justiciable Controversy* is the fact that if the Administrative Hearing is not granted immediately, you personally will be damaged by a continuing loss of money that is being withheld from your earnings. That is the kind of hard *Justiciable Controversy* averment that Judges want to hear, and that is the kind of *Justiciability* that even case-hardened Federal Judges will reluctantly respect. Correlative *Entitlement to Relief* averments of *standing* (your personal interest in the Case) are also required. Since you are personally being damaged by the operation of statutes, your *Standing* is automatic.

And speaking of the Supreme Court (and stay out of any confrontation with the King unless an extensive journey to Washington intrigues you) **the only question you should want answered is essentially a *Status* question: Does the King have the right to intervene into simple common law occupations to such an extent that an *individual* not in an Equity Jurisdictional relationship with the King and not in Commerce, and rejecting Federal political benefits, can force the acceptance of unwanted benefits, and can force a Federal Taxpayer Status on someone (with the attendant criminal liability associated therewith), and can force the signing of contracts with the King, and all of that prior to being able to experience any livelihood at all? If the Supreme Court responds by saying yes, the King does have these extreme intervention Rights to force you to accept his political and Commercial benefits against your will and over your objection, because of some important overriding Governmental interests, then let's get this monolithic slab of top down Roman Civil Law out into the open so we can deal with it for what it really is.**

My hunch is that if the Supreme Court ever grants *Certiorari*, and if they have the naked nerve to stand up to the King and actually publicly report out the decision in their *United States Reports* (which is not very likely in today's judicial climate of intellectual *minimalism* and judicial restraint (which really means to hide in a closet)), I conjecture that their ruling will be consistent with Nature and Natural Law, based on the factual setting then presented to them, and the King will lose, if the factual setting was set up properly to sever all voluntary attachments of King's Equity Jurisdiction up and down the line.

Of all of the Federal and state judicial Complaints that I have seen, going back now 10 years (requesting either injunctive or restraining relief, or Complaints seeking refunds from the IRS, although I do know of some uncontested victories), I have never seen one of them correctly plead where all of the required contract annulment indicia and elements of pure Equity severance were presented in one neat little package, with all of the Objections having been made, made substantively, and made timely. Not one. So, Federal Magistrates who have tossed aside such curt and incomplete Complaints, are not Commie pinkos and are not necessarily in bed with the King (there are some Judges who are, but their dismissals of the sophomoric Complaints I have seen are not by reason of any coziness going on with the King); since it is a correct *Principle of Natural Law* to extract money out of people under some reciprocal circumstances where there is no written contract to be found any place, and even where one of the parties is convinced no money is due and owing (because benefits have been unknowingly accepted under the terms of invisible contracts).

[END QUOTING]

In a system wherein the highest judges are politically appointed and have virtually unlimited (though not ungoverned) power, it truly does seem unlikely that they would ever allow (or be allowed to allow) a victory against the King, no matter how well prepared and plead. Still, if there is any relief to be found within the bar, this is about the only approach that makes any sense given what we have come to know about invisible contracts.

In the section that follows Mercier reviews the case of *UNITED STATES V. LEE* at great length. His review has been substantially reduced in this synopsis to stay within space constraints. In a nutshell, the Defendant in this case was bound by innumerable invisible contracts, which precluded any possibility of a win in the King's Court.

UNITED STATES V. LEE

"Whenever a person attempts to effectuate a rescission of their Social Security Number, and severs the facial attachment of Equity Jurisdiction such a number creates, the Social Security Administration will normally respond in their rebuttal retort by citing and quoting from a Supreme Court Case called *United States vs. Lee*, to try and convey the image that the *Rescission* you just filed with them is meaningless and that participation in Social Security is mandatory, just like in Poland…. [U]nknown to the poor Citizen, invisible contracts are in effect he has no knowledge of, and so the Judiciary is being asked to toss aside the contract because some of the terms it contains are philosophically uncomfortable to the aggrieved Citizen.

"Here in *United States vs. Lee*… the Amish Petitioner sought an Employer/Employee tax exemption from Social Security payments, with the exemption sought being based on judicially enlarging a parallel off-point statutory religious exemption that their lawyers had uncovered.

"(The Congress had granted by statute to *self-employed* Amish and other religious groups, elective exemptions from Social Security Taxes. *Employers* and *Employees* were not granted this exemption courtesy.)

"…The Amish are religiously barred from accepting Social Security benefits, but whether or not these particular Amish folks actually filed a written *Notice of Waiver, Forfeiture and Rejection of Benefits* with the King to attack the very existence of one of the contracts the King was collecting money under ("*Failure of Consideration*"), the Court Opinion offers no clear details.

"Since the King had quite a large number of invisible contracts in effect with these Amish folks, the actual rejection of some future cash benefits from one of the contracts individually is an unimportant question, and represents only a very small slice of the King's total contract pie.

"So here we have an Old Order Amish fellow asking the Supreme Court of the United States to violate every *Principle of Natural Law* surrounding the execution and enforcement of Commercial contracts. Under the *merger doctrine*, contracts we entered into yesterday lose their identity and significance as they are merged into contracts that we enter into today—thus overruling those contracts we previously entered into—and properly so, since the inability to go back and modify, enhance, or terminate existing contracts is irrational. So here we have our marvelous Amish Brothers, entering into Employer contracts with the King as Gameplayers in King's Commerce, and then trying to nullify a few selected self-serving terms in that contract by using wording found in an older Contract, a Constitutional Contract of 1787. So the Amish had numerous contemporary Commercial contracts with the King… But the Amish didn't see any contracts in effect with the King, so they had no knowledge of their invisible contract defilement…

"The Amish request to weasel out of their Commercial contracts with the King is therefore denied, and properly so… all voluntary Gameplayers in King's Commerce must abide by House Rules."

IS PARTICIPATION IN KING'S COMMERCE VOLUNTARY?

Accepting Mercier's statement, "The *Constitution* of 1787 cannot be held to interfere with the execution of contemporary Commercial contracts," it behooves us to address the validity of contracts foisted upon us by "clever rule-making" but which involve elements of fraud, duress and coercion.

[QUOTING:]

The *Constitution* was never designed or intended by our Framers to negotiate terms of contracts—never. If you are coerced by the King into being an involuntary party to a contract in order to enjoy a substantive natural right by clever administrative rule making (e.g., the rights of association, speech, work, and travel), then that is another question; as **contracts claimed to be in effect where Tort elements of duress and coercion were present at the time of initiation [lose] their paramount standing, and so otherwise off-point Tort Law Government restrainments found in the *Constitution* would then take upon themselves vibrant new practical meanings and now appropriately intervene into grievances where the very existence of the contract itself is disputed….** [C]onsider the following words of Warren Burger that are now partially quoted by the Social Security Administration lawyers in their retortional rebuttals to facial Social Security Number equity rescissions coming into their offices from Protestors:

"The design of the system requires support by mandatory contributions from covered employers and employees. This mandatory participation is indispensable to the fiscal vitality of the social security system."

I happen to agree with that statement totally. And if you understand Nature, you should too, otherwise go back and read it carefully again, as it only applies to covered *persons*. Covered *persons* have contracts with the King, and contracts should be honored, so stop asking to have the Judiciary help you weasel out of your contracts, based on philosophical political discontentment with some of the terms your contract calls for. I don't have any problem with Warren Burger's pronouncements, and furthermore, I don't have any problems with the merit and substance of the Social Security Administration's position that your contract rescission is utterly meaningless: because the King has an invisible contract on you even without a Social Security Number, if you accept the King's intervention and benefits in your Employer/Employee contract…. You don't need a written contract on someone else in order to work him into an immoral position on non-payment of money; and neither do you need a written contract on someone else in order to forcibly extract money out of him in a Judicial setting (written statements of contracts do offer the benefit of

settling grievances in accelerated pre-Trial judicial proceedings, but written contracts are not necessary, here in the United States of 1985, to attach liability and extract money out of other people). **But you do need to get that other person to accept and then experience some benefits you previously offered conditionally….**

And now that we are all cognizant of that, in order to get out of this Social Security wealth transfer instrument, in addition to effectuating a rescission of your facial attachment of Equity Jurisdiction via a Social Security Number, you must also effectuate an applied Equity severance by objecting to the King's intervention into your relationship with your Employer, and waive, refuse, and reject the King's benefits—and not just the future benefits of retirement income everyone knows about, but also the immediate environmental protection benefits that all Employees experience (as I will later discuss). **If one of these lily white (absolutely free from Equity contamination) non-Commercial factual settings is ruled upon adversely by the Supreme Court some years from now (that is, they rule, in some well-oiled pronouncement, that the overriding Public Policy interests involved must preclude the ability of a prospective non-Commercial Employee who involuntarily entered into the shoes of an *Employee*, to waive and reject unwanted benefits, and that our Founding Fathers in 1787 just did not understand the complex world we now live in, and that the Supreme Court just does not have the time it takes to talk about *Principles of Nature* or of the quiescent ambiance that permeated the relationship between the King and the Countryside up to the 1900s, and that the Federal Taxpayer Status with its attendant criminal liability provisions is now mandatory by all Americans just in order to eat and have a simple *livelihood*), then that's fine with us, as it is important to simply get it out into the open: Since the King is then dealing with us out in the open under Roman Civil Law-styled force and coercion, then our reciprocation will then be on similar terms.**

But as for important present considerations, this Objection and Benefit Rejection must be served synchronous with the timing of your entrance into your next non-Commercial Employee/Employer contract. Now that we understand that the entire *Employer/ Employee* relational setting is Commercially oriented from top to bottom, may I also suggest in providence that a change in addressable names from *employment* to, perhaps, livelihood, and from *Employee* to *worker* might be recommended; together with explicit disavowal of the characterization *employment*, due to the inherent *commercial benefits accepted* and important *business* stigma it automatically creates with Judges—a stigma that automatically overrules and annuls any and all Tax Protesting courtroom arguments sounding in the Tort of Constitutional unfairness.

…But what if you are different?

What happens if you did not enter into that closed private domain of King's Commerce as *a matter of choice*?

What if you are forced into Commerce by clever administrative rule making on your Employer, through the operation of a contract that your Employer already has with the King for other reasons? Now what?

In my personal facial Equity rescission, I claimed that the Social Security Administration is jurisdictionally similar to a Federal District Court, i.e., on a limited jurisdictional mission by the Congress, and that they have no grant of jurisdiction in Title 42 to prevent, interfere, or obstruct with terminal contract rescission and benefit forfeiture, nor does Title 42 in any way restrain the cancellation of Social Security contracts and the attachment of Equity Jurisdiction with the King such a contract initiates. And these rights are self-existent under Common Law unless specifically overruled. And I emphasized the waiver and forfeiture of benefits, and toned down the significance of the rescission of the assigned Social Security Number itself. So in the retortional rebuttal response I received back from the Social Security Administration, no such off-point foolish rebuttal was made to *United States vs. Lee*, and the entire rebuttal Letter, which was rather long, simply went from one paragraph to the next telling me of all the dire practical consequences I would be experiencing without having a precious little Social Security Number in effect.

To those *persons* who have Social Security contracts, both the United States Social Security Administration and the Contract itself is governed by Title 42, *Social Security Act*, and so Title 42 now becomes the terms of your Social Security Contract.

Question: Have you ever read your contract?

Why are so many folks so willing to enter into contracts they have never read? Typically, the response would be something to the effect that: "Well, it's just a checking account..."

No, it is not just a bank account. No, it's not just a Social Security Number. Those contracts have multiple secondary and ripple tertiary effects that expose people to criminal liability for nothing more than mere forgetful negligence on their part. They are *Conclusive Evidence* of your having accepted a Federal Commercial Benefit…. If no initial refusal was made by you to provide a Social Security Number to your Employer, and no objection to the presentation of your Social Security Number was made at the time actual presentation was made, then failure to object timely is fatal, and Magistrates have no choice but to ignore your defenses later on when a confrontation with the King arises, and to characterize your Protestor caliber "wages are not taxable", and "no liability exists to Title 26..." arguments, at that time, as being specious and frivolous, and properly so….

If this model scenario of initial refusal followed by continuing objection was not correctly replicated in your present employment initiation setting, then pay your Bolshevik Income Tax this time and eat it; no war was ever fought in a single campaign, and setbacks and reversals are always expected by sophisticated strategists in all disciplines (subject to the qualification that intellectual wisdom and factual knowledge were acquired in place of some other tangible form of conquest).

THE GRAND KEY: ACCEPTANCE OF BENEFITS

In summary, consider the following Case Study: If I were to lease you my car, and we signed an Agreement to that effect stating everything, we now have a contract... Right? No, not yet. There is no contract in effect until benefits have been accepted and you take possession of my car. **That acceptance of benefits is the Grand Key to lock yourself into, and unlock yourself away from, contract liability altogether, *in toto*.** The only reason why Signing the contract sometimes creates the contract is because the written statement of the contract contains the admission by you that you have accepted a benefit. Now let's give this continuing auto leasing scenario a factual twist: You now have taken possession of the car, and while you are out driving around in my car, you file a *Notice of Rescission of Contract, in rem* on me, telling me that you are canceling the Automobile Rental Agreement we signed. Does that Rescission cancel the contract? No, it does not, and the contract very much remains in full force and effect. And I, as the owner of the car, can go right ahead and keep extracting all the money out of you that the contract calls for. In fact, I actually don't even need any written statement of the terms of the contract at all—I can sue you and very much win. I would [only] need to prove that you did in fact accept my benefits, which isn't that difficult, and then I would need to prove the amount of money damages due (by showing a judge a long list of those other people I have rented that car to, and the amounts they paid). So why do merchants want written statements of contracts? Because without written admissions from you as to what the terms of the contract were, I would have to deal with you in a protracted trial setting which is financially expensive, and go through the trouble and nuisance of adducing supporting evidence (which costs money), whereas with written admissions your little lies and denials get tossed aside and ignored and I can deal with you very effectively and inexpensively in accelerated Summary Judgment Proceedings—hearings only. So a written statement of the contract in writing does not create the contract—it is just a *Statement of the Contract*; and it is actually the exchange of valuable Consideration (benefits) out in the practical setting that creates the contract and initiates the attachment of your contractual liability. I know that this line appears to be different or even contrary from what you have been taught by others since its angle of presentation is unique—but read on, and you will see that I am only enlarging on the information your intellectual repository of factual knowledge already possesses. The only time when signing your name to a statement of the contract actually initiates the contract is that when synchronous with signing the statement, you also make the written admission therein that you have accepted a benefit—usually stated as:

"In exchange for good and valuable Consideration in the amount of $1.00, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged by Party X...")

Now with that admission by you, of having accepted his benefits, the merchant has you tied down tight: **But it is not your signature that ties you down into a contract—it is your admission within the statement of the contract that you have accepted a benefit that ties you down.**

…This is the Grand Key concept to understand in unlocking yourself away from undesired contracts; it is fundamental and is of maximum importance to understand, in order to understand why Federal Magistrates correctly rule, with such rare gifted genius the way they do; as they first snort at, and then toss out, a Tax Protestor's *Notice of Rescission of Contract, in rem* filed on some Birth Certificates…. Therefore, Federal Magistrates who snort at, and then toss out, arguments that discuss *in rem contract rescissions* are not in bed with the King, as it is a correct *Principle of Nature* and American Jurisprudence that it is the practical acceptance and use of benefits that is the key determining factor on the liability question of holding someone to a contract or not (initially attaching liability).

…And accepting the King's benefits by going to work in an environmentally protected occupational Status as an *employee*, without any waiver and rejection of the King's large volume of labor-oriented benefits, does correctly give rise to a taxing liability on you (under *Principles of Nature* relating to the immorality of allowing someone to get away with unjust benefit enrichment), with the amount of the tax being measured by net taxable income (or anything else the King's statutes, as stating the terms of the contract, so define). To waive and reject tangible benefits, you need to return possession of the property

to the owner (such as surrendering the keys to an apartment you may have rented, or surrendering the car if a car rental agreement was in effect. Intangible benefits are waived and rejected by formal Notice stating so in writing (or orally with witnesses).

The reason why benefit rejection is best done in writing is for the same identical reason that complex contracts are best stated in writing: so that all of the details can be presented on the record, without protracted evidentiary presentations just to establish what the record is…. So placing statements in writing is a benefit for yourself relating to the economy of producing evidence later on, and the mere absence of a written record does not derogate your standing before a judge—although you are unnecessarily inconveniencing yourself.

…[A]lways remember just one thing: The King wants your money, and he's got plenty of ways of getting it, by getting you to accept his wide-ranging array of invisible and intangible benefits without you even knowing it.

The most important element of any playful little battle with the King is the factual setting that you will present to the Judiciary for grievance settlement; and the next most important element is the correct Pleading of the relevant points of law and the technical facts that you want that law to operate on, inuring to your favor.

ADHESION CONTRACTS

[Although Mercier does not come right out and say it in his letter, it seems that almost all contracts with the King are "adhesion" contracts, within which the King maintains the "upper hand" and dictates terms on a "take it or leave it" basis. In such contractual settings, according to a footnote, "…ambiguities surrounding the interpretation of that covenant will be subject to stricter construction, and held against the party possessing the stronger bargaining weight." (See *Graham vs. Scissor-tail, Inc*., footnote #16, 623 P.2nd 165 (1981)).]

There is a judicial reference to a particular subdivision classification of contracts where the factual setting surrounding the initiation of the contract is characterized such that one of the parties is in such an unevenly strong bargaining leverage position that the terms of the contract are always presented on a "take it or leave it basis"; these contracts, entered into this way, are in a special status, and fall under what is called the *Adhesion Contract Doctrine*…. As a result of the dominate leverage position obtained when pre-printed forms are used by some low-level clerk or contract agent who has no Grant of Corporate Jurisdiction to change, modify, or rearrange any terms contained in that statement of the contract; and so the contract is full of terms, conditions, and waivers of procedural defense lines ("the buyer hereby waives his right to a Notice of Protest") that would never be there if the contract was negotiated from scratch each time.

In Commercial Law, the requisite "Meeting of the Minds", so called, is known as *mutual assent*. Judges conveniently ignore this *de minimis* Common Law indicia for contracts when a Juristic institution is a party to the contract, with statutes then containing the terms and content of the contract. With Juristic institutions involved as parties to an Adhesion Contract, Judges want to see the *quid pro quo* of reciprocity—the acceptance of benefits—being there by you as an Individual, but generally they have no interest in making sure that there was this *mutual assent* in effect between the parties [the *presumption* being that all "voluntary" member-persons of the federal corporation have agreed to be bound by the bylaws of that corporation].

…Incidentally, the only defense out of [an] "Adhesion Contract" that numerous legal commentators have issued advisory memoranda on, involves your being able to document (prove) that you did not accept the benefits of that statutory contract. Once your adversary adduces to a judge that benefits have been accepted, the formation of the contract is deemed to be complete, and there are few outs remaining.

Employees, so called, are bound to Federal Statutes by a combination of devices, such as the acceptance of Federally created income generating benefits under the protection and advantages of the *Fair Labor Standards Act* (which gives Employees the upper hand over their Employers) by those persons accepting benefits such as corporation *situs employment* and Government contract enforcement of that *employment*. Not that the King is really responsible for the primary benefit of that corporation's offering you an employment position, but that once the corporation does offer you the position on your own merits, the King then intervenes into the Employer/Employee relationship to give Employees rights and the upper hand over their Employer through an array of direct benefits, as well as restraining the Employer in some areas. That Employer, no doubt, is involved with Interstate Commerce, and that Employer is up to his neck in air-tight redundant contracts with the King; and so now the King is using that contractual relationship with your Employer to force a transfer of his benefits over to you. Remember all along that I have been saying that **the key… to get out from underneath the King and his Equity Jurisdiction lies in refusing to accept his benefits, and in doing that, you negate the expected reciprocal *quid pro quo* Federal Judges see very clearly as they snort at Tax Protesting suits seeking withholding relief of some type**.

All courts, state and federal, who have commented on Adhesion Contracts, in explaining why *Defendant so and so* is in fact attached to a Contract of Adhesion, all pronounce similar Adhesion Contract governance: that the best way to defend yourself against Contracts of Adhesion is to go back to the very seminal point of contract formation and attack the very existence of the contract at its origin, by proving that you did not accept any benefits, since the adhesion contract, like all other contracts, came into effect whenever benefits, offered conditionally, were accepted by you. And where the records show that benefits have been accepted, the liability will always follow. Viewing this from a Judge's perspective, this means two things: When did you decline the benefits, and how did you decline the benefits? So if you improperly Objected (meaning, not in writing and therefore the explicit disavowal was disputed), or Objected belatedly, then you automatically lose; I don't know how to explain it any simpler.

…And if you accept the benefits of the King's intervention and protection, through such devices as the *Fair Labors Standards Act*, accepting Social Security Benefits, and Government enforcement of that Employment contract, it is very reasonable and very ethical and very proper under *Principles of Natural Law* for the King and your regional Prince to get paid for having done so….

Since our King has intervened to give Employees the upper [hand] in some key selected areas, such as creating a slice of *lex* to throw at us, like his high-powered *Fair Labor Standards Act*, our King now wants a percentage piece of the action from the Employee—and that does not bother me at all.

(I may personally view the percentage slice the King wants to be a bit aggressive and excessively generous towards the King when analyzed from a *cost/benefit* perspective, but the underlying moral and ethical reciprocal considerations regarding the mandatory exchange of benefits remains intact). Now that an Employee knows his Status as a beneficiary of Federal intervention and benefits, rather than badmouthing Federal Judges, one such person might very well ask the question, "...Gee, most of those benefits never apply to me. Throwing half my income out the window every year to Washington for those benefits is just not worth it."

That analysis is quite accurate for most folks: It isn't worth it; but monetary worth is a business question each of us needs to ask and decide for ourselves, and this is not a question of Law for a Judge to come to grips with in some type of a contract enforcement proceeding, after we have previously accepted those benefits without ever filing a timely objection and rejecting benefits. In every single Tax Protesting Case that I have examined, based on the arguments submitted, I would have ruled the same way the Judge did. I know that most folks—particularly *Tax Protestors extraordinaire*—do not want to hear this line and don't want to be told that it was themselves all along who were in error and not the Judges, but it's about time someone revealed your error to you.

So any half-way clever King, who wants maximum revenue enhancement, is always searching for new ways to get more folks to accept his benefits [read as: expansion of the government]; and once benefits have been accepted, then the *Constitution* fades away in significance, as its design to restrain Government under a few Tort Law factual settings is no longer applicable.

And to those types who experience benefits from the King, but don't want to pay for them by a philosophical reason of political discontentment with something grand that the King is pulling off again with looters and Gremlins, then these Kings always have a redundant pile of Aces tucked neatly up their royal sleeves, just tailor-made to deal effectively with these recalcitrant types; the type that experience benefits provided by a third party, but who refuse to reciprocate and part with any *quid pro quo* money in exchange for benefits accepted. Federal Judges have a characterization I once heard for this type of a Protestor: *a cheap person*. For these folks, the King has Nature on his side (a state of affairs warranting the Tax Protestor's failure in a Courtroom, a state of affairs Tax Protestors never seem to bother addressing when disseminating legal advice fixated on talking about technical reasons why the United States should not prevail based on impediments in the King's *lex* and Charter); for these recalcitrant Protesting types who believe that they are correct, the King has actually worked them into an immoral position: The Protestor is up to his neck in multiple layers of invisible juristic contracts with the King, and the Tax Protestor doesn't even know it. Nature is operating *against* the Protestor, and the Protestor does not even see it. Yes, there is a very good reason why so few Protestors are winning in the Courts: because the Protestor was not entitled to prevail for any reason….

[END QUOTING]

This segment is lengthy—despite considerable time spent in reducing it for the synopsis—because it is very meaty and most worthy of review at the conclusion of this series. Whether or not this material has given us the Grand Key to personal freedom remains to be seen but at the very least it has provided us with substantial insights into the "ties that bind" us to the King of this world.

VKD (And Minions?) Lay Track For Our Train

Editorial Comment: Readers might wonder WHY we continue to run VKD-and-minions' trashings of the Ekkers and GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION. The simple answer is that "they" continue to lay track for our train, thoroughly discrediting their own position in the process.

As we go to press, the most recent posting under VK Durham on the antechamber.net website, purportedly posted by "Mammonator" and dated April 3, 2004, begins:

"REPRINTING ARTICLES FROM RUMOR MILL NEWS IN ANY FORM, IN ANY PUBLISHED MEDIA OTHER THAN SIMILAR WEBSITES ON THE WORLDWIDE WEB, REQUIRES AN EXPLICIT REQUEST AND EXPRESSED WRITTEN PERMISSION OR THE AGREEMENT OF OUR PUBLISHER, ON BEHALF OF ANY OF OUR CONTRIBUTORS."

Sorry, 666-VKD/Mammonator, but that is simply not true—but then again, we have come to expect the untrue as your modus operandi.

FAIR USE

As a fully qualified international newspaper, CONTACT adheres to the rules of Fair Use, cited below:

TITLE 17, CHAPTER 1, Sec. 107.

Sec. 107. - Limitations on exclusive rights: Fair use

Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 106 and 106A, the fair use of a copyrighted work, including such use by reproduction in copies or phonorecords or by any other means specified by that section, for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research, is not an infringement of copyright. In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use the factors to be considered shall include -

(1) the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes;

(2) the nature of the copyrighted work;

(3) the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and

(4) the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.

The fact that a work is unpublished shall not itself bar a finding of fair use if such finding is made upon consideration of all the above factors.

And, as an annotation explains:

"When a copyrighted work contains unfair, inaccurate, or derogatory information concerning an individual or institution, the individual or institution may copy and reproduce such parts of the work as are necessary to permit understandable comment on the statements made in the work."

It is to be hoped from the foregoing that our position is sufficiently self-evident to avoid additional non-professional commentary from the cheap seats.

Without further ado, we present the latest idiotic rantings from VK Durham and her insipid alter-egos or minions, as the case might be.

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/FinIntBankTaDown.html

FINAL INTERNATIONAL BANKING, FINANCIAL & ECONOMIC "HOSTAGE" TAKE DOWN

By V.K. Durham

3/21/04

FINAL "INTERNATIONAL BANKING, FINANCING & ECONOMIC "HOSTAGE" TAKE DOWN

(read: http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/AbusingTheCodeOfSilence.html and listen to both recordings)

By: V.K. Durham

http://www.theantechamber.net

THE WORLDS BIGGEST TRIPLE CROSS

came into full play when THE U.S. FED. R./US TREASURY cut a deal with GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION, E.J. Ekker and Doris J. (Eloise) Ekker to "Fabricate" the BONUS CERTIFICATE 3392-181 "Counterfeit Prime Bank "Gold" Collateral Instruments" which was not to be interfered with by THE COUNCIL OF FOREIGN RELATIONS. The evidence is at

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments/DocGroupG/Gpage4.html . It is suggested you read the MEMORANDUM.

WHEN THE U.S. FROZE ALL "IRANIAN" ACCOUNT & ASSETS

a Jihad was started at that time. The Iranian Jihad was called THE AL QUAD. The Al Quad has since become a global "hate the U.S. organization" all operating under the same Al Quad, but under sound alike (idem sonans) names such as The Al Qaeda, The Al Quayeda, ALL KADA, MLIF, Abbu Sayeff and on down.

THE FIRST "TRIP(s)" 1997-98

made by Rick Martin (the one to whom Russell Herman allegedly assigned his interest") was as a

JOURNALIST FOR THE "CONTACT NEWS PAPER (one of its many names) to IRAN, LYBIA, BRUNEI,

INDONESIA, MALAYSIA, S. AFRICA etc to "THE AL QUAD" members.

THE GAIA-EKKER'S TOOK THEIR ASSIGNMENT WITH THE AL QUAD

"14 years prior to 1998." This is their published statement, not mine.

CHAPTER EIGHT

listed at

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/ChapterEight.html

tells it all. They "took a bullet to the ears of Congress" which, in essence is BUYING OF CONGRESSIONAL SILENCE through Bribery, Coercion, Intimidation..to cover up the "murder" of U.S. Coast Guard/U.S. Naval Intelligence/U.S Treasury Agent, CEO of Cosmos Seafood Energy Marketing, Ltd; Russell Herman. The evidence is documented in the form of PHOTOS of his body taken by THE CORONER September 5, 1994. Look carefully at the photos at

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/VkPublicNotice.html .

To this very day; ALL INVESTIGATIONS are STOPPED at WASHINGTON LEVELS OF CONGRESS.

See http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/UsHasBeenHijacked.html .

THE BANKING CARTELS

now know the "quasi" U.S. Federal Reserve & U.S. Foreign Federal Reserve Banking Systems (QUASI. A legal term which is used in legal phraseology to indicate that one subject resembles another, with which it is compared, in certain characteristics, but that there are intrinsic and material differences between them) have "operated as a FEDERAL U.S. GOVERNMENT CORPORATION, in VIOLATION of the Acts of Congress (out of session in both instances) mandates "Must at all times act in compliance with law."

THE FEDERAL RESERVE

is neither FEDERAL, nor is it a RESERVE.

THE OBJECTIVE OF THE AL QUAD

was to "get to know the Laws of the United States, turn the law around and use it against the United States." This

is a quote from GAIA-EKKERS in public print.

THE BRETON WOOD AGREEMENT/GATT/IMF/WORLD BANK

(Bank Reconstruction Act Number One)

(1945-47)

was finalized. There were original members totaling around 145 member nations. Today there are approximately 175. Each of these nations have CENTRAL BANKS. Each Central Bank has accounts of THE U.S. FED R. CORPORATIONS which holds approximately (1994) $200,000,000. GOLD BULLION (Fort Knox U.S. Treasury Gold Reserve).

MULTIPLY $200,000,000. X's 175... This is where the Ft. Knox Gold Reserves of the U.S. Treasury "went." It went into the Fed. R. Corporations accounts in the Central Banks of these nations. This is why THE GAO (government accounting offices) have been REFUSED to be allowed to AUDIT the Fed. R. Banking Corporations.

MAY 21, 2003 $6.5 TRILLION DOLLAR DEBT OF THE U.S. & CONTINENTAL DEBTS WERE PAID.

TWO $6.5 TRILLION DOLLAR GOLD "EQUITY COLLATERAL" INSTRUMENTS were issued. One for the

U.S. and Continental Debt. The other for GLOBAL HUMANITARIAN NEEDS.

THE US DEBT & CONTINENTAL DEBT PAYMENT was never credited back to THE U.S. DEPT OF THE TREASURY. By June 16th, 2003, it was being used to JACK UP THE STOCK MARKETS around the world.

After the acceptance of the $6.5 Trillion Debt's.. We were asked if we would underwrite the EXTERNAL U.S. DEBT of $400 Trillion Dollars.

COUNTERFEIT GOLD INSTRUMENTS

have by now, created a U.S. External Debt of approximately $858 Trillion Dollars.

MULTIPLY $6.5 TRILLION by current GOLD TRADE DOLLARS at $68.00.

DO YOU GET THE "IDEA?"

NOW YOU KNOW WHAT HAS GONE ON. The party representing CLEAR STREAM (Fed. R. operation) a Mr. Kamalurzaman Bin Annuar..Was caught by the OTHER BANKING CARTELS with his FED. R. BANKING SYSTEMS "CLEAR STREAM" OPERATION.

THE TRIPLE CROSS

of the AL QUAD known as THE GAIA-EKKER'S was to "Fabricate the gold instruments, and take the entire global Banking, Financial and Economics "hostage".. It is on the recording of their meeting at the Guilarmi Hotel in Makita City Philippines and posted athttp://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/AbusingTheCodeOfSilence.html . Listen to the recordings.

THE FED. R. BANKING SYSTEMS

entered into this agreement

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments/DocGroupG/Gpage4.html

which was intended to collapse the other BANKING CARTELS GOLD BANKS with the

"fabricated" instruments.

THE OTHER BANKING CARTELS

turned the entire situation around ON THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKING SYSTEMS. In other words "THEY REVERSED THE CHARGE/ ACTIONS" and let it fall on the U.S. Fed.R./U.S. Treasury.

THE "REVERSED CHARGE"

which the Fed. R. intended for the other Banking Cartels has brought about THE FINAL CALL to "it" or get off the damned pot.

SNOW REQUESTS A MEETING WITH FED (and outlying 12 Regional Banks)

http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin /forum.cgi?read=46104 .

RUMSFELD BIN LADIN ISN'T THE ONLY FACING US GOVT

read http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham /RumsfeldBinLadin.html

THE WORLD IS CHOOSING UP SIDES as a result of this "counterfeiting"

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham /WorldChoosingSides.html is a very enlightening article about these issues.

IT IS THOUGHT: THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL SYSTEM IS FINISHED

http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin /forum.cgi?read=46124 .

NOT SO! THERE IS THE "FORCE MAJUER"

of THE ONE TIME ONLY BONUS 3392 COMMODITY CONTRACT of April 27, 1875 which "Remains in effect until Paid" which is a DEBT assumed by the U.S. and later assumed by the FED. R. BANKING SYSTEMS.

IF THE "FIRST ASSUMPTOR FAILS"

AND THE ASSUMPTION OF "DEBT" IS ASSUMED BY A SECOND PARTY, AND THAT "ASSUMPTOR FAILS" the DEBT FALLS BACK ON THE ORIGINAL "ASSUMPTOR"...

THE "VICTIM" BANKS ARE FULLY AWARE OF THIS "RULE" OF LAW...

NO LEGISLATIVE ACT can repudiate the CREDITOR'S POSITION. They may AVOID DEBT PAYMENT, but they cannot ABSOLVE THEMSELVES OF THE "DEBTORS POSITION."

ONLY THE CREDITOR IS IN THE POSITION TO DECIDE WHAT TO DO WITH THE "DEBTOR POSITION." That is the Rule of Law.

HAVE A NICE DAY.

Signed: V.K. Durham, CEO-Signatory of the Durham Holding Trust aka
THE CREDITOR.

****

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/ MsnbcStormWarn.html

MSNBC - STORM WARNINGS

By V.K. Durham

3/22/04

It is time the Fed. R., The Council on Foreign Relations agreement with the AL QUAD-AL QAEDA UNDERWRITERS was investigated in these Acts of Financial Aggression-Terrorism against the United States.

http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/4571338/

Public Notice

GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION MEMORANDUM OF DIRECTIVE

http://theantechamber.net/VkDocuments /DocGroupG/Gpage4.html

(There is no such thing as PERUVIAN BONUS CERTIFICATE 3392-181)

(But there is a one time only BONUS 3392 commodity contract)

The Fed. R. is going down. The VICTIM BANKING SYSTEMS are going to make certain of that.

To ask for "more collateral" is outrageous. To "give the collateral underwriting to the Fed. R. Banking Systems; Would be like giving a bottle of whiskey to a alcoholic, or a shot of heroine to a DRUG ADDICT.

There will be no help forthcoming to HELP THE FED. R. BANKING SYSTEMS.

V.K. DURHAM, CEO-SIGNATORY

Durham Holding Trust

the Duly Constituted, Outstanding, Primary Creditor of the United States and ALL Debtor Nations.

****

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/ BushCreatesCat.html

BUSH CREATES NATIONAL SECURITY CATASTROPHE

Intervention Magazine War, Politic

By V.K. Durham

3/23/04

This would never have gone as far as it has, if the U.S. House of Representatives, the SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE U.S., the FBI and on down to the local Sheriffs conducted THE INVESTIGATIONS requested by this TRUST since 1998.

They probably would have caught the FED. R. & GAIA-EKKERS transactions that the MUSLIMS were raising hell about, that were TOLD were collectable against the U.S. Fed. R./U.S.T. When trying to collect the FED. R. told them the paper was worthless. Ignoring the fact THE VICTIMS HAD PUT UP 50% "GOLD" to buy the counterfeit's.

http://www.interventionmag.com/cms/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=686

This is much larger than anyone, even myself can comprehend. The GAIA-EKKERS spent nearly a week destroying COUNTERFEIT deeds of assignment records back in Y2K.

No one will ever know how many of those counterfeit gold instruments are out there.

****

http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin/ forum.cgi?read=46453

The Rumor Mill News Reading Room

http://www.rumormillnews.com

YOUR MORTGAGE & YOUR DEBT WAS PAID ~ WHERE'S THE MONEY?

Posted By: Patriotlad

Date: Wednesday, 24 March 2004, 2:30 p.m.

To the members of the National Committee of the Reform Party and to all parties interested in, or associated with Ralph Nader for President:

MARCH 24th, 2004:

IN OCTOBER OF 2002, the widow of a long-serving OSS/CIA officer, Colonel Russell Hermann (originally a Coast Guard recruit), approached the Federal Reserve Bank in Omaha and requested entry. She was questioned — "who are you ?"

Her answer was succinct: "I am V.K. Durham of the Durham Trust, and I am the Primary Creditor of the United States of America."

After a few moments of fumbling, Ms. Durham was granted immediate access to this regional member bank of the Federal Reserve System. In the next few minutes, it was made clear to the officials of the bank, and thus to the Federal Reserve System itself, that Ms. V.K. Durham was not dead — despite having been declared 'dead' by the so-called Social Security Administration in Region V. Despite having been denied survivor's benefits owed to her as the widow of a veteran who had served his country in war, peace and during the long twilight struggle called The Cold War, on the premise that she was 'dead.' She was, indeed, alive.

Over the next six months, in a series of interviews and articles posted here on Rumor Mill News and circulated widely on the Internet via e-mail, Ms. V. K. Durham explained how and why she, as the CEO of the Durham Trust, became the primary creditor of the United States of America through her ownership and control of a debt instrument created by the Legislature of Peru in 1875, and assumed as a debt of the United States some thirty-two years or so later.

Slowly, the word circulated throughout the international banking community that V. K. Durham was not dead, and that The Durham Trust, of which she was a founding member and CEO, had the only lawful "color instruments" comprising the debt created by Peru and guaranteed by a mortgage on their natural resources "until paid in full."

May, 1875

This instrument has come to be known as "the Bonus 3392-181," and it is a one-time only Commodity Contract (the same as a Bill of Lading), providing for payment in gold, with interest, and sold in New York in the spring of 1875. The purpose of this Contract was to provide the government of Peru with gold currency so that the English Bond holders who had helped finance the construction of their railroad system could be paid off. It was one of many and various instruments floated at that time, to raise money in gold for their creditors in the City of London.

Eventually, almost all of the debt instruments sold by business agents or factors on behalf of Peru were either resold, and liquidated or otherwise cashed out, mostly by the thirty-year maturity date which was most common then, or 1905. However, the Bill of Lading known as the Contract or Bonus 3392 was not secured by those looking to cash in on this issuance of debt, and it was listed as being among the debts of Peru assumed by an Agreement of the United States government via the Department of Agriculture with regard to The Guano Act of 1856 and other acts and agreements. The debts of Peru were assumed as being ours, and many of them were paid in gold at that time.

The Bonus 3392-181 was not a regular bond, not subject to a "drop-dead maturity date" and was scheduled to pay 7 per cent on both interest and principal, compounded and computed every six months — "until paid." Payment for this Bill of Lading was to be in gold coin, gold bullion or in another form of gold as lawful money, as might be stipulated later. The point is, it was a Contract for payment in gold as money. It was never paid, never liquidated, and it has never expired.

The years passed. The Bonus 3392, held by one of V.K. Durham's blood relatives, was thought to be missing or to have been destroyed, but it was simply misplaced in storage for a very long time. It passed into her possession in 1975 in a most unremarkable way, and some years elapsed before its true value was recognized. In 1989 and 1990, with the help of her late husband, Col. Russell Hermann, she was able to establish the bona fides of this Bill of Lading/Commodity Contract payable in gold, and further research proved that it was a debt assumed by the United States prior to the establishment of the privately-owned Federal Reserve System. This banking cartel was established in 1913.

After that was done in December of 1913, additional Acts of Congress passed on December 24th, 1919 created additional responsiblities under the Foreign Federal Reserve System designation. From 1919 on the Federal Reserve was made responsible for managing all of the external and pre-existing debts of the United States, for providing for Bills of Lading and for Bills of Exchange, offering Notes, and it was required by the terms of the founding acts of 1913 and the 1919 amendments, to be in conformity with U.S. law. There is no question that this outstanding debt of Peru, assumed by the United States in a debt swap to keep Peruvian guano and nitrates flowing into this country, is a lawful commodity contract under international law and under the law of the land of the United States of America, pre-existing and dating to 1875.

May, 1990

In 1990 Col. Hermann and V. K. Durham had the value of the contract calculated by the Federal Reserve System bank in Los Angeles: and as of that time, with penalties and the interest thereon having compounded every six months, the value of the Bonus 3392 was established at being in excess of $ 206, 858 Trillion U.S. au — gold. Given that the alleged debt of the United States as claimed by the Federal Reserve System, the so-called "national debt," was calculated at $6.5 Trillion last year in May, this Contract is 29,550 times larger, and that's only as of the benchmark date of May, 1990.

That makes the Bonus 3392 the largest debt owed, and the owner of that debt the primary creditor. In addition, it is the oldest debt owed of those assumed from Latin America at the turn of the last century. With the help of Colonel Hermann and other experts, V. K. Durham set up the Durham Trust to maintain the ownership of this Commodity Contract, and to protect it from predatory financial agents. As it happens, Russell Hermann was abducted, tortured, poisoned and then murdered in 1994. Counterfeiters — brilliant swindlers who posed as friends of the late Colonel — got copies of of the Bonus and began marketing them around the world a few years later, putting Deeds of Assignment into active play, based on false statements and fraud. This has created much chaos. These counterfeits have also been used to fund Islamic fundamentalist networks in the Philippines — the Abu Sayeff — and to help suppor the "Al Qaeda" network of Islamic groups.

Those frauds have all been discovered and uncovered. Some $ 400 Trillion in phony financial instruments have been written on the Bonus 3392 by these counterfeiters, who are expatriate Americans known as E.J. and Doris E. Ekker, most recently of Makatai City in the Philippines. There may be more than that, as new frauds are being discovered almost every week, but even if the number tops the $ 500 Trillion mark, that's but a mere fraction of the total value, in gold collateral, of this Bonus 3392-181.

May, 2003

Negotations begun last year in the spring, led V. K. Durham to make an agreement with the Federal Reserve System, to do a 'debt swap,' and this trade was approved by the Governors and the Central Intelligence Agency (as needed under the so-called PATRIOT Act). There were two parts to the debt swap, a block of debt swapped for collateral in gold of $ 6.5 Trillion U.S. to liquidate the so-called National Debt and a second block of $ 6.5 Trillion U.S. to be used for humanitarian purposes and for debt relief in the Latin American countries, and the United States.

Additionally, approximately one billion in U.S. dollars was to be provided to the Durham Trust and its subdivisions for gold banking operations, to enable it to oversee and do "due diligence" in the assignment of funds — in gold collateral — for humanitarian purposes and reconstruction projects. Finally, the non-negotiable part of this deal, in which the Federal Reserve System's owners would get $ 6.5 Trillion in gold collateral for the debt they themselves foisted on the U.S.A., was that all mortgages on all properties and land in the United States, as recorded through December of 2002, were to be marked "Paid In Full" and returned to the property owners or their heirs and assigns. That's correct — all of the mortgages held by all of the banks under the Federal Reserve System's control, or foreign banks with which it must correspond via the 1919 Act and other acts, were to be marked as paid in full ....

The instruments to assign this debt swap were drafted and executed on May 21, 2003. The banking cartel of Spain, otherwise known as the Control Group, and Clear Stream, were named to handle the transactions and compliance was assured to be completed within three weeks. Certain U.S. banks were named to handle the drafts to establish gold banking for the Durham Trust. Promises were made and many assurances given. Shipping numbers and receipts are available to prove this offer was made, sent and delivered.

The Federal Reserve System's governors lied. They embezzled the $ 13 Trillion U.S. and welched on the deal to 'put paid' to all of the mortgages held by the banks under their supervision, or by correspondence. These monies were shovelled into the various stock markets, while the mortgages — which are stored mainly in London and Paris, as 'assets' of foreign bankers — were not returned to the U.S. and not paid off. The Durham Trust was not invested with $ 1 billion U.S. au for the purpose of overseeing its humanitarian projects, and the indebtedness of our Latin American neighbors was not liquidated, either. This amounts to the greatest banking fraud in history.

Since that time, the leading Chinese banks and the Islamic banks who were the primary victims of the counterfeiting mentioned before, have wised up and are demanding satisfaction from the Federal Reserve System. Since they are stonewalling the bankers of Hong Kong and Shanghai, of Jeddah and Kuala Lumpur, this is leading to a sharp decline in the value of the dollar in overseas markets, and not a healthy decline either. Korean and Japanese banking is in turmoil too.

As of March 22nd, V. K. Durham has been in contact with principals of the United States Treasury, who first contacted her: she asserts that her position is clear — the embezzlers must be brought to account, and the counterfeiters brought to justice, before the Durham Trust will render any additional assistance or underwrite any other debt relief programs — period. She has made it precisely and abundantly clear to the Secretary of the Treasury that there will be no bail-out of the Federal Reserve System, no support for any private bank associated with these frauds, and no further negotiations with any private agency or agent. "They had their chance to do right," she said. "Let them twist in the wind, now."

Perhaps this message will help make certain things clear: the reason that there is so much money available now for "mortgages and refinancing" is that the embezzled money has been streamed downwards to secondary banks and to commercial lenders. Most of those operations are run by honest people who have no clue that the 'new capital' being made available, is stolen money. Second, the swindlers seem to believe that if they can write thousands and thousands of new mortgages, that this will lessen 'the pain' of having to write down all the old mortgages. What pain ?? Forget the fact that the banking factors were being provided $ 6 and one half trillion U.S. to liquidate these debts !! It was all consumer debt, ledger entries, many of which were created out of thin air, to begin with !! It isn't even really about greed, it is about their ambitions for social control and the usurpations of our rights, and their own arrogance.

V. K. Durham has tried every avenue known, to seek redress for these grievances: notice of this embezzlement and fraud has been given to the Securities Exchange Commission, to the Secret Service and Treasury, to various Congressmen and Senators, to foreign press agents and news media. She's archived the documents in question for anyone to view, and she's written extensively from her own perspective on all of the swindles and chicanery that this 'theft of the centuries' has involved. And the historical background and developments surrounding the Bonus 3392-181, and more.

The SEC has refused to consider the question at all. The Secret Service claims it has only one duty, to protect the President (which is an outright lie, as counterfeiting is in its domain). But pressure from foreign bankers and financial markets is beginning to become unbearable.

How will it all play out ? Neither political party 'on the Hill' wants to touch this, as they all crawl on their bellies to pay homage to Sir Alan of Greenspan, and hang on his every mumbled and muttered utterance.

And so, does Ralph Nader have the courage — as the leading consumer advocate of the last forty years — to demand to get, and to know the truth about the Durham debt swap of 2003, and the embezzlement of $ 13 Trillion U.S., and the unlawful pirating away of the mortgages on properties belonging to Citizens of the U.S., held by British and French banking factors, in the City of London or in Paris ???

And isn't this more important than whether or not the Supreme Court will hear arguments about "pledging allegiance" and "one nation under God ?" We all love the flag, and we all think of God as having a reality in our lives — each in our own way — but this issue is about real money, real embezzlement and the real theft of mortgage payments by British and French bankers who know very well that these properties have been PAID OFF by the Durham Trust in the debt swap of 2003. And here is her statement of intention, concerning the uses of the gold collateral value held in trust by The Durham Trust:

"This TRUST will underwrite the necessary collateral from this OUTSTANDING DEBT owed to the TRUST CREDITOR — to UNDERWRITE "AMERICAN OWNED" INDUSTRY, MANUFACTURING, HOUSING, EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS, RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT, JOBS, family owned FARMS, et cetera, as needed, and to REBUILD the U.S. & LATIN AMERICAN REPUBLICS." It is 'a Marshall Plan' for the American Continents.

Here is the link to view the documents drafted by V.K. Durham and sent to the Banking Control Group and the Federal Reserve in May of 2003:

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments/UsDebtPaymtIndex.html

Search the archives at Rumor Mill News for more information on V.K. Durham, by visiting —

http://www.rumormillnews.com/

or visit this URL for her own series of essays:

http://www.theantechamber.net/

****

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/DungeonsDragon.html

DUNGEONS, DRAGON'S & PACK MAN "PUSHED THE BANKING FRAUDS ENVELOPE TOO FAR"

By V.K. Durham

3/27/04

RESPONSE TO RICHARD ANDRESKI'S COMMENTS REGARDING "YOUR NATIONAL DEBT WAS PAID OFF~So Where's The Money

by: V.K. DURHAM

http://www.theantechamber.net

Mr. Andreski's letter (affixed)(Click) is most interesting. He address' problems with Peru, and Peru's inability to pay their debts approximately 20-25 years ago, and his RETIRED SENATOR FRIEND "VANCE HARTKE (IND.)" (now deceased)..and the usual's.. Funny that "Vance" should be mentioned. Vance used to live about 8 Blocks from me in Evansville, Indiana. I knew Vance very well. Knowing him and his family as well as we did, I called my old friend "U.S. Senator Vance Hartke" in regards to the BONUS 3392-181 matters many times.

The last time we talked about the BONUS 3392-181 Russell Herrmann and I were on the run for our lives with men dressed in Ninja Suits carrying automatic weapons, hid out in a motel in Illinois. We were on the ground floor, and laid on the floor for 2 days, to keep from being shot through the dammed window of the motel. These were the men of Hamilton & Hyuan who were sent to kill us, because of HAMILTON & HYUAN'S STATEMENT'S: "I" DID NOT KNOW WHO I WAS DEALING WITH" when "I" would not sign off on THE KOREAN transactions of 1991 which was a extension of the SEPTEMBER 12, 1991 "10 YEAR" CONTRACT which ended on, or about 9/11/01 . You will find the bank accounts, bank routes, names etc of the primary Banking in the 1991 Bank Failures-Brady Bonds (in the archives at RMNews

http://www.rumormillnews.com)

(also in the Archives at

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham /TexasTwoStep7.html).

The last time I personally talked to U.S. Senator Vance Hartke was from the motel floor explaining our situation of being cornered by these Ninja type individuals at which time I was told, by Retired Senator Vance Hartke "This situation is fast going from bad to worse case scenario. If you knew what I know; You would get rid of the documents; Move somewhere else and become invisible. I cannot help you, and I will not help you. This is too deep and too dangerous. Do not call me again. I have been instructed to stay out of this." That was the last conversation with U.S. Senator Vance Hartke. I have not even called his son's since that time.

With the two of us, Mr. Andreski and myself having familiarities with Retired U.S.Senator Vance Hartke....—

the ground-work is established sufficiently to proceeded, to wit;

Have you noticed:

1. Not a single mention of the MEMORANDUM "AGREEMENT" (go to

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments

/DocGroupG/Gpage4.html) between the U.S. Govt. high ranking officials, the Council on Foreign Relations, and the GAIA-Ekkers to "split 50-50 all monies taken down off shore on BONUS CERTIFICATE 3392-181?

2. Not a single mention of this AGREEMENT which UNDERWRITES THE AL QUAD-AL QAEDA...?

3. Not a single mention of this AGREEMENT which has created $100''s of TRILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN EXTERNAL U.S. DEBTS all around the globe, terrorizing all Banking Systems, All Financial Transactions, All Economies?

4. Not a single mention of the INTENTION TO TAKE THE GLOBAL BANKING, FINANCING AND ECONOMICS HOSTAGE, by the FABRICATION OF GOLD DERIVATIVE INSTRUMENTS WRITTEN ON "BONUS CERTIFICATE 3392-181"..?!

NO! There will be nothing that will address the TRUTH that there is one humongous COVER-UP of FRAUDS brought about by the before mentioned MEMORANDUM?

Instead; We hear HOW POOR PERU IS, and how bad the situation in Latin America is?

APRIL 14-27, 1875

Peru saw what was happening. Peru and all Latin America (as with Argentina today) was suffering from ENGLAND'S TRIPOD i.e., W.R. Grace, J.P. Morgan and Rothschild's "short billing bills of lading".. on contracted goods.

The contracted "bills of lading" suffered the "short billing" which was designed by the TRIPOD MEMBERS to keep the Peruvians (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile etc) from having the ability to pay off the ENGLISH BOND HOLDERS involved with THE LONDON STOCK EXCHANGE and BANK OF ENGLAND.

Dr. Louise Drago

(see Drago Doctrine

http://www.theantechamber.net/UsHistDoc/DocOfAmeriHist

/DocOfAmeriHistIndex.html#Dd) saw the problems..as did "PERU."

As the WAR OF THE PACIFIC came knocking at the door of PERU.. Peru, in knowing of the Warehousing frauds of W.R. Grace and Company, and knowing W.R. GRACE was flying under FALSE FLAGS (Pirate of Peru) had deliberately deceived them, and other Latin American Republics in their infinite wisdom, saw fit to LEGISLATE the "One time only BONUS 3392 commodity contract. They put into the Bonus 3392 contract a specific progression of interest rates on both the Principle and again on the Interest, payable semi annually. They also made certain; The Holder/Bearer of the one time only BONUS 3392(181) had the Rights to Mortgage the Natural Resources of Peru until paid."

MAGIC WORDS...RIGHTS OF THE HOLDER/BEARER TO MORTGAGE THE NATURAL RESOURCES "UNTIL PAID" this defined THE TERMS OF THE ENDING DATE OF THE ONE TIME ONLY "BONUS 3392"..181.

Peru and all Latin America knew THE MONROE DOCTRINE(Click) provisions, and the International Community adhered to this Doctrine. All adhered, and respected the old DOCTRINE excepting THE PIRATE OF PERU and the CROWN OF ENGLAND'S PIRATE CORPORATIONS OPERATING NOW AS THE U.S. AND U.S. FOREIGN FEDERAL RESERVE.

Peru and all Latin America knew ultimately THE LATIN AMERICAN DEBTS would be forced by THE CROWN'S PIRATE'S to be assumed when the "feet" of THE UNITED STATES feet held to the fire of THE MONROE DOCTRINE(Click). THEY WERE RIGHT!

PERU HOPED

Even though the WAR OF THE PACIFIC was at her door step, shots being fired as the Peruvian Legislature invoked the Constitution of Peru of 1862 on April 14th through the 27th, for President and the Peruvian Legislature; The Constitutional Authority to ENTER INTO THE ONE TIME ONLY BONUS 3392 COMMODITY CONTRACT, she hoped, at some time in the future, the one holding the One Time Only Bonus 3392-181 Commodity Contract, at some time out in the future would do the honorable, ethical, moral, right thing under the Law of Contracts, and do what was necessary for Remedy and Resolution of the very problems confronting the nation as mentioned in Mr. Andreski's affixed email.

THE ENDING DATE ON THE ONE TIME ONLY BONUS 3392 COMMODITY CONTRACT

"Until Paid."

BONUS 3392-181 has been in A FAMILY TRUST for many, many years.

PERU'S HOPES

that sometime, in the future; THE HOLDER/BEARER would do THE RIGHT THING have come to fruition.

LATIN AMERICA'S HOPES

to be free from a PREDATORY BANKING SYSTEM operated by THE PIRATES has also come true.

HOW SO?!

A Trust was set up years ago, to forgive the Latin American Debts from 24% (twenty four percent) of the (December 28, 1988) Calculated/Notarized, Filed of Record, Filed with the U.S. SECURITY EXCHANGE LEGAL DEPARTMENT of the accrued GOLD COLLATERAL Equity Interest derived from THE "ONE TIME ONLY BONUS 3392(181) BONUS COMMODITY CONTRACT".. Further (once all Latin America agreed) to establish a "Gold Banking System" and work together with reciprocities of sharing ingress and egress for transportation of goods etc. There is a formula. The formula is sound. The formula is "back to basics on a system that works."

RATHER THAN TO HAVE "PEACE"

UNDERWRITING THE AL QAEDA of the Iranian & Libyan Al Quad to create Civil Unrest and throw every one's attention off THE REAL PROBLEMS brought about by THESE PIRATES of the "CROWN OF ENGLAND'S ROTHSCHILD BANKING SYSTEMS known as the U.S. and U.S. Foreign Federal Reserve Banking Systems"...and creating a EXTERNAL U.S. DEBT that cannot possibly ever be serviced by a NON EXISTING, NOT KNOWN "BONUS CERTIFICATE" 3393-181...

THE U.S. DEBT & Latin American Debt has been paid. The specific conditions of said U.S. Debt & Latin American Debts have not been met.

THE GOLD COLLATERAL "EQUITY"

owned, by this TRUST is REAL. It is like your EQUITY ON YOUR HOME, OR YOUR LAND which accumulates over the years. It is not HARD PHYSICAL GOLD but, it is EQUITY GOLD COLLATERAL.

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED

WHY the Duly Constituted, Outstanding, Primary Creditor of the United States, and ALL DEBTOR NATIONS (this TRUST) is not allowed to use the EQUITY COLLATERAL to assist in JUMP STARTING THE U.S. ECONOMY but; THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEMS CAN UNDERWRITE THE AL QUAD-AL QAEDA through the GAIA-EKKERS with the SOUND ALIKE "BONUS CERTIFICATE" 3392-181?

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED

WHY ALL INVESTIGATIONS INTO "CEO" COSMOS SEAFOOD ENERGY MARKETING, LTD; NEVADA ID# 1707-85 "MURDER" IS STOPPED BY "WASHINGTON" (the latest is U.S. Congressman Steve King)?!

http://theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham

/VkPublicNotice.html

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED

WHY "V.K. Durham was taken off THE BOATMEN'S BANK, BANK ACCOUNT NOVEMBER 18, 1991 and put into THE DHHS (SOCIAL SECURITY) RECORDS DATA BASE AS "DECEASED?"

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED

WHY "All information regarding "V.K. Durham" or "V.K. Durham, CEO-Signatory THE DURHAM HOLDING TRUST" was being DENIED to THOSE "VICTIM" BANKING SYSTEMS IN CHINA, MALAYSIA, INDONESIA ETC by THE DHHS, U.S. T./FED. R. by the enforcement arm HOMELAND DEFENSE? Consider SOCIAL SECURITY IS OWNED BY "THE CROWN OF ENGLAND" (documents posted at

http://www.theantechamber.net/Mirror

/StatutoryInstrument1997.html) and THE CROWN'S PIRATES(Click)

are "in agreement with the GAIA-EKKERS which is a PUBLIC NOTICE MEMORANDUM posted also at

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments

/DocGroupG/Gpage4.html .

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED

WHY over 62,000 unauthorized uses OF THE COLLATERAL was used in the Far East Banking by U.S. Federal Govt. Agencies and "Old Boys Banking?"

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED

WHY the WORLD BANK/IMF documents show unauthorized use of the Collateral by the U.S. Dept. of the Treasury and U.S. Fed. R. using the COLLATERAL 5,868 times?

HAVE YOU EVER WONDERED

HOW CAN EVERY ONE ELSE USE THE COLLATERAL BUT THE COLLATERAL USAGE IS DENIED THE LAWFUL, DULY CONSTITUTED, CONTRACTED "OWNER" i.e., THE HOLDER/BEARER?

IT IS TIME, THESE QUESTIONS BE ASKED

We are fully aware PERU CAN NEVER PAY THE DEBT. But! We are also aware THE GOLD COLLATERAL can sure as hell cure a lot of ILLS on this American Continent, American Territories and THE VICTIM NATIONS who have suffered the gross inequities imposed by THE PIRATES before mentioned.

THE U.S. & LATIN AMERICAN DEBT "IS PAID."

—— Original Message ——-

From: VK DURHAM

To: Rosehav...@.....

Sent: Friday, March 26, 2004 7:48 PM

Subject: Re: [odpositive] RE: Fwd: YOUR NATIONAL DEBT WAS PAID OFF ~ So Where's The ...

Well, here is another "genius" at work running off his mouth, not knowing what he/she is talking about.

OK! Genius! Have you READ THE "ONE TIME ONLY BONUS 3392 COMMODITY CONTRACT?" Had you.. you would have "kept it closed." You may travel in Peru etc. However, please do not be so presumptions as to make such idiotic statements about "One time only Bonus 3392 commodity contract" if you have not read the bloody thing.

V.K. Durham, CEO-Signatory

****

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/LargerThanWatgat.html

MUCH LARGER THAN WATERGATE:

PENDING WATERGATE II

By V.K. Durham

3/29/04

PENDING WATERGATE II

based on quiet international investigations into the External U.S. Debt of over $858 Trillion Dollars (and growing) will finally expose: Counterfeit Gold Derivatives, Bribery of nations leaders, Bribery of Prime Bank Officials, Major Banking Frauds-Embezzlements of other peoples "Properties", Blackmail, Threats, Coercion, Intimidation, Trading with the Enemy, Overthrow of

Nations, Corruption at the very highest levels of Governments, Murder for Profit (click

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham

/VkPublicNotice.html look at Russell Herman's tortured-murdered body) and finally explode into full view of The Court of Public Opinion "Internationally."

This goes far beyond The U.S. Criminal Code Statutes, even far beyond THE RICO STATUTES, even further into INTERNATIONAL VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS. See:

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham

/AbusingTheCodeOfSilence.html

read it carefully, and listen to the statements made by those intending to take the International Banking, Financing and Economics "hostage"... by a Agreement, between the U.S. Federal Reserve Banking, the U.S. Foreign Federal Reserve Banking Systems, The Council on Foreign Relations back in 1997-98 see MEMORANDUM (PUBLIC NOTICE)

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments

/DocGroupG/Gpage4.html

Note: The latest issue of CONTACT: THE PHOENIX JOURNAL published by the parties to the MEMORANDUM "agreement" are now stating "We have never dealt with or had anything to do with a Peruvian Bonus Certificate 3392-181"....

Hmmmmmmmmm!?

YES INDEED; THE CURRENT INVESTIGATIONS WILL DISCLOSE THIS IS ANOTHER WATERGATE, BUT:

MUCH LARGER

THAN WATERGATE

1. http://www.theantechamber.net/UsHistDoc /Exord12803/Exord12803Index.html
2. http://www.theantecamber.net/Mirror /StatutoryInstrument1997.html
3. http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham /RumsfeldBinLadin.html

THERE IS ONLY "ONE"

thing that could possibly generate the GOLD EQUITY COLLATERAL that would be allowed to generate the outrageous External U.S. Debt currently at aprox. $858 Trillion, which has created this BANKING, FINANCING AND ECONOMIC "BUBBLE." There is nothing else that has the VALUE of "The One Time Only, Bonus 3392-181".. It is owned and held IN TRUST. We would not authorize the use of the Gold Equity Collateral to GAIA-EKKER'S.

THE GAIA-EKKERS "MEMORANDUM" (http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments /DocGroupG/Gpage4.html)

used a look alike or sounding like "fabricated" set of instruments, calling it "Peruvian Bonus CERTIFICATE 3392-181."

ALL THAT WAS NECESSARY WAS TO "SELL THE COUNTERFEITS" was bribe a banker here, a leader there, then threaten to "expose" those involved.

THERE IS NO SUCH THING, AS "BONUS CERTIFICATE 3392-181"

everyone knew that, even President Geo. H.W. Bush when he authorized JAMES BAKER III to use the Bonus 3392-181 in two $120 Billion Dollar Gold Transactions which went through NICHOLAS BRADY (BRADY BONDS) and ALAN GREENSPAN (FED. R.) using TRANS-TECH INTERNATIONAL (ISRAEL) in 1991 (without authorization from the Trust) then "along comes the selling out of PROPERTY the PRESIDENT HAD NO "CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY TO SELL-PRIVATIZE

(click)http://www.theantechamber.net/UsHistDoc /Exord12803/Exord12803Index.html

and

http://www.theantechamber.net/Mirror /StatutoryInstrument1997.html .

Along comes a new president in 1992-93; President William J. Clinton at the time of the 1997-98 agreement (MEMORANDUM) which started the Bribery, Extortion, Racketeering, Murder for Profit which reached into Libya, Iran, S. Africa, Greece, Israel, Indonesia, Malaysia, China, Saudi Arabia in another BCCI banking type of Bank within a Bank situation "A world of Unreality" described CHAPTER 22 at

(click)http://www.geocities.com/saudhouse_p/aworldof.htm

1991. U.S. GUN-SHIPS FLEW THREATENINGLY "CLOSE" OVER THE

"PERUVIAN PRESIDENTIAL PALACE" which was the residence of Peruvian President FUJIMORI.

(in other words; President Geo. H.W. Bush, Baker, Brady, Netanyaho, along with Fujimori and Montesinos, plus a few greedies in Peru's Banking System, cut a deal on BONUS 3392-181 of the Peruvian Legislature's Annex's of April 14ththrough April 27th, 1875 "AMERICAN CREDITOR/HOLDER/BEARER" Peruvian instruments; WHICH "ONLY THE CREDITOR" not the Debtor holds Lawful, Constitutional, Duly Constituted POWER to use, or not to use.")

The PERUVIANS shot the doors off the U.S. Gun-Ship, and Fujimori killed a lot of people which is currently under investigation into CORRUPTION, BRIBERY and HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS along with MONTESINOS (National Security of Peru at that time).

PAGE 8 of

http://www.geocities.com/saudhouse_p/aworldof.htm of CHAPTER 22 also makes note of BRIBERY of BANKS etc in PERU in this 1991 Bank Frauds of THE BCCI which has just been "moved into other banking systems, looking like legitimate banking" WHEN IN FACT:

THE CURRENT INVESTIGATIONS (INTERNATIONALLY) WILL PROVE "MUCH LARGER THAN WATERGATE: PENDING WATERGATE II."

THE GAIA-EKKER'S

published this last week in their ENCRYPTED MESSAGES news paper called CONTACT: THE PHOENIX PROJECT JOURNALS, knowing INTERNATIONAL BANKING, FINANCING AND ECONOMIC INVESTIGATIONS are ongoing, and moving very swiftly state: "WE HAVE NEVER DEALT WITH PERUVIAN BONUS CERTIFICATE 3392-181."

The SULTAN OF BRUNEI was "DECEIVED" into putting up "20% of his nations wealth to underwrite this INTERNATIONAL BANKING, FINANCING AND ECONOMIC'S "BUBBLE" currently under investigation globally.

The Sultan of Brunei knew the BONUS 3392-181 instruments were real. Russell and I (V.K. Durham) had been communicating via fax with the Sultans Minister of Finance during June and July of 1994.

When the GAIA-EKKER'S came on the scene THE SULTAN THOUGHT HE WAS DEALING WITH THE "REAL" Bonus 3392-181.

His COUSIN, another SULTAN (ZULU) were ripped off royally by the GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION "Ekkers".. using the same formula of THE BCCI BANKING SCANDAL and THE LATIN AMERICAN RIP OFF OF THE 1870'S-1880'S, and...—believe it or not THE GAIA-EKKER'S STOLE the SULTAN OF BRUNEI'S "COUSIN IN THE SULTAN (ZULU) PHILIPPINES, ISLANDS, GOLD, AND "OIL RESERVES" AS PROPERTY."

We are putting up the GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION "Deed of Assignment for Consideration" Number 18102612, assigned to the Sultan's "advisor" Mohammad Abdullah S. Santos President, witnessed by Habaib A. Nasser, Witness, document signed by THE GAIA-EKKER'S who allege "WE HAVE NEVER HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH PERUVIAN BONUS CERTIFICATE 3392-181.....AGAIN...—-

Hmmmmmm?

All of this International Banking, Financing and Economics frauds would have never been figured out had V.K. DURHAM, CEO-SIGNATORY OF THE DURHAM HOLDING TRUST "NOT" been on TOP of this "MASSIVE" BANKING TERRORISM of: GLOBAL BANKING, FINANCING AND ECONOMIC'S "HOSTAGE" situation...

Fortunately, THE VICTIMS have been communicating with the TRUST, sending the Counterfeit Gold Derivative "Deeds of Assignment for Consideration" such as with the SULTAN in the Philippines who was just about to lose EVERYTHING including HIS GOLD.

Another (we have 6 or 7) of these GAIA-EKKER'S assignments is to a Professor Deku(Click)

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments /Groups/GroupC.html

ALL KADA out of Ghana.. and the list just goes on.

Back in October 2003 a visit from a Isak (Cody) Krueger from S. Africa came to visit. When he held the color instruments BONUS 3392-181 his hands shook, his face turned red, and he broke out in a COLD SWEAT. He had seen a lot of the BLACK & WHITE COPIES, but he had never seen THE RAINBOW "COLOR"..

Mr. Krueger was working with the GAIA-EKKERS setting up operations again, here in the state of Nevada U.S. A.... We have been told; MR. KRUEGER has been arrested. No confirmation.

Mr. Krueger was the gentlemen (we are told by friends of the VICTIM SULTAN of the PHILIPPINES) who "stole the Sultan's Title to all his properties" which was then incorporated into the TALANO ESTATE and currently is on THE PHILIPPINE STOCK EXCHANGE....as Mr. Krueger was setting up BANKING OPERATIONS in BELIESE, until he became a guest of the State of Nevada jail systems.

RadJack here:

I was visiting with V.K. On the day that Mr. Krueger paid her a visit and frankly, I must agree with V.K.s observation, as Mr.Krueger seemed to have everything planed out, he was real cool calm and collected, good speaker, had lots to say.... That is until Mr Krueger held the Rainbow in his hands, from that point on it seemed he didn't quite know what to do, Mr Krueger just sat there in silence for some time. After that the meeting was cut rather short with pleasantries, goodbys and promises of returns. To my knowledge that was the last time Mr Krueger came a callin.

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments /DocGroupL/LpageIndex.html

YES SIREE' SHE'S A'GONA BE BIGGER THAN WATERGATE EVER DARED TO BE..

very shortly

http://www.theantechamber.net/VkDocuments /DocGroupG/Gpage4.html

and

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham /AbusingTheCodeOfSilence.html

I Am very busy and cannot continue to answer all the email, Please NO SOLICITORS !.

CLOSING EDITORIAL COMMENT

There are at least three more postings at the antechamber.net website subsequent to the last posting cited here. To the truly cretinous minds behind this lunacy, we say a sincere "thank you" for making our case so well for us.

We reiterate that VK Durham was never married to Russell Herman and there is no "holding trust" ("TIAS" or otherwise). The full-color "rainbow" certificate has nothing more than "sentimental" value, as Russell Herman had it reconfirmed, reconformed and its value assigned to the identifiable ownership of COSMOS SEAFOOD ENERGY MARKETING, LIMITED.

Legal Notices

Notices will appear in three consecutive issues, in compliance with the terms of the Uniform Commercial Code *regarding sufficient Legal Notice.*

PUBLIC NOTICE

INVOCATION OF
***HAGUE TREATY* PROTECTION**

This notice shall be construed to comply with provisions necessary to establish presumed fact (Rule 301, *Federal Rules of Evidence*), should interested parties fail to rebut any given allegation or matter of law addressed herein. The position shall be construed as adequate to meet requirements of judicial notice, thus preserving fundamental law. Matters addressed herein, if not rebutted, will be construed to have general application. A true and correct copy of this Public Notice is on file with the CLARK COUNTY RECORDER in CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.

Due to the breach of contract evidenced by the Public Notice of December 19, 2003 and in order to protect my child, Evan Christian: Kirzinger from harm, I have removed him from Nevada. I hereby invoke the terms of the *Hague Treaty* to further protect the child pending lawful adjudication of this matter. Specifically, Article 13 of the *Hague Treaty* states:

> …[T]he judicial or administrative authority of the requested State is not bound to order the return of the child if the person, institution or other body which opposes its return establishes that –
>
> a) the person, institution or other body having the care of the person of the child was not actually exercising the custody rights at the time of removal or retention, or had consented to or subsequently acquiesced in the removal of retention; or
>
> b) there is a grave risk that his or her return would expose the child to physical or psychological harm or otherwise place the child in an intolerable situation.
>
> The judicial or administrative authority may also refuse to order the return of the child if it finds that the child objects to being returned and has attained an age and degree of maturity at which it is appropriate to take account of its views.

The lawful foundation for my actions in removing and protecting the child rests with the Protective Order of May 22, 2003 (a copy of which is attached to and is part of this notice), which strictly forbids Adele Dewitt from having ANY CONTACT with the child or me for a period of one full year, through May 22, 2004. This Protective Order validates BOTH primary *Hague Treaty* defenses: Adele Dewitt was not in a position to exercise custody rights at the time of removal (nor is she yet in that position); AND there is a grave risk that return would expose the child to physical or psychological harm or otherwise place the child in an intolerable situation.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. In witness whereof I have affixed my signature this 20th day of March, 2004.

_____
Ronald William: Kirzinger, *Sui Juris*, UCC 1-207

Copy of District Court Order extending Protective Order through May 22, 2004 and stating: "...adverse party to have no contact with child until further order of Court."

DISTRICT COURT
Family Division
CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

FILED IN OPEN COURT
SHIRLEY B. PARRAGUIRRE, CLERK
BY: DEPUTY

Applicant,
vs.
Case No. T
Adverse Party

PROTECTION ORDER AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Having considered the filings, testimony and evidence presented in this day, and the Court having jurisdiction in this matter, said Adverse party ☐ was present, ☐ was not present this date ☐ through the attorney for adverse party present, the Court hereby finds and orders as follows:
The adverse party was served with notice of the hearing on

___ That the Temporary Protection Order issued in this case is CONTINUED in effect until the hearing date specified below, under the same terms and conditions as it was originally given, subject to any exceptions noted below.

___ That the Temporary Protection Order issued in this case is EXTENDED until _____. The adverse party is ordered to stay 100 yards away from the applicant, and 100 yards away from all locations the adverse party is prohibited from in the Temporary Order. The adverse party is ordered to comply with all of the orders, terms and conditions of the Temporary Order issued in this case subject to any exceptions noted below.

___ That the Court finds good cause to ISSUE the Temporary Protection Order immediately. That the adverse party may not stay away from the applicant or all places listed below, having no contact whatsoever with the applicant.

___ That the Protection Order issued in this case is DISSOLVED.

___ The parties are ordered to appear at a RETURN HEARING TO BE HELD:
On _____ at _____ a.m./p.m.
Department: TPO, Family Courts and Services Center, 601 N. Pecos Rd., Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

___ That the ☐ APPLICANT ☐ ADVERSE PARTY shall have temporary physical custody of the minor child(ren) of the parties, subject to the visitation of the other party outlined below.

___ That ☐ APPLICANT ☐ ADVERSE PARTY is ordered to pay to the other party $_____ beginning _____, for the temporary support of the minor child(ren) until a permanent order for child support is established or until the expiration of the Extended Order, whichever occurs first. A wage assignment is ordered. This amount is payable to _____ and _____ child(ren).

___ Other Orders of the Court regarding: ☐ Visitation ☐ Terms of Protection Order ☐ Other Matters

SO ORDERED

DISTRICT COURT COMMISSIONER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the herein Protection Order is hereby approved and accompanies the herein approved. These Orders are effective immediately.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Failure to appear may result in a bench warrant being issued.

NEVADA CORPORATIONS:

Respect Your Corporation And Others Will Have To

Budget's "Tip of the Week" #14:

Maintaining Separation Between the Corporation and Yourself

When properly handled, a corporation is a legal "person", separate, distinct and totally apart from you. The key to keeping things that way is to ensure that the corporation is indeed properly treated. The quickest way to lose the protection afforded by your corporate shelter is for you to treat it with disrespect.

One simple thing that many people fail to do on a regular basis—and which can tear down the walls of separation between themselves and a corporation—occurs when they sign documents in behalf of their "brainless child" (corporation). All it takes to do things right is to follow the signature with an indication that you are acting as an agent or officer of the corporation rather than in a personal capacity. If you are acting as a particular officer, as the vice president, for example—follow your signature with, ", Vice President" or ", VP". In cases where you would rather not disclose any particular position held within the corporation you may sign as "John Doe, Agent", which simply means that you are acting as an agent for the corporation and NOT in a personal capacity.

The above advice applies to ALL situations where you might sign for the corporation, including checks, of course, but also when signing such mundane things as invoices for goods received or services performed. And it certainly applies to any kind of agreement—a lease, purchase or rental agreement, for instance—as well as corporate resolutions. After a while you will find that you do this automatically and thus automatically uphold the fundamental protective insulation of your separateness from the corporate entity.

Failure to adhere to this basic corporate formality "could" allow a prospective litigant to assert that the corporation is nothing more than a "straw man" and that it actually functions only as your "alter ego". We have put the word "could" in parentheses because in Nevada there actually exists only one case in the last quarter-century where a prospective litigant managed to "pierce the corporate veil" and cause liability to be assessed against the corporation's owner/manager—and that was a case of outright and unabashed fraud. It's great to have that measure of protection but you can easily bolster it by developing the good habit of following your signature with a title.

The next essential step in maintaining separation between the corporation and yourself is to always document key decisions made for the corporation in the form of corporate resolutions. If you do not know how to construct a resolution, give us a call and we will be pleased to help out. Menawhile, if all you do is put a simple memo into the "resolutions" section of your corporate records, you will have taken a MAJOR step toward maintaining your Nevada corporation's uneqaled liability protection.

CORPORATION SETUP AND MAINTENANCE FEES

Budget Corporation—includes:
- First-year resident agent fee
- Corporate Charter
- Articles of Incorporation
- Corporate Bylaws
- Corporate Resolutions
- Budget corporate record book
- 3.5" floppy disk of resources

TOTAL **$410**

Nominee Service	**$200**
Obtain EIN	**$ 75**
Bank Account Setup	**$100**
Expedite (24-hr. setup)	**$150**
Annual Resident Agent Fee	**$ 85**
Budget Mail Forwarding (18 per yr)	**$ 50**
Full Mail Forwarding (240 pcs/yr)	**$150**

For more information:

"THE NEVADA CORPORATION MANUAL"

Priced at just $45, including shipping and handling

Budget
Corporate Renewals

*"Nevada corporations at **Budget** prices"*

(702) 870-5351

P.O. Box 27103
Las Vegas, NV 89126
E-Mail: BCR@BudgetCorporateRenewals.com

PLEASE NOTE:
CONTACT* and Phoenix Source Distributors *are NOT the same!* *Checks sent for* JOURNALS *or book orders should NOT be made out to* CONTACT—*and vice versa.



Editorial Policy

Opinions of *CONTACT* contributors are their own and do not necessarily reflect those of the *CONTACT* staff or management.

CONTACT:

THE PHOENIX EDUCATOR

is published by
CONTACT, Inc.
P.O. Box 27800
Las Vegas, NV 89126

Phone: (800) 800-5565; (661) 822-9655
Fax: (661) 822-9655

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Subscription orders may be placed by mail to the above address or by phone to **1-800-800-5565. Subscribers: Expiration date is on upper left side of mailing label.**
Quantity Subscriptions: Prices are for U.S. delivery. For foreign quantity-subscription rates based on cost of delivery to your country, please inquire.

Single Subscriptions					Quantity Subscriptions				
Qty.	U.S.	U.S. w/env	CAN/ MEX	For-ei-gn	Qty.	10 copies	25 copies	50 copies	100 copies
13 issues	$30	$40	$40	$45	13 issues	$95	$125	$160	$275
26 issues	$60	$80	$80	$90	26 issues	$190	$250	$320	$550
52 issues	$110	$150	$150	$170	52 issues	$380	$500	$640	$1100

BACK-ISSUE RATES

Back issues are $3.00 each copy.
Shipping is included in the price for U.S. orders.

"And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."—*Isaiah 2:4*