CONTACT

THE PHOENIX PROJECT JOURNAL

GOD'S NEW MILLENNIUM

KNOWING TRUTH IS NOT ENOUGH—
SUCCESSFUL CHANGE REQUIRES ACTION

VOLUME 43, NUMBER 2 **NEWS REVIEW** **$ 3.00** **JUNE 2, 2004**

U.S. Pulling Strings, CFR Rep On Scene

5/27/04—#1 (17-285)
THU., MAY 27, 2004 7:42 A.M. YR 17, DAY 285
Manila, Philippines

RE: LICHAUCO PERMISSION FOR MATERIAL USE; STEPHEN BOSWORTH VISIT TO PHILIPPINES [REF: CARLYLE GROUP AND OTHER]; IMPORTANCE RELATIVE TO MARCOS "PROGRAM"—GCH/D

COMMENTS OF THE DAY
IN THE PHILIPPINES

In an effort to sort and share the "most important" information for this paper, *CONTACT*, we are overwhelmed in just keeping up with the input.

It is certain that readers do not wish so much on the Philippines as we offer but it is necessary, for it is YOUR program of which we lay foundation, information and potential. We can only, at best, offer bits and pieces which we feel will connect dots and allow you to better see who and what in your PRESENT events came before and still wield such power as to be quite staggering. We could most certainly do a daily paper and still not touch on but the largest topics. Ah but, the "devil" is in the details, readers. These are the hidden snares and bounty hunters pulling strings of unimagined strength.

We have no way of IMMEDIATELY affecting any other location except through doing a successful JOB where we ARE. This is true of everyone anywhere.

We have permission for using anything out of the paper *TRIBUNE*, but we are awaiting the final contact permission of Mr. Alejandro Lichauco for use of his column. We can certainly be free to use his column for information as already published information, regular column status in the *TRIBUNE* and be comfortable with same. However, our full intent and purpose is to continue the connection for other purposes with this insightful and daring Philippine "citizen" patriot. WE TAKE ONE STEP AT A TIME.

"Surely, however," you might say, "you don't have to keep up with the VK dumping!"

Yes, most certainly WE DO. She has again splashed total fabrications on the Internet INVOLVING US AND OUR PROGRAM. It is not going to be allowed to drift by. She speaks right now of deeds and thieves, Santos and Habib, in which she misrepresents EVERYTHING.

There is no outstanding contract or "deed" with these people and thus WHY they went to VK. All interchange with these people and our people was severed TOTALLY long ago with retrieval of all original documents and proper reports made to the proper parties.

VK has enough problems in her lap NOW as her garbage information is making it to the sites where it is now questioned by HER PEERS on those websites. She quite overdid herself with that claim of "400++ TRILLION" to China (from GAIA). Whatever is taking place has NOTHING TO DO WITH US IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM.

ELECTIONS IN PARADISE

It is the Circus Maximus in full production here today. The fraud and corruption has caught up with the dirty-do crowd and the show and tell of trying to railroad the "vote count" and "declaration" of a President and Vice President is something to behold.

The whole of Congress was brought to a halt in

(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:

the constitutional rule-making last night by a note to a speaker who was actually "TRYING" to bring Constitutional LAW into the game at hand and CAUSE all of the votes to be counted and reconciled with the Certificates of Canvass ordered by law to be tallied by CONGRESS IN JOINT SESSION.

A note from a lady in the gallery told the speaker making long-winded speeches to, basically, and with use thereof, "Shut up!"

Without going further with the clown-show it suffices to say that it brought the whole session to a halt while the parties most involved in maintaining ORDER shouted "Shut up" at one another. COUNTING CANNOT GO ON WITHOUT RULES ESTABLISHED, ETC. At this rate there won't be a President declared—or a VP. So, MILITARY potential intervention becomes greater each day. Moreover, MARTIAL LAW becomes more plausible EACH DAY while the current unqualified "President" tosses around her power. Also, the possibility of having the Supreme Court demand intervention grows exponentially into a department where they HAVE NO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY UNDER "ANY" CIRCUMSTANCES.

Serious? Yes, but not so impacting TO US as it would have been before we got our full clearance and registration accomplished and the manifestation of same clearly entered and filed with the court of jurisdiction. DONE! See the "Notices".

All sorts of delays can become abusive and intrusive BUT THE FACTS CANNOT NOW BE ALTERED.

As an aside: Please, we know that you miss "News Desk" and the Rays; certainly, nothing like ourselves. HOWEVER, we do not annoy, plead or coerce. Everyone is working for NOTHING and if persons withdraw, they are surely appreciated for that which they have so graciously contributed and yes, still contribute, as John continues to send pertinent information as he finds it. We are limited by human limitations of all kinds. This is not a complaint; it is an explanation for that which is mandatory in the face of circumstantial change. A "paper" is not our thrust, friends, YOU ARE! The paper is only coasting in the face of the bad weather conditions.

This "program" has no resources, time allowance or privilege of "coasting" and therefore priorities must always be taken into consideration.

It costs a thousand dollars ($) minimum to publish an issue of the paper, WITHOUT ANY CONSIDERATION OF ANYTHING BUT "COSTS" OF THE PRESS AND MAILING. Those are the facts and we can wish otherwise but it matters not.

In the face of that statement where it will now seem that I do extra work which is of "little interest"—STAY ALERT. The next is SO IMPORTANT that I ask it be carefully typed and copied into this paper. It has EVERY IMPORTANCE to WORLD manipulators who go right BACK to the original players in many of the games of "getcha" and "keepya".

The article speaks for itself with just a tiny bit of pre-information. The pre-information, however, will be very cursory because I ask that YOU recognize the implications and see the interconnections and what is being attempted by the U.S. with the more recent information we have offered in reference to, say for instance, former President Fidel Ramos and his connections to that infamous group called "Carlyle".

This reference offered, however, deals with this week's visit by an interesting person who was a former U.S. ambassador to the Philippines during the infamous times and trials of Marcos and the U.S. take-over along with the change-out of Ramos who was and IS an "Intelligence ASSET" of the U.S. Bosworth was completely involved and now he "drifts" back silently through the Philippines without any hoopla as befits every visiting former ambassador but DID HAVE PRIVATE AND SECRET MEETINGS WITH YE PRESIDENT, UNELECTED, IN HER PRIVATE CHAMBERS.

Since he bore with him some documents and a "report" of some kind, it leaked out as all things contained in the Philippines DO (for good or evil) and got some press attention of a very (I like the word) "cursory" coverage. A column prior to the one we will share suggested that a "warning" came with the visit and instructions to the lady to "Clean up her act" and get the election cleaned and cleared. We have no input as to meaning other than that the Philippines still drifts around at the top of the list of "Human Rights" VIOLATORS. BOTH "ITEMS" TURNED UP MS. ARROYO'S WICK AND THE SOOT BLAST WAS DARKLY SCATTERED. This all goes right along with the timing of the "boo-boos" in the massive election fraud which makes the U.S. look worse, if possible, than it did before. It is a good trait to remember with the top-income layers (corruption and access to graft) in the Philippines—to take anything and either beat it to death, lie or fabricate and make up the story as you move along. There is no tale too great a fabrication to go unused even if REASON would dictate otherwise.

The U.S., on the other hand, has troubles EVERYWHERE and growing exponentially by the hour.

With that bit of introduction:

[QUOTING from *The Daily TRIBUNE*, Monday, May 24, (front page), 2004:]

BOSWORTH REMARKS: 'LIES' BEING CODDLED BY OPPOSITION—PALACE

MANILA—Malacañang yesterday lashed at detractors of Arroyo administration whom it called "enemies of democracy" out to sow confusion among the people when text messages circulated over the weekend which reportedly advise President Arroyo to step down or face the threat of civil war because of her administration's allegedly massive fraud activities in the May 10 elections.

According to the text messages, former U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines Stephen Bosworth told the President to resolve the election fraud complaints and stop the radicalization of Philippine Muslims.

Bosworth reportedly submitted to Mrs. Arroyo a 21-page special report of the New York-based Council of Foreign Relations Center for Preventive Action, saying the modest economic gains over the past two years "could be imperiled if the Philippines does not complete the electoral process in an [expeditious] and credible manner".

Presidential spokesman Ignacio Bunye confirmed Bosworth met with Mrs. Arroyo in Malacañang last week but the former ambassador's remarks were supposedly taken out of context as he never made such threats.

The Palace immediately pointed to the opposition as the possible source of the text messages and branded its political opponents as "enemies of democracy" who are active in hatching disinformation campaigns against the Arroyo Administration.

"The enemies of democracy are getting desperate. They are stepping up their vicious disinformation campaign. But they will not succeed," Bunye said.

"The people know better. The people are tired of the antics of these rabble rousers," he stressed.

The Palace spokesman said he was not in the meeting so he could not tell Mrs. Arroyo's responses to Bosworth's suggestion but stressed they are not offended by such remarks.

"In fairness to Ambassador Bosworth, he was not pressing any inordinate demands on the administration. No one has to tell Filipinos what our problems are and what to do about these," he said.

Although Bunye acknowledged that there were instances of poll irregularities, these were localized and could not be considered "systematic fraud" committed as a nationwide scale.

In his statement, he dismissed observations by the American think tank that the next six years "will be divisive" for the President and the legislature.

"We will have greater political and economic stability after the electoral process is over," Bunye said.

"You can bet your last peso on the capability of the President to unite the country and fight for change," he added.

Bunye cited an observation by the National Citizens Movement for Free Elections (NAMFREL) which described the conduct of the May 10 local and national elections "generally peaceful". **[H: Of course you have to realize that it is NAMFREL that is THE CAUSE, along with the administration appointed COMELEC. "It's nice to be the king," said Mel Brooks.]**

He said Mrs. Arroyo, if given a fresh mandate, would vigorously push her priority agenda.

"We will forge peace in Mindanao, fight corruption and steadily build investment confidence," Bunye stressed. **[H: Barf now, it does NOT get better.]**

The Palace explained Bosworth has been a constant visitor to Malacañang and in "constant touch with President Arroyo to tackle matters concerning the Philippines".

Bosworth had been instrumental in the withdrawal of U.S. support from the administration of then President Ferdinand Marcos.

Aside from Bosworth, those who contributed in the report were another former U.S. Ambassador Nicholas Platt, head of Asia Society, Frank Wisner, Maurice Greenberg, American International Group Inc; AND FORMER AMBASSADOR RICHARD SOLOMAN OF THE U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE.

[H: In the prior article the major focus was on the connections with the Carlyle Group with the outstanding input of Fidel Ramos. All during Bosworth's reign in Paradise.]

[END QUOTING]

Something else to note happening right this week is a replacement of Mr. Pulley who headed up the World Bank here. He was, of course, all cuddly-goo with GMA. Oh my goodness, there is no way out of this trap.

Well, Dharma, go forth and witness. There is a minimum of 137 boxes in the Congress lined up along the front—in chains. Each opened presents the seven plagues upon the earth from Pandora's box of troubles. We won't even mention the other 150 delivered one night and 135 of those EMPTY boxes delivered the next night while the cameras were down for their "rest period". Did you know surveillance cameras have to have an hour's rest per day? Especially during the period when there is something to photograph like empty ballot boxes slipped into the Congressional hall of justice to facilitate the magician's magic tricks.

Laugh? Cry? Just laugh 'til you cry is also good. And above all "stayin' alive" is even better—almost as good as being the king.

May you rest in peace—while those cameras are also resting.

GCH

dharma

ADDENDUM FROM E J EKKER

Yesterday one of our Filipino friends called to say that he had located a very old man who had a copy of "the book" and asked me to write something that would show the connection between GAIA and the book to reassure the old man that he would be doing business with the right party/organization. GCH asked me to insert it with a short introduction because it discloses another facet of the mission.

RE: Ang Bagong Lipunan (ABL)

Our information and understanding is that Ferdinand Marcos and Ronald Reagan had a plan to leave, as their legacy to the world, a gold-based currency the value of which could not be manipulated by the International Banking Cartel (IBC).

The "packages" sent to the participating countries were comprised of 780 billion in gold backed ABL Pisos, 2,500 metric tons of 12.5 kilo gold bars, and probably 30 billion in gold backed dollars. Many countries received two or more packages. Reagan supplied the paper, ink, and plates; Marcos supplied the gold and the labor. The dollars are now being purchased by some European banks at 30% of their face amount and are called "uncuts" because they were left in large sheets for ease in shipping and avoiding other "spillage".

One of the documents we have seen had a list of some thirty different-sized deposits in the same bank and under the same insurance cover. We were told that each of those deposits had its own serial number and was matched with a project listed in the "master" project book. (Projects were infrastructure, ports, airports, etc., even a "bullet train".)

("The Book" contains the list of nations, banks, deposits, and matching projects. We have "known" of its existence for nearly five years but most people claim there is no such thing so we are most anxious (and cautious) to see it.)

It seems that the country holding the deposit with its ABL and uncuts, when the program was activated, would quickly cancel its own currency and replace it with gold-based dollars and Pisos. 30% of those ABL Pisos were to be given pursuant to a set of instructions to several different groups of people—among them the Marcos family and those who helped put the program together, delivered the packages, and so forth.

The remaining 70% was to be credited by the receiving nation to the people of the Republic of the Philippines. It is our understanding that a person was designated to oversee one or more of those deposits and see that the credit was used to purchase the materials and services required to complete the project.

One part of our mission is to locate the master project book so that we can assist the Filipino people, using our asset (U.S. Treasury debt guaranteed by the FED and payable in gold), to start using the credits created by the packages to do the projects. We will leave the technical explanation of how that is to be done for another time.

As a closing statement, we observe that one of the essential signatures required for activation is from the Marcos family and that will not be likely under an Arroyo Administration.

Here is a fitting close. Our friend just called to say the "old man" had agreed to bring the book to a meeting tomorrow. We may toss and turn a bit tonight; it is exciting. In 1985 Col. Orlando Dulay, a trusted confidant of Marcos, confirmed 81,000 metric tons of gold deposited in the banks of 10 countries, and still had 15 countries left to visit when Marcos was hauled off to Hawaii and Dulay had to go into hiding. Unfortunately, he is said to have died several years ago. EJ

Challenge To Native Elders To Speak Plainly of Changes

5/26/04—#1 (17-284)
WED., MAY 26, 2004 6:42 A.M. YR 17, DAY 284
Manila, Philippines

RE: TIME FOR THE ELDERS TO "TALK" IN PLAIN ENGLISH—GCH/D

CHALLENGING THE "ELDERS" (NATIVE/TRIBAL)

I ask that my full identification be placed at the top of this writing because I want NO MISUNDERSTANDING regarding the urgency and importance of what will be presented here.

I AM Gyeorgos Ceres Hatonn (hATONn) (GCH). (Dharma is my secretary and therefore our limitations are regulated nicely by the very human aspect of presentation.) I am also recognized as "Phoenix Eagle" or "FIRE CHIEF" in more aboriginal cultures. Sometimes I am lovingly called "The one who comes IN the thunder".

I also would say that there will be MORE and we will attend more of the relevant material in focus from our "brothers" of the "original" people.

The societies of the global communities are confronting grave confrontations and we don't need to consult the "UnHOLY" books to find that to be true. YOU want we of the higher dimensions to simply tell you how it is, allow, and furnish you with luxuries, security, wealth, individual peace and shelter—AND SNATCH YOU UP TO SOME MORE LUXURIOUS CLOUD ON D-DAY (DEPARTURE DAY).

No, you have been given THOUSANDS of pages of information from me alone. You show interest and plead or demand (whichever comes first to your interest closet) and then you don't even process the information for the most part—just demand more tomorrow with ALL the answers to your individual circumstances. IT DOESN'T WORK THAT WAY! LIFE DOES *NOT* work "that way".

For you who continually ask about various "presenters" (channels) and information from the star-shifters or historical flagship riders, I have little input and certainly YOU do not like my truth regarding these rumors and fabrications, shape shifters and googley squiggles. So be it.

First, however, I would tell you that there is NO MAGIC in the gourd rattle. Any response to such dancing comes from the MIND SHAKING THAT RATTLE. The gee-gaws of "getting in touch" are interesting and totally unnecessary. Also to that: So be it!

I make no lessening of respect of any one, thing or exercise. ALL is experience whereat mostly I AM AN OBSERVER. I will not waste space going over that one again.

The most important thing about OUR program is that WE HAVE ONE! That is the proof of our presentation and position. We do not offer you fantasies or fairy god-mothers/fathers. GOD PROVIDES YOU WITH "THE WAY" TO ACHIEVE A START OF "CHANGE" ON YOUR PLACE, WHILE THOSE WHO OFFER YOU FABRICATIONS AND MAGIC—IN THE MIDST OF WISHFUL THINKING FROM RECEIVERS OF LIES—DISTRACT AND DERAIL YOU CONSTANTLY.

God allows YOU to be or do what you will in your presentation as manifest physical interloper. You "experience" and mostly that is in a totally misguided way on your way to seeking your own form of physical immortality. IT SIMPLY ISN'T SO.

Ah but, in GOD CREATOR'S creation the least are equal to what YOU seem to place as the "TOP BANANA". Well, chelas, bananas are monkey and parrot food. Think hard on this fact. ALL are "SACRED"—none are HOLY! HOLY is a fabrication of churches that have "big bosses" for the sole purpose of enslaving YOU. Your worst ENEMY has control of the whip, my friends, and you stay in line—or else! The whip has simply become a modern invention called the "gun" for lack of more simple example.

Therefore, when you ask "are you real?" or "is this program REAL?" you are doing something interesting in every instance. You MUST for some reason be curious—but more likely you just DON'T BELIEVE A WORD OF IT.

In that instance, I suggest you quit reading this NOW and turn to the "Post It" space in this very paper.

Do you actually think this little "handful of workers" have somehow manipulated themselves into positions of this magnitude or importance TO YOUR FUTURE? They have simply "served" a higher cause under the most oppressive circumstances most of you could conjure to make their way as difficult as possible. But, that too was necessary for the lessons and the growth to GET TO HERE TODAY. That does NOT make it easier, just better tolerated and able to work smarter in every encounter and step forward.

This very week we found, from the U.S. IRS, that a prior friend and supporter—actually quite unethically and UNQUALIFIED—is trying to write off massive sums for "tax losses" through, apparently, claiming loss from us. So be it. Good go, let the Elite do what they will; it is not our business or our "problem" if there should be one. And NO, do not assume this to be some case against us—IT IS NOT!

These parties turned to *Spectrum*, seized Ekkers' home and property and turned to total support of Martin-Young. Now that the money invested in *Spectrum* is LOST, the tide has turned.

No one in our "loop" has lost ANYTHING—not even a thin dime. They came for whatever purpose; they experienced and GAINED, betrayed, and now claim LOSS after being "had" by the adversarial liars and cheats. THAT IS THE JUSTICE OF "GOD", MY GOOD READERS.

I have no wish to carry this discussion further but it is truly time you begin to look at WHAT IS and stop fantasizing about what you would "druther" have for your bountiful feast of "free stuff" today.

There is NO RAPTURE coming. CLOUDS WILL NOT HOLD YOUR PHYSICAL BODY NO MATTER HOW SKINNY YOU MIGHT BE.

Neither is there an expected "snatch off" of every Tom, Dick and Harriet around who bashes, trashes, thieves, lies and cheats and then says: "But I thought……!" NO, YOU DIDN'T THINK AT ALL, MUCH THE LESS THAT YOU ARE WORTHY OF "ABDUCTION" TO THE REALMS OF JUSTICE AND ORDER IN LOVE, FREEDOM AND KNOWLEDGE.

You have to make those mind-changes of EGO in the land of your presentation and birth—that HUMAN ARENA. Fail your classes and the consequences are whatever they might be.

As you read the following message shared with us I want you to pay careful attention to what is actually taking place. NOTE that which is written about the Moon, as a for instance, and of that I have a little example—not "parable" of example tales.

It speaks of the Moon being "different" in it's cycle and orbit. Well, that may or may not be since YOU ON THE PLANET are the ones doing the major ORBITING and wobbling about in your unbalanced circulation. Three nights ago Doris got EJ by the hand and pulled him out onto the balcony and pointed off to the right to where the Moon was "setting". It was unmistakably going down behind a building in the wrong quadrant.

Almost every night when the Moon would be visible from this place it had gone down over the Bay of Manila. No more, my nervous friends—NO MORE! I call attention to this because if it has to come from here as information (usually denied), so be it.

I suggest that you who have old friends who have "gone away" should get in touch with that "phony" instrument of Ma Bell and touch them. That might well include such as Dr. Overholt and our other old "taker" partners and friends. THE TRUTH IS A FREE-SETTING "PART" OF THE RECOVERY PROGRAM—BUT IT WILL NOT ON ITS OWN SET ANYTHING FREE OR OTHERWISE.

Do I suggest that you spread your word? No, I suggest you might suggest they get back on the subscription list of THIS PAPER because we are going to start sharing this "amazing, never-ending tale" as quickly as we have time and SPACE. You want and prefer Nostradamus? Fine, but I SUGGEST you look around you and if you can't see your current circumstances, you are blind, my friend, and blind without benefit of radar guidance.

You read anything, people, and then question and quibble. So be it for you MUST QUESTION EVERYTHING AND READ AND STUDY EVERYTHING YOU CAN STUFF INTO YOUR SHORT TIME LIMITATIONS—AND DISCERN, FOR THE TRUTH IS ABSOLUTE—THE LIES TOTALLY CONFUSING.

Mr. Nidle, for instance (and example only), is again asking for your support donations to allow him to continue to give you TOTALLY ABSURD INFORMATION. This is no offense to Sheldon for he presents what he GETS. He does, however, speak for the Galactic Federation which includes non-existent entities AND non-existent societies and planets. His thrust is from the GF that there is a pending "arrival" in massive presentation. No, there is no such thing anticipated and it would not be done in any such foolish manner in any circumstance.

His program does not have any "payoff" or ability to serve back to you what you put forth—as in "the Law of Return". We have never simply headed to anywhere through anyone JUST to "get the word out", which became the biggie interpreted to be from me. NO, <u>THIS</u> IS OUR MAJOR PROGRAM, FOR WHICH WE HAVE WORKED FOR DECADES TO ACHIEVE. We have neither time nor interest in spreading more information to titillate some speculation.

Who is this Darrel Whitewolf from whom we offer this letter of challenge? Who knows? I am cautious, for his more interesting public presentation is registered at the "Surfing the Apocalypse Network", which is a "handle" of some kind where you can get some "far out" "***stuff***"—mostly more nonsense because you all still want MAGIC and "terror" as in giant insects and killer tomatoes and you name the irrational speculations of ET greenbloods.

Energy source, as you become upon physical departure, HAS NO BLOOD OF ANY COLOR—so, get with the truth and LIVE longer, friends. No space traveler capable of such a feat needs to integrate to "save themselves" somehow (that is your expectation of selves as you destroy your environment) nor eat you for lunch. The "manifest living" are those that "eat your lunch". They will not have phasers, tasers, or zappers to capture you into the "collective". They can knock you goggle-eyed or vaporize you with a look or focus and you would not probably even see them, COMING OR GOING.

I am a bit entertained by the lack of realization of even our own friends. Why is it that you do not THINK?

There is a good example for the little group having shared with us for years and years and who know that one particular PROJECT was to build a place (a house, a nice one) on a hillside with an upper living floor and a second ground floor for utilities, etc. Underneath that was a BOMB SHELTER. It is not necessarily for bombs but a reasonable place, if necessary for such an untoward, BUT NOW FULLY EXPECTED, event. It is/was for survival for MANY people and Ekkers did see to its full outfitting and availability. We won't further give information on THAT, for privacy reasons. The point is not in the space or that particular location. AH BUT: In our own circumstances there arises a warehouse full of "my" books which seem to be such a storage problem since being so attacked as to have to find a home or salvage.

Well, nobody notices even that books around the periphery of a simple basement room turn the room into a radiation-shield. But NO, we are NOT going to do more than use these things of OURS, now used in an effort to destroy us, for general distribution to those who "never thought of that".

As a matter of fact, those boxes of books plus any more that you could get of our books as court ordered BACK to us from George Green would adequately LINE THE WALLS OF OUR SAFETY SHELTER. If times continue worse following disaster, the paper in the very books, in adequate ventilation, would serve as fuel during the "winter" which would follow such major devastation as volcanic disaster or bomb probabilities, which would allow SURVIVAL and a cooking of that old SPELT you lost to the thieves and cheats. Oh well—and how is your day?

Not one person stepped forward to shift that grain at that now lost farm (tons and tons of it along with beans, lentils and millet, a whole laboratory equipped with testing apparatus—AND ANOTHER UNDERGROUND ROOT CELLAR for safe storage). Oh well, not even the "feed the hungry" programs were contacted in time to go forth and salvage the food. Again, my answer to your problems is, OH WELL.

Human is a most interesting species waiting for someone ELSE to do the work and call him to dinner when it's ready. THIS is the only "call" you will get FROM ME, and that is simply the way it IS. Where would I put the books, for instance, in Tehachapi? On the side facing Edwards Air Force Base—right after lining the wall facing Northrop.

One thing about losing the house on Adam Drive—without ability to recover some things for Doris—was the loss of the attic exhaust fan. It was of a size to keep the underground area clear and clean, while we HAD adequate generators and fuel storage area in place to run it sufficiently often enough for comfort and health safety. They never could afford to place such things in the shelter BECAUSE THE NEED TO PAY FOR THE SERVICES OF THE MISCREANTS TOOK FIRST CHOICE. Wow, do we "learn" or what?

How much would it cost to move all those books? Well, obviously too much to have been considered unless Ekkers provided the funds. Moreover, if anyone had followed up on the books from GG, he was to have delivered them to you at his cost.

I don't particularly "like" this game either, friends—but we will keep right on going until we WIN. Indeed, where WILL you be? If you think Mr. Bush or Mr. Kerry, both of notable background as to lineage (you look it up) and experience (brotherhood of Skull and Bones) will save your "bacon"—think again, very, very hard indeed. The DESTRUCTION of the world is under way—and it is NOT FROM THE COSMOS that comes your demise.

EJ, just take the Whitewolf letter off the Net so it is unchanged by copy errors and full information and credit are given. I would like to comment on every point but at this time I won't. We have things to do and miles to go before we rest.

P.S.: The central area of the "warehouse" is as good a radiation shelter as you could find in Las Vegas—so, better give thought to it. Arrange those books to the outside walls most facing the testing grounds and Area 51. Just a thought for inquiring minds.

Be alert, for the "Blue Katchina" has more MEANING than you might think other than as a blue star. There are no accidents—only signs and messages—generators and possibilities!

GCH
dharma

* * * * * * * * * *

<u>"CHALLENGE TO THE ELDERS"
FROM A CHEROKEE ELDER</u>
By Darrel Whitewolf

<u>Message from Cherokee Elder</u>
The Surfing The Apocalypse Network:
http://www.surfingtheapocalypse.com
Posted By: DarrelWhitewolf
Date: Monday, 24 May 2004, 8:16 a.m.

I HEREBY CHALLENGE THE ELDERS:

I, Darrel Whitewolf, elder of Cherokee decent, with this powerful message, hereby challenge the elders of all native nations. I hereby petition for the immediate release of sacred information to all humanity concerned for the immediate future of their families and loved ones.

At the risk of having many arrows shot in my direction, I send this message. I am an old warrior who is no stranger to battles.

It has been brought to my attention that the elders at this time are preparing the last ceremonies. The Hopi who have no word in their vocabulary for the future and are preparing to go underground. The Ojibwa and the Lakota are saying that we are at the end. They say and I quote "Go back and tell the people it is no longer the eleventh hour".

It is said that the blue star (katchina) has arrived and the "Purifier" (a large celestial body)

follows. It's time for the "CLEANSING" the "THIRD SHAKING". It is time to tell the people about the arrival of the watchers from the skies who don't look like us and the ones underground as well.

I have heard that White Buffalo Calf Woman has returned. I have been told to teach the stories of creation and how we must become together as one. This is not enough.

Chief Lookinghorse has delivered his messages at sacred sites all over the world but it is still unclear to non indian people just what is happening now, this very year, maybe even this very next month.

It is perfectly clear to me but who will believe one person?

It is not enough to quote verses from the bible. It is not enough to tell the old stories. It is not enough to talk about the animals and what it means when a certain one shows up in your life.

I think I can safely say that I speak for all readers here when I challenge you for the plain and simple truth about what is about to happen.

No more Bible verses from the unbalanced cross brought by the ones who stole our land, raped our women and killed our children. The ones manipulated by the watchers.

No more old stories. No more codes.

People do not want to hear this nonsense any longer because time is too short.

I know that you know. I also know that there is still prejudice in the hearts of some of you and you do not want non- indian people to know these things.

It is time and the time is now for you to speak clearly and decisively in releasing the information needed for people of all nations to prepare themselves practically, safely, physically and spiritually.

There is talk that the Pope is giving his final blessings.

He speaks of the fact that "Wormwood" (Planet X) has arrived.

There is talk that supposed astronomers are watching something large speeding toward Earth.

There is clear and unmistakable evidence that the skies day and night have suddenly changed dramatically. The moon has changed its orbit and appears in the west sky now when it rises. The stars are turning around in the sky at night and moving slower. The Earth Mother staggers like a drunk.

With great respect to the Creator, I bow to him in a humble way and ask for guidance in these matters not for me but for my brothers and sisters, my friends and families.

With great respect for the elders I ask you to put this knowledge forth and back up your words which say Mitakoye Oyasin. We are all your brothers and sisters. Will you leave us behind, only knowing half truths?

Grandfather, forgive me if I have offended as this message comes from my heart and the Spirit of Crazy Horse inside me speaking. Grandfather, forgive those who still hold contempt for the white man, the black man, the red and the yellow.

We send our prayers to you with the smoke from the sacred pipe on the wings of our brother Awahili, the Eagle.

I ask that you keep all of us here in your presence now and for ever.

Let the truths become clear to all.

Wado, Wakan Tanka, Aho

I do not hide. My e mail is clearly posted above for those who wish to respond. [His email address was not on the copy we received.]

That is all I have too say.

Darrel Whitewolf

'RULE OF LAW' Damning Exhibits

On the heels of the five articles by Attorney Alan F. Paguia put forth in the previous issue, we next present his "exhibits". This article is comprised of the first five exhibits, "A" through "E", while Exhibit "F" has been afforded special treatment by GCH starting on page 9 of this issue.

EXHIBIT 'A'
By Alan F. Paguia
4/23/04

What could be the Filipino people's exhibit "A" against Chief Justice Hilario Davide, Jr. and the others who conspired to remove President Joseph "Erap" Estrada from the presidency? The *en banc* resolution dated January 22, 2001. It reads:

> "A.M. No. 01-1-05-SC—*In re*: Request of Vice-President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo to take her Oath of Office as President of the Republic of the Philippines before the Chief Justice. Acting on the urgent request of Vice-President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo to be sworn in as President of the Republic of the Philippines addressed to the Chief Justice and confirmed by a letter to the Court, dated January 20, 2001, which request was treated as an administrative matter, the Court resolved unanimously to CONFIRM the authority given by the twelve (12) members of the Court then present to the Chief Justice on January 20, 2001 to administer the Oath of Office to Vice President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo as President of the Philippines, at noon of January 20, 2001.
>
> "This resolution is without prejudice to the disposition of any justiciable case which may be filed by a proper party."

What unconstitutional actions does this resolution prove? First, it proves that on January 20, 2001, Mrs. Arroyo wrote the justices a letter, which requested them to swear her in as "President of the Philippines".

We already know that Mrs. Arroyo invoked Erap's alleged "permanent disability" as the constitutional ground for her request. But we also know that the justices rejected this ground in their ruling in *Estrada vs Arroyo*. Therefore: (1) Mrs. Arroyo chose a wrong ground, and (2) "permanent disability" was not the ground relied upon by the justices for her swearing in.

So, what ground did the justices rely on? According to *Estrada vs. Arroyo*, it was "constructive resignation" based on Erap's behavior before, during and after Mrs. Arroyo's swearing in, as well as Edgardo Angara's diary. The question is: When did the justices first entertain their idea of "constructive resignation"? The answer is either before or after the swearing in. If it was before, then they had prejudged the justiciable issue of vacancy raised by Erap so that they no longer had "the cold neutrality of an impartial judge" in *Estrada vs Arroyo*—in clear violation of Erap's constitutional right to due process of law. If it was after, it would clearly appear that the justices had sworn in Mrs. Arroyo without any constitutional ground, and that the belated idea of "constructive resignation" was a mere afterthought deliberately contrived to cover up the defect of the unconstitutional swearing in. Thus, there is no escape from the fact that in both cases, the swearing in would be patently unconstitutional.

Second, it proves that the justices treated Mrs. Arroyo's request as an administrative matter.

The justices had no authority under the *Constitution* to take any positive action on the request. There was no proof of vacancy in the presidency. The justices did not mention, directly or indirectly, any such vacancy. They obviously had judicial notice that Erap was holding office as the duly elected President of the Republic. They could not treat the letter as a judicial matter because it did not comply with the requirements under the Rules of Court. Finally, the Civil Code proves that: "Administrative or executive acts, orders and regulations shall be valid only when they are not contrary to the laws or the *Constitution*" (Art. 7). Since there was no proof of vacancy, the request was obviously contrary to the *Constitution* and, therefore, invalid.

Third, it proves that on January 20, 2001, the 12 justices then present had actually conspired with Davide to remove Erap by swearing in Mrs. Arroyo.

Fourth, it proves that the judicial conspiracy which installed the Vice President as President was: (a) in favor of Mrs. Arroyo, (b) against Erap and (c) against the electoral will of the Filipino people.

Fifth, it proves that the swearing in was eventually approved in writing by all the 15 justices. Thus, the act of one became the act of all. This clearly means that the judicial conspiracy to remove Erap was as total and absolute as the judicial bias in favor of Mrs. Arroyo.

Sixth, it proves that the justices' claim to the effect that the swearing in of Mrs. Arroyo was "without prejudice to the disposition of any justiciable case"—was, in fact, a sham. How can they fairly decide on the presidential controversy raised by Erap against Mrs. Arroyo when they were the ones who created that controversy? They obviously cannot. Hence, it would clearly appear that Erap had fought with Mrs. Arroyo inside the arena of the Supreme Court where all the justices had rigged the result even before the start of the contest. In other words, the championship trophy had been awarded before the championship game could be played.

More important than knowing who the ultimate losers are is knowing who the ultimate winners would be. We are faithfully rooting for the Filipino people.

EXHIBIT 'B'
By Alan F. Paguia
4/26/04

What could be the Filipino people's Exhibit "B" against Chief Justice Hilario Davide, Jr. and the others who had conspired to remove President Joseph "Erap" Estrada from the presidency?

The ruling in *Estrada vs Arroyo*.

Essentially, the ruling provides that the collective act of the justices—in removing Erap by swearing in Vice President Gloria Arroyo in his place—was valid.

The truth is the act of the justices was invalid.

First, the justices have no authority under the *Constitution* to remove the duly elected President. Once the Filipino people challenge the anti-Erap conspirators to point out where in the *Constitution* such authority is provided, the same conspirators will find their backs pressed hard against the wall. Either they admit the undeniable if they choose to be honest, or they lie like a liar caught with his pants down if they choose to be dishonest.

Second, swearing in the Vice President as President is not a valid mode of removing the duly elected President. Under the *Constitution*, only the Senate has the authority to remove the President, and only by way of an impeachment proceeding. We all know that the prosecutors in the impeachment proceeding against Erap failed to prosecute. The conspirators are now trying hard to make the Filipino people overlook or forget this fatal error on the part of the prosecutors. The rule of law requires removal by impeachment. After the prosecutors and their supporters failed to comply with the rule of law, they resorted to the rule of force by having Mrs. Arroyo sworn in over Erap's presidency during Edsa II.

Third, the justices have no authority to overturn the electoral will of the Filipino people. The undeniable fact is Erap was constitutionally elected by the Filipino people in 1998 for a term of six years which was supposed to end this coming June. The justices cut short that term on Jan. 20, 2001.

Can they validly do that under the rule of law? Obviously not. By disregarding the sovereign will of the people, the justices committed an act that was illegal and immoral at the same time.

Fourth, the justices cannot be the fair judge of their own act. We cannot reasonably expect them to convict themselves. It is more in line with human experience to expect them to acquit themselves in consonance with the natural instinct of self-preservation. Consequently, it should not come as a surprise that they did acquit themselves.

Fifth, under the principle of separation of powers, the justices, even if acting *en banc*, cannot validly substitute their discretion for that of Erap as the duly elected chief of the Executive Department. Resignation is an exercise of discretion. A co-equal agency cannot validly exercise such discretion on behalf of a co-equal. But that is exactly what the justices appear to have done on behalf of Erap. While they have admitted that Erap never tendered any resignation letter, they nonetheless declared a "constructive resignation" on his behalf. The resultant absurdity is that, now, it would appear that a co-equal can validly declare the "constructive resignation" of a co-equal; that is, the justices can declare the "constructive resignation" of the Chief Executive or the legislators or *vice versa*! Surely, this cannot be what the Filipino people had in mind when they ratified the *Constitution*.

The most important thing to bear in mind, however, is that—in the eyes of the law—the ruling in *Estrada vs Arroyo* is void or without legal existence from the beginning. It represents a mockery of due process. The justices who made the ruling were the same justices who had earlier agreed to remove Erap from the presidency. They were the same justices who had earlier agreed to install, and actually installed, Mrs. Arroyo as President—in open defiance of the electoral will of the Filipino people, who had chosen Erap as their President.

So, what legal or moral authority did the justices have to rule on Erap's petition in Estrada vs Arroyo?

None.

EXHIBIT 'C'

By Alan F. Paguia
4/30/04

What could be the Filipino people's Exhibit "C" against Chief Justice Hilario Davide, Jr. and the others who had conspired to remove President Joseph "Erap" Estrada from the presidency?

The letter of Vice-President Gloria Arroyo, which conveyed her request for the Supreme Court to swear her in as "President" on January 20, 2001 during Edsa II. It reads [QUOTING]:

THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT
Supreme Court Building
Padre Faura St., Ermita, Manila
Attention: Honorable Hilario G. Davide, Jr.
Chief Justice
Your Honors:

The undersigned respectfully informs the Honorable Court that Joseph Ejercito Estrada is permanently incapable of performing the duties of his office resulting in his permanent disability to govern and serve his unexpired term. Almost all of his Cabinet members have resigned and the Armed Forces of the Philippines and the Philippine National Police have withdrawn their support for Joseph Ejercito Estrada. Civil society has likewise refused to recognize him as President.

In view of this, I am assuming the position of President of the Republic of the Philippines. Accordingly, I would like to take my oath as President of the Republic of the Philippines before the Honorable Chief Justice Hilario G. Davide Jr., today, 20 January 2001, at 12:00 noon, at the EDSA Shrine, Quezon City, Metro Manila.

May I have the honor to invite all the members of the Honorable Court to attend the oath–taking.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) GLORIA MACAPAGAL-ARROYO
[END QUOTING]

What does this letter prove?

First, it proves what was in the mind of Mrs. Arroyo right before and during her swearing in as President. The contents of this letter have become matters of fact binding Mrs. Arroyo and the other anti–Erap conspirators. Mrs. Arroyo and the justices who granted the request can no longer change or deny such contents. Their liability or non-liability would be considerably determined by the incriminatory or non-incriminatory nature of the letter.

Second, it proves Mrs. Arroyo agreed with the justices' proposal to swear her in as President even without the resignation of Erap.

Third, it proves the sole constitutional ground invoked by Mrs. Arroyo for her swearing in was the alleged "permanent disability" of Erap.

Fourth, it proves that Mrs. Arroyo did not invoke any resignation by Erap. She did not invoke any actual resignation. Neither did she invoke any constructive resignation. It was obvious that in her mind, there was absolutely no "Erap resignation" that existed, no "Erap resignation" to talk about; and therefore, no "Erap resignation" to invoke.

Fifth, it proves her invocation of Erap's "permanent disability" was founded on patently unconstitutional and wholly unproven grounds. What were these grounds? First, the alleged withdrawal of support by subordinate officials from the Cabinet, the military and the national police. It must be kept in mind that under the *Constitution*, the duty of every subordinate public official is to uphold the duly constituted presidency. There was no doubt Erap was then the duly elected President. Therefore, the concerned subordinate public officials violated their constitutional duty when they withdrew their support for, instead of uphold, the duly constituted Erap presidency. Second, Mrs. Arroyo's allegation that civil society had refused to recognize Erap as President—was a question of fact that needed to be established in a proper judicial proceeding. More importantly, the civil society referred to was necessarily bound by the *Constitution*, which provides the valid manner by which society may remove an incumbent President, that is, by Senate impeachment proceeding. Instead of complying with the rule of law, the justices resorted to the rule of force and judicially removed President Erap by swearing in Mrs. Arroyo in his place.

It ought to be further noted that the letter was unaccompanied by any proof of the matters alleged therein. Apparently, Mrs. Arroyo wanted the justices to grant her request right there and then and just accept her bare allegations without need of proof. She did manifest supreme confidence her request would be granted. And why not? After all, it was the justices' original idea and proposal to have her sworn in over Erap's subsisting presidency.

Sixth, it proves Mrs. Arroyo invoked a wrong ground for her swearing in. According to the ruling of her partisan justices in *Estrada vs Arroyo*, the presidency became vacant not because of Erap's alleged "permanent disability" but because of Erap's alleged "constructive resignation". But there was no mention of "constructive resignation" before, during or immediately after Mrs. Arroyo's swearing in. The idea came out more than a month later in March 2001 when the ruling in *Estrada vs. Arroyo* was issued by the justices. A clear afterthought in the absence of an actual resignation by Erap.

Seventh, it proves the justices' act of swearing in Mrs. Arroyo as President was founded upon a patently wrong ground. The justices, therefore, had brazenly violated the *Constitution*, the rule of law, President Erap's right to due process of law and the trust of the Filipino people.

Have the Filipino people properly understood the unconstitutional act of the justices in removing Erap from the presidency by swearing in Mrs. Arroyo in his place?

Have the Filipino people properly understood the fact that Erap, who is their duly elected President, had been unconstitutionally removed without their consent, electoral or otherwise?

Have the Filipino people properly understood the unconstitutionality and nullity of Mrs. Arroyo's "presidency"?

Have the Filipino people properly understood the fact that Erap remains their true President under the *Constitution*?

If the answers to the foregoing questions are in the negative, the presidential elections this May would be a grand deception with the Filipino people playing the role of unwitting victims. They would be misled into electing a new "president" in 2004 while the constitutional term of their own duly elected President in 1998 has not yet validly expired.

Why do we say that the term of Erap has not yet validly expired? The answer is simple. He was unconstitutionally removed by Mrs. Arroyo and the justices of the Supreme Court.

EXHIBIT 'D'

By Alan F. Paguia
5/3/04

What could be the Filipino people's Exhibit "D" against Chief Justice Hilario Davide, Jr. and the others who had conspired to remove President Joseph

"Erap" Estrada from the presidency?

The official statement issued by the U.S. Embassy in Manila immediately following Vice-President Gloria Arroyo's installation as President over Erap's subsisting presidency. It reads:

"The United States is pleased that the presidential crisis in the Philippines has been resolved without violence and in accordance with democratic and constitutional procedures.

"President Estrada has resigned and Vice-President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo has been sworn in as president. We are grateful for President Estrada's constant efforts on behalf of close U.S.–Philippine relations. We have an exceptionally strong working relationship with the new President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo in the past, and are looking forward to working with her to strengthen U.S.-Philippine relations even further.

"The United States has a deep multi-faceted relationship with the Philippines, a long-time ally, based on robust political, economic, cultural and informal ties that are buttressed by the millions of Filipino descent in the U.S.

"We are pleased to join the new president in our common efforts to enhance these ties."

What does this official statement prove?

It proves the American government and the American people were fooled into believing that (1) Erap had resigned; (2) the presidential crisis had been resolved; and (3) the swearing in of Mrs. Arroyo as President was in accordance with democratic and constitutional procedure under the Philippine *Constitution*.

Why do we say the Americans were fooled? Because they were made to believe the opposite of the truth. The basic premise Erap had resigned was simply false. It would then have to follow that the other two premises were also false.

Because of the wrong premises, the Americans were effectively misled into giving international recognition to Mrs. Arroyo's Edsa II "presidency". This effort to gain international recognition was clearly intended to give a semblance of legitimacy to the unconstitutional presidency. It was successful to the extent that it had—so far—been able to hide from the perception of the Filipino people and the international community the unconstitutional removal of Erap, who is the duly elected President of the Republic.

Up to now, it is not clear how many responsible Filipinos have properly understood how Mrs. Arroyo, the justices of the Supreme Court and the other anti-Erap conspirators violated the *Constitution* by forcing Mrs. Arroyo's "presidency" over Erap's incumbent presidency. It would appear certain, however, that the number has not yet reached a sufficient level to raise a constitutional howl on the part of the Filipino people.

Surely, it would not appear reasonable to suppose that the Americans fooled themselves. But it would appear reasonable to suppose that somebody must have fooled them.

So, who fooled the Americans? Who made them believe that Erap had resigned when the justices administered the presidential oath to Mrs. Arroyo on January 20, 2001? Were the Americans shown any supposed resignation letter signed by Erap? Did the Americans accept—"hook, line and sinker"—the verbal assurance of somebody that Erap had indeed resigned? Who was that somebody?

The matter of Erap's supposed resignation was then and now a clear question of fact, not a question of law. The all-important issue, therefore, is whether the resignation existed at the time the justices had Mrs. Arroyo sworn in as President. If it did exist, then the presidency was vacant and the swearing in of Mrs. Arroyo was constitutional. If it did not exist, then the presidency was not vacant and the swearing in of Mrs. Arroyo was unconstitutional and void from the beginning.

The existence or non-existence of the supposed resignation was a matter that was subject to the perception of human physical senses. Did the Americans see any Erap resignation letter? If they did, it was an absolute forgery because the justices have ruled in *Estrada vs. Arroyo* that Erap never issued any resignation letter. If they did not, then they did not have any objective basis for their conclusion in their official statement that Erap had resigned, and they—therefore—had committed a grave error in giving international recognition to Mrs. Arroyo's unconstitutional presidency.

If the Americans did not see any Erap resignation letter, what would be their basis for believing that Erap had resigned? Since it would appear that they did not see the objective basis, it would follow that all they had was, at best, a mere subjective basis. Somebody whom they obviously trusted must have given them the information that Erap had resigned. The Americans trusted him or her or them so much, they took his or her or their word for it without requiring any objective proof of the same such as, say, a copy of the resignation letter.

Now, who was that whom the Americans had trusted so much?

Was it Mrs. Arroyo? It would not seem so. In her letter to the Supreme Court dated January 20, 2001, she invoked Erap's "permanent disability", not Erap's resignation. Had she been of the belief that Erap had resigned, she would have readily invoked it over and above any other fuzzy ground.

Was it the AFP chief of staff, Gen. Angelo Reyes? It would not seem so. Had he been of the belief that Erap had resigned, there would have been no need for him to officially withdraw his and the military's support for Erap.

Was it the PNP chief, Panfilo Lacson? It would not seem so. Same reason as with Gen. Angelo Reyes. There would have been no need for him to officially withdraw his and the national police's support for Erap.

Was it any of the senators? It would not seem so. He or she would have immediately made a public announcement to that effect. No one did.

Was it any of the members of the House of Representatives? It would not seem so. Same reasons as with the senators.

Was it any of the justices of the Supreme Court? It would seem so. They were the only ones among the highest national leaders who appear to have the closest idea to an Erap resignation. They surprised legal minds with their novel idea of "constructive resignation" in *Estrada vs Arroyo*. It was all too clear without that unprecedented theory, the unconstitutionality of the justices' act of having sworn in Mrs. Arroyo over Erap's incumbency could have immediately triggered a chaotic constitutional crisis.

When the Americans spoke of Erap's "resignation", was it possible they had "constructive resignation" in mind? It would not seem so. They were talking about a constitutional resignation, one that complies with the corresponding constitutional procedure. Obviously, a "constructive resignation" does not comply with the proper procedure, which necessarily requires the President to transmit his written resignation to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in consonance with the principle of checks and balances.

If Erap did not resign, then the Americans committed a grave mistake in giving international recognition to Mrs. Arroyo's "presidency". It is a universal truth that a mistake ought to be corrected instead of tolerated. Otherwise, we suffer its consequences and fail to improve ourselves on the matter. Therefore, the Americans ought to rectify their mistake. They ought to be consistent in upholding the rule of law. The same proposition applies with equal force to all other similarly situated foreign embassies.

The Filipino people are struggling to keep their democracy and the rule of law as vibrant as possible. They need all the help they can get from their friends in the international community. After all, democracy and the rule of law are common concerns of the global community of mankind.

We must, however, distinguish between the Filipino people, the government and the administration. They are separate and distinct concepts in law. The most important thing to bear in mind is the administration refers to the group of human beings who are capable of (a) abusing the powers of the government and (b) betraying the trust of the Filipino people.

Therefore, the friends of Mrs. Arroyo's administration are not necessarily the friends of the Filipino people.

EXHIBIT 'E'
By Alan F. Paguia
5/7/04

What could be the Filipino people's Exhibit "E" against Chief Justice Hilario Davide, Jr. and the others who had conspired to remove President Joseph "Erap" Estrada from the presidency?

The official statement of Gen. Angelo Reyes on his conspiratorial role against the Erap presidency. It partially reads:

"When we decided to withdraw our support from the Estrada government, we did so not because this was the popular thing to do or because we wanted to take sides.

"Our decision had nothing to do with the innocence or guilt of Mr. Estrada. That was for the courts to decide. It had nothing to do with the issue of morality in governance either, for only heaven has jurisdiction over this realm. We made the decision because it was the only constitutional option left to avert a colossal disaster for the nation.

"As the AFP, we looked not at the past but at the future. Decision-making is always forward looking. When we decided, we measured the repercussion on the people over the long term, of action or inaction...

"It is therefore with a clear conscience that I can state that I did not plot against the Estrada government. That would have been treachery. My decision was not directed against the government. It was to protect the government against forces ready to take advantage of the situation for their own ends...

"On the strategic plane, I tried to visualize the future of the Armed Forces. Should I take a stand for or against the then duly constituted authority? To guide me in my deliberations, I reviewed Article 2, Section 3 of the *Constitution*, which states: 'Civilian authority is, at all times, superior over the military. The Armed Forces is the protector of the people and the state.'

"That fundamental principle has guided me from Day One of my appointment as chief of staff...

"Indeed, it became clear that the Estrada administration would fall. It was just a question of when and how...

"On the other hand, we had the option to go against the then duly constituted authority while still being constitutional, on the principle of protecting the will and welfare of the people. That, however, would put our professional institution at risk of becoming

adventurous Armed Forces.

"I was worried that, by so doing, I might unleash a vicious cycle of the AFP going against the government…

"I could very well have decided not to do anything and still probably be right. But I had to ask myself: How would this end if we took a passive stance? Someone might just set off an explosion. People would die. The police would react. Demonstrators would be arrested.

"If mayhem broke out, the AFP would be forced to step in and be perceived as fighting the people, instead of fighting for them. The situation would get worse and pretty soon AFP officers themselves would find it hard to remain non-partisan.

"Once that happened, it would be decades again before the AFP could recover...

"After a prolonged discussion with my staff, I finally realized that there remained only one constitutional option: to withdraw support as an integral military organization.

"After getting the concurrence of everyone in the room of my official residence in Camp Aguinaldo, I told them in jest: 'Gentlemen, I'm sure you know that we've just committed mutiny.' And they all responded in unison, 'Yes, Sir.'

"It was 10:30 a.m., Jan. 19.

"The next step was to figure out how to execute it. I then called Gen. Alvez and informed him of the decision and consulted him on the mechanics of announcing my decision...

"Alvez then made arrangements for a meeting with Vice President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo at 2 p.m at a safe house at the Corinthian Gardens, Quezon City…

"In the meantime, I instructed everyone to return to his office and project a semblance of business as usual. I also left instructions to call for a Board of Generals (BDG) meeting at 1:30 p.m in Camp Aguinaldo on the pretext of discussing pending promotions in the Army, Air Force and Navy—but actually to gather the major service commanders....

"I asked General Dagudag to prepare his contingency plans in case of resistance to our action. That tactical plan detailed specific areas of responsibility, tandem movements and rendezvous points.

"General Dagudag would command all ground forces, consisting of the special operations command and light armor units of the Army.

"General Santiago and Brig. Gen. Efren Abu of the light armor brigade would man the battle staff.

"Colonel Maclang would coordinate and monitor ground, air and naval operations at the joint operations center.

"Col. Felipe Tabas of the AFP logistics would provide logistical support.

"Brig. Gen. Reymundo Alcasid and Brig. Gen. Generoso Senga would take care of the media.

"The perimeter security of the camp would be handled by Col. Angel Atutubo.

"I was informed that the troops were ready but the plan was to be implemented only after the battle staff received word that I was on my way to Edsa.

"At around 11:15 a.m., Jan. 19, Vice-President Macapagal-Arroyo arrived at the safe house in Corinthian Gardens with Rep. Nani Braganza, now the agricultural secretary.

"In our one-on-one talk, I told her in essence: 'Ma'am, we are going to announce our withdrawal of support from the President and give it to you.' In response, she said: 'General, you are doing a great service to the people and the nation.' And I said: 'I'm not asking anything for myself. We are only asking for two things, Ma'am: good governance and a dignified exit for President Estrada.'

"The incoming President replied in essence: 'That's really my program, that's really what I want to pursue—good governance.'

"In response to commanders seeking my guidance as regards the order for them to report to Malacañang, I said: 'Don't move, stay where you are.'

"The members of the Battle Staff at the AFP joint operations center relayed my order to all field commanders to keep their forces inside their respective camps and to all intelligence units to monitor any unauthorized troop movements.

"After they were advised to await any further instructions from me, I further ordered them to shut off their cellular phones to avoid further calls from Malacañang and to communicate through the AFP radio network instead.

"Having arrived at a collective decision, I invited the Vice President to join us at the dining room to see and hear for herself the AFP brass (Army commanding general, Lt. Gen. Diomedio Villanueva; Navy flag officer in command, Rear Adm. Guillermo Wong; Air Force commanding general, Lt. Gen. Benjamin Defensor; and the deputy chief of staff (TDCS), Lt. Gen. Jaime de los Santos), and likewise for the generals to meet, face-to-face, their next Commander-in-Chief.

"...After a few minutes of waiting for Secretary (Orlando) Mercado, the Vice President, who noticed that we were not tailing her car, returned with former President Fidel Ramos. That was around 2:45 p.m. I told the Vice President that I had to wait for Secretary Mercado, who was on his way to the safe house.

"At around 3 p.m., Secretary Mercado arrived with Major de Leon. I led him to the music room inside the safe house for the one-on-one talk, while the rest waited in the living room.

"In the course of our discussion, we found that we had independently arrived at the same conclusion. However, at one point, he raised apprehensions that we might encounter some resistance from the Presidential Security Group and the Marines. I told him not to worry for I had already talked with the Marine commandant, General Ladia, who already committed to get orders only from me.

"I also relayed to him the information that the AFP chief of staff, Lt. Gen. Jose Calimlim, was already finding his way out of Malacañang to join us. After comparing notes with the other generals, Secretary Mercado said, indeed, we should all go to Edsa. He then had a brief conversation with the Vice President and former President Ramos.

"At around 3:35 p.m., I said 'Let's go!' As we all moved to our respective vehicles, I asked Gen. Leo Alvez (ret.) to join me in my staff car. We traveled up to the foot of the Ortigas flyover and arrived at the Edsa Shrine at 4:02 p.m.

"What happened next was captured by media cameras and microphones.

"What the media might have failed to note was the fact that the country's top military generals arrived at Edsa in civilian clothes—with no tanks, not even a single firearm in sight. It was to project the fact that we were not staging a *coup d' etat*. Not by any stretch of the imagination.

"Having done my job of protecting the interest and will of the people, I returned to Camp Aguinaldo and continued performing my duties.

"Representatives of former President Estrada and incoming President Macapagal-Arroyo were locked in negotiations over an orderly transition of government and the evacuation of Malacañang.

"The negotiations continued deep into the pre-dawn hours, but resulted in a dead-lock.

"... It was shortly after high noon of Jan. 20, 2001. I was at the Edsa Shrine. So, too, were an estimated half a million jubilant Filipinos. The rest of the nation was watching or listening to Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo take her oath as the 14th President of the Republic of the Philippines before Chief Justice Hilario Davide, Jr.

"After the newly installed President said '…so help me God', the crowd let go a thunderous roar of triumph and relief.… The constitutional and peaceful transition was complete."

EXHIBIT 'E' (Continued)
By Alan F. Paguia
5/10/04

What does Gen. Angelo Reyes' official statement prove?

First, it proves the political partisanship of Gen. Reyes before, during and after the removal of President Estrada. He planned, proposed and implemented with his co-conspirators the removal of Erap by installing Mrs. Arroyo as "President". He and his co-conspirators had launched a silent *coup d'etat* against Erap. They had betrayed his trust.

Second, it positively identifies some of the co-conspirators of Gen. Reyes.

Third, it proves the conspirators' deliberate abandonment of their constitutional duty to uphold the duly constituted Erap presidency.

Fourth, it proves the conspirators' deliberate abandonment of their constitutional duty to uphold the sovereign will of the Filipino people, who had duly elected Erap as the President of the Republic.

Fifth, it proves the specific acts committed by the conspirators that fully implemented their plan to remove Erap from office.

Sixth, it proves the conspirators' unconstitutional removal of President Estrada. Instead of following the constitutional procedure of removing the President by Senate impeachment proceedings, the conspirators followed the unconstitutional procedure of judicially removing the President by mob impeachment proceedings.

Seventh, it proves that in the minds of Gen. Reyes and his co-conspirators, subordinate public or military officials have the discretion under the *Constitution* to support or not support the duly elected President of the Filipino people; and that, they can validly override the Filipino people's electoral will under the *Constitution*. Of course, they are wrong.

Eighth, it proves that in the minds of Gen. Reyes and his co-conspirators, they may validly change their Commander-in-Chief if, in their judgment, such act would protect the Filipino people and the state. In other words, the electoral process required by the *Constitution* may be completely disregarded by subordinate military officials. This is obviously a dangerous mindset against a constitutional system of government.

Ninth, it proves the conspirators' open betrayal of public trust, the rule of law and Erap's right to due process under the *Constitution*.

Tenth, it proves Gen. Reyes and his co-conspirators completely disregarded the constitutional grounds of "death, permanent disability, removal (by impeachment) and resignation" when they removed Erap from the presidency.

In sum, it would appear the Filipino people have been betrayed without their knowing it; their *Constitution* had been violated without their realizing it; the relevant historical facts are being distorted without their being aware of it; and they are being misled into the coming presidential elections without their being intellectually prepared for it.

Those who understand, therefore, have the moral duty to explain to those who do not.

'Rule Of Law' Exhibit 'F' Most Important Of All

5/17/04—#1 (17-275)
MON., MAY 17, 2004 8:40 A.M. YR 17, DAY 275
Manila, Philippines

RE: PAGUIA RE EXHIBIT F; VK/JOE KENNEDY—GCH/D

URGENT REQUEST: MAKE SURE THAT IN THE VERY NEXT ISSUE OF THE PAPER THAT THE POSTING OF VK DURHAM GOES AS PRESENTED ON THE NET, REGARDING JOE KENNEDY.

Please make sure an Editorial comment is presented UP TOP that Mr. Kennedy totally disregarded all instructions, limitations and use of anything in conjunction with "GAIA". All connections were severed and that was again established in a rather abrupt phone call lately to Manila from Mr. Kennedy (location unknown).

We are no longer going to sit still while some mentally challenged fraud, VK Durham, continues her foolishness.

While it is obvious that Joe Kennedy was no longer working with or involved in any way with Ekkers-GAIA, for he was and continued to WORK WITH VK DURHAM, *(CHECK IT OUT)*, we have no interest nor input into their ongoing arrangements or how they manage or use THEIR association.

Ekkers have no notion about anything relative to a GARRY STROUD, deceased or otherwise. There is no recognition of such a person until VK Durham blamed such as "Kennedy" for being involved in his (Stroud's) DEATH.

You will please note from the directly inserted posting of VK that there has been long ongoing interchange between Joe Kennedy and VK Durham.

By the way, Thomas Ganz (referred to as "Tomas Ganz" in VK's posting) would have no way whatsoever of knowing anything about ownership of "Bonus", nor would he comment on same. Thomas Ganz is the clerk recorder of the Washington County, Illinois office of Records. Not only would he not have relative information but has been used as a means of fraud BY VK since she started posting her garbage in any recorded files. She even cut and pasted Ganz' SIGNATURE onto fraudulent and fabricated documents! This is definitely important, readers.

Further: DERIVATIVES ARE NEITHER CONSIDERED NOR ISSUED BY EKKERS-GAIA IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM.

RULE OF LAW

As we present more information directly from Alan Paguia, please pay attention for you will need ALL of the reference material you can get in managing, intelligently, the forthcoming disputes which can be expected—but possibly averted—by careful recognition of our position.

If GMA remains in power the heaviest problems will not come from her as "administration" but from the ability of the Supreme Court to run roughshod over everything and everyone. STAY ALERT.

Exhibit "F", hereby offered, is probably, without more comment spent on it today, the most important ONE recognition of misuse and abuse of power within the corrupt halls of injustice.

[QUOTING from *The Daily TRIBUNE*, (Manila, Philippines), page 5 "Commentary", "Rule of Law", Friday, May 14, 2004:]

EXHIBIT 'F'—UNJUST JUSTICES
By Alan F. Paguia

What could be the Filipino people's Exhibit "F" against Chief Justice Hilario Davide, Jr. and the others who had conspired to remove President Joseph "Erap" Estrada from the presidency?

The justices' *en banc* ruling in *Estrada vs Sandiganbayan* which promulgated on Nov. 25, 2003, it materially reads:

"Attorney Alan Paguia, speaking for petitioner, asserts that the inhibition of the members of the Supreme Court from hearing the petition is called for under Rule 5.10 of the Code of Judicial Conduct prohibiting justices or judges from participating in any partisan political activity which proscription, according to him, the justices have violated by attending the 'Edsa II rally' and by authorizing the assumption of Vice President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo to the presidency in violation of the 1987 *Constitution*. Petitioner contends that the justices have thereby prejudged a case that would assail the legality of the act taken by President Arroyo. The subsequent decision in *Estrada vs. Arroyo* (353 SCRA 452 and 356 SCRA 148) IS, PETITIONER STATES, A PATENT MOCKERY OF JUSTICE AND DUE PROCESS.

"…The ruling in *Estrada vs Arroyo*, being a final judgment, has long put to end any question pertaining to the legality of the ascension of Arroyo into the presidency. By reviving the issue on the validity of the assumption of Mme. Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo to the presidency, Attorney Paguia is vainly seeking to breathe life into the carcass of a long-dead issue.

"…In a resolution, dated 08 July 2003, this court has strongly warned Attorney Alan Paguia, on pain of disciplinary sanction, to desist from further making, directly or indirectly, similar submissions to this court or to its members. But, unmindful of the well-meant admonition to him by the court, Attorney Paguia appears to persist no end.

"WHEREFORE, the instant petition for *certiorari* is DISMISSED, and the court hereby orders Attorney Alan Paguia, counsel for petitioner, Joseph 'Erap' Estrada, to SHOW CAUSE, within 10 days from notice hereof why he should not be sanctioned for conduct unbecoming a lawyer and an officer of the court.

"On Oct. 10, 2003, Attorney Paguia submitted his compliance with the show-cause order. In a three-page pleading, Attorney Paguia, in an obstinate display of defiance, repeated his earlier claim of political partisanship against the members of the court.

"Canon 5.10 of the Code of Judicial Conduct, which Attorney Paguia has tirelessly quoted to give some semblance of validity for his groundless attack on the court and its members, provides—'Rule 5.10: A judge is entitled to entertain personal views on political questions. But to avoid suspicion of political partisanship a judge shall not make political speeches, contribute to party funds, publicly endorse candidates for political office or participate in other partisan political activities.'

[H: Of course this doesn't seem to cover dressing up in the robes of the court and swearing in a Vice President while unseating the legitimate elected PRESIDENT. How is that for interpretation of your own preferred laws?]

"Section 79 (b) of the Omnibus Election Code defines the term 'partisan political activities', the law states:

"The term 'election campaign' or 'partisan political activity' relates to an act designed to promote the election or defeat of a particular candidate or candidates to a public office…

"It should be clear that the phase 'partisan political activities', in its statutory content, relates to acts designed to cause the success or the defeat of a particular candidate or candidates who have filed certificates of candidacy to a public office in an election. The taking of an oath of office by an incoming President of the Republic before the Chief Justice of the Philippines is a traditional official function of the highest magistrate. The assailed presence of other justices of the court at such an event could be no different from their appearance in such other official functions in attending the annual State of the Nation Address by the President of the Philippines before the Legislative Department…

"Unfortunately, Attorney Paguia has continued to make public statements of like nature.

"The court has already warned Attorney Paguia, on pain of disciplinary sanction, to become mindful of the grave responsibilities as a lawyer and as an officer of the court. Apparently, he has chosen not at all to take heed.

"***WHEREFORE, Attorney Alan Paguia is hereby indefinitely suspended from the practice of law, effective upon his receipt hereof, for conduct unbecoming a lawyer and an officer of the court.***

"Let copies of this resolution be furnished the Office of the Bar Confidant, the Integrated Bar of the Philippines, and all courts of the land through the Office of the Court Administrator. [emphasis ours]

"SO ORDERED.

"(Signed) Chief Justice Hilario Davide Jr., Associate Justice Reynaldo Puno, Jose Vitug, Artenio Panganiban, Leonardo Quisumbing, Consuelo Ynares-Santiago, Angelica Sandoval-Gutierrez, Antonio Carpio (no part), Ma. Alicia Austria-Martinez, Renato Corona, Conchita Carpio-Morales, Romeo Callego Sr., Adolfo Azcuna, and Dante Tinga."

First, it proves the subsequent conspiracy of the Arroyo-appointed justices with the non-Arroyo-appointed justices to defend and uphold Mrs. Arroyo's unconstitutional presidency.

Second, it proves the justices' unfairness by acting as judge of their own act. Erap questioned the justices' act of swearing in Mrs. Arroyo as "President". Under the due process clause of the Constitution, who and how should the question be resolved? By justices who should act with the "cold neutrality of an impartial judge". Obviously, it is impossible for the justices to be the impartial judge of questions against their own act. No one can fairly be the accused and the judge at the same time. In the context of due process, the justices were as much the respondents as Mrs. Arroyo in *Estrada vs. Arroyo*. Thus, it is clear the justices violated Erap's right to due process of law. They did not afford him the benefit of the "cold neutrality of an impartial judge". It would parenthetically follow that the justices have deprived the Filipino people of the services of their duly elected President—in clear violation of the people's electoral and sovereign will.

Third, it proves the justices' unfairness in reading and applying the law. Under the Code of Judicial Conduct, "partisan political activity" plainly means any activity that is political and partisan regardless of any elections. Under the Omnibus Election Code, "partisan

political activity" means exactly the same as the term "election campaign" which obviously contemplates an election. It should therefore, readily appear the prohibition under the first law applies whether the "partisan political activity" is election-related or not. It would follow the justices' active participation in Edsa II which was patently: (a) political because it involved the removal of the President of the Filipino people; and (b) partisan because it was anti-President Erap and pro-Vice President Arroyo—constituted a violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

The justices' unfairness is highlighted by their passing *sub-silencio* upon the law's categorical pronouncement that "partisan political activity" means exactly the same as "election campaign". Apparently, the justices foresaw the difficulty, if not impossibility, of plausibly arguing that the prohibition against justices does not apply where the "partisan political activity" is not election related. It is obvious that a "partisan political activity", whether election-related or not, is a "partisan political activity" which is prohibited by law.

In other words, a kilo of cotton has exactly the same weight as a kilo of iron. A "partisan political activity that is election-related carries exactly the same prohibition under the Code of Judicial Conduct as a "partisan political activity" that is not election-related. The violation committed by the justices by actively participating in Edsa II is simply very obvious. Were it not for its tragic consequences, the justices' denial of their violation would have been somewhat laughable.

We believe that every Filipino lawyer has the sacred duty to tell the Filipino people the truth about matters of public concern. The violation of law is certainly a matter of public concern. And the public's concern is certainly heightened where the violators appear to be the justices of the Supreme Court. Unfortunately in the present case, the lawyer's faithful performance of that duty was rewarded with indefinite suspension for conduct unbecoming a lawyer and an officer of the court. Who gave the reward? The justices who committed the violation; the same justices who have effectively agreed to unconstitutionally imprison the Filipino people's duly elected President.

Should the indefinitely suspended lawyer feel sorry for doing his duty to the Filipino people?

In a society where people kneel before the truth of POWER, those who choose to stand with dignity do so with full faith in the power of truth. Those who believe in the truth of power—believe that might is right. Those who believe in the power of truth—believe that right is might. The first belief is human; the second is divine. Why?

THE POWER OF TRUTH IS THE POWER OF GOD.

[END QUOTING]

Readers, if you fail to come into the Rule of Law within the POWER OF TRUTH, you have no prayer of coming into justice and freedom—as a global species. God provides "the way"—HE DOES NOT DO IT "FOR" YOU.

GCH

dharma

Re: VKD/Joe Kennedy Connection

Editorial Comment: In the writing in the first column on the next page, VK Durham once again achieves a "truth quotient" rating of precisely ZERO.

Once again it is necessary to set some facts straight after the "mentally challenged fraud", VKD, mangles truth beyond any recognition: There is NO "Trust" (TIAS or otherwise); there was NO marriage between Vina and Russell Herman; the "color" certificate she unlawfully holds has NO value; and there certainly is NO $400 TRILLION situation with China. Much more could be added to this list of "NO-NOs" just from the more important issues that have already been covered in this paper but to address the matter at hand:

THERE IS NO WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GAIA AND JOE KENNEDY.

The March 18, 2000 Public Notice (below left) is a succinct statement of the FACT that GAIA has a "zero tolerance" policy with regard to any Deedholders fooling with "high yield" or "roll" trading programs.

Joe Kennedy signed a Memorandum of Agreement (see sample, below right, and in particular section 2). When it became known that he disregarded instructions and BROKE THE AGREEMENT, GAIA's involvement with him was terminated. Five years later, out of the blue, Mr. Kennedy comes knocking again on GAIA's door—straight from VK Durham, AS VK HERSELF DOCUMENTS. VK also documents that she has had ongoing discussions with Joe Kennedy since "'prior to Garry Stroud's death'", which was, we are informed, almost one full year ago. In comparison to GAIA's brief encounters with this particular former Deedholder, VK's relationship with Joe has been long and ongoing.

Funny thing, isn't it? GAIA terminates its relationship with Mr. Kennedy and it takes him five

GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION

PUBLIC NOTICE

March 18, 2000

In its information package the Association provides copies of several of its Public Notices informing DEEDholders, and anyone intending to utilize the DEEDs as banking reserves, that the DEEDs may not be used to provide funds for "high yield" or "roll" trading programs.

Hereafter, any violation of this restriction on the use of the DEEDs will be considered a breach of the Memorandum of Agreement and the DEED(s) in point will immediately be rescinded.

If a DEEDholder has used a DEED to provide money to a "program", the DEEDholder was obligated, at the same time, to provide an equal amount of money (cash or gold) to GAIA. Failure to have done so will be considered a fraudulent breach, subject to criminal prosecution.

For the Board of Directors,

E. J. EKKER, President DORIS J. EKKER, Secretary

18102000 **SAMPLE**

Preamble: The following MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT, as provided by Global Alliance Investment Association, is intended as a guide. If it is acceptable as is, when signed by the parties it becomes a legal-contract. If there are points requiring negotiation, GAIA will entertain them by telephone or fax so that they may be corrected or rewritten to suit the needs of all participants.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (MOA)
Deed of Assignment for Consideration No. 18102000

This is a Memorandum of Agreement regarding contracts derived from the referenced collateral, Bonus Certificate 3392-181.

This Memorandum of Agreement, entered into as of January 1, 2000, is by and between JVP M-P ASSO., INC., Address, RP and GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION, (GLOBAL) a Nevada corporation with corporate offices at 5300 West Sahara, Suite 101, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102, U.S.A.

Whereas, GLOBAL is in the business of providing collateral to qualified entities in a variety of denominations appropriate to the needs of qualified entities, and

Whereas, JVP is a qualified entity desirous of obtaining collateral, and

Whereas, GLOBAL is the owner of all rights, title and interest derived from the valid debt obligation of the United States, particularly Bonus Certificate 3392-181, hereinafter referred to as the "Bonus Collateral", and

Whereas, JVP will use the Bonus Collateral or a portion thereof "Righteously", herein meaning for humanitarian purposes allowing no part of any proceeds derived from the use of this collateral to be used for any war-related activity, now

Therefore, the parties hereto, in consideration of the promises, representations, warranties herein made and other considerations agree to the following terms and conditions:

1. Availability. GLOBAL warrants it has in its legal possession all rights, title and interest derived from Bonus Certificate 3392-181, the Bonus Collateral, worth in excess of 10 Trillion Dollars (US) and shall assign to JVP so much of the Bonus Collateral as shall be mutually agreed.

2. Place where DEEDs and/or proceeds shall be utilized. The projects(s) for which the Bonus Collateral shall be used shall be located outside the territory of the United States and no attempt at funding shall occur within the United States. JVP expressly warrants hereby that JVP will in no way allow any part or portion of the DEED(s) issued to JVP to be used in any so-called "high yield" or trading program.

3. Validity. GLOBAL warrants that the Bonus Collateral is valid debt of the United States Treasury and is guaranteed by the Federal Reserve.

4. Confirmation. GLOBAL reserves the right to coordinate the making of any and all claims for the collection of all DEEDs so issued and JVP shall make no effort to make a claim on the Bonus Collateral, or to verify its validity, with the Federal Reserve or the U.S. Treasury without the express written permission of GLOBAL. All requirements of the Uniform Commercial Code, which is by treaty superior to all other law and from which there is not appeal, were completed February 16, 1999, thus leaving the debtor(s) no recourse but to pay the debt and its accumulating interest.

18102000 **SAMPLE**

years to "try again". For SOME REASON, however, he calls and emails VKD "many times" over a period of YEARS: Does VK just have a challenge saying "NO"? No, Joe, her "game" is neither straightforward nor honorable.

There are plenty of "funny things" contained in VK Durham's presentations, not least of which are the intimations that Thomas Ganz, County Recorder, would have any opinion whatsoever regarding ownership of the value allocated to COSMOS SEAFOOD ENERGY MARKETING, LTD. by jurat/contract in Peru in 1989. Yes, if you are interested, PLEASE DO LOOK IT UP because CSEML is in no way, shape or form "retired" into any VKD "trust".

[QUOTING:]

THE 4 DERIVATIVE DICTATORS
RIGGING THE U.S. MARKETS
By V.K. Durham
5/13/04

Readers... "Three guesses" what these "derivatives" mentioned in this article are written on which is "bringing about the current global banking, financing crisis."

http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin/forum.cgi?read=48736

One "hitch"...THE FIRST TWO ANSWERS "DO NOT COUNT!"

Answer. BONUS "CERTIFICATE" 3392-181.

Go to the following for validation:

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

and the "recorded meeting stating same" at

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

Do accomplish all of this; UNFORTUNATELY, MORE THAN JUST "ONE" GOOD PEOPLE LOST THEIR LIVES

http://www.theantechamber.net/V_K_Durham/VkPublicNotice.html look at the photos (not for viewing by those "faint of heart").

Yesterday, May 12, 2004 we received very interesting information regarding a gentleman who's name is "J. Kennedy." who is involved with the "COUNTERFEIT BONUS "CERTIFICATE" 3392-181 "GAIA-EKKER'S" who was, has been and is "TRYING" to market one of those "Counterfeits" right here in the U.S.A.

The individuals who were being BILKED by Mr. Kennedy became curious and called the Washington County (Nashville, Illinois) County Recorder, Tomas Ganz to find out who actually owned the instruments the GAIA-EKKER'S are issuing COUNTERFEIT Gold Derivatives on i.e. DEED 189934.

It was reported back to me, last night: "Mr. Ganz was very adamant in stating: "The last time I checked; V.K. Durham owns the instruments. To my knowledge there has been no change in ownership, and V.K. DURHAM remains the owner of Public Record."

This directly effects some of you readers. Mr. Kennedy worked with GARRY STROUD. Mr. Kennedy has called me many times trying to get the TRUST to underwrite the Global Alliance Investment Association "DEED OF ASSIGNMENT FOR CONSIDERATION" authorized by Corporate Officers, E.J. Ekker, Doris J. Ekker.

He called and emailed me "prior to Garry Strouds death" and afterwards. Each time he was told "NO."

Last evening, the individuals who were (innocently) involved with MR. KENNEDYS' attempts on the GAIA-EKKER'S "Counterfeit instruments" were told: " All of you who have been taken and possibly innocently involved with these COUNTERFEIT "DEEDS OF ASSIGNMENTS" of the GAIA-EKKERS; Should take this to the FBI. The FBI know how to proceed on 18 U.S.C. STAT. CRIMINAL CODES involving COUNTERFEITING PRIME BANK INSTRUMENTS. This is BANKING TERRORISM."

V.K. Durham

[END QUOTING]

GEORGE MERCIER'S *INVISIBLE CONTRACTS*

PART EIGHT OF A TWELVE-PART SYNOPSIS (Pages 435-477)

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.

FRNs A "BENEFIT"?

Is there a benefit that accrues to us—are we "enriched"—by the use of Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs)? Does the mere use of FRNs constitute, somehow, commercial profit or gain?

In a world where debt-based currencies have replaced currencies backed by value, political bodies are free to borrow and borrow some more—all backed by the COLLATERAL of the "promise to pay" (someday, somehow) of the "citizens", who are all now enslaved by debt. Virtually unlimited funds are made available for purposes of making war, while great sections of the global population are left to starve to death. And this is a "benefit"? As Mercier explains in this "chapter" of his "letter" to Mr. May, the King does indeed view use of FRNs as a commercial benefit sufficient to attach Admiralty Jurisdiction.

Remember, please, that it is Admiralty Jurisdiction that permits victimless crimes (crimes without *mens rea*, without any intent to harm) and it is Admiralty Jurisdiction that occasions all manners of "legal" acts without consideration of moral turpitude. It is "legal", for instance, for the United States to attack a sovereign nation that provably posed no imminent threat. Yes, it is totally "legal" to unleash all kinds of "weapons of mass destruction" (not to mention mass distraction) against whatsoever nation and its people.

As we know, however, that which is put out returns to the sender in kind. As God provides an alternative to debt-based currencies globally, those who actually benefited from the debt-based scheme will be exposed as the enslavers and controllers that they are.

Speaking of "return in kind", readers might recall the example of "A Tank In the Parking Lot" referenced in a prior installment in this series. "But that was decades ago!" comes the retort. Let's update that scenario to present day with the following news item.

[QUOTING:]

ITALY SEIZES 8,000 KALASHNIKOVS
HEADED TO U.S.
4/21/04

ROME (*Reuters*)—Italian customs officers seized more than 8,000 Kalashnikov assault rifles and other weapons on a ship headed to the United States, officials said Tuesday.

The arms, worth about $7.15 million, were discovered aboard a ship arriving from Romania that pulled into the southern Italian port of Gioia Tauro on its way to the United States, Italy's customs said in a statement.

According to the travel documents, the arms belong to a large U.S. company with headquarters in the state of Georgia.

"We know that the destination was North America, but we don't effectively know if that's where the arms were going," a customs official told RAI state television.

The arms were found inside three containers during a routine customs check earlier this week. They were confiscated due to discrepancies in the customs forms, but the news was only made public Tuesday.

The customs office said the weapons had been described as "common guns" instead of assault rifles and longer-range combat arms in the travel documentation.

[END QUOTING]

Yes, the tank in the parking lot was decades ago—but it certainly appears that the plans remain very much in effect. Do you suppose those "UFOs" caught on video over Mexico could have been Russian cosmospheres (anti-gravitic platforms)? Let's keep in mind that only a Russian may ever head the United Nations' military forces as we endure, day after nauseating day, television presentations of the heinous actions of the largest "rogue nation" in the world. It certainly appears that someone is being set up for a mighty fall.

Returning to the subject at hand: The King and his judicial minions very much want to view our mere use of FRNs as a commercial benefit, sufficient to hold us to Admiralty Jurisdiction.

I, for one, hereby put it "on the record" that I do not use debt-based currency by choice and that there is "no deal" wherein a compelled and presumed "benefit" is shown to be harmful. In backing the movement toward value-backed currency worldwide with my life energy (which I have done for more than a decade now), I am establishing my own, personal *state of mind* with regard to the entire subject. I reject the notion (legal presumption) that debt-based currency is a benefit; it is an absolute detriment to the spirit of all whom it has been and is being used to enslave. Enough said—for now.

Let's take up with Mercier's exposition.

[QUOTING:]

FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Next, we turn now and address some Commercial debt instruments that just about everyone uses constantly. **And when this Commercial paper is used and then re-circulated by you, Federal Benefits are being quietly accepted by you and so now subtle contracts are in effect.** As *commercial holders in due course*, you and the King are experiencing mutual enrichment from each other. The King believes that the mere use of Federal Reserve Notes, those "circulating evidences of debt" that his Legal Tender Statutes have enhanced the value of as a co-endorser; and that the mere acceptance and beneficial use of those circulating Commercial equity instruments of debt, constitutes an attachment of Equity [Admiralty] Jurisdiction sufficiently related to experiencing Commercial profit or gain in Interstate Commerce as to warrant the attachment of civil liability to his so-called Title 26. Remember, once you get rid of your political contracts to pay taxes (like National Citizenship), Federal Judges will then start examining the record to see if there are any

Commercial benefits out there that you have been experiencing. Once you are a Citizen, Federal Judges will generally stop looking for other contracts; but once Citizenship is gone, then other normally quiescent Commercial nexuses that attach King's Equity Jurisdiction suddenly take upon themselves vibrant new importance.

I have thought out this perspective that the King has on this subject matter over and over again, and based on an analysis of principles, rights, liabilities and Cases that surface in Commercial Contract Law relating to Negotiable Instruments (as Federal Reserve Notes are Negotiable Instruments), and of the rights, liabilities and duties of *Holders in Due Course*, and I have come to the conclusion that the King is basically correct. For example, bills, notes and checks are also Negotiable Instruments, as well as Inland Bills of Exchange. Collectively, Negotiable Instruments differ somewhat from orthodox Commercial contracts for the reason that the American Jurisprudential law concerning them springs from several different and independent sources. Whereas the simple Law of Contracts had its origin in the Common Law of England, in contrast this Law of Negotiable Instruments arose largely out of the summary and chronologically abbreviated practices and international customs of merchants in Commerce. Those merchants formulated a body of rules and common practices relating to their trade, which were gradually adapted into the Law of the Law by the English Courts. Bills of exchange and promissory notes, of which Federal Reserve Notes are a composite blend, acquired early on the peculiar quality and nature among merchants in Commerce as being negotiable, i.e., passable as Tender to different people. Negotiability was then defined to mean that if an instrument is negotiable in form and is in the hands of a *Holder in Due Course*, then possible personal defenses someone may later assert against the Holder are cut off of in the Holder's favor. This idea of negotiability is an intriguing one. It differs quite a bit from the conception of assignability underlying the transfer of *choses in action*, which are not negotiable.

[INTERRUPT QUOTING]

Who is the true "holder in due course" of the assets upon which Federal Reserve Notes (debt obligations of the UNITED STATES corporation) are based? Could it end up being—GLOBAL ALLIANCE INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION (GAIA) and NOT THE KING OF THIS WORLD? For now, however, and until such time as the gold assets come into the possession of GAIA, those assets could be considered "choses in action".

What are "choses in action"? "Chose" is French for "thing" and at law such a "thing" refers to a possession, so this phrase means only "property in action" (as opposed to property in the hands of the "holder in due course"). GAIA's UCC-perfected (and as you will read shortly, UST/FED-RATIFIED) "claim" against the UST/Fed puts all gold assets, wherever situate globally, into the category of choses in action.

It is noteworthy that choses in action are not assignable at Common Law—BUT, in Equity (Admiralty Jurisdiction) all choses in action are assignable and the assignee has an equitable right to enforce the fulfillment of the obligation in the name of the assignor. And there you have the reason WHY the GAIA Program has proceeded with Deeds of Assignment, which are 100% "kosher" in the current legal environment.

"If there are *Holders in Due Course*, are there also *Holders* ***not*** *in Due Course*? Of course there are," Mercier answers in a footnote. Indeed, the holders of the gold in the Negev Desert are holders not in due course because of the illegitimacy of their possession. Another example would be that of a "bailment" contract: If the King as bailor hands over some gold to a bailee to transport it to another location, the bailee is a holder *not* in due course. In a larger sense, anything that we as individuals might come to possess in our lifetimes could be viewed as a bailment contract with GOD as the bailor and each of us as bailees. GOD is the TRUE "holder in due course" of ALL property (choses), a fact well recognized by indigenous people, who correctly view themselves as caretakers of the land.

It is a Natural Law that we have a responsibility to object to the assertion of falsehood, which can be expressed as: "Toleration of evil is no virtue." Programmed from birth onward to acquiesce to authority, however, this is something that we often fail to do. When our children are raised in Truth and taught full responsibility for their thoughts and actions, the world will change for the better. Eventually, the true laws of God and Nature shall prevail. For now, however, let's continue to enhance our understanding of how the laws of Equity (Admiralty) function.

ACCEPTANCE

[RESUME QUOTING:]

Furthermore, all factors considered, it is my opinion that the King is not only just basically correct, but that the King is also in a very strong position here, and that Federal Magistrates are not Star Chamber Chancellors when throwing out your civil tax defenses that ignore this invisible and adhesive attachment of King's Equity Jurisdiction, and the strong presumption of your entrance into King's Commerce that the **acceptance** and beneficial recirculation of Federal Reserve Notes necessarily infers. However, the seminal reason why the King is in such a strong position is only partially related to his *sub silentio* aggression against you; the largest reason is because you, by your own default, have **accepted** the benefits of this Commercial nexus Equity relationship with the King….

Under the Common Mercantile Law of Commercial Contract Law applicable to Negotiable Instruments, it has always been *prima facie evidence* that the mere issuance of the Negotiable Instrument itself constitutes the evidence of the receipt and enjoyment of Consideration. This **Acceptance of Consideration Doctrine** is of maximum importance to understand and appreciate in its placement into the contemporary Income Tax setting, as this Doctrine has been around for a very long time, and the King is only now using it for his own enrichment. Law books repeat over and over again that acceptable Consideration may be anything that will support a simple contract, and may even specifically include previously existing debt. This Consideration Doctrine survives the codification of the Law Merchant into the Negotiable Instruments Law, and also survives the later restatement of the N.I.L. into the Uniform Commercial Code.

The Law of Commercial Contract applicable to the use and recirculation of Negotiable Instruments is quite old, just like King's Commerce itself. Commercial Paper was also used extensively by merchants in the Middle Ages, and the origin of our contemporary *Law of Negotiable Instruments* was an unwritten Common Law applicable to merchants, called the Law Merchant. This Law Merchant was gradually assimilated as an appendage onto English Common Law, and subsequently became a part of our American Jurisprudence when the New England Colonies turned into states and adapted English Common Law. The Law Merchant is spoken of by English Judges with reference to Bills of Exchange and negotiable securities. It is neither more nor less than the common usages of merchants and traders in the different departments of trade, ratified by decisions of Courts of Law, which Courts later upon such usages being proved before them, readapted those merchant practices into the Common Law of England as settled law with a view to the interest of trade and the public convenience. Therefore, what was at one time mere custom in between merchants then became grafted upon, or incorporated onto, the Common Law, and may now be correctly said to form an overlapping part of the Common Law. When such general Commercial practices have been judicially ascertained and established, those Commercial practices become a part of the Law Merchant, which contemporary American courts of justice are bound to honor….

And if the King has got you **accepting** the Consideration inherent in Negotiable Instruments [of which] he is a *Holder in Due Course*, and [of which] his Legal Tender Statutes have enhanced the value, and additionally retains a distant Equity interest, then the King has got an invisible contract on you and the King has you plump little turkeys exactly where he wants you: ripe for a Federal plucking. So to correctly handle this beneficial "use of Federal Reserve Notes" creating a taxing liability story, we need to start out with the basic premise that the King is correct in his assertions, and so are judges in their reasoning; to believe otherwise is to be self damaging, as we have no time to waste with any error in our reasoning.

If you are like most folks, the King has got you **accepting** his Consideration and financial benefits with your mere use of Federal Reserve Notes, because most folks want to use and want to experience the beneficial enjoyment that widespread acceptance and Commercial use of Federal Reserve Notes brings. But read those words over again carefully, as they also contain the Grand Key for getting out of this Equity Ace our King has neatly tucked up in his Royal Sleeve: the contract that is in effect whenever benefits, conditionally offered, were **accepted** by you.

Examining a profile slice of the tens of thousands of Cases out there addressing questions of Commercial Contract Law applicable to the annulment of the rights and duties of *Holders in Due Course* of Commercial Paper (notes [such as FRNs], bonds, securities, checks, equitable specialties in general, etc.), **it is the *State of Mind* of the parties at the time the Negotiable Instrument was accepted that determines the subsequent rights and duties of *Holders in Due Course***. *Holders in Due Course*, so called, are in a special Status as it pertains to the use and recirculation of Commercial instruments. *Holders in Due Course* are assumed [presumed] to have taken the Negotiable Instrument (Federal Reserve Note) free of the defense of "Absence or Failure of Consideration", and additionally, are generally free of all other defenses as well. When the King is *Holder in Due Course* of Federal Reserve Notes, then the King is immune to any defense we may assert against him, as he collects on an invisible contract created when his Commercial benefits were **accepted** by you. Do you see why it is not very wise to snicker at Federal Judges if you have not properly handled your defense line in this area of using Federal Reserve Notes? In some cases, a *person* wants to be in this *Holder in Due Course* Status due to its protective nature, and in other circumstances, we don't want to be a *Holder in Due Course* due to the liabilities involved. Generally speaking, subject to the condition that the *person* accepted the Negotiable Instrument in good faith and for value, a *Holder in Due Course* occupies a protected position free from any personal defenses someone else may assert. But in dealing with the King on those Federal Reserve Notes, our declared Status as *Holders in Due Course* or *Holders* ***not*** *in Due Course* is not important: because by filing Objections and Notice of Protest, etc., the King's Status as a *Holder in Due Course* is then automatically terminated, and getting the King off

of that sovereign Status Throne of his is what's important.

So merely filing a Notice of Protest and Notice of Defect will automatically deny the King his coveted and protected Status as being a *Holder in Due Course* with Federal Reserve Notes, as that protective status applies to you….

JOINT OBLIGATION DEBTORS

And in addition to outright Consideration, by your Commercial use and recirculation of Federal Reserve Notes, the King has you strapped into his debt as an "Automatically Transferred and Joint Obligation Debtor". **Under a very large body of Roman Civil Law and Jewish Commercial Law going back to Moses and the *Talmud*, there is a kind of an obligation in law whose source is not contract or promise in the classical sense, but due to a ripple effect of debt, an obligation can be automatically transferred down a line of notes passers and debtors. This Doctrine is elucidated quite well in Jewish Law, where this doctrine is formally known as Shibuda D'Rabbi Nathan (meaning the line of Rabbi Nathan). Under this liability dispersion model, debt ripples from one *person* to another back up the line, without the appearance of any contract being readily apparent. Say that a *person* "A" owes money to "B", and "B" owes money to "C". *Person* "C" can then recover from "A" an amount of money not exceeding the sum *person* "B" owes to "C".**

The reason why this—debt liability being rippled back up the line a few persons—is called "Rabbi Nathan's Lien" is because this rule is generally attributed to Rabbi Nathan, a tannaitic sage (Babylonia and Palestine, in the Second Century), who first formulated it on the basis of a certain interpretation of a Mosaic text. Here in the contemporary United States, a very similar analogy is found operating both in Contract Law and in Tort Law, but for different reasons.

1. Under Tort-Law-liability reasoning, persons whom you never had any contract or contact with, are liable for damages they work on you. For example, be underneath an airplane when it crashes. Under the *Joint and Several Liability Doctrine*, attorneys will sue the Federal Aviation Administration, the pilot, the local political jurisdiction that owns the airport, the contractor who built the airport, the airline, the airline's insurance company, the airline's airplane manufacturer, persons who supply parts to the airplane manufacturer, the pilot's mother, etc., without limit, right up the line.

2. When a grievance is under Contract Law jurisprudence, generally, persons not a party to the contract are normally exempt from liability absent an interfering Tort they worked, somehow (Called *Tortious Interference with Contract*).

But properly viewed at the conclusion of the grievance, this Rabbi Nathan's Lien is no more than just an asset seizure against debtor's assets held by third parties, and whether the underlying factual setting behind the Judgment was under Tort Law or Contract Law is now irrelevant, once the Judgment has been docketed, and that *person's* assets are now under attack. So when a judgment has been obtained against Party "B", and Party "C" owes "B" some money, then when Party "A" throws an action at "C", then that arrangement is no more than the equivalent of a directed wage garnishment that goes on every single day of the week here in the United States. And just as this Liability Ripple Scenario goes on at such a quiet level with wage garnishments, so too does it carry on at a national level with you and I and our assets being pledged to pay off the National Debt of the United States.

But our King is our adversary in Court, and his attorneys use partially twisted logic to quiet our exception from taxation arguments, and so their attitude is a simple "you pay". But important for the moment is your knowledge that your Commercial use and recirculation of Federal Reserve Notes is properly deemed a sufficient nexus to the King's Equity Jurisdiction as to effectuate an attachment of liability for the payment of the King's outstanding **debt that he owes to the Federal Reserve Board**, with the amount of your payment being measured by your net taxable income….

[Let's see how this works: At the top of the banking game there is the Bank for International Settlements and below that the World Bank, IMF, U.S. Treasury and the Federal Reserve and the Federal Reserve owes—GAIA, the TRUE "holder in due course". Indeed, "God is about to become immensely popular," as we have been told. Does it matter if the Federal Reserve goes broke? Nope, it matters not a whit, thanks to Rabbi Nathan and the ripple effect.]

FORCE, DURESS, COERCION AND PENAL STATUTES

Question: What if you don't want to accept the benefits of and use of Federal Reserve Notes?

What if you are different? What if you have factual knowledge that the King only got this monopoly on American currency circulation (both gold and silver), not by free-market acceptance and competitive universal respect and appreciation for benefits offered by his Legal Tender Statutes, which is the way all Commercial transactions should be based, but rather, through force, duress, coercion, penal statutes, naked physical duress and literally out of the barrel of a gun: because guns being drawn is exactly what two remaining private coin mints saw as United States Treasury Agents raided the last diehard private coin mints in California in the late 1800s and physically destroyed them (but that intriguing Americana history following an act of Congress in 1864 banning private coins as currency is another Letter). But dealing with Private Coin Mints out of the barrel of a gun is only half the story, as our King is usually quite thorough in whatever he decides to muscle in on. The King also dealt with the private circulation of Notes (both bank notes and private company notes that circulated just as if they were currency) through a series of **penal statutes** going back to the Civil War.

[[FROM A FOOTNOTE:]]

Starting with the *Legal Tender* Laws in 1862, then the *National Banking Act* in 1864, then the previously mentioned acts outlawing private coin circulation, then an act in 1865 imposed a 10% tax on state bank note issues. In *Veazie Bank vs. Fenno* (75 U.S. 533 (1869)), the Supreme Court ruled that a tax of 10% on state bank notes in circulation was held to be Constitutional, not only because it was a means of raising money, but that **such a tax was an instrument to put out of business such a competitive circulation of those private notes, against notes issued by the King**. The combined effect of those Civil War era penal statutes collectively was to monopolize the entire American currency supply under Federal jurisdiction (which is exactly what the King wanted). By these penal statutes, both privately circulated coins and paper notes were outlawed, and diehard private mints were later purchased by the King, and otherwise put out of business, permanently. And in the 1900s, under an administrative regulation promulgated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, the issuance, if even for brief promotional purposes, of publicly circulating private bank notes by member banks, is forbidden.

[[END FOOTNOTE]]

RATIFICATION DOCTRINE

…What is important is that it is you, under the *Ratification Doctrine*, by your own silence and default, by your failure to object and to object timely, it is by your silence that the King wins. Under this Doctrine, your **silence in the face of a proposition being made to you constitutes your approval of the proposition, <u>if synchronous with the silence you experienced a benefit</u>**. [This is:] Reason, logic and common sense. Let us consider the application of this *Ratification Doctrine* as it hypothetically applies to a person acting in the subordinated position of agency for another person.

When one such person, as agent, does an act on behalf of another person, but without complete authority, the person for whom such act is done may afterwards adopt the act as if it is done in his behalf, thereby giving the act the same legal effect as if it had been originally fully authorized. This subsequent retroactive consent, the effect of which relates back to the time of the original act and places the Principle in the same position as if he had originally authorized the act, is called *Ratification*. Under this hypothetical agency relationship, **when a person finds that an act has been done in his name or on his behalf, that person must either Ratify it, or in the alternative, disaffirm it. But silence constitutes approval of the act.**

***Ratification* may be implied from any form of conduct inconsistent with disavowal of the contract; therefore anything else, other than explicit and blunt disavowal, is *Ratification*—if synchronous with the silence, benefits offered conditionally were accepted.** This is quite a strong Doctrine, but it has to be this way under Natural Law, since benefits offered conditionally are being accepted, invisible contracts are in effect, and failure to require the party experiencing the benefits to act quickly and reject the benefits constitutes a Tort on the other party. This *Ratification* is analogous under Contract Law to the acceptance of the contract's proposition (*Mutual Assent*), and hence is irrevocable.

[It thus becomes obvious that the GAIA "claim" against the UST/Fed has been FULLY RATIFIED by their SILENCE in the face of proper JUDICIAL NOTICE.]

…The application of this *Ratification Doctrine* is not restricted to favor the Government in the evidentiary presumptions of consent that it creates, as the Supreme Court holds this Doctrine to be binding on all persons dragged into its machinery.

The application of this *Ratification Doctrine* in the area of the Citizenship Contract does create an invisible contract, as the burden to prove that the contract does not exist then falls on the individual, with the King not required to prove or adduce anything. This Doctrine is held operational against everyone indiscriminately as the Principle that it is, when the factual circumstances warrant its provident application; this even includes drawing inferences against the Congress itself. **[Hmmm…]**

…However, rather than Patriots fighting an area of grey where there is some *de minimis* merit to the Government's position, it might be best to simply accept the application of the *Ratification Doctrine*, accept the fact that invisible contracts are in effect by your silent passive benefit acceptance and refusal to explicitly disavow and reject benefits, as generally held by Judges—but then turn around and walk away from the contract for other reasons, like *Failure of Consideration*.

So the assertion by the King of his Status as a *Holder in Due Course* (and therefore normally protected from any defense that you may throw at him

via a Federal Judge in an Income Tax grievance) then becomes meaningless: if you first Notice the King out and Object with a Rejection of Benefits, and have so Objected timely. Failure to serve a Notice of Defect on the King is fatal, as without that Objection by you, the King retains his protective *Holder in Due Course* Status, and with that Status you have absolutely no substantive defense to assert against him.

Question: How do you Object?

In Objecting to Federal Reserve Notes, we need to be mindful of the fact that Federal Judges normally do not take Judicial Notice of the Federal Reserve Note equity attachment question. By the end of this Letter, you will see the larger and more important invisible contracts to be dealt with, if a pure and correct severance of yourself away from the adhesive siphon of the Bolshevik Income Tax is to be perfected. Primarily, they search the record for the political contract of Citizenship, and when Citizenship is found, generally they stop right there and then. However, if dealing with a Denizen or some type of non-resident alien, Federal Judges then shift their attention over to finding some Commercial benefits that were accepted, in order to justify the extraction of Income Taxes out of the poor fellow's pockets, acting Ministerially as enforcement agents the way they do. So although Federal Judges find it unnecessary to take Notice of your acceptance of Federal Reserve Notes at the present time, when all other political and Commercial contracts have been correctly severed, this one remaining Commercial contract is going to be an item that needs to be wrestled with, in advance of its apparent necessity.

So if three years from now the IRS throws a prosecution at you, and you argue non-attachment of liability to Title 26, so called, based on a pure severance of Equity, then how will you prove what your *state of mind* was in 1986, as it pertains to the Federal Reserve Note use and recirculation question? Remember that the claimed *state of mind* of a Party is an affirmative defense. The person asserting the defense has the burden to prove its merit, and reasonably so. The King does not have to prove that you entered into the acceptance and beneficial use of Federal Reserve Notes with profitable expectations in your mind. Such a positive, beneficial and Commercial Federal Reserve Note use assumption is automatically inferred by the Commercial nature of those Notes and the "Public Notice" Status of the King's Title 26 statutes, and so you have to prove the opposite. How are you going to prove what your *state of mind* was in 1986? Are you going to subpoena your wife into the Courtroom and ask her to tell the Court what you said three years earlier in 1986?

"Oh, yes. I remember. Hank said that he didn't like using them things."

Well that is not much, and that is not the kind of an Objection, Notice of Protest and documented *state of mind* that the Supreme Court will respect. So what we need to do in order to Object timely, is to **file a specific Objection with the Secretary of the Treasury**, and simply tell him what your *state of mind* is at the present time; and synchronously record that document in a Public Place. Documents written by individuals are often very strong pieces of evidence to prove a person's *state of mind* and will, under some circumstances, directly overrule another person's first-person oral testimony on grounds relating to the *Parole Evidence Rule* (most often such circumstances surface in Probate proceedings in Surrogate's Court when a Will or its Codicil is being contested.

…In your Objection and Notice of Protest, we might want to mention that you are using Federal Reserve Notes for minimum survival purposes only, and that even this use is reluctant because in a previous day and in a previous era, the King used his police powers to seal a monopoly on currency instruments, and so now you have no choice in selecting between different currency instruments to use—and the involuntary adhesive attachment of Title 26 civil liability that occurs while you are being backed into such a corner, occurs against your will and over your objection.

Your *state of mind* is not one of beneficial acceptance and enjoyment of Federal Reserve Notes, but one of a forced *de minimis* coercion. You are not using Federal Reserve Notes for Commercial profit or gain, but such use is out of practical necessity since the King has physically removed all currency competitors from the marketplace under his penal statutes and literally by physical duress; and so now your use of Federal Reserve Notes is by lack of alternatives to select from, not freedom of choice. By such monopoly tactics, the King is engaging in unfair Trade Practices, which if you or I did the identical same thing, we would be incarcerated for it under numerous Racketeering and Sherman Anti-Trust criminal statutes. Yet the *forced* monopoly of a currency serves no beneficial public interest, and is actually an instrumentality to work *magnum* damages on us all after the King replaces his initial hard currency later on with a paper currency (which has now happened). Remember that Federal Judges see important benefits in everything the King does, and there are legitimate benefits in having a uniform national currency to pursue Commercial enrichment with—when those benefits were sought after voluntarily.

Judges perceive of those benefits as being related to the Legal Tender status of the King's Currency, among other things. What Federal Judges do not see collectively is that those FRNs possess only those benefits that any widely accepted circulating currency would also offer, and are the same benefits that privately circulating notes and coins did in fact offer here in the United States prior to the Civil War. **The King is not entitled to demand taxation reciprocity by merely replacing benefits originating from private mints with benefits originating from the Congress under the cloak, cover and duress of penal statutes.** So by enacting that succession of penal monopoly statutes that shut down competitors, the King has transferred the origin of currency benefits away from private mints and banks, over to himself. A forced uniform national currency serves only the private financial enrichment objectives of the King by getting everyone into Interstate Commerce, among other things, and also serves the objectives of Special Interest Groups who very much want to see the King circulate paper currency expressly for the purpose of perfecting our enscrewment—if it were not so, the King would not have had to use penal statutes and armed stormtroopers in the 1800s to enforce the acceptance of his currency monopoly *lex*. If a single national currency medium did in fact serve everyone's best interest, if everyone wanted to use the King's paper money, then why did the King have to resort to the display of physical force when initiating such a currency monopoly by police powers intervention in the 1800s, and now unilaterally use that monopoly to administratively coerce people into contractual situations they did not otherwise want or enter into?

Therefore, you do not accept any Consideration the King is handing you when Federal Reserve Notes circulate into your possession (and remember that the King's Legal Tender Statutes have very much enhanced the market value of Federal Reserve Notes). And that such use of Federal Reserve Notes is occurring against your will and over your objection and Protest, for, *inter alia*, want of alternatives, and… the reason why there are no alternatives is due to Federal monopoly penal statutes forbidding such alternatives, and that such a monopoly is an unfair restraint of trade (unfair because it is unnecessary) anyone else gets incarcerated for.

Remember that in dealing with Federal Judges, you need to "hit the nail right on the head", and by rejecting Federal benefits, and then explaining your rejection through chronologically sequential presentations of facts and of reasoned legal arguments; when that has been done, then where once there was a Courtroom hurricane of unbridled retortional ensnortment by Federal Judges, designed to rub in, in no uncertain terms, their strong philosophical disapproval of Tax Protestors—now suddenly in contrast, everything changes over to a quiescent environment.

Additional objections along the lines that Warburg and his Gremlin brothers in crime, the Rothschilds, through their ownership of the Federal Reserve System, are third-party beneficial interest holders, and that use of the police powers for the private enrichment of a Special Interest Group is unlawful, since under Supreme Court rulings, **when the King enters into Commercial activity, his Status descends to the same level as other merchants**, and that any other American merchant who pulled off such a gun-barrel monopoly grab would be incarcerated for doing so. Numerous Contract Law books provide a rich abundance of defenses to assert against Negotiable Instruments.

Numerous defenses to assert in your Objection and Notice of Protest against the use of Federal Reserve Notes attaching liability to Title 26—due to their Status as circulating Commercial Negotiable Instruments—involve both Real and Personal Defenses.

Some of the defenses you could claim include undue influence, absence or failure of Consideration, moral fraud, necessity, unilateral adhesion contract made in restraint of trade, economic duress, and the like.

Some of those Objections and statements are milktoast, and will later fall apart and collapse under attack by the King's Attorneys in adversary proceedings, and properly so. Reason: The Use and recirculation of Commercial Federal Reserve Notes necessarily involves a Contract Law factual setting, and so our arguments along the lines of the King's basic unfairness in sealing up his national currency monopoly, etc., are only peripheral arguments; only direct coercion in the use of Federal Reserve Notes is strong enough to strip the King of his Status of a *Holder in Due Course*. And unfairness arguments sounding in the Tort of third-party Special Interest Group penal statute sponsorship and of Congressional intrigue in 1913, even though very accurate factually, are way off base, if we are going into the Supreme Court under a factual setting calling for Contractual Law settlement reasoning.

But for us right now, which Objection reason that we stated either stands or falls when under attack later is not important. And what is important is denying the King his protective Status as a *Holder in Due Course* against you (if the King is a *Holder in Due Course*, the Principle is that we have no defenses to assert against him), by filing your *Notice of Protest* and related *corrigendum* (meaning filed in an interlocutory state in contemplation of secondary enhancement or error correction at a later time). But some of those arguments we listed will survive, as the naked facts surrounding the forceful acquisition of the King's monopoly on national currency are quite authentic, and elements can be raised to take the factual setting out of Contract Law and into Tort Law where, at least as a point of beginning, those arguments then become relevant (however, those arguments probably won't even be addressed for other reasons). So we are exactly on line in some areas (assuming the Case was properly plead by referring to

the Supreme Court rulings on the declension in Status the King experiences when the King engages in Commercial activity).

So the final analysis is not important right now. Getting a general Notice of Protest documenting the situational infirmities to the other party; invoking Tort Law to govern the factual setting surrounding your involuntary use of Federal Reserve Notes; and stating that there has been a *Failure of Consideration*; as your *state of mind* is what is important, and the detailed judicial affirmation or rejection of your specific Protest reasons can occur later in adversary proceedings. Failure to object is fatal, and failure to object timely is equally as fatal, as you have no right to ask the Judiciary to help you weasel out of the terms of contracts you originally intended to benefit from (which is necessarily inferred when no timely Objection was filed on your part). **If we have corrected our Status, we filed our Objections timely and we still lose, and the reasons why we lose on this issue have their seminal point of origin in the King's police power tactics in the 1800s, then it would then be time to consider dealing with the King on the same terms the King's Treasury Agents dealt with the two remaining die-hard California Coin Mints: out of the barrel of a gun. [NO—AGAIN AND AGAIN, NO! The TRUTH always suffices for our Father's purposes: "Force is not of God."]**

With the prosecution of Individuals, whose status is near lily-white, being sandbagged at low administrative and judicial levels, then such an aggressive retortional atmosphere of confrontation is quite unlikely to occur. But until those circumstances do happen, then let's not badmouth the Judiciary, because as for the past and present, *Principles of Nature* rule in the corridors of the United States Supreme Court, to the extent that they are able to apply such majestic Principles to such pathetic factual settings they are frequently presented with—with petitioners and criminal Defendants who are not entitled to prevail under any circumstances, as contracts are in effect.

Subject to these following qualifications, the filing of this Objection on the involuntary use of Federal Reserve Notes will arrest the movement of the King's Agents in a civil prosecution against you on this particular adhesive attachment of King's Equity Jurisdiction. But the most interesting reason why you now reluctantly use Federal Reserve Notes is yet to come; and it is the one reason the King's Attorneys will never be able to tear apart and get judicially annulled (it will be sandbagged before it gets annulled). And it is the one reason why even an otherwise reluctant Supreme Court might just respect this Objection, regardless of how irritating it may be for some imps nestled in the Judiciary, since the effect of this one last Objection automatically vitiates the most solemn written contracts ever sealed.

Your Objection might want to contain the following:

1. An historical overview of the gun-barrel and penal-statute factual setting surrounding the acquisition of a national currency monopoly by the King, with the authorities for your statements being cited;

2. Stating in all of your Objections and Notices of Defects that your occasional use of Federal Reserve Notes is involuntary, and transpires because **you are seeking to avoid being incarcerated as an accessory to the criminal circulation of illegal currency under Federal statutes**.

That's right. That is the real reason why you now reluctantly use Federal Reserve Notes: not because you want to, and not necessarily because of what some Treasury Agents did in California in the 1800s, but because if you now started using your own currency instruments here today in 1985, then the King will incarcerate you for doing so; and therefore we have no choice but to use the King's designated currency against our Will and over our Objection.

…That documented involuntary behavior to avoid incarceration is the one magic liability-vitiating line that Judges never deviate from, and that incarceration threat is the kind of an Objection that Judges want to hear, and that is the kind of an Objection that the Supreme Court will respect. But as always, it is the waiver and rejection of Royal benefits that is the most important item to address; and the King's Legal Tender Statutes have very much enhanced the market value and general Commercial attractiveness of those Federal Reserve Notes, so as viewed from the perspective of a Federal Judge, when you accepted and then re-circulated Federal Reserve Notes, you have accepted a Federal benefit.

…So, important for us is the filing of the Objection and Notice of Protest, and filing the objections timely. And each of these Objections should be separate and distinct from each other (Admiralty/Birth Certificate, Equity/Social Security, Commercial/*Holders in Due Course*, etc.). What happens if the Supreme Court rules some day of in the future that King's Revenue Equity Jurisdiction still attaches to involuntary users of Federal Reserve Notes? **We will then have to acquire our rights from our contemporary King the same way Ben Franklin and George Washington acquired their rights: out of the barrel of a gun. [Yet again, it is necessary to disavow Mercier on this repeated position of his—we who work for a better world cannot <u>accept</u> that force is either necessary or desirable.]**

<u>"RETORTIONAL ENSNORTMENTS"</u>

We always want to take a moment and examine ourselves in known impending grievances from the viewpoint of our adversary, in order to see things like a judge; and when dealing with an attack on the acceptance and recirculation of Federal Reserve Notes, an argument will likely be advanced to try and discredit your objection:

Your adversary will argue that Federal Law, not State Law of the UCC governs your attack on Federal Reserve Notes. Their arguments are based on numerous federal court rulings—one of which is when the Supreme Court once ruled that the rights, duties and liabilities of the United States on Commercial paper are issues that are to be governed exclusively by federal law, and not governed by state law. Therefore, your adversaries will argue that your reliance on the UCC, which are a collection of state statutes, as a source of authority, is ill-founded and that you are not entitled to prevail. This argument does not concern us at all, since in reading *Clearfield Trust*, the reason why the Supreme Court wants federal Commercial paper to be governed by Federal Law and not State Law is because they do not want the Federal Government subject to 50 different rules and restrictions proprietary to each state:

> "But reasons which may make state law at times the appropriate federal rule are singularly inappropriate here. The issuance of Commercial paper by the United States is on a vast scale and transactions in that paper from issuance to payout will commonly occur in several states. The application of state law, even without the conflict of laws rules of forum, would subject the rights and duties of the United States to exceptional uncertainty. It would lead to great diversity in results by making identical transactions subject to the vagaries of the laws of the several states."

Since the Uniform Commercial Code is just that, i.e., *uniform* throughout all of the states except one (Louisiana), having the issuance and Commercial use of Federal Reserve Notes subject to this uniform code, in the absence of any federal law to the contrary, is most appropriate. Subjecting the rights and duties of the United States and its pet corporation, the Federal Reserve, to the uniform rules of the UCC to fill in missing gaps in Federal Commercial Laws, offers to expose the United States to no exception uncertainty. Although there very much is a Federal Law Merchant, State Law is silent on the matter; and so now that leaves Federal Judges making the law.

Remember that the *Principles of Nature* the UCC codifies into sequential statutes is merely the old Law Merchant of our Fathers, and that our Fathers merely codified reason, logic and common sense; and the Uniform Commercial Code, even though it is state law, is merely cited to both fill pronouncement voids in the Federal Law Merchant, and as simply the best pronouncement of *Principles of Natur*e denominated to apply to Commercial factual settings.

The Principle we invoke when coming to grips with these Federal Reserve Notes is merely common sense: that **a person we are trying to avoid doing business with (the King) loses his expectation of our conformance to his statutes, when we place him on our *Prior Notice* that Defects are present in the paper he is circulating, and that we are not accepting the benefits otherwise inuring to the Holders and Recirculators of his Federal Reserve Notes, by reason of involuntary use**.

Everything in this Letter is all inter-related to some extent; earlier, I discussed the *Ratification Doctrine*, by which Judges hold that silence on your part, in the context of an assertion being made against you, constitutes your acceptance of the proposition that you are silent on (and for good reasons: because benefits are being accepted by you). This Notice of Defect reverses that state of silence, and the King is forced to experience a declension in his coveted status of expecting a perfect non-defense case against you, based on your terminating the acceptance of the benefits of the use and recirculation of Federal Reserve Notes. The UCC largely codified all of this since merchants have it out with each other all the time on this very question with Negotiable Instruments, and as such the UCC gave every possible thing and every party nice proprietary names and labels so that attorneys and judges can all deal with these factual settings with everyone speaking the same vocabulary. So, if the UCC is technically non-applicable to Federal Reserve Notes, then we don't really care, as the UCC is no more than codifying Nature, as Principles operate transparent to changes in factual settings. If we are Objecting to a thing, like a Note, then the Maker has lost his expectation of not having any grievances to deal with on that thing (Note); and that is only common sense. And we cite the UCC as the best codified pronouncement of that Doctrine, and we encourage our adversaries to find any federal statute inconsistent with the UCC's pronouncements.

As you well know, Mr. May, it is a *Principle of Nature* that an ounce of prevention is worth ten tons of labor exerted later on in patching up. And merely preparing your multiple objections now, in writing, will spare a person from substantial expenses in depositions and the like later, as the collection of evidence, is, generally speaking, an expensive and time-consuming process. With rare exception, all of the Patriot lawsuits I have examined never involved any form of Depositions or Interrogatories being taken on the Defendant (and the Patriot wonders why he loses). All of that is neatly avoided by a few preventative steps.

[END QUOTING, end "chapter"]

NEVADA CORPORATIONS:

Stay Small Or Increase Substance In Nevada

Budget's "Tip of the Week" #18:

More on "Nexus" and "Substance"

Two legal issues crop up when operating a Nevada corporation which might have some activities in a foreign jurisdiction: "nexus" and "substance". Without getting into a full-blown legal definition for the purposes of this discussion, nexus can be considered equivalent to the related word, "connection". And for purposes of this discussion we can consider the legal issue of "substance" to mean "physical presence".

We have previously pointed out a list of conditions under which a Nevada corporation is not considered to be "doing business" in a foreign jurisdiction. It may, for instance, use an independent contractor to effect sales outside of Nevada, as long as each sale is not considered final until accepted in Nevada. If, however, a Nevada corporation has significant nexus in (connection to) another jurisdiction, in many cases the tax-hungry foreign state will seek to extend its tax laws to compel the Nevada corporation to pay some home-state taxes. A Nevada corporation with little presence in Nevada but which provides all sorts of equipment to an independent contractor working in, say, California could find itself under attack from the California Franchise Tax Board.

So far, at least, **there are very few examples of small, private situations undergoing such scrutiny**. However, in cases where the amounts of revenue derived from the foreign jurisdiction are large enough to present a "target of opportunity", various states are becoming increasingly aggressive in extending their tax tentacles. In auditing such a situation the home-state taxation authority will pose many questions relating to the "substance" (physical presence) of the Nevada corporation in Nevada.

Actual audit questions in establishing the substance of the Nevada corporation in Nevada can be very detailed and probing, including but not limited to thr following: employees (compensation, responsibilities, payroll returns); identification of officers and compensation; copies of phone bills; actual payments made on notes; list of suppliers and professional-service providers; where decisions are made regarding investments; copies of corporate records including minutes and resolutions; banking (copies of all bank statements, checks and deposit slips).

The Nevada Department of Taxation uses the following criteria to evaluate nexus in Nevada: use of an office, distribution house, warehouse, service enterprise or other place of business; maintenance of a stock of goods; solicitation of orders by employees or independent contractors; regular engagement in the delivery of property in this state, other than by common carrier or United States mail; or regular engagement in any activity in connection with the leasing or servicing of property which is located within this state.

From the foregoing it should be obvious that it is always best to remain small in order to keep the bureaucrats out of your private business affairs whenever possible. And if and when your business grows to become a substantial potential target, it may become necessary to broaden its Nevada base, in order to retain more "substance" in Nevada relative to "nexus" in the foreign jurisdiction.

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.

"...[I]n GOD CREATOR'S creation the least are equal to what YOU seem to place as the 'TOP BANANA'. Well, chelas, bananas are monkey and parrot food. Think hard on this fact."—GCH, Year 17, Day 284