


CONTACT

PHOENIX JOURNAL REVIEW

News Reviews, Previews and Alternative Views

*NOT TO OPPOSE ERROR IS TO APPROVE IT
NOT TO DEFEND TRUTH IS TO SUPPRESS IT*



VOLUME 48, NUMBER 10

NEWS REVIEW

\$ 3.00

JANUARY 10, 2007

It's Time for the REAL

Thirteenth Amendment

1/7/07 (20-144)

Sun., Jan. 7, 2007, Year 20, Day 144

Manila, Philippines

If we ever pass out as a great nation we ought to put on our tombstone "America died from a delusion that she had moral leadership."

—Will Rogers

George W. Bush—backed by the legions of the so-called "moral majority", the mind-dead, oxymoronic Judeo-Christians, installed with the collusion of the Zionist Neocons—has become quite possibly the most reviled president in the history of the United States even as the country has fallen mightily in the court of world opinion.

Is it OVER for the nation whose destiny was to be the lamp of the world? It WILL BE, if the real American Dream—which has only ever been partly realized—is extinguished. The REAL vision of America held fervently in the hearts of many Americans to this day is that of a GREAT NATION, an ideal example to all other nations, a country which can truly claim: "out of many,

ONE", ONE NATION UNDER GOD governed by a *Constitution* which supports these IDEALS.

For TWO DECADES this newspaper and its predecessors have SHOWN THE WAY for the United States to fulfill its true and very great destiny. **In this issue we are going to revisit the CRUCIAL issue of the VALID, LAWFUL THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT to the Constitution—because this is THE way to restore the constitutional REPUBLIC while BURYING the FASCIST PLUTOCRACY IT HAS BECOME.**

The actual date of ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment was the date of re-publication of the *Virginia Civil Code*, March 12, 1819. At least eleven different States or territories printed the Amendment in twenty separate publications over forty-five years. The Amendment appears to have been simply OVERWRITTEN on December 6, 1865 by the current so-called Thirteenth Amendment prohibiting slavery.

If this was done by some "esquire(s)", THEY HAD NO POWER OR AUTHORITY TO DO SO UNDER THE CONSTITUTION of the time

because Titles of Nobility preclude constitutional CITIZENSHIP. All laws promulgated by these NON-CITIZENS since 1865 are void *ab initio*!!!

As there has never been any kind of formal repealing of the original Thirteenth Amendment, it is still in Full Force and Effect and any and all judges and attorneys who hold Titles of Nobility, i.e. Esquire, are not citizens of the United States of America and cannot constitutionally hold any office. People such as George HW Bush (Sirs William Gates III, Schwarzkopf, Kissinger, Powell, Giuliani, Greenspan, etc.) who have been knighted by the Queen of England also cannot be citizens of the United States of America while they hold these titles of nobility!

Don't expect this idea to be popular among the plutocrats, who have made out very nicely ("like bandits" or even pirates, as some would say) at everyone else's expense. But you just might find you have all the support needed from their too-often-betrayed servants. You know, the ones who swore to uphold and protect the *CONSTITUTION* and pledged allegiance to the REPUBLIC for which it stands?

(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:

All You Need Is the Real Thirteenth Amendment.....page 4

Was Marcos the Vehicle for 'Second Coming of Christ'?.....page 8

Final Warning: Part 12a.....page 11

Gold and Other Interesting Things: Part 12.....page 15

GCH-EDUCATED “MIKE” McCONNELL
NOMINATED FOR NEGROPONTE’S POSITION

It has been more than a year since we presented the Organizational Chart of the United States but most will recall the CRUCIAL role played by the Director of National Intelligence, whose job is to coordinate the functioning of sixteen separate intelligence agencies. That job has been held by John D. Negroponte but on January 5, “out of the blue”, Mr. Negroponte SUDDENLY developed an intention to become Deputy Secretary of State under Condoleeza Rice.

What makes this move most surprising is that the position of Deputy Director of National Intelligence has been vacant since May 2006, when retired Air Force General Michael Hayden was moved into the slot of Director of the CIA. SUDDENLY, George “The Decider” Bush HAS NO HEAD OF INTELLIGENCE (perhaps that is a *double entendre*). Well, Mr. Rockefeller (incoming Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence) is going to insist that Negroponte retain his position until his successor is confirmed.

The choice of successor is “interesting” from our perspective. John M. (“Mike”) McConnell, you see, was head of the National Security Agency—the NSA, sometimes referred to as the “Men in Black”—from 1992 through 1996 and he certainly knows “something” about our favorite “journalist at large”, Gyeorgos Ceres Hatonn.

Is this GOOD NEWS or what? Again, from “our” perspective: It’s nice to have a man of obvious intelligence in charge of INTELLIGENCE, especially since he obviously knows something about Lords, Overlords and the OVERMIND.

Apparently, his knowledge wasn’t considered all that useful by the Powers That Be immediately following his GCH education because he “sat out” the last ten years (though he was far from idle during this period) as a civilian consultant for Booz, Allen and Hamilton. SOMETHING HAS CHANGED and SOMEONE values Mr. McConnell’s acquired knowledge from his days at the helm of the “Men in Black” sufficiently to put him in the TOP intelligence post at this time.

Messrs. Rockefeller and Biden (incoming Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) don’t seem all that comfortable with the SUDDEN changes (Mr. Rockefeller called himself “deeply troubled” by the news) but they probably just need some time to adjust to the new reality. According to *UPI*’s Shaun Waterman (Homeland and National Security Editor), this will mark **“the first period in U.S. history since WWII when all the major intelligence posts were held by serving or retired military officers, a development that caused concern in some quarters”**. “Some quarters” probably means those who favor the current fascist plutocracy and not those who would work toward restoration of the Phoenix-like constitutional republic!

According to Mr. Waterman’s analysis (emphasis added): “The apparent inability of officials to properly choreograph news of Negroponte’s departure, which leaked Wednesday afternoon, and the veiled threats from Capitol Hill that the Senate would not allow Negroponte to move on until his successor was confirmed emphasized the degree to which **the White House seems to be losing the ability to set the agenda** as the administration moves into its final years.”

According to Sorcha Faal in “her” January 5, 2007 article, **“U.S. Military Completes Destruction Of Zionist Power Bloc In America”**:

In what Russian Intelligence Analysts are describing as a **‘stunning defeat’ for those within the American Military Power Structure supporting Israel’s planned aggression against Iran**, the American War Leader, Bush, struck from power Israel’s last remaining ally in the U.S. Intelligence Field by removing America’s top spy, John Negroponte.

In an even more dramatic move, the American War Leader is replacing Negroponte with retired U.S. Navy Vice Admiral [*John*] Michael McConnell to be America’s National Intelligence Director in charge of all that nation’s intelligence activities.

Admiral McConnell joins his fellow U.S. Military counterparts, U.S. Air Force General Michael V. Hayden, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), former U.S. Marine Hero and present Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Robert Mueller, and Director of the National Security Agency (NSA), Lieutenant General Keith B. Alexander, in completing the Military takeover of the entire American Domestic and Foreign Intelligence Services.

These reports detail that the United States Military Establishment has long blamed the establishment of the Nation of Israel as a ‘strategic debacle’ to American interests in the Middle East, and that these same U.S. Military powers have long sought revenge against the Radical Zionist faction controlling Israel for what they believe was the murder of James V. Forrestal, Secretary of the U.S. Navy, and the United States first Secretary of Defence, who in 1949, while fighting against the establishment of the CIA was, allegedly, murdered by suicide.

Though many details of Forrestal’s suicide/murder remain classified to this day, there does exist evidence supporting the U.S. Military’s belief in Zionist involvement in this affair, and as we can read [from *Wikipedia*]:

“Forrestal himself maintained that he was being tracked and bugged by Zionist operatives. Here is how Forrestal biographer Arnold Rogow put it: ‘... Forrestal, during his last months in office, harbored a conviction that he was under day-and-night surveillance by Zionist agents; and when he resigned as Secretary of Defense in March 1949, he was convinced that his resignation was not unrelated to pressures brought to bear on the Administration by American Jewish organizations.’”

We certainly hope Sorcha Faal is correct in her pronouncement of the end of the Neocon rule over America and it appears we are getting some strong confirmation that is the case.

GEORGE MERCIER’S INVISIBLE CONTRACTS
UNDER HIGH-POWERED ATTACK

For months already, little Budget Corporate Renewals—absolutely one of the LEAST “promotional” resident agencies in the State of Nevada—has been subjected to investigation and scrutiny by the United States Treasury FOR ITS “PROMOTION” of certain UNIDENTIFIED material. Perhaps it is becoming clearer what, exactly, the NON-CITIZENS of the FED are finding so objectionable.

“Someone”, apparently high-powered enough to pay six figures for some relatively simple research, appears to be desperate to stop dissemination of George Mercier’s *INVISIBLE CONTRACTS*. The *modus operandi* is distinctly Khazarian: Discredit the

MESSENGER instead of trying to confront the TRUTH of THE MESSAGE.

Here is a recent email to BCR’s Service Department from a certain private investigator:

— Original Message —

From: Lone Eagle

To: Service

Sent: Tuesday, December 26, 2006 11:34 AM

Subject:Re: Who is, or who was, George Mercier?

If you were paid a \$100,000 fee by a high powered consulting firm to fully investigate the background and bonafides of George Mercier, author of numerous books & articles, and “former federal Judge”. How would you accomplish the task? If he were, in fact, a former federal Judge, the task should be easy money, but for the life of me I can find nothing, not even an attempted biography anywhere. The Websites, including the ones you offered me are replete with his footprints, but there seems to be nothing available to personally identify Mr. Mercier.

There are a number of reasons why this should be critically important, because he has submitted a library of information, much of which is posted on your site for public consumption, that while interesting, does not always pass critical review. He has also made statements regarding Legionaire’s Disease, Avian Flu and Plutonium poisoning, which if can be proven, should set off alarm bells all over America.

As far as I can tell, “George Mercier” could be a pseudonym for one writer or a group of writers. I’ve spent several hours researching a number of websites trying to find the illusive, Mr. Mercer, to no avail. Can you provide his birthdate, or even the federal district court where he was alleged to have served? Is he still living, and do you have any way to contact him for questions? Can you prove that such a natural man exists or has ever existed? I hope the bonafides of Mr. Mercier was thoroughly investigated prior to posting such a voluminous library of material on the Budget Corporate Renewals website. If his personal identity cannot be established with certainty, will your website continue to post his material?

George Nelson

INVISIBLE CONTRACTS is a tremendously IMPORTANT source of information, whether or not an individual by the name of George Mercier ever wrote it. It covers the United States bankruptcy, the Thirteenth Amendment, Admiralty Jurisdiction and MUCH MORE which the Powers That Be simply did not want revealed.

Is it now ILLEGAL to present such information to the public? WHY??? If the material is erroneous, why not point out the error? What exactly is meant by the declaration that the material “does not always pass critical review”? WHOSE “critical review”? We certainly suggest that everyone avail themselves of this material before efforts to have it removed from the public domain succeed!

THE WAY OUT OF THE CURRENT STATE OF PLUTOCRATIC FASCISM IS THROUGH INSISTENCE ON THE RECOGNITION OF THE ORIGINAL THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT. ONCE THAT IS ACCOMPLISHED, THE DOMINOES WILL FALL QUICKLY AND FREEDOM UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC WILL BE RESTORED “IN THE BLINK OF AN EYE”.

IT IS TIME—NOW—TO RECOGNIZE THE VALID, LAWFUL THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT.

THAT WHICH WAS HIDDEN
NOW BEING REVEALED

We are receiving so many confirmations EVERY DAY now that it is hard to keep up with it all. We could do with a ten-fold increase in staffing and still not be able to present all the information. So, you'll have to put up with some teasing tidbits and draw some educated conclusions for yourself.

Sorcha Faal reports that Angela Merkel, who heads the G-8, EU and her native Germany, is apparently the daughter of Adolph Hitler by artificial insemination. (!!!) Is this connected to the fact (reported at Lenta.ru) that Nikolay Patrushev, the head of the Russian FSB, is currently at the South Pole, Antarctica, where the Germans are said to have fled following World War Two? How about the fact that the war with Germany was never ended by a peace treaty? Does anyone still recall what Admiral Byrd discovered at the South Pole? Yes, we certainly do suggest a thorough re-reading of some of those old *Phoenix Journals*, which you just might find even more interesting the second or third time around!

BRILLIANT STREAKS OF LIGHT
DAZZLE FIVE STATES





A remarkable event occurred in the skies over Colorado on January 4, 2007. The event was so brilliant it was also observed over Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming and New Mexico. Videos of the phenomenon were available from several sources on the Internet and, as usual, the earliest and uncensored reports provided the most information.

In the three frames of video shown on this page you will see approximately ten objects streaking downward and to the LEFT. Meanwhile, however, you can see TWO illuminated objects moving “against the flow”, to the RIGHT. Does anyone recall Dr. Beter’s references to Russian anti-gravitic platforms (“cosmospheres”)?

These three frames taken from a Channel 7 video do not portray the stunning brilliance of the debris field itself. Videos released later show dozens of disintegrating objects as separate bright flares—but these later videos have apparently had the two UFOs shown in the images on this page carefully expunged.

News reports tried to attribute the light show to re-entry of a Russian rocket’s booster from the launch of a French satellite on December 27. On January 5, however, *Interfax* quoted Roscosmos spokesman Igor Panarin: “Specialists of the Lavochkin research and development center, where the Fregat upper stage was manufactured, said that they know the area where Fregat was dumped for certain. It was dumped into the Pacific Ocean on December 27,” Panarin said.

We know this dazzling show was NOT the re-entry of a Russian booster rocket but beyond that



all we can safely offer are terrestrial indications of what is really going on.

In the last issue we covered the deployment of the American TAC-SAT (biological weapon) system. Just last month the United States announced its intentions to put (and defend) weapons in near-Earth orbit and more recently it was disclosed that the United States would soon begin tests of “hypersonic” (Mach 15 to Mach 20) near-space weapons systems (See NewScientist.com, “Hypersonic Weapons Projects to Begin Test Flights”), while the Russians on December 22 announced they would NOT deploy weapons in space. The very LATEST is the United States “Air Force Pursuing Anti-Matter Weapons”. But of course, just as Israel somehow doesn’t have nukes (because they have not officially acknowledged having them), Russia’s cosmospheres must not exist, either. And what ever happened to those German craft “after” World War Two?

More than anything, it is a marvel how little of the current Space War is able to be observed. THIS IS THE CLASH OF THE TITANS, readers, and you are able to observe it to a greater extent than almost all of your fellow Earthians because of the education you have received over the last twenty years.

MORE WEIRD SCIENCE:
CHECK YOUR SOFTWARE

We have been told, “There’s no such thing as science fiction” and as we have seen, the technology being revealed today has been “in play” for DECADES. Accordingly, you might want to ponder the following information excerpted from a rant by “Hsing Lee” posted on the Rense website January 3, 2007:

... Through the slow and steady process of trial and error, scientists at MIT and elsewhere can now sit a subject down in front of a collection of images, and identify which image the person is looking at. They can project sound and music into people’s heads using an electromagnetic field with no actual energy waves in the audio spectrum being present. This is not science fiction. It’s happening right now, today, in labs all over the world. We’re starting to be able to know what a given human mind is thinking about remotely, from a distance, with or without the co-operation of the individual.

Slowly but surely, we’re progressing to the point where we’ll be so good at manipulating the brain’s hardware, firmware and software that we’ll be able to create computer Artificial Intelligence which is sentient and can mimic a human mind, with the ability to learn, have ideas, and all which that entails. That’s the part which scares Kurzweil and Kaczinsky. But that’s not my major concern at this time. In my opinion, fear of AI has been overblown and negatively influenced by movies like the *Terminator* while the implications of AI may be scary and may lead to serious trouble, that trouble is not a sure thing.

For me, something else which is implied by these technologies and where they’re leading us is MUCH scarier than artificial intelligence. Once we’ve got the firmware licked, and once we’re comfortable reading the software, the next logical steps are consciousness transfer—something Kurzweil is looking forward to and which I haven’t yet decided is good or bad—and the rewriting of the brain’s firmware and software. The latter is the REALLY scary bit.

Most of you have seen that Arnold movie *Total Recall*, where Arnie goes to visit this place which sells memories for a fee, they implant a complete set of memories of a dream vacation in your brain, and afterwards you remember it all like you were actually there. This is a very real possibility in the very near future, and such distractions will be harmless for the most part middle aged perverts buying sexual memories instead of cheating on their spouse, that sort of thing. You can bet your ass that the porn industry will be one of the earliest, if not THE earliest, adopter of this technology.

Memory implantation will be easy once we’ve figured out the firmware/software issues, because we already know that the brain cannot differentiate between what it sees and what it remembers.

But memory implants are the least of our worries.

What REALLY scares me is that shortly after we can mess around with the software, the next thing we’ll be doing is working on rewriting the firmware of living human beings. ...

On the subject of aristocratic inbreeding, Mr. Lee also had some interesting things to say:

“... Check *Burke’s Peerage*. GHW Bush and his

wife Barbara Bush are, in fact, cousins. That's why George Jr. is an imbecile, and why both Jeb and Neal Bush have such funny looking, almost Neanderthal-like foreheads; they're the product of aristocratic inbreeding, and you can see just a little bit of that mongoloid-ness in their faces."

According to Lee, this information "can be verified by anyone with sufficient reading skill to read through the New England Historical Society's genealogical records".

OTHER TOPICS OF INTEREST

We don't have time to cover the story of 150,000 Iraq veterans now on disability, mostly kept alive by torso armor but with many missing limbs—not to mention exposure to depleted uranium and the horrors passed on to their progeny. One-third of U.S. troops are supposed to be robotic by 2015 anyway.

We can't afford the time and effort to document the UFO which shot up through the clouds at Chicago's O'Hare Airport in front of numerous witnesses. Let's note that President Bush took cover from yet another incoming storm cloud ("tornado", they said)—in an ARMORED CAR.

The "Saddam Hussein" execution on the Day of Eid (when a sheep is sacrificed)? Really? Do you really believe Saddam Hussein would take all those juicy Bush Family secrets with him to his grave, without saying a word about them? The \$500M joint bank account at BNL is well-documented public knowledge!

It's worthy of mentioning that Russia—the oil-energy GIANT—is contributing to the development of a DEUTERIUM-based fusion reactor.

I suppose we also really should say something about the developing Wanta "Story" for those yet in the dark: According to Christopher Story, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson was ARRESTED in Mrs. Merkel's Germany for failure to release funds timely. Numerous web sleuths have apparently confirmed that a Henry Paulson was indeed before the International Court of Justice last month. Our comment? When the smoke clears, WE HAVE THE PRIZE-WINNING RECIPE AND WE CAN AFFORD TO WAIT THROUGH ALL OF THESE DEVELOPMENTS.

As this is written, in the background are thunderous explosions from Germany's entry in the World Pyro Olympics fireworks competition. Over eight days, ten countries are putting on their best exhibitions—at a cost we can only guess to exceed the living needs of ALL hungry Filipinos.

On New Year's Eve we were literally surrounded by a pyrotechnic display which surely must be the envy of the world. Over the holiday season here, hundreds of fingers were blown off by "firecrackers", some of which we can personally attest sound like bombs.

As Sheila Crisostomo reported in the *Philippine Star*, "An unborn baby boy became the first recorded fatality of indiscriminate firing of guns during the revelry leading up to New Year's Eve, bringing to 37 the number of victims of stray bullets since Dec. 21."

The child's 21-year-old mother "was hit with a stray bullet inside their house" and underwent an immediate C-section "but her son lived for only four hours after delivery. The boy was supposed to be the first child of his parents."

AND HOW IS YOUR DAY?

When that REAL, VALID, ORIGINAL THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT is recognized, the Sun is going to shine a little more brightly for everyone.

Salu.

Ronald Kirzinger

All You Need Is the Real Thirteenth Amendment

The following article is from Phoenix Journal #37, Science of the Cosmos: The Transformation of Man, which has been BANNED FROM PUBLICATION. This information also appeared in The Phoenix Liberator of December 15, 1992 and CONTACT of July 27, 1993.

**FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1991 7:48 A.M.
YEAR 5, DAY 014**

COMMUNISM FALL?

Dear ones, hold up—Hatonn here to point out some most uncomfortable truths.

I remind you that in the Soviet Union NOTHING is as it is being given to you. Worse—Communism is NOT. Russia, nor the Soviet Union, have EVER HAD COMMUNISM. To dissolve the Communist Party means NOTHING except that the Soviets have moved into a totally DEMOCRATIC DICTATORSHIP! Moreover, the one who expected to be Dictator—is not. Democracy can only work when there are honorable "choices". A "vote" means less than nothing if there is only one thing to vote for! Further, the "show" of the Soviet nations pulling away is exactly that—a show. It is simply a phase, now, of "divide and conquer". Again, I remind you to LISTEN. What is Cheney telling you about defense budgets? For one thing—the Russians still spend a massive amount on weapons and show no signs of lessening that amount—but rather, fully intend to up it as soon as the outside (from you) aid begins to flow. If YOU continue to fool yourselves, you are in serious trouble. Why do you think the Prime Minister of Great Britain is visiting the vacation home of Bush? Worse, the Queen didn't even bother to come herself.

A little secret—the Elite all have to stay on the better side of Great Britain for the holes for safety are in New Zealand and Australia. The full intent is that the Northern Hemisphere will be radioactive—one way or another.

Now for truth in presentation. A U.S. Supreme Court statement was made regarding the lying and manipulation compiled from proven findings and written up as a portion of the *American Communications Association v. Douds*, 339 U.S. 382, 442. Let me quote:

In a 1986 *New York Times-CBS News* poll survey of 2,016 adults about incidents of the White House lying to the American public, only 1 percent of those surveyed thought that the administration told the truth all the time, 53 percent said the administration told the truth only some of the time, while 9 percent said it hardly EVER told the truth. Americans should question now whether the current administration under a former CIA Director's leadership can speak to us with more candor than the last administration under Ronald Reagan, a former Hollywood actor.

We live in a highly manipulated world. Ideas are manipulated through purposeful distortions in the press and selective omissions in our all-pervasive public education (indoctrination) system. Economic and political realities are falsified by self-serving establishment controllers and their

minions in the bureaucracy.

Our society is controlled by an "aristocracy", a small elite group of individuals who, through control of the government, have obtained special privileges in law and are thus able to live as parasites off the labor of others (mostly the hard-working American middle class) and amass large amounts of unearned wealth.

This current aristocracy operates covertly and by deceit. The bankers are the main (but not the only) element in this covert aristocracy. Using many of the standard principles of aristocracy (authoritarianism, statism, and the use of an intellectual priesthood to deceive the public) they have created a social system where robbery and exploitation are systematized and legalized and where resistance to the robber has been made a crime.

'It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizen from falling into error; it is the function of the citizen to keep the government from falling into error.'—U.S. Supreme Court

NOW IS THE TIME!

OK, it is done. Col. James Gritz is now officially announced as running for the office of President of the United States of America. He is "announced" under the shelter of the Populist Party—which, like all organized political operations, has many and varied flaws. Do not let this deter you from your duty as an American to get this man elected to office so that the flaws can be eliminated. You need votes and support—you need unification, for there is no difference whatsoever in the Democratic and Republican parties. In fact, all will now be done to pull down a dictatorship on you-the-nation prior to the '92 election so that there will not be an election. It is up to you!

I am informed that America West will be offering backing and high visibility integration with the effort to elect Col. Gritz and I shall do everything allowed to see to it that he is elected for he is chosen of God for the task. I have quite a bit of "pull"—but if you-the-people do not support this in a massive manner—why would you expect God to DO IT FOR YOU? I guarantee that I have a very nice and totally workable relationship with this man—which is boggling the minds of the UFO conspirators. I suggest that if you have ones in the "Little Gray Alien" with Cooper conspiracy—that you alert them. There are heinous things planned by the disinformers to terrify America and parts of the world to finish pulling you into captivity—"against a common enemy". YOUR ENEMIES SIT IN THE LEADERSHIP OF YOUR NATIONS AND WITHIN THE BANKS—THERE ARE NO ENEMIES IN SPACE! WHAT YOU WILL BE GIVEN AS "PROOF" IS A WORSE LIE THAN ANY THEY HAVE CONJURED THUS FAR AND ONLY KNOWLEDGE OF TRUTH CAN KEEP YOU FROM FALLING FOR THE TRAP!

Let me say something to you as a people of world citizenship. You are in the sorting of God's people from the ones who wish to follow this evil empire. We are now dealing with God's adversary who is restricted to the mortal physical plane. The intent is to take the planet earth Shan and then move outward

into space. IT WILL NOT BE ALLOWED AND THERE WILL BE MASSIVE EFFORT TO HOLD THE BEINGS OF EARTH HOSTAGE. WELL, SORRY ABOUT THIS—EARTH-MAN; GOD DOES NOT COMPROMISE NOR DOES HE NEGOTIATE. YOU EACH WILL BE EITHER ON ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER AND TO NOT MAKE A DECISION IS TO ALREADY HAVE MADE ONE.

All manner of terrible things are in the planning by the deceivers to perpetrate upon you in the guise of it being Space Brothers. No, but you will buy the tale in great masses. However, if you-the-people of the United States of America fail to fall for the lie—you will prevail and the world shall be turned about for GOD WILL WORK WITH YOU IF YOUR INTENT IS TRUTH AND HONOR—HE WILL NOT DO IT FOR YOU. IF YOUR INTENT REMAINS TO CONTINUE THE BREAKING OF EVERY LAW OF GOD AND THE CREATION—YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT WHICH COMES UPON YOU AND IT SHALL COME UPON YOU IN A MOST DEVASTATING MANNER FOR WE WILL ONLY AIRLIFT OUT GOD'S PEOPLE. WE HAVE NO AUTHORITY TO REMOVE ANY WHO PRACTICE EVIL FOR THOSE ONES ARE NOT WELCOME IN THE BALANCED SOCIETIES OF THE COSMOS. SO BE IT.

If you turn around the government of the U.S.—the chosen people and place of God—you can reclaim your planet. What else do you have to do with even a tenth as much wondrous challenge and excitement? You are a bored and sleepy civilization—stop watching the play on your pretend screens and get into the game, dear friends. God has sent Us, His Hosts, to play with you—WE HAVE NO INTENTION OF COMPETING WITH YOU FOR OUR ENEMY IS THE ADVERSARY OF GOD AND WE NEED NOT A “THREE” RING CIRCUS. NO ONE SHALL BE COERCED OR FORCED—YOU WILL BE IN THE CHOOSING.

LAWYERS: YOU HAVE LAWYERS!

Oh my, yes you do! However, since you ones fail to know anything about your Constitution—I get to lay another heavy trip on you. How many Amendments do you have? Do you know that it is UNCONSTITUTIONAL FOR A LAWYER TO BE ELECTED TO CONGRESS? WHAT DOES YOUR THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT SAY? Well, NOW it reads: “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction...etc.”

Ah, but not so. THAT WAS THE 14TH AMENDMENT I JUST CITED. THE ORIGINAL 13TH AMENDMENT READS AS FOLLOWS:

“If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any TITLE OF NOBILITY or HONOUR, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.”

Thank you, David Dodge, Researcher and Alfred Adask, Editor, *AntiShyster*, August, 1991:

These ones also give you a special version of the pledge of allegiance you might consider—for it says what the original MEANT and ceased to be accepted: I pledge allegiance to the *Constitution* of the United States of America, and to the Republic that honors that *Constitution*, one nation, under God, with Liberty and Justice for all.

MISSING 13TH AMENDMENT “TITLES OF NOBILITY” AND “HONOR”

In the winter of 1983, archival research expert David Dodge, and former Baltimore police investigator Tom Dunn, were searching for evidence of government corruption in public records stored in the Belfast Library on the coast of Maine. By chance [H: ?—I think not!], they discovered the library's oldest authentic copy of the Constitution of the United States (printed in 1825). Both men were stunned to see this document included a 13th Amendment that no longer appears on current copies of the *Constitution*. Moreover, after studying the Amendment's language and historical context, they realized the principle intent of this “missing” 13th Amendment WAS TO PROHIBIT LAWYERS FROM SERVING IN GOVERNMENT....!

So began a seven-year, nationwide search for the truth surrounding the most bizarre Constitutional puzzle in American history—the unlawful REMOVAL OF A RATIFIED Amendment from the *Constitution of the United States*. Since 1983, Dodge and Dunn have uncovered additional copies of the *Constitution* with the “missing” 13th Amendment printed in at least eighteen separate publications by ten different states and territories over four decades from 1822 to 1860.

In June of this year (1991), Dodge uncovered the evidence that this missing 13th Amendment had indeed been LAWFULLY RATIFIED by the state of Virginia and was therefore an authentic Amendment to the American *Constitution*. The evidence is correct and no errors are found—a 13th Amendment restricting lawyers from serving in government was ratified in 1819 and REMOVED from your *Constitution* during the tumult of the Civil War—deliberately!

Since the Amendment was never LAWFULLY REPEALED, IT IS STILL THE LAW TODAY! Wouldn't you now guess that the implications are ENORMOUS?

The story of this “missing” Amendment is complex and at times confusing because the political issues and vocabulary of the American Revolution were different from your own. However, there are essentially two issues: What does the Amendment mean? and, Was the Amendment ratified? Let's look first at the “meaning”.

MEANING

The “missing” 13th Amendment to the *Constitution of the United States* reads as above cited.

At first reading, the meaning of this 13th Amendment (also called the “title of nobility” Amendment) seems a bit obscure, unimportant. The references to “nobility”, “honour”, “emperor”, “king”, and “prince” lead you to dismiss this amendment as a petty post-revolution act of spite directed against the British monarchy. But in your modern world of Lady Di and Prince Charles, anti-royalist sentiments seem so archaic and quaint that the Amendment can be ignored. NOT SO!

Consider some real hard evidence of its historical significance: First, “titles of nobility” were prohibited in both Article VI of the *Articles of Confederation* (1777) and in Article I, Sect. 9 of the *Constitution of the United States* (1788); Second, although already prohibited by the *Constitution*, an additional “title of nobility” amendment was proposed in 1789, again in 1810, and was finally ratified in 1819. Clearly the founding fathers saw such a serious threat in “titles of nobility” and “honors” that anyone receiving them would FORFEIT THEIR CITIZENSHIP. (How about Sir Schwarzkopf? and Sir Dr. Kissinger?) Since the government prohibited “titles of nobility” several times

over four decades, and went through the amending process (even though “titles of nobility” were already prohibited by the *Constitution*), it's obvious that the Amendment carried much more significance for your founding fathers than is readily apparent to you today.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

To understand the meaning of this “missing” 13th Amendment, you must understand its historical context—the era surrounding the American Revolution (which of course, you are not taught).

You tend to regard the notion of “Democracy” as benign, harmless, and politically unremarkable. But at the time of the American Revolution, King George III and the other monarchies of Europe saw Democracy as an unnatural, ungodly ideological threat, every bit as dangerously radical as Communism. [H: So, the obvious solution was to turn Democracy and Communism into a method of creating what they wanted in the first place, a Monarchy-Dictatorship, while calling it nice labels.] Just as the 1917 Communist Revolution in Russia [H: financed by you nice people's bankers just as the so-called Soviet Revolution this week is sponsored and financed by the same nice people in your behalf] spawned other revolutions around the world, the American Revolution provided an example and incentive for people all over the world to overthrow their European monarchies—or so it was interpreted.

Even though the *Treaty of Paris* ended the Revolutionary War in 1783, the simple fact of your existence threatened the monarchies. The United States stood as a heroic role model for other nations that inspired them to also struggle against oppressive monarchies. The French Revolution (1789-1799) and the Polish national uprising (1794) were in part encouraged by the American Revolution. Though you stood like a beacon of hope for most of the world, the monarchies regarded the United States as a political “typhoid Mary”, the principle source of radical democracy that was destroying monarchies around the world.

The monarchies must have realized that if the principle source of that infection could be destroyed, the rest of the world might avoid the contagion and the monarchies would be saved.

Their survival at stake, the monarchies sought to destroy or subvert the American system of government. Knowing they couldn't destroy you militarily, they resorted to more covert methods of political subversion, employing spies and secret agents skilled in bribery and legal deception—it was, perhaps, the first “cold war”. Since governments run on money, politicians run FOR money, and money is the usual enticement to commit treason, much of the monarchy's counter-revolutionary efforts emanated from English banks.

DON'T BANK ON IT

The essence of banking was once explained by Sir Josiah Stamp, a former president of the Bank of England. I have given this before but it is such a dandy, I shall repeat it: “The modern banking system manufactures money out of nothing. The process is perhaps the most astounding piece of sleight of hand that was ever invented. Banking was conceived in inequity and born in sin ... Bankers own the earth. Take it away from them but leave them the power to create money, and, with a flick of a pen, they will create enough money to buy it back again Take this great power away from them and all great fortunes like mine will disappear and they ought to disappear, for then this would be a better and happier world to

live in But, if you want to continue to be the slaves of bankers and pay the cost of your own slavery, then let bankers continue to create money and control credit.”

One of the past great abuses of your banking system caused the depression of the 1930s. Today's abuses are causing another and more massive depression than the world has ever known. Current S&L and bank scandals illustrate the on-going relationships between banks, LAWYERS, politicians, and government agencies (look at the current BCCI and BNL scandals running from high government officers to the Presidency itself involved in totally criminal activities) such as the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and even the CIA. These scandals are the direct result of years of law-breaking by an alliance of bankers and lawyers using their influence and money to corrupt the political process and rob the public. (Think you're not being robbed? Guess who's going to pay the bill for the excesses of these bailouts?) As Oberli and Dharma track further and deeper into involved parties attached to this present property scam/scandal—they are finding other financial institutions involved and, as named in the investigation, find Salomon Brothers and other financial institutions who are kaput and haven't even been made public—no wonder the FDIC and RTC are asking additional BILLIONS.

The systematic robbery of productive individuals by parasitic bankers and lawyers is not a recent phenomenon. This abuse is a human tradition that predates the *Bible* and spread from Europe to America despite early colonial prohibitions. (Remember the *Protocols of Zion*? Try the issue of Oct. 1920: No. 13: “We have already established our own men in all important positions. We must endeavor to provide the Goyim (non-Jews and including Judeans/Hebrews) with LAWYERS and doctors; the LAWYERS are *au courant* with all interest”, and 14: “But above all let us monopolize Education. By this means we spread ideas that are useful to us, and shape the children's brains as suits us.” And then, 15: “If one of our people should unhappily fall into the hands of justice amongst the Christians, we must rush to help him; find as many WITNESSES AS HE NEEDS TO SAVE HIM FROM HIS JUDGES—UNTIL WE BECOME JUDGES OURSELVES!”

It is about time to again publish the Protocols, friends, but I have quite a bit of additional updating to do prior to that so let us hold up herein and not get sidetracked from the “missing” 13th Amendment—it is all tied in together, as you might have guessed by now. You may as well consider that there is total integration of the *PROTOCOLS OF ZION*, the *CREMIEUX MANIFESTO* and the epistle emanating from the “PRINCE OF THE JEWS”. Isn't it interesting that these were published in a Rothschild magazine? The “Prince of the Jews” was done in 1489 A.D. But then, who would ever think, most especially Gentiles, of connecting these things with other documents emanating from Jewry, or with modern happenings? So be it!

When the first United States Bank was chartered by Congress in 1790, there were only three state banks in existence. At one time, banks were prohibited by law in most states because many of the early settlers were all too familiar with the practices of the European goldsmith banks.

Goldsmith banks were safe-houses used to store client's gold. In exchange for the deposited gold, customers were issued notes (paper money) which were redeemable in gold. The goldsmith bankers quickly succumbed to the temptation to issue “extra” notes, (unbacked by gold). Why? Because the “extra” notes enriched the bankers by allowing them to buy property with notes for gold that they did not

own, gold that did not even exist.

Colonists knew that bankers occasionally printed too much paper money, found themselves over-leveraged, and caused a “run on the bank”. If the bankers lacked sufficient gold to meet the demand, the paper money became worthless and common citizens left holding the paper were ruined. Although over-leveraged bankers were sometimes hung, the bankers continued printing extra money to increase their fortunes at the expense of the productive members of society. (The practice continues to this day and offers “sweetheart” loans to bank insiders, and even provides the foundation for deficit spending and your federal government's unbridled growth.)

PAPER MONEY

If the colonists forgot the lessons of goldsmith bankers, the American Revolution refreshed their memories. To finance the war, Congress authorized the printing of continental bills of credit in an amount not to exceed \$200,000,000. The states issued another \$200,000,000 in paper notes. Ultimately, the value of the paper money fell so low that they were soon traded on speculation from 500 to 1000 paper bills for one coin.

It's then suggested that your *Constitution's* prohibition against a paper economy—“No State shall ... make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a tender in Payment of Debts”—was a tool of the wealthy to be worked to the disadvantage of all others. But only in a “paper” economy can money reproduce itself and increase the claims of the wealthy at the expense of the productive.

“Paper money”, said Pelatiah Webster, “polluted the equity of our laws, turned them into engines of oppression, corrupted the justice of our public administration, destroyed the fortunes of thousands who had confidence in it, enervated the trade, husbandry, and manufactures of our country, and went far to destroy the morality of our people.”

CONSPIRACIES

Be patient—it may “seem” that I am not on the same subject but I am.

A few examples of the attempts by the monarchies and banks that almost succeeded in destroying the United States:

According to the *Tennessee Laws 1715-1820*, vol II, p.774, in the 1794 *Jay Treaty*, the United States agreed to pay 600,000 pounds sterling to King George III, as reparations for the American Revolution (interesting?). The Senate ratified the treaty in secret session and ordered that it not be published. When Benjamin Franklin's grandson published it anyway, the exposure and resulting public uproar so angered the Congress that it passed the *Alien and Sedition Acts* (1798) SO FEDERAL JUDGES COULD PROSECUTE EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS FOR REPORTING THE TRUTH ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT.

Since you had WON the Revolutionary War, why would your Senators agree to pay REPARATIONS to the loser? And why would they agree to pay 600,000 pounds sterling, eleven years AFTER the war ended? It just doesn't seem to make sense does it? Especially in light of the Senate's secrecy and later fury over being exposed, UNLESS YOU ASSUME YOUR SENATORS HAD BEEN BRIBED TO SERVE THE BRITISH MONARCHY AND BETRAY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE—THAT, DEAR ONES, IS SUBVERSION!

The United States Bank had been opposed by the Jeffersonians from the beginning, but the Federalists (the pro-monarchy party) won-out in its establishment.

The initial capitalization was \$10,000,000—80% of which would be owned by foreign bankers. Since the bank was authorized to lend up to \$20,000,000 (double its paid in capital), it was a profitable deal for both the government and the bankers since they could lend, and collect interest (usury) on, \$10,000,000 THAT DID NOT EXIST.

However, the European bankers outfoxed the government and by 1796, the government owed the bank \$6,200,000 and was forced to sell its shares. (By 1802, your government OWNED NO STOCK IN THE UNITED STATES BANK.)

The sheer power of the banks and their ability to influence representative government by economic manipulation and outright bribery was exposed in 1811, when the people discovered that European banking interests OWNED 80% OF THE BANK. Congress, therefore, refused to renew the bank's charter. This led to the withdrawal of \$7,000,000 *in specie* by European investors, which in turn, precipitated an economic recession, and the War of 1812.

There are other examples of the monarchy's efforts to subvert or destroy the United States; some are common knowledge, others remain to be disclosed to the public. There is, for example, a book called *2 VA LAW* in the Library of Congress Law Library. This is an un-catalogued book in the rare book section that reveals a plan to OVERTHROW THE CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT BY SECRET AGREEMENTS ENGINEERED BY THE LAWYERS. THAT, DEAR ONES, IS ONE REASON THAT THE 13TH AMENDMENT WAS RATIFIED BY VIRGINIA AND THE NOTIFICATION ‘LOST IN THE MAIL’. THERE IS NO PUBLIC RECORD OF THIS BOOK'S EXISTENCE!

Does this sound surprising? Perish the thought of “surprising”. The Library of Congress has over 349,402 uncatalogued rare books and 13.9 MILLION UN-CATALOGUED RARE MANUSCRIPTS, LAWS AND RATIFICATIONS! THERE ARE SECRETS BURIED IN THAT MASS OF DOCUMENTS EVEN MORE ASTONISHING THAN A MISSING CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, I CAN WELL ASSURE YOU.

TITLES OF NOBILITY

In seeking to rule the world and destroy the United States, bankers committed many crimes. Foremost among these crimes were fraud, conversion, and plain old theft. To escape prosecution for their crimes, the bankers did the same thing any career criminal does. They hired and formed alliances with the best LAWYERS and JUDGES money could buy. These alliances, originally forged in Europe (particularly in Great Britain), spread to the colonies, and later into the newly formed United States of America. Just as with Dharma and Oberli's legal case—the adversary lawyer, Mr. Horn, simply removes any papers from the file which can aid and assist the defendants! When discovered, he then threatens all sorts of heinous consequences if his trick is revealed. What is this man's name? I thought you would never ask: It is spelled STEVEN HORN. ONE OF HIS THREATS IS TO “GET THEM” IF THIS INCIDENT IS REVEALED IN ANY OF THIS SO-CALLED “DHARMA'S” WRITINGS. WELL, OLD BUDDY—THEY HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT I DO SUGGEST THAT MR. HORN DOES!

Remember the part of the Protocols about providing witnesses sufficient to win your case? Well, he did that too—but he outsmarted himself. The first hearing came with sufficient “provided” witnesses to swamp the court with liars. But, he had presented a backup case petition which caused the Judge to

disallow further proceedings at that time. So, along with the presentation of the City Clerk and City Treasurer as defendant's witnesses, the "liars" did panic and disappear. How handy, though, our attorneys have turned up one or two of them and we shall see how well they like lying NOW.

Despite their criminal foundation, these alliances forged in Europe generated wealth and, ultimately, respectability. Like any modern unit of organized crime, English bankers and lawyers wanted to be admired as "legitimate businessmen". As their criminal fortunes grew so did their usefulness, so the British monarchy legitimized these thieves by granting them "TITLES OF NOBILITY".

Historically, the British peerage system referred to knights as "Squires" and to those who bore the knight's shields as "Esquires". (Isn't this fun?) As lances, shields, and physical violence gave way to more civilized means of theft, the pen grew mightier (and far more profitable) than the sword, and the clever wielders of those pens (bankers and lawyers) came to hold titles of nobility. The most common title was "Esquire" (used, even today, by lawyers!).

INTERNATIONAL BAR ASSOCIATION

In Colonial America, attorneys trained attorneys but most held no "title of nobility" or "honor". There was no requirement that one be a lawyer to hold the position of district attorney, attorney general, or judge; a citizen's "counsel of choice" was not restricted to a lawyer; there were no state or national bar associations. The only organization that certified lawyers was the International Bar Association (IBA), chartered by the King of England, headquartered in London, and closely associated with the international banking system. Lawyers admitted to the IBA received the rank "ESQUIRE"—A "TITLE OF NOBILITY"!

"Esquire" was the principle title of nobility which the 13th Amendment sought to PROHIBIT from the United States. Why? Because the loyalty of "Esquire" lawyers was suspect. Bankers and lawyers with an "Esquire" behind their names were agents of the monarchy, members of an organization whose principle purposes were political, not economic, and regarded with the same wariness that some people today reserve for members of the KGB or the CIA.

Article I, Sect. 9 of the *Constitution* sought to prohibit the International Bar Association (or any other agency that granted titles of nobility) from operating in America. But the *Constitution* neglected to specify a penalty, so the prohibition was ignored, and agents of the monarchy continued to infiltrate and influence the government (as in the *Jay Treaty* and the U.S. Bank charter incidents). Therefore, a "title of nobility" amendment that specified a penalty (loss of citizenship) was proposed in 1789, and again in 1810. The meaning of the amendment is seen in its intent to prohibit persons having titles of nobility and loyalties to foreign governments and bankers from voting, holding public office, or using their skills to subvert the government.

HONOR

The missing Amendment is referred to as the "title of nobility" Amendment, but the second prohibition against "honour" (honor), may be more significant.

The archaic definition of "honor" (as used when the 13th Amendment was ratified) meant anyone "obtaining or having an advantage or privilege over another". A contemporary example of an "honor" granted to only a few Americans is the privilege of being a judge: Lawyers can be judges and exercise the attendant privileges and powers; non-lawyers CAN NOT.

By prohibiting "honors", the missing Amendment prohibits any advantage or privilege that would grant some citizens an unequal opportunity to achieve or exercise political power. Therefore, the second meaning (intent) of the 13th Amendment is to ensure political equality among all American citizens, by prohibiting anyone, EVEN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, from claiming or exercising a special privilege or power (an "honor") over other citizens.

This interpretation is quite true, little ones, and would be the key concept in the 13th Amendment. Why? Because, while "titles of nobility" may no longer apply in today's political system, the concept of "honor" remains relevant.

For example, anyone who had a specific "immunity" from lawsuits which were not afforded to all citizens, would be enjoying a separate privilege, an "honor" and would therefore forfeit his right to vote or hold public office. Think of the "immunities" from lawsuits that your judges, lawyers, politicians, and bureaucrats currently enjoy. As another example, think of all the "special interest" legislation your government passes: "special interests" are simply euphemisms for "special privileges" (honors).

WHAT IF?

If the missing 13th Amendment were to be restored, "special interests" and "immunities" would be rendered unconstitutional. The prohibition against "honors" (privileges) would compel the entire government to operate under the same laws as the citizens of your nation. Without their current personal immunities (honors), your judges and IRS agents would be unable to abuse common citizens without fear of legal liability. If the 13th Amendment were restored, your entire government would have to conduct itself according to the same standards of decency, respect, law, and liability as the rest of the nation. If this Amendment and the term "honor" were applied today, your government's ability to systematically coerce and abuse the public would be all but eliminated. Just IMAGINE!

CAN YOU IMAGINE A GOVERNMENT WITHOUT SPECIAL PRIVILEGES OR IMMUNITIES? How could you even describe it? It would be almost like a government—OF THE PEOPLE—BY THE PEOPLE—AND FOR THE PEOPLE! COULD IT POSSIBLY BE THAT THE FOUNDING FATHERS INTENDED IT BE THAT WAY? IMAGINE: A GOVERNMENT WHOSE MEMBERS WERE TRULY ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PUBLIC; A GOVERNMENT THAT COULD NOT SYSTEMATICALLY EXPLOIT ITS OWN PEOPLE!

It's unheard of for it got deliberately undone before it could be done—it has never been done before—and you thought a poor soul called Benedict Arnold was a traitor! You have never had a Constitutional government as intended—not ever in the entire history of the world!!!

So here comes the argument: Senator George Mitchell of Maine and the National Archives concede this 13th Amendment was proposed by Congress in 1810. However, they explain that there were seventeen states when Congress proposed the "title of nobility" Amendment; that ratification required the support of thirteen states, but since only twelve states supported the Amendment, it was not ratified. The Government Printing Office hops on the bandwagon to agree; it currently prints copies of the *CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES* which include the "title of nobility" Amendment as proposed—but un-ratified.

Even if this 13th Amendment was never ratified,

even if research would be flawed and only twelve states voted to ratify the Amendment—wouldn't the possibility be wondrous to imagine? So what am I saying? Am I saying that it was a dream within one vote of historical utopia? No! I am saying that it WAS RATIFIED.

After a break we shall continue to prove it. And, dear ones of America and ones running for office with overwhelming odds against "housecleaning"—here are your tools to do the sweeping! NOW DO YOU SEE THE VALUE OF A GOOD OLD SPACE CADET WITH X-RAY VISION? IT SURELY DOESN'T SURPRISE ANY OF YOU THAT THIS PARTICULAR AMENDMENT WOULD "GET LOST"? \$O BE IT.

dharmā ☸

**FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1991 11:27 A.M.
YEAR 5, DAY 014**

PARADISE FOUND?

Again, I give humble thanks and appreciation to David Dodge and Alfred Adask for jobs well done!

In 1789, The House of Representatives compiled a list of possible Constitutional Amendments, some of which would ultimately become your *Bill of Rights*. The House proposed seventeen; the Senate reduced the list to twelve. During this process Senator Tristram Dalton (Mass.) proposed an Amendment seeking to prohibit and provide a penalty for any American accepting a "title of Nobility" (RG 46 *Records of the U.S. Senate*). Although it wasn't passed, this was the first time a "title of nobility" amendment was proposed.

Twenty years later, in January, 1810, Senator Reed proposed another "Title of Nobility" Amendment (*History of Congress, Proceedings of the Senate*, p. 529-530). On April 27, 1810, the Senate voted to pass this 13th Amendment by a vote of 26 to 1; the House resolved in the affirmative 87 to 3; and the following resolve was sent to the states for ratification:

"If any citizen of the United States shall Accept, claim, receive or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them."

The *Constitution* requires three-quarters of the states to ratify a proposed amendment before it may be added to the *Constitution*. When Congress proposed the "Title of Nobility" Amendment in 1810, there were seventeen states, thirteen of which would have to ratify for the Amendment to be adopted. According to the National Archives, the following is a list of the twelve states that ratified, and their dates of ratification.

(Herein please note that the 16th (income tax) Amendment was truly never ratified! But here you have one which was truly ratified with proof thereof—and it was secretly heisted from your *Constitution*—are you getting a bit upset yet?)

Maryland, Dec. 25, 1810
Kentucky, Jan. 31, 1811
Ohio, Jan. 31, 1811
Delaware, Feb. 2, 1811
Pennsylvania, Feb. 6, 1811
New Jersey, Feb. 13, 1811
Vermont, Oct. 24, 1811
Tennessee, Nov. 21, 1811
Georgia, Dec. 13, 1811

North Carolina, Dec. 23, 1811
 Massachusetts, Feb. 27, 1812
 New Hampshire, Dec. 10, 1812

NOW WATCH THE “NOW” USUAL SLEIGHT OF HAND AND FOOTWORK FOR IT HAS BECOME THE *MODUS OPERANDI* WHEN THE GOING GETS TIGHT: Before the thirteenth state could ratify, the WAR OF 1812 BROKE OUT WITH ENGLAND. By the time the war ended in 1814, THE BRITISH HAD BURNED THE CAPITOL, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND MOST OF THE RECORDS OF THE FIRST 38 YEARS OF GOVERNMENT. I’m sure the connection between the proposed “title of nobility” amendment which would close England out of the U.S. government forever, and the War of 1812 BECOMES SELF-EVIDENT! You have entered massive wars for far less—like Desert Storm in Iraq.

Four years later, on December 31, 1817, the House of Representatives resolved that President Monroe inquire into the status of this Amendment because all sorts of “strange” things were beginning to happen in your government. In a letter dated Feb. 6, 1818, President Monroe reported to the House that Secretary of State Adams had written to the governors of Virginia, South Carolina and Connecticut to tell them that the proposed Amendment had been ratified by twelve States and rejected by two (New York and Rhode Island), and asked the governors to notify him of their legislature’s position (House Document No. 76).


(This, and other letters written by the President and the Secretary of State during the month of February 1818, note only that the proposed Amendment had not YET been ratified. However, these letters would later become crucial because, in the absence of additional information, they would be interpreted to mean that the amendment was never ratified.)

On February 28, 1818, Secretary of State Adams reported the rejection of the Amendment by South Carolina (House Doc. No. 129). There are no further entries regarding the ratification of the 13th Amendment in the Journals of Congress; whether Virginia ratified is neither confirmed nor denied. Likewise, a search through the executive papers of Governor Preston of Virginia does not reveal any correspondence from Secretary of State Adams. (However, there is a journal entry in the Virginia House that the Governor presented the House with an official letter and documents from Washington within a time frame that includes receipt of Adams’ letter.) Again, however, no evidence of ratification; none of denial.

Whoopie! However, on March 10, 1819, the Virginia legislature passed Act No. 280 (*Virginia Archives of Richmond*, “misc.” file, p. 299 for microfilm): “Be it enacted by the General Assembly, that there shall be published an edition of the Laws of this Commonwealth in which shall be contained the following matters, that is to say; the *Constitution of the (u)nited States* and the amendments thereto” This act was the specific legislated instructions on what was, by law, to be included in the republication (a special edition) of the *Virginia Civil Code*. The Virginia Legislature had already agreed that all Acts were to go into effect on the same day—the day that the *Civil Code* was to be republished. Therefore, the 13th Amendment’s official DATE OF RATIFICATION WOULD BE DATE OF RE-PUBLICATION OF THE VIRGINIA

CIVIL CODE: MARCH 12, 1819!!!

The Delegates knew Virginia was the last of the 13 States that were necessary for the ratification of the 13th Amendment. They also knew there were powerful forces allied against this ratification so they took extraordinary measures to make sure that it was published in sufficient quantity (4,000 copies were ordered, almost triple their usual order), and instructed the printer to send a copy to President James Monroe as well as James Madison and Thomas Jefferson.



Cover of *Constitution* as Printed in Maine in 1825

(The printer, Thomas Ritchie, was bonded. He was required to be extremely accurate in his research and his printing, or he would forfeit his bond.)

IN THIS FASHION, VIRGINIA ANNOUNCED THE RATIFICATION: BY PUBLICATION AND DISSEMINATION OF THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT OF THE *CONSTITUTION*.

Some argue that there is question as to whether Virginia ever formally notified the Secretary of State that they had ratified this 13th Amendment. Some have argued that because such notification was not received (or at least, not recorded), the Amendment was therefore not legally ratified. However, printing by a legislature is *prima facie* evidence of ratification.

Further, there is no Constitutional requirement that

the Secretary of State, or anyone else, be officially notified to complete the ratification process. The *Constitution* only requires that three-fourths of the states ratify for an Amendment to be added to the *Constitution*. If three-quarters of the states ratify, the Amendment is passed. Period. The *Constitution* is otherwise silent on what procedure should be used to announce, confirm or communicate the ratification of amendments.

Knowing they were the last state necessary to ratify the Amendment, the Virginians had every right to announce their own and the nation’s ratification of the Amendment by publishing it on a special edition of the *Constitution*, and so they did.

Word of Virginia’s 1819 ratification spread throughout the states and both Rhode Island and Kentucky published the new Amendment in 1822. Ohio first published in 1824. Maine ordered 10,000 copies of the *Constitution* with the 13th Amendment to be printed for use in the schools in 1825, and again in 1831 for the Census Edition. *Indiana Revised Laws* of 1831 published the 13th Article on p. 20. Northwestern Territories published in 1833. Ohio published in 1831 and 1833. Then came the Wisconsin Territory in 1839; Iowa Territory in 1843; Ohio again, in 1848; Kansas Statutes in 1855; and Nebraska Territory six times in a row from 1855 to 1860.

So far, Dodge has identified eleven different states or territories that printed the Amendment in twenty separate publications over forty-one years. And more editions including this 13th Amendment are sure to be discovered for they ARE THERE WAITING!

So—you might be able to convince some of the people, or maybe even all of them, for a little while, that this 13th Amendment was never ratified. Maybe you can show them that the ten legislatures which ordered it published eighteen times (known) consisted of ignorant politicians who don’t know their amendments from their...ahh, articles. You might even be able to convince the public that your forefathers never meant to “outlaw” public servants who pushed people around and accepted bribes or special favors to “look the other way”. Maybe. But before you do, there is a lot of evidence to be explained.

THE AMENDMENT DISAPPEARS

In 1829, the following note appears on p. 23, Vol. 1 of the *New York Revised Statutes*:

“In the edition of the *Laws of the U.S.* before referred to, there is an amendment printed as article 13, prohibiting citizens from accepting titles of nobility or honor, or presents, offices, etc., from foreign nations.

But, by a message of the president of the United States of the 4th of February, 1818, in answer to a resolution of the House of Representatives, it appears that this amendment had been ratified only by 12 states, and therefore had not been adopted. See vol. iv of the printed papers of the 1st session of the 15th congress, No. 76.” (Emphasis added.) In 1854, a similar note appeared in the *Oregon Statutes*. Both notes refer to the *Laws of the United States*. 1st vol. p. 73/74.

It’s not yet clear whether the 13th Amendment was published in *Laws of the United States*, 1st Vol., prematurely, by accident, in anticipation of Virginia’s ratification, or as part of a plot to discredit the Amendment by making it appear that only twelve States had ratified. Whether the *Laws of the United*

States Vol. 1 (carrying the 13th Amendment) was recalled or made-up is unknown. In fact, it's not even clear that the specified volume was actually printed—the Law Library of the Library of Congress has no record of its existence.

However, because the notes' authors reported no further references to the 13th Amendment after the Presidential letter of February, 1818, they apparently assumed the ratification process had ended in failure at that time. If so, they neglected to seek information on the Amendment after 1818, or at the state level, and therefore missed the evidence of Virginia's ratification. This opinion—assuming that the Presidential letter of Feb. 1818, was the last word on the Amendment—has persisted to this day.

In 1849, Virginia decided to revise the 1819 *Civil Code of Virginia* (which had continued the 13th Amendment for 30 years). It was at that time that one of the code's revisers (A LAWYER NAMED PATTON) wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, William B. Preston, asking if this Amendment had been ratified or appeared by mistake. (A most interesting resource for information at any circumstance.)

Preston wrote to J.M. Clayton, the Secretary of State, who replied that this Amendment was not ratified by a sufficient number of States. This conclusion was based on the information that Secretary of State J.Q. Adams had provided the House of Representatives in 1818, BEFORE Virginia's ratification in 1819. (Funny thing—and take careful note: today, the Congressional Research Service tells anyone asking about this 13th Amendment this same story: that only twelve states, not the requisite thirteen, had ratified. Skunks in the woodpile?)

Note, however, that despite Clayton's opinion, the Amendment continued to be published in various states and territories for at least another eleven years (the last known publication was in the Nebraska Territory in 1860).

Once again the 13th Amendment was caught in the riptides of American politics. South Carolina seceded from the Union in December of 1860, signaling the onset of the Civil War. In March 1861, President Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated.

Later in 1861, another proposed amendment, also numbered thirteen, was signed by President Lincoln. This was the only proposed amendment that was ever signed by a president. That resolve to amend read: "ARTICLE THIRTEEN, No amendment shall be made to the *Constitution* which will authorize or give to Congress the power to abolish or interfere, within any State, with the domestic institutions thereof, including that of persons held to labor or service by the laws of said State." (In other words, President Lincoln had signed a resolve that would have permitted slavery, and upheld states' rights.) Only one State, Illinois, ratified this proposed amendment before the Civil War broke out in 1861.

In the tumult of 1865, the original 13th Amendment was finally removed from your *Constitution*. On January 31, another 13th Amendment (which prohibited slavery in Sect. 1 and ended states' rights in Sect. 2) was proposed. On April 9, the Civil War ended with General Lee's surrender. On April 14, President Lincoln (who, in 1861, had signed the proposed Amendment that would have allowed slavery and states rights) was assassinated. On December 6, the "new" 13th Amendment loudly prohibiting slavery

(and quietly surrendering states rights to the federal government) was ratified, replacing and effectively erasing the original 13th Amendment that had prohibited "titles of nobility" and "honors". Wasn't that about as clever as you can get?

SIGNIFICANCE OF REMOVAL

To create the present oligarchy (rule by LAWYERS) which you now endure, the lawyers first

citizenship in this nation where a majority may vote, but only a minority (lawyers) may run for political office. This two-tiered citizenship is clearly contrary to Americans' political interests, the nation's economic welfare, and the *Constitution's* egalitarian spirit.

The significance of the 13th Amendment and its deletion from the *Constitution* is this: Since the amendment was never lawfully nullified, it is still in full force and effect and is the Law of the Land. If public support is awakened, this missing Amendment would provide a legal basis to challenge many existing laws and court decisions previously made by lawyers who were unconstitutionally elected or appointed to their positions of power; it might even mean the removal of lawyers from your current government system.

At the very least, this missing 13th Amendment demonstrates that two centuries ago, lawyers were recognized as enemies of the people and nation. Some things never change.

THOSE WHO CANNOT RECALL HISTORY - - -

In his farewell address, George Washington warned of "... change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

In 1788, Thomas Jefferson proposed that you have a Declaration of Rights similar to Virginia's. Three of his suggestions were "freedom of commerce against monopolies, trial by jury in ALL cases" and "no suspensions of the *habeas corpus*".


No doubt Washington's warning and Jefferson's ideas were dismissed as redundant by those who knew the law. Who would have dreamed your legal system would become a monopoly against freedom when that was one of the primary causes for the rebellion against King George III?

Yet, the denial of trial by jury is now commonplace in your courts, and *habeas corpus*, for crimes against the state, suspended. (By crimes against the state, I refer to "political crimes" where there is no injured party and the *corpus delicti*—evidence—is equally imaginary.)

I had a document handed into Dharma's hands not 15 minutes ago from the Christic Institute, entitled *Avirgan v. Hull* Update.

It starts off (and I shall write just a tiny portion): Ruling disregards evidence, denies right to trial by jury. On June 18 three judges of the 11th Circuit appeals court refused to reinstate *Avirgan v. Hull*, a civil racketeering lawsuit charging 29 members of a criminal racketeering enterprise with murder, destruction of property, drug trafficking, gun smuggling, money laundering and other crimes. The judges upheld two decisions handed down by Judge James Lawrence King of Miami: An order granting "summary judgments" in favor of the defendants and a subsequent ruling ordering the Christic Institute, General Counsel Daniel Sheehand and Plaintiffs Tony Avirgan and Martha Honey to pay more than \$1 million in punitive fines for allegedly filing the lawsuit "in bad faith". The Institute has asked all 11 judges of the appellate court to review the decision. If necessary, we plan to appeal to the Supreme Court"

Just a bit more from this same case: Judge King's decision to halt proceedings shortly before the trial's scheduled opening date predicated on an argument unprecedented in law: that plaintiffs are



THE THIRTEENTH AMENDMENT

had to remove the 13th "titles of nobility" Amendment that might otherwise have kept them in check. In fact, it was not until after the Civil War and after the disappearance of the 13th Amendment that the newly developing bar associations began working diligently to create a system wherein lawyers took on a title of privilege and nobility as "Esquires" and received the "honor" of offices and positions (like district attorney or judge) that only lawyers may now hold. By virtue of these titles, honors, and special privileges, lawyers have assumed political and economic advantages over the majority of U.S. citizens. Through these privileges, they have nearly established a two-tiered

NOT ENTITLED TO THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A TRIAL BY JURY UNLESS THEY SUBMIT ALL OF THEIR EVIDENCE TO THE JUDGE IN ADMISSIBLE FORM BEFORE THE TRIAL BEGINS.

It goes on and on but I haven't space here to handle that subject also. In other words, however, you have to have and prove each of the accusations to the "judge" BEFORE the lawsuit can be filed. Grounds for objection: "A judge is prohibited from this conduct when a plaintiff has formally demanded a trial by jury."

The authority to create monopolies was judge-made law by Supreme Court Justice John Marshall, et al, during the early 1800s; Judges (and lawyers) granted to themselves the power to declare the acts of the People "un-Constitutional", waited until their decision was grandfathered, and then granted themselves a monopoly by creating the bar associations.

Although Art. VI of the U.S. Constitution mandates that executive orders and treaties are binding upon the states ("... and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."), the Supreme Court has held that the Bill of Rights is not binding upon the states, and thereby resurrected many of the complaints enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, exactly as Thomas Jefferson foresaw in "Notes on the State of Virginia", Query 17, p. 161, 1784:

"Our rulers will become corrupt, our people careless ... the time for fixing every essential right on a legal basis is [now] while our rulers are honest, and ourselves united. From the conclusion of this war we shall be going downhill. It will not then be necessary to resort every moment to the people for support. They will be forgotten, therefore, and their rights disregarded. They will forget themselves, but in the sole faculty of making money and will never think of uniting to effect a due respect for their rights. The shackles, therefore, which shall not be knocked off at the conclusion of this war, will remain on us long, will be made heavier and heavier, till our rights shall revive or expire in a convulsion."

So, you await the inevitable convulsion.

Only two questions remain: Will you fight to revive your rights? Or will you meekly submit as your last remaining rights expire, surrendered to the courts, and perhaps to a "New World Order"?

There was an addendum to this information which must be added: Documentation has been sent as to five more editions of statutes that include the Constitution and the missing 13th Amendment.

These editions were printed by: Ohio, 1819; Connecticut (one of the states that voted against ratifying the Amendment), 1835; Kansas, 1861; and the Colorado Territory, 1865 and 1867.

These finds are important because: 1) they offer independent confirmation of these claims; and 2) they extend the known dates of publication from Nebraska, 1860 (Dodge's most recent find and herein mentioned

as such), to Colorado in 1867.

The most intriguing discovery was the 1867 Colorado Territory edition which includes both the "missing" 13th Amendment AND the current 13th Amendment (freeing the slaves), on the same page. The current 13th Amendment is listed as the 14th Amendment in the 1867 Colorado edition.

Now in appreciation for this material I ask reprinting of the following:

This investigation has followed a labyrinthine path

1810.] JOURNAL OF THE SENATE. 503

And the report of the select committee having been agreed to, and the bill further amended, the President reported it to the House accordingly.

On the question, Shall this bill be engrossed and read a third time as amended? It was determined in the affirmative, { Yeas 18, { Nays 9.

On motion, The yeas and nays having been required by one-fifth of the Senators present, Those who voted in the affirmative, are, Messrs. Anderson, Brent, Clay, Condit, Crawford, Franklin, Gaillard, Giles, Gregg, Lambert, Lloyd, Mathewson, Meigs, Smith, of Maryland, Sumter, Tait, Turner, and Whiteside.

Those who voted in the negative, are, Messrs. Champlin, German, Gilman, Goodrich, Hillhouse, Horsey, Leib, Pickering, and Reed.

The bill, entitled "An act authorizing a loan of money, for a sum not exceeding the amount of the principal of the public debt reimbursable during the year one thousand eight hundred and ten," was read the second time.

On motion, Resolved, That it be referred to a select committee, to consist of five members, to consider and report thereon.

Ordered, That Messrs. Smith, of Maryland, Crawford, Lloyd, Franklin, and Hillhouse, be the committee.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion made on the 18th of January, for an amendment to the constitution of the United States, respecting titles of nobility, together with the amendments proposed thereto.

On motion, That the further consideration thereof be postponed to the first Monday in December next,

It was determined in the negative, { Yeas 8, { Nays 20.

On motion, The yeas and nays having been required by one-fifth of the Senators present, Those who voted in the affirmative, are, Messrs. Condit, Gilman, Gregg, Leib, Mathewson, Meigs, Tait, and Whiteside. Those who voted in the negative, are, Messrs. Anderson, Brent, Champlin, Clay, Crawford, Franklin, Gaillard, German, Goodrich, Hillhouse, Horsey, Lambert, Lloyd, Pickering, Pope, Reed, Smith, of Maryland, Smith, of New York, Sumter, and Turner.

On motion, To amend the last report of the select committee, so as to read as follows:

"If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain, any title of nobility, or honor, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept any present, pension, office, or emolument, of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them."

It was determined in the affirmative, { Yeas 26, { Nays 1.

On motion, The yeas and nays having been required by one-fifth of the Senators present, Those who voted in the affirmative, are, Messrs. Anderson, Brent, Champlin, Clay, Condit, Crawford, Franklin, Gaillard, German, Gilman, Goodrich, Hillhouse, Horsey, Lambert, Leib, Lloyd, Mathewson, Meigs, Pickering, Pope, Reed, Smith, of Maryland, Sumter, Tait, Turner, and Whiteside.

Mr. Smith, of New York, voted in the negative.

On motion, by Mr. Pope, To add to the resolution the following words: "And be subject to such other penalties and disabilities as may be provided by law."

It was determined in the negative, { Yeas 12, { Nays 14.

On motion, The yeas and nays having been required by one-fifth of the Senators present, Those who voted in the affirmative, are, Messrs. Anderson, Brent, Clay, Gregg, Leib, Lloyd, Pickering, Pope, Reed, Sumter, Tait, and Turner.

In 1810 the 13th Amendment Passed the Senate By a Vote of 26 to 1

that started with the questions about how our courts evolved from a temple of the Bill of Rights to the current star chamber and whether this situation had anything to do with retiring chief Justice Burger's warning that we were "about to lose our constitution". My seven year investigation has been fruitful beyond belief; the information on the missing 13th Amendment is only a "drop in the bucket" of the information I have discovered. Still, the research continues, and by definition, is never truly complete.

If you will, please check your state's archives and libraries to review any copies of the Constitution

printed prior to the Civil War, or any books containing prints of the Constitution before 1870. If you locate anything related to this project we would appreciate hearing from you so we may properly fulfill this effort of research. Please send your comments or discoveries to:

David M. Dodge, P.O. Box 985, Taos, New Mexico 87571.

Please, you other researchers, like Patrick B.—get on this and share up what you find. You will only turn this nation around through the LAW AND IT IS ALL THERE IF YOU BUT UNCOVER AND RECOVER IT. SALU.

I have only one more tidbit to dump on you in the "you are had" category for this writing: In uncovering the mess with the conspiracy regarding Santa Barbara Savings/RTC/Bank of America fraud and deceit involving Dharma and Oberli—it is uncovered that the following practice is common and takes place with the RTC in massive proportion these days: A bank, say, Bank of America, buys from the RTC, Santa Barbara Savings—BUT—THEY ONLY GET THE GOOD ASSETS AND THE RTC (YOU-THE-PEOPLE) CARRY ALL LOSSES AND CONTESTED PROPERTY. IN OTHER WORDS IT IS COMPLETELY PRE-ARRANGED THAT THE BANK(ERS) GET ALL THE ASSETS AND YOU TAKE THE DEBTS! GOOD-LUCK, WORLD! Note that this property in question is already overshadowed by expenses against its value two to one from litigation—but in the end you-the-people will hold the bag. By the way, once again, there is found to be a deadline (which is hidden from view) in which you must file an (unknown) form by a certain date or you are forever barred from any claim. Is it not about time you do something about this fraud and plague upon your lands?

I further wish to acknowledge a publication which I admire greatly for it is DEDICATED TO RAISING HELL FOR LAWYERS! If you have a good story please send it to them—we'll get around to it, too. If you can write, if you've got a personal story about the legal system to tell, an essay to publish on injustice, or a letter to the editor, they want it. They can't pay you for it—but freedom is worthy of giving unity. The editor urges you to write and not pussyfoot around—don't let the system scare you into silence—name names, send photo copies of relevant documents, pictures of yourself or the principal parties, and say what's in your heart as well as what's in your legal dictionary. They look for documents anywhere from letter-size on up to 2,000 word essays. (Well, ours is about 300,000 words, so guess it will have to be in shorthand!)

YOU CAN CHANGE THINGS IF YOU WANT TO—OR YOU CAN SIT AND WAIT AND IT WON'T MATTER ANY MORE.

THESE PEOPLE CALL THEIR PUBLICATION: AntiShyster, 9794 Forest Lane, Suite 159, Dallas, Texas 75243. 1-800-477-5508. Their slogan: IT'S NATIONAL ATTORNEY WEEK—TAKE A SHYSTER TO LYNCH.

In the meanwhile, anyone wanting to write up this particular case in point—we will be delighted! We are most happy to give a whole bunch of names and places. You are going to find the same ones that continually pop up in the news—Bush, Reagan, Shea & Gould, Salomon Bros, etc. The network is so massive that a "clean sweep" with your Constitutional broom is all that will do it. God Bless!

Hatonᅇ to clear. dharmā

Final Warning: Part 12a

We continue with our serialization of David Allen Rivera's extremely well researched, *Final Warning: A History of the New World Order, moving on to Chapter Eight*. Here we will first look at the formation of the *United Nations, an organization which, with some modifications, is capable of becoming quite useful in the New World, despite the worst intentions of the Illuminati*. [QUOTING, emphasis added:]

CHAPTER EIGHT THE ILLUMINATI INFLUENCE ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

THE UNITED NATIONS

Jan Tinbergen (from the Netherlands), the winner of the 1969 Nobel Prize for Economics, has said: "Mankind's problems can no longer be solved by national governments; what is needed is a world government." ...

In 1939, Dr. James T. Shotwell organized a group known as the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, which was made up of a number of small subcommittees. One of these, the Subcommittee on International Organization was chaired by Sumner Wells, the Under Secretary of State, and its purpose was to plan postwar policy. Shotwell and Isaiah Bowman, members of the subcommittee, were also members of the League of Nations Association, and had been on Col. House's staff at the Paris Peace Conference in 1918, where plans for the League of Nations had been laid out. This established a direct link between the League of Nations and the United Nations. The subcommittee's work formed the basis for the Charter of the United Nations, and was the means by which the Council on Foreign Relations was able to condition the Congress, and the people of the country to accept the United Nations.

Two weeks after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Cordell Hull, the Secretary of State, sent a letter to President Roosevelt recommending the establishment of a Presidential Advisory Committee on Post War Foreign Policy, which actually became a planning group for the United Nations. **Ten of the Fourteen Committee members came from the CFR.** Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms Speech" planted the seed for the United Nations. A conference held in Washington, D.C between the representatives of the 26 nations that had banded together against the axis powers, gave momentum to the movement by issuing the "Declaration of the Twenty-Six United Nations" on January 1, 1942. In February 1942, the State Department's Advisory Committee on Post-War Foreign Policy secretly worked out more details. One of their reports said: "Its discussions throughout were founded upon belief in the unqualified victory by the United Nations. It predicted, as an absolute prerequisite for world peace, the continuing strength of the United Nations through unbroken cooperation after the war."

In 1942, *Free World*, a periodical published by the International Free World Association (organized in 1941), ... stated that their objective was to create the "machinery for a world government in which the United Nations will serve as a nucleus ... in order to prepare in time the foundations for a future world order".

Leading diplomats from the United States, Russia, England and China attended preliminary meetings in October 1943, at a conference in Moscow. In November, Cordell Hull "secured the consent of Stalin to establish a general organization ... for the maintenance of international peace and security", and in proposing it to Roosevelt, made it appear as though it was an American project. Among the leading U.S. figures who were involved in the planning of the United Nations: Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Virginius Frank Coe, Noel Field, Laurance Duggan, Henry Julian Wadleigh, John Carter Vincent, David Weintraub, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, Harold

Glasser, Victor Perlo, Irving Kaplan, Solomon Adler, Abraham George Silverman, William L. Ullman, William H. Taylor and Dean Acheson. All of these men were either communists or had pro-communist sympathies.

The idea for the United Nations was officially proposed in 1944 at the secret Dumbarton Oaks Conference, where the framework was developed and the final plans laid out. The conference was attended by representatives from the U.S., England and Russia, and it was all coordinated by Alger Hiss. Hiss was a Trustee of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, a director of the Executive Committee of the American Association for the United Nations, a director of the American Peace Society, a Trustee of the World Peace Foundation, a director of the American Institute of Pacific Relations and President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. In 1950, he was convicted of perjury and sent to prison. Exposed as a Soviet spy, his communist activities extended back to 1939. Other Americans who attended: Harry Dexter White, Virginius Coe, Noel Field, Laurance Duggan, Harry Wadleigh, John Carter Vincent, David Weintraub, Nathan Silvermaster, Harold Glasser, Victor Perlo, Irving Kaplan, Solomon Adler, Abraham Silverman, William Ullman, William Taylor and **John Foster Dulles (who had been hired by Joseph Stalin to be the Soviet Union's legal counsel in the United States)**.

In February 1945, at the Yalta Conference, President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin agreed to the plans proposing the establishment of the United Nations.

The April 1945 issue of *Political Affairs*, the official publication of the U.S. Communist Party, said: "Great popular support and enthusiasm for the United Nations policies should be built up, well organized and fully articulated ... The opposition must be rendered so impotent that it will be unable to gather any significant support in the Senate against the United Nations Charter and the treaties which will follow."

On June 26, 1945, the San Francisco Conference, attended by 50 nations, established the United Nations and adopted the Charter which had been drafted. The General Assembly held their first meeting in London on January 10, 1946. The U.S. Senate ratified the UN Charter with only two dissenting votes; and in December, 1946, John D. Rockefeller III donated an 18-acre tract of land in Manhattan (which he had purchased for \$8,500,000, with New York City contributing the remaining \$4,250,000) to provide the organization with a permanent headquarters, which is located between First Avenue and Roosevelt Drive, and East 42nd and East 48th Streets.

The United World Federalists were established on February 22, 1947 by two CFR members, Norman Cousins and James P. Warburg, when the Americans United for World Government, World Federalists, Massachusetts Committee for World Federation, Student Federalists, World Citizens of Georgia and World Republic all merged. Their goal was to endorse "the efforts of the United Nations to bring about a world community favorable to peace ... (and) to strengthen the United Nations into a world government of limited powers adequate to prevent a war and having direct jurisdiction over the individual". Nixon said of them: "Your organization can perform an important service by continuing to emphasize that world peace can only come through world law. Our goal is world peace." Ronald Reagan was associated with them before he became a conservative. Various other left-wing organizations have also defended and supported this international organization.

The United Nations, "open to all peace-loving nations as sovereign equals", is made up of 191 member nations, and exists primarily to maintain peace and security; develop international cooperation in solving the political, economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems of the world; and ensure the existence of friendly relations.

Many of the countries are non-democratic, being ruled by dictators, royal families, military officers or one-party governments.

As you have read, there was a strong communist influence during the establishment of the organization, and all indications are that it has maintained a socialistic slant to its affairs. Earl Browder, a former leader in the U.S. Communist Party, said in his book *Victory and After*: "The American Communists worked energetically and tirelessly to lay the foundations for the United Nations, which we were sure would come into existence."

Alger Hiss, who was later convicted as a communist traitor, became the acting Secretary-General after the establishment of the UN. The April 16, 1945 issue of *Time* magazine called him "one of the State Department's brighter young men". It was Hiss, and Joseph E. Johnson (who later became Secretary of the Bilderbergers) who wrote much of the UN Charter, patterning it after the Constitution of Russia, and the *Communist Manifesto*. An *Associated Press* dispatch from April 7, 1970 which appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* said: "Secretary-General U Thant praised Vladimir I. Lenin, founder of the Soviet Union, as a political leader, whose ideals were reflected in the UN Charter." It contained self-granted powers for a one-world government. Even their official seal, which was similar to Russia's, was designed by Aldo Marzani, a socialist.

Trygve Lie, the first official UN Secretary-General, was a high-ranking member of Norway's Social Democratic Labor Party, which was an offshoot of the Third Communist International. Dag Hammarskjold, the second Secretary-General, was a Swedish socialist who openly pushed communist policies, and U Thant, the third Secretary, was a Marxist.

In 1978, Arkady Shevchenko, an ex-KGB agent, and Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, who defected, said that many Soviet UN delegates worked for the KGB.

With the United States having only one vote within the socialist-dominated organization, we were powerless to prevent the socialists from using diplomacy to achieve their goals. Nonaligned nations, a majority of the delegates, voted with the communists 85% of the time in the General Assembly; and in 1987, member nations voted with the U.S. only 18.7% of the time. In fact, on key issues the UN has voted against the United States nearly 85% of the time.

The Constitutional right of Congress to declare war has been completely transferred to the UN Military Committee, and as such, they can order us into war at any time, without our consent, as they did in Korea. The United States didn't make the treaty with Japan to end World War II, it was made with the UN. The UN refused to come to the aid of China in 1949, ignored the Hungarian freedom fighters in 1956, shunned the Tibetans when they were attacked by Chinese Communists, and in the early 1960s, supported the communist attempt to overthrow the African country of Katanga. They even criticized the American invasion of Grenada, which sought to stem communist activity in the Caribbean. **Remember, the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs had always been a Russian, who along with the Chairman of the UN Military Staff Committee was responsible for all UN military action.** Prior to the Korean War, the Chairman was Lt. Gen. Alexandre Vasiliev, who took a leave of absence from the position to command the communist troops, and actually gave the orders to attack. He continued to get valuable information about the UN's military plans from his handpicked successor, Gen. Ivan A. Skliaro.

In 1915, in No. 40 of the Russian document *The Socialist Democrat*, Lenin called for a "United States of the World". The Communist International in 1936, said that a world dictatorship "can be established only by victory of socialism in different countries or groups of countries, after which the Proletariat Republics would unite on federal lines with those already in existence, and this system would expand ... at length forming the World

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics". In the November 1946 issue of the communist publication *Bolshevik*, it said: "The masses know that peace is possible only on the basis of cooperation among the existing states ... The Soviet Union is fighting to have the United Nations as effective as possible." On October 7, 1961 *People's World*, a West Coast Communist Party newspaper, published an editorial, "Save the UN," which said: "The UN commands a great reservoir of support in our country ... People should write President Kennedy, telling him—do not withdraw from the UN, restore the UN to the Grand Design of Franklin Roosevelt—the design for peaceful coexistence." The Preamble to the Constitution of the U.S. Communist Party, urges the "strengthening of the United Nations as a universal instrument of peace".

The Preamble of the UN Charter says: "We the people of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" In light of this, you should be aware of what Albert Einstein said after the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945: "The secret of the bomb should be committed to a World Government and the USA should announce its readiness to give it to a World Government."

According to the *Congressional Record* of June 7, 1949, on pages 7356 and 7357, this was the wording for HCR64, a joint resolution (corresponds to Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, the Tobey or 'World Federalist' Resolution) that was introduced in the House of Representatives: "Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) that it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation, open to all nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law." Concerning this Resolution, Cord Meyer, chairman of the National Executive Committee of the United World Federalists, said at a hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter: "**We in the United States would be declaring our willingness to join with other nations in transferring to the UN constitutional authority to administer and enforce law that was binding on national governments and their individual citizens.**"

By February 1950, after the public expressed their outrage over the Resolution, the Liberals who sponsored it turned their backs on it in an attempt to salvage their political reputations. Rep. Bernard W. Kearney (R-New York) said: "We signed the Resolution believing we were sponsoring a movement to set up a stronger power within the United Nations for world peace ... Then we learned that various organizations were working on state legislatures and on peace movements for world government action under which the entire U.S. Government would be submerged in a super world government ... Perhaps we should have read the fine print in the first place. We do not intend to continue in the role of sponsors of any movement which undermine U.S. sovereignty. Many Congressmen feel as I do. We will make our position thoroughly clear." Within two years, 18 of the 23 states which had passed the Resolution eventually rescinded it.

Information about HCR64 / SCR56 can be found in the infamous Document No. 87, *Review of the United Nations Charter: A Collection of Documents*, by the Senate Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter, and published by the Government Printing Office in 1954. It was reportedly given to each of the Senators at the time, and only two copies now remain in existence. This report blows the lid off of the U.S. Government's determination for one-world government. Also discussed are Senate Resolution 133, introduced July 8, 1949 by Sen. Sparkman (Democrat from Alabama) who said: "We can create now, with Russia if possible, without Russia if necessary an overwhelming collective front open to all nations under a law just to all." The report urged (p. 846): "American atomic, military and economic superiority is only

temporary. It is essential before that superiority is lost that there be created an international organization with strength to enforce the peace." Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, introduced July 26, 1949 by Sen. Kefauver (D-Tennessee) called for an Atlantic Union of Canada, England, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and the United States. The report said (p. 848): "The establishment of a federal union ... would involve not only basic economic and social changes but also important changes in the structure of the United States Government. It is very doubtful if the American people are ready to amend the *Constitution* to the extent necessary to give an Atlantic Union the powers it would need to be effective."

Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, introduced September 13, 1949 by Sen. Taylor (D-Idaho) called for the Charter of the United Nations to "be changed to provide a true world government constitution". He claimed: "Only a true world government can achieve everlasting peace." The report stated (p. 850): "Anything less than world government would be merely a stopgap." The existence of Document No. 87 proves that the government of the United States and the political leaders of this country are working behind the scenes to strengthen the United Nations and to move towards one-world government.

In 1953, during the World Federal Government Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, UN supporters revealed plans to push for a revision of the UN Charter, which would provide for the UN to become a World Federal Government with a world legislature and court, mandatory universal membership with no right of secession; and a full and immediate disarmament which would be militarily supported by the UN. Another conference, in London, in 1954, by the World Movement for World Federation, also proposed similar ideas.

This movement to remove the sovereignty of the United States and member countries convinced Senator John Bricker to propose his "Bricker Amendment" which would have placed in the U.S. *Constitution* a safeguard against the possibility of a treaty which could result in a world government: "A provision of a Treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this *Constitution*, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect." During debate on the Bill, Sen. Pat McCarran (D-Nevada) said of the powers provided to the UN by Articles 55 and 56 of the UN Charter: "The Congress of the United States, because of the power granted to it by treaty, could enact laws ... taking over all private and parochial schools, destroying all local school boards ... and substitute a federal system ... Congress could by law provide for censoring all press telegrams ... Congress could utilize this power to put into effect a complete system of socialized medicine, from cradle to grave ... even legislate compulsory labor, if it found that the goal of full employment required such legislation or would be served by it."

The Bricker Amendment was opposed by all the "one-world" organizations and internationalists like U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, Sen. Ralph Flanders (R-Vermont), Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D-Minnesota), John J. McCloy (former Assistant Secretary of Defense and former High Commissioner to Germany), Paul Hoffman (of the State Department), Thomas K. Finletter, John Foster Dulles (Secretary of State) and President Eisenhower, who said it would curtail the power of the Presidency. After a long, bitter fight, the Amendment failed by a vote of 60-31, just one vote short of the necessary two-thirds majority of the U.S. Senate.

H. G. Wells wrote in his 1933 book *The Shape of Things to Come*: "When the existing governments and ruling theories of life, the decaying religious and the decaying political forms of today, have sufficiently lost prestige through failure and catastrophe, then and then only will world-wide reconstruction be possible."

Robert M. Hutchins (former President of Rockefeller's University of Chicago) was the Chairman of the Committee to Form a World Government, who had

drafted a new Constitution. On August 12, 1945, they said on a Round Table broadcast that they wanted to turn control of our nation over to a Socialist world government. In Hutchin's 1947 book, *The Constitutional Foundations for World Order* (published for the Foundation for World Order), he says: "Tinkering with the United Nations will not help us, if we agree with the *New York Times* that our only hope is in the ultimate abolition of war through an ultimate world government." President Dwight D. Eisenhower said on October 31, 1956: "I am more deeply convinced that the United Nations represents the soundest hope for peace in the world."

A State Department document, #7277, called *Freedom From War: The United States' Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World*, revealed a plan to disarm the U.S. military, shut down bases, and to give the UN control of our Armed Forces and nuclear weapons. The UN military arm would then be the world's police force to act as "peacekeepers". The document, which on September 1, 1961, was sent by courier to the UN Secretary General, suggested a "progressive reduction of the war-making capability of the nations and the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace ..." It was to be done through a three-step program:

"The first stage would significantly reduce the capabilities of nations to wage war by reducing the armed forces of the nations ... nuclear capabilities would be reduced by treaties ... and UN peace-keeping powers would be strengthened ... The second stage would provide further substantial reductions in the armed forces and the establishment of a permanent international peace force within the United Nations ... The third stage would have the nations retaining only those forces required for maintaining internal order, but the United States would provide manpower for the United Nations Peace Force."

The plan called for "all weapons of mass destruction" to be eliminated, except for "those required for a United Nations Peace Force" (page 12, 1st paragraph); and (on page 16, 8th paragraph) to "keep the peace, all states will reaffirm their obligations under the UN Charter to refrain from the threat of use of any type armed force". I'm sure that this includes the disarming of American citizens. Sarah Brady, one of the leading proponents in this country against handguns, said: "Our task of creating a socialist America can only succeed when those who would resist us have been totally disarmed." Sen. Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania said during a March 1, 1962 debate on the Senate floor, that the program is "the fixed, determined, and approved policy of the government of the United States". The Program was later revised in *The Blueprint for the Peace Race*, which said on page 33: "... the Parties to the Treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Police Force ... until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it." The Program was again revised by the present *Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World*.

In 1961, during the Kennedy administration, Robert McNamara, McGeorge Bundy and Dean Rusk (all CFR members), initiated a secret study to study the direct and indirect ramifications of war, and how they could control the economy during peace-time. They wanted to know what situations the United States would be exposed to in the world if it moved from a period of war to a time of permanent peace, or as the Report said, "to consider the problems involved in the contingency of a transition to a general condition of peace, and to recommend procedures for dealing with this contingency". Conceivably, it would look for ways to slowly move this country into the New World Order. By 1963, fifteen experts (known as the SSG or Special Study Group) from various academic fields: psychology, anthropology, international law, biochemistry, physics, astronomy, mathematics, literature, history, military, economy, sociology and industry. Their first and last meeting had taken place at **Iron Mountain** in Hudson, New York, the first secure underground

records storage center designed to protect vital corporate records in case of a nuclear disaster.

There was some speculation that the think-tank known as the Hudson Institute actually conducted the study. The Institute was started in 1961, "to help determine the entire future of the U.S.—and time permitting, much of the world beyond". Many of their fellows and members belonged to the CFR.

The long-term plan to control the population was said to have been completed in 1966. It was reported that President Johnson ordered the Report to be sealed because with the knowledge it contained the American people could have used it to prevent the takeover of their country during the early stages. The cover letter of the Report said: "Because of the unusual circumstances surrounding the establishment of this Group, and in view of the nature of its finding, we do not recommend that this Report be released for publication ... such actions would not be in the public interest ... a lay reader, unexposed to the exigencies of higher political or military responsibility, will misconstrue the purposed of this project, and the intent ... We urge that the circulation of the Report be closely restricted to those whose responsibilities require that they be apprised of its contents ..."

The Report, in fact, appeared to be a blueprint for the future of this country, and contained recommendations that included plans for governmental control and manipulation, depopulation, gun control and disarmament, an international police force and concentration camps.

One man, calling himself John Doe, who was involved in the Report, decided to release its contents; it was published in 1967 by Dial Press (a division of Simon and Schuster) as the *Report From Iron Mountain on the Possibility and Desirability of Peace*. Even though it was publicly renounced by the Establishment as a hoax, it was translated into fifteen languages.

The SSG concluded that **peace "would almost certainly not be in the best interest of stable society", because War was too much a part of the world economy and therefore it was necessary to continue a state of war indefinitely:**

"War has provided both ancient and modern societies with a dependable system for stabilizing and controlling national economies. No alternate method of control has yet been tested in a complex modern economy that has shown itself remotely comparable in scope or effectiveness. War fills certain functions essential to the stability of our society; until other ways of filling them are developed, the war system must be maintained, and improved in effectiveness."

It also said that war, "provides anti-social elements with an acceptable role in the social structure ... the younger, and more dangerous, of these hostile social groupings have been kept under control by the Selective Service System ... man destroys surplus members of his own species by organized warfare ... enables the physically deteriorating older generation to maintain control of the younger, destroying it if necessary".

The report also argued that the authority that the government exercised over the people came from its ability to wage war, and that **without war the government might cease to exist:** "War is virtually synonymous with nationhood. The elimination of war implies the inevitable elimination of national sovereignty and the traditional nation-state."

The Report covered a number of recommendations that the Federal government should do in the event that they were thrust into an era of peace:

"(a) A comprehensive social-welfare program, directed toward maximum improvement of general conditions of human life; (b) A giant open-end space research program, aimed at unreachable targets; (c) A permanent, ritualized, ultra-elaborate disarmament inspection system, and variant of such a system."

It also recommended **the invention of "alternate enemies"**.

Then in 1972, in a *New York Times* article, Leonard C. Lewin, a New York free lance writer and editor (A

Treasury of American Political Humor), who wrote the introduction to the book, confessed to being the author of the Report, and said he wrote it "to caricature the bankruptcy of the think-tank mentality by pursuing its style of scientific thinking to its logical ends".

In 1996 Simon & Schuster reprinted the Report with a new introduction. Evidently the germination of the Report took place in 1966 when Victor Navasky (Publisher and Editorial Director of *The Nation*), who was editor of the *Monacle*, a political satire magazine, read a *New York Times* article about the stock market declining because of a 'peace scare'. Navasky said something to Lewin who then wrote the report, and they presented the Report to E.L. Doctorow, Editor-in-Chief (and co-conspirator) of Dial Press, who agreed to publish it as nonfiction. Navasky said the purpose of the hoax was "to provoke thinking about the unthinkable—the conversion to a peacetime economy and the absurdity of the arms race".

However, some still believe the Report to be authentic because a large portion of it has come to pass.

At the Conference on Conditions of World Order, which met from June 12-19, 1965 (which no doubt led to the **establishment of the Club of Rome**), at the Villa Serbelloni (facilities obtained through the Rockefeller Foundation) in Bellagio, Italy, which was sponsored by the Congress for Cultural Freedom (with a grant from the Ford Foundation and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences), 21 scholars, writers and scientists from all over the world met to define the concepts of world order. A segment of their report, by Helio Jaguaribe said:

"The establishment of world order depends not only on its intrinsic desirability and viability, but also on the support of men and groups who decide to dedicate themselves to the completion of such a goal. As increasing sectors of developed and underdeveloped societies begin to realize the urgent necessity of world order, the viability of its establishment, and the fact that it can be achieved by adopting measures which are reasonable in themselves, none of the governments will be able to escape public pressure for establishing world order ... It is incumbent upon the intellectuals to play the decisive role in the formation of pressure groups in favor of world order ... the establishment of world order demands the mobilization of groups dedicated to international pressure for the gradual implantation of that world order ... the negotiated establishment of world order is theoretically possible and practically feasible since, in the last analysis, the probable effects of nuclear conflagration have made way an impractical alternative to the peaceful solution of contemporary problems."

... The United Nations is the root of that one-world government and since its inception, seventeen of their agencies have been working toward that goal: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), which will place the financial power of the entire world in the hands of the UN; World Health Organization, to internationalize medical treatment; International Labor Organization, to standardize labor practices; International Monetary Fund, to promote international trade and commerce; World Meteorological Association; Universal Postal Union; International Civil Aviation Organization; World Intellectual Property Organization; United Nations' Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); International Telecommunication Union; International Fund for Agricultural Development; International Finance Corporation; International Development Association; Inter-Government Maritime Consultive Organization; General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Brock Chisholm, the first director of the UN World Health Organization said: "To achieve one world government it is necessary to remove from the minds of men their individualism, their loyalty to family traditions and national identification." When he accepted an award from the World Federalist Association, CBS newscaster Walter Cronkite said: "We must strengthen the United

Nations as a first step toward a world government ... We Americans will have to yield up some of our sovereignty."

The Ditchley Group, which first met in May 1982 at Ditchley Park in London, is engineering a plan by Harold Lever (a director on the Board of the UNILEVER conglomerate) to control the fiscal and the monetary policies of the United States and called for the International Monetary Fund to control the central banks of all nations. Representatives of 36 of the world's biggest banks met at the Vista Hotel in New York in January 1982 to lay the groundwork; then met again in October, where it was reported that plans were underway to bring legislation before the U.S. Senate that would designate the IMF as the Controller of U.S. fiscal policy by the year 2000.

On January 8, 1983, Hans Vogel of the Club of Rome met at the White House with President Reagan, Secretary of State George Schultz, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, George Kennan and Lane Kirkland (President of the AFL-CIO) to discuss the objectives of the Ditchley Group. The Group met on January 10-11, 1983 in Washington to discuss the IMF takeover; and later in the year, in Williamsburg, Virginia, with a group of international bankers, to discuss a disintegration of the U.S. banking system which would force the Senate into accepting IMF control.

... While campaigning for the Presidency, Bill Clinton said: "My vision is that we would become an instrument working as much as possible through the United Nations for freedom and democracy and human rights and global economic growth." In a speech to the World Affairs Council in Los Angeles, Clinton called for a permanent UN "rapid deployment force". Richard Gardner, a Clinton advisor on the UN and a professor of international law, has outlined a plan for a world army of 30,000 men. The five member nations of the Security Council would provide 2,000 men, and 30 other nations would add up to 750 each. This would create a military force that the Security Council could deploy within 48 hours to maintain the peace.

In a February 1, 1992 speech to the UN General Assembly, President George Bush said: "It is the sacred principles enshrined in the United Nations charter to which the American people will henceforth pledge their allegiance."

In 1993, the UN became financially stretched to the limit, because of all the peace-keeping operations throughout the world (numbering about 70,000, they pay each country \$988 per soldier every month, and more for specialized troops), which forced it to cutback on travel, meetings and the use of consultants. While the U.S. is still paying about 25% of its annual budget of over \$1 billion, and about 30% of all peace-keeping costs, a move was on to force member nations to contribute a portion of their defense budgets to the UN. According to the January 16, 1996 *Washington Times* it was announced that "Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali ... urged the (UN) to consider imposing its own taxes to become less dependent on the United States ..."

We can expect one of two things to happen in the future. Either the UN will steadily grow in power until it evolves into a one-world government; or if perceptions continue that it has not lived up to expectations, it could be disbanded (perhaps if the United States would drop out) and replaced by an already burgeoning alliance, such as the WCPA. Walter Hoffman, the executive Vice President of the World Federalist Association, wrote in a letter to a national news magazine that we need "a new, more effective UN, one that will have the power to stop wars and arbitrate disputes between national groups". It seems likely that the strength of our economy may determine how soon our country agrees to become part of a one world government. If it continues to decline due to government mismanagement and manipulation by the Illuminati, it may not be long till we have to be 'saved' in order to survive, even if it is as part of a new world order dominated by a socialist political ideology.

[END PART 12A]

Gold and Other Interesting Things: Part 12

2/26/00—#1

CHANGE? ALWAYS THE SAME! IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER

... Little is said about the fact that some of the oppressed and incarcerated participants 14 years ago were incarcerated in the best hotels in Manila and, in general, nothing but show-and-tell happened—exactly as planned and orchestrated by the CIA. This was not only the most easily achieved coup in history—not to even mention “revolution”—but also it was that nobody really knew they had had either a coup or a revolution and STILL DON'T. Much like the Holocaust numbers, the number of people attending the revolution walk on the Palace 14 years ago keeps growing with each passing year and political circumstance.

The general overall comment is, however: “THE PHILIPPINES ARE IN WORSE CIRCUMSTANCES THAN EITHER DURING MARTIAL LAW OR AFTER,” AND THE ONLY MISSING PERSON FROM THE DASTARDLY POLITICAL CONTROL PUPPET-MASTERS IS ONE, FERDINAND MARCOS, WHO IS NOW BEGINNING TO LOOK PRETTY GOOD TO THESE CITIZENS. EVEN THE MARCOS FAMILY HAS NEVER LOST RESPECT, AS ONE IS A GOVERNOR OF A RATHER WELL RECOGNIZED PROVINCE, ONE IS A SENATOR AND ON GOES THE SAYING. EVEN IMELDA DID RUN FOR PRESIDENT IN THE LAST ELECTION AND WOULD HAVE WON—I MIGHT WELL PERSONALLY ADD—IF SHE HADN'T BEEN AGAIN HOG-TIED BY THE ABUSERS. FURTHER, I GO ON RECORD, PLEASE, AS RECOGNIZING THAT FOR THE NATION AS A WHOLE, MARCOS WILL BE THE RESOURCE FOR THEIR RECOVERY—AND LET US HOPE THIS TOO SHALL BE A BLOODLESS RESTRUCTURING AS FUNDS BEGIN TO FLOW BACK INTO THIS LAND.

With that in mind, let us please continue to put this manuscript to disk. Thank you.

[QUOTING:]

CHAPTER 32 THE SWISS CONNECTION

During the Second World War, the three big defenders of Roman Catholicism—Hitler, Mussolini and Franco—enjoyed concordats with the Vatican. One of them was then even known to have proudly stated, “I learned much from the Order of the Jesuits. Until now, there has never been anything more grandiose, on the Earth, than the hierarchical organization into my own party.”

Walter Schellenberg, former chief of Nazi counter-espionage, confirmed his *fuehrer's* statement: “The S.S. organization had been constituted by Himmler according to the principles of the Jesuit Order. [H: OUCH!] Their regulations and the Spiritual Exercises prescribed by Ignatius of Loyola were the model Himmler tried to copy EXACTLY. Himmler's title as Supreme Chief of the S.S. was to be the equivalent of the Jesuits' ‘General’ and the whole structure was a close imitation of the Catholic Church's hierarchical order.”

When World War II ended, the Vatican, after supporting the Nazi war machine, found itself jumping to the other side of the fence where General Eisenhower was. The reason was obvious: The Papal State didn't want its wealth included in the “Black Eagle” category, or it would face financial ruin.

By 1946, declassified intelligence reports revealed that Swiss banks had accepted gold looted from the national treasuries of Nazi-occupied countries and from dead Jews, too. In return, Swiss banks supplied the foreign currency that the Third Reich needed to purchase vital war material. They also financed foreign intelligence operations by providing funds for

German front companies in Spain and Portugal.

“Switzerland was neutral,” wrote Adam LeBor, author of the explosive book *Hitler's Secret Bankers*, “but it was an ambiguous, expedient kind of neutrality, which, like most foreign policies, was ultimately based far more on national self-interest than adherence to any abstract, let alone moral, principle.” Thus, it was not surprising to see descendants of Holocaust victims having a difficult time recovering their parents' wartime deposits.

“Money is the god of Swiss bankers,” said Katalin Csillage, a Hungarian Jew seeking reparation for her family's wealth deposited in a Swiss bank. And this, according to researchers like LeBor, has always been the real reason behind the “myth of Swiss neutrality”.

LeBor, whose findings have been based on extensive research employing several types of sources, could probably be of valuable assistance to Philippine authorities. We need someone as thorough as LeBor to help us recover the Marcos Gold Haul. Ours could prove to be a more difficult task than that of the Holocaust survivors and their descendants. We do not have an Edgar Bronfman and a World Jewish Congress to pressure the Swiss bankers to agree to return the Marcos fortune back to the Philippines. Moreover, what we are trying to recover was once part of the “Vatican Billions”.

[H: WHY WOULD YOU WANT TO “FORCE” THE ASSETS OF MARCOS TO BE TAKEN BY MORE FORCE AND RETURNED TO ANYWHERE? WHY DO YOU NOT JUST DO IT CORRECTLY AND ALLOW THE MARCOS FUNDS TO BE OPENLY USED AND BASED ON GOLD, SO THAT ALL CAN GROW AND THE MAN'S NAME CAN BE CLEARED? MUST MAN ALWAYS TURN TO “FORCE” TO ACCOMPLISH HIS DEEDS? DO YOU WANT A BETTER WORLD OR DO YOU WANT ENDLESS WARS AND CONTROL BY FORCE? IN EVERY INSTANCE, MARCOS SET UP THE VERY WAY TO RECLAIM THE ASSETS, AS IN FUNDS, AND IN THE GOLD-COLLATERAL HOLDINGS OF WEALTH. HE LITERALLY BUILT IN THE VERY LEGAL MEANS BY WHICH THIS CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED AND WE OFFER THE TOOLS WITH WHICH IT CAN BE EASILY ACCOMPLISHED. SO BE IT.]

We could and should have actually undertaken this right after the EDSA People Power cum military mutiny in 1986. At that time, the world had fully accepted and recognized Cory Aquino's takeover of government but what went wrong? Instead of the expected full recovery of the Marcos accounts, some of the key people in Cory's Cabinet went as far as conniving with the Marcos cronies, thus, enriching themselves while in power. To make matters worse, the cause-oriented leaders and the leftists metamorphosed into *nouveau-riche* and cash-oriented groups, their “left” pockets full of pieces of the action.

In fairness to the Ramos Administration, despite the non-cooperation of the Marcos family, President Fidel Ramos, through his trusted lieutenants National Security Adviser Jose Almonte and PCGG Chairman Magtanggol Gunigundo, opened a can of worms through the initial transfer of more than U.S.\$300 million from Switzerland to the PNB (Philippine National Bank). And has it ever crossed your mind that despite our huge debt, the IMF has allowed us to successfully exit from IMF bondage in March 1998? What could have been the irresistibly convenient *QUID PRO QUO* with the banking mafia?

Are the Swiss bankers, Swiss Guards and, by extension, Switzerland itself, interlocked? Why do papal guards traditionally come from Switzerland? Are they part of the services offered by the financial oligarchy which is secretly in control of the world's wealth?

In 1983, Chick Publications of California published the following information which, according to Jack T. Chick, appeared on the pages of *Avro Manhattan's* *Vatican Billions*. It read:

“The Vatican has large investments with the Rothschilds of Britain, France and America, with the Hambros Bank, with the Credit Suisse in London and Zurich. In the United States, it has large investments with the Morgan Bank, the Chase-Manhattan Bank, the First National Bank of New York, the Bankers Trust Company and others. The Vatican has billions of shares in the most powerful international corporations such as Gulf Oil, Shell, General Motors, Bethlehem Steel, General Electric, International Business Machines, TWA, etc.

“The Vatican's treasure of solid gold bars has been estimated by the *United Nations World Magazine* to amount to several billion dollars. A large bulk of this is (now) stored with the U.S. Federal Reserve Bank, while banks in England and Switzerland hold the rest. But this is just a small portion of the wealth of the Vatican which, in the U.S. alone, is greater than the five wealthiest corporations of the country.

“The Catholic Church is the biggest financial power, wealth accumulator and property owner in existence. She is a greater possessor of material riches than any other single institution, corporation, bank, giant trust, government or state of the whole globe. The Pope, as the visible ruler of this immense amassment of wealth, is consequently the richest individual of the Twentieth Century. No one can realistically assess how much he is worth in terms of billions of dollars.”

This explains why Pope John Paul II is forced to ride in bulletproof “popemobiles” each time he travels. This also spells out the reason why, while even in his home, he is still guarded and surrounded by UZI-wielding Swiss Guards.

There is a definite connection to all the events which led to Marcos' ouster from power. His tampering with the “Vatican Bullion” incurred the ire of the Vatican. It is no secret that Cardinal Jaime Sin and his Jesuit propagandists had been specifically sent by John Paul II to “punish” Marcos for running away with Peter's Pence. [H: I happen to think it rather nice that “Peter” can assist in reclaiming his “pence”!]

Some may surely ask: If the Vatican enjoys a Swiss connection, why can't Rome get its lost fortune directly from the Swiss bankers?

“Insulated by decades of political neutrality and historical isolation, buttressed by the massive amounts of the world's questionably-acquired wealth that still lies in the Swiss banks' vaults, the bankers didn't understand why they should have to answer questions from anybody, let alone from claimants without the proper paperwork,” LeBor explained. “Rules were rules; that was how Swiss banks had always operated and that is how they always would.”

As of this writing, the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines (CBCP) has suddenly announced its concurrence with President-elect Joseph Ejercito's [Estrada's] decision to bury Marcos “with full military honors befitting a hero”. Perhaps a deal has been struck between the heirs of the late head-of-state and the Vatican, or with F.M.'s Umbrella foundation.

CHAPTER 33 FVR AND THE “ROLEX 12”

President Fidel V. Ramos and the so-called “Rolex 12” certainly knew about the sale of the Marcos gold. This is the gist of the story written by Donna S. Cueto of the *Philippine Daily Inquirer* on October 2, 1997. “President Ramos was informed of the Marcos gold accounts, valued at at least \$13 billion, and (he) knew of the movements of the laundered \$466 million gold account at a Swiss bank up to August this year,” wrote Cueto.

Derisively called the “Rolex 12” for having helped to implement Martial Law, and rewarded with the expensive watches were: Juan Ponce Enrile [H: Who, now “caught” in the intrigue, claims that “the watch was only a replica”], General Romeo Espino, Major General

Fidel Ramos [**H: Yes, the same as became President.**], Major General Jose Rancudo, Admiral Hilario Ruiz, Major General Fabian Ver, Colonel Ignacio Paz, General Tomas Diaz, Colonel Alfredo Montoya, Colonel Romeo Gatan, Ambassador Danding Cojuangco, and Major General Rafael Zagala.

According to sources and letters obtained by the *Inquirer*, close aides of Mr. Ramos had been secretly in touch with Reiner Jacobi, PCGG's discredited operative. In fact, the latter even sent two letters to FVR summarizing the movements of the Marcos assets. This information virtually belied claims by the Government that it had excluded Jacobi in its efforts to recover the Marcos gold.

In his initial letter to the President, Jacobi sought compensation for his work in the elusive search for the Marcos gold which began in 1988 in a secret mission code-named *Operation Domino*. It was only recently, however, that Jacobi succeeded in obtaining the Marcos' coded accounts of their gold bullions. *Inquirer* sources said that Jacobi passed on the information to the Philippine Government on May 27, 1997. "The laundering of at least \$466 million of the Marcos gold accounts was done at the Bank Julius Baer & Co., Ltd., from June 28 to July," stated Cueto in the same article.

In seeking payment for his sleuthing, Jacobi said in his first letter, "For too long, my family's interest has come second only to the protection of the national interest of the Philippines. For too long, I have risked my personal safety through my various travels, through periods of incarceration in three different countries for crimes I did not commit, ultimately costing me and my wife the life of one of our children, all in the name of national interest ... I hope you can see your way clear to understand that my own agenda is now limited to the protection of the future of my five children and my wife."

[H: I wonder how many of you readers wonder how many times Ekkers have reached this very point of choices along this journey in behalf of Truth and Freedom? I also remind you that everything available—including the DEATH OF A CHILD—has been presented to STOP them, and this does not even reflect the "STOP EKKERS AT ALL COSTS" OF SOME "ORACLE" WHO WORKS FOR SPECTRUM CRIMINALS. AH, INDEED, THE PRICE OF TRUTH AND FREEDOM IS EXPENSIVE, INDEED, AND—SINCE MANKIND'S CREATION—IT HAS BEEN THAT MANY HAVE PAID THIS ULTIMATE PRICE TO BRING TRUTH. Is it not time to pay attention toward your own individual position?]

Jacobi's first letter to President Ramos, dated July 18, 1997, was sent through PCGG Chairman Gunigundo. The second letter, dated August 8, 1997, was sent directly to the Office of the President in Malacanang. It was acknowledged to have been received by the President's Office on August 11 at one-thirty in the afternoon.

"Attached is a summary of the movements of the Marcos assets that I described in earlier reports to the Chairman (Gunigundo)," Jacobi wrote in the second letter. "Said movements took place over the last two months and point to a systematic operation to sell gold bullion assets in their (the Marcoses') name, while at the same time engaging in money-laundering operations with respect to the cash accounts."

Jacobi told FVR that he had supplemented his intelligence report dated February 28, 1997 concerning the Sandy Foundation, the dummy corporation created by Marcos, which controlled the Marcos Swiss deposits and the gold accounts.

The documents, Jacobi said, were entitled "Legal Intelligence Assessment Re: Marcos *Operation Domino*", which he claimed to have submitted to President Ramos through Gunigundo, together with a report by a certain Dr. Chalkin dated September 30, 1996, concerning *Oplan Domino*. This second report was reportedly sent to the President through the Office of the Ombudsman sometime in 1996. Under U.S. and Swiss laws, money laundering

is a crime. With his discovery of the laundered accounts, which Jacobi placed at \$500 million, the PCGG operative is entitled to a 10 percent reward, as promised. "While admittedly, the sum represents an amount only in excess of \$50 million, it is better than nothing at this point in time," Jacobi wrote FVR on July 18.

In her published story, Cueto revealed that Jacobi received no response to his letters. Neither did the Philippine Government stop laundering despite the advance information on the money transfers. Instead, sources said, it was the lawyers of the victims of human-rights abuses who sought to stop the laundering after learning of it in August. "This could only mean one thing, the Philippine Government is a party to the transaction. If they are not with the Swiss Banks, why are they now helping them? The only way they would want to protect the Swiss is if they themselves are in bed with the Swiss," an *Inquirer* source insisted.

Cueto further added that this "collusion" enabled the laundering of at least 32 tons of legendary Marcos gold bullion, which human-rights advocates mistakenly placed at 1,241 tons.

Another mystery unlocked by the *Inquirer* was how, allegedly, the Swiss Banks, particularly the Union Bank of Switzerland (UBS) which handled the Marcos gold accounts, and the Bank Julius Baer & Co., Ltd., got hold of the witness, Peter Ritter, a lawyer and former Swiss Judge who handled the Marcos gold accounts. Ritter executed a memorandum for Robert Swift, the lead counsel in the human-rights class [-action] suit against the Marcos estate, spelling out in detail the Marcos gold accounts and telling of the supposed secret bank account reportedly of President Ramos in the same bank where the \$466 million laundered Marcos gold account was deposited.

Swift said he faxed the same memo to General Almonte, who he said must have sent it to the Swiss Government and eventually to the concerned Swiss banks, which were then able to locate Ritter. The banks, however, received an affidavit from Ritter saying that the memorandum he gave to Swift was forged.

"Swift suspected that top Philippine Government officials had a hand in this retraction," Cueto explained.

CHAPTER 34 IMELDA'S "TRUTH" REPEATED A THOUSAND TIMES

On November 9, 1990, *The People's Journal* carried the banner headline, "\$200 M from Meldy to RP". According to Yul Baritugo, who wrote the story: "After only four years and eight months of exile, former First Lady Imelda Marcos has agreed to return 60 percent of the Marcos family funds in five Hong Kong banks, in return for her country's dropping of multi-billion dollar suits against her in the United States."

Baritugo claims to have obtained his information from "a self-declared witness to the pact". The witness turned out to be Liberal Party (Young Turks) official Rey Fajardo, who claimed that Mrs. Marcos authorized then *Manila Bulletin* President Alejandro Roces to represent her in transferring the funds to the Philippine Government.

In his report to President Cory Aquino the day before the *Journal* came out with the story, PCGG's David Castro disclosed that the final deal would involve a 60-40 arrangement, including a 35 percent tax on all the Hong Kong accounts. Forty percent of the Marcos money would be transferred to unidentified "other parties".

"Fajardo said he witnessed the signing of the agreement between Mrs. Marcos and Castro in Los Angeles, California," wrote Baritugo. "Castro said in a press briefing later that Mrs. Aquino wants a 75-25 split of the Marcos money deposited in Swiss accounts."

The lawyers of Mrs. Marcos earlier offered to give the PCGG \$170 million from the Marcos money in Swiss accounts, but the PCGG rejected this since the offer would automatically nullify the claims filed by the Philippines now pending before various Swiss courts. "It's too silly

to consider," Castro said of the proposal. He told media reporters that the Zurich bank account of the Marcoses alone is worth \$340 million.

Castro admitted that the PCGG had no idea how much money was in the Hong Kong accounts, despite the fact that Fajardo presented documents to newsmen showing that the Marcos accounts were with the Standard Chartered Trustee, Ltd., Hong Kong-Shanghai Bank, Wing Lung Bank, Wing Hang Bank and the Bank de l'Indochine et Suez.

Seven years thereafter, then Representative Imelda Marcos (KBL, Leyte) still had not given the Philippine Government a single centavo of what she promised. Instead, she came out with a story confirming the existence of the Marcos gold "even used as walls of the family house in Batac, Ilocos Norte, in the 1950s".

[H: DON'T ANY OF YOU UNDERSTAND THAT SHE HAS NOT BEEN "ALLOWED" TO GIVE ANYTHING TO ANYBODY—PERIOD? IF THE IMF CAN CONTROL AS CLEARLY UNETHICALLY AND UNLAWFULLY AS SHOWN IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THIS WRITING, HOW DO YOU THINK SOME "MELDY" MARCOS COULD FIGHT "THAT" "CITY HALL"?)]

In her privilege speech in Congress, Mrs. Marcos was quoted as saying that she learned of the gold only after she and her husband arrived from their honeymoon in 1954. "Several of the walls were knocked down and the brick dividers were thrown in the backyard. When Ferdinand saw what I had done, instead of being gratified at my initiative, he was flabbergasted and asked what I had done with all those bricks," she said.—*Inquirer*, 14 October 1997, Martin Marfil and Cathy Canares.

Mrs. Marcos asserted that her husband started acquiring gold in 1946 but that it was only in 1954, shortly before the wedding, that she first saw the cache. She said that it was hoarded in a branch of the First National City Bank of New York located near Jones Bridge (Escolta) where Marcos opened a joint account.

She narrated how Marcos brought her to a vault inside the bank where she saw "piles of money and gold, from which he drew P30,000 for the wedding."

During their year-long honeymoon, Mrs. Marcos said that her husband held talks with international gold traders. She added that he bought more gold in 1957 and that they traded gold in succeeding years. As the price of gold soared from \$32 per ounce to \$700 in the 1970s, she said it netted them a "substantial profit".

To prove her fabulous tale, Mrs. Marcos informed the forum that two weeks prior to her privilege speech, several old men claiming to have taken part in the diggings approached her while she was visiting the mausoleum housing the remains of the former President. According to her surprise visitors, the spot where the mausoleum stood yielded gold!

For the nth time, Mrs. Marcos denied that the gold and her family's wealth were ill-gotten, claiming further that President Marcos even used the gold to invigorate the anemic Philippine economy in several instances, such as in 1983, after the assassination of Senator Ninoy Aquino.

This, she said, was confirmed by then Central Bank Governor Jaime Laya when he confessed to a U.S. court that he did not know who owned the dollars that began to flow into the country at the time. "And none shall ever know where those assets came from or how they got there, because Ferdinand, who made those calls in 1983, is dead. His lips are sealed by death," Mrs. Marcos said.

Corroborating his mother's statement, Ferdinand (Bongbong) Marcos, Jr. was quoted by the *Inquirer* as saying [stories of] the Gold Hoard allegedly stashed abroad "were based more on fiction than facts".

[END OF QUOTING, PART 11]

I do hope that you readers are beginning to really see that TRUTH IS SO MUCH STRANGER THAN FICTION.

Salu and good morning. Hatonn
dharmā ∴

NEVADA CORPORATIONS:

The Myth and Reality of Dividend Double-Taxation

Budget's "Tip of the Week" #13:

Getting Money Out of a Corporation Avoiding Double Taxation on Dividends

"You don't want to take income into a corporation because there is double-taxation on dividends." This statement is only partly true and a half-truth is almost always intended to mislead. The truth is that a corporation earns money on which it is taxed; then, IF it pays out a dividend, the dividend is taxable in the hands of the recipient. Perhaps a better way to express the truth of the matter would be: You don't want to pay dividends out of a corporation because they are subject to double taxation. But there are many other ways of taking money out of a corporation, so the real question is why you would ever take it out in the form of dividends.

The primary method for taking money out of a corporation is in the form of payments for services rendered. Any such payment is a deductible expense to the corporation, reducing its taxable income. At the same time, however, such a payment becomes taxable income for the recipient. You don't want to receive much income personally because in all likelihood you will pay more in taxes on income received personally than the corporation would pay in retaining that income itself. On the other hand, if an individual keeps living expenses moderate and takes out only what he needs, his personal tax rate is often not much higher than that on corporate income, resulting in an effective income split and reduced overall taxation.

Keep in mind that a corporation can pay wages to any number of persons for services rendered, so it can be quite practical to have your spouse or children on the payroll, as long as they do, indeed, provide some sort of valuable service. And before you dismiss the possibility of payments to your children, consider the potential value of intellectual property. Yes, a good idea for developing the business is compensatable as "intellectual property". No spouse and no children and still need some income splitting? Perhaps you could acquire or pay for the "intellectual property" of another private corporation?

Don't forget that a corporation may hold assets in the form of retained earnings. Without stating a specific plan of development, it is considered reasonable for any corporation to keep up to \$250,000 in retained earnings for future business development. Earnings may still be retained above this level without triggering the accumulated earnings surcharge prescribed by *Internal Revenue Code 531-537* provided there is a plan for expansion of the business (this could include, for instance, the acquisition of another business); for paying off debts; for product liability loss reserves; for supplying loans to either customers or suppliers to maintain the viability of the business; or for the need for increased working capital (say, to acquire additional inventory for the business).

CORPORATION SETUP AND MAINTENANCE FEES

Budget Corporation —includes:	Nominee Service	\$200
• First-year resident agent fee	Obtain EIN	\$ 75
• Corporate Charter	Bank Account Setup	\$100
• Articles of Incorporation	Expedite (24-hr. setup)	\$150
• Corporate Bylaws		
• Corporate Resolutions	Annual Resident Agent Fee	\$ 85
• Budget corporate record book	Budget Mail Forwarding (18 per yr)	\$ 50
• 3.5" floppy disk of resources	Full Mail Forwarding (240 pcs/yr)	\$150
TOTAL		\$410

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

Phoenix Source Online

email: GCHContact@OneMain.com
www.PhoenixSourceDistributors.com
-Published and unpublished Journals
- CONTACT back-issues



FAIR USE NOTICE:

This News Review contains excerpts of copyrighted material intended to advance understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, scientific and social justice issues. Such use is considered 'fair use', exempt from copyright laws as provided for in Title 17, Ch. 1, Section 107 of the U.S. Code.

(800) 800-5565

Phoenix Source Distributors

NOW AVAILABLE

Because we want you around to enjoy what's coming!



Turn back the clock on the aging process and enjoy the rejuvenating effects of better hormonal levels and balance. Look younger, feel younger and stick around a while for the FUN stuff ahead of us.

BACK IN STOCK! GET YOURS NOW!!!

For some 7 years over 100 Phoenix Journals were withheld from the public domain never having been published. We acknowledge Dr. Overholt for his efforts in collating the writings of Commander Hatonn into Journal format and are pleased to now be able to offer these Journals "as-is" until such time as others can apply the finishing touches (titles, indexing, etc.)

Free Download at:

www.PhoenixSourceDistributors.com

For the latest News on the

'DivinePlan'

unfolding from the Philippines:

www.GlobalAllianceAssn.com
www.TallanoFdn.com

YOU CAN CHANGE THINGS IF YOU WANT TO—OR YOU CAN SIT AND WAIT AND IT WON'T MATTER ANY MORE.—GCH, 8/30/91