

There Are No “Statute of Limitations” On FRAUD!

Part 1

This opening segment becomes our starting point in the understanding of legal terms that apply to crimes committed by the politicians and international bankster's that occurred just over a century ago in 1913. I am a student of history and have been writing on this very topic since 2000, in a monthly publication entitled "*The Truth Will Make You Free!*" I published a newsletter, and then it became a monthly magazine. It ended for lack of funds to cover printing, publishing, and mailing. If you want to read the most important books on this issue, I recommend two essential books on this matter: '***Creature From Jekyll Island***' by G. Edward Griffin and '***Secrets of the Federal Reserve***' by Eustace Mullins. Eustace Mullins' book can actually be read free on the Internet as a Pdf document here:

[http://www.eustacemullins.us/wp-content/works/Books/Eustace%20Mullins%20-%20Secrets%20of%20the%20Federal%20Reserve%3b%20The%20London%20Connection%20\(1993\).pdf](http://www.eustacemullins.us/wp-content/works/Books/Eustace%20Mullins%20-%20Secrets%20of%20the%20Federal%20Reserve%3b%20The%20London%20Connection%20(1993).pdf)

(If you want to watch a shorter version of this series, go to the Internet and pull up Aaron Russo's 2006 DVD "*From Freedom to Fascism*". This series will have much greater detail, including facts on the last chance for saving America and the restoration of Constitutional Law!)

The Federal Reserve Comes To Life or The US Gets a Central Bank 1913 USA

The Federal Reserve Act, also known at the time as the Currency Bill, or the Owen-Glass Act. The bill called for a system of eight to twelve regional Reserve Banks that would be owned by commercial banks and whose actions would be coordinated by a committee appointed by the President. The Federal Reserve System would be a privately owned central banking system. Bankers would run the twelve Banks and those Banks would be supervised by the Federal Reserve Board.

Official Version

The Federal Reserve Act was passed of December 23rd by a vote of 298 to 60. The Senate passed the measure 43 to 25. President Wilson signed the bill on December 23rd at 6 PM.

Unofficial Version

The bill had been shepherded through a Congressional Conference Committee meeting that was scheduled between 1:30 - 4:30 AM (when most members of Congress were asleep) on December 22, 1913. The Act was then voted on the next day and passed although many members of the body had left for the Christmas holidays and most others who stayed behind hadn't had time to read it or know its contents.

The Federal Reserve Bank – 105 Years of Deception

To most Americans, the notion of our government having been overthrown is the fodder of conspiracy nuts or the province of people out of touch with reality. However, not only do the vast majority of Americans have no clue our government was overthrown at the start of the 20th century, they also have no comprehension of the insane and exorbitant price we are collectively paying as a result.

America once truly was a land of freedom and opportunity, yet without our knowledge, everything changed upon the passage of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913. These changes were extensive in regard to how our government functioned, but from a citizen's point of view nothing major or important happened. This was no accident but instead, an important aspect of their plan. The changes Americans would experience came slowly at first so nobody noticed or became alarmed, but eventually Americans were put on the rollercoaster ride we live with today.

Almost all Americans know something is terribly wrong with our ship of state, but most of us have no idea what is wrong or how it can be fixed. As a result, we sit back and watch helplessly as the American dream crumbles and dies around us...



I focus your attention of this White House Oval Office picture of President Donald J. Trump. What do you see in this picture besides the President himself? The various flags of the five military branches, but symbolically as importance, a portrait of President Andrew Jackson!

The significance of this portrait is a profound symbol of the President's true agenda! President Andrew Jackson is the only president to ever have destroyed the bank, a Rothschild-central bank. Our greatest fear is in what happened when two later presidents attempted to do what Andrews Jackson achieved. Or it could prove to be an equal, if not greater, accomplishment for President Donald J. Trump.

On September 10th, 1833, President Andrew Jackson announced that the government will no longer use the Second Bank of the United States, the country's national bank. He then used his executive power to remove all federal funds from the bank, in the final salvo of what is referred to as the "Bank War."

A national bank had first been created by George Washington and Alexander Hamilton in 1791 to serve as a central repository for federal funds. The Second Bank of the United States was founded in 1816; five years after this first bank's charter had expired. Traditionally, the bank had been run by a board of directors with ties to industry and manufacturing, and therefore was biased toward the urban and industrial northern states. Jackson, the epitome of the frontiersman, resented the bank's lack of funding for expansion into the unsettled Western territories. Jackson also objected to the bank's unusual political and economic power and to the lack of congressional oversight over its business dealings.

Known as obstinate and brutish but a man of the common people, Jackson called for an investigation into the bank's policies and political agenda as soon as he settled into the White House in March 1829. To Jackson, the bank symbolized how a privileged class of businessmen oppressed the will of the common people of America. He made clear that he planned to challenge the constitutionality of the bank, much to the horror of its supporters. In response, the director of the bank, Nicholas Biddle, flexed his own political power, turning to members of Congress, including the powerful Kentucky Senator Henry Clay and leading businessmen sympathetic to the bank, to fight Jackson.

Later that year, Jackson presented his case against the bank in a speech to Congress. But to his chagrin, its members generally agreed that the bank was indeed constitutional. Still, controversy over the bank lingered for the next three years. In 1832, the divisiveness led to a split in Jackson's cabinet and, that same year, the obstinate president vetoed an attempt by Congress to draw up a new charter for the bank. All of this took place during Jackson's bid for re-election; the bank's future was the focal point of a bitter political campaign between the Democratic incumbent Jackson and his opponent Henry Clay. Jackson's promises to empower the "common man" of America appealed to the voters and paved the way for his victory. He felt he had received a mandate from the public to close the bank once and for all, despite Congress' objections. Biddle vowed to continue to fight the president, saying that "just because he has scalped Indians and imprisoned Judges [does not mean] he is to have his way with the bank."

On September 10, 1833, Jackson removed all federal funds from the Second Bank of the U.S. and redistributed them to various state banks, which were popularly known as "pet banks." In addition, he announced that deposits to the bank would not be accepted after

October 1. Finally, Jackson had succeeded in destroying the bank; its charter officially expired in 1836.

The Second Bank of the United States (1816-32)

When Thomas Jefferson (1801-09) became President he opposed the bank as being unconstitutional and when the 20 year charter came up for renewal in 1811 it was denied. Nathan Rothschild, head of the family bank in England, had recognized America's potential and made loans to a few states, and in fact became the official European banker for the U.S. Government. Because he supported the Bank of the United States, he threatened: "***Either the application for renewal of the Charter is granted, or the United States will find itself in a most disastrous war.***"

He then ordered British troops to "teach these impudent Americans a lesson. Bring them back to Colonial status." This brought on the War of 1812, our second war with England, which facilitated the re-chartering of the Bank of the United States. The war raised our national debt from \$45 million to \$127 million.

Jefferson wrote to James Monroe (who later served as our 5th President, 1817-25) in January, 1815: "*The dominion which the banking institutions have obtained over the minds of our citizens ... must be broken, or it will break us.*" In 1816, Jefferson wrote to John Tyler (who became our 10th President, 1841-45):

"If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issuance of their currency, first by inflation, and then by deflation, the banks and the corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children wake up homeless on the continent their father's conquered ... I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies ... The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government, to whom it properly belongs."

On May 10, 1816, President James Madison signed the Bill which created the second Bank of the United States. Inflation, heavy debt, and the unavailability of an entity to collect taxes were some of the reasons given for its re-chartering. The new charter allowed it to operate another 20 years, raised its capital stock to \$35 million, authorized the creation of bank branches, and the issuing of notes with denominations no smaller than \$5.00. *The new bank now had the power "to control the entire fiscal structure of the country."*

The bank was run by the Illuminati, through such international banker "front men" as John Jacob Astor, Stephen Girard, and David Parish (a Rothschild agent for the Vienna branch of the family). In 1819, the Bank was declared constitutional by Supreme Court Justice John Marshall (a Freemason), who said that Congress had the implied power to create the Bank.

Andrew Jackson Kills the Bank (1828-36)

People began to see how much power the Bank really had, and the voter backlash led to the election of Andrew Jackson as President in 1828. His slogan was: "Let the people rule." Jackson maintained: "If Congress has the right under the Constitution to issue paper money, it was given them to be used by themselves, not to be delegated to individuals or to corporations." Jackson said that the control of a central bank "would be exercised by a few over the political conduct of the many by first acquiring that control over the labor and earnings of the great body of people."

During the 1828 presidential campaign, Jackson said in an address before a group of bankers: "You are a den of vipers. I intend to rout you out and by the Eternal God I will rout you out." He went on to say: "If the people only understood the rank injustice of our Money and Banking system, there would be a revolution before morning." Jackson said that if such a Bank would continue to control "our currency, receiving our public monies, and holding thousands of our citizens in dependence, it would be more formidable and dangerous than the naval and military power of the enemy..."

After fiscal mismanagement by its first President, former Secretary of the Navy, Captain William Jones, the Bank was forced to call in loans and foreclosed on mortgages which caused bankruptcy, a price collapse, unemployment and a depression. However, the Bank began to flourish under its new President, financier Nicholas Biddle (1786-1844), who petitioned the Congress for a renewal of the Bank's Charter in 1832 four years before its current charter expired. The Bill for the new Charter passed the Senate 28-20 and the House 107-85, and everyone knew how Jackson felt. Biddle threatened: "*Should Jackson veto it, I shall veto him!*"

Jackson did veto the Charter, and abolished the Bank in 1832. He ordered the Secretary of the Treasury to remove all Government deposits from U.S. Banks and deposit them in state banks. On January 8, 1835, Jackson paid off the final installment on our national debt and it was the only time in history that our national debt was reduced to zero. At that time, we were able to accumulate a surplus, \$35 million of which was distributed to the States. Nicholas P. Trist, the President's personal secretary, said: "This is the crowning glory of A.J.'s life and the most important service he has ever rendered his country." The '*Boston Post*' compared it to Christ throwing the money-changers out of the Temple.

James K. Polk, the Speaker of the House (who later became the 11th President in 1845) said: "*The Bank of the United States has set itself up as a great irresponsible rival power of the government.*" The Bank continued to operate until 1836 and it was used by Nicholas Biddle to wreak havoc upon the economy by reducing loans and increasing the quantity of money.

Jackson became the first President of the United States to be censured which was done in March, 1834 "for removing the government's deposits from the Bank of the United States without the express authorization of the United States Congress." It is quite obvious that he did it because of the "abuses and corruptions" of the Bank and the censure was later reversed by the Senate in 1837. The Bankers continued their attempts to revive the Bank; President John Tyler vetoed two bills in 1841 that would have re-chartered the Bank of the United States.

In 1913, Congress made the Federal Reserve Bank the central bank of the United States. This name is the epitome of deception. First of all, because of the passage of the 17th Amendment, we no longer had a "federal" government. The 17th Amendment transformed our federal government into a national government. Thus, there was nothing federal about the Federal Reserve Bank. Furthermore, it is not an agency or a part of our government. Instead, it is a privately owned banking cartel accountable to no one other than the people who own it. The Fed is not a reserve of any kind and has nothing to do with reserves. Finally, it is not even a bank because no one deposits money with the Fed.

Illuminati Involvement in the U.S. Civil War (1840-1865)

In 1837, the Rothschild's sent another one of their agents to America. His name was August Belmont (real name, August Schonberg), a cousin of the Seligman family of Frankfurt, Germany. In 1829, as a 15 year-old, he started working for the bank in Frankfurt and proved himself to be a financial genius. In 1832, he was promoted to the bank at Naples so that he could be fully integrated into international banking. He became fluent in English, French, and Italian. His mission was to stir up financial trouble within the Southern banks. He ran a bank in New York City and established himself as a leading figure in financial circles by buying government bonds and later became a financial advisor to the President.

In 1857, the Illuminati met in London to decide America's fate. They had to create an incident which would allow the establishment of a Central Bank and that had to be a war since wars are expensive and governments have to borrow to pay for them. Canada and Mexico weren't strong enough, as evidenced by Santa Anna's defeat in Texas the year before. England and France were too far away, and Russia wasn't under their control. So they decided to "divide and conquer" by fomenting a conflict between the North and the South. The North was to become a British Colony annexed to Canada and controlled by Lionel Rothschild while the South was to be given to Napoleon III of France and controlled by James Rothschild.

In order to begin a movement that would lead to the secession of the South from the Union, the Illuminati used the Knights of the Golden Circle which had been formed in 1854 by George W.L. Bickley to spread racial tension from state to state using slavery as an issue. Wartime members included Jefferson Davis, John Wilkes Booth, and Jesse James (1847-1882, a Freemason, who after stealing gold from banks and mining companies, buried nearly \$7 billion of it all over the western states in hopes of funding a second Civil War). The Ku Klux Klan, formed in 1867, was the military arm of the Knights. The states which seceded united into the Confederate States of America which meant they maintained their independence and, if the South won, each state would be like an independent country.

Abraham Lincoln informed the people that "combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary machinery of peacetime government had assumed control of various Southern states." He had coastal ports blockaded to keep supplies from being shipped in from Europe.

The Rothschild's financed the North through emissaries August Belmont, Jay Cooke (who was commissioned to sell bond issues, arranging with Belmont to sell Union bonds in Europe), J. and W. Seligman and Co., and Speyer and Co.

Judah P. Benjamin (1811-84) of the law firm of Slidell, Benjamin and Conrad in Louisiana was a Rothschild agent who became Secretary of State for the Confederacy in 1862. His law partner John Slidell (August Belmont's wife's uncle) was the Confederate envoy to France. Slidell's daughter was married to Baron Frederick d'Erlanger in Frankfurt who was related to the Rothschild's and acted on their behalf. Slidell was the representative of the South who borrowed money from the d'Erlanger's to finance the Confederacy.

Towards the end of 1861, England sent 8,000 troops to Canada and in 1862 English; French and Spanish troops landed at Vera Cruz, Mexico supposedly to collect on debts owed them by Mexico. In April 1861 the Russian Ambassador to America had advised his government: "England will take advantage of the first opportunity to recognize the seceded states and France will follow her." On June 10, 1863 French General Elie-Frederic Forey with the help of 30,000 additional French troops took Mexico City over and controlled most of the country.

Through his representatives in Paris and London, Czar Alexander II in Russia discovered that the Confederates had offered the states of Louisiana and Texas to Napoleon III [of France] if he would send his troops against the North. Russia had already indicated their support for Lincoln but wanted something more to send their large navy to defend the country. As a gesture of goodwill, Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863 to free the slaves just as the Czar had done with the serfs in 1861. On September 8, 1863 at the request of President Lincoln and Secretary of State William H. Seward, Alexander sent the Russian fleet to San Francisco and New York and ordered them "to be ready to fight any power and to take their orders only from Abraham Lincoln."

Abraham Lincoln and the "Greenback" (1862-63)

Abraham Lincoln said: "The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of Government, but is the Government's greatest creative opportunity. By the adoption of these principles, the taxpayers will be saved immense sums of interest."

In February and March 1862, and March 1863, Lincoln received Congressional approval to borrow \$450 million from the people by selling them bonds, or "greenbacks", to pay for the Civil War. They were not redeemable until 1865 when three could be exchanged for one in silver. They were made full legal tender in 1879.

Thus, Lincoln solved America's monetary crisis without the help of the International Bankers. The London Times later said of Lincoln's greenbacks: "*If that mischievous financial policy, which had its origin in the North America Republic during the late war in that country, should become indurated down to a fixture, then that Government will furnish its own money without cost. It will pay off its debts and be without debt. It will become prosperous beyond precedent in the history of the civilized governments of the world. The brains and wealth of all*

countries will go to North America. That government must be destroyed or it will destroy every monarchy on the globe."

Bismarck, the German Chancellor, said in 1876 about Lincoln: "*He obtained from Congress the right to borrow from the people by selling to it the 'bonds' of States ... and the Government and the nation escaped the plots of the foreign financiers. They understood at once, that the United States would escape their grip. The death of Lincoln was resolved upon.*"

Before the Lincoln administration, private commercial banks were able to issue paper money called state bank notes but that ended with the National Banking Act of 1863 which prohibited the states from creating money. A forerunner of the Federal Reserve Act, it began the movement to abolish redeemable currency. A system of private banks was to receive charters from the federal government which would give them the authorization to issue National Bank Notes. This gave banks the power to control the finances and credit of the country and provided centralized banking under Federal control in times of war. The financial panic created by the International Bankers destroyed 172 State Banks, 177 private banks, 47 savings institutions, 13 loan and trust companies, and 16 mortgage companies.

Salmon P. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury (1861-64) under Lincoln, publicly said that: "*[My role] in promoting the passage of the National Banking Act was the greatest financial mistake of my life. It has built up a monopoly which affects every interest in the country. It should be repealed, but before that can be accomplished, the people will be arrayed on one side and the bankers on the other, in a contest such as we have never seen before in this country.*"

Lincoln said: "*The money power preys upon the nation in times of peace and conspires against it in times of adversity. It is more despotic than monarchy, more insolent than autocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country.*

Corporations have been enthroned, an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until the wealth is aggregated in the hands of a few and the Republic is destroyed ... I feel at the moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of war."

The Assassination of Abraham Lincoln (1865)

On April 14, 1865 Lincoln was shot by John Wilkes Booth and that same evening an unsuccessful attempt by his fellow conspirators was made on the life of [Secretary of State] Seward. In 1866, an attempt was made to assassinate Czar Alexander II and in 1881 the Czar was killed by an exploding bomb.

In John Wilkes Booth's trunk coded messages were found and the key to that code was found among the possessions of Judah Benjamin. Benjamin had fled to England, where he died. It was always known that Lincoln's death was the result of a massive conspiracy. However,

nobody realized how deep and far reaching it was. In 1974, researchers found letters describing the conspiracy cover-up among the papers of Edwin M. Stanton, Lincoln's Secretary of War. These were written to Stanton or intercepted by him. They also found 18 pages that were removed from Booth's diary revealing the names of 70 people (some in code) who were directly or indirectly involved in Booth's original plan to kidnap Lincoln. Besides Stanton's involvement in the conspiracy, Charles A. Dana, Assistant Secretary of War (a member of the Jesuit Illuminati), and Major Thomas Eckert, Chief of the War Department's Telegraph Office, were also involved.

Journals and coded papers by Colonel Lafayette C. Baker, Chief of the National Detective Police, detailed Lincoln's kidnapping and assassination conspiracy and subsequent cover-up. The plot included a group of Maryland farmers; a group of Confederates including Jefferson Davis (President of the Confederacy) and Judah Benjamin (the Confederate Secretary of War and Secretary of State); a group of Northern Banking and Industrial interests, including Jay Cooke (Philadelphia financier), Henry Cooke (Washington, D.C. banker), and Thurlow Weed (New York newspaper publisher); and a group of Radical Republicans who didn't want the south reunited with the North as states but wanted to control them as military territories and included Sen. Benjamin Wade of Ohio, Sen. Zechariah Chandler of Michigan, and Sen. John Conness of California.

All of these groups pooled their efforts and used actor John Wilkes Booth who was a Confederate patriot. The original plan called for the kidnapping of Lincoln, Vice-President Andrew Johnson, and Secretary of State Seward. The National Detective Police discovered their plans and informed Stanton. Planned for January 18, 1865, the kidnap attempt failed.

Captain James William Boyd, a secret agent for the Confederacy and a prisoner of war in the Old Capitol Prison, was used by the National Detective Police to report on the activities of the prisoners and to inform on crooked guards. He looked similar to Booth, and ironically had the same initials. Stanton had him released and Boyd took over the Northern end of the conspiracy which had been joined by the Police and the War Department. The [Northern group] wanted to kill Lincoln while Booth wanted to kidnap him and use him as leverage to get Confederate prisoners of war released.

Booth failed twice in March and then ended up shooting Lincoln at Ford's Theater [in April]. Boyd, warned that he could be implicated, planned to flee to Maryland. He was blamed for attacking Seward but he didn't. Boyd was the one who was shot at Garrett's farm, and was identified as Booth. The Police and Stanton discovered that it was really Boyd, after it was announced to the nation that it was Booth. The only picture taken of Boyd's dead body was found in Stanton's collection. The body was taken by Col. Lafayette Baker to the old Arsenal Penitentiary where it was buried in an unknown place under the concrete floor.

Baker and detectives Luther and Andrew Potter knew the case wasn't closed and had to find Booth to keep him from talking. They followed his trail to New York, and later to Canada, England and India. He was hidden by the Vatican and posed as a Swiss Guard protecting the pope. After a year posing as a Swiss Guard at the Vatican, he allegedly faked his death and

returned to the United States where he revealed his true identity on his deathbed in Enid, Oklahoma. The mortician who was summoned instead of burying the corpse had it preserved and it is still in existence today.

Baker broke off relations with Stanton who was discharged from the Army as head of the Secret Service in 1866. In his book, '*The History of the U.S. Secret Service*', Baker admitted delivering Booth's diary to Stanton in 1867. On another occasion, Baker testified that the diary was intact when it was in his possession. This means that Stanton did remove the pages to facilitate a cover-up because the pages were found in his collection. Col. Lafayette Baker threatened to reveal the conspiracy and was slowly poisoned until he died in 1868.

Andrew Johnson became President [after Lincoln's death] and issued the Amnesty Proclamation on May 29, 1865 to reunite the country. It stipulated that the South would not be responsible for the debt incurred, that all secession laws were to end, and that slavery was to be abolished. Needless to say, the Rothschild's who [had] heavily funded the South lost a lot of money. In addition, the cost of the support of the Russian fleet cost the country about \$7.2 million. Johnson didn't have the constitutional authority to give money to a foreign government, so arrangements were made to purchase Alaska from the Russians in April, 1867. It was labeled as "Seward's Folly" because it appeared that Seward purchased what was then a worthless piece of land, when in fact it was compensation for the Russian Navy.

In August, 1867 Andrew Johnson failed in an attempt to remove Stanton from office, and impeachment proceedings were begun against him in February, 1868 by Stanton and the Radical Republicans. Johnson was charged with attempting to fire Stanton without Senate approval, for treason against Congress, and the public language expressed was "indecent and unbecoming" as the nation's leader. Sen. Benjamin F. Wade, President pro tempore of the Senate and next in the line of Presidential succession, was so sure that Johnson would be impeached that he already had his Cabinet picked. Stanton was to be his Secretary of Treasury. The May 26th vote was 35-19, one short of the necessary two-thirds majority needed to impeach Johnson.

President James A. Garfield, our 20th President, also realized the danger posed by the bankers and said: "Whoever controls the money of a nation, controls that nation." He was assassinated in 1881, during the first year of his Presidency.

The best description which applies to the Fed is that it is a money counterfeiting operation for those who own it and this enables these people to harvest huge amounts of money from working Americans without giving them anything in return. In other words, the Federal Reserve Bank is a racket far worse than a Ponzi scheme or Mafia created con game. However, the tragedy of our situation is that the Fed is a racket which Congress made legal by voting it into existence. With it came "Fractional Reserve Banking".

Fractional-reserve banking evolved from the opportunity for all bankers to perpetrate fraud. Down through the centuries, under normal circumstances, it has always been observed that only a tiny percentage of depositors will claim their actual wealth at any one time. Thus the

temptation is for bankers to “lend” more funds than they actually possess; they are “lending” what does not even exist. This is “fractional-reserve banking” – the ultimate euphemism of banking and fraud.

Money is a medium of exchange and the study of its use is called economics. In days gone by, bartering was the order of the day. If you had corn and wanted wheat, and I had wheat and wanted corn, we would decide how much of one commodity was equivalent to the other and make an exchange on this basis. However, bartering is an awkward process because of the unwieldy items involved. Obviously, exchanges of goods would be facilitated if people used something less cumbersome as a medium of exchange such as gold or silver. If I grow wheat, by exchanging my wheat for gold this permits me to obtain other things conveniently when I want them. Thus hard to find metals like gold and silver became widely used mediums of exchange.

Once people started using precious metals to trade goods, the need to transform these metals into standardized amounts became necessary. This led to the development of rudimentary coins; whereby a ruling authority would weigh out various amounts of these precious metals and stamp them as to purity and weight. Once this practice became common, it was only a matter of time before coins took on their characteristic disc shape and were impressed with a mint date and the likenesses of important officials. With the development of coinage, a person could exchange the fruits of their labor for coins and use them to obtain other things when convenient. During good times, some people ended up with more coins than they needed. Thus they had to find a safe place to keep them. This brought the goldsmith into the picture.

Goldsmiths worked with precious metals and as a result, needed a safe or strongbox within which they would keep their supplies. Having this capability made sense for people to take their excess coins to the goldsmith for safekeeping. Upon doing so, the goldsmith gave them a written receipt for the amount of coins being stored. Soon people realized that instead of trading coins for the things they needed they could conveniently trade the receipts instead. Thus, paper currency was born and this blessing freed people from carrying bags of bulky coins when they went to market.

This rudimentary monetary system worked well in small agrarian economies, but as villages turned into towns and towns into cities, a need to borrow money developed and who was better positioned to loan money than the goldsmith. Not only did he have his own money on hand, but he also held other people's money which was sitting in his coffers doing nothing. Of course, if the goldsmith was going to loan other people's money, he needed to share some of the interest he earned with them. This was the start of modern banking. The goldsmiths were our first bankers. People would entrust their money to the banker/goldsmith and instead of paying for this service, he would pay them a share of the interest he received from loaning their money to other people. From a depositor's or borrower's perspective this made sense, was beneficial, and appeared reasonable. However, appearances can be deceiving and just how deceiving will soon be addressed.

If people are going to borrow money from a goldsmith, for obvious reasons, it would be far more convenient if the loan was made in paper demand notes instead of coins. However, the demand notes presently in circulation were for all the coins held by the goldsmith. How could the goldsmith issue demand notes on coins which he did not have? Being a clever fellow, the goldsmith solved his quandary by reasoning as follows: It was a rare occurrence when someone retrieved all the coins they deposited with me. Therefore, if I issued demand notes for more coins than I had, the chances are that I would always have sufficient money on hand to cover the notes which were redeemed by one or even several of my depositors. This line of reasoning made sense, so our enterprising goldsmith went out on the limb and adopted this practice. Upon so doing, fractional banking was born.

No one would be injured or hurt by this practice unless there was a run on the goldsmith's strongbox. Aside from this possibility, this development was a blessing to society. However, unknown to everyone else, it was a greater blessing to the goldsmith. In fact, it was so much greater that the goldsmiths became far wealthier than an average citizen. For every loan made by the goldsmith, the borrower had to pay the goldsmith not only the interest accrued by the loan, but also the total amount originally borrowed and this was true for every loan the goldsmith made. The borrower was happy because he was able to obtain something he wanted before he earned the money to buy it. The fact that this privilege also cost him the interest he agreed to pay did not dampen his enthusiasm. On the other hand, the goldsmith was far happier than the borrower. He was reaping huge returns from his loans and he was loaning money to every borrower in town. This state of affairs made the goldsmith very wealthy and it was this unconscionable wealth which positioned the goldsmith to hold sway over the institutions of society and in time, even over governments.

It is not right for one person to reap huge returns from someone else's labor while doing virtually nothing themselves to earn the money they receive. This is why usury was considered a crime for many early societies. In some places, the punishment for usury was death. While it is true that the borrower benefited from his loan, it is also true that until the loan is paid off, the borrower was an indentured servant to the lender. The lender owned a piece of the borrower's time and efforts. In effect, this made the borrower a part time slave to the lender. In olden days, such a state of affairs was considered to be wrong and immoral.

The Bible condemned usury: "***If you lend money to any of my people with you who is poor, you shall not be like a moneylender to him, and you shall not exact interest from him.***" -(Exodus 22:25). You will find nearly a hundred verses that speak to the evil issue of usury. The Roman Catholic Church had a problem with this, and chose to franchise money-lending to the Jewish House of Rothschild in 1823/24, by commissioning the House of Rothschild to be their "Fiduciary Agent". If you grasp what I am saying here, you will understand what it is that President Donald J. Trump is seeking to undo on behalf of the American people!

Throughout history, knowledge about the nature of debt and its creation was a mystery to most everyone. The bankers took great pains to keep things this way. They knew what a tremendously good thing they had going. Therefore, their first order of business was to insure nothing upset this applecart. This is why most governments have never addressed or come to

grips with this extremely unfair situation. The bankers were always there and more than willing to use their great wealth to persuade those in positions of authority to help keep their secret. Thus, concurrent with the advent of modern banking, we also have the advent of government corruption. These two things are inseparable and you cannot have one without the other. No one can honestly postulate that central banking by a private bank is a good thing for the citizens of a nation. However, many people do and because they do, it necessarily follows that either they are complete fools or feathering their own nest. There are no other possibilities.

Governments should own and operate their own central banking system. If a private company is chosen to provide this service, the government involved should set the interest rate used by this company. Furthermore, said company should only be allowed to keep the interest they earn from their loans. This interest will be a sufficient return on their investment to keep them in business and provide them with reasonable profits. The monies paid to retire the loan, which are windfall profits to the bank, should be surrendered to the government involved and placed in its general fund.

If this arrangement had been in place for the United States over the past 105 years, we would be blessed with everything we have today, but would not have a huge national debt hanging over our heads. Furthermore, there would be no need for an income tax and citizens would be able to keep and enjoy all the fruits of their labor. Instead, our elected leaders foolishly allowed the Federal Reserve to keep the windfall profits realized by creating credit. These windfall profits enabled the Fed to corrupt our government and many other key institutions of our society. These include corporations, educational institutions, the media, our entertainment industries, state and local governments, and of course, our Federal Government.

The following is a list of changes which would be to our benefit had Congress not passed the Federal Reserve Act:

- A tax on income and wages would not be needed
- The national debt would be negligible.
- The wealth garnered from establishing credit would finance government operations.
- Citizens would be able to keep the fruits of their labor.
- Inflation would be minimized.
- Depressions and major recessions would be eliminated.
- Only one member of a household would have to work
- People would be able buy things through savings.
- Credit card use would be optional.
- The work day and week would be shorter and people would be able to take longer vacations.

The above listed things are lost to us because Congress passed the Federal Reserve Act in 1913. Incredibly, the Fed has given us nothing in return for the sacrifices made by the people of this nation. In lieu of being a benefit to us, the Fed and its owners have brought us nothing but chaos, depressions, and war. They used our money to corrupt the major institutions of our

society and now they are using our military, resources, and money to corrupt the entire world. A good example is that of the Social Security Trust Fund. President's Bush (father and son) and Clinton borrowed the reserves of the Social Security Trust Fund, replacing it with IOU's in the form of Treasury Notes, to pay for the 17 years of wars in Afghanistan and Iraq

Our government – the one we lost – was special and something to be proud of. For the first time in history, a group of men came together, put their personal interests aside and established a new government designed to best serve and protect all those fortunate enough to live under it. The government created by the Founding Fathers embodied the loftiest of governing principles and because of these principles the United States of America became arguably the greatest nation in all of history. Not only did our citizens enjoy the highest standard of living in the world, we opened our doors to others and became a beacon for the oppressed and down trodden of other nations. Our government exemplified an ideal and it was for this ideal which so many Americans made the ultimate sacrifice.

If enough people become aware of this deception, all sorts of good things become possible. But unless we wake up soon, the future is going to be a living hell for our progeny. Unless we are prepared to make the same kind of sacrifices like those who went before us; unless we act as beacons for the oppressed and down-trodden and reclaim the ideals of our once-great nation, their sacrifices will have been made in vain — to our shame and dishonor.

Few Americans know anything about what is behind the events which have shaped our nation. Most of us assume that information provided by the mainstream news industry is the truth, however, on critical issues, we only get part of the story and a lot of important information is left out. This is done to deliberately shape our perceptions of events and our society's institutions. But what took place in June of 2016, with the announced run for the Presidency by one Donald J. Trump, was about to turn everything upside down. Before we go there, we need to understand the **FRAUDULENT NATURE OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT AND THE INCOME TAX** that is being exposed and hopefully overturned by President Trump. Recall the portrait on the wall in the Oval Office above. **This is President Trump's main goal!**

Once the Federal Reserve Act was signed into law by President Woodrow Wilson on Christmas Eve of 1913, then the **fraudulent** Income Tax Act followed. However, it was never legally ratified as the **(16th Amendment)**. Get this clear in your mind: **IT WAS NEVER LEGALLY SIGNED INTO LAW**. By that I am saying that the Income Tax Act was never legally ratified by the required vote to enact an Amendment to the Constitution. Thus, a crime of fraud was committed in creating the Income Tax! An Amendment to the Constitution requires a majority vote by **three-fourths of the States to ratify the amendment**. At least 38 of the 50 states must ratify the amendment to be enacted as Law of the Land. Once the states have ratified, each state legislature will submit an original copy of its ratification to the Office of the Federal Register.

The act establishing the income tax, passed in 1913 and is the most misunderstood piece of legislation in human history. This series is intended to cut through all the confusion about that law because in reality, there is no confusion in the law. The purpose is to quickly and

absolutely demonstrate the proper application of the income tax since its inception. In the Supreme Court decision that established the constitutionality of the income tax legislation, it clearly states in the very first sentence of the Opinion of the Court, delivered by Chief Justice White: "..., the appellant filed his bill to enjoin the corporation from complying with the income tax provisions of the tariff act of October 3, 1913." Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. Co, 240 U.S. 1, 9 (1916)

Notice the fact that Chief Justice White clearly and unequivocally identifies the income tax as part of a tariff act. By definition, **a tariff is a tax laid on foreign imports or activity**. Black's Law Dictionary tells us that a "tariff" is: "a schedule or system of duties imposed by a government on imported or exported goods. In the United States tariffs are imposed on imported goods only". A tariff is one form of an "impost", which is of course one of the three kinds of indirect taxes authorized by the Constitution in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, for the government to lay and collect. However, as a tax on foreign activity or on the importation of goods from a foreign country, a tariff clearly is not, and cannot be, legally or lawfully applied to the domestic activities of American citizens. Is there evidence of this limitation in the law?

In the Brushaber decision cited above the Court further tells us "2. The act provides for collecting the tax at the source; that is, makes it the duty of corporations, etc., to retain and pay the sum of the tax ..." Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. Co, 240 US 1, 21 (1916). Here, the Supreme Court clearly tells us that the scheme of the income tax, as provided by the tariff act, is that of a tax that is collected at the source, by third parties, identified as "corporations, etc." The entire scheme of the income tax as it was originally imposed, and as it is still actually established and imposed under the law, is described by the Court in this sentence. The Court identifies that "collecting the tax at the source," is how the income tax is actually imposed in the law because "The act provides...", and it identifies how the tax is to be collected and paid under the actual laws that were passed into existence, as it "...makes it the duty of corporations, etc. to retain and pay the sum of the tax...".

This "collecting the tax at the source" – through a legislatively created "duty... to retain and pay" is called "withholding", and is of course, what the income tax was really all about in 1913, and the legislatively created "duty" of the "corporations, etc.", referenced here by the Court, is defined in the law, and has been since the inception of this tax in 1913. Title 26 U.S. Code Section 7701(a)(16) clearly states "Withholding Agent. - The term "Withholding Agent" means any person required to deduct and withhold any tax under the provisions of sections 1441, 1442, 1443, or 1461." This is the complete and entire authority in the law to withhold (collect) income taxes under Subtitle A (Income Tax), and has been continuously since 1913.

This "Withholding Agent" is the entity defined in the income tax laws (Title 26 - Subtitle A) with the legal "duty" to "retain and pay the sum of the tax" as identified by the Supreme Court in the Brushaber Opinion, or re-stated – the duty to withhold the income tax at the source from all subject persons under the Subtitle A income tax authorities and mandates. The definition, and full legal powers, of the "Withholding Agent" are simple and straightforward. To understand the complete enacted authority to collect income tax at the source by withholding, all one need do is read the actual code sections invoked by the statutory

definition. The first three code sections, 1441, 1442, and 1443 which are cited in the definition of a Withholding Agent, each provide as follows: § 1441 Withholding of Tax on Nonresident Aliens, § 1442 Withholding of Tax on Foreign Corporations, § 1443 Foreign Tax Exempt Organizations. One should carefully note that the law authorizes the withholding of income tax only from foreign persons, and then remember that the Supreme Court says the income tax is part of a tariff act (imposed on foreign activity). Finally, the last code section referenced in the definition of a Withholding Agent, § 1461 Liability for withheld tax, states: "Every person required to deduct and withhold any tax under this chapter is hereby made liable for such tax and is hereby indemnified against the claims and demands of any person for the amount of any payments made in accordance with the provisions of this chapter."

Section 1461 says that the Withholding Agents are made liable for the payment of the income taxes that they have withheld from subject persons - who are all foreign. This is the only code section in all of the income tax laws (Subtitle A) where anyone is made liable for the payment of the income tax by a statute (law). And who is made liable by statute? The Withholding Agents are made liable for the payment of the tax - which they have collected from subject foreign persons. It is not the persons who are the actual subjects of the tax (the non-resident aliens and foreign corporations) that are made liable for the payment of the tax directly, it is the Withholding Agents that are made liable in an indirect fashion, under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The injection of this third party, the Withholding Agent, into the income tax collection scheme of collection at the source, keeps the income tax indirect because the burden to pay the tax is shifted from the tax collector (the Withholding Agent), to the subject foreign taxpayer. While it is the corporations, etc. who actually retain and pay the tax, the tax is only collected from foreign subject persons. Under the law the tax is collected by a third party, indirectly, and is not collected directly by the IRS, nor is the tax paid directly by the subject taxpayer - the foreign entity (or any other person), by a mandatory filing requirement imposed on the taxpayer. Nor is there any direct liability ever established in the name of the actual subject taxpayer by the statutes because none is necessary, as "the act provides for collecting the tax at the source". Under the actual provisions of the statutes, the income tax is collected by the third party tax collector, by withholding. And if they fail to withhold, it is the Withholding Agent that pays the penalty and interest under § 1463 which states: "If -any person ... fails to deduct and withhold any tax under this chapter,... this section shall in no case relieve such person from liability for interest or any penalties or additions to the tax otherwise applicable in respect of such failure to deduct and withhold."

This is all straight from the law as it exists today, and this agrees completely with what the Supreme Court wrote in its Brushaber Opinion in 1916: that the income tax is part of a tariff act under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, laid indirectly and collected at the source by withholding from subject taxpayers – who under the tariff, are of course, all foreign. The tax is laid in the original act, and still in the law today, as a tariff that is withheld only from foreign persons – because only non-resident foreign persons (aliens and foreign corporations) can be lawfully forced to pay a tariff on their activities in the fifty states.

Under the true scheme of the income tax adopted in the tariff act, and still captured and evident in the law today, the foreign entities, the non-resident aliens and foreign corporations,

are the actual taxpayers and subjects of the income tax, and the sovereign entities, the American citizens and corporations, are cast in the role of the income tax collector, and not as the subject taxpayers. All this information is documented in statutory detail, and more is revealed, at www.Tax-Freedom.com

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE 16th AMENDMENT

"...by the previous ruling (Brushaber, 240 US 1), it was settled that the **provisions of the 16th Amendment conferred no new power of taxation** but simply **prohibited** the previous complete and plenary power of income taxation possessed by Congress from the beginning **from being taken out of the category of INDIRECT taxation to which it inherently belonged..**" Stanton v. Baltic Mining Co., 240 US 103 (1916)

Article I, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution says:

"Representatives and **direct taxes shall be apportioned** among the several states which may be included in this union, according to their respective numbers..."

Article I, Section 9, Clause 4 says:

"No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, UNLESS IN APPORTIONMENT to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken."

Finally, the 16th Amendment **DOES NOT SAY** that the income tax is to be DIRECT. It says:
"Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

The 16th Amendment says that the income tax is to be without apportionment, BUT **IT DOES NOT SAY THAT THE TAX IS TO BE DIRECT.**

THE JUDICIAL TREASON EXPOSED

The inferior, lower court judges have TREASONOUSLY added that ON THEIR OWN, IN DIRECT CONFLICT AND IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION WITH THE EXISTING PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE I REGARDING DIRECT TAXATION and in direct contradiction with, and in rebellion against the controlling Supreme Court decisions on the matter.

It is erroneous to attempt **to replace by interpretation, the written provisions** of Article I with something not actually written in the 16th Amendment (or anywhere else in the Constitution for that matter).

Any judge that attempts to replace the controlling decisions, and the twice written provisions of Article I, with an interpretation of the 16th Amendment that attempts to transform the non-apportioned income tax into an allegedly direct tax fails to uphold the written provisions of Article I of the Constitution, as he or she has sworn to do.

It is not a legitimate application of the law, to use one provision of the law to completely destroy another of equal stature and standing.

Article I, section 2, clause 3 **EXPLICITLY PROHIBITS** the government from acting as they do – i.e. - to impose the income tax as though it were a direct tax that did not have to be apportioned. Every judge that alleges the 16th Amendment authorizes a direct tax, despite the fact that the 16th Amendment does not actually say that, despite the fact that the Supreme Court specifically rejected that reasoning, and despite the fact that Article I provisions prohibit that interpretation, commits at best, error, and at worst, treason and sedition, by ignoring and not upholding the actual written provisions of the Constitution as they have sworn to do, by attempting to replace them with his or her own personal (socialist communistic) interpretive opinions, not actually what is written in the Constitution.

These facts are confirmed by the Congressional Research Service.

Do The Courts Have Law Making Powers?

VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE

Finally, there is an even more obvious violation of the Constitution that is occurring – or rather, being committed by the IRS and the Judiciary. The 16th Amendment states in part:

"**Congress** shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income....

Under the current tax system and IRS operation there is a clear violation of the separation of powers clause of the Constitution. Specifically, the Constitution establishes three separate branches of the government, the Congressional, the Executive and the Judiciary. Each branch is given specific powers and responsibilities within the Constitution, and NO branch may exercise the powers of the other two branches. Briefly, Congress and the Executive cannot conduct trials – that is reserved to the Judiciary; the Judiciary and the Executive cannot enact Law – that is reserved to the Congress; and the Congress and the Judiciary cannot try to run the government on a day to day basis – that is reserved to the Executive. Now each branch also has other specific powers given to it, but the above is a very brief outline of the system of checks and balances created by the Founding Fathers to try and ensure that our government would never become too heavy handed or oppressive by exercising too much power against the citizens in an arbitrary or capricious manner.

Now, the I.R.S. is part of the Treasury, which is a Cabinet level position. And the "Cabinet" is part of the Executive Branch of the government – all appointed by the President. So, **because the I.R.S. is organized within the Treasury, it is formally a part of the Executive Branch of the government, NOT the Congressional branch.**

Now, while it may seem completely normal for the Treasury (in the form of the I.R.S.) to collect tax (that must be deposited in the Treasury) – **the income tax is explicitly ordered to be handled differently by the language of the authorizing (16th) Amendment**, which says:

"**CONGRESS** shall have power to lay **AND COLLECT**...

Congress must collect the income tax – not the executive branch of government.

Clearly, this Constitutional mandate is being ignored – it is not being followed. Congress lays the tax, BUT the Executive, NOT THE CONGRESS, is collecting it – **in clear violation of the specific language of the Amendment. It is a clear and obvious VIOLATION of the Separation of Powers clause for the IRS to try and enforce the collection of the income tax.**

The reason why this is so important is because by allowing the Executive branch to do the dirty work (collection & enforcement), CONGRESS escapes their ultimate responsibility for the horrors of what the system has become. You see – **we could vote the entire Congress out of office in just two years if the American People realized that it is Congress and Congress alone that is responsible for the tyranny and criminality of the I.R.S.**

By separating the two tasks (lay and collect) – **NO ONE BECOMES RESPONSIBLE** for the intrusions, thefts and travesties being committed by the I.R.S. Congress says – we just pass the laws – we don't enforce; and the Executive says – we don't make the law, we just enforce what we think it says. Each points the finger at the other (how convenient) and ultimately no one in the government is held responsible or accountable for the criminal trespasses committed against the citizens by the "system" in the name of tax.

Passage of the 16th Amendment (income tax) was very controversial and accountability to the American People, for both the level of taxation imposed, and the nature and tactics of the collection and enforcement operations was considered. Since Congress makes the law – they were tasked with the **ENTIRE OPERATION** of the income tax system, laying and collection – **NOT JUST LAYING THE TAX**. That way, it was felt, that if things got out of hand, the People could vote the collective Congress out of office in just two years and elect new candidates that had promised to change the (what had become over time) now oppressive tax collection operations. The I.R.S. uses their power of the "bully" pulpit to intimidate, coerce, create fear, threaten, strong-arm, terrorize, the American people to "voluntarily" pay unconstitutionally, an illegal tax, year after year after year!

By being allowed to un-constitutionally separate themselves from the collection operation, Congress has been illegally allowed to escape its ultimate responsibility (and total accountability) for the crimes being committed against the American People in the name of tax, in the form of the unlawful and tyrannical acts of the I.R.S. Meanwhile, they (Congress) spend all their time raising (taking) money from the corporations to get re-elected, too busy to care or help the average Citizens they are supposed to represent, who are caught in the bureaucratic, computerized, nightmarish misapplication of the law that the IRS calls tax collection.

And, surprise, surprise, the Judiciary does absolutely nothing to uphold the Constitutional requirement that Congress, NOT THE EXECUTIVE branch of the government, conduct and manage these tax collection activities –

The Law That Never Was

On January 10, 2008, the Federal District Court in Chicago issued a permanent injunction against Bill Benson on the grounds that by offering information demonstrating that the 16th Amendment was not legally ratified, he was promoting an abusive tax shelter. The Court then refused to look at the government-certified documentary evidence, deciding instead that the facts necessary to prove his statements true were "irrelevant."



What has America come to when the government we created to protect our rights can accuse us of lying and then prohibit us from presenting a defense in a court of law? . . .

During my working years I was audited by the I.R.S. three times, and I won my case in all three audits. I attribute my success to simply good record keeping, but there are other means by which one can defeat the I.R.S.

The Premise

The federal government rests its authority to collect income tax on the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution—the federal income tax amendment—which was allegedly ratified in 1913. We know that to be a total lie.

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration." —The 16th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America

After an extensive year-long nationwide research project, William J. Benson discovered that the 16th Amendment was not ratified by the requisite vote of three-fourths of the states and that nevertheless Secretary of State Philander Knox had fraudulently declared ratification. It was a shocking revelation; it reached deep into the core of our American system of governance.

The Discovery

Article V of the U.S. Constitution defines the ratification process and requires three-fourths of the states to ratify any amendment proposed by Congress. There were forty-eight states in the American Union in 1913, meaning that affirmative action of thirty-six was

necessary for ratification. In February 1913, Secretary of State Philander Knox proclaimed that thirty-eight had ratified the Amendment. He lied!

In 1984 Bill Benson began a research project, never before performed, to investigate the process of ratification of the 16th Amendment. After traveling to the capitols of the New England states and reviewing the journals of the state legislative bodies, he saw that many states had not ratified. He continued his research at the National Archives in Washington, D.C.; it was here that Bill found his Golden Key.

This damning piece of evidence is a sixteen-page memorandum from the Solicitor of the Department of State, among whose duties is the provision of legal opinions for the Secretary of State. In this memorandum, the Solicitor lists the many errors he found in the ratification process.

These four states are among the thirty-eight from which Philander Knox claimed ratification:

California: *The legislature never recorded any vote on any proposal to adopt the amendment proposed by Congress.*

Kentucky: *The Senate voted on the resolution, but rejected it by a vote of nine in favor and twenty-two opposed.*

Minnesota: *The State sent nothing to the Secretary of State in Washington.*

Oklahoma: *The Senate amended the language of the 16th Amendment to have a precisely opposite meaning.*

When his project was finished at the end of 1984, Bill had visited the capitol of every state from 1913 and knew that not a single one had actually and legally ratified the proposal to amend the U.S. Constitution. Thirty-three states engaged in the unauthorized activity of altering the language of an amendment proposed by Congress, a power that the states do not possess.

Since thirty-six states were needed for ratification, the failure of thirteen to ratify was fatal to the Amendment. This occurs within the major (first three) defects tabulated in Defects in Ratification of the 16th Amendment. Even if we were to ignore defects of spelling, capitalization and punctuation, we would still have only two states which successfully ratified.

Only two states ratified the 16th Amendment

If all of the above is insufficient for you to believe the 16th Amendment is Unconstitutional and a Fraud, then view the 2006 DVD “From Freedom to Fascism” produced by Aaron Russo. You can actually watch it free on the Internet here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O6ayb02bwp0> Over **803,838** have viewed it at the YouTube channel “*Liberty Patriot*”. The video is 2-hrs. 26-minutes long. You owe it to yourself to view this most important video confirming the Law that NEVER WAS! If you file any version of a form 1040 every April 15th, you need to view this documentary by Aaron Russo.

Aaron Russo produced the movie “*Trading Places*” with Eddie Murphy, “*The Rose*” with Bette Midler, and “*Wise Guys*” with Danny DeVito. It may surprise you to know that 67-million Americans do not file a 1040 anymore. Aaron Russo died August 24, 2007 at the age of 64. He had been invited to join the CFR (Counsel of Foreign Relations) by Nick Rockefeller. British writer and speaker, David Icke has stated that Aaron Russo told him a major event was going to happen eleven months before the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center, “*He was the one who told me eleven months before 911 ... happened that there was going to be an event, (he never told me what the event was going to be), but that there was going to be an event, & out of that event we would invade Afghanistan. ... [Then] we were going to invade Iraq to take over the oil fields & establish a base in the Middle East.*” Russo was an activist and planning on running for the governor of Nevada. He believed Rockefeller wanted to recruit him to the other side.

Eustace Mullins writes in the Preface of his book: “*In the fall of 1944 I went to the Library of Congress to get material for a newspaper article about the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. What I expected to be a week's labor turned into a lengthy research job of nineteen months, for I discovered, in my initial inquiry, that there existed not one narrative account of the origins and activities of this powerful organization. Consequently, the majority of my information was gathered piecemeal from a vast number of periodicals, ranging from popular magazines such as the Saturday Evening Post to the exclusive bankers' magazine, The Economist.*

The standard works on the Federal Reserve System, almost entirely abstruse and technical works on economics, I found of little practical value. Even in the matter of acceptances, the usual textbooks contained no information upon such an important item in America's economic history as the changeover from the open-book system of credit to the acceptance system, which has wrought such vast changes in our practice of commerce, and for this information I found only one source, a few pamphlets published by the American Acceptance Council from 1915 to 1928. It is, then, little wonder that the student with a Master's Degree in Economics from one of the better universities will see here for the first time material which should have been before him in his elementary courses.

The birthplace of the Federal Reserve Act, Jekyll Island, is now operated as a public park by the State of Georgia, but the tourist will find no plaque there commemorating the event. This is not so much an oversight on the part of the park officials as it is a triumph for the more than adequate publicists of the Federal Reserve Board, who have perpetuated the comfortable fiction that the Act was born in the halls of Congress, the product of the minds of Carter Glass and Woodrow Wilson. It is the writer's hope that this and many similar fictions will not long survive the publication of this work.”

It was one giant scam, a Fraud against “We The People”, and the government of the United States of America. As such, there is no “statute of limitations” if the effort was made to go back and expose the fraud and to prosecute those parties and individuals that personally benefited from the illegal Federal Reserve Act of 1913, or the Income Tax (known as the 16th Amendment) to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Our first point is to ask which cases do not have a statute of limitations. The law firm of Wallin and Klarich, a law firm in Tustin, CA provides a relatively easy to understand explanation for us here about the subject of statute of limitations. I will keep to the bare minimum of legal language, but to reveal this story requires an understanding of basic legal concepts.

Which Cases Do Not Have a Statute of Limitations?

There is no federal statute of limitations for certain crimes. A person can be charged at any time for the following:

- *Federal crimes punishable by death (U.S. Code 18 Section 3281)*
- *Terrorism crimes that resulted in death or serious bodily injury (U.S. Code 18 Section 3286)*
- *Sex crimes with a minor (U.S. Code 18 Section 3283)*

The Internet site “**Expert Law**” has the following to say on this issue:

When a crime is reported to the police, the police try to identify the person who committed the crime. Whenever possible the person is quickly identified, located and charged with the crime.

But sometimes there is a delay between when a crime is committed and when the person who committed the crime is identified or apprehended. The statute of limitations is a law that may prevent the prosecution of a crime if a criminal case is not filed within a specified time frame.

What is a Criminal Statute of Limitations

A criminal statute of limitations is a law that prevents the prosecution of older crimes, based upon the amount of time that has passed since the crime was committed. The statute defines a period of time after the commission of a criminal offense, during which the state must initiate a criminal charge. Once that deadline passes, the defense can seek dismissal of any charge that is filed by the state.

States did not pass statutes of limitations because they don't want people to get away with crimes. They created statutes of limitations out of a recognition that the passage of time makes it difficult to prosecute a case:

- Witness memories of the events surrounding a crime will fade over time
- Some witnesses may be unavailable by the time a charge is filed or can be brought to trial
- With a delay in prosecution, evidence may be lost or destroyed

Thus, with the passage of time, it can be very difficult for the state to successfully prosecute a case. For the same reasons, it can also be very difficult for a defendant to prepare a defense to a criminal charge, and it may be much harder for an innocent defendant to obtain evidence and testimony that would be required to defend against a charge.

When Does the Statute of Limitations Begin to Run

For most charges, the statute of limitations starts to run at the time a crime is committed. But that's not always the case. Possible exceptions include:

- **Sex offenses against minors:** Some states recognize that victims of sex offenses may delay reporting a crime and, particularly for younger victims. This may extend the statute of limitations to take that delay into consideration.
- **Fraudulent concealment:** For some offenses, depending upon the laws of the jurisdiction where the prosecution occurs, it may be possible for the prosecutor to argue that the statute of limitations started to run at the time the victim recognized, or reasonably should have recognized that a crime occurred. For example, an accountant may be able to hide embezzlement by issuing false financial statements to clients, causing a significant delay in the detection of the crime.

Statute of Limitations for Misdemeanors

The statute of limitations for a misdemeanor crime can vary considerably by state. Many states impose limitations periods of a year or two for a misdemeanor charge, and may have an even shorter limitations period for a petty offense or infraction. Some states have a single statute of limitations that applies to all misdemeanors and most felonies.

As a practical matter, even if the statute of limitations allows a charge to proceed, if a misdemeanor prosecution has not been commenced within a year of the time a crime is reported it is highly unlikely that a prosecution will occur.

Exceptions to the Statute of Limitations

Most states have statutes of limitations for felony offenses. These are more serious offenses that can result in prison sentences. A few states don't have statutes of limitations for any felony offenses.

Every state has crimes for which no statute of limitations applies. Typically, no statute of limitations is available for offenses classified as capital offenses: crimes that carry a potential sentence of life in prison or the death penalty. Some states do not have statutes of limitations for offenses such as kidnapping or serious sex offenses involving minor victims. There is no statute of limitations for treason or for federal terrorism charges.

A typical state may have a six year statute of limitations for most felony offenses, but have a fourteen year statute of limitations for sex offenses involving minors, and no statute of limitations at all for murder charges.

Exceptions to the Statute of Limitations

In most states, it is possible for a criminal statute of limitations to be tolled or extended, or for a prosecutor to take action to ensure that a later charge may be filed even if the offender is not identified before the statute of limitations runs out. Examples include:

- **Fugitives from Justice:** If a defendant flees to another state or nation to avoid prosecution, the defendant's period of absence from the state may extend the statute of limitations.
- **John Doe Indictments:** Under unusual circumstances, it may be possible for a prosecutor to charge a "John Doe" or unknown defendant for a crime, and to continue that prosecution against the person later identified to have committed the crime. For example, if a prosecutor has a DNA profile of an offender, the prosecutor might initiate a criminal charge against a John Doe defendant with that specific DNA profile, allowing the offender to be prosecuted based upon that prior indictment even if the statute of limitations would otherwise have run out.
- **Agreement:** Sometimes a criminal suspect will agree to extend the statute of limitations. Why would a suspect do that? If a prosecutor's further investigation might clear the suspect, but will file charges if no agreement is obtained, it can benefit the suspect to agree to extend the statute of limitations and allow the investigation to continue. Similarly, a defendant who may be able to get a charge reduction or dismissal based upon cooperation with the prosecution may agree to extend the statute of limitations to avoid being immediately charged and prosecuted for a more serious offense.
- **Prior Law:** Like any law, a statute of limitations may be changed. Sometimes a legislature will extend the statute of limitations for a crime. If the statute of limitations has not yet run for an offense under the prior law, the new, longer limitations period applies. However, if the time limit defined by the statute of limitations has already expired, even if that time limit is later extended the charge remains barred by the prior law.
- **Obtaining Evidence from a Foreign Country:** In a federal prosecution, the prosecutor may petition to extend the statute of limitations for the time it takes to make and resolve an official request through a foreign court or authority to obtain evidence located in a foreign country.

Statute of Limitations vs. Speedy Trial Rights

Although the idea of a statute of limitations may seem similar to the concept of a speedy trial, there is an important distinction, specifically, when the right begins:

- The statute of limitations requires that charges be filed within a specified period of time
- The right to a speedy trial requires that, once charges are filed, the defendant be brought to trial within a reasonable time

That is to say, the statute of limitations applies before charges are filed, and stops running when charges are filed. It is at that time, when charges are filed against a defendant, that the defendant's speedy trial rights may be invoked.

Also, speedy trial rights arise from a constitutional right to a speedy trial, as set forth in the Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and as also reflected in many state constitutions. There is no constitutional requirement that a state pass a statute of limitations for a criminal offense.

Statute of Limitations vs. Due Process Rights

There is no constitutional right to a criminal statute of limitations, even for the least serious criminal offense. But that doesn't mean that the state has the unlimited right to bring charges against an individual to start a criminal prosecution long after evidence is lost and memories have faded, and tell the defendant "tough luck for you". When the state does not initiate charges within a reasonable amount of time, the defendant may be able to obtain a dismissal of the charge based upon principles of Due Process.

A Due Process claim involves the assertion by a defendant that the prosecutor did not commence prosecution within a reasonable amount of time and that, as a result of the delay, the defendant's ability to present a defense is materially prejudiced -- that is, the ability to present a defense has been made more difficult as a result of the delay, to the degree that it has become unfair to place the defendant on trial. When asked to rule on a Due Process argument, a court will review all of the factors that the defense alleges to prejudice his or her ability to present a defense, and determine whether the prejudice is so severe that it is no longer fair to have the case precede trial.

The reasons why a delay in prosecution may unfairly prejudice a defendant are similar to the reasons to pass statutes of limitations in the first place. Witnesses may have their memories fade, become unavailable, or die before the case reaches court. Evidence may be lost or destroyed. The crime scene may have been dramatically altered since the time of the alleged offense, and may no longer exist.

In most cases, where a statute of limitations applies a court will find that it is consistent with Due Process to commence a prosecution within the statute of limitations. However it may be possible to raise a Due Process claim, if a prosecutor had the reasonable opportunity to bring charges at an earlier date and did not take action within a reasonable amount of time, and the defendant can show that the delay caused material prejudice.

The documents state that there is no statute of limitations on war crimes (as defined by the Charter of the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal of 1945) or crimes against humanity (as defined by the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal and the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide).

I will pause here with the essential point that there is no statute of limitations for crimes committed by elected political members of the government of the United States of America.

President Trump signed into law an Executive Order in December, 2016 that authorized the “claw back” seizure of assets of child trafficking and child sex crimes. On December 7, 2018, President Trump signed Bill S.2152 into law. The bill authorized restitution to victims of Pedophilia. President Trump re-authorized and signed an Executive Order on December 21st, 2018 that allows “claw back” procedures to retroactively “claw back” any financial monies gained through crimes against citizens of the United States of America. It was first issued as an Executive Order by President Trump on December 21st, 2017.

As of the end of December, 2018, there were 71,000+ sealed indictments that will be unsealed beginning on January 2, 2019 in Federal Courts across the nation. Prosecution will take place at Federal Courts in all 50 states where the sealed indictments are filed. Additional sealed indictments will be prosecuted under War Tribunals at Gitmo, Cuba. These will be the high-profile politicians and elected officials under the UCMJ – Uniform Code of Military Justice. The UCMJ is primarily the document that covers personnel in the various U.S. military branches; however, as it was revealed in the hearings of Supreme Court Brett Kavanaugh, it can apply to civilians as well. During those hearings, Senator Lindsey Graham, brought an interesting question up concerning the UCMJ’s coverage of civilians. It was Huma Abedin, Hillary Rodham Clinton’s personal assistant who initially handed the note to Senator Lindsey Graham at the beginning of his question session for Judge Kavanaugh. Brett Kavanaugh responded that he was familiar with the specific law, even quoting the case citation.

Most people would have missed the implications of Senator Graham’s line of questioning. Senator Graham’s curious questions addressed to Judge Kavanaugh on military tribunals for U.S. citizens was significant for several reasons.

Military tribunals in the United States are military courts designed to try members of enemy forces during wartime, operating outside the scope of conventional criminal and civil proceedings. The judges are military officers and fulfill the role of jurors. Military tribunals are not court martials. On September 5, 2018, during Day 2 of the Senate confirmation hearing for Supreme Court nominee Judge Brett Kavanaugh, Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC) asked Kavanaugh a series of compelling questions that seem to make a case for American citizens being subjected to military tribunals. Here’s my transcript of the Graham-Kavanaugh Q & A session:

Graham: So when somebody says, post-9/11, that we’d been at war, and it’s called the War on Terrorism, do you generally agree with that concept?

Kavanaugh: I do, senator, because Congress passed the authorization for use of military force, which is still in effect. That was passed, of course, on September 14, 2001, three days later.

Graham: Let’s talk about the law and war. Is there a body of law called the law of

armed conflict?

Kavanaugh: There is such a body, senator.

Graham: A body of law that's called basic criminal law?

Kavanaugh: Yes, senator.

Graham: Are there differences between those two bodies of law?

Kavanaugh: Yes, senator.

Graham: From an American citizen's point of view, do your constitutional rights follow you? If you're in Paris, does the Fourth Amendment protect you as an American from your own government?

Kavanaugh: From your own government, yes.

Graham: So, if you're in Afghanistan, do your constitutional rights protect you against your own government?

Kavanaugh: If you're an American in Afghanistan, you have constitutional rights as against the U.S. government.

Graham: Isn't there also a long settled law that goes back to the Eisentrager case (I can't remember the name of it)....

Kavanaugh: Johnson v. Eisentrager.

Graham: Right, that American citizens who collaborate with the enemy are considered enemy combatants?

Kavanaugh: They can be, they're often sometimes criminally prosecuted, sometimes treated in the military.

Graham: Let's talk about "can be." I think there's a Supreme Court decision that said that American citizens who collaborated with Nazi saboteurs were tried by the military, is that correct?

Kavanaugh: That is correct.

Graham: I think a couple of them were executed.

Kavanaugh: Yeah.

Graham: So, if anybody doubts there's a longstanding history in this country that your constitutional rights follow you wherever you go, but you don't have a constitutional right to turn on your own government and collaborate with

the enemy of the nation. You'll be treated differently. What's the name of the case, if you can recall, that reaffirmed the concept that you can hold one of our own as an enemy combatant if they were engaged in terrorist activities in Afghanistan. Are you familiar with that case?

Kavanaugh: Yes, Hamdi [v. Rumsfeld].

Graham: So the bottom line is on every American citizen to know you have constitutional rights, but you do not have a constitutional right to collaborate with the enemy. There is a body of law well developed long before 9/11 that understood the difference between basic criminal law and the law of armed conflict. Do you understand those differences?

Kavanaugh: I do understand that there are different bodies of law, of course, senator.

What Senator Lindsey Graham was providing is video-taped testimony from Judge Brett Kavanaugh and the Senator from South Carolina reiterating that there is a longstanding history in this country that your constitutional rights follow you wherever you go, but you don't have a constitutional right to turn on your own government and collaborate with the enemy of the nation. You'll be treated differently if that latter is found to be the case.

It is this brief bit of testimony that was exchanged between the then Supreme Court Justice-elect and Senator Lindsey Graham that will provide a clear basis for the prosecution of former and present members of the U.S. Government, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. It will be used to prosecute those who are indicted and then transferred to Guantanamo Bay detention camp in Cuba for war crime tribunals. The former Arizona Senator John McCain and President George H. W. Bush signed confessions of various crimes and were tried and convicted of war crimes against the State. It is reported that \$10-trillion dollars of stolen assets by former president George H.W. Bush, were "claw backed" confiscated for return to the U.S. Treasury. The two were executed by lethal injection and given funeral services so as to protect the innocent and retain family dignity. The recouped \$10-trillion dollars will make a huge dent into the National Debt of \$22-trillion dollars, mostly owed to Rothschild-banks, who own the shares of the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve Act had a provision stating that shares could never be sold outside of the original owners, i.e., the Crown, the Vatican, and the Rothschild banks.

In this case, we have been under a state of war against Terrorism since a few days following the 9/11 attacks. The attack against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon took place on September 11, 2001. \$250-billion dollars of "Brady" Bonds had been stolen by the George H.W. Bush crime family; and, these bonds were set to mature on September 12, 2001. I recall that they were in the vaults of World Trade Center #2, and were destroyed in the aftermath of the twin towers destruction.

Trump's Executive Order for Military Tribunals

So as to give you some clarity to Trump's Executive Order pertaining to Military Tribunals, this summation will help readers grasp what we are looking at in the coming days and weeks.

What does Trump's new Executive Order published on March 1, 2018 mean? It gives new powers to the Department of Defense by allowing civilian courts and lawyers to be used to augment military staff during military tribunals. It also alludes to the current law allowing Martial Law to be declared during times of National Emergency or during any threat to National Security. We are already declared, via Executive Orders, to be in a state of National Emergency. Are we going to have military tribunals of US civilians? Is this akin to Martial Law?

For the first time in history, experienced civilians are going to take part in the U.S. Military court-martial process—thus clearing a path for mass “Deep State” arrests whose trials and sentencing would not impact the normal flow of the US Military justice system.

This is not a rumored 71,000+ sealed indictments, and, they have been served against pedophiles and corrupt politicians. The Gitmo housing was expanded by 13,000 beds as related in the US budget, at a cost of a couple hundred million dollars.

What does Trump's Executive Order mean? It means that all Hillary funds, laundered through the Clinton Foundation, will be confiscated. The web site '*DC Clothsline*' reported on December 31st, 2018, the names of 50 other crime front groups/organizations of the Clinton family! She and Bill accepted deposits from African dictators known for their human rights abuses. All George Soros funds will be confiscated. Any Saudi funds on U.S. soil that the King cannot access will be confiscated. U.S. politicians known to be padding their pockets with drug money will find this confiscated, and that included George H.W. Bush, the drug Kingpin.

The frenzy to remove Trump from power has many sources. The criminal Clinton cabal has been double dealing the public for years, and money buys a lot of allegiances. If the public had been privy to the secret trials conducted by Marine Corps General Joseph Dunford last year, they would have been horrified. Selling 20% of the US uranium rights for \$145 million while Hillary was Secretary of State was just the tip of the iceberg. The Clinton Foundation, wherein only 5% went to actual charities, was a massive money laundering machine. Hillary is technically under house arrest now. She may be hiding an ankle bracelet monitor. Senator John McCain, wore an orthopedic boot to hide his ankle bracelet monitor. In fact, there are pictures of him on the Internet where he was wearing alternating leg boots as if he did not know which leg to put his boot on.

But what of the period between March 1 and the point in time when the official status of the Junta is admitted? During this time and ongoing in the present, Military Tribunals are in effect, confiscating drug money and payoffs so they cannot go into the pockets of the Bush/Clinton/Soros/Netanyahu cabal. Pedophile blackmail material is being confiscated. Trump's March 1, 2018 Executive Order covers that problem by stating that the time frame between March 1 and the end of 2018 should likewise be covered. So we are to assume that

the Junta expects its official status to be made public by this time. In December of 2018, President Trump re-authorized his Executive Order, thus dealing with the issue of 2019.

What was astonishing was that none of what is termed the Major Media brought this up as a topic nor discussed this among their talking heads. Not CNN, not Fox News, not MSNBC, not RT – none of them.

In Part 2 of this series we continue to examine the evidence linking the Bush Crime Family of George H.W. Bush to the crimes of 9/11. Anonymous American Patriots posted the story of the Bush crimes on “The Millennium Report” shared in Part 2 of this story of the century. There are other sources on the whole story on 9/11! More to share!

God promised that evil deeds would be exposed in the last days. I have been doing a separate series on the topic: *“God Promised to Expose Evil in the Last Days!”* Two passages that speak volumes to this puzzle more than others are Luke 12:2 and Luke 8:17.

- ◆ Luke 12:2 reads: ***“Nothing is covered up that will not be revealed, or hidden that will not be known.”*** (ESV)
- ◆ Luke 8:17 reads: ***“For nothing is hidden that will not be made manifest, nor is anything secret that will not be known and come to life.”*** (ESV)

These two passages and a few others have for decades begged the larger question concerning how this would be manifested. I have been noting this revealing of evil for about a decade, and it seems to be increasing daily. It is just as Scripture predicted, coming to pass and being exposed! But for several reasons the nation faces the potential of a “False Flag” even in 2019. The web site “All News Pipeline” posted this report below on Thursday, December 27, 2018.

Expect A 9/11 Style False Flag In 2019 To Push Us Into World War III As The Globalists Revolt Against 'Peace'

- 'The Deep State Needs Perpetual War To Survive'
By Stefan Stanford - All News Pipeline - Live Free Or Die

If anybody else had noticed the very strange bedfellows that President Trump's recent announcement of troop withdrawals from Syria and Afghanistan has created, you're not the only ones.

While California Democratic Representative Ted Lieu had not long ago proclaimed that he'd love to regulate the speech of Americans but the 1st Amendment prevents him from doing so, he also praised President Trump for his Syria troop withdrawal while taking a shot at Barack Obama, saying that neither administration had an '*end state*' in mind for Syria nor a winning strategy.

With Democrat Lieu joining Kentucky Senator Rand Paul who thanked President Trump for having the courage to do what needed to be done, Lieu's and Paul's remarks stand in stark contrast to Republican (in name only) Representative Marco Rubio who slammed President Trump's decision to pull troops out of Syria, saying "*whoever advised him has done a great disservice to the country.*"

With Rubio also claiming that POTUS Trump "*has put the US at risk by his decision*" while Republican Senator Lindsey Graham claims the decision to remove troops from Afghanistan "*could be paving the way toward a 2nd 9/11*", we'll absolutely agree with ANP reader David Galvin who left the following comment on this December 21st ANP story:

"First, expect a 9/11 type of false flag in 2019 since Trump is bringing troops home from the Middle East. The Deep State needs perpetual war to survive. 2019 gonna be wild."

ANP reader 'Master of Reality' responded to David with the following comment:

Yea we overdue for a giant false flag from hell. I figure they gonna nuke us this time, and want double taxes, to protect us.



And while President Trump friend and confidant Roger Stone recently told Infowars that he believes that the deep state will attempt to assassinate President Trump to put an end to 'peace' breaking out around the world as heard in the 2nd video below, others have warned that the Democrats will continue to hound President Trump and his agenda throughout 2019 with impeachment talk absolutely on the table.

Yet as we see in the meme below, this demon-cratic party and deep state attack upon President Trump and his agenda to put an end to the globalists maddening wars is nothing less than an all-out deep state attack upon tens of millions of Americans who voted for President Trump and hoped beyond hope that he'd finally put an end to the madness that had gone on for far too long already.

As Zero Hedge reported in this recent story, for pulling US troops out of Syria, "*Donald Trump is being portrayed as something eerily close to the antichrist. That truly is the world on its head. Bringing troops home to their families equals chaos...*" Truth is treason in the empire of lies and those who stand against the globalists eternal war agenda demonized.



And as Mac Slavo reports in this new story over at "SHTFPlan", according to a currently jailed Russian businessman, an actual 'revolution' in America is now all but inevitable with the globalists stopping at nothing to take Trump down.

Echoing comments made several years ago by Russian Professor and political scientist Igor Panarin that the US was sure to 'disintegrate' at some point in the future, with the Western states of California, Nevada, Washington and several others falling to China while most of the East coast joined the European Union and much of the Midwest joining Canada while Alaska joined Russia and the Southern states joined Mexico, Viktor Bout's new warning should not be dismissed. And Bout's warning from Slavo's story also echoes recent remarks by President Trump that America is falling to tyranny:

"Regarding my innocence – to whom I can prove it? To what system? Look at what is happening in the United States. They are trying to do what they've done to me not only to their distinguished generals but the President himself. The American justice system has become a cheap farce."

"This country is at the doorstep of great changes, and, in my opinion, a revolution, which is virtually inevitable," Bout added according to RT. "Many out there are ready for the civil war: on the two sides, armed to the teeth and only waiting for the moment when someone starts to spill blood," Bout added.

Bout's warnings come as politicians in Washington insist on ramping up tensions with Moscow. "Over these years, I've formed an opinion that the Americans are largely for good relations with Russia. At least, that's how it is for those who live in rural areas. The people are conservative, plain out there, where I serve my term," he stated, adding that the Russians and the Americans actually have more things in common than dividing.

Naturally, the common people don't want war, neither in Russia nor in England nor in America, nor for that matter in Germany.

That is understood. But the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders.

That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger.

It works the same way in any country.

—Hermann Goering
during the Nuremberg Trials



In this December 21st story over at Tzarism which the "Drudge Report" had linked to for several days running they asked if the United States military is loyal to their '*Commander in Chief*' at a time when numerous military officers have actually been taking shots at POTUS Trump, what some could consider 'treasonous sedition'.

While President Trump himself recently warned that he believes that his very well armed supporters would revolt and take down any '*coup attempt*' by the deep state, if the US military has already given up upon America and embraced globalism above country, putting Hillary Clinton and the deep state above President Trump, America is in huge trouble.

While Zero Hedge recently asked if Trump's troop withdrawal from Syria was putting the deep state on notice, and as Freedom Outpost recently reported, the resignation of James Mattis as US Secretary of Defense wasn't the only '*warmonger*' leaving the Trump administration with Brett McGurk, the U.S. envoy to the global coalition fighting the Islamic State, also stepping down. The very real potential of the globalists launching another 9/11-style

false flag to get America into yet another war that we cannot possibly win continues to grow every day.

As William B. Stoecker had reported on “ANP” back on August 20th, nearly every war that America has gotten into had begun with a '*false flag event*' that got the American people begging for retaliation, just as German war criminal Hermann Goering had warned many decades ago. How easy it is for satanic leaders to get the masses begging for death and destruction.

And as Matt Taibbi recently reported over at Rolling Stone in a story republished in full by “Zero Hedge”, "*We Know How Trump’s War Game Ends - Nothing unites our political class like the threat of ending our never-ending war.*" With members of both the left and right now frothing at the mouth like rabid dogs as President Trump finally attempts to put an end to the globalist’s never-ending war agenda, as we hear in the first video below from Infowars, the insanity we’re now witnessing from the left is mind-boggling. When did the left become the '*party of war*' in America?

While we'll close this story by joining Rand and Ron Paul in thanking POTUS Trump for finally standing up to the satanic globalists who seek to end all life upon our planet Earth, we also understand fully why people such as David Galvin and 'Master of Reality' warn of a massive false flag event ahead for America that the globalists will use to blame President Trump and his supporters for while getting us finally into another war, with Russia and/or China, a war we can't possibly win.

The article by “All News Pipeline” reflect upon what true American Patriots are facing in the event that President Donald J. Trump, for whatever reason, is removed from office at any point in time between now and the 2020 Presidential elections. President Trump is attempting to remove the fraudulent Federal Reserve System, the unconstitutional IRS, and return to the Country rule of Law, under the Constitution. This includes the removal of the WTO and the IMF. The Federal Reserve Notes [FRN's] under President Trump will be ended and the country returned to the “Gold Standard”, and we are told that the government of the USA can back up that statement.

1. Since 1913 the British have had control over financial and political affairs of the US through control over our currency and banking system. Behind the Brits orchestrating the criminal enslavement is the Vatican and their “Fiduciary” Agents, the House of Rothschild.
2. That was about to change with implementation of Martial Law. The purpose of Martial Law was to restore the Constitution to the People. We have technically been under a state of Martial Law since 9/11; and even before that back to 1861. The War Powers Act is re-authorized by the President of the USA, every January since 1861. Today, we face issues similar to those that confronted Lincoln. It is the perennial struggle between national security and civil liberties as the United States is the target of many who would destroy it. If those responsible for the preservation of our country are not permitted measures to save it, there will be nothing left to save. But we can only hope that our presidents will be as

Abraham Lincoln: patient, pragmatic and possessing political sensitivity. The War Powers Act has been updated in 1941, 1973, and again in 2001. Americans might be surprised to learn just how readily the president can deploy troops inside the United States.

3. A military operation has been in place for some time. We were now in phase 5 of 5 phases.
4. There were (71,000+) indictments about to be served on suspected criminals in government, law enforcement, news media, entertainment, big industry and big tech.
5. The Federal Reserve, WTO and IMF were all coming down and each country would regain their sovereignty and nationalize their own bank.
6. In September, 2018, President George H.W. Bush was tried and pled guilty to money laundering, human trafficking and his role in the death of President John F. Kennedy. In November, 2018 he was executed by lethal injection and ten trillion dollars was seized from the Bush organization. Ten Trillion, not billion!
7. Martial Law and full disclosure would be announced through the Emergency Broadcast System, 4Chan and 8Chan networks.
8. This Plan is called Operation Q.

More details will be forthcoming in what has to be the biggest news story of the century. As the news articles by "All News Pipeline" indicate, we can expect the "Deep State" to not go down without a fight. 2019 will be a turbulent year by any and all standards of measurement. Please pray for the President, Donald J. Trump and for the "Republic" of the United States of America.

Blessings,

Pastor Bob, EvanTeachr@aol.com