

The Land

Lawful Titles of Inheritance

There is a great deal of interest in the American law reform and patriot movements concerning various procedures to get back one's *true* and lawful title to his land. The elusive title everyone seems to want is an "allodial title," and there are at least a dozen groups willing to sell you their purported "process" to obtain one. We feel this has become the fastest growing land scam since the Florida swamp land sales of the 1960's.

Allodial Titles & Land Patents

First and foremost, **there is no such thing as an "allodial title"**! One may hold land by allodial right, or in an allodium, but there is *no* Lawful piece of paper that says "Allodial Title" at the top of it. An allodial right is a right found in the *lex non scripta*, the unwritten law - common law - and is not some form of title that can be granted by *any* civil government.

Before you go any further, look up the definitions of *allodium*, *allodial*, and *land patent* in the many standard and law dictionaries available. A good place to start is at the indexes and links to your left.

Do not confuse a "land patent" with a "title in allodium"! If you learn nothing else from this article, let that point get deep into your understanding and mind-set. When the United States Federal government patented land to anyone, especially after 1863, it merely acted as a legal agent for the People and created a record of *who* acquired the land, *how much land* was involved, the *price* that was paid, and a notice of what, if any, *restrictions* may have applied to the land. The end. There is absolutely nothing more to a "land patent" issued by the government. **The original patentee did not hold his land in allodium, but by right from the civil power.** Since he purchased the land, he could not possibly have held the land in allodium because **true title to land never passes by purchase.**

Those of you who have declared your "land patents" in the local newspaper are already upset at the statements we just made, so we're going to make this a lengthy analysis and explanation to clearly show you what is truth and what is not.

In the law, we find the following definitions:

Allodial. [Germanic. *al-ód*, all one's own: the whole estate. -Skeat.] From the low Latin *allodium*: every man's own land, which he possesses in his own right, without owing any rent or service to a superior - property, in the highest degree. Wholly independent, and **held of no superior** [2 Bl. Comm. 47, 60]. Held in **free and absolute ownership** [3 Kent, 485, 488, 498]. - *A Dictionary of Law 1893*.

Allodial. A free manor; **an inheritance** that is not held of any superior. *Allodial* lands are such as are free from any rent or service [2 Blackstone 47,60: Cowel.].

Allodium estates. Signifies an absolute estate of **inheritance**, in contradistinction to a feud. - *Bouvier's Law Dictionary 1856.*

Land. All corporeal **hereditaments** - ground, soil or earth, with all object under or upon the same, as trees, herbage, water, minerals, buildings. - *A Dictionary of Law 1893.*

Hereditament - Anything that may be **inherited**, be it corporeal or incorporeal, real, personal, or mixed. - *A Dictionary of Law 1893.*

Title is the means whereby the owner of lands or other real property has the just and legal possession and enjoyment of it. Title is acquired either by descent or purchase. The former covering the single case of inheritance of property by operation of law, and the latter including every mode of acquisition known to the law, except that by which a person, upon the death of his ancestor, acquires his estate by right of representation as his heir at law. But, **title passes by descent**, and not by purchase, the former being the worthier title, where the same quantity and quality of estate is devised that the devisee would have acquired by descent. A more modern division of the subject is made when we say, that title may be acquired by occupancy, a secession, transfer, will, or succession. - *Ibid.*

Therefore, **true title passes only by inheritance, not by purchase.** The law concerning descent and the descent of property reflects the Godly means of property ownership and is not commercial in any manner.

Let's get back to the subject of land patents for a moment. If one sub-divides his property that was first acquired by a land patent, the title immediately moves the land sale or transfer into commerce where the rules and "laws" now change. In this case, a lesser or inferior title has been sold than that of the original land patent. Because of this, such a title is almost always insured. However, all insurance is commercial and is a benefit, privilege, or opportunity provided by the corporate civil government. Therefore, the title must come under the government's jurisdiction and be recorded in the corporate County Recorder's office.

Once the land is recorded in this manner under corporation law, i.e. the UCC, it is a matter of public record and, with the imposition of commercial law governments, when such titles are recorded in the County Recorder's Office, they immediately become subject to liens from almost anyone, including the commercial entities and even the IRS.

In order to understand how this is done and why, you must understand the basis or foundation all modern commerce and corporations are based upon, which is, Roman Civil Law. Here's some Roman Law history to look at:

"The principle of *emphyteusis* furnishes a connecting link between the Roman imperial system of land tenure and the medieval system. It arose out of the custom whereby land taken in war was rented by the State on long leases. The rent paid in such cases was called *vectigal*, and the land was called *ager vectigalis*. It was a form of leasehold property especially advantageous to corporations of all kinds, as they were relieved from all duties and cares as landlords and were secured of a fixed income. When this form was employed by private person and corporations, it was known as *emphyteusis*, the land as *fundus emphyteutarius*, and the person to whom the land was given as *emphyteuta*. An

emphyteusis was a grant of land or houses forever, or for a long period, on the condition that an annual sum (*canon* or *pensio*) should be paid to the owner—*dominus*—or his successors, and that if such sum was not duly paid, the grant should be forfeited. According to the law of the Emperor Zeno (475-491), *emphyteusis* was neither a sale nor a lease by a special form of contract.

The rights of *emphyteuta* were, first of all, the right of use and enjoyment. But he was better off than a mere usufructuary. He was rather the *bona fide* possessor of the property. The only restriction to his use of the land was that he must not cause depreciation in the value of the property. Furthermore, he could, subject to certain restrictions, alienate property. It passed to his heirs; it could be mortgaged or hypothecated; and it could be burdened with servitudes. But these rights depended upon the fulfillment of certain duties. If the *canon* was not paid for three years (in the case of Church lands, for two years), or if the land tax remained unpaid for the same period, the grant was forfeited. Here, his position was different from that of the usufructuary, for the latter paid no rent. The original rent of the land granted could not be increased by the owner, but on the other hand it was not diminished by any partial loss of the property. The *emphyteuta* had to pay all the burdens attached to the land, and deliver all tax receipts to the owner. The method of alienating the property was as follows: The *emphyteuta* ought to transmit to the *dominus* formal notice of the sum that a purchaser is willing to give for it. The owner has two months to decide whether he will take the *emphyteusis* at that sum; and if he wishes it, the transfer must be made to him. If he does not buy at the price named within two months, the *emphyteuta* can sell to any fit and proper person without the consent of the *dominus*. If such a person is found, the *dominus* must accept him as his *emphyteuta*, and admit him into possession either personally, by written authority, or by attestation, before *notaries* or a *magistrate*. For this trouble, the *dominus* is entitled to charge a sum (*laudemium*) not exceeding two per cent on the purchase money. If the owner does not make acknowledgment within two months, then the *emphyteuta* can, without his consent, transfer his right and give him possession.”

Does this sound like modern day *escrow* procedure? Are you beginning to understand that we do not own any of the land our home sits on so long as there is a record of the *emphyteusis* in the name of an *emphyteuta* in the commercial County Recorder’s Office? If there is any doubt in anyone’s mind as to who the *dominus* is, it is the commercial law powers that currently rule and hold legal, not lawful, title to the land.

All this can be very depressing for those who really understand it. But, if one is a Christian and if one acts in the mode and character of a Good and Lawful Christian Man or Woman, there is another side of this coin that all the law reformers and other experts are ignorant of. It is through the other side that we really acquire and hold Our land in allodium, in spite of all we’ve read above. The process of acquiring and holding land in allodium is done by virtue of a higher Law that every Christian has access to.

The Earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof. Because we are of and in Him, we have been made joint-heirs with Christ. On the basis of these two incontrovertible facts, it’s clear that if we can discover the process to implement it, allodial title awaits every Christian in America who really desires to act in the venue and Character of a Christian by virtue of his inheritance from God.

Commerce vs. Unalienable Rights

The following was originally written by John Joseph of the King's Men.

“Commerce”—a supposedly harmless term we hear every day. But what is it and what does it mean to be “engaged in commerce?” Just what are some of the consequences of “engaging in commerce?” Dictionaries have part of the answer, court decisions have part of the answer, and Scripture has the definitive answer. Let us look at each of these and play a few scenarios that exist today. These scenarios, by the way, all look normal and harmless. But as we shall see, are deadly in terms of political, social, and individual impact.

COMMERCE. Trade on a large scale, or the exchange of commodities. (from the Latin *cum mercis*.)

This is a simple definition and covers a lot of territory in terms of what can be considered commerce. Let us then consult the Latin definitions of “commerce” to find out more about this mystery. In the Latin, “commerce” is:

COMMERCE. *Mercatura* (especially of the merchant: *mercatio* (commercial transaction, the buying and selling, Gell, 3, 3): *negotium*, or, plural *negotia* (the business which any body carries on, especially as corn-merchant and money-lender): *commercium* (commerce, commercial intercourse), Sal., Jug., 18, 6, Plin., 3, 1, 3: with anything, *alicujus rei*, Plin., 12, 14, 30; then, also=the liberty of commerce): wholesale business, *mercatura magna et copiosa*: in retail, *mercatura tenuis* (Vid. TRADE]. The Roman merchants carry on a commerce with Gaul, *mercatores Romani ad Gallos commeant* (i.e., they visit Gaul with their merchandise, Caes., B. G., 1, 1). Social intercourse, *conversatio*, (Vell., Quint.): *usus: consuetudo* (of his service, & c.): *convictus* (in so far as one lives with any body). Vid. INTERCOURSE.

Contrary to popular belief, the Latin language is not dead. It is carried forward in English today. “Commerce” deals with the trade, buying, negotiating, profiting, benefiting, selling or exchange of commodities on a large scale between two separate and distinct venues, intercourse. The large scale aspect of commerce necessarily involves the public’s (not necessarily Christendom’s) participation in some way, either willingly or unwillingly. Profiting or benefiting from the expense of the public, or their government is what must be, and is, licensed, regulated, and taxed.

Term ‘commerce’ as employed in U.S. Const. Art. I, 8, is not limited to exchange of commodities only, but includes, as well, intercourse with foreign nations, and between states [venues]; and term ‘intercourse’ includes transportation of passengers.

The last phrase in Henius’ work, “exchange of commodities” concerns us the most, because “commodities” is another term which must be defined so we can come to a true and correct definition of what truly is and is not “commerce”. And the last phrase in the Raymond decision gives a clue to removing and staying out of commerce: that being conducting your affairs among those of like-mind in the state of Christendom, thereby not crossing venues. Commodities are what we hear are being traded on many of the large exchanges in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, London, Hong Kong, Frankfurt and others. But no where on news reports are you told what is a “commodity”. Consulting Henius’ work:

COMMODITY. Something which affords convenience or profit, which can be exchanged for some other value. The commodity must be in such tangible form, whether goods and services, that it can be traded for something tangible (goods and services). Thus, a commodity becomes something that can be made the subject of trade, of acquisition as well as of an exchange offering; something possessing exchange value, that can be traded for something else.

This is a broad definition of “commodity”. According to this definition, anything which can be made the subject of a trade, buy and sell, or exchange is a commodity. Under this heading fall the following:

“The word ‘goods’ has been interpreted generally as meaning tangible movable things, called ‘chattels.’ In the law of bailments, goods includes money when treated as a commodity and not as a medium of exchange, and also documents and instruments whether representing goods (e.g., bills of lading and warehouse receipts representing goods) or representing intangibles (e.g., certificates of stock representing shares in a corporation, and negotiable and non-negotiable instruments representing rights of action, such as checks, promissory notes, insurance policies, and savings bank books).”

Money (magnitude without reference to substance) is a “commodity” when it is not considered coin of the realm,” but is merely bought, sold, traded, or exchanged for commercial paper or military scrip, i.e., Federal Reserve Notes, and the like. This is the state of affairs when one goes to a coin dealer to buy his “lawful money” and he is charged a tax for the purchase. This is intercourse between a Good and Lawful Christian Man and the licensed merchant, who has no right to possession. When, however, the “lawful money” of Christendom returns to Christendom, it is no longer a commodity, but returns to its original Lawful character, and to the Person who has the Right to Possession. Notes, bills, drafts, cheques and all forms of negotiable instruments are “commodities”. Licenses are “commodities”. Virtually anything that gives an advantage of comfort, ease, profit, or benefit, or which can be negotiated is a “commodity”.

COMMODITY. What possesses the quality of ease, comfort: commoditas: commodum: opportunitas (convenience). Profit, commodum: emolumentum, (advantage, opposed to incommodum, detrimentum): lucrum: fructus (gain: opposed to damnum): questus (gain, which one seeks, profit): utilitas, (general term for the use or serviceableness of any thing). Ware, or merchandise, merx. Commodities, merces.

BENEFIT. Beneficium. To confer a benefit on any one, beneficium alicui dare, tribuere, in aliquem conferre or deferre; beneficio aliquem afficere: benefacere alicui. Your benefits to me, tua in me officia; tua erga me merita. As a benefit, pro beneficio; in beneficii loco. Use, advantage, utilitas, usus; commodum, emolumentum.

Notice the last phrase in Riddle’s definition of “benefit.” The same words describe “benefit” to be a “commodity” or profit. Benefits in the form of profit, when derived from public detriment, are commodities. Any benefit you receive from the federal government is a commodity and is therefore subject to regulation under the interstate commerce clause. Benefits received from the State governments are subject to regulation of intrastate commerce. Remember, the benefits are crossing the boundaries mapped out by the constitutions; thus, establishing a commodity moving from one venue to another:

“But where the effect of intrastate transactions upon interstate commerce is merely indirect, such transactions remain within the domain of [that] state[‘s] power. If the commerce clause were construed to reach all enterprises and transactions which could be said to have an indirect effect upon interstate commerce, the federal authority would embrace practically all the activities of the people and the authority of the State over its domestic concerns would exist only by the sufferance of the federal government.”

Now what benefits could you be receiving? Are you receiving the benefit of free delivery of your mail at your house? Please see Randy Lee’s excellent article on Post Office’s “General Delivery.” Are you receiving the benefit of “federal corporate employment?” The receipt of a benefit from the federal government changes your whole relation to the government. Why? Because it puts you on the government defined “fief” or “feud”:

“**Fief.** The right bestowed on any body, beneficium: *feudum (technical term).”

Further, this sets up what is known as a quasi-contractual relationship, enforced in an action of assumpsit:

“Statutory contract is a contract which the statute says shall be implied from certain facts [receipt of benefit], and is governed by the ordinary rules relating to contracts.”

“A quasi contractual action presupposes acceptance and retention of a benefit by one party with full appreciation of the facts, under circumstances making it inequitable for him to retain the benefit without payment of its reasonable value.”

“A debt resulting from a normal agreement or contract has always been the result of a promise to pay, and invoked a remedy in the form of assumpsit. However, an assumpsit cannot be applied to actions of debts where there is no agreement unless the court does so by means of a fiction, because in order to support assumpsit, it is necessary to allege a promise, and without agreement there is no promise. Historically, the courts have adopted the fiction of a promise, and it was declared that a promise was implied in law.”

“For the convenience of the remedy, they have been made to figure as though they sprang from contract, and have appropriated the form of agreement.”

But quasi-contracts are insidious and *contra bonos mores*, when they violate the customs and usages of Good and Lawful Christian People:

“I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.”

“Not only unscientific, and therefore theoretically wrong, but is also destructive of clear thinking, and therefore vicious in practice. It needs no argument to establish the proposition that it is not scientific to treat as one and the same thing an obligation that exists in every case because of the assent of the defendant, and an obligation that not only does not depend in any case upon his assent, but in many cases exists without his assent.”

That beneficium, benefit, is in a commercial venue separate and distinct from Christendom, which is now under the jurisdiction of the federal military power ever since the states lost in the

Lincoln vs. All States War, during the hostilities from 1861-1865. When you receive any benefit, gratuity, or bounty, from government, a separate and distinct venue, you are engaged in the commercial activity of making profit or gain at the detriment of the government agency, and are marked a “resident” in this relationship. This is because “**residents**” exercise no traditionally vested rights retained by Good and Lawful Christian Men; and, are therefore strange to the Private Christian Man who sojourns on the land.

It is not Lawfully mandatory that any Good and Lawful Christian Man maintain any such a relationship, when that relationship attempts to deprive, cloud or destroy the Christian Man’s relationship with his Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ:

“Again it may be asked, what must be done when a human law does not agree with the Divine Law? Must such law be obeyed? Men have no right to make a law that is contrary to the law of God; and we are not bound to obey it.”

The way out is to destroy the existence of benefit, profit, ease, or comfort, using the Law:

“When performance of contract depends on continued existence of given person or thing [benefit], condition is implied that impossibility arising from perishing of person or thing [benefit] excuses performance.”

“Where performance depends on existence of a given thing [consideration, benefit] assumed as the basis of the agreement, performance is excused to extent that the thing [benefit] ceases to exist or turns out to be non-existent.”

This is the purpose of removing, destroying, returning, or otherwise Lawfully destroying the existence of benefit pleaded in statutory actions against you:

“No man can be charged in equity as a partner [promisor, resident], and sued at law as a debtor [Christian Man] of the firm, for his adversary cannot place him in these incompatible legal attitudes.”

In the case of the free mail delivery, removal of the post office box or sealing of the mail slot in your door is removal and destruction of the existence of benefit. Returning of all forms of consideration, benefit, or commodum to the grantor or giver of such is the answer.

This raises the issue of “unalienable rights”. No one has an unalienable right to receive any government “benefits” to the detriment of the public “commerce.” This is easily seen:

UNALIENABLE. Incapable of being transferred. Things which are not in commerce [traditionally vested rights], as, public roads, are in their nature unalienable. The natural rights of life and liberty are unalienable.

UNALIENABLE. The state of a thing or right which cannot be sold. 2. Things which are not in commerce [traditionally vested rights], as public roads, are in their nature unalienable. The natural rights of life and liberty are unalienable.

You don’t have unalienable rights in commerce, because everything is negotiable. “Every man has his price” is the mantra. This is simply because neither you, nor your neighbor, have a right vested by God to lie, cheat or steal from each other:

“Neither shalt thou steal.

Neither shalt thou bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbor’s house, his field, or his manservant, or his maidservant, his ox, or his ass, or any thing that is thy neighbor’s.”

Looking at the above then, traditionally vested rights which are retained by Good and Lawful Christian Men should never be compromised by entering into commerce, i.e., employment, driving, traveling, “human resource,” or labeling one’s Self a “**persona**.” The labeling of one’s Self a “persona” is when You say you are an article in commerce, or You answer to some form of commercial process which does not specifically call You. Take for example the following: You work as a welder, and you are a welder. It is all in the words. “As” means like or similar to, but it does not mean You are the commercial article. The other phrase says you are a “mercator,” merchant, a thief. This is so important. **It comes down to a battle for God’s elect:**

Mercator, *oris*, m. [mercor], a trader, merchant, esp. A wholesale dealer (opp. *Caupo*); *Caes.*, *Cic.*, *Juv.*

Mercabilis, e, adj. [mercor], that can be bought: *OV.*

Mercor, *ari* [merx]. I. To trade, traffic: *P1.* II. To buy, purchase. 1. *Lit.*: *hortos* *Hor.*: *aliquid ab aliquo*, *Cic.*; *fundum de pupillo*, *Cic.*; *quanti*, *Plin.* 2. *Transf.*: *ego haec officia mercanda vita puto*, *Cic. Ep.*; *hoc mango*, *Verg. Perf. Part. In Pass.* *Sense*: *Sail.*, *prop.*

The god of commerce is the Roman god, Mercury:

Mercurius, *I*, m. The son of Jupiter and Maia, the messenger of the gods; as a herald. The god of eloquence; the god of traders and thieves; the presider over roads; conductor of departed souls to the Lower World; *stella Mercuri*, *Cic.*; *Mercurialis*, e, adj.; *Mercuriales*, *ium*, m. *Pl.* A corporation of traders at Rome.

Good and Lawful Christian Men are to abstain from the appearance of evil. Notice **traders and thieves are on an equal basis here**. And this is why commerce must be fully licensed, regulated, and taxed. Thieves deal in speculation, i.e., inflation, deflation, market trends, etc., to derive benefit in the form of gain or profit to the detriment of the public. Speculation is:

SPECULATE. (See *Speculation*.) To undertake a venture the results of which are undetermined and can only be conjectured, with the hope or idea of profiting thereby. The purchase or sale of stocks, commodities, metals, merchandise, or the like, in the hopes of making a profit [getting a benefit] on account of expected but not yet determined fluctuations of market situations or prices [inflation or deflation] at the time the speculation is entered into.

SPECULATION. From the Latin *speculare*, to observe, to look around. The buying or selling of something, or the venture in a transaction the profits [benefits] of which are uncertain and subject to change.

SPECULATOR. The person who buys or sells something, or enters into a transaction by which he hopes to profit [benefit] although at the time of buying, selling, or entering the

transaction the chances of profit are uncertain and subject to change.

The gambler [speculator] courts fortune [benefit, commodum]; the insured seeks to avoid misfortune. The contract of gambling tends to increase the inequality of fortune, while the contract of insurance tends to equalize fortune [communism].

This is what is happening all the time. Words have been changed to protect the speculators. They are now called “bankers”, “brokers”, “insurers”, “investors”, “venture capitalists”, “entrepreneurs”, *ad nauseam*. A question arises at this point: How long or often can government tax a “commodity”? The answer is: as long as that commodity is navigated through commerce, deriving a benefit from the public, i.e., to the detriment of the public, it is taxable:

“Commerce in the sense in which the word is used in the constitution is co-extensive in its meaning with intercourse.”

“Commerce includes intercourse, navigation, and not traffic alone.”

What appears normal is not Scriptural at all. Good and Lawful Christian Men are warned in Scripture to not deal in such speculation:

“Go to now, ye that say, To day or tomorrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away.”

For this reason, when we all stepped into commerce, we all compromised our traditionally vested rights. You have only two absolute “unalienable rights”: Life and Liberty. **Everything else is conditioned on your conduct and consent.** Your Life and Liberty are vested by God in Genesis 2:7. **Dominion over property is conditional;** this is the lesson of Adam in the garden.

Just how did we all step into “commerce”? Perhaps the easiest way to put this is: when we left the land seeking something that really never existed in the first place, except in our own minds, which can be manipulated. Now many of you will say, “We still have our farm.” Not so, if it is registered in the County Recorder [County Clerk], or if you are registered to vote, or if it has a mortgage, or if it is an asset of a trust, corporation, partnership, etc., or if it has ever been sold for commercial paper, or if its owner is receiving mail at that location. **The status of the estate follows the status of its owner.** This is what I mean about leaving the land. We were never to sell or compromise the land, because it is not ours: **“The earth is the LORD’s, and the fullness thereof”** (Psalm 24:1, see also Psalm 50:12). We were to *occupy* till He returns, when He comes to take back that which belongs to Him. Occupation is not buying and selling for profit, or speculation from our neighbor. The armies of the earth do not buy and sell; their sponsoring speculators, however, do.

Just how dangerous can “harmless commerce” get? I believe the following remarks tell the story about the links between commerce and war:

War is just a racket. A racket is best described, I believe, as something that is not what it seems to the majority of the people Only a small insider group knows what it is about. It is conducted for the benefit [profit] of the very few at the expense [detriment] of the masses [public].

The trouble with America is that when the dollar only earns 6 percent interest over here [to pay war bonds from previously funded wars], then it gets restless and goes overseas to get 100 percent. Then, the flag follows the dollar and the soldiers follow the flag This is done to defend some lousy investment of the bankers [speculators].

There isn't a trick in the racketeering bag that the military gang is blind to. It has its "finger men" to point out enemies, its "muscle men" to destroy enemies, its "brain men" to plan war preparations, and a Big Boss' supernationalist capitalism [owned by the previous wars' bondholders and speculators].

I spent most of my time being a high muscle man for big business, for Wall Street and for the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer, a gangster for capitalism.

I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American Oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in. I helped in the raping of half a dozen Central American republics for the benefit of Wall Street.

The record of racketeering is long. I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909-1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American Sugar interests in 1916. In China, in 1927, I helped to see to it that Standard Oil went its way unmolested.

“From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because you ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts.”

When commerce begins to wane, and profits are low, wars are fought to create or protect markets for the speculators, who own governments through funding systems, and the **taxing power is nothing more than imposed slavery:**

FUNDING SYSTEM, Eng. law. The name given to a plan which provides that on the creation of a public loan, funds shall immediately be formed, and secured by law, for the payment of the interest, until the state shall redeem the whole, and also for the gradual redemption of the capital itself. This gradual redemption of the capital is called the sinking of the debt, and the fund so appropriated is called the sinking fund.

FUNDING SYSTEM. The practice of borrowing money to defray the expenses of government

In the early history of the system it was usual to set apart the revenue from some particular tax as a fund to the principal and interest of the loan The earliest record the funding system is found in the history of Venice. In the year 1171, during a war between the republic and the Byzantine emperor Manuel Commenas, a Venetian fleet ravaged the eastern coasts, but, being detained by negotiations at Chios, suffered severely from the plague. The remnant of the expedition, returning, took with it the frightful pestilence, which ravaged Venice and produced a popular commotion in which the doge was killed. To carry on the war, the new doge, Sebastian Giani, ordered a forced loan. Every citizen was obliged to contribute one-hundredth of his property, and he was to be paid by the state five per cent interest, the revenues being mortgaged to secure the

faithful performance of the contract. To manage the business, commissioners were appointed, called the Chamber of Loans, which after the lapse of centuries grew into the Bank of Venice. Florence and other Italian republics practised [sic] the system; and it afterwards became general in Europe. Its object is to provide large sums of money for the immediate exigencies of the state, which it would be impossible to raise by direct taxation.

In England the funding system was inaugurated in the reign of William, III. The Bank of England, like the Bank of Venice and the Bank of St. George at Genoa, grew out of it. In order to make it easy to procure money to carry on the war with France, the government proposed to raise a loan, for which, as usual, certain revenues were to set aside, and the subscribers were to be made a corporation, with exclusive banking privileges. The loan was rapidly subscribed for, and the Bank of England was the corporation which it brought into existence. It was formerly the practice in England to borrow money for fixed periods; and these loans were called terminable annuities. Of late years, however, the practice is different, loans being payable only at the option of the government; these are termed interminable annuities. The rate of interest on the earlier loans was generally fixed at three and a half per cent and sold at such a rate below par as to conform to the state of the money market. It is estimated that two-fifths of the entire debt of England consists of this excess over the amount of money actually received for it. The object of such a plan was to promote speculation and attract capitalists; and it is still pursued in France.

Afterwards, however, the government receded from this policy, and, by borrowing at high rates, were enabled, when the rate of interest declined, by offering to pay off the loan, to reduce the interest materially. The national debt of England consists of many different loans, all of which are included in the term funds. Of these, the largest in amount and importance are the three per cent 'consolidated annuities,' or consols, as they are commonly called. They originated in 1751, when an act was passed consolidating several separate three per cent loans into one general stock, the dividends of which are payable on the 5th of January and 5th of July at the Bank of England. The bank being the fiscal agent of the government, pays the interest on most of the funds, and also keeps the transfer-books. When stock is sold, it is transferred on the books at the bank to the new purchaser, and the interest is paid to those parties in whose names the stock is registered, at the closing of the books a short time previous to the dividend day. Stock is bought and sold at the stock exchange generally through brokers. Time sales, when the seller is not the actual possessor of the stock, are illegal, but common. They are usually made deliverable on certain fixed days, called accounting-days; and such transactions are called "for account", to distinguish them from the ordinary sales and purchases for cash. Stock-jobbers are persons who act as middlemen between sellers and purchasers. They usually fix a price at which they will sell and buy, so that sellers and purchasers can always find a market for stock, or can purchase it in such quantities as they may desire, without delay or inconvenience.

In America, the funding system [principally derived from the Lincoln administration] has been fully developed. The general government, as well as those of the states, have found it necessary to anticipate their revenue for the promotion of public works and other purposes. The many magnificent works of internal improvement which have added so much to the wealth of the country were mainly constructed with money borrowed by the states. The canals of New York, and many railroads in the western states, owe their existence to the system.

The funding system enables the government to raise money in exigencies, and to spread over many years the taxation which would press too severely on one [see Const. U.S.A., Article I,

section 8, clauses 1 & 2]. It affords a ready method of investing money on good security, and it tends to identify the interest of the state and the people. But it is open to many objections, the principal of which is that it induces statesmen to countenance expensive and oftentimes questionable projects who would not dare to carry out their plans were they forced to provide the means from direct taxation.

Also:

But there is no fact in the history of this war debt more startling than this: that the great body of these bankers and bondholders were, at the beginning of the war, but poor men; many of them helpless bankrupts, and many of the pretended loans were mere collusions between bankers and government officers [actors], entered into for the purpose of creating money for the one [purported government] and power for the other [bankers], at the expense of the people, who would be required to raise standing armies from their children to support this [banking] power and contribute taxes from their labor to maintain the [government] funding system.

This has always been the case in the history of paper money inflations; that the pretended benefactors of government have been simply swindlers, who have imposed upon the people their worthless promises to pay in lieu of [specie] as the pretext for their robbery.

This is true, with scarcely an exception, in every country, that the government is never assisted by paper in any war. Those who issue it amass fortunes by the issue. To this one our country has not been an exception.

In the history of insolvent estates, bankrupts, merchants, contested debts and repudiated obligations, which make up the assets of the last six years, it must not startle mankind that the honest people have thrown off the yoke rudely placed upon them by reckless and unscrupulous tyrants.

And just guess where these international speculators get the bodies to die fighting their little skirmishes? Those who are on the benefice fief, feud. This is on the international level. Domestically, one can find the same occurred during the Lincoln v. All States War:

“By mere supineness, the people of the South have permitted the Yankees to monopolize the carrying trade, with its immense profits. We have yielded to them the manufacturing business, in all its departments, without an effort, until recently, to become manufacturers ourselves. We have acquiesced in the claims of the North to do all the importing, and most of the exporting business, for the whole Union. Thus, the North has been aggrandized, in a most astonishing degree, at the expense of the South. It is no wonder that their villages have grown into magnificent cities. It is not strange that they have ‘merchant princes’, dwelling in gorgeous palaces and reveling in luxuries transcending the luxurious appliances of the East! How could it be otherwise? New York city, like a mighty queen of commerce, sits proudly upon her throne, sparkling in jewels and waving an undisputed commercial scepter over the South. By means of her railways and navigable streams, she sends out her long arms to the extreme South; and, with an avidity rarely equaled, grasps our gains and transfers them to herself by taxing us at every step and depleting us as extensively as possible without actually destroying us.”

“You are not content with the vast millions of tribute we pay you annually under the

operation of our revenue law, our navigation laws, your fishing bounties, and by making your people our manufacturers, our merchants, our shippers. You are not satisfied with the vast tribute we pay you to build up your great cities, your railroads, your canals. You are not satisfied with the millions of tribute we have been paying you on account of the balance of exchange which you hold against us. You are not satisfied that we of the South are almost reduced to the condition of overseers for northern capitalists. You are not satisfied with all this; but you must wage a relentless crusade against our rights and institutions.

“We do not intend that you shall reduce us to such a condition. But I can tell you what your folly and injustice will compel us to do. It will compel us to be free from your domination, and more self-reliant than we have been. It will compel us to manufacture for ourselves, to build up our own commerce, our own great cities, our own railroads and canals; and to use the tribute money we now pay you for these things for the support of a government which will be friendly to all our interests, hostile to none of them.”

Domestically, Lincoln used deception to “save” the Union. This is evident from the record: if the Union were saved intact, Reconstruction was a nullity, because the states were intact. If, however, the Union was destroyed, Reconstruction was necessary for erecting a new union in the image and likeness of its speculating creator, Mercury, under the imposed military power of the Commander-in-Chief; dedicated to the proposition that public slavery, by destroying Christianity in the states, for enhancing and expanding commerce, is a better idea.

It is no secret that the criminally infamous Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase, in 1861, through his *factotum* Cooke, boasted that the initial bonds issued to fund the Lincoln v. All States War were a “first mortgage” upon all the property of the United States. It is also no secret that the interest on these bonds was not paid as late as 1953. This is that same Chief Justice Chase, by the way, who created and established, by his own “judicial decree,” the huge tax base to pay his filthy war bonds sold to the Bank of England, contained in the purported Fourteenth Amendment. This is why the “public” debt cannot be questioned. Could this have been a conflict of interest?

It is no secret “harmless commerce” is dangerous:

Principiis obsta [oppose the first appearance of evil], nip the shoots of arbitrary power in the bud, is the only maxim which can ever preserve the liberties of any people. When the people give way, their deceivers, betrayers, and destroyers press upon them so fast, that there is no resisting afterwards. The nature of the encroachment upon the American constitution is such, as to grow every day more and more encroaching. Like a cancer, it eats faster and faster every hour. The revenue creates pensioners, and the pensioners urge for more revenue. The people grow less steady, spirited, and virtuous, the seekers more numerous and more corrupt, and every day increases the circles of their dependents and expectants, until virtue, integrity, public spirit, simplicity, and frugality, become the objects of ridicule and scorn, and vanity, luxury, foppery, selfishness, meanness, and downright venality swallow up the whole society.”

“For resistance to law, every government has ample powers to punish offenders; for usurpation, governments have provided no adequate remedy.”

What hath “commerce” wrought? The destruction of a confederacy of Christian states.

Final Thoughts

If we look about the land today, there appears to be nothing to justify the maintenance of “a permanent state of national emergency” by the United States government. There isn’t a war going on; we aren’t in a major economic collapse (yet), and the cold war appears to have thawed.

The question is, why a permanent state of national emergency?

The answer comes down to something quite simple and actually can be summarized in one word—hooked, a.k.a. addicted!!!

In earlier versions of this work, we summarized things by asking a good many questions and providing a simple, yet, unsatisfying solution.

Subsequent research, based on a theory of the case that developed out of earlier versions of this work, now shows a clearer and more concise answer. Briefly it comes down to the following. **At least seven years before Lincoln’s War, a number of states began to adjourn their state legislatures *sine die*.** This discovery makes no sense until we realize that the U.S. Senators of these Northern states, appointed at that time by state legislatures, were the most radical proponents of policies that would drive the South out of the Union.

If successful, this would have eliminated eleven (11) out of thirty-seven (37) states and only twenty-six would be left. Missouri and three other states (one may have been California) were contemplating an exodus too, though not to join the South. If these four (4) states leave we are down to twenty-two (22) states left in the Union.

Since it takes only a two-thirds majority (25) of the states to secede and terminate the federal Constitution, any combination of ten (10) states, by *sine die* adjournment, ends the Union. For all intents and purposes, there would be no united States of America, only a collection of independent countries on the North American continent.

But, why would the states want to terminate the Constitution???

The answer is, **the Christian under-pinnings and presuppositions embodied in the Constitution put too many restrictions on development of commerce between the states.** With the Constitution gone, it was ‘survival of the fittest’, and with the money power held by Northern banks, it is likely that much of the Southern raw material production would have ended up in the hands of Northern industrialists at the price that the North wanted to pay for it.

The South would have been reduced to feudal states under control of the Northern commercial interests, and slavery would probably still exist as a matter of sheer economic necessity. Then, along came Abe with a better idea.

Lincoln’s ego could not agree with the idea of the united States being broken up, especially on his watch. He also knew the smell of the winds blowing out of the North and turned it to his advantage. His problem was, how to keep the Union together at least while he was President, and still satisfy the demands of the Northern industrialists, commercial interests, and bankers.

Remember, at this time in our nation's history, the country was literally busting out at the seams with western expansion, discovery of gold in California, development of steam plants and engines, invention, and so on. Everyone was scrambling to get his piece of the pie and with the Christian consensus greatly reduced there was no one to sound the alarm from the pulpit. We can now see that Lincoln's plan to put the nation under military law and resurrect the old Roman law with its heavy emphasis on commerce, satisfied all competing interests, except those of the South and the common people of America. More importantly, it got rid of the Constitution and **served notice on a Christian world that, the united States was no longer a Christian nation.**

To show its gratitude to the United States for what it had done in rejecting Christianity, France produced a monument to its own French Enlightenment view of law and liberty. Today, this monument stands just off the coast of New York on an island all its own. This monument may be called the Statute of Liberty, but it is in fact, a celebration of lawlessness and licentiousness. The Greek and Roman character of the statue is lost only on the ignorant.

That the elimination of the restrictions of God's Law was in the mind of all, is clear. The assault on Christianity in politics and civil government that was begun by Lincoln in the massive blood-letting of Lincoln's War was simply carried to its logical conclusion by Roosevelt.

Today, the United States government is in the unenviable position of being between a rock and a hard place. Its people demand "bread and circuses", its politicians are little more than dilettantes, major industrial powers upon whom the tax system is based are leaving the land, the lawyers and tax men suck the substance from the people's lives and subvert their liberties daily, the bureaucrats cannot even get paid, and throughout the land there is a wailing and gnashing of teeth as the pain level rises.

And, all this because the people in America gave up the God who gave them life, liberty, and property, and exchanged Him for the gods of Mars and Mercury so they could engage in commerce and everyone would then have the 'privilege' of engaging legalized theft that brings profit only to the rich. We have all become 'hooked' on commerce and the easy life and have even re-defined what is left of Christianity to justify it. After all, **even our churches sit in commerce as 501(c)3 corporations.**

Either the people will turn back to the God who gives them life, and obey His Laws, or they will be ground to dust, mixed with their own blood, on their own land. Thus, **"If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from Heaven and will forgive their sins, and will heal their land."**

"But if ye turn away, and forsake My statutes and My commandments, which I have set before you, and shall go and serve other gods, and worship them; then will I pluck them up by the roots out of My land, which I have given them; and this house, which I have sanctified for My name will I cast out of My sight, and will make it to be a proverb and a by-word among all nations."

Please Note: God is not speaking here to the 'other guys', the non-believers, but, to You and Me, today, now, and forever.

Even so, Come, Lord Jesus. Amen.