US Corporate Fraud: Why are the courts at fault?

Posted on October 12, 2014

968 icons of rectitude for "legal" advice instead of using their own noses and common sense to 969 determine what is lawful.

The judges and court administrators are also committing tax fraud by shifting the "debt" created by every case onto the individual(s) who are actually the Creditor(s) in every case, and converting the case into an investment security belonging to the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank instead, which in turn shifts the money from the Creditor side of the "transaction" into the pockets of the Debtors. They are deceptively laundering a fraudulent debt into corporate assets belonging to the bank, and converting those assets into revenue sharing funneled back to the Department of Transportation (Federal Reserve) or DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (IMF) franchises, respectively.

So in addition to running a rigged gambling operation out of the courthouses, the courts are also laundering vast amounts of fraudulently procured credit assets back into the operations side of the two colluding Trust Management Organizations. A whopping percentage of the total take from all this securities fraud goes into the judge's retirement fund also administered by the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank.

It is self-explanatory why the courts and their administrators are at fault for this entire situation, that it is outrageous and not to be tolerated, and also why it must come to a halt and be brought to a halt by those responsible for administration of these entities. Any jurist who values his or her "law license" issued by an international banking cartel being operated as a criminal syndicate more than he or she values the law deserves to be disbarred----and will be.

9. In one of the demonstration cases you repeatedly made a great issue of whether or not the Judge was acting as a trustee or not, and at one point even offered to appoint him directly as your trustee. Why?

I did this to determine and place on the record which "hat" he was wearing. According to Section 3 of Article XIV of the Constitution of the United States of America--- the Federal Reserve corporation dba United States of America, Inc. By-Laws ---- all public employees are trustees.

The question of trusteeship is vital. Public employees under both "The Constitution for the united States of America" and "the Constitution of the United States of America" and all the related subsidiary "State Constitutions" are openly declared and required to act as trustees and to protect the respective National Trusts. It has been the erroneous practice of the UNITED STATES, INC. and its STATE franchises to forget about its obligations in this respect, and to concentrate entirely on the juicy federal services contracts it inherited during the bankruptcy reorganization of the United States of America, Inc.

The "Constitution of the United States" (yet another separate Constitution) under which the UNITED STATES, INC. was organized has no mention of trusteeship, but that doesn't mean the fiduciary obligations vanished simply because a successor Trust Management Organization has tried to ignore them. It only means that judges who don't admit to being trustees are admittedly operating in the foreign international jurisdiction of the IMF organization.

This was already implied by the title block style of the header on the case, but settling the Trustee matter forced the JUDGE to give up any pretension of *in personam* jurisdiction and to reveal the actual venue of the proceedings, which he otherwise attempted to obscure.

Throughout that case the JUDGE took an active litigant's stance and practiced law—liberally---from the bench, flagrantly acting in support of the bank's attorney. Several times during the proceedings the Judge was observed smiling, winking, and nodding to her. Although we entered Special Appearance throughout and demanded proof of jurisdiction from the outset--- and even though the bank's attorney is required to prove jurisdiction beyond reasonable doubt by canon of law---she made no attempt to do so beyond a naked verbal assertion that the ESTATES "resided in Alaska"---which has no meaning in a verbal context, because it is impossible to determine which version of "Alaska" is being referenced.

During the first Hearing, the JUDGE deliberately obscured the venue and jurisdiction of the court, claiming that his authority derived from "the de jure Constitution of the State of Alaska"----a document that doesn't exist and which would obligate him to act as our trustee if it did. Soon after making this claim, the JUDGE made an excuse to leave the courtroom and formally change the jurisdiction of the proceedings under the pretense of getting copies of a document for us. This only served to move the in-house corporate tribunal to Special Admiralty. Nobody operating under judicial canon would engage in such deceitful behavior, nor would anyone operating an honest court have reason to engage in such arcane procedure.

By process of elimination, it stands that THE SUPERIOR DISTRICT COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA, INC. was operating an agency-based "federal" debt collection procedure process against privately owned and operated international inter vivos trusts under the presumption that they were instead ESTATE franchises of the UNITED STATES, INC. operated in arrears by federal employees. This was all set up and maintained in the face of open and un-rebutted objection, without jurisdiction, in the absence of any validated claim or authority whatsoever to address us, the living principals, beneficiaries of the ESTATES, and Priority Creditors.

Part of the corruption of the courts is that they do not openly, freely, and honestly reveal the jurisdiction they are operating in at any given time, and do not discuss the presumptions—often far-fetched presumptions—they are operating under. In the demonstration case 3AN-12-6858CI the JUDGE claimed to be operating the court under the administrative auspices of the United States of America (Minor)'s local franchise, the State of Alaska, then used a subterfuge to change that declared jurisdiction to international maritime jurisdiction without disclosure. This

sort of "bait and switch" artifice is inherently fraudulent and leads inevitably to self-interested and purposeful confusion at law.

10. Who are you? How do you know all this?

Our families have struggled with the administration of the Holy Roman Empire—and the Global Estate Trust—in all its guises, for over a thousand years. There is no lie that a banker can utter that we haven't heard a dozen times before. There is no scam that a con artist can conceive that we haven't already dealt with.

Now, it's your turn.

We are tired of reading the entire list of Primary Source Documents and reference books included for your interest, plus hundreds more arcane documents detailing the attempts of Popes and Kings and Presidents and Congresses to do things both wonderful and horrible. This particular responsibility means becoming a lawyer whether you like law or not, becoming a banker whether you can stomach banking or not, becoming a historian even if history makes you gag, and becoming both a researcher and a journalist, because you have to keep up with the everchanging game board that is the globe rotating under your feet.

It means either being a wolf or a shepherd, because you cannot be a sheep after such an education. Francis is the last Pope we shall serve. We've been Good Shepherds for the innocent and helpless people of the world, but we might have been predators just as well. This is a matter of individual choice, and it bears consequences no matter what you do.

For those who have a conscience and who prefer to sleep at night and to look at themselves in mirrors without wincing, being a Good Shepherd works best. For the one in 25 among us who couldn't care less who they hurt, how much, or for what venal reasons, being a predator may be the only option, because such animals (and you know who you are) see innocence as ignorance, see weakness as opportunity, see goodness of any kind as an excuse for contempt, and purity of any sort as an excuse to despoil it.

Just be aware—there are 24 shepherds to every wolf and 390 million increasingly disgusted Americans poised to take out the entire Puerto Rican Navy.

11. Why did you include Pat Dougherty, the Managing Editor of The Anchorage Daily News, to receive a FINAL NOTICE? He's not a politician or a public employee or a banker or a judge, so it doesn't appear to make sense?

Go to The Anchorage Daily News archives and look at the first ad in the Legal Notices Section of the October 1, 2013 edition under high magnification. Write down the words that you actually see are printed there and compare them to the words that appear to be printed on that page when you are reading this ad without the aid of a strong magnifying glass.