

0913-2011-Kurt Kallenbach call

https://www.informerarchives.com/media/iatp_20110913.mp3

9:05 minute

Kurt: the 14th amendment is irrelevant. Why? It is a private corporate act and has nothing to do with government. It has nothing to do with the constitution. The corporation charter that the 1871 company put in place (includes) the 14th amendment, which is a private corporate act and has nothing to do with government and nothing to do with the constitution. To say it's 'not my government' or the 14th amendment is an issue is not true. The 14th amendment is for a private company and is private company policy no different that McDonald's or Walmart. There is nothing about Walmart that has anything to do with our lives. There is nothing about McDonald's in their private corporate policy that has anything to do with our lives. Nothing about the 14th amendment has anything to do with our lives. The fact that there is a presumption that it does, does not make it do. It doesn't make it true. All that garbage being talked about the 14th amendment, the UCC, all that crap is all irrelevant. It's worse than that—it's fruit of the poison tree. If we attacked the tree itself, we would get rid of all those symptoms like the 14th amendment, the UCC.

What is that poisonous tree? It's called the UNITED STATES. All these so-called patriot organizations and guys that have their processes and all that crap---they are all irrelevant. They need to go away. They are the ones that are perpetuating the myth. They are perpetuating the problem if we turned our backs and walked away from the UNITED STATES, no longer recognized it and revoked any participation and walked away, they would no longer have this so-called granted authority over the American people. They would shrivel and die from non-participation. When I say withdraw consent, I am not talking about turning in paperwork, I'm saying that we need to no longer consent to this private system. we need to do it through our acts.

When I have to listen to all this garbage out there and see my name negatively put forward through Republic Broadcasting, and I can't believe that John Stadmiller would even allow LB Bork to speak...he is not telling the truth. I think John Stadmiller should be held accountable for everything that comes out of Bork's mouth when Bork speaks for RBN.

Here's something: this is something that bothers me more than anything. I know the UNITED STATES is a UCC Corporation and is completely commerce driven company. Every contract, registration, every single thing that happens in America goes through this private company called the UNITED STATES. So, they laid claim to, or jurisdiction over every single aspect of business that occurs on American soil. That being said, here is my point. Tell me, someone, how a contract that is enforced at the point or the barrel of a gun is a valid contract. Here's what I am getting at: if you don't agree to the UNITED STATES terms, if you don't agree to have a license to travel along the highways or roads of America, if you don't agree, and by agree I mean if you don't do what you are told, they can put a bullet in your head. The cops in the UNITED STATES will murder you in the streets if you don't agree, you don't contract. If you don't show up in their courtrooms they will put out warrants for their commercial person's arrest. If you are fleeing from them, they will kill you. My point is for somebody to tell me how that makes a contract valid. If you sign something under duress, if you sign something because you know they are going to kill you, is that a valid contract?

Here's my problem. there are so many patriots out there that I get emails from every week who say that if contract is forced on you it is invalid. My answer is, 'yes, but the bullet is not. The bullet in your brain is not invalid; it's a very solid thing and will kill you and terminate your existence. Oh yeah, but they can't do that, you say. Wake up people. The UNITED STATES is

nothing but a giant band of thugs that will force their unlawful natures at the point of a gun. Ask Quaddafi. Caller: don't anyone try to justify our actions against Libya.

Kurt: how do you justify what is going on in the Middle East. Why is the UNITED STATES overseeing democracy? First of all I don't remember America being founded on democracy. I know that they are enforcing democracy overseas. It's the legislative democracy of the District of Columbia which is a dictatorship. My point is that someone please call in and justify and tell what it is that the American people are doing overseas murdering people. Tell me why the soldiers who are wearing the gold-fringed American flag on their shoulder on their sleeve, why are we killing people, murdering families, tearing up entire countries? Somebody remind me of what it is the American people are doing overseas. We need to differentiate America from the UNITED STATES. I know why the UNITED STATES is over there; it's for profit, to kill, maim, murder because that is what the UNITED STATES has always been about. But why are the America people going along with it? Why are the American people agreeing to what the UNITED STATES is doing overseas?

Ralph: they voted for the representatives that are letting it happen. Kurt: all the UNITED STATES needs is the thumbs up approval of the majority of the American people that at this point registers at 170 million strong. When somebody says we don't need to revoke, to turn in paper work. A caller told me that telling people to revoke their voter registration is actually recognizing the FICTION. Actually, I agree with that. but the bullet that goes into my brain because I disagree with it is not a fictional bullet. The men walking across the backyards wearing UN uniforms with fully automatic weapons that are going to murder everyone in their path are not fictional men. The UNITED STATES even though it is a fictional situation, a corporation, a document, the bullets they administer to the masses are not fictional bullets. They are real. When you die—it's over, it's not a fictional or a civil death. It's a biological, bury you in the ground death. I keep hearing from so-called patriots that want to defend what is going on. They want to vote for it and participate in it. Go ahead, when you vote, participate, and recognize the UNITED STATES then consider yourself a mass murderer. You are.

Big Al: definition of joint venture which all the patriots are in: NC supreme court case number 207 NC 831 178 SE reporter 587: in order to constitute a joint venture, a joint enterprise or common purpose, there must be an agreement. That is your claim of citizenship or registering to vote for the CEO which requires 2 signatures with full disclosure before signing to vote for the President. Right? The court says, "to enter into an undertaking in respect of which the parties have a community of interest (all UNITED STATES citizens have community of interest), and a common purpose for its performance. There is no legal distinction between the phrases "joint enterprise and prosecution of common purpose." That is in quotes by the court. The effect of the formation of a joint enterprise is to make all members responsible for the negligence of any member available who injures a 3rd person...not a man, person... to make the negligence of another member of any member as available as a defense by the third person to the recovery of another member." What does that sound like.

Big Al: you have to go in and knock out your voter registration. I did that way back in 1985 because I was stupid at the time and I voted for one of the presidents, maybe Reagan. But then I realized what was going on and I went down and just wrote a nice letter and said I'm moving out of the state and am hereby revoking my registration to vote for the PRESIDENT of the CORPORATION called the UNITED STATES. That was it. They issued me a letter stating they had revoked my registration because I no longer in that state. that was it. Now, there are many other things you can do. I filed that into a supreme court thing that I filed. Let me read it; it's a declaration to rebut all presumptions and this is what I sent them and they got it and it's an

in rem position that I am putting the court into. In that form of Roman law which has taken the expression ‘in rem and in personam’ are always opposed to one another. An act preceding in rem was done or directed with reference to no specific person. Consequently with reference to all whom it might concern or “all the world.” The act “in rem” was one bought for the assertion of the right of property, easement, and status. You the man has status. A person has character. Plain and simple. *“Such as our status of man and woman under the Creator, natural law, and against anyone who denied or infringed it. Being the Vatican allegedly owns this country and how you operate in international law, a ___ in rem then operates against the world at large in this case cause of ours and God’s natural law.”*

Big Al: The UNITED STATES operates in international law under the Law of Nations with its law merchant flag. Nobody realizes it, but on my wall I have a flag of every nation and it came from the US Navy and it states there are only three flags that has an end with it. They are national flags: the Free Irish State, Switzerland, and a far east country. The UNITED STATES is listed as a merchant flag and it doesn’t even have the gold fringe on it. It’s merchant flag. Now back to the quote:

“We operate under God Almighty’s laws by his covenant under natural law and not the world’s operation of the Babylonian law of Hammurabi AKA Admiralty Law. Therefore it is a trespass on a tort on God Almighty’s Law and his subjects when we are forced to comply with your person’s private substantive statutory law.”

Big Al: nobody in the patriot community knows what substantive law is. It is pure admiralty; that is substantive law and you can find it in any state’s codes, such as the North Carolina general statutes. All the way to the back you will see that they operate under substantive law and substantive law is defined as admiralty. Period. It’s commercial.

“Your private corporation denies us, as states of God Almighty’s natural law and is doing to us what you do to your subjects. Just on this alone we have drafted an order and letter for you to sign. The distinguishing characteristics of judgments in rem is that wherever their obligation is recognized and enforced as against any person is equally recognized and enforced against all persons.”

Big Al: there you have it. What rights are _____ to them? If they don’t answer they are admitting they are dumb, stupid and ignorant and don’t know the law. What it is is that all courts are arbitrial tribunals. This is from one of the general statutes of North Carolina: *“The arbitrial tribunals shall decide ex-acquiao et bono (on the basis of fundamental fairness) as an amiable compositor (amiable compounder) only if the parties have expressly authorized it to do so.”*

Big Al: I put in: *“which we have expressly demanded you do for us in that particular judgment in rem.”* What it says in here in the quote from the court which is the unification act of 1964 and you will find this in the library, when every patriot goes into the library, they don’t look up federal rules of decision, they look up court rules. This is 34 FRD 325: *“Black Diamond SS corporation vs Stuart and Sons”* from US supreme court case: *“to the extent that admiralty procedure differs from the civil procedure is a mystery to most trial and appellate judges and to the non-specialist lawyer who finds himself sometimes to his surprise involved in a case cognizable only on the admiralty side of the court. Admiralty practice, said Mr. Jackson, is a unique system of substantive law and procedures with which members of this court are singularly deficient in experience.”*

Big Al: when I helped a man in NC win against the IRS I used admiralty law. Nobody would help me because nobody knew what it was. They knew admiralty law but they didn’t know how

to go about it so I had to do it on my own. it took 35 hours to write the caption page to be correct. Two years and 3 months into the case, did they blow a stack. Three judges, arbiters, and 4 DOJ attorneys defending the IRS, which they can't, but they did, and nobody knows about this, but they can't defend the IRS which is a private corporation. Anyway, they wanted to change everything—the caption page, the whole thing and they said it was not fair. I told them to look at admiralty rule, and I gave them all the rules and they couldn't do a thing. They were stuck because they didn't object immediately under admiralty law.

Kurt: you are probably the only guy who would make me nervous on my own show. Let me do this: could you hang on through the break? Big Al: it's after 9:20 here and it depends on what my wife wants me to do.

31 minutes station break restart 36:36

Kurt: we are back; this is going to be a difficult show because the level of education might be beyond many people's purview. Jean is on the phone, but I want Big Al to do something real quick. I remember 3 years ago when I stumbled into this as angry as anyone could I want Big Al to tell the people what admiralty law is; there is too much confusion out there. you hear this crap all the time. There's all the admiralty, maritime, UCC and a lot of mix-up that goes on until you get it down and realize how simple it is really is and what they are doing to us.

Big Al: let me tell you how simple it is. Hammurabi came from Babylonia in 2000BC and maybe as far back as 4000BC. But Hammurabi was afraid of god and was a law merchant and Babylonian was like American law today. So Hammurabi wrote the law of the merchant which is maritime law. You have to remember that Greece, Italy, Spain everyone in the Mediterranean worked of the sea. There was no America, no south America, nothing. No highways. That was what Hammurabi wrote: the Law of the law Merchant which is maritime law and to adjudicate maritime law, it becomes the law of the admiral. Take for instance, when the king sent his people to Virginia which ran from Maine to Georgia, that was the Virginia plantation. When the King sent his people over here to control the people who were already here from Europe, that ship's captain was the admiral and carried the whole rights of the King to Virginia in 1606 and whatever he said was the King's Law. As the King was the law merchant of this plantation over here, plantation is not a farm but a jural society. Now, whatever the admiral said was law and that is admiralty law. It's that simple. It becomes the king's law through the admiral which is admiralty law for the law merchants over here who were plying their trades at that time.

Big Al: that is about as simple as you can get and it leaves a lot of questions. Jean: I understand it as the law of the sea or the law of the water. It came onto the land and that is what we inherited. Big Al: in 1857 it came—admiralty went through a whole series of countries: it was Roman law, it was the law of the country that predominantly prevailed every century. Then when it got to England---everything was done on sea. You could make a contract on land in maritime. And they still do today. But it comes under admiralty jurisdiction. Now they take the maritime law and they really had to change it and how did they do that? the UCC which is not just the UNITED STATES but the UCC of the world. It has to be universal. If you go to any shipyard, say Norfolk, Charleston, Philadelphia, New York Harbor Port Authority, they all operate under admiralty law and that is where you find the real lawyers/attorneys that know admiralty law. You will never find them in a court unless they are between ship yard and company. Then the judge knows he is sitting in admiralty. Anything to do with money is admiralty. It's plain and simple.

Big Al: You go back to the first case: Delogo vs. Boyt (?) and the UNITED STATES Steamship Company way back in 1800. and you read that and it was all admiralty which is under the UCC. What they did was the different countries were so into their own law that they didn't follow

maritime law in the particular country they were operating in. they followed it in their country. Because the ship's flag denotes the power of the admiralty on that ship from that country. That is why you don't see any of those cruise ships with American flags flying on them. You see other flags from other nations. They get in a big squabble, say if someone dies on the ship or they have a ship wreck. Whose law do they operate under? The ship's flag? Or, if they bring it into America's court, they go by UNITED STATES law and they cry foul! You have to go by our law, it happened outside the 3 mile limit. That is why they developed the UCC. If you read and follow back the UCC it will lead you all the way back to section 34 of the first judiciary act of 1789. this whole country was based on admiralty law. Period. Admiralty has two sides: prize law and civil law. And, there are cases that say that which were in The Informer's book, "The History of America." I'm trying to remember what the case was. Sorry, having a senior moment, I'm 75. 1966 Ford Station Wagon was one of the cases. They actually said that once: the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA vs. \$3000 in currency and 1960 Ford Station Wagon. I just found it.

Big Al: here's a quote from 37 Federal Rules of Decision 564 and you won't find this in any reporters or anything like that. you will find it FRD. It say: "*Key 31: although presumably for a purpose of jurisdiction action for forfeiture under Internal Revenue Laws is commenced as proceeding in admiralty. After jurisdiction is obtained, proceeding takes on the character of a civil action at law (title 28 comes in) and at least at such a state of the proceeding, the rules of civil procedure control.* (that means you go to title 28). Although it is criminal you still go to civil procedure. And then the other case was 1966 Chevy Pickup. 56 FRD 450 1972. the other one was 1960. "*A proceeding in rem is governed by the supplemental rules for certain admiralty and maritime claims. A supplement to FRCP 28 USC hereinafter supplemental rule; see rule A supplemental rules.*" Here they are telling you that you are operating in admiralty under maritime contract. Where is your maritime contract with the IRS? Jean: it's non-existent.

Big Al: that's right. I'm going to read you from George Sutherland, the Associate Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court in 1921: "*the three great rights are so bound together as to be essentially one right (listen to the words very carefully) to give a man his life, to deny him his liberty is to take from him all that makes his life worth living; to give him his liberty but take from him his property which is the fruit and badge of his liberty is to leave him a slave.*" That's what he said. Do you know that everybody in this country thinks they are a UNITED STATES CITIZEN? Jean: not all of us. Big Al: before, you did and we all did. The only way we are aliens, and you can find why we are aliens in the federalist papers. Nobody in the patriot community ever read the federalist papers. Nobody, I can guarantee that. if they read federalist paper 42 and 43 you would see that when Madison wrote the law he was afraid of these aliens coming in to the United States and taking over the corporation that they were forming. The aliens were the free white men and women and they weren't persons.

Big Al: here is what I found: the act of congress, april 14, 1802, 2 stat, 153, approximately 28, section 1, revised statute 2165 provides that: "*an alien may be admitted to become a citizen of the UNITED STATES in the following manner and not otherwise: (there are only 3 things and I'll read them out directly from this court case that said what they were:*

"first: he shall two years at least prior to his admission declare before a proper court his intention to become a citizen of the UNITED STATES and to renounce his allegiance to the potentiate or sovereignty which he may at the time be a citizen or subject." Oh, everybody in this country is not a Christian and I will prove it by that statement right there. You would have to give up your allegiance to God. And that is all that God wanted. if they became a UNITED STATES citizen they had to give up the allegiance to God. How can they be a US citizen and a Christian at the same time? It's an impossibility in law. "*Second: he shall at the time of his application to be*

admitted declare on oath before some one of the courts above specified that he will support the Constitution of the UNITED STATES and he absolutely and entirely renounces and adjures (?) all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentiate, state or sovereignty particularly by name to the prince, potentiate, state or sovereignty of which he was before a citizen or subject which proceeding shall be recorded by the clerk of the court.” Where is the recording that you did all this by a court?

Jean: I’m first generation American and my father had to do all this. Big Al: I’m part American Indian myself. ...”*Third: it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court admitting such alien that he has resided within the UNITED STATES at least five years and within the state or territory which the court at the time held one year at least and during that time he behaved as a “man of good moral character.”* Notice that was man, not person. They didn’t take man out then because they knew man was the alien. What they did was they made a term out of man and they called him a non-resident alien. Period. Kurt: you mean a non-resident alien is a man? Big Al: yes, that is the definition of a man in terms of their corporate law. It’s as plain as the nose on your face when you understand what they did. It’s words and terms. The word people is now a term of law. And they give it their own definition. Whenever you pick up and you can do this, any Internal Revenue Code and read the code, and you will find that everywhere they say non-resident alien, there is always an exception. It might sound confusing but you have to learn this stuff on your own, don’t listen to anyone else. Pick up the books and read them yourself.

Big Al: section 4062 to 4065 of the Revised Statues of the UNITED STATES called foreign relations revised statutes with all the sections which the CEO Obama down to the janitor of the smallest corporate town in America recognize God in your public law 97-280, 96 stat 1211, as does the Hartaway Court Decision which no patriot knows about, there is absolutely no need to revert to the crimes act of April 30, 1790, 1 stat for clarification that man only is the heir and states of God. Period. Now, let me read a quote from the dissenting justice of the UNITED STATES vs. Erie Railroad Company, Justice Seal. Everyone thinks this is the 1930 case, but no, this goes back to 1892. now Justice Seal says this and you learn more from the dissenting opinion than you do from the majority opinion whether the case was won or lost. This is what Justice Seal said: *“the government thus lays a tax through the instrumentality of the company upon the income of a non-resident alien over whom it cannot justly exercise any control nor upon whom it can justly lay any burden. The power of the UNITED STATES to tax is limited to persons, (not man), property, (whose property? persons can’t have property) and business within their jurisdiction as much as that of the state is limited to the same subjects within its jurisdiction.”*

Big Al: now do you know why I wrote the judgment in rem? It’s right there. here is a lexicon of tax terminology by Wiley Law Publications and I’ll read it word for word:

“non resident alien: the term is now formally defined as a person who is neither a United States citizen or a permanent resident such as a resident alien of the United States, section 7701b 1B.” There it is. When you read the definition of non-resident in Black’s law 4th or 5th edition, what does it say: *“one who does not reside within the jurisdiction in question. Not an inhabitant of the state of the forum.”* Everybody thinks: “my state”—jurisdiction, inhabitant. No, it’s the contract. Plain as day, it’s a contract.

Jean: everything is contract law. Big Al: everything, that is why the UCC is there: you argue the UCC and you are in contract law. *“An alien is defined as in the United States, one born out of the jurisdiction of the United States and who has not been naturalized under the constitution and laws.”* There it is and this goes all the way back to the 1802 case that I read where you had to

be naturalized to be a US Citizen. What is forum contractus? It's the jurisdiction of the contract. The court of the place where the contract is made.

Break: 59:24 back: 1:05

Kurt: Jean, you will be able to ask Big Al questions other people will want to hear. You are in the court room all the time and you know what is working for you.

Jean: the public want to know where one goes to start learning about this: do we read the Black's Law, do we read the rules of civil procedure, do we read federal law, statutes, codes, annotated anything? What do we read to start to learn. Big Al: you've go to go way back in history and start from there. I'm not pushing his books, but The Informer's books are the best things going for anyone who wants to get a good grasp of what it is and that's about all I can say. He has done all the research on this, as well as I have, and James Montgomery. We all work together. he has the books and he used to sell them through the ATG press and now I took over the book sales, and the ATG press had to go bye bye. Not because they wanted to, but they had to. It's a long thing that I can't get into. Jean: where do you get the books now if ATG is out of business? Through you? Big Al: yes, through me, and there's a man in NC in Raleigh that copied a lot of the stuff out of ATG press before they went down. He has practically all on a disc that was given for free?

Jean: what is the contact information? Big Al: to get the books they would write to AbarC (like a brand), 7055 Mountain Road, Oxford, North Carolina, 27565. now, if they want to know the list of what the books are, as some are going bye bye as I can't get the money to produce and print them to be able to sell them, they are small pamphlet books. They can email: informerbooks@yahoo.com Kurt: I'll get this on my blog site.

Big Al: if they just ask for books, price, I can send the whole list and the price. It's just the titles. Then they can go from there. there is a sale in September and if they buy all of them they are \$236 but if they buy in September it's \$187. that was put on by The Informer.

Jean: the next question for the audience is: I go into court a lot; I have a lot of court experience and understand a lot of it, too. But, if you go in and try to use a document or a strategy in an even in court and you don't know your game they will eat you alive. How much... Big Al: are you going in as defendant or plaintiff? Jean: that's part of the consideration. If you don't know all the UCC rules, the difference between admiralty and land rules, they look at you like you have 10 heads and you have 21 days in the psych ward. Big Al: you want to know how to go in and sort of put a kibosh on them? Say you are in a court, and I don't care if it's traffic because that is admiralty, and IRS is admiralty, but when the government comes after you, not a private person, the first thing everybody does is argue the points, the merits of the case. You don't want to do that as a defendant. *Gilbert's Law Summaries* is the book to get. When you go to the court forget about arguing anything at all. Don't even entertain the idea of arguments. It took me 35 years of studying this to get where I am.

Jean: that makes you guys the greatest generation. Big Al: there aren't many of us left. I have it here but I don't have the particular...you don't want to bring up anything about constitution, statutory rights, nothing. You want to object to the jurisdiction. I wish I had that here. It's *Gilbert's Law—civil and Criminal Procedure*. There are two different books. Kurt: you can order them on Amazon. Big Al: the first thing you do is challenge jurisdiction. Do you know how they get jurisdiction? "Oh, you are going to challenge jurisdiction, do you want some extra time? Yes, I'll take some extra time. This is continued to....." That grants them jurisdiction and whether it is continued or not, you have already lost. Jean: because you acquiesced to what the

judge wanted. Big Al: Gilberts Summaries says: *“even filing a continuance grants the court jurisdiction, even if you challenge jurisdiction at the outset.”* Big Al: you don’t want to go against the court in that vein of arguing. Everybody likes to show how smart they are and argue codes, statutes and law. Why argue something that you are not in? here is the case that I used in the 1980s and it’s a good case and I did win.

Big Al: here is a quote from the court: USA vs. one 1972 cadillac coupe deville, 355 fed supp (appeals case) 513 to 515, 1973. this is what kills the IRS and no patriot knows this. The court said and this is nothing of mine: *“thus where the Congress prohibits the commencement of a civil action unless certain specific acts are performed, this court has no jurisdiction over the subject matter until the requisite conditions are met in fact and such compliance is shown by the pleadings where necessary establish proof.”* This is IRS coming after you. *“But the mere allegation of facts necessary for jurisdiction without supporting proof is fatally defective.”* How many patriots know that? *“this court holds that 26 USC sect 7401 requirements constitute facts essential to jurisdiction. The failure to approve jurisdictional facts when specifically denied (you have to deny and object to the court’s jurisdiction) is fatal to the maintenance of this action.”* What is 7401? Jean: a section of the IRS code. Big Al: nobody knows what it is. 7401 is an order from the Secretary of the Treasury and the concurrence of the Attorney General of the UNITED STATES to come after the person that is in the court that day. There has to be a written statement by either one of them under 7401 that gives the court jurisdiction. The DOJ has to provide it. They can’t—you know why? Eric Holder is not the AG of the UNITED STATES. This is all corporate UNITED STATES and I can prove this. The real Secretary of Treasury is listed in 27 CFR 25.11 because 7401 just says a blanket Secretary. Now, Geithner is not the Secretary of the US Treasury. It was abolished in 1921 by the _____ of 1920. he is appointed as a governor of the IMF and Holder is the Alien Property Custodian only. You know who the real AG of the UNITED STATES? When I did this in 1988 the AG was John Morris of Great Britain. Kurt: almost no one would believe you when you say that.

Big Al: when I won against the IRS in 1998 it took me 3 months and I filed the paperwork to the only people that run this country. The pope, and the AG of Great Britain. No one else got this. I didn’t send this to the Secretary, the President, the court. Nobody, no congressmen, no one. I got a phone call from the US consulate in NY City and I was talking to this guy and I thought they were pulling my leg. I was talking to John Morris himself. And he asked me at the end after a 40 minute talk, “what else can I do for you?” I just said I didn’t know, because I thought someone was jerking my leg. Then I got 2 letters from the same consulate in NYCity and one asked me what else the AG could do for me. And I put it aside and I was going to answer it and ask, ‘what do you do for me?’ Then I got a letter from the pope, from the Holy See at Antioch. The IRS had already filed a court order for me and my wife to come to court and bring records and I ignored it. My wife was all shaken, but I ignored it because I had an administrative demand to the two people who run everybody else in this country. So why should I go to court? That was in January when I filed it. I got the phone call in February. And, I got the notice to appear in court in February. I wasn’t worried. Then, in March I get a letter from the National Accounts Director of the US treasury. They call it department, it’s not the US Treasury. They said: *due to your past records we cannot find the privacy act request that you put in. we had to go to our old records under your name and find the records. We now have determined that you are a non-resident alien and not subject to any income tax at all. We have now taken your IMF and destroyed it and here is the proof it is destroyed.”* I got 13 pages all the way back to 1983 when I started this fiasco and they were all blank. There were no IMF codes on there and I know how to read IMF codes.

Big Al: then I got a letter from the department of justice: *“do not appear in court. Those orders were issued in error. Any subsequent orders you may obtain, please disregard also.”* That means forever. Jean: you were exonerated. Big Al: yes. Then I got a letter from the same national accounts director stating that we have destroyed your social security number. Do not use it again. Now wait a minute; my wife said, look what you have done, we can't get social security. What will we live on. I told her not to worry that it was a gift. There is no such thing as social security. It's the enemy ID number in 1933 that was given to everybody in this country. Remember in 1933 what did Roosevelt do on March 9, 1933? He convened congress because he wrote executive order 2039 on March 5, making every American the enemy of the banking concern which was written by the attorneys for the bank itself. I have the Hoover papers to document it and at 1:30 in the morning Hoover said: *“I heard a knock at the door at 1:30 in the morning and my butler answered it and there stood the federal reserve chairman and 4 of his attorneys.* It's in the Hoover papers and you can pull it out of the national archives.”*they wanted me to sign the 1917 trading with the enemy act and make the American the enemy so they could not go into the banks and withdraw their money in gold and silver which is all they deposited then.”* How did they do that to get those people to take that banking ID number which everybody calls social security? They devised a plan and called it social security, that everybody ran down and voluntarily asked for that number. Well, if they didn't do that guess what would happen. The 13th amendment would kick in and involuntary servitude would then be enforced against the corporation for doing it. That social security number, The Informer wrote about this, is nothing. There are two court cases in 1935 that came right out and said that the social security is not a valid instrument. The law is no good. There is no such thing as social security and not a dime goes in to social security, it all goes in to the general treasury. So, therefore, who is the beneficiary? Not you. Not me. It's congress; here's what happened. When it goes in to the general treasury and the supreme court, Stewart vs Davis and Fleming vs. Nestor, stated it's not a contract, you have no rights to it, it's nothing. Whatever you get is a gift from congress. They can destroy the gift whenever they want and they can say to the people that social security is closed and you get nothing.

Jean: that's true—rights and privileges are different. Rights you have. Privileges are taken by the giver whenever they so choose. You have to volunteer, you have to sign up and you have to engage to get the privilege. The right is automatic. Big Al: then what I did and this may sound strange to patriots is I said to my wife, let's go to the bank and I got all my papers I got from department of treasury, remember, it's department of treasury, not the treasury itself. It's a department. I went to the bank with all these papers and walked in to the branch manager and said we want to open an account. My wife has an account and I want to be put on the account because anything that comes in to that bank, my social security check, is deposited there. I want to be the owner of that account, the same as my wife. In other words, if my wife dies tomorrow and I have \$3500 in there I want to be able to go in and control that \$3500 and write checks to pay bills and take it out whenever I want. The manager said that was fine. We went to an older woman at the bank, and she said *“this man wants to be put on his wife's account as a sole owner, a joint owner.”* She said okay and reached into her drawer and pulled out a stack of papers $\frac{3}{4}$ inch thick, and the branch manager said, oh not them, the other ones. Remember I said *this man* and the woman didn't catch it. I have seen all his paper work and he is one of them.

Kurt: are you kidding me? You mean even at that small bank at the local level they know this stuff? Big Al: they know it. Here's what happened; she pulled out 3 pieces of paper. I only had to sign that I verify that I was the husband of the account owner. That was it. We walked back and she said she wished more people would do what we did. It makes it so much easier. Jean: what were the other 2 pages? Big Al: they were disclaimers and I signed the disclaimer that I didn't hold the bank responsible for any losses or anything. Here's what I found out. I was an

expert witness in the Bobbie Carey case in Nevada in 1995 where he sued the IRS, IMF, the World Bank, you name it. There was John Neslon, me, Fox, and other well known researchers and in the trial Mark Syma (?) was the attorney for the Federal Reserve and the IMF—they are both the same. We five were allowed into the judge's chambers during recess and we could look at the papers that Mark had proposed to the court to dismiss the entire case which they could because they are immune from suit because they wrote the law. We went in and there were 5 of us and we had no pencils, papers, and we couldn't write anything down. We all decided we would take one part of the 400 page contract book that you get (you don't get) when you sign the signature card which is a contract to do dealing with the bank as the enemy. Who knows that? nobody. But I was in on the ground floor and we all came out and started writing down what we could. Can you imagine trying to memorize 400 pages between 5 guys in 15 minutes that we had? It's impossible. But, we did have certain parts that we all agreed on. One was when you sign the signature card you admit that the money you deposit in the bank is no longer yours because it has a lien on it by the federal reserve. There's an automatic lien the minute that money is issued. It's not money—it's script. What it is, it is listed in title 26 in section 2500; it's a transfer of property that you are paying a tax on. You are not paying it on your wages, you are paying it on the transfer of the intangible property that is worth nothing so that you can go to Walmart and buy intangible property to buy tangible property such as tv, clothes, food, for the transfer of intangible worthless property and that is what you are taxed on. The same thing for the state sales tax. Who knows that?

Jean: what you can do with you hands, your minds and your senses is natural law. When they impose the fiat currency on it, the only way they can bridge that gap is to make you exchange it for the stuff at Walmart. Big Al: and you buy gas and all that. so, here is the footnote that I put in this guy's brief, the term. Everything is the term. You look in 7701a in the definitions and what is the 2nd word in every sentence? In every definition—it's term. *This term applies to only this section; or this term means only this....* Big Al: the term Attorney General includes the alien property custodian whose functions was transferred to the Attorney General pursuant to executive order 9788 3CFR 1943-1948. title 50 part 13 section 13, part one, *president and department of justice section 101: functions of the alien property custodian*. That is who Eric Holder is. *“Except as provided in subsection B of this function all functions vested by law in the alien property custodian or the office of alien property custodian are transferred to the AG and shall be performed by him or subject to his direction and control by such officers and agencies of the DOJ as he may designate.”* You have to get this stuff right from the horse's mouth and I did all this stuff when there were no computers and I had to go to the library and get it. Jean: you had to borrow the books and read the hard copy. Many times I went to the library and was there till closing and ran out of quarters for parking.

Kurt: here's a question. What about the coin act of 1792 in relation to the lien on money? Big Al: it doesn't apply to money because there were no federal reserve notes back then. Kurt: so can you write on the back of a check or on a deposit, *this deposit is in exchange for lawful coin per the coin act*. Big Al: no, because I got a letter from the Comptroller General himself, Mark _____, and he said in two letters that you cannot exchange federal reserve notes for US coin. He said all you will get if you go in to exchange is federal reserve notes in exchange. There is no coin because it has seniorage—it is worth money; it is worth what it is. The seniorage is what gives the coin its value. There is no seniorage in printing paper. There's no intrinsic nature to federal reserve notes. Here's another thing when you go to court regarding the IRS. Write this case down: DC (district court) of Pennsylvania, 1964, 229 fed supp 647. here is a quote and why the attorney and the court is Trinsey vs. Pageliario: *“statements of counsel in brief or in argument are not facts before the court and are therefore insufficient for a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment.”* In the back it said: *“pro per and pro se litigants should therefore*

always be remembered that the majority of time the time the motion to dismiss a case is only argued by the opposing attorney who is not allowed to testify on the facts of the case; the motion to dismiss is never argued by the real party in interest.” In other words the attorney is always hearsay evidence as it never happened to him. He was never first hand party to it. Jean: his client is the one who should be speaking. Big Al: yes. Jean: that is why you cannot get attorneys sworn in with you. I go sui juris all the time and I have 3 basic questions when I open the court room; first: are we one the record; second: is this a court of law. Big Al: well, yes, it is a court of law—you know whose law? Their law. Not only that, when you are talking about the UCC and the straw man, I gave the court the definitions and it’s right on line and you can pull it yourself: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/strawman>: *definition: man of straw, alternative to this term, strawman; definition 2: third party set up to serve as a cover [to conceal the identity of the actual party] in accomplishing a shady deal or something not legally permitted.*” So now you have to conclude that **man** is a word of nature, but who created nature? Some will say God, the Creator, or other. On the other hand, **person** is a term of civil law. Jean: it’s a contrive term.

Big Al: what does UCC follow? Civil law. Now, who is the creator of civil law? Let me read you a quote from Ballantine’s Law Dictionary, 3rd edition, the Cadillac of all law dictionaries, the one I always use: *“civil law: a rule of civil contact prescribed by the supreme power of the state. the civil or municipal law of the Roman Empire.”* We are right back to the pope. *“the plaintiff reminds the court that ignorance cannot be tolerated by plaintiff when judges, arbiters or otherwise anyone making a ruling in ignorance. So, the following is for the edification of the court: volume XIII, American Law and Procedure, Jurisprudence and Legal Institutions by James D. Witt LLB Albany Law School, LLD Ruskin University from LaSalle University.* Here is a quote and nothing in here that I am going to say is my own words, this is directly from the quote. When this was posted on ATG press for about 4 years, nobody picked it up and understood, but one man from Canada, and he said it took him 20 reads to understand by reading it 20 times and looking at other law books to verify everything was correct. Chapter 65: *“the word person defined Galles says de jure division owned (that is the division of law) immediately proceeding his division of law then follows the conditione hominum meaning the condition and status of man.”* Status—got that? Not character. *“in the institute de jure personam proceeds the expression, ‘all our law relates to persons to either to persons or to things or to actions.’* The reason I said you have to put either before or is that if you use ‘or’ in any court ruling for paper, it means **and**. If you don’t put either you have no distinction. If they don’t either it would say, *“the law relates to persons, or to things, or to actions”* the **or** becomes **and**; then it becomes persons, things and actions, **total jurisdiction**.

Big Al: Continuing: *“The word persona and personae did not have the meaning in the roman which attaches to homo, the individual, or a man in the English. it had a peculiar reference to artificial beings (persons) and a condition or status of individuals. I’ll continue on and this is a really good catcher. “a moment’s reflections enables to see that man and person cannot be synonymous for there cannot be an artificial man although there are artificial persons. Thus the conclusion is easily reached that the law itself creates the entity or being which is called a person.”* Nobody does it (creates the entity or being) but the law. *The law cannot create an artificial man, but it can create an and frequently does invest him with artificial attributes. This is the personality which we are affected. The word, person, persona, does not in the language of the law as in ___ ordinary language designate the physical man.”*

Jean: that is why I don’t use ‘pro per.’ Big Al: no, if you use pro se, proper persona, it means you are a person in their law. Jean: the lawyers don’t even know what sui juris means and they ask me. I say, didn’t you go to law school? I’m just a mom. And they just frown. Big Al: this is what I wrote in the guy’s brief after I made that quote: *“Plaintiff, the physical man is subject*

to the Lord Almighty, a natural law, as stated in the term of municipal/civil law that being non-resident alien.” I kicked it right back in their face. The private debt collector uses this to defraud all men and women of their money, liberty and rights. It’s not money, but they don’t understand that for the Crown and some unnamed creditor that either Wilklins nor the examiner (put her number) cannot provide under the strict statute 15 USC 1692b (gb?) so, that is basically what it is and you can use that against IRS, the 15 USC 1692. Jean: you could use that in a driving sense also. Travel. Big Al: yes, you have to word it right, you have to be dead on.

Big Al: here is something you should remember. Are you a citizen? Yes, I am a citizen of the Lord Almighty, Ephesians 219. now what are they going to say. Did you know that you have a choice of law when you go into court? It’s in the North Carolina statutes that you have a choice of law. And if you don’t demand your choice of law, the choice of law that they use is their law. It says so right in the NC statutes buried way in the back, where they don’t expect anybody to go back that far. Jean: that is one of the hallmarks of the greatest generation: I was trained by a bunch of them and we do our due diligence to the nth degree, almost to eccentricity. But, that we are able to defend pretty well. Big Al: you see, what I did back in 1996, I decided, I knew what was going on, so I wrote to the Secretary of State of NC and I asked them for papers to do business in the state of IRS, every way you could name IRS: the federal reserve, the world bank, the IMF, everything, the federal reserve system, the federal reserve board, anything with federal reserve. I got back a certified copy with a gold seal, paper and ribbon, “there is no such entity doing business in the state.” I got it from Texas, and from Nevada and they all said the same thing. Nevada was good, but Texas was the best because they went to international and foreign domestic and corporations and covered the whole gamut. They said that IRS does not exist. That means that they can’t do business in the state, even if it is a territory. They can’t do business. They can’t collect taxes or file liens in the SOS office because they are not allowed to do that under the corporation laws of any state.

Jean: I’m challenging the banks on mortgages right now, saying that the SOS doesn’t list you as a registered entity. Some of them come back and say they are national banks and don’t have to register with the state. Big Al: yes they do. I got one from one of the states that not even the banks are authorized to do business; the federal banks are not authorized to do business in the states and are not even listed. They have all states and territories since the 1868 Act which was started on March 1, 1867 when all states became territories of the UNITED STATES; the northern states and the southern states, because they had to keep them all on an even keel. Jean: at the 14th amendment time, sure.

Big Al: yes, that is right. Guess what: do you know that all the Blacks were made slaves by the institution of the constitution when they were called 3/5 of a person. Now, when they were freed all the blacks became non-resident aliens having no contract with the UNITED STATES. So, what are they going to do with all these non-resident aliens who fit the description in federalist paper 42 and 43, and all the persons out there called UNITED STATES CITIZENS are going to complain about why they don’t go after them? Jean: we all became the same though. Big Al: in the 14th amendment which wasn’t actually passed, even as commercial law, because I have the SC quarterly law review, and others in Georgia and they all said it was unconstitutional. If it is unconstitutional then they are playing both sides of the fence. They are playing their corporate and their constitutional, and now the constitutional thing is slowly going by the side. Here is one thing for you: there was a man and in NC and he’s fighting property taxes and the drivers’ license and he went to the SOS office in October, 2008 and he called me right away and said you are right. He went in and asked where the court of North Carolina. Not the state of NC, but the Court of NC. You know what she said? We don’t recognize that court, we don’t recognize NC,

we are the corporate state of NC. End of story. Now, where is the contract? Where is your contract to be a citizen.

Jean: you get it when you sign up for things like voter registration, drivers' license. Big Al: here is a case and you can pull this and I got it from Carl Grants way back in 1993. it's a Minnesota case and I read the quote and I think that case and I quoted the man in Minnesota, I think his name was Remus, and he was a foreigner, non-resident alien and he said his intention was to be a US citizen and he never followed through. He said he was subject of the King of Saxony or something. He went through the court and the court said it didn't matter, even if he voted for a Minnesota governor, he was still not a US citizen. That might grab a lot of people. I read at the beginning of the show the 3 things they had to do. This man never did any of the 3 things. Therefore the court had to rule that he was a non-resident alien and they couldn't touch him, even if he voted. Here is the thing from the Solicitor General of the US in 1864: this is a direct quote out of his book, page 322: *"an alien owes no allegiance or obedience to our government or to our constitution, laws, or proclamations; a citizen subject is bound to obey them all. In refusing such obedience he is guilty of crime against his country and finds in the Law of Nations (if you become a person, you are under the Law of Nations) no justification for disobedience. An alien being under no such obligation is justified in refusing such obedience. Over an alien enemy our government can make no constitutional law or proclamation obligatory force because our laws bind only our own subjects and have not extraterritorial jurisdiction."* The source is the legal classics law _____ and it was filed in Massachusetts under the constitution of the United States 1864, 10th edition entered by the act of congress in the clerk's office in the district court in the district of Massachusetts
1:58:26 minutes.

Jean: I have to tell you I live in Mass. And for a long time I have been telling people it's the worst place to be and it is going to be the best place to be because we have the oldest constitution and because we were in the original part of Virginia. A lot of stuff is happening positively here in the courts right now. Big Al: here's another thing you can read: Federal Register 2Z September 7, 1943: go to page 12266 section 404.102. this is what congress states in G: *"compensation paid to non-resident alien individual, remuneration for services performed by non-resident alien individual does not constitute wages subject to withholding"* under section 1622. Now let's go to title 26 CFR pages 62 and 63, section 301, 6109-1g: *identifying numbers: well, there is your entity ID. "non-resident alien exclusion: this section shall not apply to non-resident aliens, foreign corporations, foreign partnerships or foreign private foundations that do not have income effectively connected with the conduct of a trader business within the UNITED STATES and do not have an office or place of business or fiscal or paying agent in the UNITED STATES.*

Jean: the opposite is also true then, which I had learned that unless you did business with a company in the country... Big Al: you can be a non-resident alien and be a taxpayer. Now, here is one court case that is granddaddy of all of them: *all acts of legislature apparently contrary to natural right and justice are in our laws and must be in the nature of things considered as void. The law of nature are the laws of God whose authority can be superceded by no power on earth. That means even the pope. a legislature must not obstruct our obedience to Him and from Whose punishments they cannot protect us. All human constitutions which contradict His laws, we are in conscience bound to disobey. Such have been the adjudications of our courts of justice: Robin vs Hardaway 1 Jefferson 109* and this goes all the way back to the Brohams case, an English case law they quote: *Calvin's Case, Hobb 877 CO 14.*

Jean: it's phenomenal and nice to see the understandings that are out here. Big Al: you have to put it all together and you can't understand one little part, another little point; you have to put them all together. Jean: you sir, have the right and responsibility to say that to us, because you

are one of those people who has that length of view by virtue of your age and maturity. Kurt: and his research. So, the Mexicans that here.... Big Al: when they first came in North Carolina gave them a license to drive without a social security number. Why? They were non-resident aliens and they knew it. These people know it. The Informer put in the Paddleford Case that he found: *14 Georgia 438 supreme court case*. And in 1857, when admiralty came on land, on page 520 this is what the court said and they use oxymorons to cover their butt so the people don't know that man and not person is free: *but indeed no private person* (there is the oxymoron) *has a right to complain by suit in court as the ground of a breach of the constitution*. Like everybody did when they went in against Obama. *The constitution is true; it is a compact* (this means it is a contract) *but he is not a party to it; the states are a party to it and they may complain and if they do, they are entitled to redress*. Not you. Not me. Nobody else. *Or they (the states) may waive the right to complain.*"

Jean: that makes perfect sense because the states are just an amalgamation of individuals living on the land. Big Al: the states are a 'person' and when you read the law journal that I read from it will tell you the definition of a person means a subject of government. It says it plain out. If you are a subject of government, how can you have standing to bring an action against Obama for not being a US citizen? Do you know that the UNITED STATES, when it was first formed, there was a man that brought a suit against it? It was *Republic res Publica vs (the man's name)* and it was a 1799 Supreme court case and the very first sentence states: *the United States is a corporation from the moment of its inception*. There you go, the court admitted it in 1799. *Respublic- republic*—if you follow the word all the way back in Black's Law you will find it is a corporation.

Big Al: So, a republic is a corporation. Plain and simple. Here's how you prove it: take *republic* in Black's 4th and read every word that defines the republic. Then take everyone one of *those* words and redefine it and find it in Black's law and it takes you back to Jural Society. So, a Jural Society, and I know there were people in California that formed a Jural Society, they were a corporation and they didn't know it; they thought they were doing something great. So, you take every definition and you look at the definition of every word in the definition of *republic*. Take every one of those words that define it, because they were words at that time, there were no *terms*, and define everyone of those words. It will take you 6 months to do and you have to do it to understand what republic means. The word *federal* has never been changed. Do you know what *federal* means? Contract. Look it up in 1828 Webster's dictionary. *Federal* means contract and every one of those people knew it. What is the federal government? Contract government.

Kurt: Federal Express is a contract express company. Big Al: yes, because when you contract with Federal Express it's a contract express that you contract to take your mail wherever you want. What is a federal individual income tax return? It really is a contract individual because they have defined *individual* as a **term**; it's not a word anymore in law, it's a term. You can find it by going back to the FOIA Act in section 6 and it says: *individual is a UNITED STATES citizen by term*. So, if you are an individual, you can be an individual non-resident alien because individual is not a term of law. Person individual is a term of law. But a non-resident is outside the law, outside the contract so he can call himself an individual, non-resident alien. That is the play on words, and words are what kill you. English grammar is what kills you when you write your briefs. I can pick up a brief and read it and by the third page I can tell if the guy is going to win or lose. I gave people the option to send me your briefs and I would tell them if they were going to win or lose. Well, the one guy that didn't want to listen to me, but his wife did, sent me the brief. He's the guy in NC that had written a brief against the state, and I can't think of his name. it's well known on the internet and he had a court hearing this past week in Raleigh and he lost. He lost the first case right out of the box because he wouldn't listen to me. He was too busy

writing his brief and I heard his wife in the background when I called him and I heard him say, *“I’m writing this brief and I have to get this done by Friday; I don’t want to talk to anybody.”* The wife sent me his brief. Ralph: was that Rod Class? I sent her an email back and said, *“he is going to lose. Don’t hold your hopes he is going to flat out lose. And, a week later he had the court hearing and he lost.* Big Al; yes, that was Rod Class. He wouldn’t listen to me; he killed himself by using constitutional issues, he admitted he was a US citizen, he did all the things you don’t do. He’s the plaintiff and he couldn’t use the defense in Gilberts. But, he killed himself and was ignorant of the facts of the law he was using because you don’t use their law and he never as a Plaintiff brought in the NC general statute section way back in 250.5 that says that you have a choice of law. He never brought his choice of law in, so naturally the court on its can choose the law it wishes to choose because the plaintiff never brought in his choice of law, which would be natural law.

Big Al: I’m getting the high sign from my wife, that I’ve got to go. That is basically what it is and I don’t know what else to say. It takes years, literally years, to digest this stuff. Ralph: one last thing, Big Al, you said “years to digest this stuff.” If you had to guess, looking at what is going on in America today, how much time do you think America has left before it completely implodes and all hell breaks loose. Big Al: before the end of the year. Ralph: I’m asking and I know I put you on the spot, but I can’t see any way for them to keep this thing propped up. I actually thing the UNITED STATES is going to start WWIII. The UNITED STATES is just a pig venom garbage and we are in a lot of trouble. Big Al: if you go and look at Black’s Law 5th Edition, we never satisfied the parameters of citizenship by the act of 1802. so, Black’s Law says: *a legal fiction: assumption of fact made by the court as basis for deciding a legal questions. A situation contrived (?) by the law to permit the court to dispose of the matter.* That’s what they did in Rod Class’ case. They do it all the time. But, here’s a little thing that nobody knows: do you know that the Pope—the White Pope, not the Black Pope, because there are two popes, the white pope in 1355 took all of his Knights Templars and made them attorneys. That is the first time in law in history that you can pinpoint—1355 when attorneys got their ‘coming out.’ The pope still controls every attorney in the world. The Informer put out the book, *The Myth and Reality*” has the organizational structure of the Black Pope of the Vatican. and, he put it in the book and you wouldn’t believe what the Black Pope of the Vatican, or the Vatican, controls. It’s like a who’s who in the world. Let me read this to you right out of the organizational structure and I’ll start from the top on the structure: *the top block: Satan, Lucifer; underneath that: superior general of the Jesuits, now Adolfo Nicolas Pushan; under that, the Jesuit order; under that: the Illuminati and it lists them: the Grand Orient Lodge, the Baani B’rith (spelling?), the Committee of 300, the thirteen Satanic bloodlines, the council of 33 degree Masons of the Scottis Rite, the council of the 13 of the Bavarian Illuminati; money group, banking; Federal Reserve, USA, European Central Bank BCE, IMF, world bank, Bank Mundel, WTO, National Central Banks, International Bank of Settlements; World conservation Bank, multi-national corporations (of which I worked for one), Walt Disney, Exxon, Shell, Bayer, and Hollywood, Rockefeller Foundation, Nobel Foundation, International Banking—Rothschild; Chase Manhattan Bank, Deutsche Bank; Bank of England, Goldman and Sachs. Now, let’s go down to the education group: this is what the pope owns: UNESCO, world peace group, planetary congress, world federation association, WWF, Greenspeace, Lucas trust (they call it Lucifer trust), World Goodwill, World Union, Esalyn Institute (?), American Society for Microbiology; Intelligence Group: CIA-USA, FBI-USA, NSA, Program Echelon-USA, KGB-Russia; Mossad-Israel; BND—Germany; DGSE-France; British Intelligence; SIS and MIS; Communist Party; Interpol and Europe Interpol.*

Big Al: guess who is head of Interpol in the UNITED STATES? The Attorney General. Continuing on the chart: *Drug Cartels; Mafia-organized crime; the Mafia for the pope is Opus*

Dei; *FEMA-shadow government USA; Secret Service of Pakistan*. Now let's go on the chart to religious groups: we operate and I have the books on it under ecclesiastical law and nobody knows about it. *World Council of Churches*, this is what is owned by the Vatican. *National Council of Churches, World Parliament of Religions, New Age Movements, esotericism, Unity Church; Unitarian Universalist Church, Ba'hai, people of understanding: Vatican—the pope and the cardinals, Opus Dei, Roman Catholic Church* -- the Vatican took over the Roman Catholic Church in 325 AD when it went bankrupt—*Bin Laden, theophysical society, Nation of Islam-USA, Hamas, Hezbollah*. That's what they own.

Big Al: now political groups: *national government leaders: UN, Bilderberger, Council on Foreign Relations*, this is all operating under the Vatican. *Aspen Institute, Club of Rome, Bohemian Grove, European Union, CEE and European Institutions, NATO, Pilgrim Society, Fabian Society, Round Table, Royal Institute of International Affairs, Intitute Fracas Dis Relations in French. European Royal Families: England, Spain, Netherlands, you name it. The secret societies are the T2 Lodge, the Knights of Columbus, the Knights of Malta; guess who is a Knight of Columbus—Alito on the Supreme Court. The Thule Society, Rosicrucians, Priori de Sion, the Royal Order of the Garter, Knights Templar, Grand Alfina (?) Lodge, Grand Orient Lodge, Skull and Bones, and the Freemason Scottish Rite.*

Big Al: That is all under the pope—he owns everything. Because you see, when the pope took over the catholic church, and he is a fraud to begin with, the Catholic church doctrine said that no man can own any property or possessions because the pope owns it, because he is the Vicar of God, the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Now, the first pope, after Jesus died, was St. Linus who took it upon himself to declare that he was the Vicar of Christ. He alone did that; no one else. Through his progression I got all the white popes from 67 AD as he became the pope in 67 AD on his own volition. It's gone all the way to today and the pope is not the vicar of Christ. He is the Vicar of Satan, because at the top of the heap is Lucifer. They don't like to use 'Satan' they hate the word, Satan, and they use the word Lucifer.

Jean: yes, Catholic school for 12 years and we were all trained that Lucifer was the fallen angel.
Big Al: even the bibles were changed and you can't believe any of them; I don't care if it was Geneva which I got, the Far Fenton (?), the King James, and any other bible that you get are ALL wrong and you can prove the discrepancy and the contradiction of terms by reading Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. pick the book up and read it; these are **words** and not **terms**. They have been changed so much that Genesis 1 contradicts Genesis 2. Nobody reads the bible; they have it but they don't read. Or they can quote scriptures up the wazoo but do they understand what the bible say? No.

Big Al: I'm getting the high sign from my wife. God said, that Man is head of the household, but women usually control the household. When we got married I gave all my paycheck to my wife. That's how I am. I don't want to handle the money. one time she turned the check book over to me and it took her a month to straighten it out. Anyway.. here's a direct quote: *whenever any writ or process is sued out or prosecuted by any person in any court of the UNITED STATES or of the STATE*, ok, guess what is missing. The word **either**. Let me read it again: *whenever any writ and process is sued out and prosecuted by any person in any court of the UNITED STATES and of a STATE and by any judge or justice....*see, these **ands are all 'or'**. But, they didn't put any **either** before it, so it is a conjunction, meaning they own everything and they can do anything they want in any court by any judge. This is what the patriots cannot understand because they don't know English grammar. I used to love to diagram sentences. Can anybody do this today? You get the verbs and all that. It says: *whereby the person of any public minister or foreign prince or state authorize and received as such by the president or any of the domestic*

servant of any such minister is arrested or in prison, or his goods or chattels are distrained, seized and attached, such writ of process shall be deemed void. Where does that come from? Hyde International Law, volume 1 section 438, pages 753, 754 and Moore International Law Digest Volume 4, page 634; Hershey Essentials of International Public Law.

Big Al: do you know that the first 9 presidents of the UNITED STATES could not pass constitutional requirements to be president? That includes Washington. The first president that could constitutionally hold office was “Tippecanoe and Tyler too.” That was Jackson. Because, remember when the 1783 peace treaty was written, it wasn’t until the day after the 1783 treaty of peace was written, that the UNITED STATES was recognized under international law as a corporation. That means to pass muster Washington and all, even Congress, could not hold office until 1797. they couldn’t be elected. So, the corporation formed by the Vatican, because they adopted it, had it signed as witnesses. What were the signors witnessing? They were witnessing the contract written by the pope for his corporation called the UNITED STATES. And to then control everyone of his plantations which were then the original 13 states which were originally British corporations. Jean: they were trading companies in commerce.

Big Al: man and woman created the constitution, never had any say in anything; I have the 1955 history book from when I went to school. It was written by Harper and Rowe. The man that pope elected to come here to the UNITED STATES was Rupert Murdoch, a Jesuit. The Black Pope told him to come and buy out Harper and Rowe so they could destroy those books because they were too damaging meaning the corporations of MAINE, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW HAMPSHIRE and all those including VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA and GEORGIA; these were all owned by the Pope because in April 21, 1214 when the contract was finally consummated between the Pope and the King (of England) the pope owned the entire British Empire world wide. And all the subjects of the King. Why? Because the King James (should be John?) kicked out Stephen Langton who was the pope’s head man in the Church of England. Because he did that he ‘lost his soul’ and was excommunicated from the church along with every British subject. Well, they didn’t like that so the King cut a deal with the pope since the pope was owed money by the King for the fighting they did. The King of England was also the King of France. You have to go back in history to see what is happening to us today and why. So, now you have in 67 AD the pope claiming he owns everything and taking over the Catholic Church in 355 AD, moved it to Rome and claimed to be the head of the catholic church and everyone believed it.

2:31:20 minutes

Big Al: if you have 1.5 million followers how are you going to tell them and how will I tell my aunts and uncles who are devout catholics that the pope is a fraud and the church is a fraud. They’d kill me. This is how far back in history you have to go. I even went back to Genesis 1 to find out the fraud. It’s hard to believe but if you pick up Genesis 1 and read all the chapters and lay it side by side with Genesis 2 and they contradict. When Genesis 2---everybody thinks the world was created in 7 days. That’s what they all believe. Genesis 1 ended on the 7th day. We have a problem here. In Genesis 1 the plural was used: *“Let us create man in our likeness. Us and our are plural. How can God create..there was no Jesus, so how can God be ‘us’ and ‘our.’ It must be some people from another planet.* Jean: non-resident aliens! Big Al: in Genesis 1 they created man and the beasts. In Genesis 2 a god, (one) created man, but no in his likeness, in the Garden of Eden. But in the bible in Genesis 2, he said, *‘there is not a man to till the ground.’* Why not if they were all created in Genesis 1. why not? So now he created man out of the ground and no in his likeness. He never said He made man from His likeness, but that He created man from the ground. He created the woman from man’s rib. In Genesis 1 they created in their likeness and it’s all in the plural. This is how close you have to read the Bible and the words.

Big Al: I'm a researcher from day one and have over 40 years in laboratory research. I was taught by the best researchers on (job) time, not in school. On line, in the labs, doing it and doing international work, international breaking of patents. That was my job at the end, to do that until I got fired. Why did I get fired? Because I wrote a letter to the IRS and they didn't like it. So, they fired me. Walked to the office, made sure I cleared everything out of my desk, walked me out and said goodbye, don't come back again. It was like I had stolen something from the company. That's what you go through when you know you are right.

Jean: they say ignorance of the law is no excuse but I have to tell you knowledge is truly power.
Big Al: knowledge of the law is no excuse. What law? Natural law. Felix Frankfurter said in 1933 in the Justice symposium that "*law is transcendental nonsense because no man can understand statutory law of man, but they can understand God's law.*" So that is the difference (in statements). Ignorance of the law is no excuse. Ignorance of God's law, natural law is no excuse. You know the ten commandments and that you don't go out and kill anybody....murder, not kill. In a war you can kill but you can't murder. There's all these little things you have to pick up and they come so easily when you go and start to learn what happened in ancient history. Do you know that courts call ancient history 20 years?

Big Al: so that would have me going back to 'prehistoric stuff' (by that time line of the courts).
Ralph: no wonder our educational system is in so much trouble. Big Al: that is why the man said to me, and when I got home I called the newspaper guild in Washington DC and asked them: *could you tell me what the education level of the papers that are written such as the San Francisco Chronicle, the Atlanta Journal, the New York Times, the Trenton Times, the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Chicago Sun*" They responded that it was 5th grade. 5th grade! *Yes because if we right any higher and allow the papers to right any higher level we will lose our advertisers and the papers will be out of business.* It's now down to 4th grade. Ralph: and dropping rapidly. Big Al: very rapidly. I used to watch a show on TV around midnight that was called street smarts. They would go around and ask the average person on the street questions. Whose face appears on the quarter? All the older people got it. The young kids and the college graduates didn't know. What year was the revolutionary war fought. All the college people, and people under 40 said they didn't know; the older people knew. What year did the war with Japan end? They didn't know—it was 1945. I remember as a kid, when the war ended we ran around the peach trees on our little farm banging pots and pans. The war had ended. When Roosevelt died we didn't do anything; my whole family hated him. He was one of the scumbags along with Lincoln. The only good president I have found in my research was Jackson. Even Adams, because there were certain things that Adams did because he was under the Pope's control. Adams had a quote that I put in a book *The Informer* got: *my history of the Jesuits is not eloquently written; but it is supported by unquestionable authorities and is very particular and very horrible. Their (the Jesuit order) restoration in 1814 by Pope Pius VII is indeed a step towards darkness, cruelty, despotism and death. I do not like the appearance of the Jesuits. If ever there was a body of men who merited eternal damnation on earth and in hell, it is the Society of Ignatius Loyola. By John Adams, 1735-1822—2nd president of the United States.*

Big Al: there is war. Lincoln said: *the war, the American civil war of 1861-1865 would never have been possible without the sinister influence of the Jesuits.* Ralph: the history of the Jesuits and the bankers goes back a long way. Big Al: did you know the Rothschild bank is now the head bank of the Vatican? it controls all the Vatican. Ralph: and every congressman has a Vatican bank account, by the way. Big Al: now, here's one: you tell me who wrote this one: *I have learned most from the Jesuit order and so far there has been nothing more sinister imposing on earth than the hierarchy organization of the Roman Catholic Church. A good part of that organization I have transported directly to my party. The Catholic Church must be held up as an*

example. *I will tell you a secret; I am founding an order in _____ who would then become the head of _____.* I see our Ignatius D Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order” who said this? Adolph Hitler said this and created the Nazi SS after the Jesuits. There was a Brigadier US general who wrote about that. here is his quote: *the organization of the Roman Catholic hierarchy is a complete military despotism of which the pope is the ostensible, apparent, seeming head but of which the black pope (editor’s note: the superior general of the Jesuits is the black pope) is the head of the order of the Jesuits and is called the general, i.e., the superior general. He not only has command of his own order but also directs and controls the general policy of the Roman Catholic church. He, the black pope, is the power behind the throne and is the real potential head of the hierarchy. The whole machine is under the strictest rules of military discipline. The whole thought and will of this machine to plan, propose, and execute is found in its head. The head is Lucifer. There is no independence of thought or of action in its subordinate parts. Implicit and unquestioning obedience to the orders of superiors in authority in the sworn duty, the priesthood of every grade. You know who killed Lincoln? Jesuits. You know who killed Kennedy? Jesuits. You know who killed McFadden (1933) Jesuits. You know who killed McKinley? Jesuits. You know who attempted on Jackson? Jesuits. It’s all documented and I have every documentation.*

Jean: does the etymology of Jesuit have to do with Jesus? Big Al: No. that was formed by d. Loyola, 1541. the first black pope. they killed (some) the white popes. The black popes did. Even though you see the black and white pope together, the black pope sits in the background pulling the strings on the white pope. whenever you see the white pope get out of his popemobile or get off his plane in New York what is the first thing he does? He gets down and kisses his property. he owns it.

Big Al: here is another thing that a lot of people, patriots included, don’t understand. Did you ever see the president advertised on TV when they have the general congress.. the man steps in the room and says, *I now present the President of the UNITED STATES.* They don’t say President of the United States of America; he’s the president of the corporation and that is why Obama can be put in there. he is the CEO of the corporation of the Vatican. and, the Vatican puts every president in office. You don’t vote in anyone. The electoral college doesn’t even put them in. it’s a joke. It’s a corporation, run and owned by the Vatican and do you know that they call the UNITED STATES the daughter corporation of Great Britain? I have an actual document that says that. and, not only that, but Pope Pius XVI said, *isn’t it grand that we have used the myth of Jesus this long?”* I have a newspaper clipping from 1891 that I can’t post online because it is so big and the paper is so old and is falling apart, but I did scan the article. In 1891 he came to the UNITED STATES to chew out his corporation for not doing what he wanted it to do. It was in the paper. If nobody believes that the pope runs this country, let me read you a passage of 2 pages from a 1400 page book that is a 3 volume set called Elements of Ecclesiastical Law: *page 54: on American canon or the national canon law of the UNITED STATES, What is meant by American canon law? By the national canon, national ecclesiastical law of this country we understand the various delegations from the just commune, or the different customs that exist among the churches in the UNITED STATES and are sanctioned and tolerated by the Roman Pontiff. We say sanction and tolerated by the Roman Pontiff for as was seen no national law can become legitimate except at the least by the tacit or legal consent of the Pope. again the jus particular of a nation always remains subject to the authority of the Holy See in such a manner as to be repealable at any time by the Vatican. hence, the jus nationale, or the exceptional ecclesiastical laws prevalent in the UNITED STATES may be abolished at any time by the sovereign pontiff.”* That is under national canon law. There is a whole chapter on it.

Kurt: I have something to add. A buddy of mine just yesterday told me that he knows about as much as I do, and he was talking to a friend of his at a copy machine in one of the office supply stores and struck up a conversation with a man making copies next to him. The man making copies next to him happened to be an international contract lawyer. He said that because of some of the stuff he was copying and the conversation, he said he had just returned from Switzerland. And he said he had to jump through all kinds of hoops so they could know who he was and that his background was fine. I went into a building in Switzerland and got in an elevator and I went into the ground so deeply, and then came into this giant cave. He said it was filled with nothing but gold and it was coming from the Vatican and they were stacking it in the cave. It was arriving 24/7.

Big Al: let me read a part of page 256 on the rights and prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff: *the second or catholic interpretation is that the church and therefore the pope, has indirect authority over the state. and, therefore the State is subject to the church in temporal things (not religious, but temporal) so far as they relate to external salvation or involve sin. This is a correct interpretation and appears from the holy tenor of the Bull itself.* (the Bull is from the Vatican—note taker: as in Papal Bull). *The spiritual power of the church has to instruct and judge the earthly power if it not be good. And therefore the earthly power deviates from the end. And, it will be judged by the spiritual.* The state is subject to the pope because either the pope or the church is ruling and the pope will not allow the state to rule his headquarters. Period. It's right there in 3 volumes of ecclesiastical law. That is what this country operates under, ecclesiastical law. Remember what I said about Hammurabi and he was afraid of God? But, he wrote the Hammurabi law of the Law Merchant. He tried to write it so he wouldn't offend God. That is exactly what it says in this book. You have to know the history to be able to interpret what you read in this book.

Big Al: there are so many things in the English language that people don't understand. Here is what you do if you have an 1828 dictionary. Look up the word presumption and then when you do the very first thing that you get out of the definition of presumption is supposition. Now go look up supposition—presumption is a lie that you cannot defend against because of supposition and that is how they get everyone into court. Jean: I do a thing called presumptive letters, like the opposing party, the offending party, and I give them 10 days to rebut. If they don't rebut each point, their silence is acquiescence and they lose. I go to court and use it as an affidavit and they are out. Big Al: I don't write an affidavit because God forbade an affidavit. You go to the court and they have a bible and they say to put your hand on the bible and raise your right hand and take an oath. Wait. What did Mathew 5:33 and 34 say? *No man shall take the Lord's name in vain.* Big Al: you will never swear an oath.

Big Al: I have Webster's dictionary here and let me read you presumption; they don't name the number of the books. *Presumption: supposition of the truth or real existence of something without direct or positive proof of the fact but granted on circumstance or probable evidence. Presumption in law is 3 sorts: violent, strong or probable. Presumption, a strong probability as in the common phrase "the presumption is that an event has taken place or will take place."* So now if you go to presumption and it said *supposition of the truth.* Now go back and look up supposition.

Kurt: we will put up the information on Big Al's books at Liberty and Freedom, the actual address and I'll put it on the blog and we'll promote the sale. I'll order some sets myself.

Big Al: here is supposition: *the act of laying down, imagining or admitting as true or existing what is shown not to be true or what is not proved.* Jean: that sounds like negative averments.

Big Al: the position of something known not to be true or not proved: hypothesis. Imagination and belief without full evidence. That is what the IRS always does. They presume you are a UNITED STATES citizen and you don't deny it. When you get your letters from them, it's supposition because they know they are a private organization and the private organization as a collection agency for the federal reserve and it was created by the Vatican in 1861. I got the proof by what I did in 1998 and by what I found back in 1861, the very first income tax. Everybody says I'm wrong that it was 1862. No, it was started in 1861 and the pope was the first man to lay an income tax on his Vatican people? In 1400. Immanuel Josephson's book, *The Rockefeller, the Gold Corner* lays it out how the pope created his coffers to make more money and actually laid an income tax on all the cardinals in the Vatican. so, what he did was come over here and he wanted to lay the income tax in 1861. it failed miserably because there were a lot of people alive who fought in the war (that they really lost) and they pounded on that so badly they had to change it. I got the actual documents from them at that point in time that I collected in 1983. you wouldn't believe what they did. They had to change it in 1862 and that is why everybody believes that 1862 is the first income tax; no, it was the 2nd one; they changed the first one. Then, guess what happened. They tried and changed it 7 times until 1867 and the Reconstruction Act and they completely let it drop. They found out how far they could push the American people on an income tax. That is what we have today.

Big Al: you know the case of Farmer's Loan Association in 1894? That was not an income tax and all patriots believe it was. You know what it was? It was a case on trusts. It was a trust case between the farmers and the Topkea Loan Company. It was a trust case, and not an income tax. Even lawyers believe this was an income tax case and it was not. It was a pure trust case.

Kurt: is there a chance in the future that you can come back on here. We are going to end the show. Jean, can you come back next week? Jean: yes, and I learned a lot from Big Al. Kurt: this is the best show, it was a pleasure. I have listened to all the discs from *Think or Be Eaten*. This was a pleasure and an honor. Big Al: I'll email you what The Informer gave me on his books from ATG press. There are 3 books that are around \$58 and some at \$35.

Jean: I am a dowser and there is someone who does rare book printing and puts the books on disc. Big Al: I didn't put them on discs. The Informer was in the midwest when he wrote his first book in 1990. people made new covers and claim they wrote the book. There were a bunch of attorneys that couldn't dispute the book. They got together and one woman names Down was a watch dog for the book and she would contact us to let us know that someone was stealing The Informer's book. They are well known people. They estimated that 3500 books were pirated and sold under a different name. that gave me a bad taste for patriots because they learned well from the government. There is one book with yellow cover and purple pages and The Informer did that so it can't be copied.

More discussion on having the books printed at 3:10 minutes. Big Al: there are some court cases that you can't get except from the archives. One time when I was in jail, I was in the capital city and they took all the books out of the library and hid them in the library in the prison. The original constitution was in the library in the prison. They didn't want anyone to go into the state library and get the original constitution. In there it said, and I do have the constitution here from that state: *this was never given to the people to accept or deny; it was just done*. They also said that it was a corporation because only the people that had 50 lbs. or the equivalent in land could be an elector. If you didn't have those you were nothing, you were a slave and you had no say in any government or any governership, nothing.