Narration for
Understanding Federal Tyranny, Part Two

Welcome to Part Two of the five-part Patriot Corps presentation, *Understanding Federal Tyranny.*

This Part will continue to provide listeners with a general overview on expansive federal powers, explaining in general terms how the federal government of delegated powers has nevertheless seemed to extend those limits all by itself.

The final three presentations will later prove this overview true as they "follow the money." The next presentations will fill in the details of the framework laid out in the first two presentations by examining a specific case—that of how Congress, Presidents and the Courts displaced our lawful money of gold and silver coin with paper currency.

Part Three will examine the enumerated power of Congress To coin Money and regulate its value, looking into the first Coinage Act under the Constitution. This legislative Act clearly shows American money to be only gold and silver coin of precise purity at defined weights.

Part Four will examine monetary debasement as paper currencies are cleverly upheld as legal tender, alongside gold and silver coin, by the fourth supreme Court case to rule on the matter, in 1871.

Part Five will conclude the series, exposing President Franklin D. Roosevelt's 1933 gold "confiscation" as a masterpiece of deception, to rob citizens of their property without Due Process or Just Compensation.

The goal of these five presentations is to showcase how, exactly, members of Congress and federal officials bypass their constitutional restraints, with impunity, despite the chains of the Constitution otherwise.

Understanding how federal servants cleverly exploit an unknown loophole in the Constitution to amass immense wealth, power and influence for themselves and their benefactors, provides Patriots a clear path forward for reclaiming our rightful American heritage of limited government and individual liberty.

Please recall from Part One our look into the highly unusual exception to all the normal rules of the U. S. Constitution—Article I, Section 8, Clause 17.

This clause—allowing for an "exclusive" legislative district for the government seat—is different from all other clauses, sections and articles of the Constitution.

While all the other powers came from the transfer of authority from all the States of the Union under the Article VII ratification or Article V amendment processes, the power detailed by Clause 17 came later from only the "particular" State of Maryland (and, for a time, Virginia).

The study of this source of highly-unique power in Part One of this presentation showed that this "exclusive" power for Congress to legislate "in all Cases whatsoever" extended to all matters within members' inherent discretion, except where they were specifically prohibited from acting.

This source of unlimited federal action must be examined further, to understand how this clause may be used as an ultimate weapon to effectively bypass the remainder of constitutional restraints.

Part One of this series ended with the "leaking" of these omnipotent powers sourced from Maryland *out* of the District of Columbia *into* the Union of States.

A failure to accurately diagnose the true condition facing us sadly led generations of patriots to falsely believe as true the absurd concept that supreme Court justices may alter the powers of government by changing the meaning of the Constitution's words.

Patriots came to this belief not only through their own eyes, but also their ears, as the courts loudly proclaim that they are the final arbiter of the true meaning of the Constitution.

It is imperative to rebut that false assertion, to refuse absolutely the first step of the march of the tyranny, into the land of Government-By-Inherent-Discretion. And, it should be noted, the weak protest that excessive federal actions are "unconstitutional"—because they are said to violate the reserved powers of the States under the Tenth Amendment—isn't anywhere nearly enough.

Instead, patriots interested in extricating tyranny from our land must actually come to understand how perceived tyranny is truly *constitutional*—how actions said to contravene the Constitution *actually do not violate its every clause*.

No person exercising delegated federal authority who takes an oath or affirmation to "support" or "preserve, protect and defend" the Constitution may act in contravention to its strict commands throughout the Union.

But, that doesn't mean that the same constitutional restrictions necessarily apply throughout every square foot of the Union. And, that point of truth it the small but necessary start in understanding federal tyranny in the Land of the Free and Home of the Brave.

Carrying forward that new understanding—that not all lands in the Union are of the same type and have the same governing powers over them—it is important for patriots to realize that the Tenth Amendment has no validity in the District Seat, that it does not and cannot apply there.

For well over 200 years, patriots have falsely asserted that members of Congress and federal officials could *never* exercise the reserved powers of the States. And, for that whole time, they have been wrong.

In 1791, Maryland "forever ceded and relinquished to the Congress and Government of the United States" the lands of Columbia, "in full and absolute right and exclusive jurisdiction, as well of soil as of persons residing or to reside thereon."

This cession of governing authority was absolute, to conform to the requirement of Clause 17 which requires Congress to exercise (and be able to exercise) "exclusive" legislative authority "in all Cases whatsoever."

Thus, with Maryland's cession of the lands for the District of Columbia to Congress and the U.S. Government, the State reserved no powers unto itself where the Tenth Amendment could even begin to apply.

In the District of Columbia, members of Congress may do as they see fit, other than a few minor things that the Bill of Rights expressly prohibits.

Indeed, even though legislative representation is the fundamental building block of the Union, in the District of Columbia, there is none!

Only *States* of the Union elect Representatives to the U.S. House of Representatives and Senators to the U.S. Senate. And, although the "District" Seat was formed by cessions of particular States, it is not a "State." The District of Columbia elects no voting member to Congress.

The States of the Union elect U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives to Congress and those members of Congress legislate exclusively in the District Seat in all cases whatsoever.

Thus, District residents are in no better shape than the early colonists were when others over whom they had no influence bound them against their will and without their consent in all cases whatsoever.

But, the real issue is not how the 600,000 district residents are affected, but how the highly-unique power meant for an infinitesimal area of exceptional land (now, some 44,000 acres out of 2.3 billion acres of land mass) affects the other 308 million Americans scattered throughout the States of the Union.

Careful students of political history can trace the small invasion of this exceptional power bleeding out of the geographic confines of the District Seat and begin to infect all the States of the Union.

Case-by-precedent-setting-case, the breach in the legal wall meant to separate the District Seat from the Union widened with deft precision which cannot be explained except by expert deception carefully conceived and executed.

Over the last two centuries, scoundrels in government bent on steering American government away from its original course were able to expand a unique power meant for the District Seat instead throughout the Union, for their benefit, and to the benefit of their benefactors.

These self-serving politicians and bureaucrats developed a gray area in the Constitution where the letter of the Constitution countered its spirit, where they could exploit their opponents' ignorance of the situation to their distinct advantage.

Due their solemn oaths to support the Constitution, the cunning federal officials and members of Congress that appear to give the written words of the Constitution new meaning cannot actually do that for the whole Union, although they can and do use those same words found in the Constitution *differently* for the District Seat.

There is nothing in the U.S. Constitution that prevents government servants from taking those same words found in the Constitution meant for the Union and also *using them in a wholly new light for the District Seat!*

Members of Congress or court justices may use the phrases "necessary and proper", "commerce", "supreme Law of the Land" and "General Welfare" and give them opposing meanings *for the District of Columbia.*

Only in the District Seat are those persons who are delegated enumerated powers empowered to do as they see fit. No government servant may become a political master, *except* in the District of Columbia where they rule absolutely.

Just how is it that court justices kept not only well-informed patriots wholly ignorant of their true actions, but also historians and legal scholars, who all think that federal officials have the awe-inspiring power to change their own authority by giving new meaning to old words?

The answer may be found by examining the first significant constitutional controversy, where the first claims of "unconstitutional" government actions were first asserted. In 1791, a bill to charter a national bank made its way through Congress and lay on President Washington's desk awaiting his signature to become law.

But, Washington had also been President of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, where the explicit power for Congress to be able to charter corporations was proposed, debated and explicitly voted *out* of being including in the final draft of the Constitution that was ultimately sent to the States for ratification.

Now, only two years after the Constitution was established in 1789, however, a bill charting a bank lay on Washington's desk.

In conformance with his enumerated powers, Washington required his principal officers in three executive departments to write written responses to the proposed banking bill.

Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson and Attorney General Edmund Randolph were the first to respond. They both denied Congress had the power to charter corporations, examining all the normal rules of the Constitution which could nominally reach such action and showing how none of them could support the banking bill.

President Washington forwarded those responses to his Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, who was the chief proponent of the banking bill.

Hamilton wrote a lengthy response, largely to help throw off the scent for all those he did not want following his reasoning.

It is noteworthy to mention that before Hamilton responded to support the bank charter, he first *affirmed* "that the power of erecting a corporation is not included in any of the enumerated powers" and he specifically *conceded* "that the power of incorporation is not expressly given to Congress."

In a government of delegated powers exercising only necessary and proper means, it would be difficult to recover from such admissions and yet support enactment of the banking bill.

However, Jefferson and Randolph made it easier for Hamilton to win his argument, for, after showing how none of the normal clauses could provide the allowable means to reach the charter of the bank, both opponents of the banking bill concluded that such an action would be "*unconstitutional"*— i.e., that *no clause of the Constitution* could support this action.

Thus, to prove them wrong, Hamilton only needed to point to the highly unusual exception of all the normal rules of the Constitution.

Hamilton rose to the challenge, writing:

> "Surely it can never be believed that Congress with exclusive powers of legislation in all cases whatsoever, cannot erect a corporation within the district which shall become the seat of government...And yet there is an unqualified denial of the power to erect corporations *in every case* on the part both of the Secretary of State and of the Attorney General."

With these words, Hamilton wrote what no one could deny—that members of Congress have the expressly-delegated power to exercise exclusive legislation "*in all Cases whatsoever,*" a power that easily reaches the ability to charter a corporation.

Hamilton went on to discuss the extent of this exclusive power, writing;

> "Here then is express power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over certain places, that is, to do in respect to those places all that any government whatsoever may do; For language does not afford a more complete designation of sovereign power than in those comprehensive terms."

The Secretary of the Treasury detailed that in "certain places", that government may, in "those places," do "all that any government whatsoever may do"—that the extent of governing power "in all cases whatsoever" extended to the most complete designation of sovereign power possible by the written word.

Even though Hamilton admitted that the exclusive power of Congress was actually limited to "those places"—those "certain places"—however, it was not within "those places" where the bank was actually being proposed.

Indeed, the bank of the United States was planned for Philadelphia, the acting capital at the time. Maryland would not even cede lands within its borders for the District Seat for another nine months, and the District of Columbia would not be built and become the permanent federal seat for another nine years.

Undoubtedly, that is why neither Jefferson nor Randolph thought of looking at Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, *because the bank wasn't being proposed in the District Seat.*

Hamilton wasn't going to be trifled with such small things, worrying about actually being empowered to do *what* he wanted, *where* he wanted.

The all-important question of how to use a power for D.C. beyond its borders remains. To examine that vital point, patriots need to learn about "allowable means," about the methods Congress may use to implement the enumerated powers.

The U.S. Constitution expressly lists its "allowable means test" of authorized federal powers, in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which reads;

> "The Congress shall have Power…To make all Laws which shall be *necessary and proper* for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The Constitution's *necessary and proper* means to enumerated ends sets the bar very high for determining allowable government action. When coupled with the solemn oath to support the Constitution by every member of Congress and high government official, this one-two punch *should deliver* a knock-out death blow to federal tyranny.

Within his 1791 opinion on the constitutionality of the first bank of the United States, Hamilton gives his *allowable means test*, writing;

> "If the end be clearly comprehended within any of the specified powers, and if the measure have an obvious relation to that end, and is not forbidden by any particular provision of the Constitution, it may safely be deemed to come within the compass of the national authority."

It is not vital to examine minutely Hamilton's subjective standard, beyond looking at the obvious set-up for who would determine whether an end was "clearly comprehended", whether a measure "have an obvious relation" to the end, and whether something is "forbidden by…the Constitution"—which he ultimately left to the courts.

Given Hamilton's hat-tip to the courts, perhaps it wouldn't be surprising that Chief Justice John Marshall, in the 1803 supreme Court case of *Marbury v. Madison,* makes the first bold claims of *judicial review*, that the courts had the ability to become the final arbiter of the Constitution.

Given the importance of this case, a brief review of its history is appropriate. The case stemmed from President John Adams' "midnight" appointment of William Marbury as Justice of the Peace for the District of Columbia just two days before Thomas Jefferson would be sworn in as the third American President. The Senate consented *en masse* to the nearly 60 circuit court judges and justices of the peace to attempt to lock in federalist philosophy before the (Democratic-) Republicans took over. John Marshall, in his final days as Secretary of State, gave his seal on the commissions for delivery. But, Marbury did not receive his commission before Jefferson took office, who cancelled undelivered commissions.

When Marbury's suit for his commission came before John Marshall who had taken his new seat as Chief Justice of the supreme Court, Marshall adjudicated and ruled on the case he helped set up.

But, the most important factor in the precedent-setting case was that Marbury was to receive his commission for Justice of the Peace, for the *District of Columbia*.

It is absolutely vital to realize that what the court ultimately rules for the District of Columbia is not the same as it may rule for the Union! The applicable rules in the District of Columbia, any time they are sourced in the authority ceded by only the particular State(s) of Maryland (and, for a time, Virginia) have nothing to do with the parameters all the States of the Union gave to Congress and the U.S. Government.

The whole purpose of the District Seat was to remove all influence of the States from the affairs of Congress and the U.S. Government in the federal Seat. That the States are to have NO influence in the Government Seat explains a great deal of federal action today.

Under the Union, it is the States of the Union that are the principal who crafted and established the Constitution. No person delegated federal authority for the Union has a say in the extent of their powers as they swear an oath to support the Constitution.

But, who is to say that the courts are not to be the final arbiter of what occurs in D.C. as a check on the unlimited power of Congress?

While Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 would seem to give Congress the final say on what occurs in the District Seat, it is important to realize that it is far more difficult for 435 voting members of the House and 100 Senators to agree on the wide discretion of powers they may in the District Seat exercise, far more difficult than it is for nine court justices to agree.

Of course, easiest is it for the single American President to agree with himself on how to proceed forward exercising unlimited discretion.

Thus, in a government of unlimited powers, it is not surprising when the Congress ultimately becomes the most-ineffective of the three branches of government, as the courts and the President surge forward.

With Alexander Hamilton laying out the path to expansive court "interpretation" to amass concentrated federal power, neither is it surprising that in the 1819 supreme Court case of *McCulloch v. Maryland* (which examined the constitutionality of the second bank of the United States), Chief Justice John Marshall famously writes almost verbatim that which Hamilton wrote (regarding the first bank, in 1791), saying;

> "Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the constitution, are constitutional."

The standards of Hamilton and Marshall, once the court makes all the subjective determinations necessary, essentially mean that;

> "Everything not prohibited is allowed."

Read properly, both Hamilton and Marshall's standards are the allowable-means-test *only for the District Seat*, even as both devils implied those standards were meant for the whole Union. Their written opinions are meant to throw patriots off the scent, to keep conservatives, libertarians, and strict-constructionists from seeing through their deception and to keep them from understanding what is going on, because once the true condition facing us is properly diagnosed, the ultimate cure can be applied and tyranny ended.

Their clever words inferred that the government servants who must provide a solemn oath to support the Constitution may redefine the meanings of words found in the written Constitution.

Which still begs the question, how exactly, did these scoundrels pull off that spectacular and seemingly-impossible feat?

To discover how they successfully turned the Constitution upside-down and inside out, we must examine Article VI, Clause 2, which reads, in pertinent words, that;

> "This Constitution…shall be the supreme Law of the Land."

Which begs the question, is Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 part of "This Constitution"?

Yes, of course, it is. It is the 17th clause of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution for the United States of America.

Which brings us to the next portion of Article VI, Clause 2, which states that;

> "the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance" of the Constitution also form part of the supreme Law of the Land.

Therefore, by the strictest words of the Constitution, *even laws enacted in pursuance to Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 therefore form part of the supreme Law of the Land!*

Thus, "the Judges in every States shall be bound thereby" anything in the State Constitution or the State laws to the contrary notwithstanding.

The implications of these two clauses of the Constitution—Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 and Article VI, Clause 2—held to their strictest-possible construction, have allowed them to bypass the remainder of the Constitution!

Patriots have falsely-accused progressives as "liberally construing" the Constitution, of giving the old words of the Constitution new meaning. However, that is what progressives *want* them to think, to keep patriots off-track from discovering the actual source of unlimited power.

As one may see, however, progressives actually achieve their success by holding two clauses up to their strictest-possible understanding, while ignoring all else.

In a battle between the strictest letter of the Constitution and its spirit, so-called "progressive" court justices have upheld its letter to ignore and overrule its spirit.

All federal powers expanded beyond the U.S. Constitution ultimately follow this same path, for nothing else allows them to use unlimited authority and inherent discretion. No federal servant may become a master throughout the Union, only instead in the District Seat and exclusive legislative areas used for forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards and other needful buildings.

Supreme Court justices have no power to alter the meaning of the Constitution's terms meant for the Union, because they must subscribe to a solemn oath to support the Constitution. That mandated support cannot extend to allowing them to change the meanings of any word of the Constitution that is meant for the Union or deciphering them in new light.

In the words of Disney's Genie (of *Aladdin* fame), though he may well have "phenomenal cosmic power", he has only an "itty-bitty living space." It is no different with American genies of phenomenal power, their itty-bitty living space does not extend beyond ten-miles-square jurisdiction (except to also reach exclusive legislative jurisdiction forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards and other needful buildings scattered throughout the Union).

Please realize that the cunning Delilah's of this upside-down world know to never voluntarily admit the true source of their god-like power, for that source, once widely understood, allows everyone else

to take appropriate steps to shave that source to its scalp, making god-like genies mere mortals once again.

To those patriots who blindly assert that D.C.-laws enacted by Congress cannot *bind the nation*, but are of course limited to the District Seat, examination of an early court case helps prove them wrong (even though their principles are, or certainly should be, correct [just that off-kilter judges were able to rule otherwise, because of the existing words of the Constitution]).

In 1821, local merchants in Virginia sold D.C.-based lottery tickets in contravention to Virginia law.

The case ended up in the supreme Court. Chief Justice John Marshall wrote, in *Cohens v. Virginia;*

> "Those who contend that Acts of Congress, made in pursuance of this power, do not, like Acts made in pursuance of other powers, bind the nation, ought to show some safe and clear rule which supports their contention."

Marshall ruled nearly 200 years ago that Congressional actions based in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 can and do indeed *bind the nation*—that the local laws enacted by Congress for D.C. may indeed be "enforced" throughout the Union.

He wrote that people who asserted otherwise needed to show the safe and clear rule in the Constitution which said otherwise. And, until the Constitution was clarified otherwise, that the Courts would hold that D.C.-based laws may indeed be enforced throughout the Union.

Of course, what he legally meant with that ruling versus what he implied were two different matters.

Strictly speaking, he legally meant that alleged criminals who broke a D.C.-based law and fled the area could be chased by federal marshals throughout the Union and be brought back to justice without going through any State extradition process.

What Marshall inferred, however, was that people who broke D.C.-based law *beyond the district's borders* could also be held to that law (which is false, at least if or when *fought correctly)*.

If Americans do not even understand that all of federal tyranny is simply local D.C. law enacted by Congress under the power given them by *one* State (in conformance with the U.S. Constitution but actually empowered apart from it) and then improperly extended beyond the District's borders, they have little or no chance of winning their case.

So, how do Americans correct matters today and get government again steered in the right direction?

A brief look into history helps patriots discover the appropriate path for clarifying the U.S. Constitution differently than that held by the Court.

In the 1793 supreme Court case of *Chisholm v. Georgia*, the supreme Court ruled that the States could be sued in federal court against their will by citizens from other States, in conformance with the court's understanding of the original words of Article III, Section 2, Clause 1 which read;

> "The judicial Power shall extend to…controversies…between a State…and foreign…Citizens or Subjects."

Despite the strict words of Article III, the States never intended to allow themselves to be sued in federal court by citizens of other States against their will. Thus, the States quickly ratified the 11th Amendment in 1795, which reads;

> "The Judicial power of the United States *shall not be construed* to…extend to any suit…commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State…"

Therefore, following the lead of the 11th Amendment which overruled the supreme Court and clarified the meaning of the Constitution to mean other than as the Court ruled, the Patriot Corps recommends its "Once and For All" Amendment to "contain" tyranny, reading;

> "No Law enacted under the seventeenth Clause of the eighth Section of the first Article of the Constitution for the United States of America *shall be construed* to be any part of the supreme Law of the Land under the Sixth Article thereof."

This amendment would provide the appropriate answer to Marshall's 1821 court ruling to provide now the "safe and clear rule" (that doesn't currently exist) that supports our contention that Acts of Congress, made in pursuance of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, *do not bind the nation*, like Acts made in pursuance of all other powers.

Although no existing words of the Constitution today clearly state such a principle, that does not keep us from ratifying a new amendment tomorrow to finally provide those clear words. Although the spirit of the Constitution should provide that meaning to honest and objective court justices (to give clear meaning to the whole Constitution), what is "legal" does not necessarily equate with that which is "moral" and "just."

Although all of the federal bureaucracy would remain under this new amendment, no longer could those Clause 17 powers ever "bind the nation." Just as no local laws of any single State may bind the nation, no longer should Congress' local laws bind the nation either, just because they were enacted by Congress, likely with the President's signature.

An alternative to an amendment to "contain" federal tyranny would be a stronger-acting amendment to "repeal" it. The Patriot Corps calls this alternative its "Happily-Ever-After Amendment" to end tyranny.

It is important to again examine historical precedent, to let history guide our path forward.

The 21st Amendment (the amendment that repealed Prohibition, which was put in force by the 18th Amendment), reads;

> "The eighteenth Article of Amendment to the Constitution of the United States *is hereby repealed…*"

The Patriot Corps' Happily-Ever-After Amendment to end tyranny hereby reads;

> "The seventeenth Clause of the eighth Section of the first Article of the Constitution for the United States *is hereby repealed."*

Enactment of this 28th Amendment to end tyranny would, in effect, also repeal the 23rd Amendment which provided D.C. residents a voice in presidential elections despite the District not being a "State" that was originally apportioned presidential electors.

After ratification of the Happily-Ever-After-Amendment, all that would be left would be the Amended Pie Chart of the thin blue wedge of federal authority being defined by strict construction of the U.S. Constitution and the large yellow remainder of the pie for State authority being defined by the respective State Constitutions (of State powers also limited by the U.S. Constitution).

The supposed authority of the courts to "interpret" words of the Constitution opposite their original understanding would evaporate back to the surreal ether of its deceptive origin, never again to exercise its tyranny over even one square foot of American soil.

Indeed, in a government of delegated powers, those who exercise enumerated powers can never determine the extent of those powers.

The land of D.C. would either be retroceded back to Maryland like Alexandria was given back to Virginia in 1846, or D.C. residents could vote on deciding whether to create a new State of the Union—(New) Columbia, perhaps—and enter on equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever.

While the Senate.gov website acknowledges there have been 11,700 proposed amendments since 1789, even as only 27 have been ratified, that high hurdle cannot dissuade freedom-loving patriots.

Indeed, neither amendment herein proposed would be ratified until well after the mechanism used to circumvent the bulk of the Constitution was clearly understood by an influential number of individuals.

Thus, patriots needn't look to that last step of the journey, but only to the first.

And, that first necessary step is to fully inform oneself of this clever constitutional-bypass mechanism and then tell everyone within your sphere of influence about it. In other words, learn the answer to *The Peculiar Conundrum* and then disseminate that information as far as you are able.

It is that simple. Become informed and then tell everyone who will listen.

This presentation on Understanding Federal Tyranny is the second of five planned presentations on *The Peculiar Conundrum*. These first two presentations concentrated on revealing the Big Picture, to understand how the bypass mechanism works in principle, shown from a broad perspective.

The next three presentations take the general principle and apply it in a specific case, looking at the odd and unlikely occurrence—given our Constitution—of paper currency replacing our gold and silver coin.

The third presentation examines the Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 power of Congress "To coin Money" and "regulate the Value thereof." It examines the first coinage Act under the U.S. Constitution, showing American lawful tender money to be only an amount and purity of gold and silver.

The fourth presentation examines how the fourth supreme Court case in 1871 ruled that paper currencies were a legal tender, even though the first three cases had earlier ruled that they weren't.

The fifth presentation wraps up the monetary discussion, showing how President Franklin D. Roosevelt's 1933 gold "confiscation" was a great con-job, how the only people who were "persons" with a legal obligation to deliver their gold were *bank shareholders* under the 1913 Federal Reserve Act who had a legal obligation to back their banking liabilities with gold.

In the meantime, at least until the other presentations are completed, please see any of Matt Erickson's nine public domain books found at the PatriotCorps.org website, available in online viewers, downloadable pdf, epub or mobi formats, or royalty-free paperback copies available directly from one-off printers.

God bless these United States of America and the Republic they founded.