

## Would You Extend Credit to Uncle Eddie? -- Mortgage Madness

By Anna Von Reitz



Uncle Eddie is a great guy, friendly, personable, but he's a loafer and ne'er do well. He doesn't like to work and never makes a profit. He is always cheering for the wrong team, and spends money like --- well, worse than a drunken sailor.

Uncle Eddie has been in and out of jail and bankruptcy court repeatedly. And now, he wants you to loan him more money.

That's what you do every time you give someone Federal Reserve Notes in exchange for goods and services.

You extend more and more and more credit to Uncle Eddie.

He already owes you so much that you know he will never see daylight, but still, you go on loaning him more? What do you think is going to happen? Can you say the words "debt collapse"?

It took 232 years for the UNITED STATES to rack up a \$10 Trillion debt. Then another nine years to double that, and now, just five years to add another \$10 Trillion debt.

And it's all because you don't straighten up, wake up, find your voice and say, "No! I'm not giving Uncle Eddie another dime!"

It's your money these yahoos are spending and your credit they are extending--- and always to Uncle Eddie and always with the same result.

One of our guys is in court and the Bank of America is demanding payment on a mortgage from him, but, true to form, they haven't actually produced and placed a True Bill in evidence.

A True Bill (look up the definition) is different from a "Billing Statement" but they always try to get away with a Billing Statement instead.

They avoid producing a True Bill, because the victim of their schemes could use that True Bill to discharge or swap the debt.

Their failure to produce a True Bill is like talking about a horse instead of demonstrating the existence of a horse.

And it leaves the Judge in the untenable position of enforcing eviction notices and property seizures without a leg to stand on-- or horse to ride.

The government owes you money, so the government's bank owes you money and you also owe the bank.

So you are requesting a debt swap instead, a swap of any debt you owe the government's bank, for an equal amount of what the government owes to you forgiven.

This is a perfectly reasonable request. Federal Title 12 calls it a "Mutual Offset Credit Exchange Exemption" and guarantees it as a remedy for government debt.

The situation is that the government corporation owes you money and you owe the government's bank money. That being the case, you can swap debts instead of extending any additional credit to Uncle Eddie--- which would only increase their national debt and harm everyone involved.

Also.... try a little educational demonstration.

Take a United States Silver Dollar to court with you and a stack of \$1 Federal Reserve Notes and put both down where the judge can see them.

Ask if "his honor" is familiar with the concept of positive and negative numbers?

If so, point at the silver dollar and say, now, this here is the positive number one, and these over here, this stack of Federal Reserve notes is the number negative five (or however many there are)....

So, it should be clear that this one positive number is worth more than all these negative numbers put together.

"If we aren't going to offset the debts involved, this one silver dollar is all I have that is subject to an exchange rate, that I can actually pay a debt with, and obviously, one positive number is worth more than all the negative numbers combined, so the bank should be happy no matter what we do here.

If we swap debts, their debt is reduced by a substantial amount. If I pay with a silver dollar, at least they have something of substance to credit, which is greater than all the negative numbers combined.

So, you conclude ---- "The bank has no cause to complain against me in any case, and still hasn't produced either a true Bill signed and verified by a bank officer, or an equitable exchange voucher for me to sign.

They aren't doing their part. I am here ready and willing to do mine.

So where's the controversy?

Until they produce a signed and validated True Bill and place it in evidence, there's just talk about a horse and no horse here."

They may produce a Promissory Note and allege that it was signed by you (and maybe it was) but you scoff and say, rightly, that that is no proof of the existence of any current debt and neither is a Billing Statement.

In order to establish a cause upon which relief may be granted a bank officer has to validate the debt and sign an actual True Bill and enter it into evidence. Until then, the Bank is making frivolous nuisance charges and not only wasting the court's time--- they are endangering the reputation of the court should the court be led to act on their unfounded allegations.

Extending more credit isn't good for Uncle Eddie and it definitely isn't good for you, because after you loan him the credit and he spends it, he's going to come back and expect you to pay off his credit card bill -- with 20% interest.

So insist that they produce a True Bill and when they do, you sign it "Accepted for value in the amount by: Your Name" -- and date it.

This turns the validated True Bill into a Voucher that the Bank can ledger as a credit against the debt held in YOUR NAME on its books.

Many of you have complained that "A4V" doesn't work -- and no, it doesn't work unless you have an actual True Bill from the bank (or other creditor) to sign.

It does you no good to sign a Billing Statement and similar wannabe documents as accepted for value, because a Billing Statement has no value.

Find yourself a Financial Dictionary or Financial Encyclopedia that defines "Bill" or "Elements of a Bill" --- some older versions call it a "True Bill".

You will see what I mean.

What these banks are trotting in as evidence of debt is a bank's "billing statement" and not actually a Bill at all.

You can't pay anything or credit anything off a Billing Statement and that is exactly why they give you a Billing Statement instead of a Bill.

It's yet another substitution fraud.

Another thing they try to do is leave the "dollar sign" off the Bill, so that what appears is just a number, like this --- 126,784.00. This suggests that this is the amount of dollars owing, but doesn't say so. Until it is expressed as United States Dollars, or Euros or some recognizable currency it is meaningless and undefined.

You might as well be talking about the number of grains of sand in a bottle.

These are some of the tricks that Uncle Eddie (and Uncle Eddie's banks and courts) use to fool you into thinking that your debt to them is the Big Deal, when

actually, it's their debt to you that now stands at around \$33 Trillion USD, that should be the issue.

The banks routinely trick people into thinking that they are private banks because they have shareholders and boards of directors, but all the banks were "nationalized" back in the 1930's and they all belong to and are controlled by the same government that owes you your share of \$33T.

Same thing with the courts, only they convince you that they are public courts, when they are working for the same government that owes you \$33T.

Naturally, the banks and the courts collude to force you to extend more credit to them and their parent corporation, Uncle Eddie, and to avoid paying anyone back the least little bit of the credit they owe.

When you correct your birthright political status records and walk in as an American who is owed \$33T, whatever you could possibly owe to Uncle Eddie is going to look awfully small by comparison.

And you are going to have a whole different attitude, aren't you?

-----

See this article and over 4600 others on Anna's website here: [www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)

To support this work look for the Donate button on this website.