

Meat of the Subject - Money and Not Money

By Anna Von Reitz



The citations below are from Melvin Stamper, via a faithful reader; I am simply melding this into a process for you to follow when dealing with their courts.

But first....

I do not want to confuse people so I will remind everyone that in the Hidden Caste System, there are (1) people known as men and women, sons and daughters, people have Natural and Unalienable Rights and protected by the Constitutions and there are (2) Persons known as Humans, both male and female, boy and girl, who have only Human Rights and who must obey the Constitutions but have no guarantees or rights under them, and there are (3) Things -- slaves and corporations that are Unisex and give rise to a child or franchise, and have only Civil Rights which are actually privileges that can be taken away. They also have no protections under the Constitutions.

Men and women are above any statutory law or code or regulation, so any rule that accrues via any act of legislation does NOT pertain to them unless they contract otherwise.

So when we are discussing Federal Code or Federal Court Cases (except for the 8% of Federal Law that is made part of the Federal Congressional Record and which may apply to men and women under specific circumstances) the Federal Code pertains only to Persons.

Okay? So when I am citing "Federal Code" it is (92% of the time) for the benefit of our public employees, who are Federal Dual Citizens. This is what you need to show them about their obligations and the realities about what, for them, passes for money.

Money has to have value in-and-of-itself. A gold coin has value in-and-of-itself, because gold has value apart from whatever form it takes.

Everything else that passes for money is commercial scrip -- some form of bill, credit certificate, promissory note, warehouse receipt, bill of lading, etc. This "commercial paper" has no value in-and-of-itself.

This means that Federal Reserve Notes which are "promises to pay" at some uncertain future date or upon demand, are not money. They are I.O.U.s.

If you are brought into one of their courts or have to reply to one of their courts on a "money" issue, mortgage, lien, tax debt, etc., the first thing you want to do is ask if any attorney has been assigned to represent you, and fire them. You are "present against your will and require nobody to represent you" -- which should be apparent but has to be said.

Next step: "Nothing I say may be regarded as a pleading. I am here to inform the court. I am not a corporation and not representing a corporation. I am here as a living Elector and the only holder of the survivorship interest in the estate of (name of Defendant/DEFENDANT"

Next step: "I also object to the mandatory use of Federal Reserve Notes. I reject any role as a Tort Feasor against the Federal Constitutions, Article 1, Section 10."

"Federal reserve notes are legal tender in absence of objection thereto." MacLeod v. Hoover (June 22, 1925) 159 La 244, 105 So. 305, ---but I object.

I will also remind the court that the Gold Bullion Act of 1985 makes it clear that Americans, such as myself, are no longer obligors or grantors with respect to the Federal Reserve Banks and their Notes. Please see: Public Law 99-185, [December 17, 1985](#), 99 Statutes 1177.

I also wish to remind the Court that for purposes of any U.S. Citizens or citizens of the United States brought before it, **Title 31 USC Section 408 prohibits the redemption of any currency into gold and Title 31 USC Section 405(a)-3 prohibits the redemption of any United States currency dollar for dollar into gold and silver. Also, for a check to be a negotiable instrument, it must contain an unconditional promise to pay a sum certain in money and be payable on demand or at a definite time (UCC 3-103 (b) (c)), a condition which no check issued in the current system can meet.**

Thus the Moving Party (bank, IRS, Municipality, etc.) is itself prohibited from using so-called "money of account" and cannot reference me in this matter or make demands based upon it.

I believe they have acted in contempt of court and the law which pertains to them.

A quick examination of the reasoning yields the obvious -- the owner of the asset is also owed all the credit derived from the asset and cannot possibly owe a debt to himself for the use of his own credit.

I wish to remind the court that for its own purposes: **"An Appearance induced by Fraud (legal coercion, physical duress, or in regard to a fictitious party) has no efficacy"** (*Stultz v. Stultz*, 94A.2d 527, 24 N.J.Super, 354, 6 C.J.S. §18).

I will note for further reference of the court the following instances proving the nature of Federal Reserve Notes and Money of Account and its limitations:

"Money" does not include treasury notes". *Foquet v. Headley*, 3 Conn. 534, 536. And,

"In legal acceptance, "money" means current metallic coins; therefore an indictment for embezzling "money" is not sustainable by proof of embezzling greenbacks or national currency notes." *Block v. State*, 41 Tex. 620, 622. And,

"The term "money" does not include bank notes. They pass as cash, and constitute a part of the circulating medium, and for many purposes are to be considered as money; but, in the strict sense of the term, they are not included therein." *Dowdle v. Corpening*, 32 N.C. 58,60. And,

"Money," as used in Crimes Act, section 13, providing that any person stealing any money, the property of another, shall be guilty of larceny, cannot be construed to include bank bills, for strictly bank bills are not money, though for many purposes they are treated as such." *Johnson v. State*, 11 Ohio St. 324,325. And,

"The term "money," in the statute defining robbery as taking from the person of another any money or personal property of any value whatsoever, with force and violence, and with intent to steal or rob, does not include bank notes." *Turner v. State*, 1 Ohio St. 422,426. And,

"Federal Reserve Notes are not dollars." U.S. Treasury, General Counsel, Munk. And,

"Both notes and checks are acknowledgments of indebtedness and promise of payment." Hegeman v. Moon, 131 N.Y. 462, 30 N.E. 487. Smith v. Treuhart et al, 223 N.Y.S. 481.

So, both the Moving Party and this Court are prohibited from making a demand upon my Estate or claiming the existence of any debt based on Federal Reserve Notes or other fiat Notes posed as the indebtedness of a foreign corporation or other Legal Fiction, for I own the whole of it, both the assets and the credit these legal fictions extend.

Fictional money results in fictional debts.

I hold the only substantive right and possession of interest in any case.

As my court holds superior concurrent General Jurisdiction in this matter I expect to be obeyed and for this and any other claim of this nature brought against my estate to be dismissed with prejudice."

There you have a complete example of "fully informing the court" and basically telling them and the bank or agency, etc., where to get off your merry-go-round.

The truth of the matter is that they gained a purported but not actual interest in "your estate" via means of securities fraud and by misrepresenting you as a corporation engaged in interstate commerce.

Shove it and any claim of "indebtedness" based on Federal Reserve Notes or United States Notes or any other kind of "note" right back down their throats.

And have a good day.....

See this article and over 4600 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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