



"Those who say it cannot be done should not interfere with those of us who are doing it"© - S. Hickman

[Home](#)

[Against the Grain Press
Loss of Liberty Revealed](#)

[Working Tommy C.](#)

[Livid Leigh](#)

[Boilin' Ed](#)

[D. Tom](#)

[The Informer](#)

[Knowledge is Freedom](#)

[Privacy](#)

[Links](#)

[Court Case](#)

[Contact Us](#)

© 1994 - 2009
Against the Grain

207,183

The Informer

MERRY-GO ROUND

Hello, people of America.

I have been watching all this banter back and forth on E-mail about how wonderful the Constitution and Bill of Rights are. I have seen people quoting parts of it and how it protects them. Many people sit on the merry-go-round and continually argue that it is turning. They say they can prove it, like the flat world people of the 14th Century, they can prove the world is flat. I got off the merry-go-round around 1984. Much to my surprise the merry-go-round was standing still. Now I was going around, as the rest of government was, while the people on the merry-go-round thought that government was standing still and they were moving. This just proved that those on the merry-go-round were absolutely wrong. They were standing still and the world was revolving, not them. What I am trying to prove here is that no one wants to get off and research correctly that the Constitution has been an utter fraud from the beginning and so has the Bill of Rights.

I said I was not going to do this but the Almighty says I have to keep trying. At least no one, when finding out the truth, can say "I never told you so." So with that, I am going to give you three cases that prove beyond a shadow of doubt that these merry-go-rounders are all wrong. Howard Griswold, Big Byrd, Dave DeRiemer and only a hand full of others are also, "off the merry-go-round" as they too have read these cases and agree. All the e-mail that I see that starts by showing the Bill of Rights are designed to protect the people in the States, I hit the delete key. I am waiting for a good e-mail to come over that does not say that. As a result, all the e-mail I get, extolling the constitution or the Bill of Rights gets the delete key right away. It takes up too much of my time reading falsehoods. I CAPITALIZE these words for effect in the cases.

FIRST CASE:

Supreme Court of United States--Constitutional law, John Barron v
The

Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, 7 Peters 243.

This defendant had his property taken by the State of Maryland and he plead the fifth amendment. The court lacked jurisdiction because the 5th did not apply to a state man, only to a United States man. And, the property was not within the United States or part of it's land ceded to the United States by Maryland. Therefore, the man could not use any of the amendments to the separate United States Constitution because it did not apply.

THE COURT STATED: "The provision in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, declaring that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, is intended solely as a limitation on the exercise of power by the government of the United States, AND IS NOT APPLICABLE TO THE LEGISLATION OF THE STATES. The Constitution was ordained and established BY THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR THEMSELVES, FOR THEIR OWN GOVERNMENT, AND NOT FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL STATES. Each State established a constitution for itself, and in that constitution provided such limitations and restrictions on the powers of ITS PARTICULAR government as its judgments dictated. The people of the United States FRAMED SUCH A GOVERNMENT FOR THE UNITED STATES as THEY supposed best adapted TO THEIR situation, and best calculated TO PROMOTE THEIR INTERESTS. The powers conferred on this government were to be EXERCISED BY ITSELF; and the limitations on power, if expressed in general terms, are naturally and necessarily applicable TO THE GOVERNMENT CREATED BY THAT INSTRUMENT. They are limitations of power granted in the instrument itself, NOT OF DISTINCT GOVERNMENTS FRAMED BY DIFFERENT PERSONS AND FOR DIFFERENT PURPOSES. IF THESE PROPOSITIONS BE CORRECT, THE FIFTH AMENDMENT must be understood AS RESTRAINING THE POWER OF THE GENERAL

GOVERNMENT, NOT AS APPLICABLE TO THE STATES. * * *
This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals for the Western Shore of Maryland, and was

argued by counsel; on consideration whereof, it is the opinion of this court that there is no repugnancy between the several acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, given in evidence by the defendants at trial of this cause in the court of that State, and the Constitution of the United States; whereupon, it is ordered and adjudged by this court that this writ of error be, and the same is hereby dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

SECOND CASE:

Hepburn and Dundas v. Ellzey, 2 Cranch 445

This was a case where a citizen of the District of Columbia (United States) tried to maintain an action in a Circuit Court for the Virginia district against a Virginia citizen.

*THE COURT STATED AND HELD: "A citizen of the District of Columbia CANNOT maintain an action against a citizen of Virginia, in the circuit court for the Virginia district. A citizen of the District of Columbia IS NOT A CITIZEN OF A STATE, within the meaning of the constitution. * * **

*It is contended that a citizen of the District of Columbia is a citizen of a state. It is said that he is a citizen of the United States, and not being a citizen of the same state with the defendant, he must be a citizen of a different state. But there may be a citizen of the United States who is NOT a citizen OF ANY ONE OF THE STATES. The expression "a citizen of a state," has a constitutional meaning. The states ARE NOT absolutely sovereigns, but (if I may use the expression) they are DEMI-SOVEREIGNS. the word state has a meaning PECULIAR to the United States. It means a CERTAIN POLITICAL SOCIETY FORMING A CONSTITUENT PART OF THE UNION. * * **

Even if the constitution of the United States authorizes a more enlarged jurisdiction than the judiciary act of 1789 has given, yet the court CAN TAKE NO JURISDICTION WHICH IS NOT GIVEN BY THE ACT. I, therefore, call for the law which gives a jurisdiction in this case.

[Informer's comment. The court goes into great detail using just about all the Bill of Rights and then makes the following conclusion.]

Other passages from the constitution have been cited by the plaintiffs to show that the term state is sometimes used in its more enlarged sense. But on examining the passages quoted, they do not prove what was shown by them. It is true that as citizens of the United States, and if that PARTICULAR DISTRICT which is subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, it is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which ARE OPEN TO ALIENS, and to the citizens of every state of the union, should be closed upon them. BUT THIS IS A SUBJECT FOR LEGISLATIVE, NOT FOR JUDICIAL CONSIDERATION. The opinion to be certified to the circuit court is, THAT THIS COURT HAS NO JURISDICTION IN THE CASE."

After completely reading the first case and solidify in your brain cells that the **court stated the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are not for the people in the states**, this second case, when read in its entirety squares with the first case and supports the conclusion that **the Constitution and the Bill of Rights never was yours in the first place**. Now for the kicker, clincher, hydrogen bomb, torpedo, whatever you want to call it, that finalizes the above two cases and sets it in stone that the Constitution and Bill of Rights YOU claim to be your godsend to the protection of God given Rights was a fraud from he very beginning is:

THIRD CASE

Padleford, Fay & Co. v. The Mayor, City of Savanna, 14 Ga 438.

This involved a sales tax case in 1854 by a company who refused to pay a sales tax after he collected it and brought an action. The opening opinion of the Supreme court judge states it quite clearly what the question is about. Then I will quote a paragraph or two and the final opinion only, since this case is 82 pages long. Don't read it and you are still on the merry-go-round and will never know the truth.

*THE COURT: "But a single question is presented for decision in this case; and that is, whether the Ordinance of the City Council of Savanna violates the Constitution of the United States. The Plaintiffs in error insists that it violates two of the provisions of the Constitution---that which declares that Congress shall have power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States"; and that which declares that "No State shall, without consent of the Congress, lay any imposts on duties or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its Inspection Laws." * * **

Now it must be manifest to any one, on a little reflection, that if the United States' Courts have power over the State Courts, they have power over State laws--power over operation of those Laws, within the territory of the States--power to nullify EVERY ACT OF THE STATES. Was this the intention of the makers of the Constitution--these very States? The conclusion is, * * *the Supreme Court of the United States has no jurisdiction over the Supreme Court of Georgia; and cannot, therefore

give it an order, or make for it a PRECEDENT. * * * The consumer, therefore, can waive his right to object to this ordinance, on the score of its being void; and HE DOES THIS WHEN HE PAYS THE TAX IT IMPOSES UPON HIM. It is time enough to hold the Law, made under the authority of the State, to be a violation of the Constitution, when it is complained of by somebody that it injures. It is too soon to do this, when the complaint is made by one that it does not injure, and one, who, if the complaint be allowed, will be enabled to keep what, in justice and equity, he has no right to. But, indeed, NO PRIVATE PERSON HAS A RIGHT TO COMPLAIN, BY SUIT IN COURT, ON THE GROUND OF A BREACH OF THE CONSTITUTION. The Constitution, it is true, is a COMPACT, BUT HE [the private man people, that's you.] IS NOT A PARTY TO IT. The States are the parties to it. And they may complain. If they do, they are entitled to REDRESS. [Informer: How many thought YOU had REDRESS? B.S., you never had any]. Or they may waive their right to complain. If they do, the right stands waived. * * *And this brings me to my general conclusion, which is, that the judgment of the Court below, ought to be affirmed."

The private man flat out lost. Now, how many still want to stay on the merry-go-round and moan, complain and argue that the Constitution and Bill of Rights are still yours? There are a few of us that have gotten off the merry-go-round, that is not really moving, long ago. We only laugh now at the ignorance of those on the merry-go-round, because we tried to get those on the merry-go-round, that the criminal government created so those could take the ride of their life, standing still on the merry-go-round and getting nowhere. That is why I hit the delete button when I see the drivel and ranting and ravings of a lunatic. Yes people, YOU are considered one of lunacy by the courts when you bring up the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Don't believe me, look up the word in the King's Dictionary (Black's Law) and in Words and Phrases. I am feeling sorry for those poor lost souls whose ignorance will keep them in chains by not giving up their egos. They want to be right, because they can't see the light, and don't want to admit to their followers that they may have been wrong. They are clinging to a thought process that was created by the best criminals the taxpayer could afford and refuse to get off the merry-go-round.

The Informer.

