

# Credit Loan\$ & Void Contracts

by Del Cannon

*On October 27, 1997 the U.S. stockmarket suffered the largest single daily loss ever — 550 points. Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin and other government officials quickly assured America there was no need to panic since the “fundamentals” (unemployment, inflation, etc) of our economy were strong. Curiously, none of the government officials bothered to mention money as one of our economy’s “fundamentals”. And yet, what could be more “fundamental” to our economic health than the condition of our money?*

*If there’s one section of the Constitution that’s almost universally ignored, it’s the Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 mandate that our money be backed by gold or silver. Constitution- alists have agitated over the money issue since we lost our gold to government in 1933. The public has ignored the constitutionalists since, after all, we can still “buy” whatever we want with paper money or electronic bank credits, right? So what’s the problem?*

*As you’ll read in this and the following article, the “problem” is that we the People are not only going broke for lack of real (constitutional) money, we may be slipping into personal bondage on a slide of paper money. That sort of claim may seem irrational to most Americans, but it’s entirely possible because, as one banking “legend” correctly observed, “Not one man in ten thousand understands the money sys-*

*tem.” That ignorance makes us vulnerable.*

*In fact, money is just as essential — and “invisible” — to the economic “life” of our society as oxygen is to the biological life of our bodies. Turn off the oxygen and you’ll die in minutes; turn off the money supply and your society will also quickly collapse. Why are we so collectively ignorant concerning a subject so critical to our survival and prosperity? Whatever the answer, our ignorance lays a foundation for what may be America’s most subtle and extensive form of oppression: credit.*

*By law, money is defined as a physical mass of silver. Credit (book-keeping entries and promises) is not lawful money. Banks, by law, cannot loan credit, only money. But given that there is virtually no lawful money (gold or silver coin) in circulation, banks are, in fact, loaning credit.*

*Who cares? What difference does it make if you buy a house, car, or Jetski with “lawful money,” credit, or buffalo chips, so long as you get what you want?*

*It makes a lot of differences too numerous to describe here. But consider this: Before the bank will loan you any credit (which has no tangible reality and is created essentially out of thin air), they typically demand that you put up some tangible property (your land or car) as collateral. If you fail to repay the loan of intangible credit, the bank will seize your tangible collateral.*

*For example, to secure a loan to plant crops, some farmers risk the land*

*that’s been in their family for generations as collateral, but the bank risks virtually nothing other than a few scraps of paper and bookkeeping entries. If the weather is bad and the crop fails, the bank winds up owning the real, physical farmland without ever paying a dime in real, physical money (silver). This is literally “something (the fam) for nothing (credit)”.*

*Given that the weather is bound to go bad sooner or later, any farmer who borrows regularly is playing Russian roulette. It’s only a question of time before the bank gets the farmland without really “paying” for it, sells it to some “creditworthy” corporate agri-businesses, and the price of your groceries skyrockets.*

*Consider another consequence of the banking business: failure to create the interest necessary to repay the loan guarantees mass bankruptcies. Our collective need for interest money is as critical as oxygen but just as invisible in a nation of 260 million credi-holics.*

*To illustrate, imagine you live on an island with a total population of ten, each of which owns 10% of the island’s land. Your island is a tropical paradise so benign that you and your neighbors survive by simply plucking food off the trees on your land.*

*Along comes a banker and offers to loan you \$1,000 to build a grass shack on your land. Sounds good (with a grass shack, you could impress that cute little redhead and maybe get her to marry you). Of course, to get the \$1,000 loan*

(and the shack and the girl) you must agree to repay the banker \$1,100 a year from now (\$1,000 for the loan plus \$100 in interest). And – you have to put up your 10% of the island paradise as collateral.

You sign, they loan, you build the shack, and the redhead starts flirting. Great.

Except your muscle-bound neighbor also likes the redhead, and therefore also borrows \$1,000 from the banker, agrees to repay \$1,100 a year from now, and puts up his land as collateral. Suddenly, the redhead isn't flirting with you — she's flirting with Mr. Macho.

Soon, all ten island inhabitants (even the cute redhead) have each borrowed \$1,000, put their 10% of the land up as collateral, and agreed to repay \$1,100 in one year. Collectively, the ten of you borrowed \$10,000 (\$1,000 each) and agreed to repay \$11,000 (including 10% interest).

The banker comes back a year later wanting his money (or your collateral), and guess what? Some of you can't repay the loan and therefore must surrender your land to the bank. Well, bidness is bidness, right? Some folks are lazy. Some unlucky. Some simply lack the personal discipline or smarts to handle credit wisely, right? Or so we suppose, but it's not that simple.

When the banker loaned \$1,000 to each of you, he placed \$10,000 total into circulation on your island. That money allowed you to buy sticks from one neighbor, thatch from another and labor from a third to build your shack. But the banker didn't loan (create) the additional \$100 to each of you (\$1,000 total) that would later be due as interest. Collectively, you ten islanders owed \$11,000 but there was only \$10,000 total in circulation on your island. Which means no matter how hard you islanders worked, it was mathematically impossible for all of you to repay your loans. Therefore, some of you were guaranteed to lose your land to the bank. The game was rigged.

For you to have \$1,100 to repay your loan, you'd have to squeeze the extra \$100 in interest out of one or more

of your neighbors. Suppose you overcharged for the sticks you sold to build your neighbor's shacks. Then you could get an extra \$50 from the muscle man (HA!) and another \$50 from the redhead (hey, babe, life is tough). Then, at best, they could each only pay back \$1,050 on their loans, and both would lose their 10% of tangible paradise for lacking \$50 in non-tangible credit. All ten islanders would face the same stressful choice: either overcharge and exploit your neighbors or lose your land. Once infected with credit, your island paradise becomes more immoral, unethical, and unfriendly.

The great irony in all this is that you islanders were living in near paradise. If you wanted to work cooperatively, you had all the sticks, grass, and labor you needed to build your shacks. Instead, you decided to do it the "easy way", with credit. The bank offered you a something-for-nothing deal, and you took it. You just didn't understand that the "something" was your land and the "nothing" was the bank's credit. Net result: at the end of the year, two to five of your neighbors could be homeless, and the bank (which risked virtually nothing) might easily own 50% of the tangible island based on loans of non-tangible credit. I believe that constitutes government-sanctioned oppression.

Real life is more complex and the fundamental impact of credit is harder to see but every bit as unjust. The mathematics of a credit-based economy guarantee that some of us – no matter how hard we work – are bound to go bankrupt and lose our tangible property to a bank. (The annual number of U.S. bankruptcies has risen steadily from 483,750 in 1987 to an estimated 1.06 million in 1997.)

Like the hypothetical islanders, Del Cannon borrowed credit from a bank and wound up in bankruptcy, unable to repay the credit and facing the loss of his real property. He became a student of banking and money. Ultimately, using the following "Memorandum of Law on Credit Money," he filed a Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (F.R.C.P.) Rule 52 Motion for a ruling on whether some of the loan contracts which led to his bankruptcy were

"wholly void". Under the F.R.C.P., the Court had to rule Yes or No. Instead, the Judge reportedly said on the record:

"Mr. Cannon, I will not rule on your Motion because I am not going to bring down this country's banking system."

Of course, just because one Judge was impressed by this Memorandum does not mean its contents are absolutely accurate or sure to be equally impressive to another judge (yours, perhaps). Nevertheless, those of you interested in learning the concepts of money or how to defend yourself against economic oppression should find this Memorandum interesting: Its fundamental argument seems to be that, without lawful money (gold and silver), our entire banking industry is based on fraud.

The first third of this Memorandum is a little difficult to understand. Stick with it. The last two-thirds are more easily understood and contain enough information to help you become the "one man in ten thousand who understands money."

**Tired of Fighting the battles all alone?**



Single women and men:  
Contact other singles interested in Constitution, common law, freedom issues, & traditional values.

Form a bond with someone who already shares your goals, beliefs, and concerns.

Find someone special for love and support and begin to enjoy every day to its fullest with your new partner while planning a happy and successful life together.

**JOIN US TODAY!**

For Free Information: Send large, self-addressed stamped envelope to:  
**Freedom Lovers Connection  
c/o 1111 Tenth St. #285AA  
Alamogordo, New Mexico  
[88310]**

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
PLANO DIVISION

DELANORE LEE CANNON &  
ROSE ANN HOOPER CANNON,  
PLAINTIFFS

VS.

TEXAS INDEPENDENT BANK, DEFENDANT  
Case No. 96-41 347-DRS Chapter 7  
Adversary Proceeding No. A-96-4147-  
DRS

PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW  
ON CREDIT LOANS AND VOID CON-  
TRACTS

To the Honorable Judge of Said Court:

This Memorandum with authorities, law and cases in support will establish the following facts: 1. Defendant and privately owned banks are making loans of "credit" with the intended purpose of circulating "credit" as "money". 2. Other financial institutions and individuals may "launder" bank credit that they receive directly or indirectly from privately owned banks. 3. This collective activity is unconstitutional, unlawful, in violation of common law, U.S. Code and the principles of equity. 4. Such activity and underlying

contracts have long been held *void* by State Courts, Federal Courts and the U.S. Supreme Court.

This Memorandum will show through authorities and established common law that credit "money creation" by privately owned bank corporations is not really "money creation" at all, but the trade specialty and artful illusion of law merchants who use old-time trade secrets of the Goldsmiths to entrap the borrower and unjustly enrich the lender through usury and other unlawful techniques. Issues based on law and the principles of equity, which are within the jurisdiction of this Court, will be addressed.

### *The Goldsmiths*

In his book, *Money and Banking* (8th Edition, 1984), Professor David R. Kamerschen writes on pages 56 - 63: "The first bankers in the modern sense were the goldsmiths, who frequently accepted bullion and coins for storage . . . One result was that the goldsmiths temporarily could lend part of the gold left with them . . . These loans of their customers' gold were soon replaced by a revolutionary technique . . . When people brought in gold, the goldsmiths gave them notes promising to pay that

amount of gold on demand. The notes, first made payable to the order of the individual, were later changed to bearer obligations. In the previous form, a note payable to the order of Perry Reeves would be paid to no one else unless Reeves had first endorsed the note . . . But notes were soon being used in an unforeseen way. The note holders found that, when they wanted to buy something, they could use the note itself in payment more conveniently and let the other person go after the gold, which the person rarely did . . . The specie, then tended to remain in the goldsmiths' vaults . . . The goldsmiths began to realize that they might profit handsomely by issuing somewhat more notes than the amount of specie they held . . . These additional notes would cost the goldsmiths nothing except the negligible cost of printing them, yet the notes provided the goldsmiths with funds to lend at interest . . . And they were to find that the profitability of their lending operations would exceed the profit from their original trade. The goldsmiths became bankers as their interest in manufacture of gold items to sell was replaced by their concern with credit policies and lending activities . . . They discovered early that, although an unlimited note issue would be unwise, they could issue notes up to several times the amount of specie they held. The key to the whole operation lay in the public's willingness to leave gold and silver in the bank's vaults and use the bank's notes. This discovery is the basis of modern banking."

On page 74, Professor Kamerschen further explains the evolution of the credit system: "Later the goldsmiths learned a more efficient way to put their credit money into circulation. They lent by issuing additional notes, rather than by paying out in gold. In exchange for the interest-bearing note received from their customer (in effect, the loan contract), they gave their own noninterest-bearing note. Each was actually borrowing from the other . . . The advantage of the later procedure of lending notes rather than gold was that . . . more notes could be issued if the gold remained in the vaults . . . Thus, through the principle of bank note issuance *banks learned to create money in the form of their own liability.*"

## TRAPPED IN THE LAWYERS' DEN WITH BLOODSUCKERS

A nonfiction book by Thelma N. McKoy, Founder  
*Carolina Advocates for Legal Reform (CALR)*

Price \$18.00

Book Review on the Internet

<http://members.aol.com/CALReform/index/html>  
CALReform@aol.com

mailing address:

Thelma McKoy, Executive Director  
Carolina Advocates for Legal Reform  
2825 Bancroft Street, Charlotte, NC 28206  
Telephone: (704) 372-9575

<http://members.aol.com/calreform/index.html>

Our e-mail address: [calreform@aol.com](mailto:calreform@aol.com)



[Emphasis Added]

Another publication which explains modern banking as learned from the Goldsmiths is *Modern Money Mechanics* (5th edition 1992), published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago which states beginning on page 3: "It started with the goldsmiths . . ." At one time, bankers were merely middlemen. They made a profit by accepting gold and coins brought to them for safekeeping and lending the gold and coins to borrowers. But the goldsmiths soon found that the *receipts* they issued to depositors were being used as a means of payment. "Then, bankers discovered that they could make loans merely by giving borrowers their *promises* to pay, or bank notes . . . In this way, banks began to *create* money . . . Demand deposits are the modern counterpart of bank notes . . . It was a small step from printing notes to making *book entries* to the credit of borrowers which the borrowers, in turn, could 'spend' by writing checks, thereby printing *their own* money." [Emphasis added]

### How Banks Create Money

In the modern sense, banks create money by creating "demand deposits." Demand deposits are merely "book entries" that reflect how much lawful money the bank owes its customers. Thus, all deposits are called demand deposits and are the bank's liabilities. The bank's assets are the vault cash plus all the "IOUs" or promissory notes that borrowers sign when they borrow either money or credit. When a bank lends its cash (legal money), it loans its assets, but when a bank lends its "credit," it lends its *liabilities*. The lending of credit is, therefore, the exact opposite of the lending of cash (legal money).

At this point, we need to define the meaning of certain words like "lawful money," "legal tender," "other money" and "dollars."

The terms "Money" and "Tender" had their origins in Article 1, Sec. 8 and Article 1, Sec. 10 of the *Constitution of the United States*. 12 U.S.C. 152 refers to "gold and silver coin as lawful money of the United States" and was repealed in 1994. The term "legal tender" was originally cited in 31 U.S.C.A. 392 and

is now recodified in 31 U.S.C.A. 5103 which states: "United States coins and currency . . . are legal tender for all debts, public charges, taxes, and dues." The common denominator in both "lawful money" and "legal tender money" is that both are issued by the United States Government.

With Bankers, however, we find that there are two forms of money — one is government-issued and the other is issued by privately owned banks such as Defendant, Texas Independent Bank. As we have already discussed government issued forms of money, we need to look at privately issued forms of money.

All privately issued forms of

money today are based upon the *liabilities* of the issuer. There are three common terms used to describe this privately created money. They are "credit," "demand deposits" and "checkbook money." In the Fifth edition of *Blacks Law Dictionary*, p.331, under the term "Credit," the term "Bank credit" is described as: "Money bank owes or will lend individual or person." It is clear from this definition that "Bank credit" which is the "money bank owes" is the bank's *liability*. The term "checkbook money" is described in the book *I Bet You Thought*, published by the privately owned Federal Reserve Bank of New York, as follows: "Commercial banks

### The #1 Investment For 1999 Will Almost Certainly Be: Survival/Investment Grade Rare U.S. Silver & Gold Coins.

- Fact #1: Gold is up a mere 2% since mid-January.
- Fact #2: Survival grade U.S. \$20 gold pieces pre-1934 are up 23% since mid-January.
- Fact #3: Silver is down about 17% since mid-January.
- Fact #4: Survival grade U.S. silver dollars pre-1936 are up a whopping 50% since mid-January.
- Fact #5: People who think that *modern* silver & gold coins are the way to go are losing money while the smart money buyers are *making* money.



**WHY? Call 1-800-835-6000 & ask for our FREE article:**  
"REASONABLE PREPARATIONS FOR Y2K/ YEAR 2000."

### ADVANTAGES OF PRE-1934 U.S. GOLD COINS OVER GOLD BULLION COINS



|                     | Pre-1934<br>U.S. Gold Coins | Modern Gold<br>Bullion Coins |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Confiscation?       | No                          | Yes                          |
| Government Reports? | No                          | Yes                          |
| Barter?             | Yes                         | Maybe                        |
| Inflation Hedge?    | Best                        | Good                         |
| Tax Free Trades?    | Yes                         | Not Applicable               |

**VF (very fine) Liberty \$20 Gold Piece, 1873-1907\***

**Only \$455 per coin**

\* Other dates and coins available. Prices may change according to market conditions. Supplies limited. Many other survival and investment coins available. Call for information. All coins checked by Ed Lee. Quality coins since 1958.

**Every employee bonded for \$500,000. A highly recommended firm.**

**LEE CERTIFIED COINS, LTD. P.O. Box 1045  
454 D. W. HIGHWAY, MERRIMACK, NH 03054  
1-800-835-6000**



### New From the Publisher of the Matrix Series. . .

Is it possible for the world to get through the Y2K Tribulations without suffering technological, political or natural disaster?? Before you say “No,” you must read Dr. Ted Hall’s

#### ***The Prospero Project –***

*Theory of the Human Species, Western Civilization and Reality Creation*

Dr. Ted Hall is author of *The Ark—Surviving the Flood of Disinformation*, described by Sir Laurence Gardner as “a thoroughly fascinating work,” and *Beat the Beast! – AY2K Preparedness Guidebook*. Craig Carpenter, the Hopi messenger, calls *the Beast* “a masterpiece.”

*The Prospero Project* is a velobound publication of Leading Edge Research (<http://www.trufax.org>) which sells for \$27, and *Beat the Beast!* is \$9.95. Shipping & handling: \$2.30 for first book, .93 for each add'l book. FREE 72-page Survival Center catalog with any order. Order from the

**Survival Center**  
**POB 234, McKenna, WA 98576.**  
**(800) 321-2900.**

create checkbook money whenever they grant a loan, simply by adding deposit dollars to accounts on their books to exchange for the borrower’s IOU . . . .”

The word “deposit” and “demand deposit” both mean the same thing in bank terminology and refer to the bank’s liabilities. For example, the Chicago Federal Reserve’s book, *Modern Money Mechanics* says: “Deposits are merely book entries . . . Banks can build up deposits by increasing loans . . . Demand deposits are the modern counterpart of bank notes. It was a small step from printing notes to making book entries to the credit of borrowers which the borrowers, in turn, could ‘spend’ by writing checks.” Thus, it is demonstrated in *Modern Money Mechanics* how, under the practice of fractional reserve banking, a deposit of \$5,000 in cash could result in a loan of credit/checkbook money/demand deposits of \$100,000 if reserve ratios set by the Federal Reserve are 5% (instead of 10%).

In a practical application, here is how it works. If a bank has ten people who each deposit \$5,000 (totaling \$50,000) in cash (legal money) and the

bank’s reserve ratio is 5%, then the bank will lend twenty times this amount, or \$1,000,000 in “credit” money. What the bank has actually done, however, is to write a check or loan its credit with the intended purpose of circulating credit as “money.” Banks know that if all the people who receive a check or credit loan come to the bank and demand cash, the bank will have to close its doors because it doesn’t have the cash to back up its check or loan. The bank’s check or loan will, however, pass as money as long as people have confidence in the illusion and don’t demand cash. Panics are created when people line up at the bank and demand cash (legal money), causing banks to fold as history records in several time periods.

The process of passing checks or credit as money is done quite simply. A deposit of \$5,000 in cash by one person results in a loan of \$100,000 to another person at 5% reserves. The person receiving the check or loan of credit for \$100,000 usually deposits it in the same bank or another bank in the Federal Reserve system. The check or loan is sent to the bookkeeping department of the lending bank where a book entry of \$100,000 is credited to the borrower’s account. The lending bank’s check that created the borrower’s loan is then stamped “Paid” when the account of the borrower is *credited* a “dollar” amount. The borrower may then “spend” these book entries (demand deposits) by writing checks to others, who in turn deposit their checks and have book entries transferred to their account from the borrower’s checking account.

However, two highly questionable and unlawful acts have now occurred. The first was when the bank wrote the

check or made the loan with *insufficient funds* to back them up. The second is when the bank stamps its own NSF check “paid” or posts a loan by merely crediting the borrower’s account with book entries the bank calls “dollars.” Ironically, the check or loan seems good and passes as money — unless an emergency occurs via demands for cash — or a Court challenge — and the artful illusion bubble bursts.

#### ***Different Kinds of Money***

The book, *I Bet You Thought*, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, says:

“Money is any generally accepted medium of exchange, not simply coin and currency. Money *doesn’t* have to be intrinsically valuable, *be issued by a government* or be in any special form.” [Emphasis added] Thus we see that privately issued forms of money only require public confidence in order to pass as money. Counterfeit money also passes as money as long as nobody discovers it’s counterfeit. Likewise, “bad” checks and “credit” loans pass as money so long as no one finds out they are unlawful. Yet, once the fraud is discovered, the value of such “bank money,” like bad checks, ceases to exist. There are, therefore, two kinds of money — government issued legal money and privately issued unlawful money.

#### ***Different Kinds of Dollars***

The dollar once represented something intrinsically valuable made from gold or silver. For example, in 1792, Congress defined the silver dollar as a silver coin containing 371.25 grains of pure silver. The legal dollar is now known as “United States coins and cur-

## **\$100,000.00+ Opportunity!**

Product sold only through Doctors for 16 years. International company sends out **FREE** sponsoring packet for you. C.E.O. has taken two other companies to \$1 Billion in sales.

For information call

# **888-493-8024**

*A Veritable*  
**FOUNTAIN OF YOUTH!**  
**GH4**

The next generation of the most respected and effective pro-longevity formula in the world!

Want to look and feel like you're  
35 when you're 50,  
42 when you're 60  
and 50 when you're 70?

Clinical studies by world-renowned medical scientist demonstrate how *the effects of aging can be reversed as much as 29%*

**Safe \* Effective \* Affordable**

**1-800-864-9696**

rency." However, the *Banker's* dollar has become a unit of measure of a different kind of money. Therefore, with Bankers there is a "dollar" of coins and a dollar of cash (legal money), a "dollar" of debt, a "dollar" of credit, a "dollar" of checkbook money or a "dollar" of checks. When one refers to a dollar spent or a dollar loaned, he should now indicate what *kind* of "dollar" he is talking about, since Bankers have created so many different kinds.

A dollar of bank "credit money" is the exact *opposite* of a dollar of "legal money." The former is a liability while the latter is an asset. Thus, it can be seen from the earlier statement quoted from *I Bet You Thought*, that money can be privately issued as: "Money doesn't have to . . . be issued by a government or be in any special form." It should be carefully noted that banks that issue and lend privately created money demand to be paid with government issued money. However, payment in like kind under natural equity would seem to indicate that a debt created by a loan of privately created money can be paid with other privately created money, without regard for "any special form," as there are no statutory laws to dictate how either private citizens or banks may create money.

**By What Authority??**

By what authority do state and na-

tional banks, as privately owned corporations, create money by lending their *credit* — or more simply put — by writing and passing "bad" checks and "credit" loans as "money"? Nowhere can a law be found that gives banks the authority to create money by lending their liabilities.

Therefore, the next question is: if banks are creating money by passing bad checks and lending their credit, where is their authority to do so? From their literature, banks claim these techniques were learned from the trade secrets of the Goldsmiths. It is evident, however, that money creation by private banks is not the result of powers conferred upon them by government, but rather the artful use of long held "trade secrets." Thus, unlawful money creation is not being done by banks as corporations, but unlawfully by *bankers*.

Article I, Section 10, para. 1 of the *Constitution of the United States* specifically states that no state shall ". . . coin money, *emit bills of credit*, make any Thing but gold and silver coin a Tender in Payment of Debts, pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligations of Contracts . . ." [Emphasis added] The states which grant the Charters of state banks also prohibit the emitting of bills of credit by not granting such authority in bank charters.

It is obvious that "We the people" never delegated to Congress, state government, or agencies of the state the power to create and issue money in the form of checks, credit, or other "bills of credit." The Federal Government today does not authorize banks to emit, write, create, issue and pass checks and credit as money. But banks do, and get away with it!! Banks call their privately created money nicer names, like "credit", "demand deposits", or "checkbook money". However, the true nature of "credit money" and "checks" does not change regardless of the nice terminology used to describe them. Such money in common use by privately owned banks is illegal under Art. 1, Sec. 10, para. 1 of the *Constitution of the United States* as well as unlawful under the laws of the United States.

**Void "Ultra Vires" Contracts**

The courts have long held that when a corporation executes a contract beyond the scope of its charter or granted corporate powers, the contract is void or "ultra vires".

1. In *Central Transp. Co. v. Pullman*, 139 U.S. 60, 11 S. Ct. 478, 35 L. Ed. 55, the court said: "A contract *ultra vires* being unlawful and void, not because it is in itself immoral, but because the corporation, by the law of its creation, is incapable of making it, the courts, while refusing to maintain any action upon the unlawful contract, have always striven to do justice between the parties, so far as could be done consistently with adherence to law, by permitting property or money, parted with on the faith of the unlawful contract, to be recovered back, or compensation to be made for it. In such case, however, the action is not maintained upon the unlawful contract, nor according to its terms; but on an implied contract of the defendant to return, or, failing to do that, to make compensation for, property or money which it has no right to retain. To maintain such an action is not to af-

**Radio Free Maine Recordings**  
**Portland Maine 4-4-98**  
*Powerful, Empowering Information*  
**THE IMPACT OF T.V.**  
**ON THE GROWING MIND**

Sponsored by  
**Wylland, Association of Waldorf**  
**Schools & TV Free America**

**MICHAEL MENDIZZA: Child brain development; stories and play vs. TV.**  
**JOSEPH CHILTON PEARCE: Children and TV viewing; the next Silent Spring.**  
**Dr. Keith Buzzell: Influences of TV on the human brain.**  
**Jerry Mander: Former ad man, author of Four Arguments for the Elimination of TV.**

**Forewarned is Forearmed.**

Parents and Grandparents, this information is not yet widely known.  
**Audio cassettes (4) \$45.00 to Radio Free Maine, PO Box 2705, Augusta, Maine 04338.**  
**207-622-6629 Catalog - \$1.00**



firm, but to disaffirm, the unlawful contract.”

2. “When a contract is once declared ultra vires, the fact that it is executed does not validate it, nor can it be ratified, so as to make it the basis of suit or action, nor does the doctrine of estoppel apply.” *F& PR v. Richmond*, 133 SE 898; 151 Va 195.

3. “A national bank . . . cannot lend its credit to another by becoming surety, indorser, or guarantor for him, such an act is ultra vires . . .” *Merchants’ Bank v. Baird*, 160 F 642. (Additional cases are cited as footnotes at the end of this Memorandum.)

### **The Question of Lawful Consideration**

The issue of whether the lender who writes and passes a “bad” check or makes a “credit” loan has a claim for relief against the borrower is easy to answer, providing the lender can prove that he gave a *lawful consideration*, based upon lawful acts. But did the lender give a lawful consideration? To give a lawful consideration, the lender must prove that he gave the borrower lawful money such as coins or currency. Failing that, he can have no claim for

relief in a court at law against the borrower as the lender’s actions were Ultra vires or *void from the beginning of the transaction*.

It can be argued that “bad” checks or “credit” loans that pass as money are valuable; but so are counterfeit coins and currency that pass as money. It seems unconscionable that a bank would ask homeowners to put up a homestead as collateral for a “credit loan” that the bank created out of thin air. Would a court of law or equity allow a counterfeiter to foreclose against a person’s home because the borrower was late in payments on an unlawful loan? If the court were to do so, it would be contrary to all principles of law.

The question of valuable consideration does not depend on any value imparted by the lender, but by false confidence instilled in the “bad” check or “credit” loan by the lender. In a court at law or equity, the lender has no claim for relief. The argument that because the borrower received property for the lender’s “bad” check or “credit” loan gives the lender a claim for relief is not valid, unless the lender can prove that he gave lawful value. The seller in some cases who may be holding the “bad” check or

“credit” loan has a claim for relief against the lender or the borrower or both.

### **Borrower Relief**

Since we have established that the lender of unlawful or counterfeit money has no claim for relief under a void contract, the last question is *does the borrower have a claim for relief against the lender?*

First, if it is established that the borrower has made no payments to the lender, then the borrower has no claim for relief against the lender for money damages. But the borrower has a claim for relief to void the debt he owes the lender for notes or obligations unlawfully created by an Ultra vires contract for lending “credit” money.

The borrower, the Courts have long held, has a claim for relief against the lender to have the note, security agreement, or mortgage note the borrower signed declared null and void.

The borrower may also have claims for relief for breach of contract by the lender for not lending “lawful money” and for usury for charging an interest rate several times greater than the amount agreed to in the contract for any lawful money actually risked by the lender. For example, if on a \$100,000 loan it can be established that the lender actually risked only \$5,000 (5% Federal Reserve ratio) with a contract interest rate of 10%, the lender has then loaned \$95,000 of “credit” and \$5,000 of “lawful money” while charging 10% interest (\$10,000) on the entire \$100,000. The true interest rate on the \$5,000 of “lawful money” actually risked by the lender is 200% which violates Usury laws. If *no* “lawful money” was loaned, then the interest rate is an *infinite* percentage. Such techniques the bankers say were learned from the trade secrets of the Goldsmiths.

The Courts say that such contracts with borrowers are wholly void from the beginning of the transaction because banks are not granted powers to enter into such contracts by either state or national charters.

### **Additional Borrower Relief**

In District Court the borrower may have additional claims for relief

## **CULTS OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER**

*a videotape produced by David Grossack*

- How sinister conspiratorial cults are plotting to merge America into a One World Government under United Nations’ rule.
- How Satanic influences are driving world politics.
- What Americans are doing to resist.
- How the UN will keep countries in line.
- The background of the Illuminati/Sabbatian cults, *and more....*

Only available from The Patriot Caucus

Fill in and return this coupon now!

**APPROX 1 HR. VHS**

Yes, I want the videotape

**“CULTS OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER.”**

Send \$22.00 (\$19.00 + 3.00 shipping) to:

**THE PATRIOT CAUCUS  
POST OFFICE BOX 90 HULL, MA 02045**

under “Civil RICO” Federal Racketeering laws (18 U.S.C. 1964), as the lender may have established a “pattern of racketeering activity” by using the U.S. Mail more than twice to collect an unlawful debt and the lender may be in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1341, 1343, 1961 and 1962. The borrower may have other claims for relief if he can prove there was or is a conspiracy to deprive him of property without due process of law under 42 U.S.C. 1983 (Constitutional Injury), 1985 (Conspiracy) and 1986 (“Knowledge” and “Neglect to Prevent” a U.S. Constitutional Wrong). Under 18 U.S.C.A. 241 (Conspiracy) violators, “shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten (10) years or both.”

**Continuation of case cites in support**


The following case cites also support this Memorandum on credit loans and void contracts:

4. “In the federal courts, it is well established that a national bank has not power to lend its credit to another by becoming surety, indorser, or guarantor for him.” *Farmers and Miners Bank v. Bluefield Nat ‘l Bank*, 11 F 2d 83, 271 U.S. 669.

5. “A national bank has no power to lend its credit to any person or corporation . . .” *Bowen v. Needles Nat. Bank*, 94 F 925, 36 CCA 553, certiorari denied in 20 S.Ct 1024, 176 US 682, 44 LED 637.

6. “Mr. Justice Marshall said: The doctrine of ultra vires is a most powerful weapon to keep private corporations within their legitimate spheres and to punish them for violations of their corporate charters, and it probably is not invoked too often . . .” *Zinc Carbonate Co. v. First National Bank*, 103 Wis 125, 79 NW 229.” *American Express Co. v. Citizens State Bank*, 194 NW 430.

7. “A bank may not lend its credit to another, even though such a transaction turns out to have been of benefit to the bank, and in support of this a list of cases might be cited, which would look like a catalog of ships.” [Emphasis added] *Norton Grocery Co. v Peoples Nat. Bank*, 144 SE 505, 151 Va 195.



# GOD'S WORD

A completely new translation of the Bible from the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek

*Today's* most unique new Bible translation  
 Brand new . . . accurate . . . exceptionally readable.  
 A clear, trustworthy, personal, life-changing message from God himself . . . to you!

**GOD'S WORD** is the Bible as it was meant to be – accurate, beautiful, and compelling – in clear, natural English. In **GOD'S WORD** you will discover the Bible's relevance for you . . . today!

**God's Word to the Nationals Bible Society**  
 Cleveland, Ohio  
 Call Toll Free (877) GODS WORD or call (440) 239-4380

8. “It has been settled beyond controversy that a national bank, under federal law being limited in its powers and capacity, cannot lend its credit by guaranteeing the debts of another. All such contracts entered into by its officers are ultra vires . . .” *Howard & Foster Co. v. Citizens Nat'l Bank of Union*, 133 SC 202, 130 SE 759(1926).

9. “. . . checks, drafts, money orders, and bank notes are not lawful money of the United States . . .” *State v. Neilon*, 73 Pac 324, 43 Ore 168.

10. “Neither, as included in its powers not incidental to them, is it a part of a bank's business to lend its credit. If a bank could lend its credit as well as its money, it might, if it received compensation and was careful to put its name only to solid paper, make a great deal

more than any lawful interest on its money would amount to. If not careful, the power would be the mother of panics, . . . Indeed, lending credit is the exact opposite of lending money, which is the real business of a bank, for while the latter creates a liability in favor of the bank, the former gives rise to a liability of the bank to another. *I Morse, Banks and Banking*, 5th Ed. Sec 65; *Magee, Banks and Banking*, 3rd Ed. Sec 248.” *American Express Co. v. Citizens State Bank*, 194 NW 429.

11. “It is not within those statutory powers for a national bank, even though solvent, to lend its credit to another in any of the various ways in which that might be done.” *Federal Intermediate Credit Bank v. L'Harrison*, 33 F 2d 841, 842 (1929).



12. "There is no doubt but what the law is that a national bank cannot lend its credit or become an accommodation endorser." *National Bank of Commerce v. Atkinson*, 55 F. 471.

13. "A bank can lend its money, but not its credit." *First Nat 'I Bank of Tallapoosa v. Monroe*, 135 Ga 614, 69 SE 1124, 32 LRA (NS) 550.

14. "... the bank is allowed to lend money upon personal security; but it must be money that it loans, not its credit." *Seligman v Charlottesville Nat. Bank*, 3 Hughes 647, Fed Case No.12, 642, 1039.

15. "A loan may be defined as the delivery by one party to, and the receipt by another party of, a sum of money upon an agreement, express or implied, to repay the sum with or without interest." *Parsons v. Fox*, 179 Ga 605, 176 SE 644. Also see *Kirkland v. Bailey*, 155 SE 2d 701 and *United States v. Neifert white Co.*, 247 Fed Supp 878, 879.

"The word 'money' in its usual and ordinary acceptation means gold, silver, or paper money used as a circulating medium of exchange..." *Lane v. Railey*, 280 Ky 319, 133 SW 2d 75.

16. "A promise to pay cannot, by argument, however ingenious, be made the equivalent of actual payment..." *Christensen v. Beebe*, 91 P 133, 32 Utah 406.

17. "A bank is not the holder in due course upon merely crediting the depositors account." *Bankers Trust v. Nagler*, 229 NYS 2d 142, 143.

18. "A check is merely an order on a bank to pay money." *Young v. Hembree*, 73 P2d 393.

19. "Any false representation of material facts made with knowledge of falsity and with intent that it shall be

acted on by another in entering into contract, and which is so acted upon, constitutes 'fraud,' and entitles party deceived to avoid contract or recover damages." *Barnsdall Refining Corn. v. Birnam wood Oil Co.*, 92 F 2d 817.

20. "Any conduct capable of being turned into a statement of fact is representation. There is no distinction between misrepresentations effected by words and misrepresentations effected by other acts." *Leonard v. Springer*, 197 Ill 532, 64 NE 301.

21. "If any part of the consideration for a promise be illegal, or if there are several considerations for an unseverable promise one of which is illegal, the promise, whether written or oral, is wholly void, as it is impossible to say what part or which one of the considerations induced the promise." *Menominee River Co. v. Augustus Spies L & C Co.*, 147 Wis 559, 572; 132 NW 1122.

"The contract is void if it is only in part connected with the illegal transaction and the promise single or entire." *Guardian Agency v. Guardian Mut. Savings Bank*, 227 Wis 550, 279 NW 83.

22. "It is not necessary for rescission of a contract that the party making the misrepresentation should have known that it was false, but recovery is allowed even though misrepresentation is innocently made, because it would be unjust to allow one who made false representations, even innocently, to retain the fruits of a bargain induced by such representations." *Whipp v. Iverson*, 43 Wis 2d 166.

23. "Each Federal Reserve bank is a separate corporation owned by commercial banks in its region..." *Lewis v. United States*, 680 F 2d 1239 (1982).

24. In a Debtor's RICO action against its creditor, alleging that the creditor had collected an unlawful debt, an interest rate (where all loan charges were added together) that exceeded, in the language of the RICO Statute, "twice the enforceable rate." The Court found no reason to impose a requirement that the Plaintiff show that the Defendant had been convicted of collecting an unlawful debt, running a "loan sharking" operation. The debt included the fact that exaction of a usurious interest rate rendered the debt unlawful and that is all that is necessary to support the Civil RICO action. *Durante Bros. & Sons, Inc. v. Flushing Nat 'I Bank*, 755 F2d 239, Cert. denied, 473 US 906 (1985).

25. The Supreme Court found that the Plaintiff in a civil RICO action need establish only a criminal "violation" and not a criminal conviction. Further, the Court held that the Defendant need only have caused harm to the Plaintiff by the commission of a predicate offense in such a way as to constitute a "pattern of Racketeering activity." That is, the Plaintiff need not demonstrate that the Defendant is an organized crime figure, a mobster in the popular sense, or that the Plaintiff has suffered some type of special Racketeering injury; all that the Plaintiff must show is what the Statute specifically requires. The RICO Statute and the civil remedies for its violation are to be liberally construed to effect the Congressional purpose as broadly formulated in the Statute. *Sedima, SPRLV. Imrex Co.*, 473 US 479 (1985).

Respectfully submitted,  
Delanore Lee Cannon,  
Debtor/Plaintiff  
In Person  
and wife,  
Rose Ann Hooper Cannon,  
Debtor/Plaintiff  
In Person

Can you prepare a "Memorandum" of such force that at least one Federal Judge believes it might destroy the existing, debt-based banking system? Constitutionalists CAN! ■

Cash Buyers 214-340-6688

*Fletcher's*

Gold, Diamonds, Coins & Jewelry

Antiques & Silver