

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
ASHEVILLE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA            )     DOCKET NO. 1:08-CR-55  
  )     )  
                  vs.                    )     VOLUME IV  
  )     )  
KATHY RAY WAHLER, EDWARD         )  
WILLIAM WAHLER, and LEWIS        )  
VINCENT HUGHES,                    )  
  )  
                          Defendants.    )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. VOORHEES  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE  
NOVEMBER 17, 2009

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Government:

JILL WESTMORELAND ROSE  
MARK T. ODULIO  
United States Attorney's Office  
100 Otis Street  
Asheville, North Carolina

Standby Counsel on Behalf of Defendant Kathy Wahler:

ANGELA G. PARROTT  
FREDILYN SISON  
Federal Public Defender's Office  
129 West Trade Street, Suite 300  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Standby Counsel On Behalf of Defendant Edward Wahler:

WILLIAM R. TERPENING  
Attorney at Law  
409 East Boulevard  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Standby Counsel On Behalf of Defendant Lewis Hughes:

DAVID Q. BURGESS  
Attorney at Law  
101 N. McDowell Street, Suite 216  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Cheryl A. Nuccio, RMR-CRR  
Official Court Reporter  
United States District Court  
Charlotte, North Carolina

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

PAGE

DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES

WALKER TODD

	Direct Examination by Mr. Wahler.....	542
	Direct Examination by Mr. Hughes.....	564
	Direct Examination by Mr. Wahler.....	573
	Cross Examination by Mr. Odulio.....	585
	Redirect Examination by Mr. Wahler.....	600
	Redirect Examination by Mr. Hughes.....	601

KATHY WAHLER

	Direct Examination by Ms. Wahler.....	603
	Cross Examination by Ms. Rose.....	609

ANDREW ROMAGNUOLO

	Direct Examination by Mr. Hughes.....	630
	Direct Examination by Mr. Wahler.....	650
	Voir Dire Examination by Mr. Hughes.....	658

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 TUESDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 17, 2009

2 THE COURT: Okay. Are the parties ready to bring  
3 the jury in?

4 MS. ROSE: Yes, sir, the government is ready.

5 THE COURT: Okay. May we have the jury, please.

6 (Jury entered the courtroom.)

7 THE COURT: Good morning, members of the jury.

8 THE JURY: Good morning.

9 THE COURT: As you know, we were hearing evidence on  
10 the defense side.

11 You may call your next witness.

12 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Okay. The defense calls  
13 Walker Todd.

14 WALKER F. TODD,

15 being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

16 DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER:

18 Q. Mr. Todd, would you please state your name for the  
19 record, sir.

20 A. Yes. My name is Walker F. Todd. And I live near  
21 Cleveland, Ohio.

22 Q. Okay. Would you share with the jury your resume and  
23 professional background, please.

24 A. Right. The relevant part of my background for this case  
25 is that I worked for 20 years for the Federal Reserve Banks of

WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 New York and Cleveland. I was a legal officer at the Federal  
2 Reserve Bank of New York. I was a legal officer and an  
3 economic research officer at the Federal Reserve Bank of  
4 Cleveland. I left the Federal Reserve in 1994. And I've been  
5 active more in economic research than in legal issues since  
6 then.

7 Most recently I've been employed by the American  
8 Institute for Economic Research in Great Barrington,  
9 Massachusetts, and among other things we supervise courses on  
10 money and banking.

11 Q. Thank you. I believe it was agreed with the prosecution  
12 that we would have you make some introductory statements.  
13 Would you care to do that.

14 A. Yes. This is not my first appearance as an expert  
15 witness in trials of this nature. I would guess that I have  
16 testified in about 15 to 20 criminal or high level civil cases  
17 relating to issues not unlike this, and we found over the  
18 years it's useful for the jury to make an early statement.

19 What I'd like to do would be to couch the testimony as a  
20 statement about what is money. What are the origins of money.  
21 Theories about money and how they relate to the modern  
22 American banking system. And then secondly, to deal with  
23 questions about what these defendants believed about money and  
24 banking. And then the third phase would be questions about is  
25 there a gap between what they believed and what I'm going to

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 assert for you the reality of money and banking is and was  
2 their belief reasonable. And the prosecution, of course, will  
3 have its own set of questions about this. But that's what I  
4 intend to do if that's agreeable.

5 MR. ODULIO: Your Honor...

6 THE COURT: Yes.

7 MR. ODULIO: Most of that is agreeable with the  
8 government. We'd ask the witness not comment on the  
9 reasonableness of the asserted belief.

10 THE COURT: Well, we'll take that up --

11 MR. ODULIO: I think that's a question for the jury.

12 THE COURT: We'll take that up if there's an  
13 objection.

14 MR. ODULIO: Yes, sir.

15 THE WITNESS: Right. And I agree and understand  
16 that it is not my duty; rather, it's the court's or the jury  
17 to opine on the reasonableness of these beliefs.

18 THE COURT: Yes, sir. And on exactly what a  
19 defendant believed at a certain time.

20 THE WITNESS: Correct. Exactly. They will be  
21 asking me questions about, say, a particular theory of money  
22 and my role, I think, has to be to explain how that theory  
23 does or does not relate to classical standard beliefs about  
24 money and banking.

25 Well, what is money? That's the oldest question

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 really in the whole field of economics. Economics is a term  
2 that was defined by the Greek philosopher Aristotle in the  
3 middle of the 4th century BC. He thought money represented  
4 demand. It was a store of the things you could buy in the  
5 future in exchange for present transactions and goods and  
6 services.

7           Later, let's say in the 18th century, the foremost  
8 writer about economics then was a Scottish philosopher named  
9 Adam Smith; and his book, "The Wealth of Nations," is great  
10 reading for those who are inclined to read 18th century  
11 documents, which I confess I am. But he would have said,  
12 rather, that money is more a store of value on the supply side  
13 of the equation. That is, if I have money, I can use it to  
14 satisfy my demands in the future.

15           A general definition is that money is something  
16 that's both a store of value and it's a unit of exchange. In  
17 that store of value function, it serves as a unit of account.  
18 The unit of exchange traditionally was gold or silver, coin or  
19 bullion. And the U.S. currency was created around 1792 when  
20 Congress passed a statute that defined the currency as a  
21 dollar; and the dollar, in turn, was defined as so many units  
22 of gold, and a ratio was prescribed for the convertibility of  
23 gold into silver at a fixed ratio.

24           But basically, if you follow that line of thinking,  
25 money would be a unit of exchange, this dollar, and it would

WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 have a certain weight in gold or silver.

2           In parallel, and not to be ignored, is this money of  
3 account concept. I might borrow, say, a hundred dollars from  
4 you. But as modern banking practices evolved, you might not  
5 actually reach in your pocket and hand me a hundred dollars.  
6 You might hand me a check for a hundred dollars drawn on your  
7 account at a bank, and I can take your check and deposit it in  
8 my account and get a value for it from my bank. So I borrowed  
9 a hundred dollars and I owe it back to you, but as between the  
10 two of us, it's a unit of account matter as opposed to a unit  
11 of exchange matter.

12           And so these terms are going to come up throughout  
13 this testimony: What's a unit of account? What's a unit of  
14 exchange?

15           And the third set of concepts about money that's  
16 relevant would be inside money versus outside money. The  
17 founding fathers dealt with a world in which it would be fair  
18 to say that money was something that existed by custom and  
19 tradition among the people. You can ask when did people start  
20 using gold or silver, for example, as monetary units? When  
21 did that happen? The answer goes back to the beginning of  
22 time. There's a story in the, I think it's the 23rd chapter  
23 of Genesis where Abraham buys a tomb that he brawned for his  
24 wife Sarah who had died and he weighs out silver when he buys  
25 the tomb. They brought out a balance scale and he put silver



WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 on the balance scale, and the silver he paid out was probably  
2 bullion of some kind, but it was of a fineness that was  
3 generally accepted by merchants in the marketplace.

4           So it goes back a very long way this use of money,  
5 modern forms of money. But they had money at the time. The  
6 people had money. Abraham had it. No king had given him  
7 money. So the founding fathers would put it that the people  
8 have money and the government through taxation tries to get it  
9 from you. That's the classical theory of money.

10           There's a competing utilitarian view of money that's  
11 also probably the most widespread belief about money today and  
12 that is that the government is the sole source of authority on  
13 money. Something is not money unless the government says it  
14 is.

15           I happen to be just old enough to have known  
16 personally some of the original drafters of the Uniform  
17 Commercial Code when I was a young lawyer in New York and I  
18 had discussions with them about this issue. I said when you  
19 were debating the Uniform Commercial Code, what did you guys  
20 think about the origin of money? And the answer was the code  
21 was drafted so as to give validity to the  
22 government-must-define-it school of thought that's valid under  
23 the code.

24           But if you read the official comments carefully in  
25 the UCC, Uniform Commercial Code -- by the way, this thing was

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 drafted in the 1950s. That's when this came to -- but anyway,  
2 the draftsmen said we clearly want to recognize the older,  
3 classical theory of money. Money is that which exists by  
4 custom and tradition and we don't want to exclude money  
5 classically defined from the code. So it's sort of a  
6 two-stage analysis. Stage one money is what the government  
7 says it is. But stage two still exists in the background:  
8 Money is that which the people by custom and tradition have  
9 adopted as money.

10           Now, how does banking fit into all of this? And  
11 this will be the last part of this introductory part of the  
12 talk. The idea of banks has always been controversial in  
13 western European societies and in the United States from the  
14 beginning. When the Constitution was written, there were only  
15 four banks in existence in the United States and they were all  
16 north of the Potomac River. Because of this people from the  
17 southern and western states were always skeptical about  
18 whether banks were central to the existence of the people.  
19 Could they get along without them? The State of Texas was the  
20 most extreme example of that view. Until 1905 or so, the  
21 State of Texas Constitution prohibited banking inside the  
22 state of Texas. You couldn't be a banker inside Texas. They  
23 used currency notes that they brought in from out of state.  
24 They used gold, they used silver, they used cattle and other  
25 things.

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1           So that's one view: There shouldn't be any banks.

2           Andrew Jackson from my native state of Tennessee was  
3 one of those fellows who didn't like banks very much, and he  
4 said let it be a warning to you. But if you dig out a \$20  
5 bill, you see the picture of Andrew Jackson on a Federal  
6 Reserve Note, paper money. And there were two things Andrew  
7 Jackson hated in life: Central banks and paper money. So you  
8 have to be careful about the way you live because after you're  
9 gone, you may be honored in the thing you hate the most. So  
10 you have to be careful about that.

11           On the flipside, during the Civil War, Abraham  
12 Lincoln said, you know, we, the union, are running up monster  
13 debts to fight this war and we don't quite know how we're  
14 going to pay for it. His Treasury secretary, Salmon Chase,  
15 who later became chief justice of the Supreme Court. Chase  
16 was originally a lawyer in Cincinnati. He drafted the -- or  
17 compiled the first Ohio Code, the Ohio Revised Code. It was  
18 originally something that Chase put together. And he was a  
19 bit of an expert on banking. He was later governor of the  
20 State of Ohio and then a U.S. senator before joining Lincoln's  
21 cabinet.

22           And he was the Treasury secretary and he went to  
23 Lincoln and said let's charter a new system of banks called  
24 national banks and they will be allowed to issue currency  
25 notes sort of like our modern Federal Reserve Notes. But in

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 return for the privilege, they will have to buy government  
2 debt as we, the Treasury, issue it. So the reserves against  
3 the currency would be the debt that the banks have purchased.  
4 Okay. And the system worked reasonably well for about 50  
5 years after the war. For a variety of reasons we won't get  
6 into, in the period roughly 1907 to 1913, it was decided that  
7 we needed a new, stronger form of central bank and that's when  
8 the Federal Reserve was created.

9           But in the first 20 years of the Fed's existence  
10 from 1913 to 1933, there were at least four competing currency  
11 systems still equally valid in the United States: gold  
12 certificates, silver certificates, national bank notes, and  
13 Federal Reserve Notes. And your grandpa knew the difference  
14 among them and which was better to hold than the other thing.  
15 And you might even encounter commercial obligations, drafts,  
16 bills of exchange, banker's acceptances, and the like. And  
17 your grandpa knew the difference among these things.

18           But since 1933 there's only been one standard form  
19 of currency, Federal Reserve Notes. And the silver  
20 certificates were pulled out in the '60s. There's only a  
21 little bit of Treasury currency still in circulation.

22           So basically, if you ask anyone what's money today.  
23 Whip out a dollar bill from your pocket. It's a Federal  
24 Reserve Note and it says it's a legal tender.

25           Okay. If you go down to the Fed and you say what

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 can I get in exchange for my note? Can I get gold or silver,  
2 for example? The answer is no. All we'll give you is one  
3 crisp, shiny, new Federal Reserve Note.

4           So what is the backing for these Federal Reserve  
5 Notes, the legal tender paper? And the backing is the taxing  
6 power of the United States. Federal Reserve Notes under the  
7 Federal Reserve Act are defined as a full faith and credit  
8 obligation of the United States. So that means that should  
9 there be a default in payment of Federal Reserve Notes, the  
10 government has the right to raise taxes to fully back the  
11 notes and their -- I won't get into the technicality of how  
12 that backing is done, but there is still a residual form of  
13 backing of Federal Reserve Notes in the Fed's accounting  
14 system today.

15           So anyway, with that I'll stop the main line of the  
16 presentation and I'll be glad to answer any questions either  
17 side has about it, but go ahead and proceed with the  
18 questioning.

19 Q. Thank you, Mr. Todd.

20           So based on your discussion, what is a dollar?

21 A. A dollar is a unit of account that also is a unit of  
22 exchange. For most people today the dollar is basically a  
23 unit of account. But originally, it was intended to be a unit  
24 of exchange, something that was defined as so many grains,  
25 minor weight, or so many grams of gold or silver in whatever

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 the statutorily defined ratio was. But a dollar is a unit of  
2 account, but it's also a unit of exchange.

3 Q. What is a bill of credit?

4 A. A bill of credit is a promissory note typically issued by  
5 a governmental entity that would promise to pay value to the  
6 bearer or the holder in -- at some future date. Usually bills  
7 of credit were issued for a short term, 30, 60, 90 days. The  
8 most recent public example of a bill of credit were the  
9 warrants that Governor Schwarzenegger ordered issued in  
10 California to pay the state's bills while the state did not  
11 have a budget approved. And so that -- and my father told me  
12 that in the depression he was paid this way as a school  
13 teacher by some of the local school districts that didn't have  
14 money.

15 So the bill of credit or the warrant just says I, the  
16 Municipality of Statesville, will pay to the holder a hundred  
17 dollars 60 days after the date of issue, whatever. And that's  
18 a bill of credit.

19 Q. And are bills of credit by states authorized in the  
20 Constitution?

21 A. No, the constitutional framers decided to prohibit the  
22 states -- well, let me put it this way. They cannot issue  
23 bills of credit that are required to be accepted as a legal  
24 tender. States can issue bills of credit, municipalities can  
25 too, but they just can't be made a legal tender.

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Q. Okay. Thank you. Did the Committee of Style deny this  
2 authority to the federal government?

3 A. I believe you're referring to the Committee of Style  
4 drafting the Constitution --

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. -- right?

7 And my opinion is that the committee did not deny this  
8 power to the Constitution -- to the federal government.  
9 The -- the particular account of that part of the debate  
10 showed that the framers did not want to tie the hands of the  
11 federal government during an emergency. I think there was a  
12 standing assumption that in normal times, only gold and silver  
13 would be a legal tender. But in an emergency, if the federal  
14 government felt it had to issue paper currency, they were to  
15 be allowed to do so.

16 The states, however, could not issue a paper currency and  
17 call it a legal tender.

18 Q. Okay. So are we in an emergency now?

19 A. Well, I suppose we are in the sense that we have legal  
20 tender out there, legal tender paper. What happened was the  
21 Emergency Banking Act of March 9th, 1933, it's still in  
22 effect. It's never been repealed.

23 And so I have a friend in Colorado who's a bit of an  
24 expert on these things and he says we're now in the 76th year  
25 of the emergency regarding legal tender. But when does the

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 emergency end?

2 Q. Okay. You've mentioned the Emergency Banking Act of  
3 March 9th, 1933. Is there anything else that would have been  
4 indicative of the government becoming insolvent on or about  
5 that date?

6 A. The main thing that happened that's relevant was the Gold  
7 Reserve Act of January 30th, 1934. Under the Gold Reserve  
8 Act, the president was authorized to devalue the dollar  
9 against gold within a certain prescribed statutory limit. And  
10 in effect, President Roosevelt wound up ordering the Treasury  
11 secretary to devalue gold down to -- the dollar against gold  
12 down to about 59 cents on the dollar versus its prior value.  
13 So it was a little bit over a 40 percent devaluation.

14 Q. So can you give a professional opinion as a conclusion of  
15 whether or not the United States went bankrupt?

16 A. Objectively measured, you would say that that was an  
17 insolvency, a bankruptcy because you had to settle your  
18 previous debts for 60 cents on the dollar, in effect. Legally  
19 it was not so defined, but an economist would say, yes, that  
20 was a bankruptcy.

21 Q. Okay. Thank you. Can you pay a debt with a Federal  
22 Reserve Note or only discharge a debt?

23 A. If I understand the question properly, I believe the  
24 answer is that you discharge a debt by tendering a legal  
25 tender note. The question of is it full payment and ultimate



## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 satisfaction, this has been a matter of some debate. Depends  
2 on the various state formulations of the Uniform Commercial  
3 Code, but in New York, which is sort of the common standard,  
4 the view would be that you have in fact satisfied the debt by  
5 offering the legal tender note equivalent in value to whatever  
6 the thing was that was being transacted on any particular day.  
7 It usually comes up in foreign exchange agreements in New  
8 York.

9 Q. Are the people of the nation now a surety for the U.S.  
10 debt?

11 A. I suppose you could say that in a roundabout way. It  
12 gets back to that point I made about full faith and credit. A  
13 Federal Reserve Note or U.S. public debt, these are full faith  
14 and credit obligations of the United States. And what that  
15 means is that the taxing power of the government backs that  
16 promise so that if the debt cannot be paid any other way, the  
17 government can raise taxes to pay it.

18 Q. The creditors of the United States, whoever they are, do  
19 they -- would they have any claim to other than taxes? Say  
20 the actual physical assets or property of the nation?

21 A. My opinion is that a foreign creditor has no direct claim  
22 on physical property owned by private citizens. Whether they  
23 would be able to assert a claim on the national parks, for  
24 example, or any other public property of the United States,  
25 that's another story. It would be the middle case. I would

WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 argue that they do not, but the European view of the matter is  
2 they would probably assert that they do. And as for a claim  
3 to the future labor of the citizens of the United States, I  
4 think they would say the government has a duty to raise taxes  
5 enough to pay their debts.

6 Q. As an economist, is it right to be able to mortgage our  
7 future without our consent? I mean, how does that power come  
8 about? What's the exchange?

9 MR. ODULIO: Objection. Relevance, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Sustained.

11 Q. Okay. What was the rate of inflation generally between  
12 1789 and 1933?

13 MR. ODULIO: Same objection, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Overruled.

15 A. The tables began around 1792 with the second inauguration  
16 of George Washington as president. And in 1933 the purchasing  
17 power of the dollar was the same as it was when George  
18 Washington was sworn in that second time. It's largely  
19 because the dollar had been linked one for one to the gold  
20 standard and it still was on gold in 1933.

21 The pattern historically is that in an inflation, the  
22 dollar's value will drop some. In a war, the dollar would  
23 drop some. But in a recession, the dollar's value would  
24 recover above par. And on the whole, the dollar came out  
25 about the same as where it was, purchasing power the same from

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 beginning of the republic until 1933.

2 Q. And since?

3 A. Since '33, I think the factor of inflation now is about  
4 14, meaning that a 1933 dollar is worth about 7 cents.

5 Q. Okay. What causes this devaluation of the money?

6 A. Basically, printing money causes inflation. Milton  
7 Friedman said it best when he said that inflation is  
8 everywhere and at all times a monetary problem. It's the  
9 quantity of money in circulation versus the supply of goods  
10 and services that determines the inflation rate.

11 Q. Okay. A promissory note for a mortgage was placed into  
12 evidence. What is the source of funding in a home mortgage?

13 A. If I understand your question properly, you're asking  
14 what is the real source of the money that's in play in a  
15 mortgage exchange when a borrower obtains a mortgage from a  
16 bank. And it's a two-stage process.

17 Stage one is the borrower signs a promissory note at the  
18 bank and under modern fractional reserve banking, the bank  
19 does not actually have to have money in the bank deposits  
20 equal to the value of what it is paying out under the mortgage  
21 note. The bank typically would take the note and pledge it or  
22 sell it to some other entity. Or if it's a pledge, at the  
23 Federal Reserve or at the federal home loan bank of its  
24 district. So the bank would recover its monetary value that  
25 way.

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1           The bank, however, in a modern transaction typically  
2 gives you a check for the value of the mortgage or a check  
3 will be drawn on itself as a rule or it will advance a credit  
4 to the previous mortgage holder on the property extinguishing  
5 your debt.

6           So what the bank has done is it issues its own credit to  
7 pay off prior debts, but it does not obtain money other than  
8 by taking your promissory note and pledging it to somebody  
9 else.

10 Q.   Does the bank create money out of thin air?

11 A.   Under a fractional reserve banking system, that is in  
12 effect what happens. The Federal Reserve requires the bank to  
13 maintain about 10 percent of any deposit -- demand deposit in  
14 reserve. So the rate of expansion is about nine to one so  
15 that when the bank discounts your promissory note at the  
16 Federal Reserve, 10 percent of that is real money and the  
17 other 90 percent is thin air money, as you would put it.

18 Q.   So every mortgage is inflationary.

19 A.   It is potentially inflationary. The inflation comes in  
20 when more mortgages are issued than the real underlying demand  
21 for housing. Once you get the supply of money expanding  
22 beyond what the real demand is, then the inflation kicks in.

23 Q.   Does this 90 percent or 9X or this money out of thin air  
24 become an obligation of the United States?

25 A.   It becomes an obligation of the United States in a

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 roundabout way because when the bank pledges the note at the  
2 Federal Reserve, your borrower's mortgage note pledged at the  
3 Fed, the bank that did the borrowing from the Fed has the  
4 right to withdraw what the Fed is paying in Federal Reserve  
5 Notes, currency. And those notes are an obligation of the  
6 United States.

7 Q. Okay. Does this meet the constitutional requirement for  
8 an appropriation by Congress to take on debt?

9 A. Legally I think the wisdom of the system would say yes, I  
10 think the obligation has been met. Whether economically this  
11 is true is another story.

12 Q. Why does the Redemption debt discharge process stay alive  
13 for so long in this country or why has it?

14 A. Okay. My usual story on that question is something like  
15 this. There's this theory I first encountered in the western  
16 states. It's called Redemption theory. And the essence of it  
17 is that everybody is credited with a certain value attached to  
18 his name or social security number at the Treasury when you  
19 are born. And in effect, you have a lifetime earnings  
20 expectation, and let's say that was \$600,000, average citizen,  
21 and that you have a right to go borrow against that value at  
22 the Treasury.

23 The origin of this theory, as near as I can tell, is  
24 Canadian social credit theory. This is an idea that was born  
25 on the prairies of western Canada and became widely popular up

WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 there in the early part of the 20th century. By mid century,  
2 the social credit party controlled the Parliament, so the  
3 provinces of the prairies in Canada. And eventually those  
4 ideas trickled down into the northern high plains states. So  
5 if you traveled in Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota in the last  
6 30 years or so, you would probably encounter some variation of  
7 this theory.

8 But as regards to the United States, there is no basis  
9 for this theory. That's been propagated by people who think  
10 that there are secret Treasury accounts linked to your social  
11 security number, for example, but near as I can tell, these  
12 theories are all bogus. But they are -- their origin is, I  
13 think, wishful thinking about applying Canadian social credit  
14 theory down here in the United States.

15 Q. Do the American people have a claim against the  
16 government for pledging their property in terms of their  
17 earnings against the national debt?

18 A. That's what the Constitution is all about. It lays out  
19 the terms of the agreement between the people on the one side  
20 and the government on the other. I would not myself go so far  
21 as to say that the American people have a claim against the  
22 government because of running up a national debt. I think  
23 it's a moral problem. I think it's a monetary problem. It's  
24 a fiscal problem. And I think government can misbehave in  
25 running up debt for improper schemes.

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1           Whether the person -- the public has a personal remedy  
2 against the government for doing that, that's a whole  
3 different ball game. There's all kinds of cases, theories,  
4 lines of law typically related to Federal Court Claims Act,  
5 for example, that would lay out how you go about pursuing a  
6 claim against the government. But generally speaking, it's --  
7 I think there is a Supreme Court case about 20 years ago that  
8 expressed it pretty well saying, regrettably, your remedy here  
9 is at the ballot box. You have to change the politicians.  
10 There's no private remedy against the government for these  
11 sorts of things.

12 Q.    You've already addressed that the banking emergency is  
13 still in force. You've written on the corporatization of the  
14 United States, and I think you brought one of your books here.

15 A.    Uh-huh.

16 Q.    How is that significant?

17 A.    I think what you mean is is the United States, the  
18 government, a body corporate? Is it a corporation? The  
19 answer, I think, is yes, the U.S. is a form of corporation.  
20 But a corporation in the general sense means originally a  
21 voluntary agreement of citizens to create some entity that  
22 will survive their personal lives, their private lives, their  
23 material lives, and would have certain rights, property rights  
24 in particular that would be peculiar to that corporate entity.  
25 The United States is such a corporation. That's what the

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Constitution is all about ultimately, and before it the  
2 Articles of Confederation. It is a body corporate.

3 Q. How about national associations, GSE's, are they  
4 extensions of that corporate charter?

5 A. National associations, meaning like national banks?

6 Q. Yes, sir.

7 A. Yes. National banks under the old National Bank Act of  
8 the Civil War era, they were corporations chartered by  
9 Congress. So they were certainly bodies corporate.

10 And what was the last one you asked about?

11 Q. GSE's, even the Federal Reserve.

12 A. Government sponsored enterprises, that's a -- GSE, that's  
13 a modern term of art. But the Federal Reserve also is a  
14 corporation chartered by Congress just like the old national  
15 banks. In fact, the original Federal Reserve charters came  
16 from the Comptroller of the Currency just as though the Fed  
17 were a standard national bank.

18 But modern government sponsored enterprises typically  
19 were created during the 1930s and -- more recent ones too, of  
20 course, but they're a little bit different. But some of them  
21 are corporate entities separate from the United States.  
22 Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example, originally were such  
23 bodies, but they've been brought back into the fold. And  
24 Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac doesn't quite have full faith and  
25 credit status but it's getting close.



## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Q. Didn't the Committee of Style have a specific vote on  
2 giving Congress the power to incorporate?

3 A. I'm sorry, I missed the first part of your question.

4 Q. Didn't the Committee of Style that we mentioned earlier  
5 have a specific vote on giving Congress the power to  
6 incorporate?

7 A. Yes. Again, I think you're referring to the  
8 constitutional framers Committee of Style. Did they vote on  
9 the power to incorporate? And yes, they did. The power to  
10 incorporate lost on a vote of the states eight to three. But  
11 this issue was revived, then, in 1791 by Alexander Hamilton  
12 with his proposal to create a central bank, the First Bank of  
13 the United States and the Supreme Court case of *McCulloch*  
14 *versus Maryland*. In 1819 Justice Marshall, Chief Justice  
15 Marshall ruled that the implied powers of the Constitution  
16 give Congress the power to create national bank charters. And  
17 all modern corporations essentially are descended from those  
18 corporations and that ruling.

19 Q. Well, but as a constitutional scholar, the states  
20 withheld that. How can the Supreme Court give the federal  
21 government something the states specifically withheld?

22 A. I think the fair reading of that would be that the  
23 Supreme Court found another route to accomplish what was being  
24 asked apart from the specific vote at the constitutional  
25 convention. Once again, you can ask whether this is proper,

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 but it's legal.

2 Q. Is there any gold in Ft. Knox?

3 A. It's -- I've not seen it. The last audit was in a  
4 partial audit in the late 1970s. People periodically ask for  
5 an audit at Ft. Knox. I remember the auditor's maxim that  
6 physical assets that remain in one place uninspected for too  
7 long tend to disappear. So I personally would advocate an  
8 audit, but so far the bills in Congress that are being  
9 considered about auditing the Federal Reserve do not yet  
10 include an audit of Ft. Knox. But I did send a letter to a  
11 relevant congressional staffer last week asking that a  
12 Ft. Knox audit be added to the Fed audit bill.

13 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Thank you. Just a moment.

14 (Defendants conferred.)

15 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Okay. I yield to  
16 Mr. Lewis.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY DEFENDANT HUGHES:

18 Q. Mr. Todd, what's the difference between a BOE, bill of  
19 exchange, and a closed account check?

20 A. As I understand the question, a check drawn on a closed  
21 account at a bank, it is in form a bill of exchange because a  
22 check is a bill of exchange, so legally the form is the same.  
23 It's what happens that is different. The closed account check  
24 won't go anywhere. A bill of exchange might go somewhere.  
25

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Q. Is the bank liable when it fails to follow instructions  
2 printed on a check?

3 A. Okay. Here you have to parse narrowly the standard  
4 instructions that a bank knows it has to comply with with an  
5 ordinary form bill of exchange or a draft or a check.

6 Nonstandard instructions go into a separate chain of  
7 collection. When I was at the Federal Reserve, we had two  
8 sets of collection. We called one cash collection. That was  
9 standard form items. And noncash collection. And that would  
10 be, for example, bills of exchange with documents attached or  
11 bills of exchange that had nonstandard instructions on them.  
12 So it was just a separate channel of handling.

13 Q. Okay. If a check is made out to two people, say John and  
14 Henry, and only John signs and cashes the check, what is the  
15 bank's liability if Henry doesn't get his share of the check  
16 from John?

17 A. Okay. There the bank might be liable to Henry because --  
18 the second person in your example. The story is that if a  
19 check is made out payable to John and Henry, then in theory,  
20 both signatures are required for cashing that check. But if  
21 the bank pays out John or Henry, then either one could cash  
22 the check. But in the example you gave me, it was John and  
23 Henry, so the bank should be liable to Henry for failure to  
24 honor the instruction.

25 Q. Okay. In your role as an examiner for the Federal

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Reserve, would you have determined that the bills of exchange,  
2 which are Exhibits B and C in this case, to have been valid?

3 A. Well, I've been shown some exhibits before, but I don't  
4 know which. If you were referring to bills of exchange of the  
5 sort that I was shown by both the prosecution and the defense  
6 prior to the testimony, I would have rejected them. My -- I  
7 wasn't officially an examiner of the Fed. I was a lawyer and  
8 an economist. But one of my legal duties was I was the  
9 discount windows lawyer. So whenever strange documents came  
10 into the bank, I would be called over to the discount window  
11 to look at them and decide whether we were going to take them  
12 or not. And so I would have been called to look at these  
13 instruments if they had shown up at the Federal Reserve and I  
14 would have rejected them. But remember that I am an expert  
15 and I see a lot of these documents and I can quickly detect  
16 nonconforming things. Some cases a layman might be fooled;  
17 other cases he might not.

18 Q. What kind of notification would have been returned to the  
19 maker of the instrument that they were not valid?

20 A. Okay. At the Federal Reserve, we would have charged back  
21 the account of the bank that gave us that instrument. There  
22 are some cases where the instruments came in and there was no  
23 bank identifiable who could be charged, in which case they  
24 just came to rest at the Fed until we dealt with it.

25 But typically if an instrument comes in and isn't paid or

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 can't be paid, you charge it back up the chain of collection.  
2 So the Fed would go back to Bank of America, for example, and  
3 say that check you gave us was no good, give us our money  
4 back. And then Bank of America in turn would go to whoever  
5 gave it the check and say the check was no good, give us our  
6 money back, and the chain of collection would be reversed.

7 Q. Okay. What is a setoff account?

8 A. A setoff account is actually common practice  
9 traditionally in banking. Under the common law, persons  
10 engaged in a business of banking would have asserted a right  
11 of setoff against other assets of an obligor that came into  
12 their possession once something that was a primary instrument  
13 to the banker was not paid.

14 An illustration would be suppose you had an account at  
15 Bank of America and you overdrew the account by, say, \$10,000,  
16 and then you take the next airplane for Venezuela never to be  
17 seen again. What is the bank going to do? And the answer is  
18 suppose a trailing paycheck for you, your boss still owed you  
19 money, paycheck comes into that account, but it's \$10,000  
20 overdrawn. The bank would set off the money you owe it  
21 against that paycheck that suddenly came in to its possession.

22 In New York under the New York banking law, there is a  
23 banker's right of setoff that is spelled out in the banking  
24 statute. The practice is similar in every state and the  
25 Federal Reserve has certain rules about it. But the governing

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 law, the original law was the New York law and some states  
2 will have something similar. Others won't. But anyway,  
3 setoff works that way. It's a -- in New York it's a statutory  
4 right. In another state it might be a common law right of the  
5 banker to try to recover from any new asset that shows up on  
6 account of a previously existing debt.

7 Q. Okay. Could you speak a little bit to the theory of why  
8 we might have thought that it works and would be legal for us  
9 to use.

10 MR. ODULIO: Objection to that, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Overruled.

12 MR. ODULIO: May we be heard on that?

13 THE COURT: Yes.

14 Members of the jury, we'll take a morning break at  
15 this time. You may step out and we'll call for you in about  
16 10 or 15 minutes.

17 (Jury exited the courtroom.)

18 THE COURT: All right. You may be heard.

19 MR. ODULIO: Your Honor, we would just object --  
20 note our objection to this line of testimony. The  
21 government's position is that Rule 704(b) is applicable in  
22 this area in that the question is seeking to elicit from an  
23 expert witness an opinion concerning the mental state or  
24 condition of the defendant as to whether or not the defendant  
25 did or did not have the mental state constituting an element

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 of the charged offense. As the court is aware --

2 THE COURT: You may have misunderstood the question.  
3 It was apparently carefully worded to ask whether -- whether  
4 it's -- in essence, whether anyone could have had a reasonable  
5 belief that that exchange might have worked, that setoff might  
6 have been proper. Didn't ask what the state of mind of these  
7 defendants was.

8 MR. ODULIO: I thought he said we, Your Honor.

9 DEFENDANT HUGHES: What I said was would he speak to  
10 the theory that we might have looked at that would cause us to  
11 think that these were proper and legal.

12 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: You need to make it  
13 general. Don't talk about us.

14 DEFENDANT HUGHES: All right. Can I reword it?  
15 Would you speak to the theory of why people would think that  
16 this works and is legal.

17 THE COURT: That would be fine.

18 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

19 THE COURT: Any objection to that?

20 MR. ODULIO: We would, Your Honor, just because of  
21 the potential confusion of the jury. I think, Your Honor,  
22 they're trying to elicit, again, the notion of whether or not  
23 this belief is reasonable. I think it's ultimately -- that's  
24 an ultimate issue for the jury to consider in making a  
25 determination under its verdict, whether or not, number one,

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 the belief is held in good faith. And, you know, a component  
2 of that certainly, Your Honor, is whether or not it's  
3 reasonable. So I don't think the testimony of the witness  
4 would be appropriate there. Certainly the defendants could  
5 draw that inference as the government can make an inference.  
6 But neither party should be allowed to elicit that kind of  
7 testimony.

8 THE COURT: Well, I don't think it's confusing to  
9 the jury. The witness has been testifying all along about  
10 realities and also certain theories and commented on it, and  
11 that's essentially what he's being asked to do here. So as  
12 long as your question is properly worded, the objection is  
13 overruled.

14 MR. ODULIO: Thank you, sir.

15 THE COURT: We'll take a ten minute break.

16 (Brief recess at 11:35 a.m.)

17 THE COURT: May we have the jury, please.

18 And I would ask the witness to return.

19 (Witness resumed the witness stand.)

20 (Jury entered the courtroom.)

21 THE COURT: All right. To pick up where we were,  
22 would you ask your question again, please.

23 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Yes, sir.

24 WALKER F. TODD

25 DIRECT EXAMINATION (Cont'd)



## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 BY DEFENDANT HUGHES:

2 Q. Mr. Todd, would you speak to the theory of why people in  
3 the public might think these sorts of things would work and  
4 why they would think they would be legal.

5 A. I'm assuming you are referring to instruments of the type  
6 that I was shown before testifying.

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. Yes. It's my experience -- remember that I am an expert  
9 and so I could fairly quickly decipher these instruments as  
10 something that looked real or not. But I have seen many of  
11 these instruments in the past where they were pretty well  
12 done, fairly easily calculated, I think, in their form to  
13 deceive the layman or to make someone who didn't understand  
14 fully what they were, not realize what they were and take them  
15 at face value. There's been many instances where these things  
16 have been taken at face value, either by a merchant or into  
17 the banking system, for example.

18 The problem always arises in the chain of collection  
19 where they come to rest because ultimately there's no way they  
20 can be redeemed, but I suppose you have to be a chain of  
21 collections expert to know that there's no way it can be  
22 redeemed at the end of the day. If you floated an instrument  
23 into the chain of collection, how do you know what's going to  
24 happen to it unless you have some line of expertise in that  
25 area.

WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Q. Would you say that on the part of the people, that it was  
2 ignorance or criminal intent?

3 MR. ODULIO: Objection to that, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: Sustained.

5 Q. Okay. Let me ask the question a different way, then.  
6 Given that there seemed to be only about a dozen marketers --  
7 I'm going to use that term because I can't think of any other  
8 thing to call them -- people who go around giving seminars,  
9 teaching people that this is legal and proper, why would you  
10 speculate that either the Federal Reserve or the Treasury or  
11 the OCC doesn't come out with some type of highly visible  
12 public statement that these particular people are teaching  
13 fraudulent information?

14 MR. ODULIO: Objection to that, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Overruled.

16 A. Okay. This is actually, I think, a very good question.  
17 That is, has the Treasury been as proactive as it should be,  
18 the Fed the same way, in trying to offset the effects of the  
19 disinformation campaign that's out there. And I do think the  
20 defense raises a good point in the sense of are there seminars  
21 and other educational things happening out there that might  
22 mislead the public into thinking there was validity in these  
23 instruments and, yes, these things exist. You can find  
24 countervailing testimony on the internet by searching, if you  
25 Google a seminar for Treasury warrants or comptroller

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 warrants, for example, you might find somebody saying, well,  
2 no, they don't work.

3 But the real question is what does the Treasury do? What  
4 does the Federal Reserve do? They issue circular notices when  
5 a new type of instrument surfaces in the collection system.  
6 But unless you're a banker, I'm not sure how thoroughly you'll  
7 see that. I think there are some classes of merchants who are  
8 particularly tied closely to the banking system, like car  
9 dealers, for example, who would get and regularly read these  
10 circular notices on the Treasury's or Fed's website. But most  
11 people don't spend their days reading Treasury check  
12 collection notices. So it is a fair question.

13 But if you Google the Fed's website, which I do daily,  
14 you -- you have to look pretty hard to find guidance on what's  
15 wrong with instruments in the check collection system. And I  
16 haven't tried it on the Treasury's website lately, but I think  
17 it's a little easier to find over at the Treasury, but  
18 definitely not at the Fed.

19 (Defendants conferred.)

20 DIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER:

22 Q. Of the instruments you saw come in and reviewed or that  
23 you're aware of by any means, were they all prosecuted?

24 MR. ODULIO: Objection, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Sustained.

WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Q. As a constitutional scholar having studied the  
2 Constitution, would this activity constitute a form of protest  
3 under the First Amendment?

4 MR. ODULIO: Objection to that, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Sustained.

6 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Okay. This should be  
7 Government's Exhibit 164 so it should already be in evidence  
8 so everybody can see it, right?

9 Q. Can you see that now, Mr. Todd?

10 A. It just came up.

11 Q. Okay. This is one of the documents that has been  
12 presented into evidence. You'll notice the verbiage up at the  
13 upper right in bold. Does that mean anything to you?

14 A. As an expert I would say no, it's inconsistent. It's a  
15 hallmark of these instruments, by the way, the original ones  
16 that I first saw 15 years ago. I said the person who drafted  
17 them had some knowledge of what was happening regarding  
18 banking and money, but it sort of veers off into unforeseen  
19 terrain. So it's as though they were drafted by someone who  
20 wasn't quite in his right mind as he was drafting it, but had  
21 a great deal of technical knowledge.

22 So I would say that's sort of -- the boldfaced thing at  
23 the top and the paragraph 1 statement of facts that I'm being  
24 shown here has language that's inconsistent with what you  
25 would normally expect, okay.

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 I was an expert on banker's acceptances, for example.  
2 Probably considered the leading expert on banker's acceptances  
3 in the entire U.S. government when I was at the New York Fed.  
4 And that second sentence there really blows me away. Said,  
5 "Acceptance in the form of a banker's acceptance or national  
6 bank note." They're not the same thing at all, and anyone who  
7 is familiar with banker's acceptances would know that. But if  
8 you're a layman, could you define what is a banker's  
9 acceptance? So there are problems with the language that way.

10 Q. Okay. So if -- here we find more recitations of law --

11 A. Uh-huh.

12 Q. -- specific to setting up the definition of legal tender,  
13 correct? Subtitle --

14 A. Yes, the definition from Title 31, key point being  
15 Federal Reserve Notes are -- national bank notes are legal  
16 tender.

17 Q. And I think as you stated as testimony, the one sentence  
18 there, "This official definition for legal tender was first  
19 established in HJR 192 in 1933." That is a correct statement,  
20 correct?

21 A. Yes, it was done by a joint resolution in 1933, right.

22 Q. And then at the end of the sentence, "Notes of national  
23 banks, legal tender, both backed by the credit of the nation,"  
24 that's a correct statement?

25 A. Yes, and that is correct. Separately provided in the

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Federal Reserve Act that Federal Reserve Notes are full faith  
2 and credit obligations of the United States.

3 Q. Then below that, the quote, "From HJR 192 that abrogated  
4 the gold clause," do you recognize that?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. The gold clause -- well, basically, by June of '33, the  
8 federal government was denying its obligation to pay out gold  
9 even on previously issued bonds of the United States promising  
10 payment in gold. And the Supreme Court later upheld the right  
11 of the government to do that.

12 Q. Okay. There was an executive order demanding the people  
13 turn in their gold. Was that constitutional?

14 A. It was held to be legal. Whether it was proper is  
15 another story. But it was later sustained as a matter of law.  
16 I have personal objections to it and I view it as improper,  
17 but -- and I was glad when the private right to own gold was  
18 restored in 1974. But the -- the rulings of the Supreme Court  
19 are consistent on this that the right of the executive to  
20 suspend gold in the circumstances was correct.

21 Q. Due to emergency.

22 A. Due to emergency powers.

23 Q. The lower section deals, I believe you'll see, with  
24 Title 12 and the number of repealed laws.

25 A. Yes.

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Q. And the quote down from money and banking, "Today  
2 commercial banks no longer issue currency." I don't know what  
3 the --

4 A. Uh-huh.

5 Q. Then it says commercial banks don't, correct?

6 A. Yes. Right, national bank notes were the last form of  
7 circulating currency that was issued by any commercial bank,  
8 in that case national banks, but that ended in 1933.

9 Q. Okay. Thank you. This is where we need your expert  
10 input. UCC4-105.

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Says what?

13 A. "Bank means a person engaged in the business of banking."

14 Q. Okay. Seems reasonably easy to understand. How about  
15 the next one.

16 A. Right. "The term bank also includes any person engaged  
17 in the business of banking."

18 Q. And the next one.

19 A. "Bank means any person engaged in the business of  
20 banking."

21 Q. So we've got some consistency here. And then Black's Law  
22 Dictionary definition of banker.

23 A. Right. It's anyone, including a private person, who is  
24 engaged in the business of banking without being incorporated.

25 Some statutes or legal systems call these people private

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 bankers and the like. And this is consistent with that older  
2 story I was telling you about in the 1950s when the draftsmen  
3 were doing the New York version of the Uniform Commercial Code  
4 and they said who is a banker. And for purposes of the law,  
5 they said we have to use the broad definition of banker,  
6 meaning anyone who does this business as opposed to particular  
7 banks or bankers licensed by the state or by the federal  
8 government. Under the common law anyone could be a banker,  
9 but state laws were later enacted restricting the privilege of  
10 banking to certain defined classes of individuals,  
11 partnerships, corporations.

12 The National Bank Act allowed individuals or partnerships  
13 or associations to be national banks until 1933 when the  
14 government provided an inducement under the old reconstruction  
15 finance corporation to banks to go ahead and incorporate  
16 because that way you could sell preferred stock to this  
17 government rescue entity, the RFC. If you were just an  
18 individual, you couldn't sell preferred stock in yourself.

19 Q. Okay.

20 A. So that was -- that was the background of this whole  
21 distinction between a banker as a person on one side and a  
22 bank as some specifically licensed entity on the other side.

23 Q. Okay. But the last sentence of that where it says,  
24 "while a private banker is a person engaged in banking without  
25 having any special privileges or authority from the state."



## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. That's still a good definition, is it not?

3 A. (No response.)

4 Q. Black's Law Dictionary?

5 A. Yes. Yes, that's right. It's the common -- all Black's  
6 is doing here is restating the common law definition of a  
7 banker.

8 Q. Okay. And then the next sentence where it says "Banking  
9 is partly."

10 A. "Banking is partly and optionally defined as a business  
11 of issuing notes for circulation or negotiating bills." The  
12 classical traditional definition of banking is issuing notes  
13 intended to circulate as money payable on demand.

14 Q. Okay. And then where it says banker's note, defines  
15 banker's note as.

16 A. It says, "A commercial instrument resembling a bank note  
17 in every particular except it's given by a private banker or  
18 an unincorporated banking institution."

19 Q. That's consistent with what we've seen so far, correct?

20 A. Yes. Once again, that's just allowing private persons to  
21 engage in this business of banking.

22 Q. Okay. Let's go to the next page, then. Have to drag you  
23 through this to...

24 All right. Basically, the first big paragraph there  
25 forms the conclusion of this document. If you would please

WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 analyze that for us. Starts with "therefore" right at the  
2 top.

3 A. "Therefore, as noted above, the legal definitions  
4 relating to legal tender" -- do you want me to analyze it or  
5 read it?

6 Q. Well, probably read it for the jury and then comment on  
7 it, please.

8 A. "The legal definitions relating to legal tender have been  
9 written by Congress and maintained as such to be both  
10 exclusive, where necessary, and inclusive, where appropriate,  
11 to provide for the inclusion of the principals, sureties,  
12 prime creditors, and holders in equity over the United States,  
13 who, since 1933, have collectively and nationally constituted  
14 a national bank or a national banking association."

15 This is preliminary language that's basically saying who  
16 are the persons authorized to organize a national bank, and  
17 let's talk about their rights regarding the legal tender  
18 privilege.

19 And then it continues, "So a national bank with a right  
20 as stated in the instrument to issue as legal tender notes on  
21 the full faith and credit of the United States." They're  
22 cleaning up the language. In '33 the statute was changed to  
23 substitute this modern phrase full faith and credit where  
24 previously it said obligations of the United States and so on.

25 And it continues. It says these -- under the old

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 statutory definition, a national bank's organizer or principal  
2 was a surety for the obligations, currency and credit as a  
3 remedy for equity interest recovery over U.S. corporate public  
4 debt due to them.

5 This is all related to that older system where national  
6 banks were allowed to issue notes serving as currency, but in  
7 return they had to back those notes with purchases of U.S.  
8 government obligations. And those obligations are what's  
9 being talked about in this older statutory language here in  
10 the second half of the statute.

11 Q. Okay. Do you see there where it says the Fourteenth  
12 Amendment?

13 A. In the bottom middle of the page, yes. The Fourteenth  
14 Amendment provides "no person shall be deprived of property  
15 without due process of law."

16 Q. Correct.

17 A. Right.

18 Q. And then the next sentence after that.

19 A. It says, "The courts have long ruled to have one's  
20 property legally held as collateral or surety for a debt even  
21 when he still owns it and still has it is to deprive him of it  
22 since it is at risk and could be lost for the debt at any  
23 time."

24 Q. So this --

25 A. And --

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 Q. You've made the comment that the government has pledged  
2 our future earnings which are our property, is it not? I  
3 mean, our -- we have the property --

4 A. Yes, in the broad economic sense, your future earnings  
5 stream would be deemed your property, yes.

6 Q. Okay. So we have had that pledged, and is this not  
7 saying that that is a form of deprivation? That we're not --  
8 they can't do it without due process of law under the  
9 Fourteenth Amendment?

10 A. I think it's generally recognized in law that you cannot  
11 state a claim on future earnings of a private individual  
12 without due process of law. That he has to sign a contract or  
13 something to that effect.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. So, yes.

16 Q. So by this definition, the American people have become  
17 sureties for the national debt, correct?

18 A. A portion of their earnings may be taxed away. That's --  
19 that's the sense in which the people would stand as a surety  
20 for the national debt. It is that you know that taxes would  
21 have to increase at some point to pay off or pay down the  
22 debt.

23 Q. Okay. So the little -- where it starts, quote, Sureties  
24 compelled.

25 A. Uh-huh.

## WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 THE COURT: Well, I think you're going to have to  
2 make a comment to advise the court where you're going with  
3 this because otherwise you're just going over miscellaneous  
4 phrases from a miscellaneous document.

5 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: And, sir, that's the  
6 problem.

7 THE COURT: And you're not showing -- you're not  
8 showing how it might apply to this case.

9 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: I'm trying to get at the  
10 point in the document where -- all this foundation is being  
11 laid before the conclusion.

12 THE COURT: Well, you better move it quickly, then,  
13 because otherwise I'm going to cut it off.

14 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Okay.

15 Q. The question was asked earlier, and I think we've come  
16 around to it, are we sureties? And you basically said a  
17 portion of our earnings is surety; is that correct?

18 A. Future earnings.

19 Q. Future earnings would have been pledged as a surety to  
20 the national debt.

21 A. And my answer there is in the broad general sense we are  
22 sureties for the national debt. As a legal matter, there are  
23 two categories of thinking about public debt traditionally.  
24 The prior tradition that was abandoned by the formation of the  
25 Constitution was no future Congress can be bound by an act of

WALKER TODD - DIRECT

1 the present Congress. And so it was decided based on 17th  
2 century English practice that evolved then that we would  
3 establish that regarding public debt, a commitment can be made  
4 by a present Congress or parliament that binds a future  
5 Congress or parliament and that commitment would be, in this  
6 case, backed by a taxing power. The taxes would stand as  
7 sureties. But if you talked to insurance lawyers or lawyers  
8 experienced in guarantys, I think they would say what they --  
9 what is meant by surety here is the general sense and not any  
10 technical legal term as binding you, saying aha, now you are a  
11 legal surety for this public debt over here. I think that  
12 would be a stretch. It would be beyond the settled  
13 understanding of the term.

14 I understand how you could conclude that a person is a  
15 surety for the public debt, but I think it's a  
16 misinterpretation.

17 Q. Okay.

18 (Defendants conferred.)

19 BY DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER:

20 Q. Would it be reasonable on the part of a layman -- you're  
21 the expert. The people in general are not -- to conclude they  
22 are a surety for the national debt and would have a right of  
23 redress?

24 A. On the first part, would -- reading this language, would  
25 you be able to conclude that you're a surety for a debt -- for

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 the public debt? Yes, I can see how laymen would read that  
2 and draw that conclusion.

3 And if you're saying, well, what is the remedy there?  
4 The issue is -- again, I think it was *Lucas versus South*  
5 *Carolina Coastal Commission* in 1988, a Supreme Court decision,  
6 where basically the ruling is if you don't like what's being  
7 done in your name, your only remedy is to go to the ballot box  
8 and throw the rascals out.

9 The problem is if you see a provision of law being  
10 violated or law -- or the Constitution, do you have as a  
11 citizen a private remedy against the United States for that  
12 wrong? And I believe it is settled law that you do not have a  
13 private remedy unless you can state a claim under the Federal  
14 Tort Claims Act or something to that effect.

15 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: No more questions. Thank  
16 you.

17 THE COURT: Cross examination.

18 MR. ODULIO: Yes, sir.

19 CROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. ODULIO:

21 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Todd.

22 A. Good afternoon.

23 Q. You were just asked a series of questions about  
24 Government's Exhibit 164. Do you recall that?

25 A. Yes.

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 Q. And you were shown various passages in isolation of  
2 purported legal authority.

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Take a look at paragraph 1 there.

5 A. Uh-huh.

6 Q. And I'll ask you whether or not anything that you were  
7 presented would support the assertion being made there in  
8 paragraph 1 concerning this purported tender offer or banker's  
9 acceptance or the use of a national bank note to pay...

10 A. Well, that -- that whole second sentence is something  
11 that to an expert would have been a red flag warning that this  
12 is not a regular instrument in form. You would want to ask  
13 further questions about who drafted it and why, things of that  
14 sort.

15 In the first sentence, you would have to know some  
16 particulars that are not self-evident on the instrument, like  
17 what are these account numbers, for example. But other than  
18 that, the first instrument is not necessarily a red flag. It  
19 would be a -- particular account number information would be a  
20 red flag, but the second sentence is the red flag to the  
21 expert.

22 Q. How about the use of a national bank note? Anything that  
23 you read and was presented in direct examination would support  
24 the use of a national bank note --

25 A. No --



## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 Q. -- to pay --

2 A. Go ahead, I'm sorry.

3 Q. To pay a Countrywide home loan on January 15th of 2004?

4 A. No, the use of national bank notes for this purpose would  
5 have ended in 1933.

6 MR. ODULIO: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?

7 THE COURT: Yes.

8 Q. Show you, sir, what's in evidence there as Government's  
9 Exhibit 110.

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. It's also on your monitor. That's styled a Bill of  
12 Exchange, is it not?

13 A. Yes, in the upper left it says Bill of Exchange.

14 Q. And this instrument -- first of all, are you familiar  
15 with it?

16 A. I saw this prior to testimony today, yes.

17 Q. And my question to you, sir, is this instrument is  
18 purporting to draw money from a Treasury direct account, is it  
19 not?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And if I were to tell you that the direct Treasury  
22 account listed there is not valid, what would your opinion be  
23 on the legitimacy of this instrument, Government's 110?

24 A. Well, if the account number is not a valid number, there  
25 are still other red flag warnings in this top half of the

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 instrument. The idea of calling John Snow the trustee at the  
2 Department of the Treasury would have been a red flag right  
3 there. John Snow was the secretary of the Treasury at the  
4 time. And it says, "Prepaid exchange item. Process through  
5 the TT&L account by FedWire."

6 TT&L is a banker's jargon term for Treasury tax and loan  
7 accounts and these are not things that laymen would ordinarily  
8 be involved in. It's a way for private businessmen to make  
9 federal tax payments. You can go down to a Federal Reserve  
10 member bank and make a payment of taxes for the credit to the  
11 Treasury's account. Alternatively, the Treasury will deposit  
12 money back in the banking system using these accounts,  
13 Treasury tax and loan or TT&L accounts. But this is something  
14 that happens only between bankers on the one hand and the  
15 Treasury on the other hand. So that for a private person to  
16 say, oh, go debit the TT&L account, this would be deemed a  
17 nonsense instruction.

18 Q. All right. So do you have an opinion on whether or not  
19 this is fictitious? I take it your view is it is.

20 A. Would I have taken this if I were at the Fed do you mean?

21 Q. Correct. Yes, sir.

22 A. Yes. No, I would not. I would have kicked this  
23 instrument out.

24 Q. And in fact, you're familiar with these kinds of  
25 instruments, are you, in your work with the Fed; isn't that

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 right, sir?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And you testified earlier that these so-called bills of  
4 exchange began to circulate in the upper midwest.

5 A. In the high plains states originally. The Rocky Mountain  
6 west starting in the early 1990s to mid '90s. The claims  
7 started piling up at Federal Reserve Banks. That's when they  
8 first came to the notice of the Fed and the Treasury that  
9 there might have been more than just isolated incidents, but  
10 at the time we wondered if there was some kind of concerted  
11 attempt to tie up the payment system.

12 Q. And the Montana Freemen, for example, would be a subset  
13 of that?

14 A. That's right. Ultimately, we think this was traced back  
15 to the activities of the Montana Freemen who seem to have been  
16 ground zero in the origination and circulation of these types  
17 of instruments.

18 Q. And again, your testimony is you're familiar with them  
19 and the related scheme. Is there an underlying antigovernment  
20 or antilawyer sentiment related to these kinds of schemes?

21 A. Certainly for the Montana Freemen there was both of the  
22 elements you described, both antifederal government and  
23 antilawyer. The Montana Freemen refused on principle to  
24 cooperate with their defense attorneys or with their expert  
25 witness.

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 Q. All right. I'm going to ask you, you're familiar with a  
2 Treasury direct account or a direct Treasury account as styled  
3 here, sir?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Isn't it true that you cannot use a Treasury direct  
6 account to write checks to third parties, for instance, to pay  
7 off the clerk of the superior court or make a mortgage payment  
8 or a car payment?

9 A. Yes, this is correct. What you're describing would  
10 amount to using the Treasury direct account as like a checking  
11 account at a bank, but it is not intended for that. It's  
12 usually just the device through which an individual citizen  
13 may buy and sell securities from the Treasury. If you want to  
14 buy a Treasury bill, for example, it would be credited into  
15 your Treasury direct account. When you sell the security or  
16 if it matures and you fail to roll it over, there would be  
17 cash in the account.

18 Q. Okay. And Dr. Todd, these bills of exchange really  
19 relate to -- and you've testified about the Redemption. It  
20 relates to an assertion that HJR 192 somehow allowed  
21 individuals to trade their birth certificates in for millions  
22 or hundreds of millions of dollars; is that right?

23 A. Yes, a variation of the theme. And economists would say  
24 it's only worth 625,000, but that's right.

25 Q. Okay. And in fact, in the line of questioning you were

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 asked on direct examination about sureties, does that relate  
2 to this notion that you just discussed about redeeming your  
3 birth certificate?

4 A. Yes. I believe that the surety concept as described  
5 there is related to the, what we were calling Redemption  
6 theory and that spinoff from Canadian social credit theory.

7 Q. And does HJR 192 have anything to do or give individuals  
8 the ability to use their birth certificate to get an account  
9 for hundreds of millions of dollars?

10 A. No, not to my knowledge, no.

11 Q. And you've seen language that used HJR 192 and the UCC in  
12 conjunction to purportedly open these accounts; is that right?

13 A. Yes, I have seen that in other cases, yes.

14 Q. Okay. HJR 192 was enacted in 1933; is that right?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And I think you testified on direct that the UCC wasn't  
17 widely accepted or codified until the 1950s; is that right?

18 A. Yes. In fact, the graduation speaker at my law school  
19 graduation was the original draftsman of the UCC. Her name  
20 was Soia Mentschikoff, and she started working on the project  
21 in 1949.

22 Q. Okay. So Ms. Mentschikoff wouldn't have -- certainly  
23 wouldn't have contemplated the use of the Uniform Commercial  
24 Code to trade your birth certificate in to open a direct  
25 Treasury account as reflected in 110.

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 A. Right. That would have been deemed nonsense.

2 Q. All right. Let's take a look at 162, sir, which is in  
3 evidence. I'm going to direct your attention, I think, to the  
4 back of the page.

5 A. The back, right.

6 Q. Again, do you have a view based on your experience  
7 concerning the legitimacy of this purported payment?

8 A. Yes. This is a payoff demand. Right. The language  
9 is -- on this -- the top half of this instrument is basically  
10 just a hodgepodge of legal phrases that seem to have been  
11 slapped together disjointedly. So "this note is legal tender  
12 for all debts public and private," for example, that's the  
13 language that appears on currency notes, dollar bills.

14 The phrase "accepted for value" and "returned for value,"  
15 "discharge and closure of the accounting," to an expert this  
16 would have no meaning. We would say we don't know what this  
17 means.

18 "Issued under the authority of U.S. Code as a legal  
19 tender offer national bank note," well, again, there's the  
20 reference to the out-noted national bank notes which have not  
21 been around since '33.

22 And the conjunction -- or the reference to HJR 192, I  
23 believe HJR 192, that's House Joint Resolution 192 which  
24 declared Federal Reserve Notes legal tender. That may have  
25 been the resolution that suspended the circulation of national

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 bank notes. So the two could be related that way. But it has  
2 nothing to do with a current commercial transaction.

3 Q. Any kind of expertise needed, sir, to determine that this  
4 is not a valid instrument when the entity you sent it to  
5 rejects it?

6 A. Would you need expertise to reject this, is that  
7 essentially what you're asking?

8 Q. I'll withdraw the question.

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. Let's take a look at Government's 32. Do you see that,  
11 sir?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. If -- and this just looks like a check drawn on a Bank of  
14 America account payable to Countrywide for 323,915 and some  
15 dollars. Do you see that?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. If this check was drawn on either a closed account or an  
18 account that did not have funds in it, what would happen to  
19 this check?

20 A. Do you mean if it came into the Federal Reserve?

21 Q. Yes, sir.

22 A. Yes. It would be rejected for a variety of reasons.  
23 First, it has a handwritten certified number in the upper  
24 left. That would be deemed highly irregular. And the real  
25 question is who has authority to certify a check. Only a

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 banker does. And there are various statutes that deal  
2 particularly with the effect of certifying a check.

3 It says "FedWire Only" stamped on the check. So a banker  
4 would be puzzled by this because you'd say it's a check but  
5 why am I being told to run this through FedWire?

6 Then you have the legend that's stamped on the lower  
7 right: "Attention U.S. Treasury direct prepaid item," et  
8 cetera, "private pass through account." Again, to my  
9 knowledge, no such accounts exist. Or if they do, they're not  
10 available for payments by third -- payments to third parties.

11 Let's see. "Electronic funds transfer only. Do not send  
12 to bank printed on check." That would be, again, a most  
13 irregular instruction because when you see a check, the only  
14 thing you're supposed to do is present it back to the bank on  
15 which it was drawn and here is language telling us do not  
16 present to that bank. So it's inconsistent with the  
17 fundamental nature of the instrument.

18 Q. Okay. Any of the stamps on here magically make -- would  
19 magically make this check work if there weren't any money in  
20 this related account or if it was closed?

21 A. No. I think the initial instinct of a banker seeing this  
22 check would be to try to present it on to that account and he  
23 would learn that the account has been closed and so he would  
24 then begin the process of reversing any value paid for the  
25 check back up the chain of collection. He would just reverse



## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 the process of collection that it had come into.

2 Q. You were also asked questions on direct examination about  
3 fractional banking. Do you recall that?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Any of your answers relating to fractional banking, would  
6 that support this Redemption scheme?

7 A. No. No. Fractional reserve banking is entirely related  
8 to the question of what percentage of reserves, if any, are  
9 required to be held against currently demand deposits in the  
10 banking system.

11 Q. This --

12 A. And the rate of expansion of money that's related to it.  
13 But that has nothing to do with the collection of instruments.

14 Q. Does fractional banking have anything to do or -- have  
15 anything to do with negating someone's promise to pay a  
16 promissory note signed in conjunction with a mortgage?

17 A. No, I would say it does not.

18 Q. Has no effect at all on that person's obligation to pay  
19 back the mortgagor.

20 A. No. You might encounter a particular case where the note  
21 called for payment in a certain form, but by and large, the --  
22 as long as all that is being exchanged is bank credit, then  
23 one's obligation is to pay back to the bank the value of the  
24 credit advanced.

25 Q. Let's take a look at Government's 137. Do you have that

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 in front of you, sir?

2 A. I do. Do I have that one or only on the screen? Wait,  
3 yes, I do. I do. I see it. Okay.

4 Q. And again, you looked through this document prior to your  
5 testimony today; is that right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And this is styled Notice of International Commercial  
8 Claim Administrative Remedy.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And it's purportedly being made by Edward William Wahler  
11 and Kathy Ray Wahler to Kelly King, d/b/a President, BB&T  
12 Bank.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Is this a valid mechanism to resolve a dispute you might  
15 have with a bank?

16 A. Probably not in the sense that it looks like a document  
17 that would have a mix of legal and accounting concepts  
18 embedded within it, but I don't think it has any monetary  
19 value attached to it. It appears to be drawn under the  
20 reference to International Commercial Claim. There's a whole  
21 line of questionable financial instruments that supposedly are  
22 drawn under International Chamber of Commerce, ICC,  
23 documentation. And this may have been somehow intended to  
24 conform to understanding -- it's about the International  
25 Chamber of Commerce, but to my knowledge there is no such

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 thing as an International Commercial Claim Administrative  
2 Remedy.

3 Q. And would a bank's failure to respond to a document like  
4 this result in a liability to the bank?

5 A. Would a bank receiving this therefore automatically have  
6 a liability based on the fact of receipt? And the answer is  
7 no.

8 Q. You were also asked questions, sir, about whether or not  
9 the Fed or the Treasury has been proactive concerning  
10 informing the public about these scams and schemes.

11 A. About these -- uh-huh.

12 Q. Do you recall that?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Show you what's on your monitor as Government's Exhibit  
15 249, which has been admitted into evidence. Do you see that?

16 A. Not yet.

17 Q. Bear with us here.

18 A. Okay. Yes. This is 249. And it's an alert from the  
19 Comptroller of the Currency regarding fraudulent debt  
20 elimination schemes, yes.

21 Q. I'm going to turn your attention --

22 A. Right. And it's addressed by the Comptroller of the  
23 Currency who's the administrator for national banks to  
24 national banks, state banks, et cetera, and bank examiners and  
25 the like.

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 Q. And certainly, sir, there have been other alerts issued  
2 like this by the OCC and related authorities especially after  
3 this Freeman --

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. -- episode that you just testified about.

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. And again, in pretty plain English it says that  
8 these kind of Redemption schemes are fraudulent; is that  
9 right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And in fact, it's styled Fictitious Debt Elimination  
12 Schemes in the description there.

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Dr. Todd, you were contacted only recently by the  
15 defendants for your testimony in this matter; is that correct?

16 A. Yes. The first inquiry was Friday, I believe.

17 Q. And sir, you're appearing here and collecting a witness  
18 fee in connection with or -- or a fee in connection with  
19 your -- the testimony, the expert testimony you're providing  
20 today; is that right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And who is paying the fee? Or let me rephrase that.

23 THE COURT: Sustained.

24 Q. Okay. What is your fee?

25 A. I believe it is \$2,500 plus my expenses of travel.

## WALKER TODD - CROSS

1 Q. Okay. Would you accept your payment in the form of  
2 Government's Exhibit 110 if it was tendered to you?

3 THE COURT: Sustained.

4 MR. ODULIO: Just a moment, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

6 (Government counsel conferred.)

7 MR. ODULIO: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Any redirect within the scope of cross?

9 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Yes. We're trying to find  
10 a document, if you'll just...

11 (Defendants conferred.)

12 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Your Honor, is it possible  
13 to break for lunch so we can try and find some documents and  
14 get our act together, if you don't mind?

15 THE COURT: All right. But any redirect has to be  
16 within the scope of cross examination.

17 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Okay. Thank you.

18 THE COURT: We'll take our lunch break, members of  
19 the jury. Please remember the usual instructions. Keep an  
20 open mind about the case. Don't discuss it. Thank you.

21 JUROR: What time are we supposed to be back?

22 THE COURT: It would be a good idea if we all know  
23 that. That would be -- let's try 2 o'clock.

24 (Lunch recess at 12:45 p.m.)

25 TUESDAY AFTERNOON, NOVEMBER 17, 2009

## WALKER TODD - REDIRECT

1 THE COURT: May we have the jury, please

2 (Jury entered the courtroom.)

3 THE COURT: All right. The jury is with us.

4 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Would the government put  
5 Exhibit 249 back up, please.

6 MR. ODULIO: What page?

7 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: It's the OCC alert, right?  
8 I guess the top of it to start with.

9 WALKER F. TODD

10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER:

12 Q. Mr. Todd, I think we -- the "To" section of this  
13 document, who did that indicate this document was addressed  
14 to, please?

15 A. This document of the OCC alert from the Comptroller of  
16 the Currency is addressed to the chief executive officers of  
17 national banks, state banking authorities, the Federal Reserve  
18 system, the FDIC, the state bank supervisors, the deputy  
19 comptrollers, that's the people that work for him, the  
20 assistant deputy comptrollers, district counsel, and all  
21 examining personnel. That, again, would be all people  
22 involved in the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

23 Q. Okay. Would all of them also be considered fairly  
24 sophisticated in the banking system?

25 A. They either are or should be, yes, to hold the positions

## WALKER TODD - REDIRECT

1 that they do.

2 Q. And still, they needed to see a document like this to be  
3 noticed of this situation; is that correct?

4 A. Well, it was addressed to them, let's put it that way,  
5 yes.

6 Q. Okay. Based on either OCC alerts or any knowledge you  
7 have, has this activity subsided?

8 A. The particular activity that is described there was  
9 essentially bonds for discharge of debt, bills of exchange,  
10 due bills, Redemption certificates, and the like, and the date  
11 on this was from '03, December of '03, and I believe that the  
12 activity peaked maybe a year or two after that and then it has  
13 subsided since then. But yes, it has subsided by now.

14 Q. So would you say there's a lag, then, for information  
15 like this before it possibly gets out to the public?

16 A. That has been my experience, yes.

17 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Okay.

18 (Defendants conferred.)

19 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

20 BY DEFENDANT HUGHES:

21 Q. Would a layman reading this OCC alert necessarily know  
22 exactly what was meant by fictitious instruments here?  
23 Because one of the things it talks about is bill of exchange  
24 and obviously there are plenty of legal bills of exchange.

25 A. Uh-huh.

## WALKER TODD - REDIRECT

1 Q. So if a layman had this, how would he know what kind of  
2 bill of exchange this alert had to do with?

3 A. They would have to read the rest of the document. It may  
4 be spelled out which entities are involved with the bills of  
5 exchange that are suspect. But I think your point is a valid  
6 one, that if you say watch out for due bills and bills of  
7 exchange, those are or may be valid instruments elsewhere in  
8 commerce. So it's only a particular subset that they are to  
9 watch out for, and then it would be a question of is adequate  
10 notice available in this document here to tell people which  
11 ones to watch out for.

12 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Thank you.

13 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: I have no further  
14 questions.

15 MR. ODULIO: Your Honor, no further questions from  
16 the government.

17 THE COURT: All right. You may step down.

18 THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.

19 (Witness stepped down.)

20 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Do we need to say that he's  
21 excused at this point?

22 THE COURT: If there's no objection, he'll be  
23 excused. Thank you.

24 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

25 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. I didn't know if we needed



1 to do that or not.

2 THE COURT: Just as well, thank you. Yes, we did  
3 so.

4 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Thank you.

5 We're having a little discussion. Give us one  
6 moment.

7 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

8 The jury may be at ease. That means you may stand  
9 and stretch, chat with one another, but not talk about the  
10 case.

11 (Defendants conferred.)

12 DEFENDANT KATHY WAHLER: Your Honor, I am ready to  
13 take the stand to testify --

14 THE COURT: All right.

15 DEFENDANT KATHY WAHLER: -- on behalf of myself.

16 THE COURT: If you'll step forward.

17 KATHY WAHLER,

18 being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

19 DIRECT EXAMINATION

20 THE WITNESS: My name is Kathy Wahler. I am the  
21 wife of Edward Wahler. Defendant in this case.

22 I am taking the stand to tell my story. You guys  
23 have heard all of everything here. All about instruments.  
24 All about seminars, teachings, all of that. As I told you in  
25 the beginning that you would find that I am a housewife,

1 stay-at-home mom. Home schooled my children. Didn't attend  
2 seminars. Didn't get into any of this. To me it's all  
3 gobbledegook. Haven't we all at one point said -- your  
4 husband said sign this, you sign it. Or he said take this to  
5 the post office, you'd take it to the post office.

6 I was born in Asheville, North Carolina. Raised  
7 there all my life. Raised in a traditional home where my  
8 husband -- my father was the head of the household. My mother  
9 took care of the household. And raised in church. And my  
10 belief system is is that the husband is the head of the  
11 household as Christ is head of the church and you defer to  
12 that. I know a lot of you are saying in this day and time how  
13 can you be that way. It's plain and simple, it's in the  
14 Bible. And if it's in his word, it's his word. The Bible is  
15 the same today, tomorrow, yesterday. It doesn't matter. It  
16 is the same. So that's the way I have taken it.

17 I have two children. We have two children. We have  
18 a fourteen-year-old boy and a nine-year-old girl. And have  
19 spent their lives with them, basically. As I said, we home  
20 school. Very traditional family spending lots of time with  
21 our children, not spent running here and there.

22 Hang on a second, I'm trying to stay in order here.

23 Ed and I have been married for 25 years. And  
24 when -- when you saw what first happened with the BB&T check,  
25 and that was a Nigerian scheme. If you -- I know now you're

1 saying, well, everybody knows about Nigerian schemes. Well,  
2 you have to think back. This was in 2002. Did we know about  
3 Nigerian schemes back then? And he legitimately was trying to  
4 do business. So there was no cause for -- you know, the shock  
5 four months later when the bank came back and the Secret  
6 Service showed up and they did all their questioning -- which  
7 again, I didn't sit in on the questioning. I was with the  
8 children and they questioned my husband.

9           So I can't -- I have not questioned anyone about the  
10 documents as you may have noticed. I don't understand the  
11 documents. Gobbledegook. And I just don't understand it.  
12 And at this point, in the last 16 months, one of the  
13 conditions of my release was is that I not have any contact  
14 with my husband. No contact with my husband whatsoever until  
15 two weeks ago I actually got to start talking to him in court.  
16 And we've been married for 25 years.

17           Excuse me.

18           (Witness began to cry.)

19           THE COURT: You may take time as you see fit.

20           THE WITNESS: So you see, I got shoved into the  
21 point of being a single mother. I did not handle the  
22 financial things in the household. I let him do that. I  
23 also -- and that's like being widowed when you can't even talk  
24 to your husband. It's like he no longer exists. And I had to  
25 pack up, sell or give away everything that we had. Didn't

1 have much left, but what we had, our personal items. I know  
2 that you heard that Ed is an electrical engineer, developing  
3 products. I had to pack his lab up. And just pack it up with  
4 the hope that it would sometime be unpacked.

5           The children and I live with my parents. And I do  
6 have a job. And...

7           Ed and I moved back to Asheville. When we got  
8 married, we moved -- we were in Charlotte because that's where  
9 he worked. And we moved back to Asheville to have our  
10 children. To live in a slower pace, a good life. I had been  
11 raised there and that seemed a good place to start a -- you  
12 know, to start our family there. And it was always that I  
13 would stay home and be with the children. And so that's --  
14 that's what we have done.

15           It's just very hard to think of the separation of  
16 the last 16 months and what the future may hold. But I did  
17 not go to seminars. I did not research. It was just not  
18 something to do. And I relied on the word. And my husband  
19 had never done anything illegal. I had no cause to even think  
20 that it would be. I mean, people were giving seminars. Okay.  
21 If they're giving seminars and they're charging money for it,  
22 then I'm naive enough to think, okay, then it must be okay or  
23 why would they be doing this?

24           I've heard more and probably learned more in the  
25 last 16 months about these -- these things than I've known

1 over the last -- past few years since 2000. Eight years.

2           The subjects that I do know about are my family, my  
3 belief system, and my spirituality. And hopefully, you will  
4 have gained from the questions that I have asked the kind of  
5 person I am inside.

6           I know that the prosecution will cross examine me  
7 and they will have questions and they're going to say, well,  
8 you said this, you said that. I'd like to be put on the  
9 record as saying when I was picked up, I was in shock. I was  
10 chained to a wall for six hours. Okay. I got one bathroom  
11 break, thank you very much. But I hadn't eaten before they  
12 picked us up so therefore it had been about 20 to 24 hours  
13 without eating. And I've read over the statement that I --  
14 that was made and I'm, like, okay. I guess that's right. But  
15 we all know what duress and stress can do to you in trying to  
16 remember things. So I ask that you look at those things and  
17 go with your heart on those things.

18           I tried to make notes and tried to write all this  
19 out and I couldn't succinctly come up with a story line, so I  
20 kind of skipped around to tell you who I am, what I am, what  
21 my beliefs are and I think it stayed the same throughout.  
22 Because it's too hard to try and tell lies because if you try  
23 and tell lies, then you just tell lies on top of lies and then  
24 you forget what you told. So I tell the truth and that seems  
25 to just go from there.

1           I ask you to remember that the Secret Service did  
2 not find any criminal activity with the fraudulent -- with  
3 that check on the Nigerians. And that we took all the  
4 appropriate actions. And you'll see here today we do have  
5 standby counsel, but we don't have an attorney and you may be  
6 saying, well, why don't you have an attorney? Well, it's very  
7 hard to trust once you've trusted an attorney and they made no  
8 effort to do their job. And I've had a real hard time  
9 trusting in anyone because I trusted the word that, okay, you  
10 know, sign here, sign here, sign here -- and not that I'm  
11 turning against my husband, but when you can't even talk to  
12 the one you've talked to for 25 years to say, well, what's  
13 your opinion. So you don't have -- have an opinion there. So  
14 what I have done is just prayed about it to see where we came  
15 from. And I just ask that you look at all those things.

16           I'm looking real quick here just to make sure I  
17 didn't miss anything.

18           And to add that on each of those documents, I did  
19 notice on there it says prohibited -- void where prohibited by  
20 law. And I relied on that. I said, okay, well, this looks --  
21 you know, hey, void where prohibited by law. Don't companies  
22 do that to us all the time to cover themselves? Oh, it's on  
23 there; they're covered. Well, not all the time. And it  
24 doesn't mean, I guess, what you think it means. You have to  
25 read more words into it.

1                   So that's all I have, Your Honor.

2                   THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Any questions?

3                   MS. ROSE: Yes, sir.

4                                   CROSS EXAMINATION

5 BY MS. ROSE:

6 Q.    Have you ever worked outside the home?

7 A.    Yes, ma'am.

8 Q.    In what capacity?

9 A.    I've been a substitute home school teacher. I've worked  
10 at the Billy Graham Training Center, The Cove, as a  
11 server/hostess. I worked at Cracker Barrel as a retail  
12 cashier. I've been a sales rep. And when I was back out --  
13 right out of high school and first year of college, I worked  
14 at the bank as a teller.

15 Q.    You also worked for King Auto Auctions?

16 A.    Oh, yeah, the auto auction. I filed titles and pulled  
17 them back out when they sold.

18 Q.    And did -- what other duties did you have there other  
19 than filing of titles?

20 A.    I took the -- when you come in and you register your car,  
21 you pay a \$5 fee, and sometimes I took that.

22 Q.    And how long did you work in that capacity with the auto  
23 auction?

24 A.    Maybe a year. I'm not sure.

25 Q.    You mentioned the -- what you called the Nigerian scheme.

1 What do you understand that to be or what was your  
2 understanding at the time that it occurred?

3 A. Ed was trying to get -- the company that he started and  
4 owned had -- did lottery terminals and he did the California  
5 lottery terminals. He did some other terminals -- other  
6 lotteries in other countries. I think Austria was one of  
7 those. I never worked for the company, so I didn't -- I  
8 didn't get involved. At this point in time, I was -- had --  
9 we were having our children and I didn't really get involved  
10 with it. But he had been trying to get other lottery  
11 contracts outside the U.S.

12 Q. And there was a time, then, prior to that, maybe even  
13 after, when he was working as an engineer.

14 A. Yes. Because he was designing the lottery terminals.  
15 They were his designs.

16 Q. And was quite successful at that; isn't that fair to say?

17 A. Uh-huh.

18 Q. You indicated that you had not been able to discuss any  
19 of this with your husband in over 16 months; is that correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. When did that begin?

22 A. That was one of the qualifications of my release last  
23 June.

24 Q. If I may, I'm going to approach and show you a couple of  
25 documents and ask you if you're able to identify them. First,



1 Government's Exhibit 253.

2 A. Do me a favor, would you grab my glasses over there.

3 Q. Absolutely. Here you go.

4 A. Thanks.

5 Q. Uh-huh.

6 A. Okay. It's a lot of gobbledegook.

7 Q. Is it a document -- if you'll just go to the last page.

8 The first page is entitled what?

9 A. Affidavit of Rejection for Code Enforcement Agent Default

10 Criminal Complaint.

11 Q. And it's filed with whom?

12 A. With Buncombe County.

13 Q. And the date of that filing?

14 A. 5/21/03.

15 Q. And that document, does it have your name anywhere on it?

16 A. Uh-huh.

17 Q. What does it say? It's handwritten, isn't it?

18 A. Uh-huh.

19 Q. What does it say?

20 A. Kathy Wahler, 1120 Cane Creek Road, Fletcher, North

21 Carolina. Not my handwriting.

22 Q. And the last page?

23 A. What about all these pages in between?

24 Q. Well, I just wanted to ask if that was your signature?

25 A. Could be. Okay.

1 Q. And prior to the part where you say that could be your  
2 signature, what does it say right above it?

3 A. Executed without the, capital -- all caps, United States.  
4 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the  
5 United States, which is in small, of America that the  
6 foregoing is true and correct.

7 Q. So that was signed under penalty of perjury as being  
8 true.

9 A. Does that mean all of this and this?

10 Q. The foregoing, meaning page 1 until your signature.

11 A. Okay.

12 Q. And then in addition, below your signature, if you take a  
13 look at the back page, is there also a notary there?

14 A. Uh-huh.

15 Q. And who notarized this document?

16 A. Brenda Jones.

17 Q. And you know Brenda Jones, obviously. You worked  
18 together.

19 A. We did.

20 Q. And did she notarize that you personally appeared before  
21 her and signed that document?

22 A. Uh-huh.

23 Q. All right. I'm going to show you what has been marked as  
24 Government's Exhibit 251. Do you recognize Exhibit 251?

25 MR. BURGESS: Your Honor, I'm standby counsel and I

1 would like to see if we could have the lawyer be at the table  
2 rather than in front of the witness like that.

3 THE COURT: Well, overruled.

4 THE WITNESS: What was your question?

5 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 251?

6 A. I have no clue.

7 Q. Is that your signature that appears there on the front of  
8 the document?

9 A. Looks like it is.

10 Q. And if you'd turn to the last page, please, ma'am. The  
11 signature page, if you would. That would be page 6 of 8.

12 A. Uh-huh.

13 Q. Is that signed?

14 A. Uh-huh.

15 Q. What else appears on that page? Is there also a notary?

16 A. No, not on this page.

17 Q. Or witness?

18 A. Looks like he's a witness.

19 Q. And what is the title on this particular document,  
20 Government's Exhibit 251?

21 A. Declaration of Intention of Citizenship.

22 Q. And was that also a document that was filed with the  
23 register of deeds or a clerk's office?

24 A. It looks like it was.

25 Q. And the date?

1 A. Needless to say, I have never gone in and filed anything  
2 in Haywood County.

3 Q. Does your signature appear on there as witnessed by  
4 Mr. Hannigan?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. All right. Thank you.

7 And what -- the Declaration of Intention of Citizenship,  
8 does that show a filing date of 2007?

9 A. Yep.

10 Q. Next is Government's Exhibit 211, and that's document 74.  
11 It's previously been admitted. Are you able to see this  
12 document --

13 A. No.

14 Q. -- Ms. Wahler?

15 A. No, ma'am.

16 Q. Are you now able to see the document?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. If you would, take a moment. Do you recognize this  
19 particular document?

20 A. Could I see the rest of it to make sure it's what I think  
21 it is.

22 Q. Absolutely. And if it may help you, I will turn to page  
23 7, which would be page 4 of 8. Are you able to see that?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Is that your signature?

- 1 A. Uh-huh.
- 2 Q. And then on page 9 -- excuse me, 5 of 8, a Certificate of  
3 Service? Did you --
- 4 A. No, that's not my signature.
- 5 Q. Did you or someone on your behalf deliver this --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- to the U.S. Attorney's Office?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Was this actually filed with the court in this matter?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And the date of filing, do you see it there on the  
12 document?
- 13 A. December 8th, 2008.
- 14 Q. And this is a document that was filed by you.
- 15 A. Yep.
- 16 Q. Let's start at the top where it has your name, Kathy  
17 Wahler, purported defendant.
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. The third line says, "Buncombe: The county." What is  
20 the significance of referring to the county in that fashion?
- 21 A. Honestly, I don't know.
- 22 Q. This is a document that you filed --
- 23 A. I know. I know.
- 24 Q. -- without your husband's assistance; isn't this correct?
- 25 A. Exactly. Right.

1 Q. Why is there a box around the zip code? Is there some  
2 significance to which you would attach to that having filed  
3 this document?

4 A. Because I was told that they -- somebody did it for me.

5 Q. Not your husband.

6 A. No.

7 Q. Did you do this at someone else's direction?

8 A. I did it -- they were trying to help in -- in solving --  
9 in trying to solve this whole thing and so there were people  
10 out there that were saying, okay, you can do this. You can do  
11 that. And...

12 Q. This is not a lawyer. It's not one of your lawyers here  
13 that filed these documents for you.

14 A. No, it was not.

15 Q. And --

16 A. Because they are standby counsel. And I had been -- I  
17 was still trying to trust in someone that I thought would --  
18 would know. This person has been to law school. He is not a  
19 bar attorney. And if I am correct, he is also a rabbi.

20 Q. Do you see the language there, "Acceptance of charges?"

21 A. Yep.

22 Q. And that's some of the same language that is used in the  
23 documents which were filed in the matters before the court;  
24 isn't that correct?

25 A. Yes, it is. I've been told that there are penal sums

1 that go along with these court cases and that if the penal sum  
2 is taken care of, that it cancels the court case. And I was  
3 desperate. My children don't have their father and I'm just  
4 flopping around out here trying to figure out what to do. I  
5 was asked to make a plea bargain that would have me sit up  
6 here and lie to you. I have been told, well, maybe you don't  
7 want to be married to your husband anymore after this is all  
8 over with. But folks, I took a vow before God. We're not bad  
9 people.

10 Q. Well, ma'am, I would like to ask you some questions.  
11 Government's Exhibit 212. This is already in evidence.

12 A. Yes, it is.

13 Q. The date of this filing?

14 A. (No response.)

15 Q. The date this was filed --

16 A. Oh.

17 Q. -- in this matter?

18 A. Excuse me, December 31st, 2008.

19 Q. Once again, does your signature appear on this court  
20 filing?

21 A. Yep.

22 Q. And this was actually a document that you filed with the  
23 court in this matter?

24 A. Yes, I did.

25 Q. And obviously, this was not drafted by your husband,

1 correct?

2 A. Nope.

3 Q. And this is entitled what?

4 A. Third Notice of Post Settlement and Closure of the  
5 Account Under Public Policy.

6 Q. Again, does the acceptance, conditional acceptance,  
7 settlement enclosure, acceptance of charges, all language used  
8 in the documents alleged in the bill of indictment. This  
9 document you filed with the court contains that same language;  
10 isn't that correct?

11 A. Yes, but I felt I had to do something.

12 Q. This was, again, as I understand your testimony, not with  
13 court-appointed standby counsel, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Government's Exhibit 213, which is already in evidence.  
16 Do you recognize Exhibit 213 as a filing in this matter?

17 A. Uh-huh.

18 Q. Do you see documents here with -- do those appear to be  
19 your signature?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And these are documents that you filed with the court.

22 A. Yeah. And the notary was just notarizing my signature,  
23 not what was in the document.

24 Q. Well, you filed this with the court; is that correct? On  
25 your behalf.



1 A. Uh-huh.

2 Q. And this is entitled Submission of Named Defendant for  
3 Settlement and Closure, correct?

4 A. Uh-huh.

5 Q. And does that document appear familiar to you?

6 A. Uh-huh.

7 Q. And that is in fact your birth certificate, is it not?

8 A. Yes, it is.

9 Q. And what's written across your birth certificate?

10 A. I was told to write "Accepted for value."

11 Q. Not by your husband.

12 A. Nope.

13 Q. By someone whose legal advice you sought.

14 A. He was -- he was sought by my husband for legal advice  
15 before we were picked up. So I felt that he knew what was  
16 going on. Had talked with Ed before -- he was like one of the  
17 last ones to talk with him so he would know what my husband's  
18 wishes were and how to handle things.

19 Q. And it's your testimony here before the jury that it was  
20 in following your husband's witness that these charges were  
21 brought forward -- following your husband's wishes; is that  
22 your testimony?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Although once again, your husband did not direct you to  
25 file these documents; is that correct?

1 A. He couldn't tell me to do it, but I was going on the fact  
2 that this is the person he had spoke to. This is the person  
3 that --

4 Q. And who is this person?

5 A. -- he trusted.

6 Q. Who's the person that helped you with these filings?

7 A. Does that have a bearing on this case?

8 Q. You have testified that this is a person who assisted  
9 with these filings that you put before the court. Who was  
10 that individual?

11 A. Sean Rice.

12 Q. Where is Mr. Rice now?

13 A. I don't know. I haven't talked to him in -- what's it  
14 been? He took a sabbatical. It's been a couple months.

15 Q. What was his status the last time you spoke with him?

16 A. I really didn't ask. All I asked was is do you have any  
17 information for me to help us in this case.

18 Q. Is he under indictment in federal court in Nevada?

19 A. I know he -- he -- something had happened. I don't know  
20 what the status is of that.

21 Q. All right. Government's Exhibit 214 which has been  
22 admitted. The date on Government's Exhibit 214?

23 A. May 28th, 2009.

24 Q. And the title of this document?

25 A. This is Private Remedy Notice of Affidavit of Admissions

1 in Commerce by Negative Averment. Administrative Notice,  
2 Beneficiary Under Contract Law of Power of Attorney of Limited  
3 Fiduciary Trusteeship Duty to the Public Trusts of Office in  
4 case number.

5 Original Issue and of Defendant's Acceptance of the Claim  
6 or case number and the case number.

7 Q. And the first -- first line, number one?

8 A. "I, Kathy Wahler, appear and state under penalty of  
9 perjury that the following is true and correct."

10 Q. And did you also date this particular document,  
11 Government's Exhibit 215 -- excuse me, 214 prior to its  
12 filing? Is that your verification --

13 A. Yes, ma'am.

14 Q. -- contained on page 32 of 33?

15 A. Yes, ma'am.

16 Q. And what does the verification say above your signature?

17 A. "Do say upon my own unlimited commercial liability, that  
18 I have read the above affidavit and notice and do" the  
19 contents thereof --

20 Q. And do what the contents thereof?

21 A. Oh, "do know the contents thereof to be true, correct and  
22 not misleading, the truth and nothing but the truth, and that  
23 I do believe the acts of the U.S.D.C. set forth therein have  
24 been committed contrary to law."

25 Q. And the U.S.D.C., is that referring to the United States

1 District Court?

2 A. I don't know.

3 Q. And you indicated that you had read all of -- all of this  
4 document prior to its filing; is that correct? That's what  
5 you just stated.

6 A. Yeah.

7 Grasping at straws.

8 But in my defense, let me say --

9 Q. I haven't asked you a question. If you'll just --

10 THE COURT: Well, she can complete her answer if you  
11 need to.

12 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

13 In my defense, let me say that the verbiage in these  
14 documents were the same and along the same lines as what my  
15 husband had done. I had no reason to believe any different  
16 other than what other people were saying to me. Now, I've had  
17 expert witnesses up here today tell me that, okay, this --  
18 this verbiage is garbage. Okay. I contend with that. I  
19 acknowledge that now. But at the time I was still relying on  
20 what I had seen, bits and pieces of this and that, that may,  
21 okay, this is -- this goes along the same lines. Okay. That  
22 would make, you know, would make sense.

23 Q. Who is -- how long have you known Robert Clarkson?

24 A. Let's see. I've been familiar with him when Ed started  
25 going to the Patriot meetings, which would have been -- I

1 don't know. I -- I became aware of him when Ed started doing  
2 meetings and doing that. And he would have him to the home --  
3 to the house to eat and I fixed a meal and I -- but I truly  
4 don't know.

5 Q. And just -- I know you said earlier that you recall  
6 following your arrest you spoke with Agent Romagnuolo. Who  
7 was Art Patton?

8 A. He is a friend of Ed's in Asheville.

9 Q. And Bob P.? Pelletier?

10 A. Pelletier. Uh-huh. His wife is named Peggy. His phone  
11 number is in my phone because Bob is shorter than Peggy.

12 Q. And Keith Livingway?

13 A. Another friend of Ed's.

14 Q. Is his number also in your phone?

15 A. It was.

16 Q. Sean Rice.

17 A. Uh-huh.

18 Q. Who is Sean Rice?

19 A. We've already gone over that.

20 Q. That's the individual from whom you've been seeking legal  
21 advice?

22 A. Whom we had been, yes.

23 Q. And T.J. Henderson?

24 A. He's a friend in Iowa.

25 Q. Is he someone that you and your husband met through the

1 Patriot Network?

2 A. No. I was friends with his previous wife.

3 Q. You indicated that you ran items to the post office for  
4 your husband but never paid attention to what those items  
5 were.

6 A. From time -- I mean, you're handed mail. You don't go  
7 through and look and see what each piece is.

8 Q. The registered mail required a little more hands on  
9 involvement before that --

10 A. Not if -- not if he fills out everything in advance and  
11 everything is just there and you hand it to them and they do  
12 whatever they do and they hand it back to you and you pay  
13 them.

14 Q. And you were required to sign on those receipts; is that  
15 correct?

16 A. What -- what -- what do you mean sign on receipts? Just  
17 if you paid with a credit card.

18 Q. On the mailing receipts.

19 A. I don't understand.

20 Q. Let me just show you.

21 I'm going to show you what's --

22 A. Okay.

23 Q. -- previously been admitted as Government's Exhibit 61.  
24 Do you see that receipt there from April 22nd of '03?

25 A. Oh, okay.

1 Q. You signed a number of those; is that fair to say?

2 A. Okay. Yeah. I can see -- I see where you're talking  
3 about now. The from and the to, okay. And, yeah, there were  
4 some that had my name on them.

5 Q. I'm also going to show you what's been previously marked  
6 as Government's Exhibit 245. It has been admitted. Are you  
7 able to see Government's Exhibit 245?

8 A. Uh-huh.

9 Q. And what is that, if you recall?

10 A. Looks like an account balance on a Chase credit card.

11 Q. And was that credit card held in your name?

12 A. It looks to be held in my name. I really don't remember  
13 since it was so long ago and I haven't had it -- I haven't had  
14 cards in forever.

15 Q. In relation to these credit cards, we've heard a lot  
16 about the checks sent to them during the course of this  
17 testimony. Did you ever speak with individuals from those  
18 credit card companies about the checks you had sent?

19 A. I don't know. Honestly, I cannot remember.

20 Q. This is part of Exhibit 245. It's dated May 18th, 2004.

21 A. Uh-huh.

22 Q. Is that your signature?

23 A. Uh-huh.

24 Q. Do you recall this communication?

25 A. I would be willing to bet you that Ed typed it up and I

1 signed it. Because I never did -- I mean, I know this --  
2 you're going to get tired of hearing it and it sounds  
3 unplausible. He handled it; I just signed it. Why were all  
4 the checks in my name? Why did the account get opened in my  
5 name? I don't remember. There was something and I really --  
6 I just don't remember. And he said do it, we did it.

7 Q. All right. I'm going to show you what's been marked and  
8 admitted as Government's Exhibit 215. This is again a court  
9 filing. What is the date on this Exhibit 215?

10 A. October -- I mean, excuse me, no. August 19, 2009.

11 Q. And once again, that is a document that you filed with  
12 the court without your husband's assistance, correct?

13 A. Yes, I did file this. Because I had been told that I  
14 needed to do -- if you'll turn the page. Because I had been  
15 told that I needed to do a -- this is what I think it is.  
16 That I had been told I needed to do a revocation of the power  
17 of attorney so no one would act on my behalf without my  
18 knowledge.

19 Q. And so this filing was certainly with your knowledge,  
20 correct? In that you signed it, filed it.

21 A. Yeah.

22 Q. And of course, above your signature, I, Kathy Wahler, did  
23 in fact give the truthful testimony, correct?

24 A. Uh-huh.

25 Q. And then there's attached a document about the flag with



1 the gold fringe. Do you recall that document?

2 A. Uh-huh. Yeah. I've -- I had to start looking at all  
3 this stuff and I read this little article thing and I said  
4 okay.

5 Q. So this was not something someone else asked you to file.  
6 This was something that upon your research you felt was  
7 significant --

8 A. Yeah.

9 Q. -- to this case.

10 A. And there again, I wouldn't have been researching it had  
11 I not been thrown into this.

12 Q. And is it your contention, then, that this is a military  
13 courtroom?

14 A. My contention is is that it doesn't matter. It is a  
15 court of law. And we're here. And...

16 Q. You said this document was significant to you.

17 A. At the time I thought it was.

18 Q. This is back in August of this year.

19 A. Exactly.

20 Q. All right. Thank you, ma'am.

21 A. And I had -- I had talked to the person about that, and  
22 after I had done it, realized that we didn't quite see eye to  
23 eye.

24 Q. But this is -- you said you researched and filed on your  
25 own.

1 A. Well, I had read about it and put it in and thought,  
2 okay, this -- you know, but there again, I was grasping at  
3 straws because I couldn't talk to my husband. Had no other --  
4 I didn't know where to turn. Truly did not know where to  
5 turn. And I just was like okay. And all these people, you  
6 know, you should do this, look at this. Da da da da da da,  
7 you know. When I should have just said, okay, I'll just go in  
8 and I'll tell you my story and that will be that.

9 MS. ROSE: Thank you very much.

10 THE COURT: Okay. We'll take a ten minute recess,  
11 members of the jury.

12 (Brief recess at 3 o'clock p.m.)

13 (Jury not present.)

14 THE COURT: Mr. Wahler, are you going to testify  
15 next?

16 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: No.

17 DEFENDANT HUGHES: No, we're going to call Agent  
18 Romagnuolo next.

19 THE COURT: All right.

20 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I need to ask counsel a question  
21 first, please.

22 (Counsel and defendant conferred.)

23 THE COURT: Now, what we normally do --

24 MR. BURGESS: I apologize, Your Honor, I need to go  
25 up here and make a request.

1 THE COURT: Go ahead.

2 (Mr.~ Burgess and the clerk conferred.)

3 THE COURT: What we normally do with defendants in  
4 custody who are testifying, we'll put them -- with the leg  
5 irons, we put them in the witness box before the jury even  
6 comes out. They're sworn in the witness box. And then when  
7 they're done, the jury leaves and then they come back to  
8 counsel table.

9 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. I don't think we're going  
10 to get to there this afternoon. We're going to call Agent  
11 Romagnuolo at this time.

12 THE COURT: All right. When it happens -- when one  
13 of y'all gets ready to do that, though, if you're okay with  
14 the usual procedure, then we'll have to send the jury out  
15 first. So you can just tell me who's going to testify next  
16 and we'll take care of that.

17 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. That will be fine. I'm  
18 all right with that. Yeah, we're okay.

19 THE COURT: All right. May we have the jury,  
20 please.

21 (Jury entered the courtroom.)

22 THE COURT: All right. The jury is seated. You may  
23 call your witness.

24 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Defendant calls FBI Agent Andrew  
25 F. Romagnuolo.

1                   THE COURT: You've already been sworn. You may take  
2 the stand.

3                                   ANDREW F. ROMAGNUOLO,  
4 having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified  
5 further as follows:

6   DIRECT EXAMINATION

7 BY DEFENDANT HUGHES:

8 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Romagnuolo.

9 A. Good afternoon, Mr. Hughes.

10 Q. Could you explain to the court and just kind of give a  
11 brief summary to the court of your training in law which you  
12 are expected to use in the course of your investigations.

13 A. I attended the new agents training at Quantico, Virginia,  
14 at the FBI academy for 26 weeks, from December of 1997 to  
15 April of 1998.

16                   Additionally, I've received specialized training as a  
17 crisis negotiator. That was a two-week course.

18                   I've also received specialized training as an Evidence  
19 Response Team member. And I participated as an Evidence  
20 Response Team team leader for 10 of my 12 years in the FBI.

21                   I have additional training regarding international  
22 terrorism, domestic terrorism, Indian country matters. And  
23 additional training if you'd like to go into a specific area.

24 Q. Not a specific area. What university or college level  
25 courses in law have you taken?

1 A. I took basic criminal justice courses at the State  
2 University of New York at Brockport.

3 Q. Okay. And have you pursued a degree in law?

4 A. No.

5 Q. Okay. Just wondered. Thank you.

6 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I'm sorry, he was asking a  
7 question.

8 (Defendants conferred.)

9 DEFENDANT HUGHES: We've got so many documents in  
10 front of us now we're having trouble finding who's got which  
11 documents, so if you would pardon us for the confusion.

12 Kathy, would you work the viewer for us. I'm glad  
13 somebody knows how to work the viewer.

14 Q. Can you see that?

15 A. I can.

16 Q. Okay. Would you read the paragraph that starts in --  
17 would you -- I'm sorry, try it again.

18 Could you read the paragraph --

19 THE COURT: Wait just a minute. It will be  
20 important for you to identify the document that you're using.

21 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Oh, I'm sorry.

22 Q. This is a page out of the filing in the lawsuit against  
23 Mr. Romagnuolo in Washington, DC, which was filed in early  
24 2008 and which has been entered into the court record on  
25 behalf of the plaintiff.

1 THE COURT: All right.

2 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I mean the defendants.

3 THE COURT: You may ask him questions about that  
4 lawsuit unless there's objection. But as far as just reading  
5 from it, this witness didn't prepare it according to what  
6 you're saying, so it would be inappropriate for you to just  
7 have him sit here and read it.

8 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Then I need a copy of  
9 Title 28 of the U.S. Code, Section 535 because that's what I'm  
10 going to have him read.

11 THE COURT: Well, that's another thing.

12 DEFENDANT HUGHES: That's what's printed in the  
13 document here. That's what I want him to read.

14 THE COURT: Well, I'm saying that the court is not  
15 going to allow just the reading of a statute without laying  
16 some basis for why you would want to do that. You haven't  
17 asked him a question yet --

18 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Oh, okay.

19 THE COURT: -- that calls for a reading of the  
20 statute.

21 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Oh, well, I was going to ask him  
22 what this statute said his duties were.

23 THE COURT: Well --

24 DEFENDANT HUGHES: That was going to be my first  
25 question.

1 THE COURT: You can ask him about that.

2 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

3 THE COURT: But you need to tie it to something in  
4 the case.

5 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I think this does, so --

6 THE COURT: Well, ask a question that ties it in if  
7 you wouldn't mind.

8 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

9 Q. The -- let me see how to do this.

10 Does Title 28 of the United States Code, Section 3 -- 535  
11 set forth the duties of government officers and employees and  
12 their limitations as opposed to their investigative authority?

13 A. If this is a quote of Title 28, U.S.C., Section 535,  
14 then, no, this section does not describe that. It describes  
15 investigations of crimes involving government officers and  
16 employees, which is the investigation of government officers.

17 Q. Good. Does it in any way authorize you to investigate a  
18 citizen domiciled upon a state?

19 MS. ROSE: Objection.

20 THE COURT: Overruled.

21 A. My authority is derived from Title 28, Section 533 which  
22 gives the attorney general the authority to appoint  
23 investigators to investigate matters of federal law. This  
24 section is talking about investigations of government  
25 officials involved in some type of crime.

1           DEFENDANT HUGHES:  Then I need to see Title 28:533,  
2  please.

3           THE COURT:  Well, why don't you ask him a question  
4  about it.

5           DEFENDANT HUGHES:  Since I don't know the wording of  
6  535, I don't know how to frame my question -- or 533, I'm  
7  sorry.  I was afraid this might happen.

8           DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER:  Yeah, me too.

9           DEFENDANT HUGHES:  Until I can see the wording of  
10  533, I don't know whether my next couple of questions are  
11  appropriate or not.  What does 533 say?

12          THE COURT:  Well, we'll allow you the leeway to ask  
13  a question based on what you assume that statute says.

14          DEFENDANT HUGHES:  Okay.

15  Q.    Can you give me a section of the U.S. Code which  
16  authorizes an FBI agent to go on to the soil of a sovereign  
17  state to investigate one of the citizens who is sovereign on  
18  that state?

19  A.    I don't accept your assertion that there is sovereign  
20  soil.  The United States of America is my jurisdiction and as  
21  a person within the United States, you are subject to my  
22  jurisdiction if you engage in matters that constitute crimes  
23  of Title 18.

24                   (Defendants conferred.)

25  BY DEFENDANT HUGHES:



1 Q. All right. Based upon your answer, I will build upon  
2 that when I do my narrative -- when I testify and so I'm going  
3 to refrain from the next question.

4 When the FBI seizes property at a given location, if you  
5 are given written notice that the seized property is owned by  
6 someone else and you are not required -- are you not required  
7 to return the property to the rightful owner after a  
8 reasonable amount of time, say, three months or so, unless  
9 that property is going to be put on display in a court case?

10 A. Are you asking me in relation to a search warrant, sir?

11 Q. I'm asking you in relation to property that was seized at  
12 my domicile.

13 A. As testified before, an authorized federal search warrant  
14 was obtained for your residence and the property from your  
15 residence was seized in accordance with that search warrant.  
16 And the FBI maintains that evidence until the matters under  
17 its investigation, and if it goes to prosecution, through  
18 prosecution and appeal. So we would maintain it until all the  
19 criminal matters are done with.

20 Q. That's a good answer, but you didn't answer my question.

21 A. That is the answer that I have for you. Could you  
22 restate the question, then.

23 Q. Okay. First off, I don't have a residence in Washington  
24 state. I have a domicile. At that location was also a  
25 business operation with an office and a business license.

1 When the FBI seized property at that given location, after  
2 some period of time, if you are given notice that property  
3 seized at that location was not owned by the party named in  
4 the search warrant and you are given notice of who the  
5 rightful owner of that property is, are you not required to  
6 return that property to the rightful owner?

7 A. Who specifically are we talking about, sir? Who gave me  
8 notice of that?

9 Q. Hughes Micro Corporation.

10 A. Well, the search warrant related to yourself and Hughes  
11 Micro Corporation, it was for the residence located at  
12 215-15th Street, Snohomish, Washington. So if we collected  
13 evidence pursuant to the list of items to be seized, we will  
14 maintain it until the court case is concluded and appeals are  
15 concluded.

16 Q. So you make no distinction between a business operation  
17 and what a man does in his private time?

18 A. We execute search warrants on private residences and  
19 businesses, sir. And your residence, and if you deem it to be  
20 a business, was the subject of a search on that date and we  
21 collected evidence and will continue to maintain it.

22 Q. Okay. On the three computers which were identified to  
23 you as belonging to Hughes Micro Corporation, did you find any  
24 documents that were in any way related to the cause of action  
25 before this court?

1 A. I don't recall specifically from your computers as we  
2 collated that information by database searches. I can't say  
3 that I looked at every document from your computers, but they  
4 are in evidence. Is there something specific you would like  
5 me to look at from your computer, sir?

6 Q. Yes. The fact that nothing even remotely related to this  
7 case exists on any of the three computers which belonged to  
8 Hughes Micro Corporation.

9 A. I can't definitively state that there's not.

10 THE COURT: Wait just a minute. First of all, you  
11 don't ask him questions; he asks you questions.

12 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

13 THE COURT: Second of all, you don't make statements  
14 of fact by way of testimony from the questioning position  
15 you're in. So just ask the question, please.

16 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Well, he had turned on me  
17 so I turned around on him. So thank you.

18 Q. Given that you have not found any documents on the three  
19 computers which were identified to you by Hughes Micro  
20 Corporation as belonging to the corporation, why have you  
21 continued to hold them?

22 A. I think I've answered that. Anything that we collected  
23 in relation to the search warrant we will maintain until the  
24 end of the case. It's evidence.

25 Q. Okay. Does 28 U.S.C. 533 give you the authority to

1 investigate citizens who are foreign to the U.S. that are  
2 outside of the United States?

3 A. In certain instances crimes against United States  
4 citizens overseas do fall under the jurisdiction of the FBI.  
5 In relation to this case, there was not a subject that fell  
6 without the jurisdiction of the United States.

7 Q. And where would you say the jurisdiction of the United  
8 States is?

9 A. Within the United States of America, the Continental  
10 United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and United States protectors.

11 Q. So my understanding is, then, that you feel that the  
12 jurisdiction of the United States is any soil anywhere within  
13 the 50 several states?

14 A. My jurisdiction includes what I have described and it's  
15 by statute. It's not a feeling, sir.

16 Q. Okay. Would you please tell me what the statutes  
17 describe the United States as being.

18 A. My jurisdiction is derived from that Title 28:533,  
19 executive orders and other jurisdiction ascribed to me by law,  
20 and the United States is the United States of America.

21 THE COURT: Mr. Lewis Hughes, I think we've  
22 exhausted this subject. You'll need to move to something  
23 else.

24 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

25 Did you print out the arrest warrants?

1 (Counsel and defendant conferred.)

2 THE COURT: Mr. Hughes, let me ask you if your next  
3 line of questioning would be to challenge something about the  
4 arrest warrant?

5 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Yes, sir, it is.

6 THE COURT: That will be ruled out of order. It's  
7 not relevant to the case before us.

8 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I believe it's very relevant,  
9 sir. Could I explain why?

10 THE COURT: No, sir. I'll hear you outside the  
11 presence of the jury at the appropriate time, but not take up  
12 time with it now.

13 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

14 Q. Okay. What I had Kathy put on the viewer is Title 27 of  
15 the Code of Federal Regulations, specifically Section 72.11.

16 In the middle of the screen is -- what we are looking at  
17 is the meaning of terms as used in the courts and in the  
18 regulations and by the government. In the middle of the  
19 screen is a section that says, "Commercial crimes. Any of the  
20 following types of crimes, federal or state, offenses against  
21 the revenue laws; burglary; counterfeiting; forgery;  
22 kidnapping; larceny; robbery; illegal sale or possession of  
23 deadly weapons; prostitution, including soliciting, procuring,  
24 pandering, white slaving, keeping house of ill fame, and like  
25 offenses; extortion; swindling and confidence games; and

1 attempting to commit, conspiring to commit or compounding any  
2 of the foregoing crimes. Addiction to narcotic drugs and use  
3 of marijuana will be treated if such were a commercial crime."

4       Would you say that swindling and confidence games would  
5 be equivalent to fraud?

6               MS. ROSE: Objection.

7               THE COURT: Sustained.

8               DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

9 Q.    Do you agree that what I just read says that all of these  
10 crimes are commercial in nature?

11              MS. ROSE: Objection.

12              THE COURT: Sustained.

13 Q.    What do you think this means, then?

14              MS. ROSE: Objection.

15              THE COURT: Well, sustained.

16              DEFENDANT HUGHES: All right. We'll move on.

17 Q.    In a number of my documents and a number of times before  
18 this court, I have declared myself to be a free white man. Do  
19 you recognize me as being a free white man?

20              MS. ROSE: Objection.

21              THE COURT: Sustained.

22 Q.    Okay. I am looking at amendment -- I mean Article XIII  
23 of the Bill of Rights which specifically prohibits involuntary  
24 servitude and peonage. Am I a free white man or am I  
25 property?

1 MS. ROSE: Objection.

2 THE COURT: Sustained.

3 Q. Do you happen to know where the term free white man comes  
4 from when describing a citizen on a state?

5 MS. ROSE: Objection.

6 THE COURT: Sustained.

7 Q. Do you know if it comes from the Articles of  
8 Confederation?

9 THE COURT: Let me make myself clear since you're  
10 not experienced as counsel, but we -- I've sustained the  
11 objection to these individual questions and I'm also  
12 sustaining the objection to the general line of questioning.  
13 So you'll have to move to another subject.

14 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

15 MS. ROSE: Object to this document, Your Honor,  
16 without further identification and showing the relevance.

17 THE COURT: Sustained.

18 DEFENDANT HUGHES: He made a statement in answering  
19 a question a moment ago that he does not recognize a sovereign  
20 state and does not recognize sovereignty. So my question is  
21 does he think the courts know what they are talking about when  
22 they describe sovereignty?

23 THE COURT: I've sustained an objection to that line  
24 of questioning also.

25 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Very well. We'll move

1 forward.

2 Q. In 1909 -- let me rephrase that since I'm supposed to ask  
3 a question. Are you acquainted with a law enacted in 1909  
4 which says that anything but a title or a last name is a  
5 corporation or other commercial entity?

6 A. I'm not familiar with that.

7 Q. Okay. Does a birth certificate have spaces labeled first  
8 name, last name, middle name?

9 A. Well, a birth certificate would contain that information  
10 if it was properly filled out.

11 Q. All right. Would you say, then, that a birth certificate  
12 is a registration of some commercial entity?

13 MS. ROSE: Objection.

14 THE COURT: Sustained.

15 Q. Can you tell me, then, why a registered birth certificate  
16 is sent to the Department of Commerce?

17 MS. ROSE: Objection.

18 THE COURT: Sustained.

19 Q. Does my true and correct name appear on any document  
20 generated by this court?

21 MS. ROSE: Objection.

22 THE COURT: Overruled.

23 A. Lewis Vincent Hughes, it appears on the indictment and  
24 other documents.

25 Q. The only Lewis Vincent Hughes I've seen on the indictment



1 is in all capital letters which the law I just asked you about  
2 says has a last name and therefore is a commercial entity. Do  
3 you not agree?

4 A. If your assertion is that your name in all capital  
5 letters is a commercial entity and then how you write your  
6 name on other documents, for instance, it's appeared as  
7 Lewis-Vincent: Hughes, or some combination of those to  
8 separate yourself, that is part of the Redemption scheme  
9 philosophy that separates -- it's called straw man. It  
10 separates -- or their assertion is that it separates their  
11 commercial entity from their living being. But that is part  
12 of the scheme as well.

13 Q. Do you know what the Styles manual is which is put out by  
14 the United States Government printing office?

15 A. I'm not familiar with it, sir.

16 Q. Does title 21 of the Styles manual say that anything  
17 written in all capital letters represents a corporation, ship  
18 or vessel?

19 A. I'm not familiar with that.

20 Q. Okay. We'll move on. I've asked this question to the  
21 court before and had not gotten an answer.

22 I am acquainted with three persons named Lewis Vincent  
23 Hughes. One is registered in the State of Washington, one is  
24 registered in the State of Pennsylvania, and one is registered  
25 in the State of New Mexico. There may possibly be others with

1 the same name. Which one of these persons is the defendant or  
2 is some other person named Lewis Vincent Hughes, the  
3 defendant?

4 A. My answer to you is that you are Lewis Vincent Hughes.  
5 You are the person that we've identified that goes with the  
6 residence 215-15th Street, Snohomish, Washington. So that's  
7 you, sir.

8 DEFENDANT HUGHES: David, did you get me a copy of  
9 Executive Order 6260 yet?

10 MR. BURGESS: Can I have a moment?

11 (Counsel and defendant conferred.)

12 DEFENDANT HUGHES: We seem to have a little bit of  
13 disconnect on -- between David and I on getting the documents  
14 that I need. I keep writing him out notes and I apologize  
15 that I don't have them as I need them. So the line of  
16 questioning that I was just pursuing I'm going to have to  
17 probably do it on testimony or something else.

18 THE COURT: You can move on to something else and  
19 we'll come back to that after the jury departs if necessary.

20 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Okay. We'll go a  
21 different direction.

22 Q. Agent Romagnuolo, were you the manager or controller, or  
23 whatever the proper term might happen to be, for the actions  
24 which were brought against me on Washington the state?

25 MS. ROSE: Object.

1 THE COURT: Sustained.

2 Q. Do you have -- do you acknowledge that there is a  
3 difference between the State of Washington and Washington, the  
4 state?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Are you aware that Washington, the state and country,  
7 came into existence November 4, 1878, and that the State of  
8 Washington came into existence in 1889?

9 A. I'm not familiar with the history of the State of  
10 Washington, but I don't differentiate between what we know as  
11 the State of Washington and what you assert the State of  
12 Washington is.

13 Q. Okay. Then would you not be -- or would you therefore  
14 then not be aware that the U.S. Secretary of State,  
15 Condoleezza Rice --

16 MS. ROSE: Objection.

17 THE COURT: Sustained.

18 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I hadn't even got close to asking  
19 the question. What's the problem?

20 THE COURT: Well, this is the type of thing that --  
21 you're not aware of it, but when you get an objection  
22 sustained and there's evidence -- the evidence therefore has  
23 been limited, you're entitled after the jury leaves to put  
24 into the record that which the answer would have been so that  
25 you can complain about it on appeal if there ever were an

1 appeal.

2           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Ah, okay. Then I got a whole  
3 pile of questions after the jury leaves.

4           THE COURT: Exactly.

5           DEFENDANT HUGHES: I'm sorry, what?

6           THE COURT: Yes.

7           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Good. Good. Good. As  
8 long as we get it in the record.

9           This may be down the same road, but I'll see.

10 Q. Are you aware that the Washington Supreme Court is  
11 located in Walla Walla and that the Supreme Court of the State  
12 of Washington is located in Olympia?

13 A. I'm not familiar with where they're located.

14 Q. Okay. Are you aware that information about both courts  
15 is on display in the lobby of the Temple of Justice in  
16 Olympia. Temple of Justice houses the Supreme Court in the  
17 State of Washington.

18 A. I've never been to Washington state.

19           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Then because of your  
20 previous limitation, I can't continue on with that question.

21 Q. Have you ever seen or read my Declaration of Citizenship  
22 on Washington state which removes all presumption that I am a  
23 U.S. citizen, that is, a United States citizen?

24 A. That may have been attached to the fraudulent lawsuit you  
25 filed against me, but I don't recall reading the whole thing

1 and I'm not entirely sure.

2 Q. Are you aware that the United States District Court,  
3 Western District for Washington, has recognized that I am a  
4 Washington state citizen only and not a U.S. citizen in two  
5 different proceedings?

6 A. I'm not familiar with that.

7 Q. Okay. I would like to at this time show you the document  
8 that I just referenced.

9 DEFENDANT HUGHES: If you could put that up there.

10 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Actually, they put this  
11 into evidence already with the picture, remember?

12 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Right. He hasn't -- he hasn't  
13 seen.

14 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Right, the first page.

15 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. And we couldn't read it  
16 before.

17 Q. Okay. So do you recognize what the information  
18 underneath the bar code is?

19 MS. ROSE: Your Honor, just for the record, this is  
20 not a document that has been entered into evidence by the  
21 government.

22 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Actually, I believe it has. I  
23 believe it's one of your exhibits.

24 MS. ROSE: No, sir, it's not.

25 DEFENDANT HUGHES: You had it up on the screen the

1 other day and we couldn't quite read it, so...

2 MR. BURGESS: Your Honor, just to clarify, I think  
3 that was a photograph of something lying there. So just mark  
4 it -- identify it as a number.

5 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Oh, is that how I do it, then?

6 THE COURT: Mark it as the defendant's next exhibit  
7 for identification.

8 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: It's D.

9 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. I ask that this be entered  
10 as Exhibit D.

11 THE CLERK: What's the title of the document, sir?

12 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I'll show you in just a moment.

13 THE CLERK: Okay.

14 Q. Okay. Do you recognize what the information underneath  
15 the bar code is, sir?

16 A. There's a series of numbers, the date and time, the  
17 dollar amount of \$79, and the words Snohomish County,  
18 Washington, with a bar code.

19 Q. Would you know what that represents?

20 A. It appears to be a filing stamp.

21 Q. Very good. And what is the title of the document?

22 A. In the upper left-hand corner --

23 Q. No, no, no. Where it says Document Title.

24 A. Notice.

25 Q. Thank you, sir. And who is the notice to under the word

1 "grantee?"

2 A. The public.

3 Q. Thank you.

4 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Next page.

5 Q. And there's a title to the document. Would you please  
6 read that.

7 A. When recorded mail to --

8 Q. No, no, no. The title for the document, please, sir.

9 A. Affidavit and Declaration of Citizenship, Dwelling, and  
10 Sovereign Status of Lewis Vincent. This is an international  
11 notice.

12 Q. Thank you, sir.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Lewis Hughes, the court would ask  
14 you to move to another line of questioning because this one is  
15 irrelevant in the court's view, and that's something you may  
16 challenge in due course.

17 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

18 Q. I direct your attention now to Title 8 of the United  
19 States Code which is Immigration, Naturalization and  
20 Citizenship. Section 1481 has to do with loss of nationality  
21 and citizenship. If you would be so kind as to read paragraph  
22 2.

23 THE COURT: Same ruling.

24 Q. Or A2.

25 THE COURT: Same ruling. Sustained.

1                   DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

2    Q.    Do you happen to know what the law of nations is?

3                   MS. ROSE: Objection.

4                   THE COURT: Sustained.

5                   DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. When I want to ask these  
6    questions outside of the jury, do I get to question  
7    Mr. Romagnuolo?

8                   THE COURT: Yes, sir.

9                   DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Okay. We can cover it  
10   outside of the jury, then.

11                   Well, I've got about five pages of questions, then,  
12   that you've barred the jury from hearing.

13   Q.    Do you know what the Puget Sound Agricultural Society is?

14                   MS. ROSE: Objection.

15                   THE COURT: Sustained.

16                   DEFENDANT HUGHES: Am I going to be allowed to ask  
17   anything? Apparently not.

18                   THE COURT: Any other questions?

19                   DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Yeah, just one.

20                                   DIRECT EXAMINATION

21   BY DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER:

22   Q.    You mentioned in your testimony of my cross examine, I  
23   guess, that you had an attorney to defend our fraudulent  
24   lawsuit in DC, and that he entered into the record. This is a  
25   copy of the docket for that case. Do you see any such entry?



1 A. The one thing that I know that the DOJ attorney did was  
2 notice the court that he represented me. That's what I was  
3 informed of. The other -- the other piece of information that  
4 I received was the order dismissing this civil lawsuit.

5 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Okay. Let the record  
6 reflect that there is no such entry of appearance on the  
7 docket, please.

8 THE COURT: The court -- the court will sustain an  
9 objection if there were one to the relevance of this document.

10 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Okay. It will be made  
11 relevant on my testimony.

12 DEFENDANT HUGHES: We're done with this witness  
13 until the jury leaves.

14 THE COURT: All right, sir. You may step down.

15 (Witness stepped down.)

16 THE COURT: Please call your next witness.

17 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Because you eliminated about ten  
18 pages of questions, I'm not ready for the next witness.

19 THE COURT: Well, one of you -- you know, we're in  
20 session for another probably 35 or so minutes anyway, maybe  
21 40.

22 (Defendants conferred.)

23 DEFENDANT HUGHES: We would like you to ask the jury  
24 to be excused so that we can continue the line of questioning  
25 with Agent Romagnuolo.

1           THE COURT: Well, we'll take that up at another  
2 time, but right now we have access to this jury since they  
3 understand -- now, what I want you to do is identify the next  
4 witness that might be called now.

5           DEFENDANT HUGHES: The next witness that I would  
6 call would be Agent Mike Peffer.

7           THE COURT: All right. Is he available?

8           MS. ROSE: He was on standby. I inquired at the  
9 break whether he would be needed today.

10          DEFENDANT HUGHES: I didn't -- I didn't expect to  
11 need him today because, like I said, I have another ten pages  
12 of questions for Mr. Romagnuolo.

13          MS. ROSE: He is in -- we left him at his hotel  
14 which is in Charlotte. He did not return to Seattle today.  
15 So he is in the area and I'd be glad to --

16          THE COURT: He'll be available in the morning?

17          MS. ROSE: Yes, sir.

18          DEFENDANT HUGHES: I'll be ready for him first thing  
19 in the morning.

20          THE COURT: All right. We'll expect you to be ready  
21 to do your witnesses in the morning sequentially one after the  
22 other without any delay. That's how we'll do it. And then  
23 when that's all done and the jury is doing other things, then  
24 we can hear all this questioning that you would like to enter  
25 into the record.

1           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. That will be the last  
2 witness that I'm calling as far as I know given what else has  
3 transpired.

4           THE COURT: All right. Members of the jury, thank  
5 you very much for your attention to the case today. Please  
6 remember all the instructions and be with us, if you will, at  
7 9:30 in the morning.

8           (Jury exited the courtroom.)

9           THE COURT: All right.

10          MS. ROSE: If I may just inquire. There were a  
11 couple of other witnesses that were on standby. I'd be happy  
12 to have those here for the court's convenience if needed  
13 tomorrow.

14          THE COURT: Well, let's hear defense counsel as to  
15 who you say your remaining witnesses will be, including any  
16 defendants.

17          DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: We're calling ourselves.

18          DEFENDANT HUGHES: We're calling ourselves, but as  
19 far as the two witnesses that we had reserved possibly  
20 recalling, in light of what's transpired, we're not going to.

21          THE COURT: All right, sir. Do you want them called  
22 for purposes of entering into the record any testimony they  
23 might have offered?

24          DEFENDANT HUGHES: I'm sorry, I didn't understand.

25          THE COURT: As I said to you earlier, when the court

1 sustains an objection to a line of questioning or certain  
2 questions --

3 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Oh, oh, oh. No --

4 THE COURT: -- then the jury doesn't hear the  
5 answer, but you're entitled to get those answers into the  
6 record outside the presence of the jury if you want to do  
7 that.

8 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Everything that I know of that we  
9 want to do at this time would be strictly with Agent  
10 Romagnuolo.

11 THE COURT: All right. Now, just for -- go ahead.

12 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I believe we've abandoned the  
13 line that we were taking with the other two witnesses.

14 THE COURT: All right. Well, just for information,  
15 the two of you would expect to testify, and then would you  
16 want to talk to Mr. Peffer in the morning?

17 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I would call Mr. Peffer first  
18 witness in the morning, yes, sir.

19 THE COURT: All right. And then after that, I take  
20 it we would send the jury out and put one of y'all in the box  
21 and then we would have your testimony and then the other one  
22 of you.

23 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Right.

24 THE COURT: And that would be it as far as witnesses  
25 as far as you know now.

1           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Right. At this time I plan to go  
2 first and then Ed will follow me.

3           THE COURT: All right, sir. Very well.

4           DEFENDANT HUGHES: And --

5           THE COURT: Now --

6           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Now, relative to that, I have  
7 problems preparing for this because I can't get anything to  
8 write with in the jail except every once in a while. I tried  
9 all night last night to get my pencils sharpened so that I  
10 could do some writing. I finally got them sharpened during  
11 breakfast this morning; and as soon as I finished breakfast,  
12 they pulled me out of the pod and put me in the booking area  
13 for an hour and a half. I didn't even get a chance to take a  
14 shower this morning, which normally I take a shower right  
15 after breakfast. So I need some assistance in being able to  
16 get paper and pencil so that I can write out an outline of  
17 what I'm to talk about tomorrow.

18           THE COURT: Well, we'll ask the marshal to make sure  
19 the jail personnel understands that he has to have access to  
20 writing and pad at all times when he is in any of the  
21 facilities around that jail.

22           DEFENDANT HUGHES: The other problem, I'm still not  
23 getting adequate nutrition. Nothing has been done about my  
24 meals. For dinner last night I had a half a cup of applesauce  
25 and two cookies. That was it.

1           THE COURT: You didn't eat the whole cup of  
2 applesauce?

3           DEFENDANT HUGHES: No, sir, it was a half a cup of  
4 applesauce and it was highly sweetened with artificial  
5 sweetener and there is no nutrition whatsoever in that.  
6 Nothing to drink. Nothing else. That was it.

7           THE COURT: Well, we've been in touch with the  
8 authorities over there about that and we'll tell them to  
9 comply with their obligations.

10          DEFENDANT HUGHES: Well, what they tell me is their  
11 food service is contracted. The contractors prepare the  
12 evening meal between breakfast and lunch and that there's  
13 nobody there to provide anything other than the -- what they  
14 provide all the rest of the inmates, which I can't eat.

15          THE COURT: Well, did you get your double sandwich  
16 today?

17          DEFENDANT HUGHES: No, sir, I did not.

18          THE COURT: Would ask the marshal to rectify that  
19 tomorrow.

20          DEFENDANT HUGHES: Yes, sir, appreciate it. And  
21 what I got was a straight vegetarian which was just bread,  
22 lettuce and two slices of tomato and a little bit of onion.  
23 There's no protein or anything in that. So I'm running at a  
24 terrible sugar deficit right now.

25          THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you.

1           DEFENDANT HUGHES: So if they could bring me a tuna  
2 fish, double tuna fish sandwich tomorrow, I'd sure appreciate  
3 it.

4           THE COURT: All right.

5           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Thank you for your help.

6           THE COURT: We'll put Agent Romagnuolo on the stand.  
7 Take the stand.

8           (Witness resumed the witness stand.)

9           THE COURT: All right. You may commence to ask  
10 questions in those areas where your questioning is limited.

11          DEFENDANT HUGHES: Thank you, sir.

12          THE COURT: And I would expect the government would  
13 object when it deems it appropriate, although we'll probably  
14 be letting answers come in just for the proffer.

15          DEFENDANT HUGHES: He already started packing up,  
16 I'm sorry. Give us just a moment.

17          MS. ROSE: Are you looking for the last document you  
18 identified?

19          DEFENDANT HUGHES: No.

20          MS. ROSE: Okay.

21          DEFENDANT HUGHES: In answer to my question earlier,  
22 Mr. Romagnuolo challenged the validity that the state was  
23 sovereign and that citizens on the state were sovereign, so I  
24 want to show that the courts have held that such exists. And  
25 I direct your attention to a quote from *Yick Wo versus*





1 A. The State of Washington is within the United States of  
2 America and subject to my jurisdiction.

3 Q. I will totally agree with that if you are talking about  
4 the State of Washington as formed in 1989. Is that the one  
5 you're referring to? The one which joined the Union called  
6 the Federal Corporation of United States? Is that the one  
7 you're referring to?

8 A. I only understand the State of Washington to be one  
9 entity. I don't think there are separate states of  
10 Washington.

11 Q. Okay.

12 A. And as far as citizenship goes on a general level, I  
13 contacted the state department during this case and spoke to  
14 them about what -- what is required to renounce your  
15 citizenship to the United States of America. And in order to  
16 do so, you have to travel outside of the country. Go to a  
17 United States embassy. Fill out the state department  
18 documents that renounce your citizenship and then turn over  
19 whatever documents that you have that identify you as a United  
20 States citizen. Then in order to get back into the United  
21 States, you have to establish residency and citizenship in  
22 another country in order to travel back. That's my  
23 understanding of renunciation of citizenship, and I think  
24 that's the issue you're asking me.

25 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Put this up on the viewer.

1           THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Lewis Hughes, it  
2 looks like you're proposing to put up a statute and I --

3           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Yes, sir.

4           THE COURT: -- want to advise you that if you're on  
5 appeal on an issue related to any of these matters, you're  
6 entitled to quote any and all laws or cases or language from  
7 cases that you see fit to cite or quote.

8           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

9           THE COURT: And so there's no limit on that. So the  
10 only useful -- useful thing we can do with our time now is  
11 take questions from this witness. So you need to ask him  
12 things that might be within his personal knowledge.

13           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Well, I'm going to -- he just  
14 testified to his personal knowledge and I want to refute it by  
15 showing him what the statute says.

16           THE COURT: I'm saying you can do that by showing  
17 any and all law that you want to show.

18           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Correct.

19           THE COURT: But I've ruled that this discussion is  
20 irrelevant to this case. Now, you can take that up on appeal  
21 and cite all the case law and statutes that you want to.

22           DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. All right. Never mind.

23           Did you get the arrest warrant?

24           Am I going to be allowed to pursue the question of  
25 the arrest warrant?

1 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

2 MS. ROSE: I would object as to relevance for the  
3 record.

4 THE COURT: Well, it's irrelevant to the current  
5 case. Now, if your arrest was improper, then it should have  
6 been raised long before now.

7 DEFENDANT HUGHES: It was. It was.

8 THE COURT: Well, and I take it, then, it's been  
9 ruled on.

10 DEFENDANT HUGHES: No. I've never seen anybody rule  
11 on the issue.

12 Did you take my marker out? No, it's a different  
13 one. Wrong book.

14 MR. BURGESS: I don't have that. If the court wants  
15 to let him use it, if we could print it out.

16 THE COURT: Well, if it's something you can find on  
17 the docket sheet.

18 MR. BURGESS: It would be on the docket sheet.

19 THE COURT: I have no problem having it printed out.

20 THE CLERK: We're talking about the warrant in this  
21 case, correct?

22 MR. BURGESS: Yes, ma'am.

23 THE CLERK: Yeah, I think I can print out the one  
24 that was...

25 THE COURT: But the arrest warrant would be a matter

1 of record already then if, in fact --

2 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Right.

3 THE COURT: -- it is part of the record.

4 DEFENDANT HUGHES: If we don't need to look at it,  
5 then I can -- I can just go ahead.

6 THE COURT: Yes, sir, please do.

7 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Looking at Supplemental  
8 Rules for Admiralty, specifically Rule C, subparagraph 3,  
9 subparagraph A. It says, "Arrest Warrant. The court must  
10 review the complaint and any supporting papers. If the  
11 conditions for an interim action appear to exist, the court  
12 must issue an order directing the clerk to issue a warrant for  
13 the arrest of the vessel or other property that is the subject  
14 of the action."

15 I believe if you will examine the arrest warrant, the  
16 only one who signed it is the clerk of court. I can find no  
17 statute, code, rule, regulation which authorizes a clerk of  
18 court to issue an arrest warrant for a man, only for property.  
19 And in light of the law of 1909 which says that anything with  
20 a last name, anything with a title is a corporation or other  
21 commercial entity, I would enter into the record that this  
22 arrest warrant is for property only.

23 THE COURT: All right. Your objection is duly  
24 noted.

25 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

1 Q. Then I will ask the question of Mr. Romagnuolo, does he  
2 have any evidence that Congress has ever authorized a clerk of  
3 court to issue an arrest warrant for a free white man?

4 MS. ROSE: Objection.

5 THE COURT: Sustained. And he needn't answer that  
6 because of the way the question is phrased.

7 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

8 Q. Then I'm going to ask if you recognize me to be a free  
9 white man?

10 THE COURT: Sustained for the same reason and he  
11 needn't answer.

12 Q. Then am I considered property?

13 THE COURT: Well, let me say this for the record,  
14 that if your objection to the person who signed the arrest  
15 warrant is well taken, then that -- that issue can be raised  
16 based on the arrest warrant itself. That would be a legal  
17 matter, and I don't believe this witness would have anything  
18 to add to it.

19 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay.

20 Q. I think I got cut off on this question. I'm not sure  
21 where we're at, but Mr. Romagnuolo, would you say that a birth  
22 certificate is a registration of some commercial entity based  
23 on the law of 1909 which says anything with a last name is a  
24 corporation or a commercial entity?

25 MS. ROSE: I object to that as well, Your Honor, for

1 the record.

2 THE COURT: Sustained. But if you have an answer,  
3 you may give it.

4 A. I don't know.

5 Q. Would you happen to know why the registered birth  
6 certificate is then sent to the Department of Commerce?

7 A. I don't know that it is.

8 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the definition of the word  
9 "person" as it appears in Executive Order 6260, dated  
10 August 28, 1933?

11 A. No, I've never read it.

12 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Did you find that, David?

13 MR. BURGESS: I haven't been able to get a copy of  
14 that. I don't have it. Do you know where it is?

15 DEFENDANT HUGHES: I can almost quote it.

16 Q. In paragraph 2 of Executive Order 6260 is the definition  
17 for a person. So not being familiar with it, then you  
18 wouldn't know that a person is defined as a corporation, an  
19 association, an unincorporated corporation, a partner, a ship,  
20 a vessel or other artificial entity, as well as some other  
21 things that I don't quite remember what all of them are. So  
22 you wouldn't be familiar with that.

23 A. I don't know.

24 Q. Okay. Section 2, "Definition as used in this order. The  
25 term person means an individual, partnership, association,

1 corporation, ship, vessel."

2 And "the term United States means the United States and  
3 anyplace subject to the jurisdiction thereof."

4 So now you're familiar with it.

5 THE COURT: Let me ask --

6 MS. ROSE: Objection.

7 THE COURT: Let me ask the parties to comment on a  
8 procedural matter.

9 Rule 103 talks about the effect of an erroneous  
10 ruling. This is the rules of evidence. And it says, "Error  
11 may not be predicated upon a ruling which admits or excludes  
12 evidence unless a substantial right of the party is affected.

13 "And in the case the ruling is one excluding  
14 evidence," this is Section 2, "the substance of the evidence  
15 was made known to the court by offer or was apparent from the  
16 context within which questions were asked."

17 Now, in fairness, I wanted to make some effort to  
18 let the defendant get in the record the substance of the  
19 evidence that he is offering, and I believe I can do that by  
20 letting him or any of the defendants comment on what they seek  
21 to elicit.

22 It's also true that none of this would perhaps make  
23 a lot of difference on appeal except where a substantial right  
24 of the party is affected.

25 So let me ask the government if you wish to comment

1 on that before I ask the defendant the same question. Now  
2 we're talking here about whether we're wasting time or not.

3 MS. ROSE: Well, it appears that we are revisiting  
4 the jurisdictional issues that the court has previously ruled  
5 upon, and there are numerous filings within the record by the  
6 defendants regarding whether this court has jurisdiction over  
7 them. Given what we've heard, it appears that that is an  
8 issue which is being revisited. The law is well settled. The  
9 court has ruled on it. And I would submit to the court that  
10 this is not a matter that would be defined as substantial  
11 under Rule 103.

12 THE COURT: Do you want to be heard on that?

13 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Yes, sir. I think this is a very  
14 fundamental issue. It directly affects my freedom. It goes  
15 to the heart of the matter of the laws of whether or not a  
16 person can be a citizen on a state. Whether or not that state  
17 is sovereign and separate from the jurisdiction of the United  
18 States.

19 It goes to where -- whether or not the United States  
20 has a jurisdiction on one of the organic states or whether it  
21 only has jurisdiction in the corporation state.

22 It addresses the issue of whether or not a right --  
23 a person has a right as guaranteed by the law of nations which  
24 the United States is a signature party to, the United Nations  
25 Human Rights Accord of 1958. It says a person has a right to



1 be a citizen of any political group he chooses.

2           And so there is a number of fundamental issues here  
3 that determine whether -- whether or not my freedom is at  
4 stake. Because if you're not recognizing the law of nations  
5 and if you're not recognizing the organic state is unique,  
6 separate and distinct from the corporation state, which is a  
7 subdivision of the federal corporation, then you're ignoring  
8 numerous court cases such as *Shelby versus Norton* -- *Norton*  
9 *versus Shelby County* out of Tennessee, among others, which  
10 clearly establish that there is a very unique difference  
11 between the organic state and the corporation state.

12           And so I don't know where to go. I mean, this is  
13 very fundamental to me.

14           THE COURT: Well, I think it's correct that we've  
15 already ruled on most if not all of the issues that you have  
16 raised. Certainly we've ruled that the court has jurisdiction  
17 to try this case.

18           DEFENDANT HUGHES: But I've never seen anything in  
19 writing.

20           THE COURT: Well, but the court doesn't have to  
21 prove to you that. The court has to rule on that. And I have  
22 done that.

23           DEFENDANT HUGHES: That's not what I've read in the  
24 past so I'm confused.

25           THE COURT: Well --

1           DEFENDANT HUGHES: I mean, that's --

2           THE COURT: -- I'm sorry about that.

3           DEFENDANT HUGHES: I'm sorry?

4           THE COURT: I've tried to be as clear as I can about  
5 it. But the court's ruling about this jurisdictional issue  
6 and the human rights accord, the law of nations, all those  
7 things the court finds are not relevant to the current trial  
8 because they have either already been ruled on or, in any  
9 event, they have -- you have made the substance of your  
10 objection known. And it's further the view of this court that  
11 this witness wouldn't have anything to add to that. So in  
12 other words, your disagreement with the court is preserved for  
13 appeal as far as this judge is concerned for all purposes.

14           MS. ROSE: And if I just could make it clear for the  
15 court. The court actually did in document 36 rule. The  
16 government responded to that particular filing of the  
17 defendant. The court filed an order on August 11th of 2008  
18 dismissing -- Defendant's Motion to Dismiss the Indictment was  
19 denied, which also addressed the motions for lack of  
20 jurisdiction.

21           DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: However, I would rebut  
22 that, Your Honor, that -- I brought that up. That motion  
23 relied on 18 U.S.C. 3231 which there is absolute  
24 uncontroverted evidence in this court that 3231 does not exist  
25 at law and the prosecution has never offered one shred of

1 counter rebuttal. So I mean, she can't rely on something she  
2 put in there when we've already destroyed it.

3 THE COURT: Well, the statute has -- is one that the  
4 court takes judicial notice of, and it's in the statute book.  
5 So that's what the court is relying on. And of course, you  
6 disagree with that and you're entitled to take that to a  
7 higher court.

8 Is there any other subject matter besides  
9 jurisdiction or anything of the nature we've been looking at  
10 that you would like to ask this witness?

11 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Well, there's -- I want to rebut  
12 his statement about loss of citizenship and nationality.  
13 Title 8 --

14 THE COURT: No, I'm not going to let you make a  
15 statement of law because that's -- it's just not appropriate.  
16 It's a waste of time for the current purposes.

17 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Okay. Then -- then basically  
18 you're telling me I can't introduce what's important to my  
19 freedom.

20 THE COURT: You can introduce on appeal any and all  
21 statutes, cases, and other legal materials that you think are  
22 relevant.

23 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Uh-huh.

24 THE COURT: So we'll take our recess for the night.  
25 I think a couple more sandwiches are being brought in for the

1 defendants.

2 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Thank you, sir.

3 DEFENDANT EDWARD WAHLER: Thank you.

4 DEFENDANT HUGHES: Thank you. Very appreciative.

5 (Evening recess at 4:45 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25