

# Ignorance

Abyss

From the darkness of the abyss a message was delivered.

Brinkman is back online, actions and intervention are for the benefit of humanity.

I.

## Terror and Fear

Over the decades and most likely over centuries, one has learned and accepted the method and means taught that instill terror and fear. Do not confuse financial *terror and fear* with that of a *terror and fear* instilled by terrorist organizations, for they are not the same. This writer has already noted that the American people would rise to thwart any attack toward the people, whether it is an attack by weapons of war or by financial deceit. An attack is an attack. The fact of the matter, the people of the world will rise in unison to defeat any evil attack.

Could it have been, the terrorist attack upon the World Trade Center was not a planned attack against the people but against a financial industry? Could there have been an entity not identified that would have wanted such an attack? Would it be possible that a financial institution could have planned such an attack to provide the means and methods for assuring future profits?

In 2012, banks were imposed fines for unlawfully channeling money to restricted entities. After the World Trade Center attack, manpower resources for discovering white collar crime were

shifted to prevent future terrorist attacks. Could it have been, depletion of manpower from oversight of the financial industry that allowed for a greater fraud potential and aided in covering up a truth behind the WTC attack?

As the Bank's Manifesto was made available to the world by Charles Lindberg, which appears remarkably to have followed the principles found in Sun Tzu's "*Art of War*."

One has to only read many insurance documents to note that a *loss payable* does not occur as a result of an act of war. Could it be loss denials were put into place to assure the insurance institutions suffered no loss? Could it be, a relationship existed to assure that neither the banks nor insurance company suffered a loss? Could it have been an independent act of a financial institution? Could it have been a method and means to assure the banks could hold leverage over future obligors?

## II.

### Securitized Note

In the century past, before the days of securitization, the term *Obligation* defined the *Note*. "The Security follows the Note", as opined in *Carpenter v Longan* by the United States Supreme Court along with modern day courts, concur, the Security follows the Note. In short, The *Security (Security Instrument)* will always follow the *Note*.

### III.

#### ”OR”

In the prior version of the United Commercial Code bifurcation of the payment stream away from a *Note* was lawful. Under the current Uniform Commercial Code, bifurcation of the payment stream (interest in, transferable record, etc.) is legally viable. Were it is legal to bifurcate the payment stream, (obligation) from the Note; however it is not legal to bifurcate the Security Instrument away from the Note to allow the Security Instrument to follow the payment stream obligation.

As the Note travels a path to a custodian usually endorsed “in blank”, nothing here to prevent the Note from being a bearer instrument, but the Security Instrument that secures the Note contains verbiage that states the Security Instrument is to follow the payment stream (obligation), which is contrary to law and many a courts opinion. Without knowing the “in blank” Indorsee’s name, (subsequent payee), a question presents. Who is the Secured Party of Record?

### IV.

#### ILLUSION

To provide the illusion, claims are made that intervening assignments of the Security Instrument (securing real property) is in compliance with governing laws attempts are made that Uniform Commercial Code Article 9 governs. Whereas Uniform Commercial Code Article 9 allows for an assignment of a

mortgage, (such is limited to that of personal property security instrument, warehouse receipts, bills of lading), whereas the laws of local jurisdiction apply for assigning a mortgage (Real Property Security Instrument) that affect an interest in real property. Similar, Uniform Commercial Code Article 9, exclude documents that involve Documents of Title, such as a car or boat.

The elevator facts, many of the modern day Security Instruments reflect that the Security Instrument will follow the payment stream obligation and not the Note. This lacks supporting law and is in contrary to opined case law!!!