

Kennedy's Revenge: The Election of 2016

Chapter 1 (October 2016)

Why am I doing this? I don't even like humanity. Fitzgerald Cavendish was having his first panic attack, his first failure to focus in over a year. Why am I doing this? Was it to avenge the death of his father, whom he never personally knew, or was it to simply right a perceived wrong? Whatever the reason, Fitz needed to concentrate or he was going to fall flat on his face in front of 70 million people. His plan had worked perfectly to this point: his engineered overnight fame and the use of it to catapult him in front of a televised audience surpassed only by the Super Bowl. His opponents were grizzled veterans, who were not only used to the spotlight, but also embraced it. The good news was that the expectations for Fitz, at least as far as the media (and most viewers) were concerned, were low. He wasn't even a candidate. But based on his performance over the next ninety minutes, he could change all of that. He could change everything.

Even though his plan had worked to perfection so far, it was not without sacrifice. He had given up his peaceful anonymity for celebrity -- planned, but never desired. More importantly, he had given up his love -- hopefully, only temporarily -- for this moment that he was now beginning to question.

"Your twitter followers are now over 24 million." Polly Preston, his publicist and fast confidant, snapped him out of his funk with news he never thought he would hope to hear: Fitz was now more popular than Miley Cyrus. Cavendish knew that the only reason he was in the position to espouse his views to a large American audience -- in a presidential debate, no less -- was due to his popularity and unique background (along with the desire of the networks to get their ratings up.) Popularity was a necessary evil. Polly tightened his yellow Hermes tie, perched on his Brooks Brothers French-cuffed blue shirt, underneath his dark suit. Polly told Fitz that the blue shirt and yellow tie combination made him appear more honest, according to some study conducted by the FBI. Polly had a calming influence on Fitz which is exactly what he needed at this moment, backstage at Wright State University's Nutter Center. Preston's ability to placate Cavendish was amusing to him because it

was sourced in the fact that she couldn't stay still for two seconds. She only seemed right when her hair was on fire.

By contrast, the scene backstage at the Nutter Center was fairly subdued given that representatives of the two most powerful political families (Bush and Clinton) were about to square off in the first of a series of presidential debates. In fact, Cavendish had yet to see either candidate, not that he really wanted to, given the ambush he planned to unleash on them over the subsequent hour and a half. His closing speech tonight would be as important as the one that set him on his journey.

History Lesson #1

Chapter 2 (1763)

History is a big lie; a lie of omission -- at least the version taught in classrooms around the country, blasted over the airwaves, and printed by the press. History is a lie that is edited and censored by the winners. In a country where freedom of the press is trumpeted as one of the rights protected by the first amendment to its Constitution, investigative journalism is all but dead in the United States. This is because the media are controlled by the winners. So is public education. The United States won its freedom in the Revolutionary War and its citizens have slowly given it back over the course of the past two centuries, initially with a fight, but now by ignorant consent. So what does this have to do with the price of your caramel macchiato at Starbucks, you ask? Answer: Quite a bit. For the avoidance of doubt, this lacuna has nothing to do with a perversion of the past, a glorification of your imperfect forefathers that give your children an ideal to aspire to. And it is not the loser's side of the story. Yes, your ancestors committed genocide by obliterating at least twelve million Native Americans, which is brushed under the rug and excused in fifteen minutes of classroom discussion about Manifest Destiny. That history is well established. What the 99.9% of you don't know about is not taught by your schools or discussed in the media. This is by design. Your trust in the system has been abused. You have been indoctrinated to believe that the news anchor, the doctor, and the scientist purport the truth. It isn't the truth, or at least not all of it. It is a message from the winners. History, after all, is written by the winners. What follows is what the winners don't want you to know. Why

should you care? Answer: because if you're not educated, you will never understand the root causes to such problems such as the debt, the healthcare crisis, and terrorism and it might be too late for you to change a damn thing when you come to realize that you have been had – or worse yet, if Henry Kissinger has his way, you will be so brainwashed that you will consent to your own enslavement.

The American Revolution was not about taxes or freedom from tyranny. It was about money and banking. Riding high on the success of the American colonial economy, Ben Franklin decided, in retrospect, rather naively, to share with the British Board of Trade and the Bank of England in 1763, the secret of the colonies' success. That secret was debt-free money, otherwise known as Colonial Script. The shareholders in the Bank of England were none too happy to hear about this. The Bank of England was a debt-based, privately held, central bank. A central bank is an entity responsible for overseeing the monetary system for a nation. The shareholders had already waged a successful campaign against their rival currency, debt-free money known as tally sticks.

Tally sticks were simply polished pieces of notched wood that served as currency. It was an acceptable form of money – and for a long time, the only acceptable money -- for payment of taxes from the time of King Henry the First (1100) until the end of the 17th Century. The tally sticks worked because the populace had confidence to accept these wooden sticks as money, because the kings accepted them for tax payments. However, when Henry VIII eased usury laws – that allowed for the loaning of money with interest – in the 17th century, the bankers, with their gold and silver coins, launched a quiet war against the debt-free tally sticks. The culmination of their efforts occurred in 1694, when the Bank of England was formed to loan money to the British government, left in financial ruin from 50 years of war, brought about by those same bankers. Ironically, shareholders purchased interests in the bank with debt-free tally sticks. Yes, you heard that correctly (for a third time): the Bank of England has shareholders. It is privately held! Private individuals loan money to the British government. The original shareholders were a “society of about 1,300 persons” that included the King and Queen of England – their shares were likely free of charge – others who understood the scam (the bankers), and people with titles such as Duke, Lord, or Earl. What the Bank of England issued was debt-based money, and profited from the interest charged on that loaned money. Who is ultimately responsible for the loans? Answer: the population of England.

Taking a quick detour, what you were not taught in school is that there are two types of money: 1. Debt-based, which is the kind of money that is in existence today. Money that comes from a printing press (or a stroke of the computer) that is then loaned into existence by a bank. If your government needs to wage war, it may have to spend more money than it collected in tax receipts, so it borrows the difference from a central bank. The central bank then cranks up its printing press and gives your government money to wage its war, and charges your government interest on that money. 2. Debt-free, like the Colonial Script of Ben Franklin's day. Similar to debt-based money, this currency came from a printing press (or in King Henry the First's case, a piece of wood.) However, unlike debt-based money, this money was issued by the government itself, not by a central bank. When the government needed to pay for something, it cranked up its printing press and produced paper money (or tally sticks). This system operated just like the debt-based money except that there was no bank involved. And since there wasn't any bank involved, the money wasn't loaned into existence and no interest was charged. Debt-free money was merely part of the economy – an aid in the exchange of goods -- not a claim on it. Both forms of currency can be "backed" by a precious metal, such as silver or gold, but this is unnecessary and unwise. 'Fiat' currency is actually superior for reasons you will understand later. The entire history of the United States (and to a great extent, the world since the 1700s) is about debt-based money versus debt-free money. News flash: the debt-based money people won and you are indoctrinated with their version of history. In fact, until you read this, you probably didn't even know there was debt-based and debt-free money. The difference is the difference between your thralldom and your freedom.

Getting back to 1763, when Ben Franklin was queried by the British about the prosperity in the colonies, he offered,

"That is simple. In the colonies we issue our own money. It is called Colonial Script. We issue it in proper proportion to the demands of trade and industry to make the products pass easily from the producers to the consumers [i.e. as a medium of exchange, as an alternative to bartering]. In this manner, creating for ourselves our own paper money, we control its purchasing power, and we have no interest to pay to no one."

Once the Bank of England knew that the reason for the colonies' prosperity was a direct threat to its existence, it pressured the British crown to pass the Currency Act of 1764. This act essentially made it illegal for the colonies to print their own money. Money, in the form of silver and gold coin, now had to be borrowed from the Bank of England. What ensued is best described by Franklin:

“In one year, the conditions were so reversed that the era of prosperity ended, and a depression set in, to such an extent that the streets of the Colonies were filled with the unemployed.”

This contrasts greatly with his statement in 1763 when asked by English officials how it was the Colonies managed to collect enough taxes to build poor houses, and how they were able to handle the great burden of caring for the poor:

“We have no poor houses in the Colonies, and if we had, we would have no one to put in them, as in the Colonies there is not a single unemployed man, no poor and no vagabonds.”

In one year, a currency act forcing debt-based money on its subjects had driven the prosperous British colonies into a depression. Ben Franklin sited this as the chief cause of the Revolutionary War:

“The colonies would gladly have borne the little tax on tea and other matters had it not been that England took away from the colonies their money, which created unemployment and dissatisfaction. The inability of the colonists to get power to issue their own [debt-free] money permanently out of the hands of George III and the international bankers was the prime reason for the Revolutionary War.”

As you will see, the institutions that issue this debt-based money are responsible for your education, your news, and the price of your caramel macchiato.