# BANAMAN INVESTIGATES...!

**A THREE PART INVESTIGATIVE DOCUMENTARY INTO THE WORLD MARTIAL AUTHORITY**

OFFER TO THE WORLD MARTIAL AUTHORITY TO RESPOND IN THE NEXT VIDEO PRODUCTION UPDATE SCHEDULED TO BE RECORDED 11 SEPTEMBER 2026

**AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION DATE**

8 AUGUST 2026

**PART ONE**

JURISDICTION

**PART TWO**

TURON

**PART THREE**

THE AUTHORITY TEST

# PART ONE
## JURISDICTION

### THE COMPARISON NOBODY WANTS EXAMINED

Today, we enter the arena of **jurisdiction, authority and application.**

UCC-1 financing statements versus the legal and commercial frameworks of the United Kingdom.

**Two countries.**

**Different legal systems.**

**Different jurisdictions.**

**Different mechanisms.**

And potentially very different consequences when legal concepts are misunderstood, misrepresented, or presented as something they are not.

This investigation is not about asking you to believe a conclusion.

It is about asking you to examine the evidence.

When the paperwork is stripped away.

When the declarations are stripped away.

When the titles are stripped away.

When the claims are tested against recognised law.

One question remains:

**Who actually has jurisdiction?**

### THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

Commercial law and criminal law are not the same battlefield. They operate through different rules, procedures and authorities;

**A commercial filing does not automatically become a criminal instrument.**

**A registration does not become a shield against lawful authority.**

**A document does not, merely by existing, overthrow a court, and a document**

**created under one country's legal framework does not automatically acquire unlimited authority in another country.**

That distinction matters.

Because when commercial documents, criminal proceedings, jurisdiction and international authority are mixed together, confusion can quickly replace law.

So let us separate the systems. Let us examine the documents. Let us examine the claims. And most importantly:

**LET US EXAMINE THE SOURCE OF THE AUTHORITY BEING CLAIMED.**

## THE UCC

The **Uniform Commercial Code**, commonly known as the UCC, is a body of commercial law adopted, with variations, by U.S. states.

It governs areas of commercial activity, including secured transactions.

A **UCC-1 Financing Statement** is generally a notice filing associated with a claimed security interest.

It can play an important role in establishing the public notice and priority framework surrounding a secured transaction.

But this is where the distinction becomes critical. A UCC filing is a **commercial instrument**.

**It is not a criminal indictment.**

**It is not a diplomatic credential.**

**It is not, by itself, a declaration of sovereignty, and it is not a passport into another country's jurisdiction.**

A UCC filing may have legal significance within the framework for which it is designed.

But that significance has boundaries, and those boundaries matter.

**THE DOCUMENT HAS A FUNCTION, THE LAW DETERMINES THAT FUNCTION.**

## WHAT A UCC-1 DOES NOT DO

Now we reach the question that must be asked. What does a UCC-1 **not**, merely by being filed, do?

It does not automatically:

**Erase criminal responsibility;**

**Prevent lawful arrest;**

**Override criminal law;**

**Rewrite court jurisdiction;**

**Grant diplomatic immunity;**

**Create sovereign status;**

**Place the filer above the law or extend U.S. commercial law into another country.**

**A commercial filing remains a commercial filing.**

**It may establish or give notice of a claimed commercial interest.**

**But it does not transform that interest into criminal immunity.**

**It does not create international jurisdiction.**

**And it does not place a private filer beyond the authority of a court that otherwise possesses lawful jurisdiction.**

**THE DOCUMENT MAY EXIST**

**THE CLAIM MAY EXIST**

**BUT THE CLAIM MUST STILL HAVE A LEGAL FOUNDATION**

## THE UNITED KINGDOM

Now we cross the Atlantic. The United Kingdom does not operate under a single UCC system equivalent to the American Uniform Commercial Code.

The UK has its own legal frameworks governing commercial transactions, companies, land, security interests, civil disputes and criminal matters.

So when someone seeks to rely on a UCC concept or filing in the United Kingdom, the question becomes:

**WHERE IS THE LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR THAT UCC FILING TO HAVE THE CLAIMED EFFECT IN THE UK?**

A document created under one country's legal framework does not automatically acquire unlimited authority under another country's legal system.

That distinction is fundamental.

## UK COMMERCIAL MATTERS

Commercial security interests in the United Kingdom operate through UK legal mechanisms.

Examples include company charge registration through **Companies House**, relevant provisions of the **Companies Act 2006**, and registration mechanisms relating to land through **HM Land Registry**.

These mechanisms exist within the UK legal framework. They can have important commercial consequences, but they do not create authority beyond the law that gives them effect.

**A company charge does not become a criminal warrant.**

**A land registration does not become diplomatic immunity.**

**A commercial charge does not become a declaration of sovereignty.**

The same principle applies:

**A COMMERCIAL DOCUMENT PERFORMS THE FUNCTION GIVEN TO IT BY LAW.**

It does not acquire unlimited power simply because somebody claims that it does.

## CRIMINAL LAW

Now we enter a completely different arena, criminal law. UK criminal law operates through its own legal framework, including legislation, applicable common law, criminal procedure and judicial decisions.

**A commercial registration does not determine criminal guilt.**

**It does not decide whether an offence has been committed.**

**It does not remove the jurisdiction of a criminal court.**

**And it does not create immunity from criminal proceedings.**

**Commercial law and criminal law may sometimes intersect factually.**

**But they remain legally distinct areas.**

**A company charge is one thing.**

**A criminal allegation is another.**

**A UCC-1 is one thing.**

**A criminal charging process is another, and jurisdiction must not be confused with either.**

Now we arrive at the central question.

## JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction is exercised by courts and authorities under recognised legal rules.

**Not from paperwork alone.**

**Not from filings alone.**

**Not from declarations alone.**

**Not from self-appointed titles.**

**A UCC-1 does not automatically.**

**Extend U.S. jurisdiction into the United Kingdom.**

**Override UK courts.**

**Defeat UK law.**

**Create international authority or cancel criminal proceedings.**

**Likewise, UK commercial registrations do not override U.S. jurisdiction.**

**Different nations.**

**Different courts.**

**Different legal authority.**

The boundary remains.

**COMMERCIAL FILINGS MAY ESTABLISH INTERESTS**

**BUT THEY DO NOT COMMAND JURISDICTIONS**

## CRIMINAL CHARGES AND INTERNATIONAL JURISDICTION

Now we move from commercial law into criminal law. A criminal charging document or formal charging process belongs to the criminal justice system in which it was issued.

**It is not a commercial filing.**

**It is not a security interest, and it does not automatically become enforceable in another country merely because it exists.**

If a foreign criminal proceeding requires action in another country, recognised mechanisms of international legal cooperation may become relevant.

Depending upon the circumstances, these may include extradition arrangements, mutual legal assistance, judicial procedures and government-to-government cooperation.

The principle is straightforward:

**A FOREIGN DOCUMENT DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY BECOME FOREIGN JURISDICTION.**

The legal framework surrounding the document is what determines its effect.

## DIPLOMATIC STATUS

Now we reach another critical distinction. What happens when someone says:

**“I am a diplomat.”**

Or:

**“I operate under my own jurisdiction.”**

Or:

**“My organisation has authority above the laws of the country I have entered.”**

This is where the claim must be tested against recognised international and domestic law.

Diplomatic status is not simply something an individual can manufacture for themselves.

Under the Vienna Convention framework, diplomatic relations and permanent diplomatic missions arise through recognised relationships between states.

Diplomatic accreditation is relevant to the status and privileges of diplomatic personnel within a receiving state.

So the question becomes:

**WHO RECOGNISED THE STATUS?**

**A person may possess:**

**A self-created diplomatic passport.**

**A privately issued identification card.**

**A certificate declaring diplomatic immunity.**

Credentials issued by a private organisation or documents declaring a personal or organisational jurisdiction.

But possession of such a document does not, by itself, establish diplomatic status under UK law.

**THE DOCUMENT MAY EXIST**

**THE CLAIM MAY EXIST**

**THE CREDENTIAL MAY EXIST**

But the existence of any of these does not by itself establish the legal status being claimed.

**THE DOCUMENT IS ONE THING**

**RECOGNITION IS ANOTHER**

## THE PRIVATE JURISDICTION TEST

Suppose an individual claims that they operate under a private jurisdiction created in the United States. Then suppose that same individual travels to the United Kingdom and declares themselves to be a diplomat under that private jurisdiction.

The critical question is not:

**“What does their document say?”**

The critical question is:

**“WHAT RECOGNISED LEGAL AUTHORITY GIVES THAT DOCUMENT EFFECT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM?”**

If the claimed authority has no recognised legal basis in the relevant legal system, the declaration does not simply create a legal bubble around the individual.

UK law continues to apply according to ordinary principles governing jurisdiction, and applicable legal status.

The UK's diplomatic framework includes legislation such as the **Diplomatic Privileges Act 1964** which gives effect in UK law to relevant diplomatic privileges and immunities.

Diplomatic immunity is a recognised legal status arising from specific legal foundations

It is not something an individual can simply manufacture by declaration.

A privately created jurisdiction does not by itself create diplomatic status.

A privately issued credential does not by itself create diplomatic immunity.

And a self declared title does not by itself place an individual outside the jurisdiction of UK Law.

**YOU CANNOT CREATE DIPLOMATIC IMMUNITY SIMPLY BY DECLARING YOURSELF A DIPLOMAT.**

## FALSE DOCUMENTS AND FALSE REPRESENTATIONS

Now the matter becomes potentially more serious. Suppose someone creates or uses:

**a false diplomatic passport.**

**a false identity document.**

**a fraudulent diplomatic credential.**

**or a document claiming immunity that has no recognised legal foundation.**

But here we must be precise.

Making an unusual, unconventional or legally incorrect claim is not automatically fraud.

**The actual conduct matters.**

**The intention matters.**

**The evidence matters, and the legal elements of the particular offence must be established.**

However, knowingly, creating, possessing, using or presenting false documentation or dishonestly making a false representation with the required intent, can potentially engage UK criminal law depending upon the circumstances, and the specific offence alleged.

The distinction is therefore critical:

**A CLAIM OF IMMUNITY IS ONE THING.**

**THE DELIBERATE USE OF A FALSE DOCUMENT OR DISHONEST REPRESENTATION IS ANOTHER.**

## FOLLOWERS, ENFORCERS AND ASSOCIATES

Now consider someone who does not merely make the claim themselves. Suppose others begin acting under the same supposed authority.

They appoint themselves:

**Martials.**

**Judges.**

**Enforcement officers.**

**Diplomatic representatives.**

**Private police.**

**Court officials.**

The title itself does not create the legal office. The question remains:

**WHAT LAW CREATED THE POWER?**

And another question follows:

**WHAT LAW RECOGNISES THE POWER?**

Holding or using a particular title is not by itself necessarily a criminal offence. But if individuals use claimed powers to deceive, defraud, threaten, obstruct lawful officials, interfere improperly with court proceedings or commit other offences, their conduct may expose them to ordinary criminal or civil liability depending upon the circumstances.

The precise offence depends upon what they actually do and whether the required legal elements are satisfied.

The title **“Martial”** does not by itself create a legally recognised martial.

The title **“Judge”** does not by itself create a court.

The title **“Diplomat”** does not by itself create diplomatic immunity.

And the title **“Sovereign”** does not by itself create sovereignty.

**A PRIVATE HIERARCHY DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY BECOME PUBLIC LEGAL AUTHORITY.**

## THE AUTHORITY TEST

When an organisation claims:

**“We are above every court.”**

**“We are above every government.”**

**“We answer to no legal system.”**

The questions remain:

**WHO RECOGNISED THIS AUTHORITY?**

**Under what law does it exist?**

**Which state recognises it?**

**Which court recognises it?**

**What treaty, statute or other lawful instrument gives it effect?**

Established legal systems operate through recognised legal authority and defined legal rules.

**Not personal declarations.**

**Not private status claims.**

**Not self-appointed superiority.**

**Not titles created by the individuals making the claim.**

**RECOGNITION MATTERS.**

**LEGAL FOUNDATION MATTERS.**

**AUTHORITY MATTERS.**

## THE QUESTION THAT REMAINS

**A person can create a document.**

**An organisation can create a constitution.**

**A group can declare itself a nation.**

**An association can declare its members diplomats.**

**A private body can declare its own court.**

**A person can declare that they have created a new jurisdiction, but none of those declarations, standing alone, answers the legal question.**

The real question remains:

**HAS THE CLAIM BEEN RECOGNISED OR OTHERWISE GIVEN LEGAL EFFECT?**

If not;

**The claimant may possess a document.**

**They may possess credentials.**

**They may possess titles.**

**They may possess an elaborate internal structure.**

**They may even possess a complete body of rules and procedures.**

But possessing a document and possessing legal authority are two entirely different things.

**A claim is not the same as authority.**

**A title is not the same as power.**

**A document is not the same as legal effect, and ultimately the question that cuts through all the paper work remains.**

**WHO GAVE YOU THAT AUTHORITY?**

# PART TWO
### TURON

### FOLLOW THE MONEY

Part One examined jurisdiction, now we move into a different arena. **DIGITAL**

**VALUE,** and this is where the investigation requires a different approach because allegations of fraud should never be established merely by rhetoric. They should be tested.

**Documents should be examined**
**Transactions should be traced**
**Technical claims should be verified**

The underlying records should be scrutinised, and the claims made about Turon should be compared against the evidence because when money, digital assets and financial promises are involved, assumptions are not enough.

**FOLLOW THE PAPER TRAIL**
**FOLLOW THE MONEY**
**FOLLOW THE EVIDENCE**

## WHAT EXACTLY IS TURON?

A digital token can mean many different things. It can be:

**A cryptocurrency;**

**A blockchain-based asset;**

**A private database entry;**

**An internal accounting unit;**

**A loyalty point or another form of digital credit.**

The word **"token"** alone tells us very little. What matters is how the system actually operates. So the first question is:

**What actually exists behind TURON?**

**Is there a public blockchain?**

**Is there a verifiable transaction history?**

**Is there an independent network?**

**Can ownership be independently verified?**

**Can tokens be transferred without the organisation's permission?**

**Can holders redeem or exchange them?**

**Can the token be traded openly?**

**Are transactions independently recorded and verifiable?**

And perhaps most importantly:

**Who controls the system?**

## THE CLOSED-LOOP QUESTION

If TURON exists only as entries within a private database controlled by the organisations administrators, that would be fundamentally different from an independently decentralised cryptocurrency.

A number displayed on a private portal does not automatically represent transferable real world wealth.

A balance of **100,000 TURON** may look impressive, but the number itself does not answer the question. What can 100,000 TURON actually buy?

**Can it be independently exchanged?**

**Can it be withdrawn or redeemed for recognised value?**

**Can it be transferred outside the system?**

**Can somebody else independently verify ownership?**

**Can the balance exist independently of the organisation's database?**

**Can transactions be independently verified?**

**Can the token be traded on an open and independently accessible market?**

If the answer to these questions is no, then the claimed value of Turon deserves serious scrutiny because a displayed balance and independently realisable value are not necessarily the same thing. A number on a screen is not by itself proof of value.

**FOLLOW THE SYSTEM**

**VERIFY THE VALUE**

## VALUE VERSUS DISPLAYED BALANCE

This distinction is crucial. A bank balance generally represents a claim recognised within an established financial system, and governed by the relevant contractual and legal framework.

A publicly traded cryptocurrency may have a market price established through independent trading activity.

But an internal database can display:

**£1,000.00**

**100,000 TURON.**

The display itself does not prove that the underlying value exists, is independently transferable or can actually be realised.

The investigation therefore asked:

**WHERE DOES THE VALUE COME FROM?**

**WHO GUARANTEES IT?**

**WHO PROVIDES LIQUIDITY?**

**WHO DETERMINES THE EXCHANGE RATE?**

**WHO CONTROLS THE LEDGER?**

**WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE ORGANISATION REFUSES ACCESS?**

And another question follows;

**CAN THE CLAIMED VALUE BE INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED?**

These are not accusations, they are basic due diligence questions. The purpose is not to assume the answer, the purpose is to establish the answer from evidence.

## THE TURON BUYBACK QUESTION

Now we reach an allegation that requires evidence. The alleged scenario is this:

A member leaves or is removed from the organisation while holding a substantial TURON balance.

The member is allegedly told that the organisation will purchase, redeem or otherwise convert those tokens in to real world currency, but before the payment can allegedly be released, an additional real world fee is demanded. For example:

**“PAY £50 TO PROCESS THE RELEASE.”**

This is where the investigation must stop and ask:

**WHAT EXACTLY IS THE £50 FOR?**

**Is it a legitimate and independently verifiable fee?**

**Is it contractually disclosed?**

**Is there an invoice?**

**Is there a clearly identified entity receiving the payment?**

**Is the payment connected to an independently verifiable transaction?**

**Is there a recognised third-party processor?**

**Is the fee consistent with the actual cost of the service being provided?**

**Or is the fee simply a condition imposed by the organisation itself?**

**And perhaps most importantly, what evidence supports the demand for payment?**

A request for an up front fee does not by itself prove fraud, but where money is demanded before a promised payment or redemption can be released, the circumstances warrant careful scrutiny. The investigation therefore does not begin with a verdict, it begins with the evidence.

**FOLLOW THE PAYMENT**

**VERIFY THE CLAIM**

**FOLLOW THE MONEY**

## THE ADVANCE-FEE WARNING SIGN

An advance fee arrangement can be a serious warning sign where someone is promised money, an asset or a payout but is required to send additional money before that promised value can be released.

But the existence of an upfront fee does **not automatically prove fraud**.

**There can be legitimate processing costs.**

**There can be network fees.**

**There can be administrative charges.**

**There can be contractual conditions.**

The critical question is whether the fee is **genuine, proportionate, properly**

**disclosed, supported by evidence and actually connected to the transaction being promised.**

So the investigation asks:

**WHY WAS THE FEE REQUIRED?**

**WHO RECEIVED THE MONEY?**

**WHAT SERVICE WAS THE FEE ACTUALLY PAYING FOR?**

**WHERE DID THE MONEY GO?**

And then:

**WHAT HAPPENED AFTER IT WAS PAID?**

**WAS THE PROMISED TRANSACTION COMPLETED?**

**WAS THE TURON REDEEMED?**

**WAS THE PAYMENT RELEASED?**

**WAS FURTHER MONEY REQUESTED?**

**WAS ACCESS TO THE ACCOUNT MAINTAINED?**

**OR DID THE TRANSACTION SIMPLY STOP?**

These questions do not establish guilt by themselves, but they can establish a pattern and patterns must be tested against evidence.

**FOLLOW THE PAYMENT**

**FOLLOW THE TRANSACTION**

**FOLLOW THE MONEY**

## THE ACCESS QUESTION

If evidence shows that an individual:

1. **Held a stated TURON balance;**
2. **Was promised a real world payout or redemption;**
3. **Was required to pay an additional fee;**
4. **Paid that fee;**

5 **Subsequently lost access to the system;**

6 **And did not receive the promised payout;**

then that sequence may warrant serious investigation.

But again:

**EVIDENCE FIRST.**

**Screenshots - Transaction records - Payment receipts - Emails - Messages - Terms and conditions - Wallet addresses, if applicable - Blockchain records, if applicable - Account histories - Portal records and the identity of the recipient of the payment.**

The investigation should establish what happened before drawing conclusions, because a sequence of events is only as reliable as the evidence supporting each stage.

The objective is therefore not simply to tell a story, it is to reconstruct the transaction. What was promised, what was paid, who received it, what happened next and where is the promised value.

That is how an allegation becomes something capable of being independently assessed.

**FOLLOW THE EVIDENCE**

## THE DIGITAL SMOKE SCREEN

There is another question. **What does TURON actually claim to be?**

Is it:

**A currency?**

**A token?**

**A cryptocurrency?**

**An internal credit?**

**A private accounting unit?**

**An investment?**

**A digital asset?**

The terminology matters.

Calling something a **currency** does not by itself make it legal tender.

Calling something a **cryptocurrency** does not by itself establish that it is decentralised.

Calling something a **token** does not by itself establish that it has transferable or redeemable value.

And calling something an **investment** does not by itself establish that it is a legitimate or regulated investment.

The label tells us what someone claims the thing to be. It does not by itself establish what the thing actually is. That requires evidence. We therefore need to examine;

**How Turon is created?**

**How is it recorded?**

**Who controls it?**

**How can it be transferred?**

**How can it be redeemed or exchanged?**

**What if anything gives it value?**

**And ultimately, can the claims made about Turon be independently verified?**

Because in an investigation like this, the label is not the evidence, the system is the evidence.

**FOLLOW THE FACTS**

**FOLLOW THE TECHNICAL TRAIL**

If TURON is represented as blockchain based, the technical investigation becomes straightforward.

Ask:

**What blockchain?**

**What is the contract address?**

**What network is it deployed on?**

**Can transactions be independently verified?**

**Is there a public ledger?**

**Can holders transfer the asset without administrator approval?**

**Can the supply be independently verified?**

**Who controls the contract?**

**Can the contract be changed?**

**Can tokens be frozen restricted or otherwise controlled?**

**Is the code publicly available for inspection?**

**Can the claim token balances be reconciled with the underlying records?**

These are technical questions, and technical questions can often be tested.

A genuine block chain deployment should leave technical evidence that can be examined.

A claimed transaction should have a verifiable record where the system is represented as publicly auditable.

A claimed token should have an identifiable technical structure where one is asserted, and where no such evidence exists, that absence itself becomes a question requiring explanation.

The investigation therefore does not ask the audience to accept the label, it asks for the underlying technical evidence.

**SHOW THE BLOCK CHAIN**

**SHOW THE CONTRACT**

**SHOW THE LEDGER**

**SHOW THE EVIDENCE**

## THE CENTRAL QUESTION

If TURON cannot be independently verified outside the organisation's own systems, then any claimed value requires considerably greater scrutiny.

The question is not:

**“Does the website show a balance?”**

The question is:

**“CAN THE BALANCE BE INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED?”**

And then:

**CAN THAT BALANCE ACTUALLY BE TRANSFERRED, REDEEMED OR OTHERWISE REALISED?**

These are separate questions, a digital balance may be visible, it may be recorded internally, It may even be described as having a monetary value, but visibility alone does not establish independent verification.

And a stated balance does not automatically establish that the holder can transfer or realise that value outside the system. That is the distinction this investigation must examine.

An internal number is not necessarily an independently verifiable asset. The evidence must establish what exists beyond the organisations own records.

**VERIFY THE BALANCE**

**VERIFY THE TRANSFER**

**VERIFY THE VALUE**

## THE DOUBLE LOSS SCENARIO

Now consider the alleged scenario from the perspective of a departing member. They may believe they possess valuable TURON.

They may then be told:

**“We will buy it back.”**

Hope returns, then comes the condition:

**“Pay the processing fee first.”**

The member pays, the promised payment does not arrive.

**Access subsequently disappears!**

**Communication may stop!**

**The TURON balance may become inaccessible!**

If supported by reliable evidence, that sequence would be extremely important, because the alleged victim may potentially have suffered two separate financial consequences:

The loss of the claimed or perceived digital value, and the additional real world payment. That is why this investigation refers to the possibility of a:

**DOUBLE LOSS SCENARIO!**

But the evidence must establish what actually happened.

**Was the Turon balance independently valuable?**

**Was the buy back or redemption promise genuine?**

**Was the additional fee legitimate?**

**Where did the payment go?**

**Was the promised payout ever maid?**

**And what happened to the members Turon balance and account access afterwards?**

Only when after those questions have been answered can the description Double Loss Scenario be properly assessed.

**THE CLAIM MUST BE TESTED**

**THE TRANSACTION MUST BE TRACED**

**THE EVIDENCE MUST SPEAK FOR ITSELF**

## THE PAPER TRAIL

A financial investigation ultimately depends heavily upon the records, the transactions, the communications, the agreements, the evidence and the questions are straight forward,

**Who received the money?**

**When was it received?**

**How much was paid?**

**Under what terms?**

**What was promised?**

**What was actually delivered?**

**What happened afterwards?**

**Was there a refund?**

**Was there a genuine underlying transaction?**

**Was the fee disclosed before the payment was made?**

**Was the fee supported by an identifiable service or cost?**

**Was the individual subsequently blocked?**

**Was the account terminated?**

**Was access withdrawn?**

**Was the digital balance altered or removed?**

**Was the promised Turon redemption completed?**

And perhaps most importantly;

**Can the entire transaction be reconstructed from independent records?**

These questions matter far more than grand titles. They matter more than impressive credentials. They matter more than declarations of authority, because when money is involved; **Follow the records, follow the transaction, follow the money.**

## TURON: THE QUESTION OF VALUE

**A digital balance can be impressive.**

**A website can look professional.**

**A portal can display enormous numbers.**

**A token can have an impressive name, but none of those things by themselves independently proves value.**

## VALUE MUST BE TESTABLE

If somebody claims:

**“This token is worth real money.”**

Then the next question is simple:

**“SHOW US THE MECHANISM.”**

**Show us the ledger.**

**Show us the transactions.**

**Show us the exchange mechanism.**

**Show us the redemption mechanism.**

**Show us the terms and conditions.**

**Show us how the claim value can actually be realised.**

**Show us where the money goes.**

And if there is a buyback:

**“SHOW US THE BUYBACK.”**

**Show us the transaction.**

**Show us the payment.**

**Show us the recipient.**

**Show us the evidence that the promised value was actually delivered.**

Because claimed value, displayed value and independently realisable value are not necessarily the same thing, and that distinction matters.

In financial investigations, we follow the evidence, we follow the records, we follow the money. And if the evidence supports the claim, it should withstand scrutiny. If it does not, the unanswered questions remain.

**The value must be verified, the transaction must be traceable, the claim must be testable.**

# PART THREE

## THE AUTHORITY TEST

### THE FINAL QUESTION

**Part One** examined jurisdiction.

**Part Two** examined TURON.

Now **Part Three** brings the investigation together because ultimately, these are not three completely separate questions.

They lead to one central test:

### AUTHORITY

**Who has it?**

**Where did it come from?**

**Who recognises it?**

**What law supports it?**

**What legal mechanism gives it effect?**

And perhaps the most revealing question of all;

**What happens when somebody challenges it?**

**A claim of authority is easy to make.**

**A document can be created.**

**A title can be adopted.**

**A jurisdiction can be declared.**

**A digital system can assign balances, but the investigation does not end with a claim.**

It begins there, because genuine authority should have a legal foundation that can be identified, examined and tested.

The claim must meet the test, the authority must have a foundation, the evidence must support the claim.

## TITLES ARE NOT AUTHORITY

Consider the titles.

**Global Commander - Martial - Judge - Diplomat - Sovereign - Doctor of Laws - Supreme Authority.**

A title may sound impressive, a title may have meaning within a private organisation, a title may even describe an honorary ceremonial professional or organisational position, but a title is not automatically a public legal office.

**And a title does not by itself create legal powers.**

**An office requires a legal or institutional foundation.**

**And an authority requires a source.**

So the test is simple:

**Who created the title?**

**Under what authority?**

**Who recognises it?**

**What power if any does it actually give?**

And if someone claims that the title carries authority beyond the private organisation, another question must follow;

**Where is the legal foundation for that power?**

Because the appearance of authority and the existence of authority are not necessarily the same thing. A title may describe a position, a law creates a legal power, the two must not be confused.

## THE CREDENTIAL TEST

Now consider credentials:

**A certificate can be printed.**

**A passport style document can be designed.**

**An identification card can be produced.**

**A medal can be manufactured.**

**A title can be added to a name.**

But the physical existence of a document does not by itself establish its authenticity, authority or legal effect.

The investigation must therefore ask:

**Who issued it?**

**Was the issuer authorised to issue it?**

**Can the credential be independently verified?**

**Does the claimed institution actually exist?**

**Does that institution have the authority it claims to have?**

**Does the credential actually confer the legal status being asserted?**

And there is another important distinction, a document may be genuine in a sense that an organisation actually issued it. But that does not necessarily mean the organisation had the legal authority to grant the status, privilege or power being claimed.

That is why the investigation must examine both, authenticity and authority, because there is a fundamental difference between;

**A DOCUMENT** and **AN AUTHORITATIVE DOCUMENT!**

And there is an even greater difference between a credential that exists and a credential that the law recognises. The document is evidence of a claim. The investigation must determine whether the claim has a lawful foundation.

## THE ACADEMIC CREDENTIAL QUESTION

The same principle applies to academic qualifications. If somebody claims to hold a degree such as an **LLD Doctor of Laws**, the appropriate response is not simply to repeat the claim.

**Verify it.**

**Which university?**

**Which faculty?**

**Which programme?**

**Which awarding authority?**

**What year was it awarded?**

**What records exist?**

**Can the institution independently confirm the award?**

And importantly:

**WHAT EXACTLY DOES THE QUALIFICATION REPRESENT?**

A title written after someone's name does not by itself establish that a recognised university awarded the qualification. Likewise, the existence of a certificate does not automatically establish the academic standing, accreditation or legal significance being claimed.

The investigation should therefore examine the underlying evidence. Where possible, that means checking institutional records, official university information, accreditation or regulatory records where applicable. The awarding bodies published qualifications and direct confirmation from the institution where appropriate, because there is a difference between claiming a qualification, and holding a verified qualification.

And there is another distinction that matters, an academic qualification is not automatically a legal license or public authority. The investigation should therefore establish not only whether a qualification was awarded, but also what that qualification actually represents.

**Check the institution, check the records, check the award, then check the claim.**

## THE INTELLIGENCE CLAIM TEST

Now we reach another recurring type of claim.

**“The FBI knows about us.”**

**“The CIA is watching us.”**

**“Intelligence agencies are investigating our critics.”**

These are dramatic claims, but drama is not evidence. If somebody makes such a statement, the correct response is:

**Where is the evidence?**

**Is there a document?**

**A case number?**

**A public statement?**

**A court record?**

**A formal communication?**

**A verified source?**

**Or is the claim simply being repeated without independent confirmation?**

There is an important qualification. Law enforcement and intelligence activity may in some circumstances be confidential, therefore the absence of a public record does not necessarily prove that no investigation exists. But equally, an unsupported assertion that a major intelligence or law enforcement agency is involved, does not establish that the agency is actually involved.

The name of a powerful organisation can create an immediate impression of importance, but the invocation of an agencies name is not evidence of its involvement.

So the investigative standard remains;

**Show the source?**

**Verify the claim?**

**Distinguish fact from assertion?**

Because when extraordinary claims are made about government agencies, the greater the claim, the greater the need for reliable evidence. Authority cannot be borrowed simply by invoking the name of an agency.

## THE INTIMIDATION TEST

**Why might someone invoke powerful institutions?**

Whatever the intentions, the psychological effect can be significant. If somebody tells a critic:

**"The FBI is watching you."**

The critic may become frightened.

If somebody says:

**"International intelligence agencies are involved."**

An audience may assume the speaker possesses extraordinary government connections or privileged information.

But the question remains:

**Where is the evidence?**

A statement can create fear.

A name can create an impression of authority.

A reference to a powerful institution can make an ordinary dispute appear far more serious than it may actually be, but none of those things independently establishes a genuine connection.

The relevant question is not how impressive does the claim sound, it is;

**Can the claim connection be verified?**

**Is there a reliable source?**

**Is there documented communication?**

**Is there an independently verifiable record?**

**Is there credible evidence that the institution has actually taken an interest in the matter?**

If not, the claim should remain exactly that, a claim!

Authority does not come from simply invoking the name of a powerful organisation, authority comes from verifiable evidence of authority.

## THE CRITIC TEST

There is another warning sign worth examining.

**What happens when somebody challenges the organisation?**

**Do they answer the questions?**

**Do they produce documents?**

**Do they provide evidence?**

**Do they correct mistakes when credible evidence demonstrates an error?**

**Do they permit independent verification?**

**Or does the response become focused on attacking the person asking the questions?**

The investigation must distinguish legitimate criticism from abusive, threatening or unlawful conduct.

Disagreement does not by itself establish wrongdoing.

A strong organisation should be capable of answering reasonable questions, presenting evidence, and correcting demonstrable errors, and when substantive questions are repeatedly met with personal attacks rather than evidence, that behaviour may be relevant when assessing the credibility and reliability of the claims being made.

It does not prove that the underlying claim is false, but it does raise an important investigative question:

**Why is the question not being answered?**

Because criticism of the investigator does not establish the truth of the claim under investigation.

**ATTACKING THE QUESTIONER DOES NOT ANSWER**

**THE QUESTION, EVIDENCE DOES!**

## THE IDENTITY TEST

The same principle applies when attempts are made to discredit a critic because of:

**Their identity.**

**Their race.**

**Their nationality.**

**Their occupation.**

**Their appearance.**

**Their background.**

**Their personal beliefs.**

None of those characteristics establishes whether their evidence is accurate.

None of them by themselves proves that a claim is true or false. The proper question remains:

**Is the claim true?**

Not:

**“Who asked the question?”**

The identity of the person raising an allegation may be relevant to understanding the circumstances, but identity is not a substitute for evidence. A claim should be examined according to;

**The facts, the documents, the records, the evidence!**

And where competing claims exist, they should be tested against independently verifiable information wherever possible. Because ultimately, the evidence should stand or fall on its merits.

## THE RECOGNITION TEST

Now we return to the central principle from Part One.

If an organisation claims:

**“We are a government.”**

Ask:

**WHO RECOGNISES IT?**

If it claims:

**“We have diplomatic authority.”**

Ask:

**WHO ACCREDITED IT?**

If it claims:

**“We operate under our own jurisdiction.”**

Ask:

**WHAT RECOGNISED LAW GIVES THAT JURISDICTION EFFECT?**

If it claims:

**“We issue legal judgments.”**

Ask:

**WHAT LAW CREATED THE COURT?**

If it claims:

**“We issue our own currency.”**

Ask:

**WHAT GIVES THAT CURRENCY ITS CLAIMED LEGAL OR ECONOMIC STATUS?**

And if it claims:

**“Our TURON is worth real money.”**

Ask:

**WHERE CAN THAT VALUE BE INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED?**

A private organisation may create its own internal terminology, records, tokens or organisational structures, but creating something privately is not the same as establishing that it has the legal status, public authority or monetary value being claimed.

So the same investigative principle keeps appearing;

**Show us the authority?**

**Show us the legal foundation?**

**Show us the evidence?**

Because when extraordinary authority or value is claimed, the critical question is not how impressive the claim sounds, it is whether the claim can withstand independent verification!

## THE FOUR QUESTIONS

At this point the investigation can be reduced to four fundamental questions.

### QUESTION ONE - WHO CREATED THE AUTHORITY

Who or what institution is claimed to have created or conferred it?

### QUESTION TWO - WHAT LAW OR INSTITUTION SUPPORTS IT

What Statute/Treaty recognised institution legal instrument or other lawful foundation is relied upon?

### QUESTION THREE - WHO RECOGNISES IT

Which government court, regulator, institution or other recognised authority accepts the claimed status or power?

### QUESTION FOUR - CAN THE CLAIM BE INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED

Can the underlying claim, document, transaction, credential or authority be tested against reliable evidence outside the claimants own assertions?

If those questions cannot be satisfactorily answered, then the claimed authority deserves further scrutiny.

**Not because this documentary has already decided the conclusion.**

**Not because an unusual claim is automatically false, but because a claim of extraordinary requires a corresponding evidential foundation.**

**Claims can be made, authority must be established, evidence must be tested!**

This investigation is not about declaring every unusual organisation fraudulent, it is not about attacking individuals simply because they hold unusual beliefs.

It is not about claiming that every private organisation is unlawful, and it is not about replacing a court of law. It is about examining claims. Claims of jurisdiction, claims of diplomatic status, claims of academic credentials, claims of government authority, claims of intelligence connections, claims concerning digital currency, claims concerning financial value and claims of immunity.

Each claim can be tested, the appropriate questions are;

**What evidence supports the claim?**

**Can that evidence be independently verified?**

**What recognised authority if any gives the claim legal effect?**

**What records exist and do the facts support what is being asserted.**

This investigation therefore does not ask the audience to accept a conclusion simply because it is presented with confidence, it asks the audience to examine the evidence.

Evidence over theatre, documentation over declaration, recognition over self appointment, verification of a belief and above all the claim must be testable.

## THE AUTHORITY MATRIX

Put the entire investigation together. The questions can now be organised into a simple framework;

### JURISDICTION

Does the claimed jurisdiction have a recognised legal foundation? What law is said to create it? Does that law actually apply in the circumstances being claimed?

### DIPLOMATIC STATUS

Is the claimed diplomatic status recognised and appropriately accredited? What recognised legal framework is being relied upon?

### CREDENTIALS

Can the claimed qualifications, identities and documents be independently verified? Are they authentic and do they confer the status or authority being claimed?

### FINANCE

Can TURON's claimed value be independently established? Is there a demonstrable mechanism by which that value can be transferred, exchanged or redeemed?

### TRANSACTIONS

Can alleged payments, fees, redemptions and buy-backs be independently traced? What records exist? Where did the money go? What happened afterwards?

### AUTHORITY

Who legally created the offices and powers being claimed? What is the source of those powers? Are they merely internal organisational titles or are public legal powers being asserted?

### ENFORCEMENT

What law if any authorises the people claiming to exercise those powers? What happens when those claimed powers are challenged?

### RECOGNITION

Which governments, courts, regulators or recognised institutions if any, recognise the claimed legal status or authority? And where recognition is not required because the matter is purely private or contractual, what other lawful foundation is relied upon?

That is the investigation, not the title, not the declaration, not the appearance of authority, not the size of the organisation, not the confidence with which the claim is presented. The foundation, the evidence, the recognition, the authority, the test!

### THE WORLD MARTIAL AUTHORITY QUESTION

Now apply the test to the **World Martial Authority**.

**Do not begin with the titles.**

**Do not begin with the uniforms.**

**Do not begin with the badges.**

**Do not begin with the documents.**

Begin with the evidence;

**What is the claimed legal foundation?**

**What recognised authority if any, created or established it?**

**What government, court, regulator or other recognised institution recognises its claimed status?**

**What court recognises its claimed jurisdiction?**

**What recognised legal instrument if any, establishes or supports its claimed diplomatic authority?**

**What institution validates its credentials?**

**What independent evidence supports the claimed value and operation of TURON?**

**And what legal authority if any, allows its officers or representatives to exercise the powers they claim?**

<u>These are not unreasonable questions, they are the questions reserved for the World Martial Authority</u>

They are questions that should be asked of any organisation claiming extraordinary, legal, governmental, diplomatic, financial or enforcement authority.

The investigation therefore does not begin with;

**Do we believe them?**

It begins with what evidence supports the claim, and then can that evidence be independently verified, because extraordinary authority should have an identifiable foundation.

Claim the authority, Identify the foundation, produce the evidence, let the claim be tested!

## THE EVIDENTIAL TEST FOR EXTRAORDINARY CLAIMS

The greater the claim; **The greater the need for reliable evidence.**

If someone claims to possess a private jurisdiction: **SHOW THE LEGAL FOUNDATION.**

If someone claims diplomatic immunity: **SHOW THE RECOGNISED STATUS AND ACCREDITATION.**

If someone claims an extraordinary academic title: **SHOW THE INSTITUTIONAL RECORD.**

If someone claims intelligence or law enforcement connections: **SHOW THE EVIDENCE.**

If someone claims a digital currency or token has real world value: **SHOW THE MECHANISM.**

If someone claims authority over other people: **SHOW THE LEGAL SOURCE OF THAT AUTHORITY.**

If someone claims an organisation possesses powers beyond those of an ordinary private association; **SHOW THE RECOGNISED LEGAL FOUNDATION.**

Because confidence is not proof, a title is not proof, a document is not necessarily proof of the authority claimed by that document, a declaration is not proof, and repetition does not transform an allegation in to an established fact.

**The claim is not the proof, the evidence is the test.**

## THE FINAL AUTHORITY TEST

So when somebody presents a document claiming:

**“I have jurisdiction.”**

Ask:

**WHAT JURISDICTION?**

When somebody says:

**“I am a diplomat.”**

Ask:

**RECOGNISED BY WHO?**

When somebody says:

**“I am immune from your laws.”**

Ask:

**UNDER WHICH RECOGNISED LEGAL INSTRUMENT?**

When somebody says:

**“I am a judge.”**

Ask:

**WHAT LAW CREATED OR RECOGNISED YOUR COURT?**

When somebody says:

**“I have a degree.”**

Ask:

**WHICH RECOGNISED INSTITUTION AWARDED IT?**

When somebody says:

**“TURON is worth real money.”**

Ask:

**WHERE CAN THAT VALUE BE INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED?**

When an organisation says:

**“We are above your government.”**

Ask:

**WHICH STATE COURT OR OTHER RECOGNISED AUTHORITY HAS ACCEPTED THAT STATUS?**

And when someone presents a UCC-1 and says:

**“This overrides the court.”**

Ask:

**WHERE DOES THE UCC GRANT THAT POWER?**

Because every extraordinary claim ultimately leads back to the same principle, what is the source of the authority. Not the title, not the document, not the declaration, not the confidence with which it is presented. The source, the legal foundation, the evidence and the final point;

**No filing.**

**No registration.**

**No criminal charging document.**

**No commercial instrument.**

**No private constitution.**

**No self created jurisdiction.**

**No self declared diplomatic status.**

**No privately issued credential.**

**And no digital balance displayed on a private portal,** can by itself automatically place an individual company or organisation above the lawful authority of a recognised court.

**Documents may exist.**

**Claims may exist.**

**Arguments may exist.**

**Declarations may exist.**

**Balances may appear on screens.**

**But the existence of a claim** does not establish the truth of the claim.

The existence of a document does not necessarily establish the legal authority behind it. And the existence of a digital balance does not by itself establish independently realisable financial value.

The questions therefore remain; What is the legal foundation? What is the evidence? Who recognises the claim? Can it be independently verified?

Because ultimately, authority must have a foundation, value must have a basis, jurisdiction must have a legal source and where extraordinary powers, privileges or financial value are claimed.

The evidence should be capable of withstanding independent scrutiny.

The claim is not the authority, the balance is not the proof of value, the document is not the source of law, the evidence is the test.

## THE INVESTIGATIVE PRINCIPLE

This documentary does not ask you to believe BANAMAN. It asks you to investigate. Do not accept the claim simply because somebody says it is true. Do not reject a claim simply because somebody else says it is false.

**CHECK IT.**

**Check the legislation.**

**Check the institutional records.**

**Check the relevant court records.**

**Check the corporate records.**

**Check the financial records.**

**Check the technical records.**

**Check the accreditation.**

**Check the transaction.**

**Check the source.**

**Check the evidence.**

And where possible, verify the information independently, because the purpose of an investigation is not to replace one persons assertion with another persons assertion. It is to examine the evidence and determine what that evidence actually supports.

**Do not follow the title, follow the evidence!**

**Do not follow the declaration!**

**Check the foundation!**

**Do not follow the hype!**

**Follow the records,** and then make your own assessment because ultimately the question is not who do you believe, the question is what can you verify!

**YOU THE VIEWER ARE INVITED TO REFUTE THIS IF YOU THINK YOU CAN!**

But there is an important condition.

Do not attempt to refute evidence with insults.

Do not answer documentation with intimidation.

Do not answer questions with titles.

Do not answer financial questions with ideology.

And do not answer legal questions with self-created definitions of law.

If there is an error in this investigation:

**SHOW THE EVIDENCE.**

If a legal proposition is incorrect:

**IDENTIFY THE APPLICABLE LAW.**

If a credential is genuine:

**SHOW THE INSTITUTIONAL RECORD.**

If TURON has independently verifiable value:

**SHOW THE MECHANISM.**

If diplomatic authority exists:

**SHOW THE RECOGNISED LEGAL FOUNDATION.**

If jurisdiction exists:

**SHOW THE LEGAL SOURCE.**

If an allegation presented in this documentary is wrong, show what the evidence actually establishes, because serious claims deserve serious scrutiny. The purpose is not to silence disagreement, it is to test competing claims against evidence.

So if you believe this investigation is wrong, do not tell us, show us, bring the documents, bring the records, bring the applicable law, bring the evidence and let the evidence speak for itself.

That is how serious claims should be tested.

**After three investigations...**

**After jurisdiction...**

**After TURON...**

**After the examination of authority...**

**There remains one question that cuts through all the paperwork.**

**All the titles.**

**All the declarations.**

**All the credentials.**

**All the promises.**

**All the claims.**

Strip away the presentation, strip away the ceremony, strip away the language, strip away the assumptions and ask the question that has remained at the centre of this entire investigation;

**WHO GAVE YOU THAT AUTHORITY?**

**Not what you call yourself!**

**Not what document do you carry!**

**Not what title appears beside your name!**

**Not what does your organisation declare!**

**But, what is the source?**

**What is the legal foundation?**
**What is the evidence?**
**And ultimately, can it be independently verified?**

Because authority is not established merely by declaration. Value is not established merely by display, jurisdiction is not established merely by assertion and recognition is not established merely because somebody claims to have been recognised.
The investigation therefore ends where it began, with a question, a simple question, a question that applies to every organisation, every title, every credential, every jurisdictional claim and every exertion of extraordinary authority.

**BANAMAN INVESTIGATES...!**

**JURISDICTION**
**TURON**
**THE AUTHORITY TEST**

**THE INVESTIGATION CONTINUES…**