

American Land Ownership: A True Oxymoron
Last Chapter

INTRODUCTION

by the Informer

What Mr. Montgomery is trying to convey in this, his final writing on this subject, is that of laying the foundation for how this country operates today. Not that you can go into a court and present these arguments today, you can't.. If you don't know the power structures beginnings then you are doomed forever to repeat the same mistakes as those that preceded you in their quest to seek justice. To truly win in the situation there must be a concerted effort by at least 70 percent of the people to overturn the present state of affairs. That will not happen because of the ignorance of the masses that are so easily led by those in power. The people have truly forsaken the true Sovereign, namely the Lord Almighty. Without going into the so-called "religion" aspect, let me just pose some questions. Did not the Lord Almighty create the land? Yes. Did the Pope create the land? No! Did the King create the land? No! Did any other man create the land? No! Did any group of men called State create the land? No! Now that I have answered the questions for you then here are some that you are to answer. Then, who is the real owner of the land? Did not the creator of the land bestow it upon all men and their heirs to be stewards of the land, granting to no one man or group of men, absolute dominion over any land? When man dies who does the land escheat to? For those not familiar with that term escheat, it means who does the land go back to when all men die? Your answers can only show that no Pope, King, Man himself, or group of men called State can ever claim they own the land and charge another man a fee to live on that land. Mr. Montgomery is showing you the progression from a certain period of time that certain mere mortal men have decided that they were granted certain rights above all other men in claiming dominion over all land. The pecking Order starting from the top in controlling land are;

1. The Pope
2. The Kings of all lands, but we are talking specifically England here.
3. Knights
4. Lord Proprietors of the King in America
5. Royal Governors of the King, in America
6. Administrative officers of the corporate colonies of America
7. Freeholders/Freemen of granted property in America.
8. The officers of the newly constituted States of America which, gave way to the;
9. Officers of the United States which now reverses 8 and 9 due to the States joining Union.
10. The County officers which are the corporate instrumentalities of the State.
11. Simple man, meaning you, reading this.

You, number 11, are so far removed from the land that the Lord Almighty gave to all men, that essentially you have no claim but as a squatter on someone else's land and have no control whatsoever in saying you have the right to not pay taxes for the use of the Pope's land. But the Pope is the figure head of a corporation called the Vatican consisting of men forming a "religion," WHICH THE LORD ALMIGHTY NEVER CREATED A "RELIGION," claiming complete dominion over all land in the world. When the Pope dies another of these men is chosen as the new Pope. There is one little quirk that needs to be mentioned. That is, a group of men exist that has control of even the Vatican, therefore every chain holder on down to number 11 on the list is controlled. That group of men are called Bankers. The Pope and the King, in 1213, on to a period just past 1218, lost a lot of money fighting each other and drew on a group of men, one in particular, that loaned to each side money. When neither could pay the loans back and defaulted, the moneylender foreclosed. He foreclosed in agreement by not taking all the property, except for England, as is done today on foreclosures; but, an arrangement was made that satisfied the so called "holy trinity" that is espoused by Mr. Montgomery below. That "Holy Trinity" is mentioned in the Treaty of 1783. Of whom do you think the Holy Trinity consists? So the list above from 1 to 11 needs another entity. I did not put him in so I could make it clear who it is in order of claim to the land you live on as a tenant. Now number one has been replaced by the Banker and everyone has shifted down a notch.

Hello number twelve, how do you like your position on the list? Well, if you people reject allegiance to the True Lord and cling to another and pledge allegiance to another then you deserve to pay those that allow you, through privilege, to live on their land. You gave up that RIGHT to live on land of the True Land Owner without even a fee, except to abide by His Laws, and not that of mere mortal man such as yourself. Until you understand this and what Mr. Montgomery has tried telling you in his previous articles and I have in my books and articles on the net, you will continue to be nothing but a slave to the system that perpetrated a fraud on you and your family tree for centuries. No, you cannot attack unless the numbers are sufficient. Yes, the below is true despite what any one says to degrade Mr. Montgomery's research of many years. These people that degrade have either an ignorance level so high that no amount of education will correct it or they are in league with a higher number on the pecking order that wants to keep the status quo. These men are the only ones that the Lord Almighty wished woe upon in the Bible for "hiding the key of knowledge," in Luke and Matthew. You can look at it this way as relates to present day. The Banker remains in complete control. I don't mean your local banker, but those that control all banks in America and the world. They operate with straw men many deep so as to keep the people ignorant as to what is going on. Look at the list above to see how many straw men exist. Mr. Montgomery mentions the pope once below. He is trying to keep it a little simpler because the straw man of the Vatican/Pope, The Crown, is easier to understand for most people. This is the same operation that many people get into by creating so many corporations that you never know just who is the controlling man. You may see this on government stories where the detective says he traced back through a tree of corporations and got lost in the many branches and could not find who really owns the contraband. I will vouch that Mr. Montgomery is a very thorough researcher and has nothing to gain from the dissemination of the information below, with the exception to get people to wake up to the truth instead of constantly, for decades, chasing the elusive wizard of OZ with all his smoke and mirrors.

I have read Mr. Montgomery's article below and it confirms what I have also found. As I said, the power brokers control every lawyer and judge, who are also lawyers, in this if not all other judges in the world, because without them the fraud could not be carried out. Have you ever heard of an honest trial where justice is dispensed to the American man or woman who runs afoul of "the System," even when he is innocent? Where do you think all the money the private IRS collects goes? Maybe to the credit of the Straw man # 9 above? Credit to whom? Just follow the ladder back up to the top, and remember the original numbers have all dropped one notch down to make room for whom?

A WORD FROM THE AUTHOR

This book represents 10 years of my life, whether you agree with my findings or not; know that my purpose for doing this research and writing this book, is out of love for my Country, and the desire to serve my Lord Jesus Christ; with the hope of seeing the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth once again serve the God of Abraham. I've learned over the years, that My Lord's grace IS sufficient, and His Love passes any comprehension or understanding I thought I had, we are not forsaken. So those of you that have become discouraged, don't, read the last chapter of our Lord's letter, we WIN. In the days ahead there will no doubt be temptation to yield to discouragement and despair, just keep your purpose true and your eyes on Jesus, as with Peter, reach out, take our Lord's hand, walk above the storm around you.

My thanks to the Informer and his years of dedication and historical research; helping American's see through the fog of deception, and his unmatched technical work and research in the field of law and taxes, and for making his books available to the public. The books we have published on this subject are in no way the totality of the historical and legal documents concerning the reality of our freedom, or rather, the lack thereof. I challenge anyone with eyes to see and ears to hear, with a desire to know the truth, continue the search with us. It's your freedom, with knowledge as its key; never allow yourself to become complacent with the status quo, always try to increase your knowledge, because Knowledge Is Freedom.

James Franklin Montgomery

American Land Ownership: A True Oxymoron Last Chapter

Many of you are aware that the laws of this nation and its states, were made to be in compliance and submission to the laws of England, only modified by state and federal law. You will see in this last Chapter state statutes from just a few of the original colonies, that this is the case. Are these what are called ancient statutes? Yes. However, since the king's Corporation is alive and well as are his heirs, so is his Trust and the law used to create and govern it. The law that governs his Trust can only be amended, no law could be enacted contrary to the king's will and cestui que trust, the main corporate sole where office is always found, the Crown. The king's practice of granting lands in this country to those loyal to him continues, along with their land grants being protected by state ancient statutes which are still on the books. We are governed by the king's nobles just as in times of old England, self proclaimed nobles, and corporate trusts. They rule this country and the world. The huge corporations have been granted power and liberty not known by the common man. The nobles, real and the created, occupy their possessions as fiduciaries and trustees of the king's grants; only if they remain loyal to the system, their privilege and life style are their reward.

You will see that the Church of England was granted lands in this country and their lands are protected by corporate privilege, through trusts and fee simple title. As I have stated before, the king receives the gain for his business venture here in the United States, as he does with all his corporations. A portion of the fines and taxes we pay today go right back to the sovereign, the king of England, and his heirs and/or successors as I pointed out in previous chapters of, "The United States Is Still A British Colony". After reading the facts contained in this chapter, you will find my conclusion, which is based on my 10 years of researching this subject, through acquiring and culmination of historical facts which I have shared with you in this Book.

The Nexus

"ALL that Territory or Tract of ground, situate, lying, and being within our Dominions in America,....(listed known boundaries).... AND moreover, all Veins, Mines, and Quarries, as well discovered as not discovered, of Gold, Silver, Gems, and precious Stones, and all other, whatsoever be it, of Stones, Metals, or any other thing whatsoever found or to be found within the Country, Isles, Limits aforesaid;" The Carolina Charter, 1663

"SAVING always, the Faith, Allegiance, and Sovereign Dominion due to us, our heirs and Successors, for the same; and Saving also, the right, title, and interest of all and every our Subjects of the English Nation which are now Planted within the Limits bounds aforesaid, if any be;..." The Carolina Charter, 1663

"YIELDING AND PAYING yearly, to us, our heirs and Successors, for the same, the yearly Rent of Twenty Marks of Lawful money of England, at the Feast of All Saints, yearly, forever, The First payment thereof to begin and be made on the Feast of All Saints which shall be in the year of Our Lord One thousand six hundred Sixty and five; AND also, the fourth part of all Gold and Silver Ore which, with the limits aforesaid, shall, from time to time, happen to be found." The Carolina Charter, 1663

The below statute contains a wealth of information, it is just another example of who owns the land in this country. The first thing I want you to see is, Corporation is large case C, proper noun, referring to the main Corporation, the United States Corporation, also made clear by the end of the first sentence. Notice also, that even the Corporation (the United States government) doesn't claim Allodial title, because that office found is with the king, the government has only been vested with fee simple title through the Corporate Charters of the Crown, as amended by the 1783 Treaty of Peace and resulting 1787 Constitution. The king can only pass Allodial title to his heirs, no one else. This is why the highest title the government can pass is fee simple.

Also, notice that the Corporation can divest any and all occupiers of the land of any title or deed they may hold, transfer the land to the Corporation, in which it holds the land in fee simple title, and the title previously held by individuals or State has its title quieted (divested) and office found, then reversion back to the

Corporation.

Now if you will recall, the information I found concerning an act George Washington enacted, contained in emails attached as the addendum to the third chapter to this book, wherein Washington extended the jurisdiction and control of the District of Columbia. He created District States that overlaid the States, since it is such a relevant subject and part of this book, I include it after the below statute, so you can better understand the statute below.

16 USC Sec. 831x

TITLE 16

CHAPTER 12A

Sec. 831x. Condemnation proceedings; institution by Corporation; venue

-STATUTE-

"The Corporation may cause proceedings to be instituted for the acquisition by condemnation of any lands, easements, or rights-of-way which, in the opinion of the Corporation, are necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter. The proceedings shall be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which the land, easement, right-of-way, or other interest, or any part thereof, is located, and such court shall have full jurisdiction to divest the complete title to the property sought to be acquired out of all persons or claimants and vest the same in the United States in fee simple, and to enter a decree quieting the title thereto in the United States of America."

Also, see below: 40A-2 sec. 3 "Eminent domain", N.C. statute.

Before we move on to the action taken by George Washington, you need to understand that the legal term fee simple is now a metaphor, just as the legal term United States. It is given lip service today in relation to the common man, and has another meaning when used in relation to the Crown or the main sub Corporation, the United States, with its seat being the District of Columbia. When dealing with land ownership you have to use the definition at law that governs the Crown, not the metaphors created later by his barristers, to con the common man into believing he/she has allodial, or fee simple title to the land. All that is necessary to know the condition you own your land. If you think have allodial, fee simple title, or fee tail title, is ask yourself one question. Is there a tax imposed on the land you claim to own? If a tax is or can be levied, you DO NOT own the land, because if you fail to pay the tax, the land is reclaimed by the Corporation, by alienation, and reversion.

Also, under the institutional law of the Crown, that came with the conquest of Britain by William the Conqueror, you could not be charged a tax on the land if you had fee simple title, it could not be diminished in any way. The fee was payment by the king for the sworn loyalty of the lords and knights to fight for the king, in his wars of Conquest, later changed to a monetary fee, to pay soldiers to fight in the wars. King Edward I began the redefining of the legal term fee simple.

"Tenthly, He made that great Alteration in Estates from what they were formerly, by Statute Westminster 2. cap. 1. Whereby Estates of Fee-Simple, conditional at Common Law, were turn'd into Estates-Tail, not removable from the Issue by the ordinary Methods of Alienation; and upon this Statute, and for the Qualifications hereof, are the Superstructures built of 4 H. 7. cap. 32, 32 H. 8. and 33 H. 8." The History of the Common Law of England by Matthew Hale 1713

Those living on your land under fee tail or a lessor title, via deed to the land would pay the king's tax. As a metaphor, as applied today, you can be charged a tax when you are told you have fee simple title if you are a common man. The Corporation's holdings are not taxed depending on the Corporate Charter granted by the government, or if you have a trust that contains fee simple title, with tax protection, you could be protected legally, but you still don't own the land, when the life of the trust expires, or is mis handled by the trustees, it reverts back to the corporate sole, through alienation and office found, or by confiscation due to delinquent tax obligations. So any fee simple title you may have comes by legal right, not sovereign grant. This is the difference

between the tenants on the land and the Corporation. Again if you are talking about the Corporation or any of its holdings, its fee simple title is not taxed, and is by sovereign grant from the king, enhanced by Conquest, as his successor and trustee over his holdings.

George Washington's thought on Independence from the king was echoed by many of our fore fathers.

"In May, 1775, Washington said: 'If you ever hear of me joining in any such measure [as separation from Great Britain], you have my leave to set me down for everything wicked'- He also said: 'It is not the wish or interest of the government [meaning Massachusetts], or of any other upon this continent, separately or collectively, to set up for independence'" Ingersoll, North American Review, CLV. No.2, August, 1892, p. 183, also quote in Sources of the Constitution of the United States, c. Ellis Stevens, 1927, page 36.

Now to the Act of Washington, and for those of you who have not seen this, the Act that made the reclaiming and managing of the kings Corporation possible, and made possible the end run of the 1787 Constitution.

STATE VS. DISTRICT, DID THE 1787 CONSTITUTION SURVIVE

Fall 1997

"How was this accomplished, in reading the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, Vol. I, 1789-1897 I discovered the following:

Gentlemen of the Senate:

Pursuant to the powers vested in me by the act entitled "An act repealing after the last day of June next the duties heretofore laid upon distilled spirits imported from abroad and laying others in their stead, and also upon spirits distilled within the United States, and for appropriating the same," I have thought fit to divide the United States into the following districts, namely:

The district of New Hampshire, to consist of the State of New Hampshire; the district of Massachusetts, to consist of the State of Massachusetts; the district of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, to consist of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; the district of Connecticut, to consist of the State of Connecticut; the district of Vermont, to consist of the State of Vermont; the district of New York, to consist of the State of New York; the district of New Jersey, to consist of the State of New Jersey; the district of Pennsylvania, to consist of the State of Pennsylvania; the district of Delaware, to consist of the State of Delaware; the district of Maryland, to consist of the State of Maryland; the district of Virginia, to consist of the State of Virginia; the district of North Carolina, to consist of the State of North Carolina; the district of South Carolina; and the district of Georgia, to consist of the State of the State of Georgia .Page 99 March 4, 1791

In George Washington's Proclamation of March 30, 1791 he declares the district of Columbia to be created and it's borders established, he says further:

"And Congress by an amendatory act passed on the 3rd day of the present month of March have given further authority to the President of the United States...."

"First of all, the Judicial Districts were created by the Judiciary Act of 1789, two years before Washington said Congress gave him additional powers, thereby HE created District States,so the federal government could use the militias to crush the tax protesters in Pennsylvania, by Washington's order. Since the Judicial Districts already existed, why did they recreate them? If the District States were already created, would it not be redundant to create them again?"

Washington said he was dividing the United States into District States. He said DIVIDING THE STATES, listen, DIVIDING THE STATES, not creating districts in the states, DIVIDING THE STATES into DISTRICTS, changing them, or you would not DIVIDE THEM, because the states were already divided. How can you DIVIDE, SEPARATE the states, made by the state and federal Charters/Constitutions? Why do this when Congress already had the power to put down rebellion, Article I, section 8, U.S. Constitution? This was an excuse to DIVIDE the states into DISTRICTS, extending the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia/Congress and delegating to the President, authority given to Congress to suppress insurrection, under art. I, sec. 8.

Second, the use of any military power before Congress declares war, by direction of the President is done by him as Commander-in-Chief. Until Congress declares war they cannot stop the President unless they impeach him, or when they declare war they can stop the President with their power of the purse, unless the President were to then declare a national emergency, as Commander-in-Chief, overriding Congress, in effect declaring himself king, or in our case anyone holding that office, which we now have. I disagree with the un-Constitutional emergency powers claimed by the President, but unless the Judiciary declares the President out of line, neither you nor I cannot change this, unless you or I were elected President, and declared this power un-Constitutional, but Congress would then impeach you or me to protect Public policy. Around and Around it goes. Again this power comes from their operating under executive jurisdiction, insular capacity: which was allowed by the Judiciary, beginning with what Washington did. Because it was up to the Judiciary to declare what Congress was doing as un-Constitutional, and up to Washington to not take power delegated to Congress. This power was affirmed by the Congressional Act of 1845, and in the 1850's by the insular cases. This set the stage for Lincoln to legislate by executive orders, and here we are.

Third, the Districts Washington created answered directly to the Commander-in-Chief, not Congress. In order for these Districts to be created by the President, Congress had to give the President power outside of the Constitution, as declared by Washington himself. Martial law can be used as soon as the military is called upon to put down insurrection or fight a war. Washington created District States, not state districts, and the military occupied the Pennsylvania District until the insurgents went home, Washington said these Districts were created for putting down the rebellion, however they were never disbanded when the rebellion ended.

My email on the District States:

"These courts, then, are not constitutional courts in which the judicial power conferred by the Constitution on the general government can be deposited. They are incapable of receiving it. They are legislative courts, created in virtue of the general right of sovereignty which exists in the government, or in virtue of that clause which enables Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States. The jurisdiction with which they are invested is not a part of that judicial power which is conferred in the third article of the Constitution, but is conferred by Congress in the execution of those general powers which that body possesses over the territories of the United States." Harvard Law Review, Our New Possessions. page 481.

See also; Propeller Genessee Chief et al. v. Fitzhugh et al. 12 How. 443 (U.S. 1851) Jackson v. Magnolia, 20 How. 296 315, 342 (U.S. 1852) DOWNES v. BIDWELL, 182 U.S. 244 (1901), Hooven & Allison & Co. vs Evatt, 324 U.S. 652 (1945)

Below you will see how Lincoln codified the war powers, the nexus was the District States Washington created. I won't go into the subject of the Conquest after the Civil War, since it is far easier to understand, I invite you to read and study the documents in Part III to learn about this subject. However, I offer the below codification of Military Occupation, Conquest and International codification of Martial law, you can download the whole general order 100.

Martial Law - Military jurisdiction - Military necessity - Retaliation

"Article 1. A place, district, or country occupied by an enemy stands, in consequence of the occupation, under the Martial Law of the invading or occupying army, whether any proclamation declaring Martial Law, or any

public warning to the inhabitants, has been issued or not. Martial Law is the immediate and direct effect and consequence of occupation or conquest.

The presence of a hostile army proclaims its Martial Law.

Art. 2. Martial Law does not cease during the hostile occupation, except by special proclamation, ordered by the commander in chief; or by special mention in the treaty of peace concluding the war, when the occupation of a place or territory continues beyond the conclusion of peace as one of the conditions of the same.

Art. 3. Martial Law in a hostile country consists in the suspension, by the occupying military authority, of the criminal and civil law, and of the domestic administration and government in the occupied place or territory, and in the substitution of military rule and force for the same, as well as in the dictation of general laws, as far as military necessity requires this suspension, substitution, or dictation.

The commander of the forces may proclaim that the administration of all civil and penal law shall continue either wholly or in part, as in times of peace, unless otherwise ordered by the military authority."

{Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field, prepared by Francis Lieber, LL.D., Originally

Issued as General Orders No. 100, Adjutant General's Office, 1863, Washington 1898: Government Printing Office.}"

END OF DISTRICT STATE EMAIL

PLAN OF A NEW GOVERNMENT

Our forefathers were first and foremost administrators for the king and his holdings, so as to keep their grants and fee simple titles to their own land holdings in America and Britain. Prior to the Revolutionary War, 1783 Treaty and the 1787 Constitution, there was a plan to organize a central government, still subject to the king, still collecting taxes for the king. The only difference between the government we have and the government you read about below is your perception, with word and technical changes. The 1787 Constitution was a well thought out document, but the document below was its predecessor, the similarities are obvious. What you will read below, along with the other documents provided in this book, describe exactly what we have today. Notice the two paragraphs provided below, in the first a central government is to be set up, with each colony to retain its own constitution. In the second paragraph you see that, a President-General is to be elected to run the central government for the king. What do we have now? President-Commander-in-Chief. Also, he is appointed and supported by the Crown.

How does any President get elected? The system is setup so that only someone supported by the large corporations of this country can seriously run for President, or be elected, because of their financial support. Without this support, you cannot be President, no matter what the public wants. So the public, only has Crown approved men, they can select from, to vote for, that way no matter who wins the Crown's interest is protected. The public is told what to think about the different men the corporations have chosen to represent them, so they think they are making informed choices. Nothing could be further from the truth, they are electing a man, no matter the party, that will protect the Crown's interest, not the public's. You may wish to continue to deny reality, but you can't separate the wet from water, nor our government from Britain.

The 1754 Albany Plan of Union

"It is proposed that humble application be made for an act of Parliament of Great Britain, by virtue of which one general government may be formed in America, including all the said colonies, within and under which government each colony may retain its present constitution, except in the particulars wherein a change may be directed by the said act, as hereafter follows.

That the said general government be administered by a President-General, to be appointed and supported by the crown; and a Grand Council, to be chosen by the representatives of the people of the several Colonies met in their respective assemblies...." The 1754 Albany Plan of Union

The king's corporations are alive and well, lands they hold in fee simple can be parceled out to whom they will, with the lands returning to the king when the grant/trust/license expires. The king made grants to his colonies and lords, they became corporations under the United States Corporate Charter, the lords make grants to other select men via corporate charters, or by grants of Trusts or license to smaller corporations and individuals. Any time a corporation dies and no office is found, it's lands revert back to the granter of the corporation, and so on back up the line, this is the reason for the inheritance tax, and why it will never be repealed. I refer you to an earlier chapter I wrote called, "How Long Can A Corporation Live". Also, check out a paper the Informer and I jointly wrote on the subject of rent roll and reversion and corporation sole, "Friends, Enemies And Die Hard Doubters", and you would be well advised to read the Informer's book, "The New History Of America", and his other publications. Before you read the ancient statutes, you must understand the legal term fee simple.

UNDERSTANDING FEE SIMPLE

"63. 1. Origin of feuds- The constitution of feuds had its original from the military policy of the northern or Celtic nations, the Goths, the Huns, the Franks, the Vandals, and the Lombards, who all migrating from the same officina gentium (the storehouse of nations), as Crag very justly entitles it, poured themselves in vast quantities into all the regions of Europe, at the declension of the Roman empire. It was brought by them from their own countries, and continued in their respective colonies as the most likely means to secure their new acquisitions: and to that end, large districts or parcels of land were allotted by the conquering general to superior officers of the army, and by them dealt out again in smaller parcels or allotments to the inferior officers and most deserving soldiers. These allotments were called feoda, feuds, fiefs, or fees; which last appellation in the northern languages signifies a conditional stipend or reward. Rewards or stipends they evidently were; and the condition annexed to them was, that the possessor should do service faithfully, both at home and in the wars, to him by whom they were given; for which purpose he took the juramentum fidelitatis, or oath of fealty: and in case of the breach of this condition and oath, by not performing the stipulated service, or by deserting the lord in battle, the lands were again to revert to him who granted them." 2 Blackstone's Commentaries, page 45

"Feud: An inheritable right to the use and occupation of lands, held on condition of rendering services to the lord or proprietor, who himself retains the property in the lands,"
Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition p.748 (1968).

"Thus, the people had land they occupied, devised, inherited, alienated, or disposed of as they saw fit, so long as they remained in favor with the King." F. L. Ganshof, Feudalism, p. 113 (1964).

"The largest estate in the land known to the law and implying absolute dominion over the land; an estate of inheritance clear of any condition, limitation, or restriction, to particular heirs. 28 Am J2d Est 10. An estate of lawful inheritance or pure inheritance, "fee" standing for inheritance and "simple" for pure or lawful. A legal or equitable estate in land constituting the largest estate and implying absolute dominion, although possibly subject to executory limitations or conditions subsequent. Hay's Estate v Commissioner (CA5) 181 F2d 169, 39 ALR 2d 453; Ford v Unity Church Society, 120 Mo 498, 25 SW 394."

Ballentine's Law Dictionary, Third Edition, 1969

Are taxes to be paid by common man holding fee simple title? Yes, according to the way fee simple is defined today. Today fee simple has been reduced in status to fee tail for common man, he is to pay all land taxes, also he must abide by all restrictions placed on the land by federal, State and local governments, nor can he use the land in any activity contrary to the Public Policy. The difference is the U.S. Corporation just as the knight was granted land for fee, in service of the king by grant. Common man receives their fee from the Corporation in tail, a lessor title, today fee simple and fee tail are synonymous, depending on your status. I would have placed the quote here from the Ohio Bar Association on fee simple, but they restrict its use, however below is their web site so you can

look for yourself.

<http://www.ohioabar.org/public/law&you/part8.html>

"This holding of lands under another was called a tenure, and was not limited to the relation of the first or paramount lord and vassal, but extended to those to whom such vassal, within the rules of feudal [2] law, may have parted out his own feud to his own vassals, whereby he became the mesne lord between his vassals and his own or lord paramount. Those who held directly to the king were called his "tenants in ... chief.

" I E. Washburn, Treatise on The American Law of Real Property, Ch. 11, Section 58, P. 42 (6th Ed. 1902), Allodial And Land Patents Titles

Maybe with the below quote you will also understand the meaning and significance behind the pyramid on our dollar, with the all seeing eye at the top of the pyramid.

"The fiefs were built in the same manner as a pyramid, with the King, the true owner of the land, being at the top, and from the bottom up there existed a system of small to medium sized to large to large sized estates on which the persons directly beneath one estate owed homage to the lord of that estate as well as to the King." Id. at 114, Allodial And Land Patents Titles.

"At the lowest level of this pyramid through at least the 14th and 15th centuries existed to serfs or villains, the class of people that had no rights and were recognized as nothing more than real property." F. Goodwin, Treatise on The Law of Real Property, Ch. 1, p. 10 (1905), Allodial And Land Patents Titles.

"Under this type of fief a certain portion of the grain harvested each year would immediately be turned over to the lord above that particular fief even before the shares from the lower lords and then serfs of the fief would be distributed. A more interesting type of fief for purposes of this memorandum [3] was the money fief. In most cases, the source of money was not specified, and the payment was simply made from the fief holder's treasury, but the fief might also consist of a fixed revenue to be paid from a definite source in annual payments in order for the tenant owner of the fief to be able to remain on the property." Gilsebert of Mons, Chronique, cc. 69 and 1 15, pp. 109, 175 (ed. Vanderkindere), Allodial And Land Patents Titles.

"142. (1) Fee-simple estates--Tenant in fee simple (or, as he is frequently styled, tenant in fee) is he that hath lands, tenements, or hereditaments, to hold to him and his heirs forever; generally, absolutely, and simply; without mentioning what heirs, but referring that to his own pleasure, or to the disposition of the law. The true meaning of the word "fee" (feodum) is the same with that of feud or fief, and in its original sense it is taken in contradistinction to allodium; which latter the writers on this subject define to be every man's own land, which he possesseth merely in his own right, without owing any rent or service to any superior." 2 Blackstone's Commentary, page 105

"Thus, the term fee simple absolute in Common-Law England denotes the most and best title a person could have as long as the King allowed him to retain possession of (own) the land. It has been commented that the basis of English land law is the ownership of all reality by the sovereign. From the crown, all titles flow. The original and true meaning of the word "fee" and therefore fee simple absolute is the same as fief or feud, this being in contradiction to the term "allodium" which means or is defined as a man's own land, which he possesses merely in his own right, without owing any rent or service to any superior." Wendell [4] v Crandall, 1 N. Y. 491 (1848), Allodial And Land Patents Titles

"Therefore on Common-Law England practically everybody who was allowed to retain land, had the type of fee simple absolute often used or defined by courts, a fee simple that grants or gives the occupier as much of a title as the "sovereign" allows such occupier to have at that time. The term became a synonym with the supposed ownership of land under the feudal system of England at common law. Thus, even though the word absolute was attached to the fee simple, it merely denoted the entire estate that could be assigned or passed to heirs, and the fee being the operative word; fee simple absolute dealt with the entire fief and its divisibility, alienability and inheritability." Friedman v Steiner, 107 111. 131 (1883), Allodial And Land Patents Titles

If a fee simple absolute in Common-Law England denoted or was synonymous with only as much title as the King allowed his barons to possess, then what did the King have by way of a title?

The King of England held ownership of land under a different title and with far greater powers than any of his subjects. Though the people of England held fee simple titles to their land, the King actually owned all the land in England through his allodial title, and though all the land was in the feudal system, none of the fee simple titles were of equal weight and dignity with the King's title, the land always remaining allodial in favor of the King." Gilsbert of Mons, *Chronique*, Ch. 43, p. 75 (ed. Vanderkindere), *Allodial And Land Patents Titles*.

"Thus, it is relatively easy to deduce that allodial lands and titles are the highest form of lands and titles known to Common-Law. An estate of inheritance without condition, belonging to the owner, and alienable by him, transmissible to his heirs absolutely and simply, is an absolute estate in perpetuity and the largest possible estate a man can have, being in fact allodial in its nature." *Stanton v Sullivan*, 63 R.I. 216, 7 A. 696 (1839), *Allodial And Land Patents Titles*.

The law of Mortmain, law of the sovereign, protecting his lands held by his lords and religious men in fee, prohibiting them from diluting his title. Declaring he could confiscate the land he or his lords were alienated from. Even the lords were subject to have their land reclaimed by the king, if they violated the king's license requirements. You can find the law of Mortmain at the end of the chapter, in the quotes section.

I want to make this clear, if the king and his law (common law) are still live, so are his Charters, Corporations and Trusts. Without defeating the king (death or removal) his law still exists, if his law still exists, his Corporation (Crown) is as I have said: alive and well. What did we do at the end of the Revolutionary War and in framing the 1787 Constitution? Claim the king's law, his common law, his feudal law for our own, and made it our law. So, if you are subject to any tax on the land you live on, you do not, I repeat, DO NOT own your land, you do not have allodial title to your land. It is not possible, allodial and taxed property are an oxymoron, the two are as opposite as light and darkness, the two cannot exist together. Even worse than this, under common law, which we made our law of the land, you do not even have fee simple possession of your land, because early fee simple possession is free from taxation, you hold the land in fee simple at best if you have a tax shelter, trust. Fee tail, and lessor ownerships are evidenced by a title, deed or mortgage, which is how most land is held, and is subject to taxation and or repossession, if the taxes are not paid. I'm sorry but this is a fact, I don't care what you have been told, or lead to believe concerning allodial title. A huge number of patriots believe because of the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary War that we are sovereigns here possessing the land through allodial title, as a matter of sovereignty, by defeating the king. Wrong, it is impossible, the king has conned Americans, or I should say allowed them to believe they are sovereigns, owning their land through allodial title.

This would be a good place for you to read some quotes by Sir Edmund Burke, and by Adam Smith, because of the importance taxation plays in proving land ownership in America, by allodial title is an oxymoron. I'm including more quotes at the end of this chapter by Adam Smith and other relevant information.

"If America gives you taxable objects on which you lay your duties here, and gives you, at the same time, a surplus by a foreign sale of her commodities to pay the duties on these objects which you tax at home, she has performed her part to the British revenue. But with regard to her own internal establishments, she may, I doubt not she will, contribute in moderation. I say in moderation, for she ought not to be permitted to exhaust herself. She ought to be reserved to a war, the weight of which, with the enemies that we are most likely to have, must be considerable in her quarter of the globe. There she may serve you, and serve you essentially.

For that service—for all service, whether of revenue, trade, or empire—my trust is in her interest in the British Constitution. My hold of the Colonies is in the close affection which grows from common names, from kindred blood, from similar privileges, and equal protection. These are ties which, through light as air, are as strong as links of iron. Let the Colonists always keep the idea of their civil rights associated with your government, they

will cling and grapple to you, and no force under heaven will be of power to tear them from their allegiance." Burke on Conciliation with the Colonies, March 22, 1775, pages 71,72, published by Allyn and Bacon"

"Let us get an American revenue as we have got an American empire. English privileges have made it all that it is; English privileges alone will make it all it can be."

Speech of Sir Edmund Burke, before the House of Commons, March 22, 1775

"But my idea of it is this; that an empire is the aggregate of many states under one common head, whether this head be a monarch or a presiding republic."

Speech of Sir Edmund Burke, before the House of Commons, March 22, 1775 (So Benjamin Franklin saying: we have given you a Republic, if you can keep it, means nothing, and was not a hindrance to the king and his barristers.) Author's comment in parentheses.

"The people heard, indeed, from the beginning of these disputes, one thing continually dinned in their ears, that reason and justice demanded that the Americans, who paid no taxes, should be compelled to contribute...."Their wealth was considered as our wealth. Whatever money was sent out to them, it was said, came all back to us by the balance of trade, and we could never become a farthing the poorer by any expense which we could lay out upon them. They were our own in every respect, and it was an expense laid out upon the improvement of our own property and for the profitable employment of our own people."

1776, AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND CAUSES OF THE WEALTH OF NATIONS by Adam Smith

Here are some court cases, that will help you understand fee simple, and how land is held in this country. In this first case you will see our perception of what took place, then the judge lets the air out, and tells you how it was and is, as a matter of law.

North Carolina Reports (Archive)

MARSHALL v. LOVELASS, 1 N.C. 412 (1801)

2 S.E. 70

Page 368

"....Every person knows in what manner the citizens acquired the property of the soil within the limits of this State. Being dissatisfied with the measures of the British Government, they revolted from it, assumed the government into their own hands, seized and took possession of all the estates of the King of Great Britain and his subjects, appropriated them to their own use, and defended their possessions against the claims of Great Britain, during a long and bloody war, and finally obtained a relinquishment of those claims by the treaty of Paris. But this State had no title to the territory prior to the title of the King of Great Britain and his subjects, nor did it ever claim as lord paramount to them. This State was not the original grantor to them, nor did they ever hold by any kind of tenure under the State, or owe it any allegiance or other duties to which an escheat is annexed. How then can it be said that the lands in this case naturally result back by a kind of reversion to this State, to a source from whence it never issued, and from tenants who never held under it? Might it not be stated with equal propriety that this country escheated to the King of Great Britain from the Aborigines, when he drove them off, and took and maintained possession of their country?....

"....At the time of the revolution, and before the Declaration of Independence, the collective body of the people had neither right to nor possession of the territory of this State; it is true some individuals had a right to, and were in possession of certain portions of it, which they held under grants from the King of Great Britain; but they did not hold, nor did any of his subjects hold, under the collective body of the people, who had no power to grant any part of it"....

North Carolina Reports (Archive)

WARNER v. HARDING, 1 N.C. 700

2 S.E. 70

Page 703

DODERIDGE, J.

"As to the exception to the value of 12d., nothing appears, non refert. As to the matter of record. The Queen may seize lands without any record. If return be made into the Exchequer that a man is beyond the sea and will not return, being commanded so to do, the Crown may seize his lands. And although the son cannot be heir during the life of his father, *the father may have an action de filio et haerede."

North Carolina Reports (Archive)

WARNER v. HARDING, 1 N.C. 680

2 S.E. 70

Page 680

Page 681

...."The statute is to be construed reasonably, and shall be expounded as the King's patents are. Therefore, if the King grant by his letters patent, under the great seal, all mines, the patentee shall not have royal mines. Then when all possessions are given, there is a right of entry and a right of action, but the right of action is not given by the general words of an act of Parliament. Now the word condition is a species and not a genus; and the 26 H., 8, enacting that such persons shall forfeit all the lands, tenements, and hereditaments, in which the offender shall have any estate of inheritance, there is not a difference between an inheritance in fee or in tail, while there are but these two estates of inheritance, and the statute says that he shall forfeit all the lands in which he has an estate of inheritance; and a condition is as simple as an inheritance"....

North Carolina Reports (Archive)

McKENZIE v. HULET, 4 N.C. 613 (1817)

2 S.E. 70

Page 443

...."Where a grant abuts upon the sea or a navigable river, it stops, according to the common law, at the ordinary high-water mark; and the shore that is, the ground between the high and low water marks belongs of common right to the king. Hale, de Jure Maris, 12. But it seems to be well settled that whatever is below the high-water mark may be granted by the king, of which many instances are put in the book already cited. The charter of Car. II. to the lords proprietors is an illustration of the form used by the crown in the grant of royalties"....

North Carolina Reports (Archive)

MARSHALL v. LOVELASS, 1 N.C. 412 (1801)

2 S.E. 70

Page 347

...."If the land had escheated, it then becomes necessary to inquire, In what manner has the State taken? I contend that the land is taken by the State, exempt of any trust for in England, when the Lord or King takes by escheat, they take discharged of the trust. 1 Coke's Rep., 122, Chudleigh's case. Before the Statute of 27 Henry, 8, whenever feoffee to uses did anything which produced escheat, the land reverted to the Lord discharge of the trust.

North Carolina Reports (Archive)

MARSHALL v. LOVELASS, 1 N.C. 412 (1801)

2 S.E. 70

August 1, 1999

Page 349

When the war broke out those who did not like the new government were at liberty to sell their lands and retire with the proceeds where they pleased; and this is agreeable to the law of nations. Vattel, B. 1, sec. 33, 195. This doctrine seems to have been held in view by the framers of the Constitution. Iredell's Rev., 276. Declaration of Rights, sec. 25. This section only charges the sovereign, and by it no escheat can take place, and aliens may still take and hold lands. This section provides that the titles made by the King and the Lords Proprietors shall not be

affected; and the General Assembly of this State have shown that they were under the influence of this opinion, as appears from the 3d chap., Acts 1777. Iredell's Rev., 284, 285

So read closely the portions of ancient state statutes, provided below.

ANCIENT STATUTES

Delaware

"All fines and common recoveries levied and suffered within this State, in pursuance of or according to the common or statute laws of England, in the Superior Court of the county wherein the lands, tenements or hereditaments entailed lie shall be as good in law, to bar estates so entailed, as fines and common recoveries of lands, tenements or hereditaments levied, or England are. Any heir at law or other person claiming any right in the lands, tenements or hereditaments may, either by appeal or writ of error, reverse such fines or recoveries for any errors in levying or suffering the fines or recoveries."

(Code 1852, _ 1639, 1640; Code 1915, _ 3234; Code 1935, _ 3697;

25 Del. C. 1953, _ 301.)

302. Bar of estate tail by deed.

"A person having a legal or equitable estate or right in fee tail in possession, remainder or reversion, in any lands, tenements or hereditaments may alien the lands, tenements or hereditaments, in fee simple, or for other less estate, by deed, in the same manner and as effectually as if such estate or right were in fee simple. The deed of alienation in fee simple of any person, of any lands, tenements or hereditaments shall have the same effect and operation for barring all estate tail and other interests in the lands, tenements or hereditaments, as such persons being a party cognizor to a fine in due manner levied, or party vouchee to a common recovery with a double voucher in due manner suffered, of the lands, tenements or hereditaments. No deed shall avail within either of these provisions, unless it is duly acknowledged or proved according to law, or unless it would be a valid and lawful deed sufficient to pass the premises, if the maker were seized of the premises in fee simple."

(Code 1852, _ 1641; Code 1915, _ 3235; Code 1935, _ 3698; 25 Del.

C. 1953, _ 302.)

303. Warranty by life tenant and collateral warranty.

"A warranty made by a tenant for life shall not, by descending or coming to a person in remainder or reversion, bar or affect his title. A collateral warranty shall not in any case bar or affect a title not derived from the person making such warranty."

(Code 1852, _ 1642; Code 1915, _ 3236; Code 1935, _ 3699; 25 Del.

C. 1953, _ 303.)

304. Permanent leasehold estates as estates in fee simple.

"Permanent leasehold estates, renewable forever, shall be considered to be estates in fee simple, and shall be subject to the same modes of alienation, power of devise, and rules of descent and distribution, and to all the incidents of an estate in fee, provided that the grantor of the leasehold or the person entitled to the estate, out of which the term issues, has first released to the grantee of the term or the person in possession of the leasehold all his right to the rent charged upon or growing out of the leasehold."

(15 Del. Laws, c. 168; Code 1915, _ 3237; Code 1935, _ 3700; 25 Del. C. 1953, _ 304.)

305. Deeds by foreign corporations; recording as evidence; ownership rights.

"All deeds to lands in Delaware executed and delivered by corporations created by and existing under the laws of the states and territories of the United States of America, other than Delaware, or created by and existing under the laws of any foreign state or nation, are made valid and effective to convey the fee simple or other estate purported to be conveyed in such deeds, with the same force and effect as if the corporation grantor had been a corporation lawfully created by and existing under the laws of this State. Such deeds, when recorded, or any office copy thereof, shall be admitted as evidence in all courts of this State, and shall be valid and conclusive

evidence, with the same force and effect as if such deeds had been properly executed, acknowledged and delivered by corporations created by and existing under the laws of this State. A foreign corporation owning lands in Delaware may exercise all rights and privileges of ownership to the same extent as if such corporation were a corporation lawfully created by and existing under the laws of this State."

(26 Del. Laws, c. 253; Code 1915, _ 3238; 38 Del. Laws, c. 174; Code 1935, _ 3701; 25 Del. C. 1953, _ 305.)

I just wanted to point out the below statute declared that the State of Georgia (created Corporation) is a successor to the Crown of England. The Crown is the Corporate entity of the king, and as I have stated before, first there were the Corporate Charters, amended to corporate colonies, amended to corporate States, via their State Constitutions, that did not change the original corporate charter, as declared in the 25th sec. of the North Carolina, Declaration of Rights, 1776 N.C. Constitution, which I quote again here:

"And provided further, that nothing herein contained shall affect the titles or possessions of individuals holding or claiming under the laws heretofore in force, or grants heretofore made by the late King George II, or his predecessors, or the late lords proprietors, or any of them." Declaration of Rights 1776, North Carolina Constitution.

Then confirmed by the 1783 Paris Treaty, wherein the minerals did not change hands, they stayed with the king, his heirs and successors. In other words, the king, his heirs and his successors forever, were to continue to receive as a matter of Trust, the gain, profit from his corporate venture. To cement this since his subjects had gone brain dead, and now believed themselves free from their obligations. Believing when the States became States of, after the 1787 Constitution was ratified, they became free and sovereign. In March 1791 thanks to George Washington, the States of, became District States of the Crown, side stepping the 1787 Constitution and the States short lived independence declared in 1776, in favor of the king's public policy, his taxes and licenses to be administered by his United States Corporation and its elected fiduciaries and den of thieves. When governing for the king, the President and Congress were no longer bound by the 1787 Constitution. The king would now receive as declared in his early Charters for himself, his heirs and successors, the 30 percent tax for his family business venture. Because now his bank could operate within the several District States, incorporated in the District of Columbia, this was not possible until Washington made the District States; never to be repealed. Also, go back and read the quotes I gave by Burke and Smith, there is no doubt.

Georgia

52-1-2 G

*** CODE SECTION *** 12/31/98

52-1-2.

"The General Assembly finds and declares that the State of Georgia became the owner of the beds of all tidewaters within the jurisdiction of the State of Georgia as successor to the Crown of England and by the common law. The State of Georgia continues to hold title to the beds of all tidewaters within the state, except where title in a private party can be traced to a valid Crown or state grant which explicitly conveyed the beds of such tidewaters. The General Assembly further finds that the State of Georgia, as sovereign, is trustee of the rights of the people of the state to use and enjoy all tidewaters which are capable of use for fishing, passage, navigation, commerce, and transportation, pursuant to the common law public trust doctrine. Therefore, the General Assembly declares that the protection of tidewaters for use by the state and its citizens has more than local significance, is of equal importance to all citizens of the state, is of state-wide concern, and, consequently, is properly a matter for regulation under the police powers of the state. The General Assembly further finds and declares that structures located upon tidewaters which are used as places of habitation, dwelling, sojournment, or residence interfere with the state's proprietary interest or the public trust, or both, and must be removed to ensure the rights of the state and the people of the State of Georgia to the use and enjoyment of such tidewaters. It is declared to be a policy of this state and the intent of this article to protect the tidewaters of the state by authorizing the commissioner of natural resources to remove or require removal of certain structures from such tidewaters in accordance with the procedures and within the timetable set forth in this article."

"(1) An Act for reviving and enforcing certain laws therein mentioned and adopting the common laws of England as they existed on May 14, 1776, approved February 25, 1784. (For the adopting Act of 1784, see Prince's 1822 Digest, p. 570; Cobb's 1851 Digest, p. 721; and Code of 1863, Section 1, paragraph 6.)"

Florida

CHAPTER 2

COMMON LAW IN FORCE; REPEALED STATUTES

"2.01 Common law and certain statutes declared in force.

2.04 Repealed statute not revived by implication.

2.01 Common law and certain statutes declared in force.—The common and statute laws of England which are of a general and not a local nature, with the exception hereinafter mentioned, down to the 4th day of July, 1776, are declared to be of force in this state; provided, the said statutes and common law be not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States and the acts of the Legislature of this state. History.--s. 1, Nov. 6, 1829; RS 59; GS 59; RGS 71; CGL 87."

Virginia

_ 1-10

"The common law The common law of England, insofar as it is not repugnant to the principles of the Bill of Rights and Constitution of this Commonwealth, shall continue in full force within the same, and be the rule of decision, except as altered by the General Assembly _ 1-11 Acts of Parliament The right and benefit of all writs, remedial and judicial, given by any statute or act of Parliament, made in aid of the common law prior to the fourth year of the reign of James the First, of a general nature, not local to England, shall still be saved, insofar as the same are consistent with the Bill of Rights and Constitution of this Commonwealth and the Acts of Assembly."

I hope by now when you read the below statute, you recognize when they say public's interest they are not talking about the people that voted them into office.

Maine

_ 571. Legislative findings and purpose

"The Legislature finds and declares that the intertidal lands of the State are impressed with a public trust and that the State is responsible for protection of the public's interest in this land. [1985, c. 782 (new).]

The Legislature further finds and declares that this public trust is part of the common law of Maine and generally derived from the practices, conditions and needs in Maine, from English Common Law and from the Massachusetts Colonial Ordinance of 1641-47. The public trust is an evolving doctrine reflective of the customs, traditions, heritage and habits of the Maine people. In Maine, the doctrine has diverged from the laws of England and Massachusetts. The public trust encompasses those uses of intertidal land essential to the health and welfare of the Maine people, which uses include, but are not limited to, fishing, fowling, navigation, use as a footway between points along the shore and use for recreational purposes. These recreational uses are among the most important to the Maine people today who use intertidal land for relaxation from the pressures of modern society and for enjoyment of nature's beauty. [1985, c. 782 (new).]

The Legislature further finds and declares that the protection of the public uses referred to in this chapter is of great public interest and grave concern to the State. [1985, c. 782 (new).]"

Vermont

VERMONT STATUTES ONLINE

Title 24. Municipal and County Government

Chapter 65. Public Lands and Funds

"_ 2401. PUBLIC LANDS; DUTIES OF SELECTMEN

The selectmen shall have the care of lands in the town granted under the authority of the British Government as glebes for the use of the Church of England and now by law granted to such town for the use of schools, and

lands granted to the use of the ministry or the social worship of God, and lands granted to the first settled minister, and not appropriated according to law.

2402. RIGHT OF POSSESSION

The selectmen shall be entitled to the possession of such lands, except when the same have been otherwise disposed of according to law. They may commence, prosecute or defend, in the name of the town, any action necessary to recover or protect such possession, or recover damages for injuries done to such lands.

2404. RENTS OF OTHER LANDS, HOW DIVIDED AND APPLIED

The rents of lands granted to the use of the ministry or social worship of God, and the rents of lands granted to the first settled minister, shall annually, on February 1, be equally divided by the selectmen among the different organized religious societies in town that maintain public worship at least a fourth of the Sabbaths in the year. If there is not such a society, the same shall be covered into the treasury, and may be appropriated to pay for preaching the gospel or for the support of public schools, or for the improvement or care of public burial grounds, as such town by a vote in town meeting directs, until a religious society is organized in the town.

2405. CONTRACT UNDER PREVIOUS LAW NOT AFFECTED

Section 2404 of this title shall not affect a lease of such lands or a contract relating to or disposition of the same under previous law.

2406. CONVEYANCE OF LEASEHOLDS, TRUST FUNDS

Educational, ecclesiastical or municipal corporations may convey by deed the fee simple in lands the title to or use of which is held by such corporations under state or colonial grant for purposes defined in such grants. Such conveyance may be made to the owner and holder of leasehold rights in such land if such lands are then held under lease, but shall not be made to other than such holders of leasehold interests except subject to such leasehold interest, if any, or simultaneously with the extinguishment thereof. Such lands may be condemned in accordance with and in the manner provided by law. The funds received in consideration of such conveyance or awarded such corporations as damages in condemnation proceedings shall be kept intact, in trust, by such corporations as endowment funds, and the income only shall be used for the purposes for which such lands were originally granted. Such lands as may be sold, conveyed or condemned as provided in this section shall thereafter be subject to taxation as are other lands."

New Jersey

PROPERTY TITLE 46

46:1-1. Words and phrases defined

"As used in this title, except where the context clearly indicates a contrary intent, the terms "county recording officer" and "office of the county recording officer" mean the register of deeds and mortgages and his office in counties having such an officer and office, and the county clerk and his office in the other counties."

46:2-1. Titles, rights and interests preserved

"Nothing in this title contained shall in any way affect, abridge or abrogate any title to or rights or interests in any real estate or personal property lawfully given, acquired and existing at the time when the Revised Statutes take effect."

The main thing I want you to understand, and I believe most do, as I said earlier, our laws were based on the Common law of England, all states in union of the United States are, except one. That's right one state out of the fifty is not under English Common law. A lot of you may think this must be Texas, but it's not. The one state not subject to, or formed under English common law is New York, New York City is responsible for not only our demise, but the entire World's. New York City is the alter ego of London, and the other banking centers for the Banksters of the World to operate. New York City is the home of the Bankers, the World Trade Center, the Stock Market, the World Bank's control via the IMF and the United Nations, etc. The controlling center for all banking, communication and super computers containing data on everyone and every transaction for the Bankers to control the Worlds population and their leaders, through their finances, with the U.N. as their police force and

NATO as prosecutor of the Law Of The Flag and Conqueror of new Empires. When you read the very revealing statements in the New York statutes below you will see, they declare themselves not to be under English Common law, by section 70, sec. 71 deals with Acts and sec. 72 deals with Resolutions.

If you would like to understand how this fits into God's Word, that is New York City, read Rev. 17-18, Jer. 51 and Isa. 13. I wrote on this subject years ago and I won't go into it here other than to say, New York City is the Biblical Babylon as you can read for yourself, as God Almighty defines Babylon in Rev. 18, no other City in the World meets His definition.

New York

New York State Consolidated Laws: General Construction

ARTICLE 3

ANCIENT STATUTES AND RESOLUTIONS

"Section

70. Statutes of England and Great Britain inoperative in this state.

71. Acts of the legislature of the colony of New York inoperative.

72. Resolutions of the congress of the colony and the convention of New York inoperative.

S 70. Statutes of England and Great Britain inoperative in this state. A statute of England or Great Britain shall not be deemed to have had any force or effect in this state since May first, seventeen hundred and eighty-eight.

S 71. Acts of the legislature of the colony of New York inoperative. Acts of the legislature of the colony of New York shall not be deemed to have had any force or effect in this state since December twenty-ninth, eighteen hundred and twenty-eight.

S 72. Resolutions of the congress of the colony and the convention of New York inoperative. The resolutions of the congress of the colony of New York and of the convention of the state of New York, shall not be deemed to be the laws of this state hereafter."

Texas

Civil Practice and Remedies Code

TITLE 2. TRIAL, JUDGMENT, AND APPEAL

SUBTITLE A. GENERAL PROVISIONS

CHAPTER 5. RULE OF DECISION

Sec. 5.001. Rule of Decision.

"The rule of decision in this state consists of those portions of the common law of England that are not inconsistent with the constitution or the laws of this state, the constitution of this state, and the laws of this state. Acts 1985, 69th Leg., ch. 959, Sec. 1, eff. Sept. 1, 1985"

North Carolina

"Chapter 40A. Eminent Domain. ARTICLE 1. General. _ 40A-1.

Exclusive provisions. It is the intent of the General Assembly that the procedures provided by this Chapter shall be the exclusive condemnation procedures to be used in this State by all private condemnors and all local public condemnors. All other provisions in laws, charters, or local acts authorizing the use of other procedures by municipal or county governments or agencies or political subdivisions thereof, or by corporations, associations or other persons are hereby repealed effective January 1, 1982. Provided, that any condemnation proceeding initiated prior to January 1, 1982, may be lawfully completed pursuant to the provisions previously existing. This chapter shall not repeal any provision of a local act enlarging or limiting the purposes for which property may be condemned. Notwithstanding the language of G.S. 40A-3(b), this Chapter also shall not repeal any provision of a local act creating any

substantive or procedural requirement or limitation on the authority of a local public condemnor to exercise the power of eminent domain outside of its boundaries."

"40A-2. Definitions. As used in this Chapter the following words and phrases have the meanings indicated unless the context clearly requires another meaning:

(1) "Condemnation" means the procedure prescribed by law for exercising the power of eminent domain.

(2) "Condemnor" means those listed in G.S. 40A-3.

(3) "Eminent domain" means the power to divest right, title or interest from the owner of property and vest it in the possessor of the power against the will of the owner upon the payment of just compensation for the right, title or interest divested.

(4) "Judge" means a resident judge of the superior court in the district where the cause is pending, or special judge residing in said district, or a judge of the superior court assigned to hold the courts of said district or an emergency or special judge holding court in the county where the cause is pending.

(5) "Owner" includes the plural when appropriate and means any person having an interest or estate in the property.

(6) "Person" includes the plural when appropriate and means a natural person, and any legal entity capable of owning or having interest in property.

(7) "Property" means any right, title, or interest in land, including leases and options to buy or sell. "Property" also includes rights of access, rights-of-way, easements, water rights, air rights, and any other privilege or appurtenance in or to the possession, use, and enjoyment of land."

"40A-3. By whom right may be exercised.

(a) Private Condemnors. -- For the public use or benefit, the persons or organizations listed below shall have the power of eminent domain and may acquire by purchase or condemnation property for the stated purposes and other works which are authorized by law.

(1) Corporations, bodies politic or persons have the power of eminent domain for the construction of railroads, power generating facilities, substations, switching stations, microwave towers, roads, alleys, access railroads, turnpikes, street railroads, plank roads, tramroads, canals, telegraphs, telephones, electric power lines, electric lights, public water supplies, public sewerage systems, flumes, bridges, and pipelines or mains originating in North Carolina for the transportation of petroleum products, coal, gas, limestone or minerals. Land condemned for any liquid pipelines shall."

I guess now is a good time to deal with the pipe dreams we have been taught and allowed to believe, reinforced by the governments school system, in the selective teaching of history, also, parroted by the media. The pipe dream as I said earlier is our belief we do, or can possess land in this country, under the present law, in allodial title. Notice I said under the present law, this is the key to the king's power, retaining possession to his Corporation, the Crown. What did we do at the beginning of this nation? Declare our law to be English common law, confirming the king's Corporation and the law that created it and protects it even today.

"Corporation Sole: A corporation consisting of one person only and his successors. An older concept of the status of a king or a bishop as incorporated in order to give to them and their successors legal capacities and advantages, particularly that of perpetuity, which they could not have in their natural capacities." Ballentine's Law Dictionary, Third Ed., 1969

"Reversion. The residue of an estate and left in the grantor, to commence in possession after the determination of some particular estate granted out by him. The return of land to the grantor and his heirs after the grant is over." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, vol. 3, 1914

"651. b. Civil corporations (1) Lay corporations.But, first, as I have laid it down as a rule that the founder, his heirs, or assigns, are the visitors of all lay corporations, let us inquire what is meant by the founder. The confounder of all corporations in the strictest and original sense is the king alone, for he only can incorporate a society; and in civil incorporations, such as mayor and commonalty, etc., where there are no possessions or endowments given to the body, there is no other founder but the king:" Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. 1 pg. 685

654. 10. Dissolution of corporations.But the body politic may also itself be dissolved in several ways; which dissolution is the civil death of the corporation: and in this case their lands and tenements shall revert to the person, or his heirs, who granted them to the corporation: for the law doth annex a condition to every such grant, that if the corporation be dissolved, the grantor shall have the lands again, only during the life of the

corporation; which may endure forever: but, when that life is determined by the dissolution of the body politic, the grantor takes it back by reversion, as in the case of every other grant for life." Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. 1 pg. 700

Not to get ahead of myself, we first declared our Independence, sounded good, but why would you place your neck back under the yoke, the law that subjected you? Simple, as history proves, many of our fore fathers, including Washington did not want to be separated from the king. Some stood to lose lands and title, others understood they were subjects of the king and liked it. History shows they were not at odds with being subjects of the king, just his policies, regarding taxes and their government being so far removed; commerce and legal convenience demanded representation here, but still controlled by the king.

The king being so far removed from his possessions in America, misjudged his subjects needs, rebellion turned into War. But as always, the belligerents just wanted their redress heard, and our fore fathers knowing full well English history and how the game was played, knew the king would capitulate and make the concessions needed, never dreaming they would have what appeared to be a separate sovereign country at the end of the War. What about this War, did we win? Well let's look at history, I have covered this before, but it bears repeating.

Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, but the document read, Capitulation at Yorktown. Did Cornwallis surrender, or did they just quit fighting because the king, made the necessary capitulations to the colonist demands? Well, did Cornwallis surrender his arms, in other words, did he and his troops lay down their arms and leave unarmed? No. Did Cornwallis surrender his colors, the king's flag? No. Anyone that knows anything about War and Conquest, knows the flag of the surrendering enemy has to be surrendered; if not, you just fought a battle, and did not win the war. Was Cornwallis and his army allowed to return to England armed and with their colors? Yes. Were British subjects allowed to retain their lands and possessions in America? Yes Was the king removed from his throne and his laws defeated, by his removal? No. Tell me again America, we won the Revolutionary War? I'm sorry, the facts don't support what you want to believe is the case.

Now, to the so-called 1783 Paris Treaty, wherein the king's possessions were turned over to us without his losing the War. Benjamin Franklin spent almost the entire war traveling back and forth from France and England working out the terms of the Treaty, excuse me GRANT, from the king of England. Let me see, we did not win the War, we did not dictate the terms of surrender, the king's barrister's along with the esquires chosen from America, Franklin, Jay and Adams, wrote the document. A document wherein the king's law remained in force, and he GRANTED lands to his new Corporation, the United States. However, he did not grant to his Corporation the rights to the minerals existing and all to be found in the future. As I have said before, he declared in his Charters, ownership to all minerals, and that he was to receive a portion of the gain/profit in this country forever. Go back and read the quotes earlier in this paper. Also, how can the king do anything else but give fee simple title, when his law provides for only him to have allodial title. Did he change his law? NO. Could he change the un-revocable Trust his Charters established for all his heirs and successors? No. No, and could not, without destroying his throne, his Crown (corporation) and his law, thereby conquering himself. You see that is the only way under the king's law to own land by allodial title, via conquest, as the conqueror. This is why no country has defeated the king of England and his Crown, because if his law exists wherein the Corporate Charter was created, and the king and his heirs remain, the king's Crown and Charters remain in force.

Let's look at another source, here are several relevant quotes I pulled out of the Book written by Frederic Maitland, 1901, The Crown as Corporation.

"In 1522 Fineux C.J. after telling how some corporations are made by the king, others by the pope, others by both king and pope, adds that there are corporations by the common law, for, says he, "the parliament of the king and the lords and the commons are a corporation."(7*) Y.B. 14 hen. VIII, f. 3 (Mich. pl. 2). The Crown as Corporation, Frederic Maitland, 1901

"The king has two capacities, for he has two bodies, the one whereof is a body natural... the other is a body

politic, and the members thereof are his subjects, and he and his subjects together compose the corporation, as Southcote said, and he is incorporated with them and they with him, and he is the head and they are the members, and he has the sole government of them."(12*) Plowden, p. 234. The Crown as Corporation, Frederic Maitland, 1901

"But, says an Act of 1738, the said premises "being vested in His Majesty, his heirs and successors in his politick capacity, which in consideration of law never dies, it may create a doubt whether the tenants of the said estates ought... to pay such fines... on the death of His present Majesty (whom God long preserve for the benefit of his People) or On the death of any future King or Queen." So the tenants are to pay as they would have paid "in case such King or Queen so dying was considered as a private person only and not in his or her politick capacity".(27*) (II Geo. II, c. 30, pr. and s. 1.) Thus that artificial person, the king in his politick capacity, who is a trustee for the Publick, must be deemed to die now and then for the benefit of cestui que trust.

But it was of "the Publick" that we were speaking, and I believe that "the Publick" first becomes prominent in connexion with the National Debt. Though much might be done for us by a slightly denaturalized king, he could not do all that was requisite. Some proceedings of one of his predecessors, who closed the Exchequer and ruined the goldsmiths, had made our king no good borrower. So the Publick had to take his place. The money might be "advanced to His Majesty", but the Publick had to owe it. This idea could not be kept off the statute book. "Whereas," said an Act of 1786, "the Publick stands indebted to" the East India Company in a sum of four millions and more."(28*) 26 Geo. III, c. 62.
The Crown as Corporation, Frederic Maitland, 1901

"This is natural, for we may, if we will, trace the beginnings of a national debt back to days when a king borrows money and charges the repayment of it upon a specific tax; perhaps he will even appoint his creditor to collect that tax, and so enable him to repay himself."
The Crown as Corporation, Frederic Maitland, 1901

"In 1714 the Governor, Council and General Assembly of New York passed a long Act "for the paying and discharging the several debts and sums of money claimed as debts of this Colony". A preamble stated that some of the debts of the Colony had not been paid because the Governors had misapplied and extravagantly expended "the revenue given by the loyal subjects aforesaid to Her Majesty and Her Royal Predecessors, Kings and Queens of England, sufficient for the honorable as well as necessary support of their Government here." "This Colony", the preamble added, "in strict justice is in no manner of way obliged to pay many of the said claims"; however, in order "to restore the Publick Credit", they were to be paid.(35*)(Act of 1714 13 Anne) Here we have a Colony which can be bound even in strict justice to pay money. What the great colonies did the small colonies did also."
The Crown as Corporation, Frederic Maitland, 1901

"But then comes the lawyer with theories in his head, and begins by placing a legal estate in what he calls the Crown or Her Majesty. "In construing these enactments, it must always be kept in view that wherever public land with its incidents is described as 'the property of' or as 'belonging to' the Dominion or a Province, these expressions merely import that the right to its beneficial use, or to its proceeds, has been appropriated to the Dominion or the Province, as the case may be, and is subject to the control of its legislature, the land itself being vested in the Crown."(44*)St. Catherine's Milling and Lumber Co. v. The Queen (1888), 14 App. Cas. 46. esp. p. 56; A.-G. of Brit. Columbia v. A.-G. of Canada, 14 App. Cas. 295; A.-G. of Ontario v. Mercer (1883), 8 App. Cas. 767; A.-G. of Canada v. As.-G. of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia [1898] A.C. 700."
The Crown as Corporation, Frederic Maitland, 1901

"Although the Secretary of State [for India] is a body corporate, or in the same position as a body corporate, for the purpose of contracts, and of suing and being sued, yet he is not a body corporate for the purpose of holding property. Such property as formerly vested, or would have vested, in the East India Company now vests in the Crown."(45*) Ilbert, Government of India (3rd. ed. 1915), p. 196"

The Crown as Corporation, Frederic Maitland, 1901

In the quote below from Maitland, you will see that even the Postmaster General was used to secure the king's possessions in America, and was a vehicle used by the king, through the President and his powers as Commander-in-Chief, to expand the king's land west, via the king's law going west with the laws governing the mail. After that, is a quote from President Monroe, arguing that such powers were not being used and did not exist, he would no doubt have to eat a huge amount of crow today, if he was alive today, and saw the Dept. of Transportation, and the power they have been granted over the Nation's roads, and skies. You will also see the need for the king to incorporate, and that a grant of sovereign land ownership in was given to the War Dept. Sounds like the military's loyalty was bought and paid for, leading up to conquest of America, after the Civil War.

"In 1840 the Postmaster-General and his successors "is and are" made "a body corporate" for the purpose of holding and taking conveyances and leases of lands and hereditaments for the service of the Post Office. From the Act that effected this incorporation we may learn that the Postmaster as a mere individual had been holding land in trust for the Crown.(52*) 3&4 Vict. c. 96, s. 67[now - Ed. VII, c. 48, s. 45] One of the main reasons, I take it, for erecting some new corporations sole was that our "Crown", being more or less identifiable with the King, it was difficult to make the Crown a leaseholder or copyholder in a direct and simple fashion. The Treasurer of Public Charities was made a corporation sole in 1853.(53*) 16 & 17 Vict. c. 137, s. 47. Then in 1855 the Secretary of State intrusted with the seals of the War Department was enabled to hold land as a corporation sole.(54*) 18&19 Vict. c. 117, s. 2. Perhaps if there were a Lord High Admiral he would be a corporation sole vel quasi.(55*) 27&28 Vict. C. 57, s."

The Crown as Corporation, Frederic Maitland, 1901

"If the United States possessed, the power contended for under this grant, might they not, in adopting the roads of the individual states for the carriage of the mail, as has been done, assume jurisdiction over them, and preclude a right to interfere with or alter them? Might they not establish turnpikes, and exercise all the other acts of sovereignty, above stated, over such roads, necessary to protect them from injury, and defray the expense of repairing them? Surely, if the right exists, these consequences necessarily followed, as soon as the road was established. The absurdity of such a pretension must be apparent to all, who examine it. In this way, a large portion of the territory of every state might be taken from it; for there is scarcely a road in any state, which will not be used for the transportation of the mail. A new field for legislation and internal government would thus be opened." President Monroe's Message, of 4th May, 1822, p. 24 to 27. .

1 Johnson's Dict. ad verb.; Webster's Dict. ibid.

Post Routes

"All public roads and highways while kept up and maintained. 39 USC 482. All the waters of the United States during the time the mail is carried thereon, all the railroads or parts of railroads and all air routes which are now, or hereafter may be, in operation; all canals and plank roads during the time the mail is carried thereon; the road on which may mail is carried to supply any court house which may be without a mail; the road on which mail is carried under contract made by the Postmaster General for extending the line of post to supply mails to post offices not on any established route, during the time such mail is carried thereon; and all letter-carrier routes established in any city or town for the collection and delivery of mail matter." 39 USC 481.

Below is the Quote section, I've also added The Treaty of Verona, a quote by Senator Owen, from the Congressional Record, 1916 on the same Treaty, and last but not least, the Jesuit Oath. In these documents you will see thee hidden agenda of the Pope, had bought this information out in previous emails, but now is the proper time to re air this subject, so you can understand the relevance of the Informer's comments, in his introduction. As the Informer said, in this last chapter I have dealt primarily with our nexus with the king of England, so as not to cloud the issue anymore than it is, by dealing with more than this subject.

Conclusion

THE UNITED STATES IS STILL A BRITISH COLONY!
THE END

RELEVANT QUOTES

"Their wealth was considered as our wealth. Whatever money was sent out to them, it was said, came all back to us by the balance of trade, and we could never become a farthing the poorer by any expense which we could lay out upon them. They were our own in every respect, and it was an expense laid out upon the improvement of our own property and for the profitable employment of our own people."

1776, AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND CAUSES OF THE WEALTH OF NATIONS by Adam Smith

OUR FORE FATHERS WANTED THE BENEFITS AND PRIVILEGES WITHOUT PAYING THE TAX TO THE KING.

"Resolved, 4. That the foundation of English liberty, and of all free government, is a right in the people to participate in their legislative council: and as the English colonists are not represented, and from their local and other circumstances, can not properly be represented in the British Parliament, they are entitled to a free and exclusive power of legislation in their several provincial legislatures, where their right of representation can alone be preserved, in all cases of taxation and internal polity, subject only to the negative of their sovereign, in such manner as has been heretofore used and accustomed. But, from the necessity of the case, and a regard to the mutual interest of both countries, WE CHEERFULLY CONSENT TO THE OPERATION OF SUCH ACTS OF THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT, as are BONA FIDE, restrained to the regulation of our external commerce, for the PURPOSE OF SECURING THE COMMERCIAL ADVANTAGES OF THE WHOLE EMPIRE TO THE MOTHER COUNTRY, and the COMMERCIAL BENEFITS OF ITS RESPECTIVE MEMBERS; excluding every idea of taxation, internal or ETERNAL, for raising a revenue on the SUBJECTS IN AMERICA, without their consent." Declaration of Rights, from September 5, 1774 (The forefathers wanted the commercial benefits without paying the taxes that go hand in hand, it does not work that way Patriots.)

"Resolved, 7. That these, His Majesty's colonies, are likewise entitled to all the IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED and confirmed to them by ROYAL CHARTERS, or secured by their several codes of provincial laws." Declaration of Rights, from September 5, 1774

4. WHERE THE PRESENT DAY TAXES COME FROM.

"Before I enter upon the examination of particular taxes, it is necessary to premise the four following maxims with regard to taxes in general.

I. The subjects of every state ought to contribute towards the support of the government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities; that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the state. The expense of government to the individuals of a great nation is like the expense of management to the joint tenants of a great estate, who are all obliged to contribute in proportion to their respective interests in the estate. In the observation or neglect of this maxim consists what is called the equality or inequality of taxation. Every tax, it must be observed once for all, which falls finally upon one only of the three sorts of revenue above mentioned, is necessarily unequal in so far as it does not affect the other two. In the following examination of different taxes I shall seldom take much further notice of this sort of inequality, but shall, in most cases, confine my observations to that inequality which is occasioned by a particular tax falling unequally even upon that particular sort of private revenue which is affected by it.

II. The tax which each individual is bound to pay ought to be certain, and not arbitrary. The time of payment, the manner of payment, the quantity to be paid, ought all to be clear and plain to the contributor, and to every other person. Where it is otherwise, every person subject to the tax is put more or less in the power of the tax-

gathered, who can either aggravate the tax upon any obnoxious contributor, or extort, by the terror of such aggravation, some present or perquisite to himself. The uncertainty of taxation encourages the insolence and favours the corruption of an order of men who are naturally unpopular, even where they are neither insolent nor corrupt. The certainty of what each individual ought to pay is, in taxation, a matter of so great importance that a very considerable degree of inequality, it appears, I believe, from the experience of all nations, is not near so great an evil as a very small degree of uncertainty.

III. Every tax ought to be levied at the time, or in the manner, in which it is most likely to be convenient for the contributor to pay it. A tax upon the rent of land or of houses, payable at the same term at which such rents are usually paid, is levied at the time when it is most likely to be convenient for the contributor to pay; or, when he is most likely to have wherewithal to pay. Taxes upon such consumable goods as are articles of luxury are all finally paid by the consumer, and generally in a manner that is very convenient for him. He pays them by little and little, as he has occasion to buy the goods. As he is at liberty, too, either to buy, or not to buy, as he pleases, it must be his own fault if he ever suffers any considerable inconveniency from such taxes.

IV. Every tax ought to be so contrived as both to take out and to keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible over and above what it brings into the public treasury of the state. A tax may either take out or keep out of the pockets of the people a great deal more than it brings into the public treasury, in the four following ways. First, the levying of it may require a great number of officers, whose salaries may eat up the greater part of the produce of the tax, and whose perquisites may impose another additional tax upon the people. Secondly, it may obstruct the industry the people, and discourage them from applying to certain branches of business which might give maintenance and unemployment to great multitudes. While it obliges the people to pay, it may thus diminish, or perhaps destroy, some of the funds which might enable them more easily to do so. Thirdly, by the forfeitures and other penalties which those unfortunate individuals incur who attempt unsuccessfully to evade the tax, it may frequently ruin them, and thereby put an end to the benefit which the community might have received from the employment of their capitals. An injudicious tax offers a great temptation to smuggling. But the penalties of smuggling must rise in proportion to the temptation. The law, contrary to all the ordinary principles of justice, first creates the temptation, and then punishes those who yield to it; and it commonly enhances the punishment, too, in proportion to the very circumstance which ought certainly to alleviate it, the temptation to commit the crime. Fourthly, by subjecting the people to the frequent visits and the odious examination of the tax-gatherers, it may expose them to much unnecessary trouble, vexation, and oppression; and though vexation is not, strictly speaking, expense, it is certainly equivalent to the expense at which every man would be willing to redeem himself from it. It is in some one or other of these four different ways that taxes are frequently so much more burdensome to the people than they are beneficial to the sovereign."

1776, AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND CAUSES OF THE WEALTH OF NATIONS by Adam Smith

"It is not contrary to justice that both Ireland and America should contribute towards the discharge of the public debt of Great Britain. That debt has been contracted in support of the government established by the Revolution, a government to which the Protestants of Ireland owe, not only the whole authority which they at present enjoy in their own country, but every security which they possess for their liberty, their property, and their religion; a government to which several of the colonies of America owe their present charters, and consequently their present constitution, and to which all the colonies of America owe the liberty, security, and property which they have ever since enjoyed. That public debt has been contracted in the defense, not of Great Britain alone, but of all the different provinces of the empire; the immense debt contracted in the late war in particular, and a great part of that contracted in the war before, were both properly contracted in defense of America."

1776, AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND CAUSES OF THE WEALTH OF NATIONS by Adam Smith

"The expense of the peace establishment of the colonies was, before the commencement of the present disturbances, very considerable, and is an expense which may, and if no revenue can be drawn from them ought certainly to be saved altogether. This constant expense in time of peace, though very great, is insignificant in comparison with what the defense of the colonies has cost us in time of war. The last war, which was undertaken altogether on account of the colonies, cost Great Britain, it has already been observed, upwards of ninety millions. The Spanish war of 1739 was principally undertaken on their account, in which, and in the French war

that was the consequence of it, Great Britain spent upwards of forty millions, a great part of which ought justly to be charged to the colonies. In those two wars the colonies cost Great Britain much more than double the sum which the national debt amounted to before the commencement of the first of them. Had it not been for those wars that debt might, and probably would by this time, have been completely paid; and had it not been for the colonies, the former of those wars might not, and the latter certainly would not have been undertaken. It was because the colonies were supposed to be provinces of the British empire that this expense was laid out upon them. But countries which contribute neither revenue nor military force towards the support of the empire cannot be considered as provinces. They may perhaps be considered as appendages, as a sort of splendid and showy equipage of the empire. But if the empire can no longer support the expense of keeping up this equipage, it ought certainly to lay it down; and if it cannot raise its revenue in proportion to its expense, it ought, at least, to accommodate its expense to its revenue. If the colonies, notwithstanding their refusal to submit to British taxes, are still to be considered as provinces of the British empire, their defense in some future war may cost Great Britain as great an expense as it ever has done in any former war. The rulers of Great Britain have, for more than a century past, amused the people with the imagination that they possessed a great empire on the west side of the Atlantic. This empire, however, has hitherto existed in imagination only. It has hitherto been, not an empire, but the project of an empire; not a gold mine, but the project of a gold mine; a project which has cost, which continues to cost, and which, if pursued in the same way as it has been hitherto, is likely to cost, immense expense, without being likely to bring any profit; for the effects of the monopoly of the colony trade, it has been shown, are, to the great body of the people, mere loss instead of profit."

1776, AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE AND CAUSES OF THE WEALTH OF NATIONS by Adam Smith

5. THE FEDERAL RESERVE SISTER OF THE EXCHEQUER.

Exchequer: "The English department of revenue. A very ancient court of record, set up by William the Conqueror, as a part of the aula regia, and intended principally to order the revenues of the crown, and to recover the king's debts and duties. It was called exchequer, "scaccharium," from the checked cloth, resembling a chessboard, which covers the table." Ballentine's Law Dictionary

Exchequer: "That department of the English government which has charge of the collection of the national revenue; the treasury department." Black's Law Dictionary 4th ed.

Exchequer: "In English Law. A department of the government which has the management of the collection of the king's revenue." Bouvier's Law Dictionary 1914 ed.

Court of Exchequer: "56. The court of exchequer is inferior in rank not only to the court of king's bench, but to the common pleas also: but I have chosen to consider it in this order, on account of its double capacity, as a court of law and a court of equity [44] also. It is a very ancient court of record, set up by William the Conqueror, as a part of the aula regia, through regulated and reduced to its present order by King Edward I; and intended principally to order the revenues of the crown, and to recover the king's debts and duties. It is called the exchequer, scaccharium, from the chequed cloth, resembling a chess-board, which covers the table there; and on which, when certain of the king's accounts are made up, the sums are marked and scored with counters. It consists of two divisions; the receipt of the exchequer, which manages to royal revenue, and with which these Commentaries have no concern; and the court or judicial part of it, which is again subdivided into a court of equity, and a court of common law."

Black Stone Commentaries Book III, pg 1554

Court of Exchequer: "An English superior court with jurisdiction of matter of law and matters involving government revenue."

Ballentine's Law Dictionary

Court of Exchequer: "A court for the correction and prevention of errors of law in the three superior common-law courts of the kingdom.

A court of exchequer chamber was first erected by statute 31 Edw. III. C. 12, to determine causes upon writs of error from the common-law side of the exchequer court. It consisted of the chancellor, treasurer, and the "justices and other sage persons as to them seemeth." The judges were merely assistants. A second court of exchequer chamber was instituted by statute 27 Eliz. C. 8, consisting of the justices of the common pleas and the exchequer, or any six of them, which had jurisdiction in error of cases in the king's bench. In exchequer chamber substituted in their place as an intermediate court of appeal between the three common-law courts and

Parliament. It consisted of the judges of the two courts which had not rendered the judgment in the court below. It is now merged in the High Court of Justice." Bouvier's Law Dictionary 1914 ed.

The equity court of the exchequer: "57. The court of equity is held in the exchequer chamber before the lord treasurer, the chancellor of the exchequer, the chief baron, and three puisne' ones. These Mr. Selden conjectures to have been anciently made out of such as were barons of the kingdom, or parliamentary barons; and thence to have derived their name: which conjecture receives great strength from Bracton's explanation of magna carta, c.14, which directs that the earls and barons be amerced by their peers; that is, says he, by the barons of the exchequer. The primary and original business of this court is to call the king's debtors to account, by bill filed by the attorney general; and to recover any lands, tenements, or hereditaments, any goods, chattels, or other profits or benefits, belonging to the crown. So that by their original constitution the jurisdiction of the courts of common pleas, king's bench, and exchequer, was entirely separate and distinct; the common pleas being intended to decide all controversies between subject and subject; the king's bench to correct all crimes and misdemeanors that amount to a breach of the peace, the king being then the plaintiff, as such offenses are in open derogation of the jura regalia (regal rights) of his crown; and the exchequer to adjust [45] and recover his revenue, wherein the king also is plaintiff, as the withholding and nonpayment thereof is an injury to his jura fiscalia (fiscal rights). But, as by a fiction almost all sorts of civil actions are now allowed to be brought in the king's bench, in like manner by another fiction all kinds of personal suits may be prosecuted in the court of exchequer. For as all the officers and ministers of this court have, like those of other superior courts, the privilege of suing and being sued only in their own court; so exchequer, are privileged to sue and implead all manner of persons in the same court of equity that they themselves are called into. They have likewise privilege to sue and implead one another, or any stranger, in the same kind of common-law actions (where the personalty only is concerned) as are prosecuted in the court of common pleas."

Black Stone Commentaries Book III, pg 1554

The common-law court of the exchequer: "58. This gives original to the common-law part of their jurisdiction, which was established merely for the benefit of the king's accountants, and is exercised by the barons only of the exchequer, and not the treasurer or chancellor. The writ upon which the plaintiff suggests that he is the king's farmer or debtor, and that the defendant hath done him the injury or damage complained of; quo minus sufficient exist, by which he is the less able, to pay the king his debt or rent. And these suits are expressly directed, by what is called the statute of Rutland, to be confined to such matters only as specially concern the king or his ministers of the exchequer. And by the articuli super cartas it is enacted that no common pleas be thenceforth holden in the exchequer, contrary to the form of the great charter. But not, by the suggestion of privilege, any person may be admitted to sue in the exchequer as well as the king's accountant. The surmise of being debtor to the king is therefore become matter of form and mere words of course, and the court is open to all the nation equally. The same holds with regard to the equity side of the court: for there any person may file [46] a bill against another upon a bare suggestion that he is the king's accountant; but whether he is so or not is never controverted. In this court, on the nonpayment of titles; in which case the surmise of being the king's debto is no fiction, they being bound to pay him their first-fruits, and annual tenths. But the chancery has of late years obtained a large share in this business."

Black Stone Commentaries Book III, pg 1555

Definition of a legal fiction: For a discussion of fictions in law, see chapter II of Maine's Ancient Law, and Pollock's note D in his edition of the Ancient Law. Blackstone gives illustrations of legal fictions on pages 43, 45, 153, 203 of this book. Mr Justice Curtis (Jurisdiction of United States Courts, 2d ed., 148) gives the following instance of a fiction in our practice:

"A suit by or against a corporation in its corporate name may be presumed to be a suit by or against citizens of the state which created the corporate body, and no averment or denial to the contrary is admissible for the purpose of withdrawing the suit from the jurisdiction of a court of the United States.

There is the Roman fiction: The court first decides the law, presumes all the members are citizens of the state which created the corporation, and then says, 'you shall not traverse that presumption'; and that is the law now. (Authors note-by your residence you are incorporated) Under it, the courts of the United States constantly

entertain suits by or against corporations. (Muller v. Dows, 94 U. S. 444, 24 L. Ed. 207.) It has been so frequently settled, that there is not the slightest reason to suppose that it will ever be departed from by the court. It has been repeated over and over again in subsequent decisions; and the supreme court seem entirely satisfied that it is the right ground to stand upon; and, as I am now going to state to you, they have applied it in some cases which go beyond, much beyond, these decisions to which I have referred. So that when a suit is to be brought in a court of the United States by or against a corporation, by reason of the character of the parties, you have only to say that this corporation (after naming it correctly) was created by a law of the state; and that is exactly the same in its consequences as if you could allege, and did allege, that the corporation was a citizen of that state. According to the present decisions, it is not necessary you should say that the members of that corporation are citizens of Massachusetts. They have passed beyond that. You have only to say that the corporation was created by a law of the state of Massachusetts, and has its principal place of business in that state; and that makes it, for the purposes of jurisdiction, the same as if it were a citizen of that state" See Pound, Readings in Roman Law, 95n.

Black Stone Commentaries Book III, pg 1553

Statute of Mortmain, 1279

"The king to his Justices of the Bench, greeting. Where as of late it was provided that religious men should not enter into the fees of any without the will and licence of the lords in chief of whom these fees are held immediately; and such religious men have, notwithstanding, later entered as well into their own fees as into those of others, appropriated, them to themselves, and buying them, and sometimes receiving them from the gift of others, whereby the services which are due of such fees, and which at the beginning, were provided for the defence of the realm, are unduly withdrawn, and the lords in chief do lose their escheats of the same; we, therefore, to the profit of our realm, wishing to provide a fit remedy in this matter, by advice of our prelates, counts and other subjects of our realm who are of our council, have provided, established, and ordained, that no person, religious or other, whatsoever presume to buy or sell any lands or tenements, , or under colour of gift or lease, or of any other term or title whatever to receive them from any one, or in any other craft or by wile to appropriate them to himself, whereby such lands and tenements may come into mortmain under pain of forfeiture of the same. We have provided also that if any person, religious or other, do presume either by craft or wile to offend against this statute it shall be lawful for us and for other immediate lords in chief of the fee so alienated, to enter it within a year from the time of such alienation and to hold it in fee as an inheritance. And if the immediate lord in chief shall -be negligent and be not willing to enter into such fee within the year, then it shall be lawful for the next mediate lord in chief, within the half year following, to enter that fee and to hold it, as has been said; and thus each mediate lord may do if the next lord be negligent in entering such fee as as been said. And if all such chief lords of such fee, who shall be of full age, and within the four seas and out of prison, shall before one year negligent or remiss in this matter, we, straightway after the year is completed from the time when such purchases, mgifts, or appropriations of another kind happen to have been made, shall take such lands and tenements into our hand, and shall enfief others therein by certain services to be rendered thence to us for the defence of our kingdom ; saving to the lords in chief of the same fees their wards, escheats and other things which pertain to them, and the services therefrom due and accustomed. And therefore we command you to cause the aforesaid statute to be read before you, and from henceforth firmly kept and observed. Witness myself at Westminster, the 15th day of November, the 7h year of our reign."

Could the President as trustee, in behalf of the Crown, sell what it does not control, as trustee? No. Will the unsuspecting purchasers of the sold property own it? No. They might be granted fee simple title, or be made to pay taxes if given only fee tail title. Either way the king is still the corporate sole, and they will not have allodial title. Remember this Executive Order, I use it because it further proves the American people do not own any land in America.

19063

Monday, May 4, 1992

Title 3-- Executive Order 12803 of April 30, 1992

The President

Infrastructure Privatization

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to ensure that the United States achieves the most beneficial economic use of its resources, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Definitions. For purposes of this order:

(a) "Privatization" means the disposition or transfer of an infrastructure asset, such as by sale or by long-term lease, from a State or local government to a private party.

(b) "Infrastructure asset" means any asset financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government and needed for the functioning of the economy. Examples of such assets include, but are not limited to: roads, tunnels, bridges, electricity supply facilities, mass transit, rail transportation, airports, ports, waterways, water supply facilities, recycling and wastewater treatment facilities, solid waste disposal facilities, housing, schools, prisons, and hospitals.

(c) "Originally authorized purposes" means the general objectives of the original grant program; however, the term is not intended to include every condition required for a grantee to have obtained the original grant.

(d) "Transfer price" means: (i) the amount paid or to be paid by a private party for an infrastructure asset, if the asset is transferred as a result of competitive bidding; or (ii) the appraised value of an infrastructure asset, as determined by the head of the executive department or agency and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, if the asset is not transferred as a result of competitive bidding.

(e) "State and local governments" means the government of any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, and any county, municipality, city, town, township, local public authority, school district, special district, intrastate district, regional or interstate governmental entity, council of governments, and any agency or instrumentality of a local government, and any federally recognized Indian Tribe.

Sec. 2. Fundamental Principles. Executive departments and agencies shall be guided by the following objectives and principles:

(a) Adequate and well-maintained infrastructure is critical to economic growth. Consistent with the principles of federalism enumerated in Executive Order No. 12612, and in order to allow the private sector to provide for infrastructure modernization and expansion, State and local governments should have greater freedom to privatize infrastructure assets.

(b) Private enterprise and competitively driven improvements are the foundation of our Nation's economy and economic growth. Federal financing of infrastructure assets should not act as a barrier to the achievement of economic efficiencies through additional private market financing or competitive practices, or both.

(c) State and local governments are in the best position to assess and respond to local needs. State and local governments should, subject to assuring continued compliance with Federal requirements that public use be on reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms, have maximum possible freedom to United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

[Signed George Bush]

THE WHITE HOUSE

April 30, 1992.

{FR Doc. 92-10495

Filed 4-30-92; 4:17 pm}

Billing code 3195-01-m

Secret Treaty Of Verona

"The undersigned specially authorized to make some additions to the treaty of the Holy Alliance, after having exchanged their respective credentials, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I. The high contracting powers being convinced that the system of representative government is equally as incompatible with the monarchial principles as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people with the divine right, engage mutually, in the most solemn manner to use all their efforts to put an end to the system of representative governments, in whatever country it may exist in Europe, and to prevent its being introduced in those countries where it is not yet known.

ARTICLE 2. As it cannot be doubted that the liberty of the press is the most powerful means used by the pretended supporters of the rights of nations to the detriment of those of princes, the high contracting parties promise reciprocally to adopt all proper measures to suppress it, not only in their own state but also in the rest of Europe.

ARTICLE 3. Convinced that the principles of religion contribute most powerfully to keep nations in the state of passive obedience which they owe to their princes, the high contracting parties declare it to be their intention to sustain in their respective states, those measures which the clergy may adopt with the aim of ameliorating their own interests, so intimately connected with the preservation of the authority of the princes; and the contracting powers join in offering their thanks to the Pope for what he has already done for them, and solicit his constant co-operation in their views of submitting the nations.

ARTICLE 4. The situation of Spain and Portugal unite unhappily all the circumstances to which this treaty has particular reference. The high contracting parties, in confiding to France the care of putting an end to them, engaged to assist her in the manner which may at least compromit them with their own people and the people of France by means of a subsidy on the part of the two empires of 20,000,000 of francs every year from the date of signature of this treaty to the end of the war.

ARTICLE 5. In order to establish in the peninsula the order of things which existed before the revolution of Cadiz, and to insure the entire execution of the articles of the present treaty, the high contracting parties give to each other the reciprocal assurance that as long as their views are not fulfilled, rejecting all other ideas of futility or other measure to be taken, they will address themselves with the shortest possible delay to all the authorities existing in their states and to all their agents in foreign countries, with the view to establish connections tending toward the accomplishment of the objects proposed by this treaty.

ARTICLE 6. This treaty shall be renewed with such changes as new circumstances may give occasion for; either at a new congress, or at the court of one of the contracting parties, as soon as the war with Spain shall be terminated.

ARTICLE 7. The present treaty shall be ratified and the ratifications exchanged at Paris within the space of six months.

Made at Verona the 22nd of November, 1822.

For Austria: Metternich.

For France: Chateaubriand.

For Russia: Bernstet.

For Russia: Nesselrode."

Senator Owen

"This Holy Alliance, having put a Bourdon prince upon the throne of France by force, then used France to suppress the condition of Spain, immediately afterwards, and by this very treaty gave her a subsidy of 20,000,000 francs annually to enable her to wage war upon the people of Spain and prevent their exercise of any measure of the right of self-government. The Holy Alliance immediately did not same thing in Italy, by sending Austrian troops to Italy, where the people there attempted to exercise a like measure of liberal constitutional self-government; and it was not until the printing press, which the Holy Alliance so stoutly opposed, taught the people of Europe the value of liberty that finally one country after another seized a greater and greater right of self-government, until now it may be fairly said that nearly all the nations of Europe have a very large measure of self-government.

"However, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to this important history in the growth of constitutional

popular self-government. The Holy Alliance made its powers felt by the wholesale drastic suppression of the press in Europe, by universal censorship, by killing free speech and all ideas of popular rights, and by the complete suppression of popular government. The Holy Alliance having destroyed popular government in Spain, and Italy, had well-laid plans also to destroy popular government in the American Colonies which had revolted from Spain and Portugal in Central and South America under the influence of the successful example of the United States."

"It was because of this conspiracy against the American Republics by the European monarchies that the great English statesman, Canning, called the attention of our government to it, and our statesmen then, including Thomas Jefferson, who was still living at that time, took an active part to bring about the declaration by President Monroe in his next annual message to the Congress of the United States that the United States would regard it as an act of hostility to the government of the United States and an unfriendly act, if this coalition, or if any power of Europe ever undertook to establish upon the American continent any control of any American republic, or to acquire any territorial rights.

"This is the so-called Monroe Doctrine. The threat under the secret treaty of Verona to suppress popular government in the American republics is the basis of the Monroe Doctrine. This secret treaty sets forth clearly the conflict between monarchical government and popular government, and the government of the few as against the government on the many."

Senator Owen, Congressional Record 1916

THE JESUIT OATH

"I....., now in the presence of Almighty God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Blessed Michael the Archangel, The Blessed St. John the Baptist, the Holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the Saints, sacred hosts of Heaven, and to you, my ghostly Father, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, founded by St. Ignatius Loyola, in the Pontification of Paul the Third, and continued to the present, do by the womb of the virgin, the matrix of God, and the rod of Jesus Christ, declare and swear that his holiness, the Pope, is Christ's Vice-regent, and is the true and only head of the Catholic or Universal Church throughout the earth; and that by the virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his Holiness by my Savior, Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths and governments, all being illegal without his sacred confirmation, and that they may be safely destroyed.

"Therefore, to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine and his Holiness' right and customs against all usurpers of the heretical or Protestant authority, whatever especially the Lutheran Church of Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, and the now pretended authority of the Church of England and Scotland, the branches of the same, now established in Ireland, and on the continent of America and elsewhere....I so now renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince or state named Protestant or Liberals, or obedience to any of their laws, magistrates or officers.

"I do further declare, that I will help and assist and advise all or any of his Holiness' agents in any place wherever I shall be, and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestant or Liberal doctrines and to destroy all their pretended powers, legal or otherwise.

"I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical, for the propagating of the Mother Church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agents' counsels, from time to time as they may instruct me, and not to divulge directly or indirectly, by word, writing, or circumstances whatever; but to execute all that shall be proposed given in charge or discovered unto me, by you, my ghostly father.....

"I do further promise and declare, that I will have no opinion or will of my own, or any mental reservation whatever, even as a corpse or cadaver (perinde ac cadaver) but unhesitatingly obey each and every command that I may receive from my superiors in the Militia of the Pope and Jesus Christ.

"That I will go to any part of the world, whatsoever, without murmuring and will be submissive in all things whatsoever communicated to me.....I do further promise and declare, that I will, when opportunity presents, make and wage relentless war, secretly or openly, against all heretics, Protestants and Liberals, as I am directed

to do to extirpate and exterminate them from the face of the whole earth, and that I will spare neither sex, age no condition, and that I will hang, waste, boil, flay, strangle and bury alive these infamous heretics; rip up the stomachs and wombs of their women and crush their infants' heads against the wall, in order to annihilate forever their execrable race.

“That when the same cannot be done openly, I will secretly use the poison cup, the strangulation cord, the steel of the poniard, or the leaden bullet, regardless of honor, rank, dignity or authority of the person or persons whatsoever may be their condition in life, either public or private, as I at any time may be directed so to do by any agent of the Pope or superior of the brotherhood of the holy faith of the Society of Jesus.”

Congressional Record, House Bill 1523, Contested election case of Eugene C. Bonniwell, against Thos. S. Butler, Feb. 15, 1913,

pages 3215-16, sited: The Suppressed Truth About The Assassination Of Abraham Lincoln.