

Question 12 Conquering governments

Wouldn't only 'U.S. citizens' be considered 'enemies'?

Aren't members of a Religious Order freed from 'U.S. citizenship'?

I wish this were the case, this is the hurdle I have been trying to jump, in relating this to our fellow Americans, causing them to realize the gravity of our situation. In the Patriot literature that has been put out for years, we have focused on citizenship vs. non citizenship, meaning enfranchised vs. non enfranchised, subject vs. freeman. With these terms as blinders, and the only possible outcome of the human condition in this country, the illusion is complete. No one has looked any further in the Patriot Community, unknowingly they continue the preaching of the Conquering government's propaganda. Because they appear to be on the outside of the laws of the Conquering government, they look no further. They don't realize that if they win the issues they have been fighting for, the Conquering government is still in place and can put down any group that grows to large or is educated in the truth, to the detriment of their public policy. Have you ever heard of the legal term "federal intimidation"? Even with your knowledge, for which I commend you, for receiving knowledge via the Holy Spirit, our condition appears to be cloudy. The reason it is so hard to see, is because Satan is behind it, the master deceiver. Under the International rules of Conquest, and even if these rules had never been defined and codified by Lincoln, these maxims of Conquest have remained unchanged for thousands of years.

If Country A attacks Country B with Military force and Conquers Country B, all inhabitants in the borders of Country B come under the authority of Country A, because of Military force and rule. The Conquering army of A dictates to B its laws regardless of the status of anyone in Country B. If belligerents in Country B refuse to obey the laws or rule of Country A, and if the civil police under the control of Country A cannot enforce the laws of Country A, A puts down the revolt of the belligerents of Country B, by their submission to Military force, imprisonment or death. The difference between Country A and B is brute force by military power and the fact country B's military no longer exists, either by defeat or infusion into country A's Military. The reason country A's Conquest is not seen or understood by the majority of people in country B, is because under the Art of War, rules of Conquest and Military Occupation, it is best that as few laws as possible are changed by Country A, so as not to alarm the inhabitants of country B. This limits the length and duration and cost of Conquest to country A. After a period of time through reeducation of the inhabitants, via propaganda in the public schools, by twisting history and social studies, and by control of the news media, Conquest is complete. The inhabitants of Country B lose their original identity and take on the identity of their Conqueror, Country A. If Country B becomes aware of their plight, Country A has the option of finishing the Conquest or further distracting Country B via economic collapse insuring Country B's loyalty. Another way to insure loyalty is for Country A to involve Country B's inhabitants in wars, creating other enemies more easily seen and understood, thereby shifting Country B's suspicion away from Country A's leaders and their Military Control. I hope this helps.

Hello Fred,

James Montgomery here, I am going to send you some old emails I have sent to others. I try to not re invent the wheel, because of time constraints. The Definitive Treaty of 1783 is for the most part not different than what you have already read. Have you read "The United States Is Still A British Colony"? If not I can send it to you, I include all relevant Treaties and Charters. To just briefly answer your question below, you have to read the Charters and understand them, before reading the Treaties you mentioned. The king of England created corporations called Virginia, Carolina and so on. These were business ventures, family businesses and un revocable Trusts, because of the way they were written. The king's subjects were to lay claim to any land they settled for the king of England and were to send back to England a percentage of gold, silver and copper, not only during the king's life time, but for all time, to go to all of his successors and heirs. The king had/has allodial title to this land, he owned everything below and above ground. You have to understand this before you read the Treaties. We fought a war and supposedly won the Revolutionary War, and entered into a Treaty with the king of England. Question. Why was the king granting us lands and defining the borders, if we WON the war? Do those that lose wars dictate to the winners the conditions? Now read the 1783 Treaty of Paris again and show me

where the king ceded the gold, silver and copper to the states. I say states because the Treaty did not cede anything to the inhabitants of the states, as a matter of fact their condition was left up to the states, to determine their status. Here in North Carolina we were declared to be freeman by the 1776 North Carolina Declaration of Rights, we remained so until the 1787 Charter/Constitution was ratified by the states, triggering in North Carolina, section 25 of the Declaration of Rights, which negated any declaration or grant of land in opposition to the king of England's Charters or grants. Only the land was ceded to the states, that which was above ground, no mineral rights were ceded to the states. Why? The king could not cede the gold, silver or copper to the states when it was placed in an un revocable Trust, given to the heirs of the king, that continue to be born even today. Since the states were only granted what was above ground, how could anyone after the 1783 Treaty, claim to have allodial title to any property, to have allodial title you must own everything above and below, own it completely, no liens. If there is no allodial property, there are no freemen, the two are synonymous. The Jay Treaty began the process of the king regaining his land above, the Bank of the United States finished the process, with the purchase of much of the Congressman and the office of the President and the judiciary. Is the money still transferred to Britain, you bet. How? The 1040 tax form is the transference, and is a result of a treaty with Britain. I have this information contained in *British Colony* part I, and I am sure the Informer could tell you even more on the taxation issue and its relevance to the 1783 Paris Treaty. I am going to stop here because of the reason I stated at the beginning, I will send you the emails I was referring to, if you have any questions don't hesitate to ask.

James Montgomery