

Question 19 Comments on the Laws of Mortmain

Bill D Bradley wrote:

This is how the CORPORATE states own property and you don't and why they charge you a rent roll tax which you call a property tax. You have to read this a couple of times and know the laws of Mortmain as does James and I. Good work Joyce. Big Al-

Joyce, this whole case is summed up in the last paragraph, the Court ruled Mortmain does not exist in this country. On its face it would appear to contradict what the Informer and I have been saying, but oh contraire. There are some very interesting and deceptive truths that can be taken from this case. I first read this case a few years ago when researching "A Country Defeated In Victory" 2. The English statutes of mortmain were never in force in the English colonies; and if they were ever considered to be so in the State of Ohio, it must have been from that resolution by the Governor and judges in her territorial condition; and if so, they were repealed by the act of 1806. If it is as the Court ruled, that is, that there is, nor never has been the right of Mortmain in this country, Americans need to wake up to the truth of what the Informer and I have been saying. Lets examine a quote from Jefferson, that I have in my research paper, called "*A Country Defeated In Victory*".

"On February 15, 1791 Jefferson wrote Washington to tell him his objections to the establishment of a National Bank.

The bill for establishing a National Bank undertakes among other things:

1. To form the subscribers into a corporation.
2. To enable them in their corporate capacities to receive grants of land; and so far is against the laws of mortmain.
3. To make alien subscribers capable of holding lands; and so far is against the laws of alienage.
4. To transmit these lands, on the death of a proprietor, to a certain line of successors; and so far changes the course of descents.
5. To put the lands out of the reach of forfeiture or escheat; and so far is against the laws of forfeiture and escheat.
6. To transmit personal chattels to successors in a certain line; and so far is against the laws of distribution.
7. To give them the sole and exclusive right of banking under the national authority; and so far is against the laws of monopoly.
8. To communicate to them a power to make laws paramount to the laws of the States; for so they must be construed, to protect the institutions from the control of the State legislatures; and so, probably, they will be construed.

I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground; That "all powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people."

To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress, is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition.

The incorporation of a bank, and the powers assumed by this bill, have not, in my opinion, been delegated to the United States, by the Constitution.

Can it be thought that the Constitution intended that for a shade or two of convenience, more or less, Congress should be authorized to break down the most ancient and fundamental laws of the several States; such as those against mortmain, the laws of alienage, the rules of descent, the acts of distribution, the laws of escheat and forfeiture, the laws of monopoly?"

Clearly Jefferson was of the opinion the law of Mortmain was in effect in the states. The only way you can use the law of Mortmain on your behalf, and require a corporation to obtain a license from you, or reject its incorporation, because the corporation would consume your land, without your being able to own it again, is for you to be sovereign. Jefferson believed he, the states or at least the U. S. government had the power of Mortmain.

So, we have a dilemma here, who is right, the Court or Jefferson? The Court was right, Mortmain never existed in this country, meaning the Power, sovereignty to use it. Jefferson assumed, maybe that is too harsh of a word, he believed as a result of his extensive legal training, through his command of five languages, that he was a freeman and had the Power to demand any corporation had to obtain a license to become a corporation. Under Mortmain, the corporation (Bank) was illegal because this nation's land would fall into dead hands as a result of interest and fiat money. Jefferson also argued that the Bank would also violate several long standing laws common to Anglo Saxons.

Based on the information the Informer and I have published, the Court was right; you see freedom, sovereignty and Mortmain are synonymous, if you don't have the Power to execute Mortmain, you are neither free or sovereign. The Court was boldly telling America the truth, a truth we are now aware of, the Revolutionary War never changed the king's corporation, America Inc.. Knowing Washington's honor and will to do right, Hamilton had no problem in convincing Washington to allow the incorporation of the Bank into this Country. Washington's personality and honor were well known, all Hamilton had to do was show Washington, the legal title, through the Charters and the Trust, and Washington would be forced to allow the Bank to increase the king's holdings so he and his heirs would enjoy the fruits of the king's investment. In spite of Jefferson's on point arguments against it, the Bank was incorporated, look at the outcome, just in 207 years. So what was it Jefferson misunderstood? He did not understand that the War was not enough to overturn the king's holdings and corporations, he did not understand Conquest. The only way we could have gotten the land, above and below ground, was not to allow the 6th Article of the 1783 Peace Treaty or the 9th Article of the 1794 Treaty to be included, or we would have had to go and defeat England on their soil, Conquest in other words. If the two above mentioned Articles had been left out, the Revolutionary War would not have stopped, nor would the king have pulled out his troops from Washington D.C. during the War of 1812.

So you see, the Court was telling us early on, along with other decisions, that we were still subject to England, as far as being Contributors to the king's commercial enterprise, because any way you cut it, we were enjoying a benefit that the king provided, because we would not be here if not for the king's commercial venture, this is why the courts ruled in this manner.

James