

Question 3

In response that the Anglo-Saxon common law was left out of the Informer's question, is as follows, and I do not answer for him, but this is in addition to his response.

Britain was first invaded in 55 BC. by Julius Caesar, then again in 54 BC. In 63 AD. Joseph of Arimathea was sent by the Pope in Rome to try and establish the Catholic Church in Britain. In 77 AD. Britain was taken over through conquest by Rome. The Imperial governor Julius Agricola was put in place to rule over Rome's new territory. Britain was as of 77 AD. subject to Rome, with Roman law.

In 407 AD. Emperor Constantine III withdrew the Roman troops from Britain leaving a political vacuum. The Celts (Irish), and the Vikings (Scandinavians) saw an opening to obtain land. In 410 AD. Britain won its independence from Rome, when the Goths ransacked Rome.

In 446 AD. the British government sought help to defeat the invading arms of the northern countries. Rome was unable to send troops because it was defending itself from Attila the Hun. So Rome offered mercenaries to aid Britain, Britain hired these barbaric mercenaries which were from northern Germany, they as you know are called Saxons.

In 450 AD. the Saxon barbarians began to massacre the Britons and take their land, in this manner they occupied the country of Britain. The Saxons were pagans some believed the Druid religion, others worshiped the same gods Rome worshiped, mercury and Venus, etc. etc.

The long and short of it is the Saxons were not responsible for a Common law by themselves. They were not Christians and did not support Canon or ecclesiastical law, and their law was influenced greatly by Roman law. The major difference was the Saxon king called himself king of the English, and William the Conqueror called himself king of England, meaning, William the Conqueror claimed he owned the land and the Saxon king made no such claims. Under Saxon law citizen meant freeman, and under Roman law, continuing in England in 1066 under William Conqueror, citizen meant subject. Under both systems you were forced to pay taxes to support the government. A tax payer is always a subject, so under William the Conqueror, he left no doubt as to your status, the Saxon kings were more subtle, the outcome is the same. Taxation and the subjection it confirms, is not always a bad thing. It depends on the government. Case in point, those that are Christians, are subject to Jesus Christ and are taxed 10% to support His government.

Look at what happened at Runnymede with the Magna Charta, the Barons thought they were gaining freedom, by the king granting them rights under the Charta. However, if they had stopped to read the 1213 Charta, wherein the king granted and ceded the Pope all of his lands, they would have known the king could not grant the rights without the blessing of the Pope. Did not the Pope sign off on the Charta of 1215, as a party to the Contract? Ask yourself this, did the granted rights end their tax obligations to the king, or the Pope? No. So is the granting of rights a problem or hindrance to the money lenders? No. Did the 1215 Charta in anyway overturn the obligations of the 1213 Charta? No, and they could not. Here is another reason.

Guess what America, and the rest of the free world, that claim their rights come from the Magna Charta, which was ratified by Pope Innocent III and of course the king under duress on June 15, 1215, on August 24, 1215, Pope Innocent III Declared that the Magna Charta was null and void, [(Geary) 49.3 August 24, 1215 parliamentary origins in England, Internet Medieval Source Book.]

I just found this, I do not have a copy of the above declaration at this time, it has been copyrighted, the book will have to be purchased, if it is still available. I won't speculate as to why it is kept in copyright and not released to the public as most other medieval documents have been.

To continue, Edward I, in 1297 was forced to re-declare the 1215 Magna Charta, because the Pope forbid his monks and bishops etc. etc., to pay taxes to the king, so the king began to tax the Barons again, and they drew their swords. King Edwards action holds less weight than that of his predecessor king John, because as of August

24, 1215 the Charta was an invalid document. Not to mention the issue I raised earlier concerning debt obligations of a previous Charter could not be voided.

The Pope by his confirmation of the Magna Charta was jerking the chains of the Barons, so to speak. As I said in earlier papers, there was no way the Pope would give up what was granted/ceded to him in the 1213 Charter. The Magna Charta could not void an earlier Charter which contained a debt obligation between parties, without all parties agreeing. Since the parties of the 1213 Charter would continue to be born, it was an irrevocable trust.

As example, read the 1689 Declaration of Rights, which became law. Did it, or could it overturn any financial obligations under previous Charters? No. Read the third section of the 1689 Declaration of Rights. It says if any provision of the Declaration comes into conflict with earlier Charters, the Declaration will be as if it were never written. If you do not have a copy of all the above cited material let the Informer or I know and we can supply you with the relevant material.

Do you see how not only Americans, but the entire world have been conned into thinking we are free? Every time the king has been challenged, the king grants rights to the combatants and they go home saying "WE WON", however nothing changed, because the king retained his power to tax, through previous Charters and new tax obligations created by accepting the kings benefits.

Another example, the Declaration of Independence and the war of Independence that followed, is no different than any other time in the history in challenging the king. The king said, OK, I will grant my created Corporations, the states, Independence and allow them to establish their own governments. But wait the governors retained the power granted by the king and the council of state. The states then consolidated their corporate Charters under one Charter, called the U.S. Constitution. Could the tax obligations of previous Charters be removed by our Declaration of Independence, or a war which did not remove the control of the king, which is obvious since in the peace Treaty of Paris he was granting us land? No.

No where in the 1783 Paris peace treaty will you find granted rights to the inhabitants of the states. No where in the treaty will you find where the taxes of gold, silver and copper (mineral rights) were ceded to the states. So much for allodial title in the states, freeman status and allodial title are synonymous, you can't have one without the other. Since the king did not cede all of his corporate enterprise he retained his taxation and the subjection of those that enjoy his benefits.

"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."

(Feast of All Saints occurred November 1 of each year.) 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

"KNOW YE, that We, of our further grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, HAVE thought fit to Erect the same Tract of Ground, Country, and Island into a Province, and, out of the fullness of our Royal power and Prerogative, WE Do, for us, our heirs and Successors, Erect, Incorporate, and Ordain the same into a province, and do call it the Province of CAROLINA, and so from henceforth will have it called..." The Carolina Charter, 1663

Nothing has changed the parties of interest still rule. It is our pitiful lack of knowledge and understanding of history, which causes us to hang our hats (Independence) on documents that maintain and did not change our subjection. Does this sound familiar to what has happened to the blacks. They assumed, since they were made citizens and given more rights, that they were now free. As you know a 14th Amendment citizen is subject to its

creator, who granted their rights, the corporation and the trustees, subject to the contracting parties, the Crown and the Pope. Maybe, now you know why history repeats itself, it has the same authors.

James Montgomery Sui Juris Servant of Jesus Christ