

Question 4 Sir Edmund Burkes' comments

Marty the information continues to pour in, in support of the information the Informer and I have been writing about and totally confirms, the below comments of Sir Edmund Burke, read the following quote, just one of many from his speech:

"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.

"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 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.

Marty John Jay, one of the men to construct and sign the Peace Treaty of 1783 and the sole man responsible for the Jay Treaty of 1795, he made very clear by his statements that he did not want Independence from England. And as Burke said above you can believe you are free and still be subject to England.

"Jay did not favor independence from Britain. His absence from the signing of the Declaration of Independence was noted by Thomas Jefferson."

Copyright c 1995 by Left Justified Publik. All rights reserved.

Marty to prove what Sir Edmund Burke said is possible and was part of the plan of the king, you need to look at the 1213 Charter and the 1689 Declaration of Rights. Because of space limitations I was not able to include them in this email, but will send them to you if you want them. I included them in British Colony part III.

The following is a section from my addendum from British Colony part III:

ADDENDUM

I have just discovered the following two endnotes. They completely confirm in a very final way my research in British Colony parts 1, 2 and 3, and the Informer's research and book "The New History Of America". If you will study the following papers, the Magna Carta and our Bill of Rights, and come to an understanding of their similarities. Then re-read the Charters included in British Colony parts 1 and 2, keeping in mind the issues I raised, then read the following commentary.

"The two main issues as I see them in British Colony are;
one, the financial obligations of the 1213 Charter En #1, are still in effect, along with the Charters establishing America.

Two, the last sentence of the 1689 Bill of Rights En #2, proves the following:"

"That the Charters of the Colonies could never be overturned by a Declaration of Independence, or the 1787

treaty, otherwise known as the Constitution, I'm talking about the real subject matter, financial obligation. Title for the land was transferred to the states and then ceded by Charter to the federal government under Cestui que trust, but the contracted debt and obligation of the Colonial Charters, and the 1213 Charter could not be negated. Rights could be granted to the citizens, subjects or combatants, which ever the case may be, but the financial obligation cannot, nor could not be affected, because it involves parties not yet born. This why King William said, the 1689 Bill of Rights would not free the kingdom from the obligation of the 1213 Charter. This is why the United States Bank was given right of Charter in America. George Washington had no choice but to succumb to the Rothschild's point man, Hamilton. Talk about deja vu, I mean does this not sound familiar. Our Bill of Rights was given to us, to give us the illusion of freedom. When the tax obligation of the Charters above marched along un-impeded and un-seen, by Americans and Britons alike. Read the Magna Carta again, they wanted the Pope's blessing for the 1215 Charter, this same Pope is the Pope in the 1213 Charter where England and Ireland were given to him. He could not just give back his land, because of other parties not yet born. The Pope let the barons presume they were free and gave his blessing to the 1215 Magna Carta, knowing to do so would in no way lawfully overturn the grant made to him in the 1213 Charter. Also, it is apparent, it was recognized as law that you could not even create a Charter, wherein you declared a previous grant or Charter null in void unless the relevant parties agreed. How can a Charter be made void if parties to the Charter will never cease to be born, an heir can always be found. To prove this, again what did the new king William do, even though the previous monarchy had come to an end, its obligations did not, this is why he had to included paragraph III, a clause to protect the other parties of an earlier Charter."

Statue of 32. Hen. VIII c. 84. (1540)

Marty, to further prove our point read the following previous email I sent out so as not to replicate work:

" You will have to read the below statute many times to understand what the king is saying. It was obviously made to be vague and ambiguous, it contains two sentences, the first is 658 words long, the second is 166 words long, not counting punctuation. I have included the following commentary to help your understanding of the below statute.

The king is saying that some of the representatives of the Catholic Church and some of his subjects have received grants of land from the king. The king is also saying they are in violation of certain provisions contained in the grants and land patents. Portions of these grants and land patents were granted to 3rd party entities by his 1st party grantees, through the kings grants and charters, having been granted to them. Because of contractual provisions contained in the grants and land patents being violated, the land was declared to revert back to the original grantees who received grants from the king.

As stated in section 1, this statute deals with land twice removed from the king; to preserve the clarity of hisgrants and land patents, in conjunction with the law of mortmain. You will see that the 1st party grantors, included ecclesiastical and religious persons, as well as secular. This statute does not change grants between the king, and the 1st party grantees and land patentees.

#7, section I should make you think. If any tax or rent due, (as declared in #5, section I), under the kings grants or Charters, are not paid, the land reverts back to the king, as if the Grants and Charters were never written. This is the same language of intent, used in the 1689 Declaration of Rights, third section, and the 25 section, in the 1776 North Carolina Bill of Rights, of the North Carolina 1776 Constitution, which established the North Carolina Corporation.

In section II, the king extends this statue to all grants made by him, now or in the future. The key and purpose to this statute is contained in #2, section I, no stranger is to enjoy a benefit of any Grant or Charter, if they are not a grantee and benefactor, without paying a rent or tax, see #5, section I. The main target of this statute was the Catholic Church, because they were not paying the tax due under the grants made to them. However, as shown in previous email the Vatican owned the land they were being taxed for, under the 1213 Charter. I am sure this is why the Vatican refused to pay a tax, because the owner of the land does not tax himself.

Since the states were the benefactors from the 1783 Peace Treaty, not the inhabitants, and they later transferred their original Grant from the king to the United States Constitution/Corporation, making the inhabitants of the states strangers, maybe now you know how and why we are taxed, and when the tax is not paid, the land reverts back to the benefactor of the of the kings original land grants, the United States Corporation, the trustee administering the trust/Constitution/Charter.

Nothing has changed since the days of William the Conqueror I, where taxes were levied based on the record of the land holdings written down in the Domesday Book, used by the Exchequer to tax the benefactors of the kings grants. Today the same procedure is followed, continued under the Charters creating this country. The king established the rent-roll tax in the states based on the counties record of all titles, which are now used by the Exchequer/Federal Reserve to tax the stranger, levy or foreclose on the ryot-tenure, as defined in Black's Law Dictionary, 4th ed..

"A system of land-tenure, where the government takes the place of landowners and collects the rent by means of tax gatherers. The farming is done by poor peasants, (ryots), who find the capital, so far as there is any, and also do the work. The system exists in Turkey, Egypt, Persia, and other Eastern countries, and in a modified form in British India. After slavery, it is accounted the worst of all systems, because the government can fix the rent at what it pleases, and it is difficult to distinguish between rent and taxes." Black's Law Dictionary, 4th ed.

I want to inject a big however, the king and the Vatican are both in violation of the LAW, they do not have ownership of the land, or have perfected land title, no matter what their Charters and land patents say. Why? Who is the original Grantor of land? God Almighty. Not the King or the Pope, their claim to the land to the detriment of the righteous will be revoked. Who did He intrust the land to? The Church (government), the Christians, trustees of Christ's Kingdom. Are not the riches of the world stored up for the righteous? Do not the kingdoms of the world, become the Kingdom of Christ, upon his return? So who are the true benefactors of the one and only Lawful land Grant? The servants of Jesus Christ!

I asked the Informer to run this statute on RightWriter to see how it would grade the reading level of this statute. It has a reading grade level of a 17th grade level, that is as high as the program goes.

READABILITY INDEX: 16.97

4th 6th 8th 10th 12th 14th

|*****|*****|*****|*****|*****|*****|*****|*****|*****|*****|

SIMPLE | ----- GOOD ----- | COMPLEX Readers need a 17th grade level of education. The writing is complex and may be difficult to read.

The Informer also tried to run it on Grammatik and program went bonkers. If you have a hard time understanding this statute, don't be surprised. You will be in good company, our fore fathers with their high level of education would have a hard time understanding this statute. By the way, the Informer has said since his early book "Which One Are You", that we were still subject to the king and under the ryot-tenure system, since the inception of this country.

Under The Statues of 32. Hen. VIII c. 84. (1540)

(a) Parties

St. 32 Hen. VIII. c. 84.--Where before this time divers, as well temporal as ecclesiastical and religious persons, have made sundry leases, demises and grants to divers other persons, of sundry manors, lordships, forms, meases, lands, tenements, meadows, pastures, or other hereditaments, for term of life or lives, or for term of years, by writing under their seal or seals, containing certain conditions, covenants and agreements to be performed, as well on the part and behalf of the said lessees and grantees, their executors and assigns, as on the behalf of the said lessors and grantors, their heirs and successors; (2) and forasmuch as by the common law of this realm, no stranger to any covenant, action or condition, shall take any advantage or benefit of the same, by any means or ways in the law, but only such as be parties or privies thereunto, by the reason whereof, as well all grantee of reversions, as also all grantees and patentees of the King our sovereign lord, of sundry manors, lordships, granges, forms, meases, lands tenements, meadows, pastures, or other hereditaments late belonging to

monasteries, and other religious and ecclesiastical houses dissolved, suppressed, renounced, relinquished, forfeited, given up, or by other means come to the hands and possession of the King's majesty since the fourth day of February the seven and twentieth year of his most noble reign, be excluded to have any entry or action against the said lessees and grantees, their executors or assigns, which the lessors for the breach of any condition, covenant or agreement comprised in the indentures of their said leases, demises and grants: (3) be it therefore enacted by the King our sovereign lord, the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons, in this present parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, That as well all and every person and persons, and bodies politic, their heirs, successors and assigns, which have or shall have any gift or grant of our said sovereign lord by his letters patents of any lordships, manors, lands, tenements, rents, parsonages, tithes, portions, or any other hereditaments, or of any reversion or reversions of the same, which did belong or appertain to any of the said monasteries, and other religious and ecclesiastical houses, dissolved, suppressed, relinquished, forfeited, or by any other means come to the King's hands since the said fourth day of February the seven and twentieth year of his most noble reign, or which at any time heretofore did belong or appertain to any other person or persons, and after came to the hands of our said sovereign lord, (4) as also all other persons being grantees or assignees to or by our said sovereign lord the King, or to or by any other person or persons than the King's highness, and the heirs, executors, successors and assigns of every of them, (5) shall and may have and enjoy like advantage against the lessees, there executors, administrators and assigns, by entry for non-payment of the rent, or for doing of waste or other forfeiture; (6) and also shall and may have and enjoy all and every such like, and the same advantage, benefit and remedies by action only, for not performing of the other conditions, covenants or agreements contained and expressed in the indentures of their said lessees, demises or grants, against all and every the said lessees and farmers and grantees, their executors, administrators and assigns, as the said lessors or grantors themselves, or their heirs or successors, ought, should, or might have had and enjoyed at any time or times, (7) in like manner and form as if the reversion of such lands, tenements or hereditaments had not come to the hands of our said sovereign lord, or as our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, should or might have had and enjoyed in certain cases, by virtue of the act made at the first session of this present parliament, if no such grant by letters patent had been made by His Highness.

II. Moreover be it enacted by authority aforesaid, That all farmers, lessees and grantees of lordships, manors, lands, tenements, rents, parsonages, tithes, portions, or any other hereditaments for term of years, life or lives, their executors, administrators and assigns, shall and may have like action, advantage and remedy against all and every person and persons and bodies politic, their heirs, successors and assigns, which have or shall have any gift or grant of the King our sovereign lord, or of any other person or persons, of the reversion of the same manors, lands, tenements, and other hereditaments so letten, or any parcel thereof, for any condition, covenant or agreement contained or expressed in the indentures of their lesse or leases, as the same lessees, or any of them might and should have had against the said lessors and grantors, their heirs and successors; (2) all benefits and advantages of recoveries in value by reason of any warranty in deed or in law by voucher or otherwise only excepted.Fn#1

Footnote #1 "The Statute deals only with actions by the assignee of the reversion against the lessee or his assignee, and actions by the lessee or his assignee against the assignee of the reversion; and not with actions by the lessor against the assignee of the lessee, or e contra, which actions seem therefore to be governed by the common law." 1 Smith, L. C. (10th ed.) 74

Marty you are right, the 14th Amendment is very relevant, but I think misunderstood on just what its implications are. If you will read British Colony part III, I include forgotten history that shows just how relevant the 14th Amendment argument is. However, after you learn this information, if you do not already know it, you will come to the conclusion the Informer and I have come to. No reoccurring remedy will be obtained in the courts, just brief aberrations of justice based on the demeanor or impatience of the judge, or his/her lack of self-confidence based on the judges lack of knowledge concerning public policy. Once the judges know their decisions will not be overturned, or their careers damaged, defeat of patriot arguments will be swift, and the penalty for frivolous lawsuits will be just as swift and increase with intolerance of the Judiciary. I don't mean to sound like a stick in the mud, but it is true. Only through the education of the public, coinciding with the coming financial pain, will change the publics perception of their freedom. Unfortunately I fear it will be to late to make any changes, until

Rome self-destructs.

James Montgomery