

WERE YOU EVER FREE*CAN YOU BE FREE***WITHOUT OWNING LAND???**
THE LAND STILL BELONGS TO THE KING, AMERICANS WERE NEVER FREE

My Comments

Well it's been 5 years since I released "The United States Is Still A British Colony, part I." I asked in part 7, the last chapter, that others having seen the truth and relevance of this book, do their own research, to see what others across the country could turn up. Arthur Marron, a researcher from one of the northern states found a document called Treaties and Conventions, he sent it to the Informer, who forwarded it to me for me to comment on. The document is from an unlikely source, the Dept of State, the Secretary of State. The information contained in it is fascinating, it is further proof of what I have been saying, as well as the Informer, in his book "The New History Of America".

Below you will find several quotes I scanned in, along with my commentary, which as always is brief, the facts speak for themselves. This document prints out to 15 pages in dos text, new courier.

I stated in my book that the 1783 Paris peace Treaty DID NOT give America title to the land, it recognized our use of it, it DID NOT grant individuals any freedom, it only recognized the States as independent powers, with the inhabitants being subject to the States in which they lived. It recognized the States intent to incorporate into the United States. I asked the simple question in my book, "if we won the war, how is the king granting us anything?". I stated this was a continuation of the king's corporate Charters and that he was allowing through subterfuge the re-incorporation of the States into the United States. I have stated the king had no lawful, legal right or authority to grant (cede America by way of title) to anyone, because legally it was not his to give away. As I have shown in my book the king's possessions in America were governed by corporate Charters and that they were also irrevocable trusts, with his heirs and successors to forever profit from the kings exploration and conquest of America. Read the following quotes and see what jumps out to you.

End Comment

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

"In regulating the commercial and political relations between the United States and other Powers, these several Treaties secured the recognition of the Independence of the United States, and also the assent of other Powers to many important principles, some of which were not then universally recognized as constituting part of the public law which should govern the intercourse of nations with each other." Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg.1220

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

"The power of the new nation whose existence had been recognized by these Treaties to regulate and control its commercial relations with foreign Powers was uniformly asserted in this series of Treaties. They placed each of the other Powers, in respect of commerce and navigation within each and every State, on the footing of the most favored nation;...."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1221

NOTES-GREAT BRITAIN

"The several States which compose this Union, so far, at least, as regarded their municipal regulations, became entitled from the time when they declared themselves independent to all the rights and powers of sovereign States, and did not derive them from concessions of the British King. The treaty of peace contains a recognition of the independence of these States, not a grant of it. The laws of the several State governments passed after the Declaration of Independence were the laws of sovereign States, and as such were obligatory upon the people of each State."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1338

NOTES-GREAT BRITAIN

"The treaty of peace of 1783 between the United States and Great Britain was a mere recognition of pre-existing rights as to territory, and no territory was thereby acquired by way of cession from Great Britain.³ All British grants are invalid which were made after the Declaration of Independence, and purported to give title to land within the territories of the United States as defined by the Treaty of 1783."

My Comment

1. The Independence was recognized, not granted. The fore fathers always wanted, listed agnosium in the demands made to the king prior to the 1776 Declaration of Independence, self determination so as to not be taxed without representation. This is exactly what they obtained in the 1783 Paris peace treaty, not allodial possession of the land.
2. The powers recognized were the States, not the people, just as the Informer has said in his books, the People being empowered were the aristocrats setting up the corporation, not the little people who were to be governed by the States. (Must read the Informer's book "Which One Are You". Also, get a copy off the net of Mercier's letter of several hundred pages dealing with contracts and obligations, must read also.
3. The king knew the 1783 Treaty was not worth the paper it was written on, just as when king John was forced to sign the Magna Charta, but he had to take steps to overcome it, so as not to expose his mode of operation.
4. Also, the land was not his to give away, you will see this in the below quote, I had many other quotes from court cases and other legal authorities that stated this in my book.
5. After the Declaration of Independence, according to the Secretary of State, ALL British grants were and are invalid.
6. I have said this so many times I must sound like a broken record. We are not free from the Crown, because we do not have allodial title, never have, could not, we never had it, never conquered it, were never granted it, nor was it ever ceded to us. You can claim you are free till hell freezes over, but if you do not have allodial title to your land, meaning it cannot be taken from you under any situation, it is an empty declaration. You cannot have one without the other, it would be like trying to have water without the wet. You are not a Freeman by definition, if your land can be taken from you.

From the above quote: "The treaty of peace of 1783 between the United States and Great Britain was a mere recognition of PRE-EXISTING rights as to TERRITORY, and NO TERRITORY WAS THEREBY ACQUIRED BY WAY OF CESSION FROM GREAT BRITAIN". Hello, the rights to territory, never changed, they remained just they were, pre-existing; from what? The king's Charters of course, the original grants, while we were still admitted subjects of the king, leasing the land from him. At the end of the Revolutionary War and with the signing of the 1783 Paris Peace Treaty, no territorial change took place, nor did the status of Americans. We were not free before the Declaration of Independence, evidenced by no man having allodial title, and no change took place after the Declaration of Independence, the Revolutionary War, or the 1783 Paris Peace Treaty. Why do you think that later in history you have a grater status than our fore fathers, with the amazing knowledge they had? The only reason you do is because this illusion has been propagated by your conquerors, to keep the servants on the plantation working hard. Stop with the claim that you are sovereign and have allodial title, as I have said before, and will continue to say, if your land can be taken through the none payment of taxes, or through eminent domain, you are not sovereign, you are not possessing land by allodial title, I don't care what you believe or have been lead to believe, it just ain't so. I'll ask another question as I did in my book to prove this point. How did you acquire your supposed allodial property, who did you conquer to obtain it, any lessor title of ownership, is not synonymous with a Freeman? The only way to acquire allodial title is by conquest, and you must have the ability to keep it from anyone trying to take it from you.

You must remember a important fact concerning the below quote, the below quote is true, but must be qualified by saying, as long as office can be found, if office cannot be found the land reverts back to the king. Office will always be found for the original grants to America, this is why the king could not cede the land to another owner.

End Comment

NOTES-CESSION OF TERRITORY

"Even in cases of conquest, the conqueror does no more than displace the sovereign, and assume dominion

over the country. 7 Peters, 86; (10 Peters, 720, 729-30, passim). "A cession of territory is never understood to be a cession of the property of the inhabitants. THE KING CEDES ONLY THAT WHICH BELONGS TO HIM; LANDS HE HAD PREVIOUSLY GRANTED, WERE NOT HIS TO CEDE...."
Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1253

TREATIES ARE THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND

My Comment

I have also stated that treaties are the law of the land, and have strongly been rebuffed for this position. The reason I have held this position is because after the advise and consent to a treaty by the Senate, any Constitutional limitations or conflicts have tacitly been declared not to exist, making the treaty equal to and part of our law, the Constitution. Also, once passed, any laws inconsistent with the treaty, state or federal, will be corrected by legislation, by Congress or the Executive Branch. Reread the "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights", you will see in that Treaty what I am saying here, and something you may not have noticed before. Read the following quotes.

End Comment

NOTES-TREATIES

"A treaty, constitutionally concluded and ratified, abrogates whatever law of any one of the States may be inconsistent therewith.

A treaty made conformably to the constitution in substance and form repeals pre-existing conflicting Federal law.²

Not to observe a treaty is to violate a deliberate and express engagement, and afford good cause of war. When Congress takes upon itself to disregard the provisions of any foreign treaty it, of course, infringes the same, in the exercise of sovereign right, and voluntarily accepts the casus belli, as when, in 1798, it annulled the treaties between the United States and France. See act of July 7, 1798

Under the constitution, treaties, as well as statutes are the law of the land; both the one and the other, when not inconsistent with the constitution, standing upon the same level and being of equal force and validity; and, as is the case of all laws emanating from an equal authority, the earlier in date yields to the latter.⁴
Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1400

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

"The construction put by President Washington on the agreement of guaranty contained in the 11th article of the Treaty of 1778 with France, together with the conclusion of the Treaty of 1794 with England, had affected the relations of the two countries to such a degree that, in 1798, Congress had, by law, assumed to exonerate the nation from further obligation to observe the Treaties with France and the Attorney-General had given an official opinion that there was a state of war. The Treaty of 1800 restored the good relations: but in the amendments on each side the old Treaties entirely disappeared."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1223

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

"I. A Treaty, constitutionally concluded and ratified, abrogates all State laws inconsistent therewith. It is the supreme law of the land, subject. only to the provisions of the constitution.⁴

[While, however, treaties are a part of the supreme law of the land, they are nevertheless to be viewed in two lights, that is to say, in the light of Politics and in the light of juridical law. The decision of political questions is preeminently the function of the political branch of the government, of the Executive or of Congress, as the case may be; and when a political question is so determined, the courts follow that determination.

IV. Where a Treaty cannot be executed without the aid of an act of Congress, it is the duty of Congress to enact such laws. Congress has never failed to perform that duty.

VIII. The constitution of the United States confers absolutely on the government of the United States the power of making war and of making Treaties, from which it follows that government possesses the power of acquiring territory either by conquest or by Treaty.⁹

X. A Treaty of cession is a deed of the ceded territory by the Sovereign grantor, and the deed is to receive an equitable construction.

XII. Interest, according to the usage of nations, is a necessary part of a just national indemnification.²

The Treaty Power under the Constitution has also been the subject of legislative discussion in Congress.

When the Treaty of 1794 with Great Britain was sent to that body, Edward Livingston, who was a member of the House, moved that the President be requested to transmit to the House a copy of the instructions to Mr. Jay, and of the correspondence and documents relative to the Treaty. This motion was resisted on the ground that the Treaty had become the supreme law, and the House had no constitutional jurisdiction over questions which were settled by it. The House, however, adopted the resolution, 61 ayes, 33 noes? President Washington replied to this resolution thus: "Having been a member of the General Convention, and knowing the principles on which the Constitution was formed, I have ever entertained but one opinion on this subject, and from the first establishment of the Government to this moment, my conduct has exemplified that opinion, that the power of making treaties is exclusively vested in the President, by and with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, and that every treaty so made, and promulgated, thence-forward becomes the law of the land. * * * As, therefore, it is perfectly clear to my understanding that the assent of the House of Representatives is not necessary to the validity of a Treaty; as the Treaty with Great Britain exhibits in itself all the objects requiring legislative provision, and on these the papers called for can throw no light; and as it is essential to time due administration of the Government that the boundaries fixed by the Constitution between the different departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duty of my office, under all the circumstances of this case, forbid a compliance with your request."

The House thereupon, after a short debate, resolved "that it is not necessary to the propriety of any application from this House to the Executive for information desired by them, and which may relate to any constitutional functions of the House, that the purpose for which such information may be wanted, or to which it may be applied, should be stated in the application."³

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1227-1229

TREATIES COME TO AN END WHEN A STATE OF WAR EXISTS

My Comment

The following quotes were something I never considered, while conducting my research for my book. If the signers of a Treaty later find themselves in the state of war against themselves, the Treaties made prior to the war are suspended. As always lawyers want everything their way, depending on what side of the issue they are on. This issue is no different, when it benefited the U.S. government, they said yes this is the case, but then later this secretary says no, war does not suspend treaties, or it just suspends parts of the treaties. The government lawyers are disingenuous as always, but Britain was telling the truth on this subject. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure this out, just use a little common sense, if you have a treaty with someone saying you can fish my waters, and you then are being attacked by that person, are you going to continue to allow them to fish your waters? I think not. You read the below quotes, you be the judge.

End Comment

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

"Mr. Monroe, in an early stage of negotiations with Holland, for this purpose, informed the Dutch Minister at Washington that "the Treaties between the United States and some of the Powers of Europe having been annulled by causes preceding from the state of Europe for some time past, and other Treaties having expired, the United States have now to form their system of commercial intercourse with every Power, as it were, at the same time."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1224

ABROGATED, SUSPENDED, OR OBSOLETE TREATIES

"Great Britain 1782 (VII.), 1783 (VII.), 1794 (II. and VII.), 1796 (V II.), 1798 (VII.), 1802 (VII.). 1827 (VI.), 1854 (III.), 1862 (VI.), 1871 (lit.)."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1232

NOTES-ALIENS AND ALIENAGE

"VII. Treaties the Executory parts of which are claimed to have been terminated by war: [Great Britain, 1782, 1783, 1794, and the Additional and Explanatory Articles thereto, and 1802; Mexico, 1831 and the Additional Article thereto, but Article 17 of the Treaty of February 2, 1848 revived the Treaty except so far as the stipulations were incompatible and except the additional Article; Tripoli, 1796.

After the conclusion of the Treaty of Ghent it was claimed by Great Britain that the rights which the Americans had enjoyed in the British fisheries before the war, under the Treaty of 1783, had been lost through the abrogation of the Treaty in consequence of the war. John Quincy Adams, who was the United States Minister at London at that time, contended that the Treaty of 1783 was not "one of those which by the common understanding

and usage of civilized nations is or can be considered as annulled by a subsequent war between the same parties.¹ Lord Bathurst replied, "To a position of this novel nature Great Britain cannot accede. She knows of no exception to the rule that all Treaties are put an end to by a subsequent war between the same parties."² During the negotiations which followed Great Britain never abandoned that position, and the United States may be said to have acquiesced in it. By it they secured the exclusion of Great Britain from the Mississippi, the free and open navigation of which was granted to the subjects of Great Britain forever by the Treaty which Lord Bathurst set aside.

The political department of the Government of the United States assumed the same position during the Mexican war. President Polk, in his annual message to Congress, in December, 1847, said, "A state of war abrogates Treaties previously existing between belligerents, and a treaty of peace puts an end to all claims for indemnity."³

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1237

NOTES-TREATIES

""But we are not inclined to admit the doctrine urged at the bar, that treaties become extinguished, ipso facto, by war between the two governments, unless they should be revived by an express or implied renewal on the return of peace. * * There may be treaties of such a nature, as to their object and import, as that war will put an end to them; but where treaties contemplate a permanent arrangement of territorial and other national rights, or which, in their terms, are meant to provide for the event of an intervening war, it would be against every principle of just interpretation to hold them extinguished by the event of war. If such were the law, even the treaty of 1783, so far as it fixed our limits, and acknowledged our independence, would be gone, and we should have had again to struggle for both upon original revolutionary principles."⁷

"We think, therefore, that treaties stipulating for permanent rights, and general arrangements, and professing to aim at perpetuity, and to deal with the case of war as well as of peace, do not cease on the occurrence of war, but are at most only suspended while it lasts; and unless they are waived by the parties, or new and repugnant stipulations are made, they revive in their operation at the return of peace.

The termination of a treaty by war does not divest rights of property already vested under it.²"

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1400-1401

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

VII. Treaties do not generally ipso facto become extinguished by war. Vested rights of property will not become divested in such case.

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1227-1229

THE LAW OF CONQUEST

My Comment

The Treaties of 1782, 1783 and 1794 were suspended and abrogated by the War of 1812. The king knew this, and I believe this was one of the reasons he instigated our declaring war on Britain, allowing the king to get out of the legal mess he had gotten himself into by signing the Paris Treaty. However, to be fair, the king thought the Treaties were already in jeopardy if not abrogated, by the U.S. for not paying its war debt and interest.

End Comment

NOTES-CESSION OF TERRITORY

"The formation of the civil government in California, when it was done, was the lawful exercise of a belligerents right over a conquered territory."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1251

NOTES-CESSION OF TERRITORY

"The usage of the world is, if a nation be not entirely subdued, to consider the holding of conquered territory as a mere military occupation, until its fate shall be determined at the treaty of peace. If it be ceded by treaty, the acquisition is confirmed, and the ceded territory becomes a part of the nation to which it is annexed, either on the terms stipulated in the treaty of cession, or on such as its new master shall impose."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1251

NOTES-GREAT BRITAIN

"Jefferson met this on the 15th of December, by a note stating briefly the American position as to the British infractions of the Treaty and producing evidence in its support.⁶ This drew from Hammond an elaborate reply the 5th of March, 1792, in which he contended (1.) that the United States had failed to execute the 4th article of the Treaty, by not preventing the placing of impediments in the way of the recovery, in sterling, of debts due to British subjects; (2) that interest had not been allowed on judgments in favor of British creditors; and (3) that article 5 had not been carried into effect by the United States, inasmuch as confiscated estates had not been restored; and that therefore "the measure that the King has adopted (of delaying his compliance with the 7th article of the Treaty) is perfectly justifiable." To this, Jefferson, on the 29th of May, 1792, replied, (1) that impediments, within the meaning of the Treaty, had not been thrown in the way of the collection of British debts in the United States; (2) that interest is not an integral part of a debt under British and American law, and therefore it was not embraced in the Treaty; (3) that the United States had only undertaken in the Treaty to recommend the States to restore confiscated estates, and had fully complied with that agreement; and he showed conclusively that it was understood both by the Ministry and by both Houses of Parliament, when the Treaty was negotiated, that the American Plenipotentiaries not only would not agree to restore the confiscated estates, but expressed the opinion that the States themselves would not restore them, even if recommended by Congress to do so; (4) that the British infractions of the Treaty, so far from being the result of alleged infractions by the United States, preceded them, and were in no way dependent upon them.'

More than a year elapsed without a reply. Jefferson then, on the 19th of June, 1793, wrote Hammond, asking when one might be expected. "The subject," he said, "was extensive and important, and therefore rendered a certain degree of delay in the reply to be expected. But it has now become such as naturally to generate disquietude. The interests we have in the Western posts, the blood and treasure which their detention costs us daily, cannot but produce a corresponding anxiety on our part."² Hammond replied that as soon as he should receive instructions the reply should be transmitted, and added, "There is one passage in your letter of yesterday, Sir, of which it becomes me to take some notice. The passage I allude to is that wherein you mention 'the blood

and treasure which the detention of the Western posts costs the United States daily.' I cannot easily conjecture the motives in which this declaration has originated. After the evidence that this Government has repeatedly received of the strict neutrality observed by the King's Governors of Canada, during the present contest between the United States and the Indians, and of the disposition of those officers to facilitate, as far as may be in their power, any negotiations for peace, I will not for a moment imagine that the expression I have cited was intended to convey the insinuation of their having pursued a different conduct."

Jefferson made no response to this. In a few months he again asked Hammond whether he was prepared to reply on this subject of the infractions of the Treaty.⁴ No answer was ever made.

In the autumn of 1793 a new question of difference arose. The Admiralty instructions to British ships of War and privateers, issued in June, 1793, ordered the seizure of all neutral vessels laden with corn, flour, or meal, destined for French ports, and of all neutral vessels, except those of Denmark and Sweden, attempting to enter any blockaded port.⁵ As Denmark, Sweden, and the United States were the principal neutral maritime powers, there was no question as to the vessels against which the latter provision was aimed. When complaint was made of the order to seize vessels laden with provisions, it was justified by Great Britain on the assumption that provisions were contraband of war.⁶ Edmund Randolph, Jefferson's successor as Secretary of State, met this by saying: "We have labored to cultivate with the British nation perfect harmony. We have not attempted by a revival of maxims which, if ever countenanced, are now antiquated, to blast your agriculture or commerce. To be persuaded, as you wish, that the instructions of the 8th of June, 1793, are in a conciliatory spirit, is impossible. And be assured, Sir, that it is a matter of sincere regret to learn the intention of your Government to adhere to them, notwithstanding our representations, which utter, as we flatter ourselves, the decent but firm language of right."

Under such circumstances President Washington, on the 16th of April, 1794, sent a message to the Senate, in which, referring to the "serious aspect of our affairs with Great Britain," he said: "But, as peace ought to be pursued with unremitting zeal, before the last resource, which has so often been the scourge of nations, and cannot fail to check the advancing prosperity of the United States, is contemplated, I have thought proper to nominate, and do hereby nominate, John Jay as Envoy Extraordinary of the United States to His Britannic Majesty."

The nomination was confirmed by a vote of 18 to 8. Jay's instructions were dated the 6th of May, 1794.² He sailed from New York on the 12th of the same month.³

He had scarcely left the shores of the United States when a new and still more irritating cause of difference arose. Lord Dorchester, the Governor-General of the British possessions in America, in a speech to the Indian tribes which were in hostility with the United States, said: "Children, since my return I find no appearance of a line remains, and, from the manner in which the people of the States push on, and act and talk on this side, and from what I learn of their conduct towards the sea, I shall not be surprised if we are at war with them in the course of the present year; and, if so, a line must then be drawn by the warriors." Simultaneously with this three companies of a British regiment went to the foot of the rapids of the Miami, in the southern part of what is now the State of Ohio, to build a fort there.' When complaints were made of these hostile acts, the British Minister at Washington justified both as defensible preparations for an actual state of war about to begin between the two nations, and he retorted by complaining of the fitting out of French privateers in American ports, and of the "uniformly unfriendly treatment which His Majesty's ships of war * * experienced in the American ports." President Washington, in transmitting the correspondence to both Houses of Congress, said: "This new state of things suggests the propriety of placing the United States in a posture of effectual preparation for an event which, notwithstanding the endeavors making to avert it, may, by circumstances beyond our control, be forced upon us."

The treaty concluded by Jay on the 19th of November, 1794, removed or suspended these grave causes of difference. It named a day for the withdrawal of British troops from the territories of the United States. The United States undertook to make compensation to British creditors who had been prevented by "lawful impediments,"⁸ in violation of the Treaty of 1783, from the recovery of their debts. Great Britain agreed to make compensation to the merchants and citizens of the United States whose vessels had been illegally captured or condemned, The United States undertook to make compensation to certain British subjects whose vessels or merchandise had been captured within the jurisdiction of the United States and brought into the same; or had been captured by vessels originally armed in the ports of the United States. it was agreed that provisions and

other articles not generally contraband of war should not be confiscated if seized, but that the owners should be fully indemnified; and that vessels approaching a blockaded port, in ignorance of the blockade, should not be detained, nor the cargo confiscated unless contraband."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1319-1321

BRITAIN THROUGH WAR WAS LEGISLATING FOR THE UNITED STATES

*****My Comment*****

What was the another cause and effect of the War of 1812? The biggest slave trading nation in the world would use this divisive issue against America in the Ghent Treaty of 1815, knowing once passed, legislation would have to be passed by the American Congress, to comply with the Treaty. Knowing this issue would divide the North from the South, to divide and then conquer. Was this the only way Britain attacked the United States, no they used even more subversive ways, the creation and control of the Bank of the United States in 1791-1811 and again in 1816-1836, which could not have be done without Washington creating federal District overlays in every state in March of 1791, the same month the bank was Chartered, I might add, when this took place Congress was out of session. This was the case until President Jackson drove a stake through its heart. However, their control over the money, finances and the media was so complete, with their bought Congressman and Senators we were doomed. The other way they completed their attack and Conquest was through the Lawyers and Judges they controlled, to overrule and rewrite long standing stare decisis, coinciding with their destruction of our documents in Washington during the War of 1812. There is no telling the significance of the documents that were destroyed, one document we know of, was the existence of the original Thirteenth Amendment, which would have forever driven a stake through the heart of the legal professions influence over our government, making it illegal for them to hold office in the U.S. government, because of their conflict of interest, serving two masters. This would have destroyed the kings ability to legislate for the United States, for he would have no access to our government through his esquires.

*****End Comment*****

*****Comment by the Informer*****

"One has to read the treatise by Charles Warren titled "The History Of The American Bar", published 1966 by Howard Fertig and Little , Brown and co., lib. Of cong. Card # 66-24357. This will tell you the entire sordid history of lawyers, when they started, where they started, how they came to be the scourge of American colonies before the revolutionary war and how they seemingly became the good guys at the time of 1774 to 1790. It explains the middle and inner temples of the bar and how they influenced the American courts to the point that all the non lawyer judges said they would some day rule the courts and every aspect of life in America. Now that has come to pass and this was predicted back in 1774. This book cannot be skim read and is 581 pages. After you read this you will know why the king placed the inner and middle temple lawyers in America so that he would have rule of the courts and why the war of 1812 was created to destroy the original 13th Amendment. Without the esquires the king was dead in the water so to speak."

*****End Comment the Informer*****

*****My Comment*****

Have you never wondered why our system of government so mirrors the British system? I bet many of you yet today have no idea where our federal reserve system comes from. It is the copy of the British Exchequer, it was written in secret by the Bank of England. Don't believe it, I suggest you read a Book I wrote back in 1992 called "A Country Defeated In Victory, parts 1 and 2", the facts cannot be disputed, much of which is Congressional Record. There are many other policies and programs we have that mirror Britain's, but I will not go into them here. So read the following quotes, then contemplate what it means that the above Treaties were suspended.

End Comment

NOTES-GREAT BRITAIN

"On the 1st of June, 1812, President Madison transmitted a confidential message to Congress respecting the relations with Great Britain. It ended without recommending any particular action.² It was received in each Body with closed doors.³ In the House it was considered on the 2d and 3d of June with closed doors. On the 3d, Calhoun, from the Committee on Foreign Relations to whom it had been referred, reported (the House being in secret session) "that after the experience which the United States have had of the great injustice of the British Government towards them, exemplified by so many acts of violence and oppression, it will be more difficult to justify to the impartial world their patient forbearance, than the measures to which it has become necessary to resort to avenge the wrongs and vindicate the rights and honor of the nation. * The period has now arrived when the United States must support their character and station among the nations of the earth. * More than seven years have elapsed since the commencement of this system of hostile aggressions by the British Government on the rights and interests of the United States. * As early as 1804 the Minister of the United States at London was instructed to invite the British Government to enter into a negotiation on all the points on which a collision might arise between the two countries in the course of the war, and to propose to it an arrangement of their claims on fair and reasonable conditions. The invitation was accepted. * it was at this time, and under these circumstances that an attack was made, by surprise, upon an important branch of the American Commerce. * The commerce on which this attack was so unexpectedly made, was that between the United States and the Colonies of France, Spain, and other enemies of Great Britain. * In May, 1806, the whole coast of the continent from the Elbe to Brest, inclusive, was declared to be in a state of blockade. By this act the well-established principles of the law of nations—principles which have served for ages as guides, and fixed the boundary between the rights of belligerents and neutrals--were violated. * The next act of the British Government which claims our attention is the order of council, of January 7, 1807, by which neutral powers are prohibited from trading from one port to another of France or her allies, or any other country with which Great Britain might not freely trade. * We proceed to bring into view the British order in council of November 11, 1807. * By this order all France and her allies, and every other country at war with Great Britain, or with which she was not at war, from which the British flag was excluded, and all the colonies of her enemies, were subjected to the same restrictions as if they were actually blockaded in the most strict and rigorous manner; and all trade in articles, the produce and manufacture of the said countries and colonies, and the vessels engaged in it, were subject to capture and condemnation as lawful prize. The attempt to dismember our Union, and overthrow our excellent Constitution, by a secret mission, the object of which was to foment discontent and excite insurrection against the constituted authorities and laws of the nation, as lately disclosed by the agent employed in it, affords full proof that there is no bound to the hostility of the British Government against the United States."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1325-1326

NOTES-GREAT BRITAIN

"From this review of the multiplied wrongs of the British Government, since the commencement of the present war, it must be evident to the impartial world that the contest which is now forced on the United States is radically a contest for their sovereignty and independence."

Treaties and Conventions, Department of State 1889, pg. 1326

My Comment

Finally America, it does not get any plainer than the facts above. Unless you can hold your hand up to the government when they come to take your land, and say: stop, "you cannot come on my land", and the government turns away and never comes back, to bother you or your heirs again, the arguments you may have with what I said above are bogus, because the nexus between allodial and Freeman cannot be overcome.

America, is there any hope of your waking up? Why must you be hit over the head over and over with truth? Still you make bogus claims in the courts, just to have the judges admonish you for your foolishness? Do you have to go to jail before you say "Damn, something is not right here, things are not as they appear, black is white, white is black"? As long as you don't know the enemy, nor the weapons used against you in this warfare, how in God's name do you think anything will change? Much of America, the Christians are waiting for Jesus Christ to come back and take care of the problem. Christians, unless you can figure a way to force Christ off His Throne,

before His enemies are destroyed, thereby forcing Him to violate His Word, you are going to have a very long wait, and continue to go down the crapper while you wait. Why the strong admonishment, because I'm tired of America accepting a lie, to acquiesce for the easiest path, rather than facing up to the facts of their legal and financial enslavement, because only when you face up to a problem will you do anything about it. As long as you wish to accept voluntary slavery, which is legal, the remedy will never be learned or used.

I have said all the above to say this; there is a way to change this, and I am not talking of armed rebellion or insurrection. In fact, it is the only way of reaching the level of freedom we seek, and what we have a right to demand, thereby removing the yokes from around our necks. The answer does not lie in a civil remedy, as I stated several times above in dealing with mans physical attempts to do it his way. Our Freedom has to do with a Trust granted by our Father in Heaven, I am working on a short paper, that will explain how we can regain our freedom through His knowledge, thereby exercising our rights provided in our Trust, as the legitimate heirs of Christ's Kingdom; the neat thing is, just as with the worldly kings system, no one has access to our Trust, except the heirs of Christ; until then keep the faith.

End Comment

James Franklin Montgomery