Friends, Enemies and the *die-hard* Doubters

Friends, Enemies and the die-hard Doubters, this is a joint writing by The Informer and James Montgomery which will reinforce what we have been saying all these years. Yet the so called "patriot" community continue on their way, and they lose, lose, lose, using the same old arguments that have not won since The Informer was started in the late 70's.

These irrefutable facts of case law prove that the King is still Sovereign. And the State, being his corporation, is Sovereign. "We the people" are nothing in the scheme of things. Neither were they when the 1787 compact of the State was adopted via the Treaty of 1783, which is still a contract, but with the crown. The King is a Corporation Sole. These cases were found using Corporation Sole which is explained in Black's 1st, & 4th Ed., and Ballantines Law Dictionaries. For brevity, only short quotes are used. The legal premise of the court's definitive description shows the royal Crown, operating through the States in Union (U.S.), remains sovereign in this country, operating behind the corporate vail as described in Anderson's Business Law, 14th ed.

North Carolina Reports (Archive) ASHEVILLE DIVISION NO. 15 v. ASTON, 92 N.C. 578 (1885) 2 S.E. 70, Page 584

(2) The estate conveyed. In strictness, while a CORPORATION SOLE has successors, a corporation aggregate has none, for it continues to exist, one and the same, as the river retains its identity, while the currents of water that from it are continually following in and passing out. There is a succession among the constituent members, but none in the corporation itself. Angell & Ames on Corporations, sec. 172.

Second case North Carolina Reports (Archive) DOUGHERTY v. SPRINKLE, 88 N.C. 300 (1883) 2 S.E. 70 Page 302

Third case North Carolina Reports (Archive) CARSON v. COMMISSIONERS,

64 N.C. 566 (1870) 2 S.E. 70 Page 442

Fourth case North Carolina Reports (Archive) McDOWELL v. HEMPHILL, 60 N.C. 95 (1863) 2 S.E. 70

McDOWELL v. HEMPHILL, 60 N.C. 95 (1863) ROBERT J. McDOWELL, TREASURER v. ANDREW HEMPHILL ET AL. Supreme Court of North Carolina. (June Term, 1863.)

"The treasurer of the trustees of Davidson College is not a CORPORATION SOLE; on a bond, therefore, payable to one as such, and his successors, a suit cannot be sustained in the name of a successor."

That case is decisive of the present action, and we suppose the attention of the counsel who issued the writ was not called to it. *"The treasurer of the trustees of Davidson College"* is *not* a CORPORATION SOLE, and cannot be made so, EXCEPT BY AN ACT OF THE LEGISLATURE. Fifth case North Carolina Reports (Archive) FEREBEE v. SANDERS, 25 N.C. 360 (1843) 2 S.E. 70 Page 247

"In England corporations are erected either by the charter of the King or by act of Parliament, or they exist by prescription. In this State they are created ONLY BY THE LEGISLATURE. The Legislature has heretofore passed acts, directing bonds in certain cases to be made payable to persons holding certain offices and to their successors in office, as to the Governor and his successors, the chairman of the county court and his successors. These individuals then became SOLE CORPORATIONS, BY FORCE OF THE ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE, for the particular object contemplated, and a bond taken in pursuance of those laws would go to the successor, and not to the executor of the obligee."

These cases were found using Sole Corporation:

Sixth case North Carolina Reports (Archive) GOVERNOR v. WELCH, 25 N.C. 249 (1842) 2 S.E. 70 Page 178

"They said that a bond given to a SOLE CORPORATION AND ITS

SUCCESSORS, did not, in law go the successor, but would go to the executor of the first obligee that bonds given TO CORPORATIONS SOLE, AS BISHOPS, PREBENDARIES, PARSONS, VICARS, ETC., would enure to them in their NATURAL CAPACITY, as they cannot take a chattel or chose in action in succession, unless by custom; and for this were cited Bac. Ab. Obligation, D. 2; Byrd v. Wilford, Cro. Eliz., 464; Fulwood's case, 4 Co., 65. THE ANSWER IS, THAT THE RULE RELIED UPON DOES NOT APPLY TO THE KING. HE MAY TAKE A CHATTEL OR CHOSE IN ACTION TO GO IN SUCCESSION THE REVENUE, NATIONAL SHIPS AND ALL THE MATERIALS OF WAR, WHICH ARE THINGS PERSONAL IN THEIR NATURE, GO IN SUCCESSION. SPECIALTIES AND OBLIGATIONS TAKEN TO THE USE OF THE KING WILL GO IN THE SAME WAY. WE HAVE NO MODERN AUTHORITY ON THIS POINT, BECAUSE, BY THE STAT., 33 HEN. 8, IT IS ENACTED, THAT ALL OBLIGATIONS AND SPECIALITIES, TAKEN TO THE USE OF THE KING, SHALL BE OF THE SAME NATURE AS A STATUTE STAPLE. THEY ARE NOW AS RECORDS, AND THE USUAL REMEDY FOR A BREACH IS BY SCIRE FACIAS." Williams on Ex'ors 653; Bingham on Executions, 228, 229. It appears from the face of this bond that the money belongs to the State; and the act directs that the bond shall be payable to the Governor for the time being.

Seventh case North Carolina Reports (Archive) BUTLER v. GODLEY, 12 N.C. 94 (1826) 2 S.E. 70 Page 69

"If a legal estate passed to Mary Godley by the deeds in question, the limitations after her life estate are void, and the whole interest vested in her. To me it is incomprehensible how a person can take to the use of or in the trust for himself; that he should be his own trustee; that he should have a right to call upon himself to perform the use or trust, and, if refused, enforce performance. So far from such an union being recognized in law, IT IS A WELL-ESTABLISHED MAXIM THAT IF THE TWO INTERESTS BECOME VESTED IN THE SAME PERSON, THE USE OR TRUST IMMEDIATELY VANISHES; it does not exist for a moment. It is true that where there is a sole corporation, as a parson or a bishop, the individual, the sole corporation, may hold in one capacity to the use of or in trust for the

other; and there is an unsatisfactory attempt made to make a tenant in fee hold for himself in tail, BUT THIS IS UPON THE GROUND THAT THERE ARE TWO PERSONS, THE ONE NATURAL, THE OTHER ARTIFICIAL, and it was attempted to be shown that a tenant in tail is an artificial person, created by the statute de bonis; but this shows that it is upon the idea that there are two persons that the two interests are supported. I must therefore discard the idea entirely that Mary Godley held in trust for herself, and afterwards in trust for ulterior remainders."

Well people what are you going to do now with all this info? Sit home and wait for more? Are you interested in obtaining freedom? These other cases below are right in line with the Davidson case above showing how the King, a CORPORATE SOLE, is controlling you through a process known as citizenship (being in a joint-venture) in commercial aspects operating in a capacity as CORPORATION SOLE under the Presumption Rule, that the commercial courts use to justify that you have no rights and need a lawyer because a corporation cannot represent itself. One of the cases above states there is a natural and artificial person tied in the same body. That is what the IRS has identified you on a alleged IMF, when it is truly a BMF and the fact they use a TC 148 HOLD is P, verifies the commercial status of a CORPORATION SOLE. The case above shows how people with trusts get nailed when they are caught saying *"this is MY TRUST."* The judge said differently did he not? Read the below cases for further proof.

WIGGINS v. ROGERS, 175 N.C. 66 (1917) 94 S.E. 685 TAYLOR V. MEADOWS, 175 N.C. 373 (1918) 95 S.E. 662 KIRKPATRICK v. McCRACKEN, 161 N.C. 198 (1912) 76 S.E. 821 BODDIE v. BOND, 154 N.C. 359 (1911) 70 S.E. 824 HANSTEIN v. FERRALL, 149 N.C. 240 (1908) 62 S.E. 1070 CHEATHAMv. YOUNG, 113 N.C. 161 (1893) 18 S.E. 92 BLOW v. VAUGMAN, 105 N.C. 198 (1890) 10 S.E. 891 ROBERTS v. PRESTON, 100 N.C. 243 (1888) 6 S.E. 574 DAVIDSON v. ARLEDGE, 97 N.C. 172 (1887) 2 S.E. 378

Mr. Informer, after writing the paper on corporations and reading your additional comments and cases, I remembered a case I looked up a couple of years ago, when doing the research for *"A Country Defeated In Victory".* It was on the subject of mortmain (the condition of land held inalienably by a

corporation). Because of our increased understanding now, it sheds more light on what was said in this case. The reality of these cases severely limits our remedies. The cases below prove no one can own property, without fear of it being seized for any reason either by the State or the king/queen of England.

Remember the States were and still are corporations of the Crown. The King is just a figurehead and the controlling people, like the Pope and the International banking cabal are in the background. Just as the President is only a figurehead in this country. He is not the one pulling the strings. Reading this case one has to remember the date it was decided was well after the 1776 Revolution and well after the 1783 Treaty by which allegedly the King gave up everything. The State is the King's Corporation, so read carefully every word of this next case remembering that the CORPORATE SOLE is the King and we are the aliens. That means aliens to the contract. I am not talking about geographical aliens but CONTRACT aliens. If you don't understand I suggest you buy my book, *Which One Are You,* and read it at least three times before trying to grasp the word Alien. An alien has no privity to a contract and is considered a *"stranger"* as noted in my book in great detail. They are talking about contract in all the court cases. I will emphasize below in caps.

"The cases of purchases of land by ALIENS and corporations, under the statutes of mortmain, are not in point. It is settled, that AN ALIEN or a corporation may, by purchase, take land, BUT CANNOT HOLD; and the doctrine is put on the ground, that if one by an executed conveyance, which is his own act, passes land to an ALIEN, or corporation, he shall not have it back; but it shall belong to THE SOVEREIGN, UPON OFFICE FOUND. It is otherwise in regard to the act of law. If the heir, of one dying seized of land, be an ALIEN, the law will NOT CAST THE DESCENT ON HIM, because he cannot hold beneficially, and the law will not give with one hand and take away with the other, but will cast the descent upon the next relation who is capable of holding. For the same reason, an ALIEN husband does not take as tenant by the curtesy, nor an ALIEN wife take dower.... ....It is a well-settled rule of law in England, AND IN THIS STATE AS WELL AS IN MOST, IF NOT ALL, OF THE OTHER STATES OF THE UNION, that an ALIEN may

acquire lands by purchase, and may hold them against all persons EXCEPT THE KING, OR THE STATE; [OK PEOPLE, I MUST INTERJECT HERE, THE KING GAVE UP ALL RIGHTS IN THE 1783 TREATY? READ ON] but upon office found, the KING IN ENGLAND, or THE STATE IN THIS COUNTRY, MAY SEIZE AND HAVE THEM. Co. Lit. 2; 1 Black. Com. 372. [MY GOD PEOPLE, WHAT ELSE BESIDES A 2X4 UPSIDE OF THE HEAD WILL MAKE YOU UNDERSTAND?] Different reasons have been given for the rule. Mr. Justice BLACKSTONE, on the page above cited, says that "if an ALIEN could acquire a permanent property in lands, he must owe an allegiance, equally permanent with that property, TO THE KING OF ENGLAND, which would probably be inconsistent with that which he owes to his own natural liege-lord; besides, that, thereby, the nation might in time be subject to foreign influence, and feel many other inconveniences. Wherefore, by the civil law, such contracts were also made void; but the prince had no such advantage of forfeiture thereby, as with us in England. Among other reasons which might be given for our constitution, it seems to be intended by way of punishment for the ALIEN'S presumption in attempting to acquire any landed property." One of the editors in his note (8) on this page remarks that "a political reason may be given for this, stronger than any here adduced. If ALIENS were admitted to purchase and hold lands in this country, it might at any time be in the power of a foreign State to raise a powerful party amongst us; for power is ever the concomitant of property." He illustrates his position by referring to the course pursued by the Czarina of Russia to raise up a party and acquire an influence in Poland whereby she was enabled to dismember that devoted and unhappy Kingdom. In the case of Governeur v. Roberston, 11 Wheat. Rep. 332, Mr. Justice JOHNSTON, in delivering the opinion of the Court, speaks of the rule as having been so long and so firmly established in the common law, that an enquiry into the foundation of it was a mere matter of antiquarian curiosity, and he then seems to approve what he had seen in an elementary writer, as the reason why the sovereign could not seize the lands until an office was found, to wit, "that every person is supposed a natural born subject, that is resident in the Kingdom, and that owes allegiance to the King, till the contrary be found by office." There can be no doubt, then, of the rule of law, whatever may be the reason for it, that an ALIEN may acquire by purchase, land or any other species of real estate, and may hold it

against all persons EXCEPT THE KING OR STATE; and may hold even against the sovereign, until he may choose to have an office found, and process thereupon to have it seized into his hands. Among the modes of acquisition in England AND IN THIS STATE, is that by devise, or disposition contained in a man's last will. Hence, in England, and perhaps in this State, an alien might take real property by devise, which would give him a good title to it, as against all persons BUT THE SOVEREIGN...." TRUSTEES, DAVIDSON COLLEGE v. CHAMBERS' EXECUTORS, 56 N.C. 253 (1857)

Now if you people who claim to be sovereign, I hate to bust your bubble, here it is in this case that you are not. Oh what deluded fools we have been thinking we created the states and the constitution and are sovereign. This is the biggest fraud in history pulled on you and you never knew it. That is why I wrote "The Big Lie" and the American's Bulletin published an expanded version called The Big Lie III. The State is the corporation of the King and the State created corporations are political subdivisions of the State so read on.

"....At common law, corporations generally have the legal capacity to take a title IN FEE to real property. They were prohibited in England by the statutes of mortmain, but these statutes have never been adopted in this State, so that the common-law right to take an estate in fee, incident to a corporation (at common law), is unlimited, EXCEPT BY ITS CHARTER AND BY STATUTE. But the authorities go to the extent that even when the right to acquire real property, is limited by the charter, and the corporation transcends its power in that respect, and for that reason is incompetent to take title to real estate, a conveyance to it is not void, BUT ONLY THE SOVEREIGN (HERE THE STATE) CAN OBJECT. It is valid until assailed in a direct proceeding instituted by THE SOVEREIGN for that purpose...." Leazern v. Hilegas, 7 Sargt., 313; Gonndie v. Northamton Water Co., 7 Pa. St., 233; National Bank v. Whiting, 103 U.S., 99; Angel & Ames on Corporations, Secs. 152-777; Runyon v. Coster, 14 Pet., 122; The Bank v. Poiteaux, 3 Rand (Va.), 136 Case is also cited in: MALLETT v. SIMPSON, 94 N.C. 37 (1886)and CROSS v. R. R., 172 N.C. 119 (1916).

I know you can't believe what you read and probably cannot comprehend what

you read, but there it is. This is why Eminent Domain exists and the State corporation of the King can seize land whenever it damn well please. Since the Railroad is a corporation of the United States and all States are under the Treaty of 1783, whereby the King DID NOT grant everything away, you might want to pull and read the next entire case. I will only quote excerpts and they are not out of context to show my point because when you read the entire case you will have to concur.

CROSS v. R. R., 172 N.C. 119 (1916) 90 S.E. 14 MAMIE W. CROSS ET AL. v. SEABORD AIR LINE RAILWAY COMPANY. Supreme Court of North Carolina. (Filed 4 October, 1916.)

4. Railroads-- Rights of Way-- Ultra Vires Acts--Objection by State.

Where the owner of lands brings action against a railroad company involving its right of way thereon, it is not open to the plaintiff to show that the defendant was acting ultra vires in its use and occupation, such position being available ONLY TO THE STATE.

5. Same-- Deeds and Conveyances.

Where a railroad company takes a conveyance of lands for use beyond its character powers, the deed is not a valid, but only voidable upon THE OBJECTION OF THE STATE.

The defendant could acquire title by grant or deed, and why not by adverse possession for twenty years, which tolled the entry originally, because there arose therefrom the presumption of a grant or deed? If the land had been conveyed to the defendant, and the act of acquiring and holding it was ultra vires, NO ONE BUT THE STATE COULD COMPLAIN, AND A PRIVATE PERSON WOULD NOT BE HEARD TO ATTACK THE TITLE ON THAT GROUND. NO ONE BUT THE STATE can take advantage of the defect that the purchase was ultra vires. This principle is fully sustained by the authorities. Like an ALIEN WHO IS FORBIDDEN by the local law to acquire real estate, he may take and hold title until "office found." Fairfax v. Hunter, 7 Cranch, 604. In the Leazern case the corporation had been restricted by its charter from purchasing land except for certain purposes, which it had

transcended, and the title was assailed upon the ground that the purchase was void, but the Court held:

"The corporation might take independent of a provision in the act of incorporation, and the title of the corporation, like that of an alien, would be defeasible only by the State. No one can take advantage of the defect (of title) but the State." In another case it was held: "When a corporation was authorized by its charter to purchase real estate for certain purposes, but for no other, a deed executed to it by one having capacity to convey vested the title in the corporation, and such title could be assailed, on the ground that the purchase was ultra vires, only the State or by a stockholder." Hough v. Land Co., 73 Ill., 23.

Two other cases to pull and read are: BARCELLO v. HAPGOOD, 118 N.C. 712 (1896) 24 S.E. 124 MALLETT v. SIMPSON, 94 N.C. 37 (1886)

But the controlling case and granddaddy of them all is:- TRUSTEES, DAVIDSON COLLEGE v. CHAMBERS' EXECUTORS, 56 N.C. 253 (1857)

"The executors admit that they have the fund in their hands, and express their readiness to pay it over to whomsoever the Court may declare that it ought to be paid. The question is thus fairly raised between the plaintiffs and the next of kin of the testator, and it becomes the duty of the Court to decide it according to the established principles of equity.

In the very able arguments made for the plaintiffs, the counsel have urged their claim upon two grounds: First, its analogy to the acquisition of land by an alien; and, secondly, its analogy to the principle upon which the statutes of mortmain in England were construed. I will proceed to consider them both, and will commence with that of the alien.

It is a well-settled rule of law in England, AND IN THIS STATE as well as in most, if not all, OF THE OTHER STATES OF THE UNION, that an alien may acquire lands by purchase, and may hold them against all persons except the King, or the State; but upon OFFICE FOUND, the King in England, or the State in this country, may seize and have them. Co. Lit. 2; 1 Black. Com. 372.

SOUND FAMILIAR PEOPLE? READ ON. *"There can be no doubt, then, of the rule of law, whatever may be the reason for it, that an alien may acquire by purchase, land or any other species of real estate, and may hold it against all persons EXCEPT THE KING OR STATE; and may hold even against the sovereign, until he may choose to have an OFFICE FOUND, and process thereupon to have it seized into his hands. Among the modes of acquisition in England and in this State, is that by devise, or disposition contained in a man's last will. Hence, in England, and perhaps in this State, an alien might take real property by devise, which would give him a good title to it, as against all persons BUT THE SOVEREIGN.* [And you thought you were the sovereign?] *In analogy to this, the counsel for the plaintiffs have contended that their clients have the right to take the whole legacy bequeathed to them by Mr. Chambers, though it may be that by force of the restrictive clause in their charter, the State might, if it saw fit, take from them the excess over the value of the property which they were authorized to own."*

What is this *"office found?"* Here is the definition from Bouvier's 1870 Dictionary; *"When an inquisition is made to the king's use of any thing, by virtue of office of him who inquires, and the inquisition is found, it is said to be office found. See Inquest of office."* So we go to Inquest of office and it says; *"An inquiry made by the king's officer, his sheriff, coroner, or escheator, either virtute officii, or by writ sent to him for that purpose, or by commissioners especially appointed, concerning any matter that entitles the king to the possession of lands or tenements, goods or chattels. It is done by a jury of no determinate number, -- either twelve, or more, or less. An inquest of office was bound to find for the king upon the direction of the court. The reason given is that an inquest concluded no man of his right, but only gave the king an opportunity to enter, so that he could save his right tried. An inquest of office was also called, simply, "office." As to "office" in the United States, see 1 Caines, N.Y. 426; 7 Cranch 603."* Now people, go read Black's Fourth Ed., it has been incorporated into the United States. Now pull and read Phillips v Moore, 100 US 208, 25 L.Ed. 603

IT GETS EVEN BETTER, OR WORSE DEPENDING UPON YOUR VIEW.

"In the case of Rouche v. Williamson, 3 Ire. Rep. 141, this Court suggested

the following explanation: "It has occurred to us, that perhaps the doctrine may be thus accounted for and explained. In real and in mixed actions strictly so called, the demandant seeks to obtain, by means of the law, the seizin of a parcel of land or a tenement, whereof he has never had seizin, or of the seizin whereof he has been unlawfully deprived. Now, as the law will not aid aliens to get land, because by such means THE REALM MAY BE IMPOVERISHED, (The King v. Holland, Allen, 14), it will withhold its aid to restore, or to give him seizin, though, while he remains seized, it will protect him against wrongdoers. It may be, also, that while the alien is seized, the law regards him AS HOLDING FOR THE USE OF THE SOVEREIGN, (1 Inst. 186, a), but the law deems him an improper person to take such seizin for the King, without the King's license." It is true that the Court held that the alien might maintain ejectment; but they put the decision expressly upon the ground, that as against the tenant in possession, the lessor had the right to the possession of the land, of which such tenant had unjustly deprived him."

Right here people, is enough proof that the King, operating through the State (his corporation in union with other corporations under a common constitution devised in 1787, which was initiated by previous treaties), is still the real owner and you, only as an alien to the contract, are a tenant in possession, See OFFICE FOUND above. I don't care whether you have a deed or not, it is only a possession deed till the King or the State or one of their corporate subdivisions want it. Don't pay the land use tax and your outta there in a heart beat and another Ryot Tenure takes over. I had written about this in my Which One Are You book in 1990 where on page 55 I stated we are nothing but Ryot Tenure on the land. Ok, back to the case.

"Upon an examination of all of them, except that of 9th George 2nd, it will be seen that they did not make void the purchase of lands by the corporations, but declared that if it was made without licenses from the king, and the lords of whom the lands were holden, the lands should be forfeited, and the lord, or king, as the case might be, should have the right to enter for the forfeiture, and seize the lands for his own use. It will be seen further, that the king could not enter until office found; Shelf. on Mort. 10, citing Hayne v. Redfern, 12 East. Rep. 96; Evans v. Evans, 5 Barn. and Cres. 587, note (e); S.

C. 8 Dowl. and Ryl. 399. The statute of 9 George 2, ch. 36, was intended to apply to conveyances and devises of lands, or any interest in them made to individual trustees, as well as to bodies politic, for charitable purposes, and it declared all such as were not executed as therein prescribed, to be void. Under this statute, then, all the forbidden conveyances and devises were construed to be void, and in the case of a devise, the heir-at-law was held to be entitled to the land. Shelf. on Mort. 204.

I have hereinbefore referred to the opinion of Chancellor KENT, that none of these statutes of Mortmain had been adopted in any State of the Union except Pennsylvania. I think I may safely assert that not one of them has ever been in force in North Carolina. I do not find in our reports any trace of their existence here. It is true, that the statute of 18th Edw. 1st, enacting that "no feoffment shall be made to assure land in main," is inserted by the revisors of 1820, in their list of British statutes then in force. (See 1 Rev. Code of 1820, p. 87). It may well be doubted whether it ever was so; but if it were, it was certainly repealed when the statutes were revised in 1836. (See 1 Rev. Stat. ch. 1, sec. 2). There has been no necessity for any such restraints upon corporations by statutory enactments in this country. In England it was otherwise; and the difference in the condition of the two countries with regard to their bodies politic, and the resulting difference in their legislation concerning them, is clearly stated by the Court in a case to which I shall refer more particularly hereafter. "A capacity to purchase and alien land, unless specially restrained by its charter, or by statute, has been held to be an incident, at common law, to every corporation. This general power, it has been found necessary in England to restrain by statute; and there, their powers in this respect are understood to be general and unlimited, except so far as controlled by such statutes. A large proportion of the corporations there hold their corporate rights by prescription. This supposes the grant no where to be found in written form. The uncertainty of the limits of the powers granted, and the great extent of powers claimed, at an early period created a necessity of limiting them by act of parliament. The statutes of Mortmain have this effect, in reference to purchasing and holding lands. In this country, few instances can be found of the existence of corporations, whose charters did not originate in express legislative enactment, and are not

to be found printed in the statute books. In these cases, the grant of power is before us. THE CHARTER DEFINES THE GRANT, with its restrictions and limitations. Unless some other statute, enacted by the same authority, either general or special, can be found, enlarging or restricting those powers, WE LOOK NO FURTHER FOR THE RIGHTS OF THE BODY CORPORATE."

Ok people, what is this *"Charter"* they speak of? The 1783 Treaty in conjunction with the 1787 Constitution. The States, by prescription from the King, by Treaty, hold the land for the King under Legislative enactment because they are His corporations. They in turn, parcel out the land to other corporations, and aliens (you) because you are an alien friend allowed to only hold the land in TAIL for your use, but the King still owns it and the State is his agent. Got to remember people that Statute "De Donis" converted all such estates fee simple to estates tail. Did not know that did you? So why is it that you get a document stating in fee simple? Because they slyly made you a CORPORATE SOLE, but not like the King. That is why the United States, the corporator of all the states into a Union can control all the land it owns and if a State cedes land from its corporate domain to the corporate United States the King still owns it and that is why we are considered by the States as *"corporation sole"* for that is the only way they can collect a tax. Remember Butler v Godley where you are considered two characters? Remember that legal entity, corporate, name on your IMF. Remember the CP 55 UK/US Treaty designation and only corporations can be taxed? Why does the IRS come after you using a CP 515, 516, 517 and 518 notices which are only designed for a BUSINESS Entity? Are you a corporate person of artificial character called a *"resident"* in legal terms, thereby being a "citizen" (26 CFR 1.1-1 and 26 USC sec. 1) in *"joint-venture"* and therefore a subject "to the jurisdiction thereof" because you are presumed to be a corporate sole for taxing purposes because you have the privilege of living on the Kings land held in trust by the corporate State and United States? You are also in fee simple so that after your body dies the Corporate Sole still lives on. Gottcha again, didn't they?

Our forefathers were, in effect, at the mercy of their business ventures with lands and assets coming to them as a result, and also any lands or rem

property they may have inherited from their ancestors. Why? Well as a matter of settled English common law, anyone declared to have committed treason, automatically forfeited any estates or rem property to the king, without a trial. Everyone of our fore fathers that signed the Declaration of Independence were declared traitors and were to be hung if found by British troops. Also, after independence was so called won, everyone swearing their new allegiance to the United States became aliens also, subject to have their estates forfeited to the king, when a senior land holder died and Office found. So ask yourself. Did the king have any leverage over our fore fathers when they negotiated the 1783 Peace Treaty? Is this why even though we said we won in the history books the king granted us the lands in America. Does the defeated country ever grant lands to the victor, or do they not always become property of the Conqueror? This fact along with the above and below court cases prove, because English common law was not defeated and retained by the new states, the king's corporations continued unchanged. All that took place was a reorganization of the king's corporations he set up in America, into individual state corporations, who transferred their corporate sovereignty over to the United States. The war was over in 1781, the Treaty was signed in 1783, the United States Corporation was officially started in 1787. However, the king signed off on its creation. Read the 1783 Treaty again, the United States corporation is mentioned four years before it was chartered and the 6th section was added as a condition for the fore fathers not to lose their estates, and as a matter of quid quo pro, the kind not forfeit his holdings and corporation, and thanks to English common law being recognized in the States the forefathers new there was nothing they could do about it, but play word games to cover it up. Patrick Henry recognized their game, using such terms as *"We the People"* or the united States being change to United States. Mr. Informer, I think this would be a good place to inject the following case, HAMILTON v. BROWN, 161 U.S. 256 (1896). Now those of you in Texas or in other States that claim to be in a Republic not subject to the laws or jurisdiction of the state in which you live, you better reserve judgment for just a minute longer. I know those in Texas claiming they live in a Republic truly believe this, but you have not seen the debilitating fact of the Republic of Texas claiming English common law. Where English common law exists, so does the king's corporation, and all

grants stemming therefrom. Sorry, but it is true, this trumps every argument except one. A grant of land preceding the king's incorporation, the grant from God Almighty that all men are tenants on His land, and are to be stewards of it. Any man cannot own the land as the king and Pope claim, they are only receivers of the grant from God Almighty like all men, co equal. Now the court case. The subject matter of the case was a man owing a portion of land in the Texas Republic died, he had heirs living in another state. The land was claimed by the later formed State of Texas, by the Sheriff. The land was later sold. The heirs of the dead man tried to sue for possession of their relative's land. They lost and the Supreme court upheld their lose.

"By the law of England, before the Declaration of Independence, the lands of a man dying intestate and without lawful heirs reverted by escheat to the king as the sovereign lord; but the king's title was not complete without an actual entry upon the land, or judicial proceedings to ascertain the want of heirs and devisees. Attorney General v. Mercer, 8 App. Cas. 767, 772; 2 Bl. Comm. 245. The usual form of proceeding for this purpose was by an inquisition or inquest of office before a jury, which was had upon a commission out of the court of chancery, but was really a proceeding at common law; and, if it resulted in favor of the king, then, by virtue of ancient statutes, any one claiming title in the lands might by leave of that court, file a traverse, in the nature of a plea or defense to the king's claim, and not in the nature of an original suit. Lord Somers, in The Bankers' Case, 14 How. State Tr. 1, 83; Ex parte Webster, 6 Ves. 809; Ex parte Gwydir, 4 Madd. 281; In re Parry, L. R. 2 Eq. 95; People v. Cutting, 3 Johns. 1; Briggs v. Light-Boats, 11 Allen, 157, 172. The inquest of office was a proceeding in rem. When there was a proper office found for the king, that was notice to all persons who had claims to come in and assert them, and, until so traversed, it was conclusive in the king's favor. Bayley, J., in Doe v. Redfern, 12 East, 96, 103; 16 Vin. Abr. 86, pl. 1.....By the constitution of 1836 of the republic of Texas (article 4, 13), it was provided that the legislature should, 'as early as practicable, introduce, by statute, the common law of England, with such modifications as our circumstances, in [161 U.S. 256, 264] their judgment, may require.' 2 Chart. & Const. 1757. And by the statutes of Texas, from the time of its existence as an independent republic, the common law of England,

so far as not inconsistent with the constitution and laws of Texas, has been declared to be, together with such constitution and laws, the rule of decision, and to continue in force until altered or repealed by the legislature. Tex. St. Jan. 20, 1840; Pasch. Dig. (4th Ed.) art 978; Rev. St. 1879, 3128; Courand v. Vollmer, 31 Tex. 397; Barrett v. Kelly, Id. 476. By the constitution of the state of Texas of 1845, it was provided, in article 4, 10, that the district court should have original jurisdiction 'of all suits in behalf of the state to recover penalties, forfeitures and escheats'; and in article 13, 4, as follows: 'All fines, penalties, forfeitures and escheats which have accrued to the republic of Texas under the constitution and laws shall accrue to the state of Texas; and the legislature shall by law provide a method for determining what lands may have been forfeited or escheated.' 2 Chart. Const. 1773, 1781. ....'The object of such a proceeding is not simply to have a decree declaring the escheat, and vesting the title in the state, but, by and through process to be issued under the judgment, to divest, not only the title of persons entitled to take the property of the deceased as his heirs, if perchance any such there be, but also, by a sale, to divest the title of the state, and to start, ana confer upon the purchaser, a new title, deraigned directly from the sovereign of the soil. Rev. St. 1777- 1780...." HAMILTON v. BROWN, 161 U.S. 256 (1896)

I love the above case because when you read Texas v White, 74 U.S Wall 7, which is only 43 pages long, or you can read it in the eight pages of The Informer's *"Would You Use The Constitution as a Source of Rights"* published in 1993, you will immediately see why James included the Brown case. So although, as James says that Republics are under the Crown, it also shows that when people claim that they are forming a *"de jure"* Republic, it is an impossibility until they oust the Pope and King who are the contractual heirs to the land. You cannot dispute this because of the evidence laid out here. If it is, it is the knee jerk, gut reaction I spoke of in the beginning. The same reaction that has got us nowhere so far. The court in Texas v White specifically said, *"By this act, the new State and the people in the new State, were invested with all the rights, and became SUBJECT to all the responsibilities and duties of the ORIGINAL constitution.*" Hmmm, NEW STATE, INVESTED with rights? What was the old State? What rights, the

rights dictated and granted by whom? I thought people had all the RIGHTS they needed, why are they invested? By golly there we go with words that people think they know what they mean. Do you know what invested really means in the context of the Brown and White case? Let me show you what it means and in doing so it makes the Brown and White case even clearer. Out of Ballantine's Dictionary invested means, *"See invest; invested capital; investment. So lets look at investment and the particular section specific to the above two cases." This word, within the meaning of a clause authorizing executors and trustees to retain investments or any property in which the estate may be "invested" at the time of the testator's death, means property from which an income or profit is expected to be derived in the ordinary course of events."* Does the King own the property? Does the King expect a portion of the proceeds from that property as stated in the cases James mentioned? Are you nothing but a trustee when you buy the *"invested"* rights only granted to you by the sovereign's agent, the State? Do you now know why you pay property taxes? Ok James, back to you.

The ruling of the below case should set everyone down, but the Informer and I have been saying, and continue to say this is the condition in this country. Also, contained in the Blackstone quote, it is mentioned, rights of the British in their declaration of liberties, not so, read the Declaration of Rights 1689, third section, it is made clear the rights of the corporation and the grantors take precedent. *"Office Found",* depends on the context, if talking about the king it refers to an heir or successor and removing holdings from aliens, if talking about sub corporations, the corporations are protecting their grants to keep the grants out of the hands of an alien friend or enemy. In either case once office is found the land or possession reverts back to the corporation, state or king, the sovereign. Gee, I wonder if this is why we were all declared to be enemy aliens in 1933? It was cited as "Trading with the enemy" and we were declared the enemy by 48 Stat 1 by Roosevelt. Read it in the opening parts of the statute.

I am also citing the land mark case: FAIRFAX'S DEVISEE v. HUNTER'S LESSEE, 11 U.S. 603 (1812) It absolutely defines a Treaty is the Supreme law of the land and how the Treaties of 1783 and 1794 protected the kings

holdings, period. This is the same as the supreme court case the Informer cited in his The New History of America on page 19, that also, definitively states the Treaty is above the Constitution because it created the Constitution. In the case below you will see what the king has been doing is recapturing corporate holdings that came about after the two Treaties were passed, because the holdings were in the hands of aliens. After this case read the three supreme court cases that echo this North Carolina case.

"Military conquerors of foreign states in time of war may doubtless displace the courts of the conquered country, and may establish civil tribunals in their place for administering justice; and in such cases it is unquestionably true that the jurisdiction of suits of every description is transferred to the new tribunals. United States v. Rice, 4 Wheat. 246; Cross v. Harrison, 16 How. 164....Towns, provinces, and territories, says Halleck, which are retaken from the conqueror during the war, or which are restored to their former sovereign by the treaty of peace, are entitled to the right of postliminy; and the original sovereign owner, on recovering his dominion over them, whether by force of arms or by treaty, is bound to restore them to their former state. In other words, he acquires no new right over them, either by the act of recapture or of restoration. . . . He rules not by any newly acquired title which relates back to any former period, but by his antecedent title, which, in contemplation of law, has never been divested. Halleck, Int. Law, 871. " DOW v. JOHNSON, 100 U.S. 158 (1879) *"It is clear, therefore, that this doctrine has no sufficient sanction in authority, and it will be found equally unsupported by principle or analogy. [152 U.S. 505, 509] 'The general rule is positively against it, for the books, old and new, uniformly represent the king as a competent grantor in all cases in which an individual may grant, and any person in esse, and not civiliter mortuus, as a competent grantee. Femes covert, infants, aliens, persons attainted of treason or felony, clerks, convicts, and many others, are expressly enumerated as competent grantees. Perkins, Grant, 47, 48, 51, etc.; Comy. Dig. 'Grant,' B 1. It behooves those, therefore, who would except aliens, when the immediate object of the king's grant, to maintain the exception."* MANUEL v. WULFF, 152 U.S. 505 (1894)

"Whether the plaintiffs in error were entitled to be allowed, in the

assessment of damages, for the value of prospective gold mines in tract 39, designated on the map of the park, was a question mooted at the trial, and the action of the court in striking out the testimony offered to show such value, and in holding that, if there are any deposits of gold in this ground, they are the property of the United States, is complained of in the 7th, 8th, and 9th assignments of errors. The history of the tract in question was gone into at great length, and various patents of the province and state of Maryland were put in evidence. The court below held that, as by the grant of Charles I. to Lord Baltimore, 'all veins, mines, and quarries, as well opened as hidden, already found, or that shall be found, within the regions, islands, or limits aforesaid, of gold, silver, gems, and precious stones,' passed to the grantee, he yielding unto the king, his heirs and successors, 'the one-fifth part of all gold and silver ore which shall happen, from time to time, to be found;' and as the confiscation of the proprietary's title in 1780 vested the same in the state of [147 U.S. 282, 307] Maryland; and as also the royalty of one fifth part of the gold and silver reserved to the king had also become, by the Revolution, vested in the state, -consequently the United States succeeded to the state's title by the act of cession of 1791." SHOEMAKER v. U S, 147 U.S. 282 (1893)

"The necessity of an inquest of office was considered by this court at an early day in two cases. In Smith v. Maryland, 6 Cranch, 286, it was held that by the confiscation act of Maryland, passed in 1780, before the adoption of the constitution, interests in land were completely divested by operation of law, without office found. The validity of the act was apparently not considered. [165 U.S. 413, 432] The case of Fairfax's Devisee v. Hunter's Lessee, 7 Cranch, 603, involved the title to a large tract of land in Virginia, granted to Lord Fairfax. The lands were devised by will to Denny Fairfax, a British subject, who never became a citizen of the United States, but always resided in England, and was an alien enemy. In 1789 the governor of the commonwealth of Virginia granted the lands by patent to Hunter, a citizen of Virginia, who entered into possession prior to the institution of the action. It was the opinion of the court that the title acquired by an alien by purchase is not divested until office found, although it was contended that the common law as to inquests of office had been dispensed with by statute, so as to

make the grant to Hunter complete and perfect. As to this point, Mr. Justice Story observed (page 622): 'We will not say that it was not competent for the legislature (supposing no treaty in the way), by a special act, to have vested the land in the commonwealth without an inquest of office for the cause of alienage. But such an effect ought not, upon principles of public policy, to be presumed upon light ground. That an inquest of office should be made in cases of alienage is a useful and important restraint upon public proceedings. ... It prevents individuals from being harassed by numerous suits introduced by litigious grantees. It enables the owner to contest the question of alienage directly by a traverse of the office. It affords an opportunity for the public to know the nature, the value, and the extent of its acquisitions, pro defectu hoeredis. And, above all, it operates as a salutary suppression of that corrupt influence which the avarice of speculation might otherwise urge upon the legislature. The common law, therefore, ought not to be deemed to be repealed, unless the language of a statute be clear and explicit for this purpose.' It was further held that during the war the lands in controversy were never, by any public law, vested in the commonwealth. It was also held that the treaty of 1794 with Great Britain completely protected and confirmed the title of Denny Fairfax. Mr. Justice Johnson, dissenting, was of opinion that the interest acquired by Denny Fairfax under the devise was a mere scintilla juris, and that [165 U.S. 413, 433] scintilla was extinguished by the grant of the state vesting the tract in Hunter; that it was competent for the state to assert its rights over an alien's property by other means than by an inquest of office; that in Great Britain, in the case of treason, an inquest of office had been expressly dispensed with by the statute of 33 Hen. VIII. c. 30; and that he saw no reason why it was not competent for the legislature of Virginia to do the same." ATLANTIC & P R CO v. MINGUS, 165 U.S. 413 (1897)

Now people, you have to go back and see what The Informer said earlier about *"Office Found,"* as I am about to quote the following case and Blackstone on this issue. This should dispel any doubts that people might have left that THEY are sovereign, they never have been, and are but peons in the grand scheme of things. In no way do we control Congress or the State legislators. In no way are "we the people", the bosses of any legislator

despite what a lot of so called "patriots" want to believe. The constitution was worthless to start with and will always remain worthless to enslave people. Patrick Henry and some other anti-federalists saw this but no one would take heed and so it has escalated to the present day regime having more control than they ever thought over the people. The King reins supreme through his Legislators in this country as they keep the sovereign's agent (the State), a fiction, in complete control.

"Substantial evidence that British Corporations established an office in the United States under a resident agent, that the office collected dividends from vast holdings of American securities and did countless other tasks essential to the maintenance of a large investment portfolio, constituted sufficient basis for Tax Court's finding that corporations maintained an "office or place of business" in the United States and were taxable as "resident foreign corporations" C.I.R. v. Scottish American Inv. Co., U.S., 65 S.Ct. 169, 172, 323 U.S. 119, 89 L.Ed. 113. Words and Phrases

"332. b. Inquest of office, etc. Such is that of inquisition or inquest of office: which is an inquiry made by the king's officer, his sheriff, coroner or escheator, virtute officii (by virtue of their office), or by writ to them sent for that purpose, or by commissioners specially appointed, concerning any matter that entitles the king to the possession of lands or tenements, goods or chattels. This is done by a jury of no determinate number; being either twelve, or less, or more. As, to inquire, whether the king's tenant for life died seised, whereby the reversion accrues to the king; whether A, who held immediately of the crown, died without heirs; be attainted of treason, whereby his estate is forfeited to the crown: whether C, who has purchased lands, be an alien; which is another cause of forfeiture: whether D be an idiot a nativitate (from his birth); and therefore, together with his lands, appertains to the custody of the king: and other questions of like import, concerning both the circumstances of the tenant and the value or identity of the lands. These inquests of office were more frequently in practice than at present, during the continuance of the military tenures amongst us: when, upon the death of every one of the king's tenants' an inquest of office was held, called an inquisitio post mortem (an inquest after death), to inquire of

what lands he died seised, who was his heir, and of what age, in order to entitle the king to his marriage, wardship, relief, primer-seisin, or other advantages, as the circumstances of the case might turn out. To superintend and regulate these inquiries the court of wards and liveries was instituted by statute 32 Henry VIII, c. 46 (Court of Wards, 1540), which was abolished at the restoration of the King Charles the Second, together with the oppressive tenures upon which it was founded. With regard to other matters, the inquests of office still remain in force, and are taken upon proper occasions; being extended not only to lands, but also to goods and chattels personal, as in the case of wreck, treasure-trove an the like; and especially as to forfeitures for offenses. For every jury which tries a man for treason or felony, every coroner's inquest that sits upon a felo de se, or one killed by chance-medley, is, not only with regard to chattels, but also as to real interest, in all respects an inquest of office; and if they find the treason or felony, or even the flight of the party accused (though innocent) the king is thereupon, by virtue of this office found, entitled to have his forfeitures; and also, in the case of chance-medley, he or his grantees are entitled to such things by way of deodand as have moved to the death of the party. These inquests of office were devised by law, as an authentic means to give the king his right by solemn matter of record; without which he in general can neither take nor part from anything. For it is a part of the liberties of England, and greatly for the safety of the subject, that the king may not enter upon or seize any man's possessions upon bare surmises without the intervention of a jury. It is, however, particularly enacted by the statue 33 Henry VIII, c 20 (Treason, 1541), that, in case of attainder for high treason, the king shall have the forfeiture instantly, without any inquisition of office. And, as the king hath no title at all to any property of this sort before office found, therefore by the statute 18 Henry VI, c. 6 (Crown Grants, 1439), it was enacted that all letters patent or grants of lands and tenements before office found, or returned into the exchequer, shall be void. And, by the bill of rights at the revolution, 1 W.&M., st. 2, c. 2 (1688), it is declared that all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction (which is here the inquest of office) are illegal and void; which indeed was the law of the land in the reign of Edward the Third. With regard to real property, if an office be found for the king, it puts him in immediate

possession, without the trouble of a formal entry, provided a subject in the like case would have had right to enter; and the king shall receive all the mesne or intermediate profits from the time that his title accrued. As, on the other hand, by the articuli super cartas, if the king's escheator or sheriff seize lands into the king's hand without cause, upon taking them out of the king's hand again, the party shall have the mesne profits restored to him." Blackstone's Law commentaries, book III

The Fairfax case was excellent and I am going to quote small portions to whet people's appetite to go and get this case and read it.

". . and being also agreed never to have been escheated and seized into the hands of the commonwealth of Virginia, pursuant to certain acts of assembly concerning escheators, and never to have been the subject of any inquest of office, was contained and included in a certain patent, bearing date the 30th April, 1789, under the hand of the then governor, and the seal of the commonwealth of Virginia, purporting that the land in question, is granted by the said commonwealth unto David Hunter [the lessor of the Plaintiff in ejectment] and his heirs forever, by virtue and in consideration of a land office treasury warrant, issued the 23d January, 1788. The said lessor of the Plaintiff in ejectment is, and always has been a citizen of Virginia; and in pursuance of his said patent entered into the land in question, and was thereof possessed, prior to the institution of the said action of ejectment.

6th. The definitive treaty of peace concluded in the year 1783, between the United States of America and Great Britain, and also the several acts of the assembly of Virginia, concerning the premises, are referred to as making a part of the case agreed.

Treaties and acts of assembly referred to.

Provisional articles of peace between Great Britain and the United States, concluded 30th November, 1782, Art. 5 and 6.

Definitive treaty of peace between the same powers, concluded 3d September, 1783, Art. 5 and 6.

Treaty of amity, &c. between the same powers, concluded 19th November, 1794, Art. 9.

'An act respecting future confiscations.' (Oct. 1783.)

'Whereas it is stipulated, by the sixth article of the treaty of peace between the United States and the king of Great Britain, that there shall be no future confiscations [11 U.S. 603, 609] made; Be it enacted, That no future confiscations shall be made, any law to the contrary notwithstanding; provided, that this act shall not extend to any suit, depending in any Court, which was commenced prior to the ratification of the treaty of peace.'

'An act declaring who shall be deemed citizens of this commonwealth.' [May, 1779, ch. 55, repealed.]

'An act for sequestering British property,' &c. [Oct. 1777, ch. 9. vid. Chy. Rev. p. 64.] All the property and estate whatsoever of British subjects is, by this act, sequestered into the hands of commissioners of sequestration, by them to be preserved, according to certain regulations, for the purpose of being restored or otherwise dealt with, according of the king of Great Britain should act towards the property of citizens of the commonwealth, in the like circumstances. The preamble declaring that inasmuch as the British sovereign was not yet known to have set the example of confiscation, 'the public faith and the law and usages of nations,' required the like forbearance on our part."

And further on in the case are these statements; *"3d. That the treaty of peace prohibited the confiscation of the estate, whether by inquest of office, or by any other mode whatsoever; and so operated a release and confirmation to the British proprietor, whose title was again explicitly acknowledged and confirmed by the treaty of 1794; which completely removed every incapacity and disability that might possibly be supposed to remain in him, as a landed proprietor.*

4th. That the patent, under which the Defendant in error claims the land in question, was not authorized by any [11 U.S. 603, 613] pre-existing law of Virginia, but was in direct contravention of the treaty of peace, and of the

statute of Virginia, enacted expressly in execution of the treaty, and strictly enjoining the observance of its stipulations with good faith: and, therefore, the said patent conveys no title to the Defendant in error.

AND YOU THOUGHT YOU HAD A CHANCE AT ALLODIAL TITLE? Think again my dear deluded people when reading further into the case. Is your blood boiling yet? Here is a little more heat.

"1. Upon the first point they relied upon the express words of the grant, from the crown to the original patentees, and the following cases: 2, Wash. 113, Picket v. Dowdall-id. 120, Johnson v. Buffington-id. 125, Curry v. Burns-1, Wash. 34, Birch v. Alexander-and 2, Dall. 99, McCurdy v. Potts.

2. The estate, by the devise, vested in Denny Fairfax, who continued to hold the same till the treaty of peace. Although an alien enemy, he could take and hold until office found. The law is perfectly settled that an alien can take by purchase, although he cannot take by descent. In this respect there is no difference between an alien enemy and an alien friend. He took a fee simple subject to the right of the sovereign to seize it. Co. Lit. 2, (b)-5, Co. 52, Page's case-9. Co. 141(a)-2, Bl. Com. 293, Powell on aev. 316-2, Vent. 270.

It is essential to the Plaintiffs title that the estate should have vested in Denny Fairfax, for if it did not, it could not escheat to the commonwealth under whom the Plaintiff claims. It is one of the principles of the common law, upon which the security of private property from the grasp of power depends, that the crown can take only by matter of record. 3, Bl. Com. 259. Those authorities which say an alien may take, but cannot hold, clearly mean that he cannot hold against the claim of the crown asserted in a legal manner-Co. Lit. 2, a & b. An alien may suffer a common recovery-Goldsb. 102. 4, Leon, 82. Bro. tit. Denizen and Alien, 17. And it is expressly laid down that only the tenant of the freehold can suffer a common recovery-3, Bl. Com. 356-7. But he could not be tenant of the freehold unless the estate vested and remained in him-1, Bac. ab. 133."

I Think that is all I'm going to give, as it is sufficient at this point that you are totally exploded over this or are brain-dead by all the false teaching of

government dis-informationists and people who truly believe they are sovereigns. The question is to them is, if all of us are sovereign how is it that we allow "them" to control our lives? Why are so many who claim to be sovereign citizens; (1) In jail for; a. tax crimes they are not guilty of not paying b. not obtaining a driver license c. not registering their household good called a car d. being asked for "your papers comrade" at anytime the police want to ask and thrown in jail for any period of time e. having to exhibit a social slave number to do anything f. failing to present your private papers to a private IRS collection agency, not of this government g through z, any other thing you can think of that your rights are abrogated in the name of *"government"* that a sovereign would not have to put up with.

Is this the mark of a free sovereign among the many slaves? Why, if these people claim they are sovereign and government has no right to do this and take my land for not paying a tribute to the Crown, do they allow them to put them out on the street, or why do the continually pay a yearly rent tax on the land they merely hold in possession for the King?

James and I have a theory that is solid on how we can take possession for the real Sovereign who owns the land and possession of ourselves so we are not *"subject"* to any other sovereign but the Almighty. Remember that the King, the Pope, the President nor any man is your sovereign UNLESS you want them to be. It is evident that most people don't even recognize the Covenant with the True Sovereign and have forsaken Him for another. If you can't recognize that you are a stranger to the King's Covenant, an alien, and are not a party to the constitution (contract/compact) Lord help you all, you will never win.

James mentioned the word "reversion" in his article, *"Corporations How Long"*. If the Lord Almighty created the land and gave it to man to steward, who really owns the land? Can the Pope who claims no man can own land as he is the vicar under the tenets of the Catholic "religion?" Can the King through conquest? Can the fictional corporation soles, States or United States? Can even the lowly county or townships? The answer is NO! NO! and NO! So read below for a hint. We don't claim to have all the answers but one has to come to terms as to, who do you want to be your master and true Sovereign over

you. Can't have your cake and eat it too, got to choose one or the other. Remember the case of Cruden v Neale on page 33 of my book *The New History of America* and what they said about natural law rights?

North Carolina Reports (Archive) DAVIDSON v. ARLEDGE, 97 N.C. 172 (1887) 2 S.E. 378 Page 153 *1. The burden is on the plaintiff in this action, to show by a preponderance of testimony, that he has title to the land described in the complaint, and if the plaintiff has not satisfied the jury by a preponderance of testimony that he is the owner and has the title, the jury will respond to the first issue, "No."*

If the plaintiff has so satisfied them, they will respond "Yes" to the first issue. In actions for possession, the plaintiff may show title in himself by connected chain of title from the State, or from the Sovereign of the British Empire before the date of our independence; or the plaintiff may show the title out of the State, and possession under color of title for seven years; or without exhibiting a title from the State or Sovereign, may show continuous adverse possession under color of title for twenty-one years; or after showing title out of the State by thirty years actual possession, the plaintiff may show continuous adverse possession in himself and those under whom he claims, for twenty years before the action was brought."

Ok readers, do you remember this quote from above? I'll bet 98 percent will say no. And it is understandable, yet for the most part this is what gets people in trouble when they agree but do not know that much about it to argue. That is why boiler platers go to jail a lot quicker because all they do is copy and don't fully understand the argument. So here is the quote from the Davidson case.

"if an ALIEN could acquire a permanent property in lands, he must owe an allegiance, equally permanent with that property, TO THE KING OF ENGLAND, which would probably be inconsistent with that which he owes to his own natural liege-lord;"

How many ever caught this? Be honest with yourself because look how lying, got Clinton into trouble? What is inconsistent with your natural liege-lord?

The king. So the court stated that the King of England is not your natural liege-lord. The Lord's property is His and under the same principle, YOU, being the steward of the land under the Almighty's command of His word, cannot allow the same thing that the King is claiming. The king is the alien to our true liege-lord and it is he and the State and the United States corporate sole's that are in conflict with the Almighty's contract with man at Genesis 17:1-9. So can we, as stewards of the Almighty's property allow these aliens to claim the land that is permanently our property to protect? Does our liege-lord say we have to pay a property tax on land he gave us? Don't you think this is a good start to rid us of this Satan controlled garbage called the Pope, The King, The State, The United States, The County, The Townships, the legislators and worst of all the *"Woe be unto you Lawyers?"* Do this and why do you need a *"republic?"* It, in legal terms, is a commercial bunch of people because it is a commonwealth and that my dear people will put you right back on the path to where you are now and history will repeat itself over and over again. I wrote extensively that a *"republic"* is not what you want in, Which One Are You, Would You use the Constitution as a Source of Rights, The Big Lie and The BIG Lie III Expanded. So is any body listening? Noooo, because look at all the *"de jure Republics"* being formed all across the country. Lack of knowledge has destroyed His people.

The Informer and James Montgomery king44.htm

Associated Files: Common Law Versus Conquest The Law of Office Found History of Lawful Gold and Silver Legal Tender and the Debt Brought on by unlawful Fiat Paper Money
A King's Charter that Refuses to Die How Long can a Corporation Live?
The United States is Still a British Colony A Country Defeated in Victory - Part I Part II Part III

---

http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/