

# The US is still a British Colony

## **No. 3: Senate Document # 43; SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 62 (Pg 9, Para 2) April 17, 1933:**

“The ultimate ownership of ownership of all property is in the State; individual so-called “ownership” is only by virtue of Government, i.e., law, reducing the individual to a mere user; and use must be in accordance with law (actually the creditor’s “policy”) and subordinate to the necessities of the STATE [Novus Ordo Seclorum].”

Here is un rebuttable facts of case law that prove that the King is still Sovereign, the State, being his corporation, is Sovereign. You people are nothing in the scheme of things and neither were the people in general at the time of the adoption of the compact of 1787 of the State 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 explain what that means, as does Black's 1st, & 4th Ed., and Ballantines Law Dictionaries. For brevity, only short phrases are used. Go pull these cases and rebut, if you can, the legal premise of the court's definitive description which shows the royal Crown, operating through the States in Union (U.S.), does yet remain sovereign in this country. He is operating behind the corporate veil as described in Andersons Business Law, 14th ed.

" 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 bonds taken in pursuance of those laws would go to the successor, and not to the executor of the obligee."

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."

This is the case that James talks about quoted here. Remember the States were and still are corporations of the Crown. Remember, that the King is just a figurehead and the controlling people are in the background, like the Pope and the International banking cabal, just like 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 which allegedly the King gave up everything, Ha, Ha. The State is the King's Corp. 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. Do you people understand that I am not talking about geographical aliens but CONTRACT aliens? If you don't you will never understand so 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.

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.

"...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...."

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

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.

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

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 fore fathers 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 fore fathers 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 judgement 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.

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.

"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;

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.