

The Freeman

I am about to Address an issue which is, in my opinion, sorely misunderstood by a large group of people whom in their attempts to rid themselves of the yolk of slavery and the fear of coercion have become desperate and therefore resorted to desperate measures in pursuit of a remedy at law befitting their true status as the creditors, but I fear it has been in ignorance.

Many whom have seen through and pierced the corporate veil and now chose to operate in a private capacity have adopted the phrase “Freeman” when referring to themselves because they know they are not a person, a fictional corporate entity or a vessel created via registration/incorporation and have made the distinction in this way.

The living woman know as Irene of the line Gravenhorst and the living man known as Robert of the line Menard use the term frequently as a way to differentiate between the person and themselves as a sentient living man/woman and their person and this may be correct in Canada? but after many hours of research, based upon what I have found, it may not be the best way to destinguish yourself when dealing with a municipal corporation or one of their courts/tribunals in England de jure.

I am not negating the input from this living man or woman, they are in many ways my teachers, along with the living man Winston of the line Shroust and I will always be mindful of the contribution which they have made to a wider comprehension by laymen at law, paralegals and truth seekers of the legal deception and legal and lawful remedy.

With that out of the way, the truth is that” ignorance of ones right does not prejudice the right” (Legal maxim), so if you operated out of ignorance yesterday and did not assert your rights, but alter your modus operandi today and stand upon that which you did not yesterday then today’s assertion of those rights is all that is important or relevant to any matter at hand at that time, place and/or jurisdiction.

I think and believe that it is most prudent to discuss and further analyze the term/title of “Freeman”.

The term/title of “Freeman” was defined in more but we will concentrate on just two Act(s) (Municipal Corporation Act(s) 1835&1882) after a summary on the issue I have left a link and a copy of the page underneath in order for further reference regarding other statutes covering and defining the phrase, so let’s go to the source:

Municipal Corporations Act 1882

Freemen

Section 201. In this part the term freeman includes any person of the class whose rights and interests were reserved by the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, under the name either of freemen or of burgesses.

Section 204. Where a person is entitled to be admitted a freeman for the purposes of this Part in respect of birth, servitude, or marriage, and claims accordingly, the mayor shall examine into the claim, and on its being established the claimant shall be admitted and enrolled by the town clerk on the Freeman's Roll.

205.-(1.) Every person who had before the passing of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, been admitted a freeman, or if that Act had not been passed might have been so admitted otherwise than by gift or purchase, and

(2.) Every person who for the time being is--

(a.) An inhabitant of a borough, or

(b.) Wife, widow, son, or daughter of a freeman, or

shall, subject to the provisions of this Part, have and enjoy and be entitled to acquire and enjoy the same share and benefit of the hereditaments, and of the rents and profits thereof, and of the common lands and public stock of any borough or body corporate, and of any property held in whole or in part for any charitable uses or trusts, as if the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, or this Act, had not been passed.

Section 206 sub (2): Where, if the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, or this Act, had not been passed, any such person would have been liable by statute, byelaw, charter, or custom, to pay any fine, fee, or sum of money to any body corporate, or to any member, officer, or servant thereof, in consideration of his freedom, or of his or her title to those reserved rights, or there was any condition precedent to any person being entitled to those rights, he or she shall not have any benefit in respect of those rights until he or she has paid that fine, fee, or sum to the treasurer on account of the borough fund, or has fulfilled that condition, as far as it is capable of being fulfilled according to the provisions of this Act.

Section 207: Nothing in this Act shall strengthen or confirm any claim, right, or title of any freeman or of any person to the benefit of any right in this Part, reserved, but the same may in every case be brought in question, impeached, and set aside, as if this Act had not been passed.

Summary of the Freem(e)an

A Freeman is enrolled onto a register, its not a free man in the sense that William Wallace meant it, it would seem. The term Freeman includes any person of the class whose rights and interests were reserved by the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, under the name either of Freemen or of Burgesses, it is an hereditary title, its another class of legal fiction created via registration entered onto a different class of register but nonetheless, it's a person, a title and nothing more than a legal fiction of a different class and in the same way that a rose by any other designation smells as sweet so it is true that feces by any other designation still smells as bad.

An inhabitant of a borough though in accordance with section 205(2)(a) may have and enjoy and be entitled to acquire and enjoy the same share and benefit of the hereditaments, and of the rents and profits thereof, and of the common lands and public stock of any borough or body corporate, and of any property held in whole or in part for any charitable uses or trusts, as if the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, or this Act, had not been passed. This section may be of interest to those being short changed, so everyone mostly?

But because you play the role (persona) of their person/legal fiction in accordance with section 206 (2): any such person would have been liable by statute, byelaw, charter, or custom, to pay any fine, fee, or sum of money to any body corporate, or to any member, officer, or servant thereof, in consideration of his freedom or of his or her title to those reserved rights, or there was any condition precedent to any person being entitled to those rights, he or she shall not have any benefit in respect of those rights until he or she has paid that fine, fee, or sum to the treasurer on account of the borough fund, or has fulfilled that condition, as far as it is capable of being fulfilled.

Remember that anyone charged with a public duty to do a thing is a trustee by definition in accordance with the Municipal Corporations Act 1882, this is important but knowledge relating to trusts and the different parties involved will come later in another document I just want there to be frame of reference for everyone when we eventually get there.

So a person has to pay a toll, fee or sum (i.e council tax) for access to reserved rights and they consider the person's freedom as consideration for a bill of exchange emanating from a port (municipal corporation) charged against a vessel/person, so it is abundantly clear that the rights of the person/vessel are reserved by and to the MC to be held on trust for the living entity upon which the trust is based and implied via the process of registration and incorporation into a municipal corporation and as the section asserts, person(s)/company(s) have "title" to those rights and having title to a thing and actually possessing that thing are two entirely different things, and besides fictional entities cannot posses anything, and ting.

All becomes much clearer in some circumstances (this being one) where if you line up the operative words from a section in an Act into a sentence, it reads very differently i.e Section 206 (2) MCA 1882: **any such person liable by statute, byelaw, charter , to pay**

any fine, fee, or sum of money to any body corporate, or to any member, officer, or servant thereof, in consideration of his freedom or of his or her title to those reserved rights shall not have any benefit in respect of those rights until he or she has paid.

These are not natural, unalienable rights they speak of, they are corporate rights you cannot lien someone else's rights without their consent and even if they consent through ignorance, acquiescence, coercion or duress I say to you again "ignorance of ones rights does not prejudice the right" (Legal maxim)

Lets finally look at section 207 where it states: Nothing in this Act shall strengthen or confirm any claim, right, or title of any freeman or of any person to the benefit of any right in this Part, reserved, but the same may in every case be brought in question.

The rights of the corporate entity are subrogated to the MC as they are rights of a person/legal fiction vessel incorporated to the MC, **nothing in the Act strengthens or confirms any claim, right, or title of any freeman or of any person to the benefit of any right**, why? Because **those rights are reserved from a person, not by it, the person only has title to its rights.**

So when you walk into a municipal court asserting "I am a Freeman on the land and all my rights are reserved", what did the municipal magistrate/officers(s) just hear?!

I am a living man not a title, I don't require representation nor can I accept it , I am the principle beneficiary of a trust which is dependant upon my life, the first named on an instrument which creates a trust or vests a legal estate is the principle or primary beneficiary, it is my estate, it can only have gained credit via my existence, I was living when I was ousted from my estate, in accordance with the International Securities Manual being that a certificate was given to me to hold in bearer form and by way of the fact that it was entered onto a register it qualifies by definition as an international security, a certificate issued in bearer form is an instrument used to transfer stocks.....getting carried away, 1-2-3-4, in good time and back to the subject matter at hand.

So it would seem that you can acquire the title of Freeman if you so choose or if so chosen more likely as most the title is mostly hereditary based upon my research so far, although my friend came across a site when we were working a year or so ago which proposed an offer where you pay 20 pounds GBP and surrender your berth/birth certificate in order to attain the title but for some reason my PC did not bookmark the page and trying to reach that man is like trying to touch the moon at this moment in time, I will get the link eventually and edit it into this document as soon as I have it, I wouldn't go that route like I said I am a living man whom cannot be represented by a title/company.

A Freeman is another legal abstraction/fiction, a company, registered to a MC with a certificate of inc/berth just like any other person/body corporate.

The original work of a living man known as Stephen and on occasion as Billy.

Freeman of the Borough

<http://moderngov.sthelens.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=4478>

By section 249(5) of the Local Government Act 1972 amended by section 180 of the Local Government Planning and Land Act 1980), a Borough or City Council may admit "persons of distinction and persons who have in the opinion of the Council, rendered eminent services to the city, borough or royal borough" as Honorary Freeman.

Similarly, section 249(5) was amended by the Local Government Planning and Land Act 1980 to give Parish and Community Councils which have been granted the status of City the same power to appoint Honorary Freeman.

The document goes on and you have a link there if you'd like to read further.