

Regarding the document by Michael Joseph Kearns  
titled [EXTREMELY DANGEROUS POLITICAL INFORMATION](#)  
as found on the website <http://www.freesovereignandindependent.com>

- an exposé by Rickoff -

In regards to the website, I have seen that site before, and although there are some elements of truth woven in here and there, most of what Kearns is saying in the above mentioned document, found on their *Page 2 - Education Begins* page is pure bulldiggy. For example, at the very beginning of the document Kearns says, "*When you read Article 1 of the said Definitive Treaty of Peace, 1783, (8 stat 80) you will note the Crown of Great Britain retained two positions for itself, the Arch Treasurer and the Prince Elector of the United States of America.*" Well, lets take a look at what Article 1 of the 1783 Definitive Treaty of Peace actually says:

"**Article 1st:** His Brittanic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz., New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, to be free sovereign and Independent States; that he treats with them as such, and for himself his Heirs & Successors, relinquishes all claims to the Government, Propriety, and Territorial Rights of the same and every Part thereof."

Do you see the words "Arch Treasurer," or "Prince Elector of the United States of America" anywhere in Article 1? I don't. You do find "arch-treasurer and prince elector" in the opening paragraph of the Treaty, but here are the exact words: (**bolded emphasis** is mine)  
"It having pleased the Divine Providence to dispose the **hearts** of the most serene and most potent Prince George the Third, by the grace of God, king of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, duke of Brunswick and Lunebourg, **arch-treasurer and prince elector of the Holy Roman Empire etc.**, and of the United States of America, to forget all past misunderstandings and differences that have unhappily interrupted the good correspondence and friendship which they mutually wish to restore..."

Up until, and including the abbreviation "**etc.**" the Brits are lauding George III by mentioning all of his actual or self proclaimed titles. The abbreviation "**etc.**" (for et cetera, and written as "&c." in the Treaty document) means to state that George may also have other given or self-proclaimed titles which aren't specifically mentioned. Then comes a "," followed by "**and of the United States of America.**" The important thing to notice, however, is that "**and of the United States of America**" isn't mentioning any further title supposedly held by George III, nor is that phrase somehow connected to George's claim to being "**prince elector of the Holy Roman Empire.**" Now go back to the full quote and notice my **bolding** of the tenth word, "**hearts.**" With that word in mind, noting it is a plural, who or what do you think this pertains to? George III's claim to titles was everything stated up to and including the "**etc.**" abbreviation, and he is of course one heart. Who or what do you suppose is the other heart, or hearts, which made the first instance of "**hearts**" a logical and correct use of the plural? It is what follows the "**etc.**" - it is the heart or hearts of the "**United States of America.**" That, of

course could only be comprehended to mean the hearts of all the good people of the United States of America, since the Confederation of States titled "The United States of America" itself had no heart - it was simply a confederation arising from a written agreement (the Articles of Confederation) of the States. So that whole, long, drawn-out quote can be narrowed down to be understood as what it actually was - simply the recognition of a desire, common to both George the Third, and the people of the United States of America, to "forget all past misunderstandings" and restore friendship.

If one feels reluctant to accept my explanation concerning what the text of the Treaty meant, then let me give further clarity by breaking down all that was stated in the paragraph in question, after **"the hearts of"** into the simplest of terms. The words, **"the most serene and most potent Prince,"** which follows **"the hearts of"** are merely included as laudatory descriptors, and therefore can be left out. The words **"George the Third"** are really all that matters, since the Treaty is an agreement between George the Third and the United States of America. All of the laudatory titles included after **"George the Third"** and separated by commas, are merely a list of actual or self-proclaimed titles, and also include the **"etc."** found at the end of that list, meaning that there may be more which are not mentioned. None of those laudatory titles can be thought of as being anything other than a reference to George the Third, so of course are redundant and can also be left out for the sake of a clearer understanding. In doing so, here's what we have left: **It having pleased the Divine Providence to dispose the hearts of George the Third, and of the United States of America, to forget all past misunderstandings and differences that have unhappily interrupted the good correspondence and friendship which they mutually wish to restore...** What could possibly be any more clearly understood in its intended meaning?

So, right from the start, what the website states is, as I said earlier, just pure bulldiggy. I could go on like this for hours on end to pick apart other false claims Kearns makes, but I think you get the idea. I don't think he wrote these things thinking that he was correct in his understanding, as a careful reading of the actual Treaty text can lead to no other conclusion than what I have stated, and I think you will agree. Therefore, I can only view this document from Kearns as intended disinformation, which might also be called intentional misinformation, having the intent of leading people astray from the truth. If you continue on with what Kearns wrote, I'm sure you would come up with more examples of such disinformation. Take, for example, the next "quote," which states that, *"the Crown retained control of the 'public rights' of 'inhabitants of the United States.' "* Nowhere in the Treaty text is **"public rights"** found, so why does he enclose those words in quotation marks to suggest that this is a direct quote from the Treaty? **"Inhabitants of the United States,"** and **"People of the United States,"** are both found in Article 3 of the Treaty, but, contrary to what the website states, these are not contradictory terms, and I assure you that I can offer a valid explanation. You might try proofreading this 3rd article yourself, just to take a guess, and then compare these "inhabitants" to provisions found in the Constitution which also use that word. Then continue reading below.

Next in debunking Mr Kearns' document, **EXTREMELY DANGEROUS POLITICAL INFORMATION**, let's take a look at another one of his statements:

*"The group who wanted to be 'free and sovereign' are mentioned as the 'people of the United States' while the loyalists are mentioned as 'inhabitants of the United States' and both are mentioned in the Definitive Treaty of Peace, 1783, (8 stat 80) specifically Article III therein."*

First of all, the "group who wanted to be 'free and sovereign,' " which he speaks of, is not mentioned in Article 3. That is found in Article 1, where we find the "free sovereign and Independent States" that George III is acknowledging, and relinquishing "all claims to the Government, Propriety, and Territorial Rights of the same and every Part thereof."

Let's compare what Article 3 actually says, to what Mr Kearns is claiming it says:  
"It is agreed that the **People of the United States** shall continue to enjoy unmolested the Right to take Fish of every kind on the Grand Bank and on all the other Banks of Newfoundland, also in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence and at all other Places in the Sea, where the Inhabitants of both Countries used at any time heretofore to fish. And also that the Inhabitants of the United States shall have Liberty to take Fish of every Kind on such Part of the Coast of Newfoundland as British Fishermen shall use, (but not to dry or cure the same on that Island) And also on the Coasts, Bays & Creeks of all other of his Brittanic Majesty's Dominions in America;"

So what's the difference between the **People** and the **inhabitants in Article 3**? Notice that the Article is talking about **rights**, and fishing rights to be exact. Black's Law Dictionary, 2nd edition, makes it clear that the People are the inhabitants, saying:

**The word "people" may have various significations according to the connection in which it is used. When we speak of the rights of the people, or of the government of the people by law, or of the people as a non-political aggregate, we mean all the inhabitants of the state or nation, without distinction as to sex, age, or otherwise.**

When speaking of **rights**, the word "**people**" means **all the inhabitants** of a state or nation.

- Black's Law Dictionary, 2nd edition, book pg 888.

Article 3 goes on to talk about the **rights** of the **Inhabitants of both Countries [Britain and the United States]** that are **equal rights**, and then the **rights** of the **Inhabitants of the United States** which differ from British **rights** [not to dry or cure fish on the island of Newfoundland]. So in all cases here, this conforms to the Black's law definition as being the rule when speaking of **rights**, wherein the **people** are **all the inhabitants**.

So what are **Inhabitants**? The Black's Law Dictionary definition states:

**HABITANCY.** Settled dwelling in a given place; fixed and permanent residence there. This term is more comprehensive than "domicile," for one may be domiciled in a given place though he does not spend the greater portion of his time there, or though he may be absent for long periods. It is also more comprehensive than "residence," for one may reside in a given place only temporarily or for short periods on the occasion of repeated visits. But in neither case could he properly be called an "inhabitant" of that place or be said to have his "habitaney" there. See *Atkinson v. Washington & Jefferson College*, 54 W. Va. 32, 46 S. E. 253; *Hairston v. Hairston*, 27 Miss. 711, 61 Am. Dec. 530; *Abington v. North Bridgewater*, 23 Pick. (Mass.) 170. And see **DOMICILE; RESIDENCE**.

It is difficult to give an exact definition of "habitaney." In general terms, one may be designated as an "inhabitant" of that place which constitutes the principal seat of his residence, of his business, pursuits, connections, attachments, and of his political and municipal relations. The term, therefore, embraces the fact of residence at a place, together with the intent to regard it and make it a home. The act and intent must concur. *Lyman v. Fiske*, 17 Pick. (Mass.) 231, 28 Am. Dec. 293.

**INHABITANT.** One who resides actually and permanently in a given place, and has his domicile there. Ex parte Shaw, 145 U. S. 444, 12 Sup. Ct. 935, 36 L. Ed. 768; *The Pizarro*, 2 Wheat. 245, 4 L. Ed. 226.

"The words 'inhabitant,' 'citizen,' and 'resident,' as employed in different constitutions to define the qualifications of electors, mean substantially the same thing; and one is an inhabitant, resident, or citizen at the place where he has his domicile or home." Cooley, Const. Lim. \*600. But the terms "resident" and "inhabitant" have also been held not synonymous, the latter implying a more fixed and permanent abode than the former, and importing privileges and duties to which a mere resident would not be subject. *Tazewell County v. Davenport*, 40 Ill. 197.

These definitions are found in Black's Law Dictionary, 2nd Edition, book pages 555 and 625.

The definition of **DOMICILE** is shown here because of its inclusion in the word **INHABITANT**, and is found on book page 388 of Black's 2nd.

**DOMICILE.** That place in which a man has voluntarily fixed the habitation of himself and family, not for a mere special or temporary purpose, but with the present intention of making a permanent home, until some unexpected event shall occur to induce him to adopt some other permanent home. In re Garneau, 127 Fed. 677, 62 C. C. A. 403.

In its ordinary acceptation, a person's domicile is the place where he lives or has his home. In a strict and legal sense, that is properly the domicile of a person where he has his true, fixed, permanent home and principal establishment, and to which, whenever he is absent, he has the intention of returning. *Anderson v. Anderson*, 42 Vt. 350, 1 Am. Rep. 334.

Domicile is but the established, fixed, permanent, or ordinary dwelling-place or place of residence of a person, as distinguished from his temporary and transient, though actual, place of residence. It is his legal residence, as distinguished from his temporary place of abode;

As you can see, the **Inhabitants** are those **people** who have established a permanent home, or **domicile**, in one location. Thus, the **Inhabitants of the United States** are the **people** who live there on a permanent basis, rather than simply as "visitors" or "residents" [as in "summer residents," etc.]. The Definitive Treaty of Peace, in Article 3, was not suggesting that **Inhabitants of the United States** were all British subjects, and to think so, or to think - like Kearns does - that **British subject Inhabitants of the United States** were delegated to provide us with "essential government duties" is absurd. Think about it. When the Founding Fathers wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, they would not even have considered allowing British loyalists, who refused to take a stand against British tyranny, to have anything to do with our government. So consider Article 1, Section 2 of the Constitution, which states, "*No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an **Inhabitant** of that State in which he shall be chosen.*"

Likewise, Article 1, Section 3 of the Constitution states that, "*No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States and who shall not, when elected, be an **Inhabitant** of that State for which he shall be chosen.*"

To whom, other than Mr Kearns and his led astray followers, would it not be perfectly clear that, in writing the Articles of the Constitution, the Founding Fathers insisted on qualifications for those who would serve in Congress which denied foreigners, relative newcomers, and British loyalists [those who retained their British loyalty and citizenship] the right to participate in the United States Congress? If Mr Kearns could be considered correct, in stating that the **Inhabitants of the United States** are the British loyalists, we would have to believe that only British loyalists could participate in our government. What an absurd belief that would be, considering that the Founders pledged their fortunes, and their very lives, to deliver us from the evils and tyranny of British Rule.

I think that I have sufficiently, if not more than sufficiently, proven that Mr Kearns' statements of "truth about America and its Republican form of government" are as false as can be, but I'll end this with yet another preposterous example from his writing. In the second paragraph, on page 2 of his document, Kearns includes a quoted statement, "essential governmental duties," which implies that this phrase is found in the 1783 Definitive Treaty of Peace. Not only is this phrase not found, but also you will find that not one of the 3 words of this quote are found therein! Mr Kearns claims to have learned his stated "truths" from the "research" he has done. Unfortunately, those who believe these "truths" would appear to have done little or no research of their own.