

The court history that George Washington did do such acts can be found in the case: PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK -v- BOOT, Co.Ct. N.Y.(1981)

It can be proven legally that a lease signed with representatives of the United States which was used in Congressional acts of 1875 and 1890, the signer of this lease did not have tribal rights to lease these tribal lands. It has been accepted by Indians in ignorance, that tribal governments possess sovereignty and immunity from review of their actions.

Indians who have had tribal lands taken under state condemnation, attacked the Indian Government in courts but always lost because of sovereignty and immunity. Sovereignty under tribal rights does give immunity, but it was tribal members trying to get this protection and did not receive it. Why?

Because individuals who, claiming to be sovereign Indians assumed the Indian government could not take Indian lands as they wished because of Indian tribal sovereignty^{and}/it was the duty of the government to protect the lands because it was an instrument of Indian sovereignty.

Any Internal Revenue Agent could tell these Indians that the tribal government is an instrument and division of the state it is located in.

This Indian government draws its sovereignty and immunity from the state. It is state sovereignty and when one assumes it is an instrument of tribal sovereignty, the court must dismiss the case because of Immunity on behalf of the Indian government because the wrong type of sovereignty was brought into court procedures, giving the court no jurisdiction.

Getting back to this lease which now has two congressional acts, the signer of the lease who was an instrument of the state. Under color, this Indian government presented itself as an Indian government under tribal sovereignty. Because at the time, tribal Indians believed this to be correct, this state agency signed the lease and still receives the money with none of it going to the tribe. This lease is up for renewal.

The court history that George Washington did do such acts can be found in the case: PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK -v- BOOT, Co.Ct. N.Y.(1981)

It can be proven legally that a lease signed with representatives of the United States which was used in Congressional acts of 1875 and 1890, the signer of this lease did not have tribal rights to lease these tribal lands. It has been accepted by Indians in ignorance,

possess sovereignty and immunity from review of their actions.

Indians who have had tribal lands taken under state condemnation, attacked the Indian Government in courts but always lost because of sovereignty and immunity. Sovereignty under tribal rights does give immunity, but it was tribal members trying to get this protection and did not receive it. Why?

Because individuals who, claiming to be sovereign Indians assumed the Indian government could not take Indian lands as they wished because of Indian tribal sovereignty. It was the duty of the government to protect

the lands because it was an instrument of Indian sovereignty.

Any Internal Revenue Agent could tell these Indians that the tribal government is an instrument and division of the state it is located in.

This Indian government draws its sovereignty and immunity from the state. It is state sovereignty and when one assumes it is an instrument of tribal sovereignty, the court must dismiss the case because of immunity on behalf of the Indian government because the wrong type of sovereignty was brought into court procedures, giving the court no jurisdiction.

Getting back to this lease which now has two congressional acts, the signer of the lease who was an instrument of the state. Under color, this Indian government presented itself as an Indian government under tribal sovereignty. Because at the time, tribal Indians believed this to be correct, this state agency signed the lease and still receives the money with none of it going to the tribe. This lease is up for renewal.