

The United States is still a British Colony

<http://www.civil-liberties.com/books/colony2.html>

The trouble with history is, we weren't there when it took place and it can be changed to fit someone's belief and/or traditions, or it can be taught in the public schools to favor a political agenda, and withhold many facts. I know you have been taught that we won the Revolutionary War and defeated the British, but I can prove to the contrary. I want you to read this paper with an open mind, and allow yourself to be instructed with the following verifiable facts. You be the judge and don't let prior conclusions on your part or incorrect teaching, keep you from the truth.

I too was always taught in school and in studying our history books that our freedom came from the Declaration of Independence and was secured by our winning the Revolutionary War. I'm going to discuss a few documents that are included at the end of this paper, in the footnotes. The first document is the first Charter of Virginia in 1606 (footnote #1). In the first paragraph, the king of England granted our fore fathers license to settle and colonize America. The definition for license is as follows.

"In Government Regulation. Authority to do some act or carry on some trade or business, in its nature lawful but prohibited by statute, except with the permission of the civil authority or which would otherwise be unlawful." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914.

Keep in mind those that came to America from England were British subjects. So you can better understand what I'm going to tell you, here are the definitions for subject and citizen.

"In monarchical governments, by subject is meant one who owes permanent allegiance to the monarch." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914.

"Constitutional Law. One that owes allegiance to a sovereign and is governed by his laws. The natives of Great Britain are subjects of the British government. Men in free governments are subjects as well as citizens; as citizens they enjoy rights and franchises; as subjects they are bound to obey the laws. The term is little used, in this sense, in countries enjoying a republican form of government." Swiss Nat. Ins. Co. v. Miller, 267 U.S. 42, 45 S. Ct. 213, 214, 69 L.Ed. 504. Blacks fifth Ed.

I chose to give the definition for subject first, so you could better understand what definition of citizen is really being used in American law. Below is the definition of citizen from Roman law.

"The term citizen was used in Rome to indicate the possession of private civil rights, including those accruing under the Roman family and inheritance law and the Roman contract and property law. All other subjects were peregrines. But in the beginning of the 3d century the distinction was abolished and all subjects were citizens; 1 sel. Essays in Anglo-Amer. L. H. 578." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914.

The king was making a commercial venture when he sent his subjects to America, and used his money and resources to do so. I think you would admit the king had a lawful right to receive gain and prosper from his venture. In the Virginia Charter he declares his sovereignty over the land and his subjects and in paragraph 9 he declares the amount of gold, silver and copper he is to receive if any is found by his subjects. There could have just as easily been none, or his subjects could have been killed by the Indians. This is why this was a valid right of the king (Jure Coronae, "In right of the crown," Black's forth Ed.), the king expended his resources with the risk of total loss.

If you'll notice in paragraph 9 the king declares that all his heirs and successors were to also receive

the same amount of gold, silver and copper that he claimed with this Charter. The gold that remained in the colonies was also the king's. He provided the remainder as a benefit for his subjects, which amounted to further use of his capital. You will see in this paper that not only is this valid, but it is still in effect today. If you will read the rest of the Virginia Charter you will see that the king declared the right and exercised the power to regulate every aspect of commerce in his new colony. A license had to be granted for travel connected with transfer of goods (commerce) right down to the furniture they sat on. A great deal of the king's declared property was ceded to America in the Treaty of 1783. I want you to stay focused on the money and the commerce which was not ceded to America.

This brings us to the Declaration of Independence. Our freedom was declared because the king did not fulfill his end of the covenant between king and subject. The main complaint was taxation without representation, which was reaffirmed in the early 1606 Charter granted by the king. It was not a revolt over being subject to the king of England, most wanted the protection and benefits provided by the king. Because of the king's refusal to hear their demands and grant relief, separation from England became the lesser of two evils. The cry of freedom and self-determination became the rallying cry for the colonist. The slogan "Don't Tread On Me" was the standard borne by the militias.

The Revolutionary War was fought and concluded when Cornwallis surrendered to Washington at Yorktown. As Americans we have been taught that we defeated the king and won our freedom. The next document I will use is the Treaty of 1783, which will totally contradict our having won the Revolutionary War. (footnote 2).

I want you to notice in the first paragraph that the king refers to himself as prince of the Holy Roman Empire and of the United States. You know from this that the United States did not negotiate this Treaty of peace in a position of strength and victory, but it is obvious that Benjamin Franklin, John Jay and John Adams negotiated a Treaty of further granted privileges from the king of England. Keep this in mind as you study these documents. You also need to understand the players of those that negotiated this Treaty. For the Americans it was Benjamin Franklin Esqr., a great patriot and standard bearer of freedom. Or was he? His title includes Esquire.

An Esquire in the above usage was a granted rank and Title of nobility by the king, which is below Knight and above a yeoman, common man. An Esquire is someone that does not do manual labor as signified by this status, see the below definitions.

"Esquires by virtue of their offices; as justices of the peace, and others who bear any office of trust under the crown....for whosoever studieth the laws of the realm, who studieth in the universities, who professeth the liberal sciences, and who can live idly, and without manual labor, and will bear the port, charge, and countenance of a gentleman, he shall be called master, and shall be taken for a gentleman." Blackstone Commentaries p. 561-562

"Esquire - In English Law. A title of dignity next above gentleman, and below knight. Also a title of office given to sheriffs, serjeants, and barristers at law, justices of the peace, and others." Blacks Law Dictionary fourth ed. p. 641

Benjamin Franklin, John Adams and John Jay as you can read in the Treaty were all Esquires and were the signers of this Treaty and the only negotiators of the Treaty. The representative of the king was David Hartley Esqr..

Benjamin Franklin was the main negotiator for the terms of the Treaty, he spent most of the War traveling between England and France. The use of Esquire declared his and the others British subjection and loyalty to the crown.

In the first article of the Treaty most of the kings claims to America are relinquished, except for his claim to continue receiving gold, silver and copper as gain for his business venture. Article 3 gives Americans the right to fish the waters around the United States and its rivers. In article 4 the United States agreed to pay all bona fide debts. If you will read my other papers on money you will understand that the financiers were working with the king. Why else would he protect their interest with this Treaty?

I wonder if you have seen the main and obvious point? This Treaty was signed in 1783, the war was over in 1781. If the United States defeated England, how is the king granting rights to America, when we were now his equal in status? We supposedly defeated him in the Revolutionary War! So why would these supposed patriot Americans sign such a Treaty, when they knew that this would void any sovereignty gained by the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary War? If we had won the Revolutionary War, the king granting us our land would not be necessary, it would have been ours by his loss of the Revolutionary War. To not dictate the terms of a peace treaty in a position of strength after winning a war; means the war was never won. Think of other wars we have won, such as when we defeated Japan. Did McArthur allow Japan to dictate to him the terms for surrender? No way! All these men did is gain status and privilege granted by the king and insure the subjection of future unaware generations. Worst of all, they sold out those that gave their lives and property for the chance to be free.

When Cornwallis surrendered to Washington he surrendered the battle, not the war. Read the Article of Capitulation signed by Cornwallis at Yorktown (footnote 3)

Jonathan Williams recorded in his book, Legions of Satan, 1781, that Cornwallis revealed to Washington during his surrender that "a holy war will now begin on America, and when it is ended America will be supposedly the citadel of freedom, but her millions will unknowingly be loyal subjects to the Crown."...."in less than two hundred years the whole nation will be working for divine world government. That government that they believe to be divine will be the British Empire."

All the Treaty did was remove the United States as a liability and obligation of the king. He no longer had to ship material and money to support his subjects and colonies. At the same time he retained financial subjection through debt owed after the Treaty, which is still being created today; millions of dollars a day. And his heirs and successors are still reaping the benefit of the kings original venture. If you will read the following quote from Title 26, you will see just one situation where the king is still collecting a tax from those that receive a benefit from him, on property which is purchased with the money the king supplies, at almost the same percentage:

-CITE-

26 USC Sec. 1491

HEAD-

Sec. 1491. Imposition of tax

-STATUTE-

There is hereby imposed on the transfer of property by a citizen or resident of the United States, or by a domestic corporation or partnership, or by an estate or trust which is not a foreign estate or trust, to a foreign corporation as paid-in surplus or as a contribution to capital, or to a foreign estate or trust, or to a foreign partnership, an excise tax equal to 35 percent of the excess of -

(1) the fair market value of the property so transferred, over

(2) the sum of -

(A) the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of such property in the hands of the transferor, plus

(B) the amount of the gain recognized to the transferor at the time of the transfer.

-SOURCE-

(Aug. 16, 1954, ch. 736, 68A Stat. 365; Oct. 4, 1976, Pub. L. 94-455, title X, Sec. 1015(a), 90 Stat. 1617; Nov. 6, 1978, Pub. L. 95-600, title VII, Sec. 701(u)(14)(A), 92 Stat. 2919.)

-MISC1-

AMENDMENTS

1978 - Pub. L. 95-600 substituted 'estate or trust' for 'trust' wherever appearing.

1976 - Pub. L. 94-455 substituted in provisions preceding par.

(1) 'property' for 'stocks and securities' and '35 percent' for '27 1/2 percent' and in par.

(1) 'fair market value' for 'value' and 'property' for 'stocks and securities' and in par.

(2) designated existing provisions as subpar. (A) and added subpar. (B).

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1978 AMENDMENT

Section 701(u)(14)(C) of Pub. L. 95-600 provided that: 'The amendments made by this paragraph

(amending this section and section 1492 of this title) shall apply to transfers after October 2, 1975.'

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1976 AMENDMENT

Section 1015(d) of Pub. L. 94-455 provided that: 'The amendments made by this section (enacting section 1057 of this title, amending this section and section 1492 of this title, and renumbering former section 1057 as 1058 of this title) shall apply to transfers of property after October 2, 1975.'

A new war was declared when the Treaty was signed. The king wanted his land back and he knew he would be able to regain his property for his heirs with the help of his world financiers. Here is a quote from the king speaking to Parliament after the Revolutionary War had concluded.

(Six weeks after) the capitulation of Yorktown, the king of Great Britain, in his speech to Parliament (Nov. 27, 1781), declared "That he should not answer the trust committed to the sovereign of a free people, if he consented to sacrifice either to his own desire of peace, or to their temporary ease and relief, those essential rights and permanent interests, upon the maintenance and preservation of which the future strength and security of the country must forever depend." The determined language of this speech, pointing to the continuance of the American war, was echoed back by a majority of both Lords and Commons.

In a few days after (Dec. 12), it was moved in the House of Commons that a resolution should be adopted declaring it to be their opinion "That all farther attempts to reduce the Americans to obedience by force would be ineffectual, and injurious to the true interests of Great Britain." The rest of the debate can be found in (footnote 4). What were the true interests of the king? The gold, silver and copper.

The new war was to be fought without Americans being aware that a war was even being waged, it was to be fought by subterfuge and key personnel being placed in key positions. The first two parts of "A Country Defeated In Victory," go into detail about how this was done and exposes some of the main players.

Every time you pay a tax you are transferring your labor to the king, and his heirs and successors are still receiving interest from the original American Charters.

The following is the definition of tribute (tax).

"A contribution which is raised by a prince or sovereign from his subjects to sustain the expenses of the state. A sum of money paid by an inferior sovereign or state to a superior potentate, to secure the friendship or protection of the latter." Blacks Law Dictionary forth ed. p. 1677

As further evidence, not that any is needed, a percentage of taxes that are paid are to enrich the king/queen of England. For those that study Title 26 you will recognize IMF, which means Individual Master File, all tax payers have one. To read one you have to be able to break their codes using file

6209, which is about 467 pages. On your IMF you will find a blocking series, which tells you what type of tax you are paying. You will probably find a 300-399 blocking series, which 6209 says is reserved. You then look up the BMF 300-399, which is the Business Master File in 6209. You would have seen prior to 1991, this was U.S.-U.K. Tax Claims, non-refile DLN. Meaning everyone is considered a business and involved in commerce and you are being held liable for a tax via a treaty between the U.S. and the U.K., payable to the U.K.. The form that is supposed to be used for this is form 8288, FIRPTA - Foreign Investment Real Property Tax Account, you won't find many people using this form, just the 1040 form. The 8288 form can be found in the Law Enforcement Manual of the IRS, chapter 3. If you will check the OMB's paper - Office of Management and Budget, in the Department of Treasury, List of Active Information Collections, Approved Under Paperwork Reduction Act, you will find this form under OMB number 1545-0902, which says U.S. withholding tax-return for dispositions by foreign persons of U.S. real property interests-statement of withholding on dispositions, by foreign persons, of U.S. Form #8288 #8288a. These codes have since been changed to read as follows; IMF 300-309, Barred Assesment, CP 55 generated valid for MFT-30, which is the code for 1040 form. IMF 310-399 reserved, the BMF 300-309 reads the same as IMF 300-309. BMF 390-399 reads U.S./U.K. Tax Treaty Claims. The long and short of it is nothing changed, the government just made it plainer, the 1040 is the payment of a foreign tax to the king/queen of England. We have been in financial servitude since the Treaty of 1783.

Another Treaty between England and the United States was Jay's Treaty of 1794 (footnote 5). If you will remember from the Paris Treaty of 1783, John Jay Esqr. was one of the negotiators of the Treaty. In 1794 he negotiated another Treaty with Britain. There was great controversy among the American people about this Treaty.

In Article 2 you will see the king is still on land that was supposed to be ceded to the United States at the Paris Treaty. This is 13 years after America supposedly won the Revolutionary War. I guess someone forgot to tell the king of England. In Article 6, the king is still dictating terms to the United States concerning the collection of debt and damages, the British government and World Bankers claimed we owe. In Article 12 we find the king dictating terms again, this time concerning where and with who the United States could trade. In Article 18 the United States agrees to a wide variety of material that would be subject to confiscation if Britain found said material going to its enemies ports. Who won the Revolutionary War?

That's right, we were conned by some of our early fore fathers into believing that we are free and sovereign people, when in fact we had the same status as before the Revolutionary War. I say had, because our status is far worse now than then. I'll explain.

Early on in our history the king was satisfied with the interest made by the Bank of the United States. But when the Bank Charter was canceled in 1811 it was time to gain control of the government, in order to shape government policy and public policy. Have you never asked yourself why the British, after burning the White House and all our early records during the War of 1812, left and did not take over the government. The reason they did, was to remove the greatest barrier to their plans for this country. That barrier was the newly adopted 13th Amendment to the United States Constitution. The purpose for this Amendment was to stop anyone from serving in the government who was receiving a Title of nobility or honor. It was and is obvious that these government employees would be loyal to the granter of the Title of nobility or honor.

The War of 1812 served several purposes. It delayed the passage of the 13th Amendment by Virginia, allowed the British to destroy the evidence of the first 12 states ratification of this Amendment, and it

increased the national debt, which would coerce the Congress to reestablish the Bank Charter in 1816 after the Treaty of Ghent was ratified by the Senate in 1815.

| [Index](#) | [Part 1](#) | [Part 2](#) | [Part 3](#) |

[Home](#)

``