

The Civil-Government of the United States
Uses Fraudulent Treaties, to Extort Taxes from Our People;
& there-by, to Fraudulently Support the British Empire!

Here-under; our USA Civil-Government Fraudulently Continues
the Same Roman 'Empire' Private Municipal-Corporation Model of Government,
so-as to Subvert the Organic/Constitutional Democratic/Libertarian/Common-Law form of
"Republican-Government", which we were Constitutionally "Guaranteed";
& there-by to Reduce Our People to the Same Sort of 'Conquered Slaves'
as existed under the Roman Empire.

(Originally Titled: The United States is Still a British Colony; Extorting Taxes for the Crown!
A Documentary Review of Charters and Treaties. Part One of Seven Parts. 17-August-1996.)
(Formatting Changes Made, along with Some Editorial-Commentary Inserted, all in Parenthesis ());
all by Charles Stewart, aka: "CBS". January-2018. (Some parentheses commentary are not from CBS.))
<http://nesaranews.blogspot.com/2018/01/the-united-states-is-still-british.html>

An introduction by the "Informer" This is the latest from a man who visits me quite often. He and another man researched my theory that we have never been free from the British Crown. This disc shows the results. I have stated that we will never win in their courts. This shows conclusively why. We have the hard copy of the treaties that are the footnotes. This predates Schroder's material, my research of the 1861 stats by Lincoln that put us under the War Powers confiscation acts, and John Nelson's material.

All our material supports that the real Principal, the King of England, still rules this country through the bankers and why we own no property in allodium. (Under Their Un-Lawful Interpretation of "Law. CBS) This is why it is so important to start OUR courts of God's natural (common) Law and break away from all the crap they have handed us. This is one reason Virginia had a law to hang all lawyers but was somehow, by someone, (the King) set aside to let them operate again. Some good people put in the original 13th amendment so that without the lawyers the King could not continue his strangle hold on us.

James (Montgomery) shows how that was quashed by the King. I am happy that James' research of six months bears out my theory, that most people would not listen to me, that we are still citizen/subjects under the kings of England. (Under Their Un-Lawful Interpretation of "Law. CBS) My article called "Reality" published in the American Bulletin and the article of mine on the "Atocha case," wherein Florida in 1981 used it's sovereignty under the British crown to try to take away the gold from the wreck found in Florida waters supports this premise.

James makes mention of the Law dictionaries being England's Law Dictionary. You will note it lists the reign of all the Kings of England. It never mentions the reign of the Presidents of this country. Ever wonder Why?

Get this out to as many people as you can. The Informer.

The United States is still a British Colony

The trouble with history is, we weren't there when it took place. Therefore, 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. 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 in the footnotes at the end of this paper. 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. (Wrong. CBS.)

“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 kings. 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 kings 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.](#)

Esquire ??

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. (Or, more accurately; We Did 'Win the War'; but These Three Treasonous-Conspirators Colorably Signed a Lawfully 'Null & Void' Treaty. CBS) 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. (All Lawless. CBS) 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:

(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 Declared Upon America

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, (“Emperor”. CBS) 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. (One has been Created For All Tax-Payers. CBS) 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 Assessment, 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 (Emperor. CBS) 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 (they were Loyal to Our Declared Ideals, &; CBS) we are free and sovereign people, when in fact

(According to the Criminally-Lawless Conspirators. CS.) 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 (Emperor of England. CS) 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.

Forgotten Amendment

The Articles of Confederation, Article VI states: “nor shall the united States in Congress assembled, or any of them, grant any Title of nobility.” The Constitution for the united States, in Article, I Section 9, clause 8 states: “No Title of nobility shall be granted by the united States; and no Person holding any Office or Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.”

Also, Section 10, clause 1 states, “No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque or Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but Gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto of Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of nobility.”

There was however, no measurable penalty for violation of the above Sections. Congress saw this as a great threat to the freedom of Americans, and our Republican form of government.

In January 1810 Senator Reed proposed the Thirteenth Amendment, and on April 26, 1810 was passed by the Senate 26 to 1 (1st-2nd session, p. 670) and by the House 87 to 3 on May 1, 1810 (2nd session, p. 2050) and submitted to the seventeen states for ratification.

The Amendment reads as follows:

“If any citizen of the United States shall Accept, claim, receive or retain any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them.”

From An “American Dictionary of the English Language, 1st Edition,” Noah Webster (1828), defines nobility as:

“3. The qualities which constitute distinction of rank in civil society, according to the customs or laws of the country; that eminence or dignity which a man derives from birth or title conferred, and which places him in an order above common men.”; and, “4. The persons collectively who enjoy rank above commoners; the peerage.”

The fore-mentioned Sections in the Constitution for the united States, and the above proposed Thirteenth Amendment sought to prohibit the above definition, which would give any advantage or privilege to some citizens an unequal opportunity to achieve or exercise political power. Thirteen of the seventeen states listed below understood the importance of this Amendment.

Date Admitted to the Union	State	Date voted the Amendment	Date Voted Against the Amendment
1788	Maryland	Dec. 25, 1810	
1792	Kentucky	Jan. 31, 1811	
1803	Ohio	Jan. 31, 1811	
1787	Delaware	Feb. 2, 1811	
1787	Pennsylvania	Feb. 6, 1811	
1787	New Jersey	Feb., 13, 1811	
1791	Vermont	Oct. 24, 1811	
1796	Tennessee	Nov. 21, 1811	
1788	Georgia	Dec. 13, 1811	
1789	North Carolina	Dec. 23, 1811	
1788	Massachusetts	Feb. 27, 1812	
1788	New Hampshire	Dec. 10, 1812	
1788	Virginia	Mar. 12, 1819	
1788	New York		Mar. 12, 1811
1788	Connecticut		May 1813
1788	South Carolina		Dec. 7, 1813
1790	Rhode Island		Setp. 15, 1814

On March 10, 1819, the Virginia legislature passed Act No. 280 (Virginia Archives of Richmond, “misc.” file, p. 299 for micro- film):

“Be it enacted by the General Assembly, that there shall be published an edition of the laws of this Commonwealth in which shall be contained the following matters, that is to say: the Constitution of the united States and the amendments thereto...”

The official day of ratification was March 12, 1819, this was the date of re-publication of the Virginia Civil Code. Virginia ordered 4,000 copies, almost triple their usual order. Word of Virginia’s 1819 ratification spread throughout the states and both Rhode Island and Kentucky

published the new Amendment in 1822. Ohio published the new Amendment in 1824. Maine ordered 10,000 copies of the Constitution with the new Amendment to be printed for use in the public schools, and again in 1831 for their Census Edition.

Indiana published the new Amendment in the Indiana Revised Laws, of 1831 on P. 20. The Northwest Territories published the new Amendment in 1833; Ohio published the new Amendment again in 1831 and in 1833. Connecticut, one of the states that voted against the new Amendment published the new Amendment in 1835. Wisconsin Territory published the new Amendment in 1839; Iowa Territory published the new Amendment in 1843; Ohio published the new Amendment again, in 1848; Kansas published the new Amendment in 1855; and Nebraska Territory published the new Amendment six years in a row from 1855 to 1860. Colorado Territory published the new Amendment in 1865 and again 1867, in the 1867 printing, the present Thirteenth Amendment (slavery Amendment) was listed as the Fourteenth Amendment.

The repeated reprinting of the Amended United States Constitution is conclusive evidence of its passage. Also, as evidence of the new Thirteenth Amendment's impending passage; on December 2, 1817 John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, wrote to Buck (an attorney) regarding the position Buck had been assigned. The letter reads:

“...if it should be the opinion of this Government that the acceptance on your part of the Commission under which it was granted did not interfere with your citizenship. It is the opinion of the Executive that under the 13th amendment to the constitution by the acceptance of such an appointment from any foreign Government, a citizen of the United States ceases to enjoy that character, and becomes incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under the United States or either of them. ... J.Q.A.”

By virtue of these titles and honors, and special privileges, lawyers have assumed political and economic advantages over the majority of citizens. A majority may vote, but only a minority (lawyers) may run for political office.

After the War of 1812 was concluded the Treaty of Ghent was signed and ratified (footnote 6). In Article 4 of the Treaty, the United States gained what was already given in the Treaty of Paris 1783, namely islands off the U.S. Coast. Also, two men were to be given the power to decide the borders and disagreements, if they could not, the power was to be given to an outside sovereign power and their decision was final and considered conclusive.

In Article 9, it is admitted there are citizens and subjects in America. As you have seen, the two terms are interchangeable, synonymous. In Article 10 you will see where the idea for the overthrow of this country came from and on what issue. The issue raised by England was slavery and it was nurtured by the king's emissaries behind the scenes. This would finally lead to the Civil War, even though the Supreme Court had declared the states and their citizens property rights could not be infringed on by the United States government or Congress.

This was further declared by the following Presidential quotes, where they declared to violate the states rights would violate the U.S. Constitution. Also, history shows that slavery would not have existed much longer in the Southern states, public sentiment was changing and slavery was quickly disappearing. The Civil War was about destroying property rights and the

U.S. Constitution which supported these rights.

Read the following quotes of Presidents just before the Civil War:

“I believe that involuntary servitude, as it exists in different States of this Confederacy, is recognized by the Constitution. I believe that it stands like any other admitted right, and that the States where it exists are entitled to efficient remedies to enforce the constitutional provisions.” Franklin Pierce Inaugural Address, March 4, 1853 – Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 5.

“The whole Territorial question being thus settled upon the principle of popular sovereignty - a principle as ancient as free government itself – everything of a practical nature has been decided. No other question remains for adjustment, because all agree that under the Constitution slavery in the States is beyond the reach of any human power except that of the respective States themselves wherein it exists.” James Buchanan Inaugural Address, March 4th, 1857 – Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 5.

“I cordially congratulate you upon the final settlement by the Supreme Court of the United States of the question of slavery in the Territories, which had presented an aspect so truly formidable at the commencement of my Administration. The right has been established of every citizen to take his property of any kind, including slaves, into the common Territories belonging equally to all the States of the Confederacy, and to have it protected there under the Federal Constitution.

Neither Congress nor a Territorial legislature nor any human power has any authority to annul or impair this vested right. The supreme judicial tribunal of the country, which is a coordinate branch of the Government, has sanctioned and affirmed these principles of constitutional law, so manifestly just in themselves and so well calculated to promote peace and harmony among the States.” James Buchanan, Third Annual Message, December 19, 1859 – Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 5.

So there is no misunderstanding, I am not rearguing slavery. Slavery is morally wrong and contrary to God Almighty’s Law. In this divisive issue, the true attack was on our natural rights and on the Constitution. The core of the attack was on our right to possess allodial property. Our God given right to own property in allodial was taken away by conquest of the Civil War. If you are free, this right cannot be taken away. The opposite of free is slave or subject, we were allowed to believe we were free for about 70 years. Then the king said enough, and had the slavery issue pushed to the front by the northern press, which so formed northern public opinion, that they were willing to send their sons to die in the Civil War.

The southern States were not fighting so much for the slave issue, but for the right to own property, any property. These property rights were granted by the king in the Treaty of 1783, knowing they would soon be forfeited by the American people through ignorance. Do you think you own your house? If you were to stop paying taxes, federal or state, you would soon find out that you were just being allowed to live and pay rent for this house. The rent being the taxes to the king, who supplied the benefit of commerce.

A free man not under a monarch, democracy, dictatorship or socialist government, but is under a republican form of government would not and could not have his property taken. Why! The king's tax would not and could not be levied. If the Americans had been paying attention the first 70 years to the subterfuge and corruption of the Constitution and government representatives, instead of chasing the money supplied by the king, **the Conquest of this country during the Civil War could have been avoided.** George Washington (Allegedly. CS) had vision during the Revolutionary War, concerning the Civil War. You need to read it. ([Footnote 7](#))

End Part One.

Proceed To PART **TWO**

THREE

FOUR

FIVE

SIX

Copyright acknowledgment: Presented as free information in public domain.

Earlier **Format editing by: Eldon Warman; Calgary, Alberta, Canada.**

COMMON LAW Homepage

<https://scannedretina.com/2014/11/17/suspicion-confirmed/>