

# The United States is Still a British Colony

## PART II

### Bend Over America

It's not an easy thing having to tell someone they have been conned into believing they are free. For some, to accept this is comparable to denying God Almighty.

You have to be made to understand that the United States is a corporation, which is a continuation of the corporate Charters created by the king of England. And that the states upon ratifying their individual State constitutions, became sub corporations under and subordinate to the United States. The counties and municipalities became sub corporations under the State Charters. It is my duty to report further evidence concerning the claims I made in "The United States is Still a British Colony, part 1."

I have always used a copy of the North Carolina Constitution provided by the State, I should have known better to take this as the final authority. To my knowledge the following quote has not been in the Constitution the State hands out or those in use in the schools. The 1776 North Carolina Constitution created a new corporate Charter, and declared our individual freedoms. However, the same corporate Charter, reserved the king's title to the land, which restored, and did not diminish, his grants that were made in his early Charters. If you remember, I made the claim that legally we are still subject to the king. In the below quote you will see that the king declares our taxation will be forever, and that a fourth of all gold and silver will be returned to him.

"YIELDING AND PAYING yearly, to us, our heirs and Successors, for the same, the yearly Rent of Twenty Marks of Lawful money of England, at the Feast of All Saints, yearly, forever, The First payment thereof to begin and be made on the Feast of All Saints which shall be in the year of Our Lord One thousand six hundred Sixty and five; AND also, the fourth part of all Gold and Silver Ore which, with the limits aforesaid, shall, from time to time, happen to be found."

(Feast of All Saints occurred November 1 of each year.)

The Carolina Charter, 1663 footnote #5

I know Patriots will have a hard time with this, because as I said earlier, they would have to deny what they have been taught from an early age. You have to continue to go back in historical documents and see if what you have been taught is correct. The following quote is from section 25 of the 1776 North Carolina Constitution, Declaration of Rights.

And provided further, that nothing herein contained shall affect the titles or possessions of individuals holding or claiming under the laws heretofore in force, or grants heretofore made by the late King George II, or his predecessors, or the late lords proprietors, or any of them.

Declaration of Rights 1776, North Carolina Constitution, Footnote #8

Can it be any plainer? Nobody reads, they take what is told to them by their schools and government as gospel, and never look any further. They are quick to attack anyone that does because it threatens their way of life, rocks the boat in other words. Read the following quote from a court case:

"\* \* \* definition given by Blackstone, vol. 2, p. 244. I shall therefore only cite that respectable authority in his own words: "Escheat, we may remember, was one of the fruits and consequences of feudal tenure; the word itself is originally French or Norman, in which language it signifies chance or accident, and with us denotes an obstruction of the course of descent, and a consequent

determination of the tenure by some unforeseen contingency, in which case the estate naturally results back, by a kind of reversion, to the original grantor, or lord of the fee."

Every person knows in what manner the citizens acquired the property of the soil within the limits of this State. Being dissatisfied with the measures of the British Government, they revolted from it, assumed the government into their own hands, seized and took possession of all the estates of the King of Great Britain and his subjects, appropriated them to their own use, and defended their possessions against the claims of Great Britain, during a long and bloody war, and finally obtained a relinquishment of those claims by the treaty of Paris. But this State had no title to the territory prior to the title of the King of Great Britain and his subjects, nor did it ever claim as lord paramount to them. This State was not the original grantor to them, nor did they ever hold by any kind of tenure under the State, or owe it any allegiance or other duties to which an escheat is annexed. How then can it be said that the lands in this case naturally result back by a kind of reversion to this State, to a source from whence it never issued, and from tenants who never held under it? Might it not be stated with equal propriety that this country escheated to the King of Great Britain from the Aborigines, when he drove them off, and took and maintained possession of their country? At the time of the revolution, and before the Declaration of Independence, the collective body of the people had neither right to nor possession of the territory of this State; it is true some individuals had a right to, and were in possession of certain portions of it, which they held under grants from the King of Great Britain; but they did not hold, nor did any of his subjects hold, under the collective body of the people, who had no power to grant any part of it. After the Declaration of Independence and the establishment of the Constitution, the people may be said first to have taken possession of this country, at least so much of it as was not previously appropriated to individuals. Then their sovereignty commenced, and with it a right to all the property not previously vested in individual citizens, with all the other rights of sovereignty, and among those the right of escheats. This sovereignty did not accrue to them by escheat, but by conquest, from the King of Great Britain and his subjects; but they acquired nothing by that means from the citizens of the State. Each individual had, under this view of the case, a right to retain his private property, independent of the reservation in the declaration of rights; but if there could be any doubt on that head, it is clearly explained and obviated by the proviso in that instrument. Therefore, whether the State took by right of conquest or escheat, all the interest which the U. K. had previous to the Declaration of Independence still remained with them, on every principle of law and equity, because they are purchasers for a valuable consideration, and being in possession as cestui que trust under the statute for transferring uses into possession; and citizens of this State, at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and at the time of making the declaration of rights, their interest is secured to them beyond the reach of any Act of Assembly; neither can it be affected by any principle arising from the doctrine of escheats, supposing, what I do not admit, that the State took by escheat."

MARSHALL v. LOVELESS, 1 N.C. 412 (1801), 2 S.A. 70

There was no way we could have had a perfected title to this land. Once we had won the Revolutionary War we would have had an unconditional surrender by the king, this did not take place. Not what took place at Yorktown, when we let the king off the hook. Barring this, the king would have to have sold us this land, for us to have a perfected title, just as the Indians sold their land to the king, or the eight Carolina Proprietors sold Carolina back to the king. The treaty of 1783 did not remove his claim and original title, because he kept the minerals. This was no different than when king Charles II gave Carolina by Charter to the lords that helped put him back in power; compare them and you will see the end result is the same. The Charter to the lords is footnote #6, where eight proprietors were given title to the land, but the king retained the money and sovereignty for his heirs. The king could not just give up America to the colonialist, nor would he. He would violate his own law of Mortmain to put these lands in dead hands, no longer to be able to be used by himself, or his heirs and successors. He would also be guilty of harming his heirs and successors, by giving away that which he declared in the following quotes, and there are

similar quotes in the other Charters:

"SAVING always, the Faith, Allegiance, and Sovereign Dominion due to us, our heirs and Successors, for the same; and Saving also, the right, title, and interest of all and every our Subjects of the English Nation which are now Planted within the Limits bounds aforesaid, if any be;..." The Carolina Charter, 1663 footnote #5

"KNOW YE, that We, of our further grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, HAVE thought fit to Erect the same Tract of Ground, Country, and Island into a Province, and, out of the fullness of our Royal power and Prerogative, WE Do, for us, our heirs and Successors, Erect, Incorporate, and Ordain the same into a province, and do call it the Province of CAROLINA, and so from henceforth will have it called..."  
The Carolina Charter, 1663 footnote #5

The U.S. Constitution is a treaty between the states creating a corporation for the king. In the below quote pay attention to the large "S" State and the small "s" state. The large "S" State is referring to the corporate State and it's sovereignty over the small "s" state, because of the treaty.

Read the following quote:

"Headnote 5. Besides, the treaty of 1783 was declared by an Act of Assembly of this State passed in 1787, to be law in this State, and this State by adopting the Constitution of the United States in 1789, declared the treaty to be the supreme law of the land. The treaty now under consideration was made, on the part of the United States, by a Congress composed of deputies from each state, to whom were delegated by the articles of confederation, expressly, "the sole and exclusive right and power of entering into treaties and alliances"; and being ratified and made by them, it became a complete national act, and the act and law of every state.

If, however, a subsequent sanction of this State was at all necessary to make the treaty law here, it has been had and repeated. By a statute passed in 1787, the treaty was declared to be law in this State, and the courts of law and equity were enjoined to govern their decisions accordingly. And in 1789 was adopted here the present Constitution of the United States, which declared that all treaties made, or which should be made under the authority of the United States, should be the supreme law of the land; and that the judges in every state should be bound thereby; anything in the Constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding. Surely, then, the treaty is now law in this State, and the confiscation act, so far as the treaty interferes with it, is annulled."

"By an act of the Legislature of North Carolina, passed in April, 1777, it was, among other things, enacted, "That all persons, being subjects of this State, and now living therein, or who shall hereafter come to live therein, who have traded immediately to Great Britain or Ireland, within ten years last past, in their own right, or acted as factors, storekeepers, or agents here, or in any of the United States of America, for merchants residing in Great Britain or Ireland, shall take an oath of abjuration and allegiance, or depart out of the State."

Treaties are the "Law of the Land" HAMILTON v. EATEN, 1 N.C. 641(1796), HAMILTON v. EATEN. Ā., 2 Mart., 1. U.S. Circuit Court. (June Term, 1796.)

Your presence in the State makes you subject to its laws, read the following quote:

"The states are to be considered, with respect to each other, as independent sovereignties, possessing powers completely adequate to their own government, in the exercise of which they are limited only by the nature and objects of government, by their respective constitutions and by that of the United States. Crimes and misdemeanors committed within the limits of each are punishable only by the jurisdiction of that state where they arise; for the right of punishing, being founded upon the consent of the citizens, express or implied, cannot be directed against those who never

were citizens, and who likewise committed the offense beyond the territorial limits of the state claiming jurisdiction. Our Legislature may define and punish crimes committed within the State, whether by citizen or strangers; because the former are supposed to have consented to all laws made by the Legislature, and the latter, whether their residence be temporary or permanent, do impliedly agree to yield obedience to all such laws as long as they remain in the State;"

STATE v. KNIGHT, 1 N.C. 143 (1799), 2 S.A. 70

Do you understand now? The treaty, the corporate Charter, the North Carolina Constitution, by proxy of the electorates, created residence in the large "S" State. Not by some further act you made. So how can expatriation from the United States, remove your residence in The "State", which was created by treaty, ratified by our Fore Fathers. As soon as the corporate Charter (treaty) was ratified we returned to subjection to the king of England, through the legal residence created by the treaty. Remember in the quote I gave earlier, by treaty we recanted our declared freedom, and returned to the king his sovereignty and title. In the following quote you will see that the State supreme court sits by being placed by the general assembly:

NC Supreme Court History Supreme Court of North Carolina A Brief History:

"The legal and historical origins of the Supreme Court of North Carolina lie in the State Constitution of 1776, which empowered the General Assembly to appoint; Judges of the Supreme Courts of Law and Equity; and; Judges of Admiralty....The first meeting of the Court took place on January 1, 1819. The Court began holding two sittings, or ; terms, ; a year, the first beginning on the second Monday in June and the second on the last Monday in December. This schedule endured until the Constitution of 1868 prescribed the first Mondays in January and July for the sittings. Vacancies on the Court were filled temporarily by the Governor, with the assistance and advice of the Council of State, until the end of the next session of the state General Assembly."

From the internet, address can be made available.

## Council of State

What is the Council of State, and where did it originate?

III. "The one of which councils, to be called the council of state (and whose office shall chiefly be assisting, with their care, advice, and circumspection, to the said governor) shall be chosen, nominated, placed, and displaced, from time to time, by us the said treasurer, council and company, and our successors: which council of state shall consist, for the present only of these persons, as are here inserted,..."

IV. "The other council, more generally to be called by the governor, once yearly, and no oftener, but for very extraordinary and important occasions, shall consist for the present, of the said council of state, and of two burgesses out of every town, hundred, or other particular plantation, to be respectively chosen by the inhabitants: which council shall be called The General Assembly, wherein (as also in the said council of state) all matters shall be decided, determined, and ordered by the greater part of the voices then present; reserving to the governor always a negative voice. And this general assembly shall have free power, to treat, consult, and conclude, as well of all emergent occasions concerning the public weal of the said colony and every part thereof, as also to make, ordain, and enact such general laws and orders, for the behoof of the said colony, and the good government thereof, as shall, from time to time, appear necessary or requisite;..." An Ordinance and Constitution of the Virginia Company in England. Footnote #4

The job of the 1st Council of State was to make sure the governor followed the king's wishes. The 2nd was the general assembly, the laws they passed had to conform to the king's law.

Read the following quote:

V. Whereas in all other things, we require the said general assembly, as also the said council of state, to imitate and follow the policy of the form of government, laws, customs, and manner of trial, and other administration of justice, used in the realm of England, as near as may be even as ourselves, by his majesty's letters patent, are required.

VI. Provided, that no law or ordinance, made in the said general assembly, shall be or continue in force or validity, unless the same shall be solemnly ratified and confirmed, in a general quarter court of the said company here in England, and so ratified, be returned to them under our seal; it being our intent to afford the like measure also unto the said colony, that after the government of the said colony shall once have been well framed, and settled accordingly, which is to be done by us, as by authority derived from his majesty, and the same shall have been so by us declared, no orders of court afterwards, shall bind the said colony, unless they be ratified in like manner in the general assemblies. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our common seal the 24th of July, 1621. . . .An Ordinance and Constitution of the Virginia Company in England. footnote #4

The Council of State still exists to day, although it has been modified several times. The first major change came in the 1776, North Carolina Constitution, read the below quotes:

16. "That the senate and house of commons, jointly, at their first meeting, after each annual election, shall, by ballot, elect seven persons to be a council of state for one year; who shall advise the governor in the execution of his office; and that four members shall be a quorum; their advice and proceedings shall be entered in a journal, to be kept for that purpose only, and signed by the members present; to any part of which any member present may enter his dissent. And such journal shall be laid before the general assembly when called for by them." footnote #9

19. "The governor, for the time being, shall have power to draw for and apply such sums of money as shall be voted by the general assembly, for the contingencies of government, and be accountable to them for the same. He also may, by and with the advice of the council of state, lay embargoes, or prohibit the exportation of any commodity, for any term not exceeding thirty days, at any one time in the recess of the general assembly; and shall have the power of granting pardons and reprieves, except where the prosecution shall be carried on by the general assembly, or the law shall otherwise direct; in which case, he may, in the recess, grant a reprieve until the next sitting of the general assembly; and he may exercise all the other executive powers of government, limited and restrained, as by this constitution is mentioned, and according to the laws of the State. And, on his death, inability, or absence from the State, the speaker of the senate, for the time being, and in case of his death, inability, or absence from the State, the speaker of the house of commons, shall exercise the powers of government, after such death, or during such absence or inability of the governor, or speaker of the senate, or until a new nomination is made by the general assembly." footnote #9

20. "That, in every case, where any officer, the right of whose appointment is, by this constitution, vested in the general assembly, shall, during their recess, die, or his office by other means become vacant, the governor shall have power, with the advice of the council of State, to fill up such vacancy, by granting a temporary commission, which shall expire at the end of the next session of the general assembly." footnote #9

Also take notice who was not allowed to serve as Council of State:

26. "That no treasurer shall have a seat, either in the senate, house of commons, or council of state, during his continuance in that office, or before he shall have finally settled his accounts with the public, for all the moneys which may be in his hands, at the expiration of his office, belonging to the State, and hath paid the same into the hands of the succeeding treasurer."

27. "That no officer in the regular army or navy, in the service and pay of the United States, of this State or any other State, nor any contractor or agent for supplying such army or navy with clothing or provisions, shall have a seat either in the senate, house of commons, or council of state, or be eligible thereto; and any member of the senate, house of commons, or council of state, being appointed to, and accepting of such office, shall thereby vacate his seat."

28. "That no member of the council of state shall have a seat, either in the senate or house of commons."

30. "That no secretary of this State, attorney-general, or clerk of any court of record, shall have a seat in the senate, house of commons, or council of state." footnote #9

The king continued to rule through the Council of State until several things were in place, his bank, his laws and tradition. The king succeeded by the acceptance of the American people that they were free, along with the whole of our history not being taught in our schools. The next change to the Council of State came at the conquest of this country, I referred to this in part 1, and in A Country Defeated In Victory.

Read this quote from the 1868 North Carolina constitution, Article 3, sec 14:

SEC. 14. "The Secretary of State, Auditor, Treasurer, Superintendent of Public Works, and Superintendent of Public Instruction, shall constitute ex officio, the Council of State, who shall advise the Governor in the execution of his office, and three of whom shall constitute a quorum; their advice and proceedings in this capacity shall be entered in a Journal, to be kept for this purpose exclusively, and signed by the members present, from any part of which any member may enter his dissent; and such journal shall be placed before the General Assembly when called for by either House. The Attorney General shall be, ex officio, the legal adviser of the Executive Department." footnote #10

After the Civil War, the conquest of America, you see those that were allowed to be Council of State, were elected officials. Under the 1776 North Carolina Constitution, it was unlawful for these elected officials to be Council of State. Why? Because, the king could not trust the common man to obey him, now that they thought they were free. After the Civil War the Council of State was no longer needed to fulfill the public policy of the king, the Council of State still exists today, but in a reduced capacity as far as the king goes. Now he had the 14th Amendment, his lawyers in the government, his bankers in control of the governments money, and above all greed that causes most in office to continue the status quo.

## The Federal Reserve, Taxes and Tax Court

What I will show you next will shock you. I made brief mention in part 1, that taxes paid in this country were under treaty to the king of England. How about if I told you that the law that created our taxes and this countries tax court go back in history to William the Conqueror. And to further help you understand the below definitions, exchequer is the British branch of the Federal Reserve.

Exchequer: "The English department of revenue. A very ancient court of record, set up by William the Conqueror, as a part of the aula regia, and intended principally to order the revenues of the crown, and to recover the king's debts and duties. It was called exchequer, "scaccharium," from the checked cloth, resembling a chessboard, which covers the table." Ballentine's Law Dictionary

Exchequer: "That department of the English government which has charge of the collection of the national revenue; the treasury department." Black's Law Dictionary 4th ed.

Exchequer: "In English Law. A department of the government which has the management of the collection of the king's revenue." Bouvier's Law Dictionary 1914 ed.

Court of Exchequer: "56. The court of exchequer is inferior in rank not only to the court of king's bench, but to the common pleas also: but I have chosen to consider it in this order, on account of its double capacity, as a court of law and a court of equity [44] also. It is a very ancient court of record, set up by William the Conqueror, as a part of the aula regia, through regulated and reduced to its present order by King Edward I; and intended principally to order the revenues of the crown, and to recover the king's debts and duties. It is called the exchequer, scaccharium, from the chequed cloth, resembling a chess-board, which covers the table there; and on which, when certain of the king's accounts are made up, the sums are marked and scored with counters. It consists of two divisions; the receipt of the exchequer, which manages to royal revenue, and with which these Commentaries have no concern; and the court or judicial part of it, which is again subdivided into a court of equity, and a court of common law."

Black Stone Commentaries Book III, pg 1554

Court of Exchequer: "An English superior court with jurisdiction of matter of law and matters involving government revenue." Ballentine's Law Dictionary

Court of Exchequer: "A court for the correction and prevention of errors of law in the three superior common-law courts of the kingdom."

A court of exchequer chamber was first erected by statute 31 Edw. III. C. 12, to determine causes upon writs of error from the common-law side of the exchequer court. It consisted of the chancellor, treasurer, and the "justices and other sage persons as to them seemeth." The judges were merely assistants. A second court of exchequer chamber was instituted by statute 27 Eliz. C. 8, consisting of the justices of the common pleas and the exchequer, or any six of them, which had jurisdiction in error of cases in the king's bench. In exchequer chamber substituted in their place as an intermediate court of appeal between the three common-law courts and Parliament. It consisted of the judges of the two courts which had not rendered the judgement in the court below. It is now merged in the High Court of Justice."

Bouvier's Law Dictionary 1914 ed.

It gets worse, are you just a little ticked off, or maybe you are starting to question what you have been taught all these years? It's time to wake up America!

If you'll look at the Judiciary Act of 1789 (I know most won't take time to read it), you'll see that all district courts are admiralty courts. This is the king's court of commerce, in which he is the plaintiff, recovering damages done against him, or what belongs to him.

The equity court of the exchequer: "57. The court of equity is held in the exchequer chamber before the lord treasurer, the chancellor of the exchequer, the chief baron, and three puisne' ones. These Mr. Selden conjectures to have been anciently made out of such as were barons of the kingdom, or parliamentary barons; and thence to have derived their name: which conjecture receives great strength from Bracton's explanation of magna carta, c.14, which directs that the earls and barons be amerced by their peers; that is, says he, by the barons of the exchequer. The primary and original business of this court is to call the king's debtors to account, by bill filed by the attorney general; and to recover any lands, tenements, or hereditaments, any goods, chattels, or other profits or benefits, belonging to the crown. So that by their original constitution the jurisdiction of the courts of common pleas, king's bench, and exchequer, was entirely separate and distinct; the common pleas being intended to decide all controversies between subject and subject; the king's bench to correct all crimes and misdemeanors that amount to a breach of the peace, the king being then the plaintiff, as such offenses are in open derogation of the jura regalia (regal rights) of his crown; and the exchequer to adjust [45] and recover his revenue, wherein the king also is plaintiff, as the withholding and nonpayment thereof is an injury to his jura fiscalia



(fiscal rights). But, as by a fiction almost all sorts of civil actions are now allowed to be brought in the king's bench, in like manner by another fiction all kinds of personal suits may be prosecuted in the court of exchequer. For as all the officers and ministers of this court have, like those of other superior courts, the privilege of suing and being sued only in their own court; so exchequer, are privileged to sue and implead all manner of persons in the same court of equity that they themselves are called into. They have likewise privilege to sue and implead one another, or any stranger, in the same kind of common-law actions (where the personalty only is concerned) as are prosecuted in the court of common pleas."

Black Stone Commentaries Book III, pg 1554

The common-law court of the exchequer: "58. This gives original to the common-law part of their jurisdiction, which was established merely for the benefit of the king's accountants, and is exercised by the barons only of the exchequer, and not the treasurer or chancellor. The writ upon which the plaintiff suggests that he is the king's farmer or debtor, and that the defendant hath done him the injury or damage complained of; quo minus sufficient exist, by which he is the less able, to pay the king his debt or rent. And these suits are expressly directed, by what is called the statute of Rutland, to be confined to such matters only as specially concern the king or his ministers of the exchequer. And by the articuli super cartas it is enacted that no common pleas be thenceforth holden in the exchequer, contrary to the form of the great charter. But not, by the suggestion of privilege, any person may be admitted to sue in the exchequer as well as the king's accountant. The surmise of being debtor to the king is therefore become matter of form and mere words of course, and the court is open to all the nation equally. The same holds with regard to the equity side of the court: for there any person may file [46] a bill against another upon a bare suggestion that he is the king's accountant; but whether he is so or not is never controverted. In this court, on the nonpayment of titles; in which case the surmise of being the king's debtor is no fiction, they being bound to pay him their first-fruits, and annual tenths. But the chancery has of late years obtained a large share in this business."

Black Stone Commentaries Book III, pg 1555

Definition of a legal fiction: For a discussion of fictions in law, see chapter II of Maine's Ancient Law, and Pollock's note D in his edition of the Ancient Law. Blackstone gives illustrations of legal fictions on pages 43, 45, 153, 203 of this book. Mr Justice Curtis (Jurisdiction of United States Courts, 2d ed., 148) gives the following instance of a fiction in our practice:

"A suit by or against a corporation in its corporate name may be presumed to be a suit by or against citizens of the state which created the corporate body, and no averment or denial to the contrary is admissible for the purpose of withdrawing the suit from the jurisdiction of a court of the United States.

There is the Roman fiction: The court first decides the law, presumes all the members are citizens of the state which created the corporation, and then says, 'you shall not traverse that presumption'; and that is the law now. (Authors note-by your residence you are incorporated) Under it, the courts of the United States constantly entertain suits by or against corporations. (Muller v. Dows, 94 U. S. 444, 24 L. Ed. 207.) It has been so frequently settled, that there is not the slightest reason to suppose that it will ever be departed from by the court. It has been repeated over and over again in subsequent decisions; and the supreme court seem entirely satisfied that it is the right ground to stand upon; and, as I am now going to state to you, they have applied it in some cases which go beyond, much beyond, these decisions to which I have referred.

So that when a suit is to be brought in a court of the United States by or against a corporation, by reason of the character of the parties, you have only to say that this corporation (after naming it correctly) was created by a law of the state; and that is exactly the same in its consequences as if



you could allege, and did allege, that the corporation was a citizen of that state. According to the present decisions, it is not necessary you should say that the members of that corporation are citizens of Massachusetts. They have passed beyond that. You have only to say that the corporation was created by a law of the state of Massachusetts, and has its principal place of business in that state; and that makes it, for the purposes of jurisdiction, the same as if it were a citizen of that state" See Pound, Readings in Roman Law, 95n. Black Stone Commentaries Book III, pg 1553

Combine this with what I said earlier concerning power of the treaty and it's creation of the corporate State, and you now know why you are not allowed to challenge residence or subjection in the State Courts. And because of the treaty, residence in the State is synonymous with residence in the district. I know this puts a sour taste in your mouth, because it does mine, but that is the condition we find ourselves in. The only way I see to change it, is to change the treaty and reinforce the original Declaration of Independence, but this would meet severe objection on the part of the international Bankers, and of course the king's heirs in England. And most Americans, even if they were aware of this information, would have no stomach for the turmoil this would cause.

Still a little fuzzy on what has taken place, the word Exchequer is still used today? In Britain the Exchequer is the Federal Reserve, the same as our Federal Reserve. They just changed the name here as they have done many things to cloud what is taking place, hoping no one would catch on. Who wrote the Federal Reserve Act, and put it in place in this country? Bankers from the Bank of England with their counter part in New York!

Congressman McFadden: "I hope that is the case, but I may say to the gentleman that during the sessions of this Economic Conference in London there is another meeting taking place in London. We were advised by reports from London last Sunday of the arrival of George L. Harrison, Governor of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and we were advised that accompanying him was Mr. Crane, the Deputy Governor, and James P. Warburg, of the Kuhn-Loeb banking family, of New York and Hamburg, Germany, and also Mr. O. M. W. Sprague, recently in the pay of Great Britain as chief economic and financial adviser of Mr. Norman, Governor of the Bank Of England, and now supposed to represent our Treasury. These men landed in England and rushed to the Bank of England for a private conference, taking their luggage with them, before even going to their hotel. We know this conference has been taking place for the past 3 days behind closed doors in the Bank of England with these gentlemen meeting with heads of the Bank of England and the Bank for International Settlements, of Basel, Switzerland, and the head of the Bank France, Mr. Maret. They are discussing war debts; they are discussing stabilization of exchanges and the Federal Reserve System, I may say to the Members of the House.

The Federal reserve System, headed by George L. Harrison, is our premier, who is dealing with debts behind the closed doors of the Bank of England; and the United States Treasury is there, represented by O. M. W. Sprague, who until the last 10 days was the representative of the Bank of England, and by Mr. James P. Warburg, who is the son of the principal author of the Federal Reserve Act. Many things are being settled behind the closed doors of the Bank of England by this group. No doubt this group were pleased to hear that yesterday the Congress passed amendments to the Federal Reserve Act and that the President signed the bill which turns over to the Federal Reserve System the complete total financial resources of money and credit in the United States. Apparently the domination and control of the international banking group is being strengthened....  
Congressional Record, June 14, 1934

What else does the Exchequer do? The government (Congress) puts up bonds (bills of credit) on the international market, that the Federal Reserve (Exchequer) prints fiat money, for which the government (Congress) is the guarantor for, read the following quote:

Exchequer Bills: Bills of credit issued by authority of parliament.

They constitute the medium of transaction of business between the bank of England and the government. The exchequer bills contain a guarantee from government which secures the holders against loss by fluctuation. Bouvier's Law Dictionary 1914 ed.

Also re-read "A Country Defeated In Victory". Who do you think the national debt is owed to? If that's not bad enough the bond indebtedness allowed the king to foreclose on his colony when it was time for the one World government, the king/bankers caused us to reorganize under bankruptcy. The Bank of England allowed the United States to use you and I (our labor) for collateral and all the property in America, read the following quote:

Congressman Lemke: "...This nation is bankrupt; every State in this Union is bankrupt; the people of the United States, as a whole, are bankrupt. The public and private debts of this Nation, which are evidenced by bonds, mortgages, notes, or other written instruments about to about \$250,000,000,000, and it is estimated that there is about \$50,000,000,000 of which there is no record, making in all about \$300,000,000,000 of public and private debts. The total physical cash value of all the property in the United States is now estimated at about \$70,000,000,000. That is more than it would bring if sold at public auction. In this we do not include debts or the evidence of debts, such as bonds, mortgages, and so fourth. These are not physical property. They will have to be paid out of the physical property. How are we going to pay \$300,000,000,000 with only \$70,000,000,000?" Congressional Record, March 3, 1934, footnote #10

This debt was more than could be paid as of 1934, this caused the declared bankruptcy by President Roosevelt. Now the national debt is over 12,000,000,000,000. The government only tells you about 5,000,000,000,000, they don't tell you about the corporate debt, which America is also guarantor for. Add to that the personal debt; you know credit cards and home loans, and it approaches 20,000,000,000,000, that's trillion for those of you that miss read the number of zero's. Mix this with a super inflated stock market and a huge trade deficit, and that is what brings you to understand my subtitle for this paper. BEND OVER AMERICA. What could possibly be the purpose of the international bankers allowing our nation to over extend so badly and not cut us off? When back in 1934 they could have legally seized the whole country. We are being used for the purpose of the international bankers which is loaning money to third world countries, to enslave them as we are, to colonize the world for Britain, and to use our military machine to control unruly countries and to collect the king's debt. There will soon be a United Nations personal income tax for the whole world. The end purpose of the international bankers, is a one world government, with England as the center of government and the international bankers calling the shots.

I am going to share a dream I had, July 1992, at the risk of being ridiculed. I told my friend who is mentioned in the dream, the next day. At that time neither of us understood the dream, about a month later I started to understand when I began learning about admiralty law and where our admiralty law came from. As time has passed I have come to understand the dream, because of further information coming to light, such as the information contained in part 1, and part 2, which you are now reading. I new when I woke up that the dream was not the normal nonsense you can sometimes experience in a dream. And I might add I dream very seldom, after having this dream I was given the desire to write down and pass along the information that has been brought my way, via. the Holy Spirit. The information has defined the dream not the other way around.

## MY DREAM

July 1992: A record of a dream I had. I was what appeared to be hovering above the below scene, and it appeared to be three dimensional, like the scene had texture. It was also in color, with the smell of war in the air. I awoke at 5:00 am, and was wide awake and immediately wrote down what took place in my dream.

A friend and I were among thousands of Christians that were massed together awaiting execution. I

saw untold thousands of Christians executed before us. There were many troops guarding us, these troops were British; they had on Revolutionary War clothing and were carrying the old style muskets.

The people that went before us to be executed went voluntarily. They went out of some false sense of duty to this envisioned government, that was British controlled. These people were in ranks waiting to be lead away to their death. While standing in the ranks my friend and I kept looking at one another, but we were separated by what seemed to be hundreds of people.

Just before they called our number they lead us away (untold thousands) under guard to return later. I asked some of the people in the ranks to step aside so I could get next to my friend. I told him that while I was in the ranks awaiting death, the Holy Spirit told me not to listen to their reasons for death, but to consider His reasons (Holy Spirit's) for the sanctity of life and that we were to do whatever it took to stay alive and defeat the beast. I saw myself tapping my friend on the head, and told him this was an example of how the Holy Spirit related to me, that He wanted our attention.

The Holy Spirit said we were to go and do the Holy Spirit's bidding no matter where it lead us and that we would be protected. We both looked at each other and decided we could not die voluntarily as the other Christians. We looked at each other and said this is crazy, my friend said this is voluntary just like being a Fourteenth Amendment citizen. We then walked out of the ranks right in front of the British guards, unseen and escaped.

Keep in mind you cannot control your dreams. Does God Almighty still communicate through dreams as he did with George Washington? The Bible makes it clear He does. Whether this dream is a product of uncontrolled imagination while asleep, or insight from the Holy Spirit, I will only say, let history decide. I am satisfied of the dreams origin, because of its fulfillment through recent knowledge, that wasn't known at that time. I hope you will read the rest of the documentation in the footnotes following this commentary.

[Footnote #1](#) - Chronology of North Carolina Governors and Original Virginia Colony, page 15

[Footnote #2](#) - Virginia Charter, 1609, page 18

[Footnote #3](#) - Virginia Charter, 1621, page 27

[Footnote #4](#) - Charter creating the Council of State, 1621, page 29

[Footnote #5](#) - Carolina Charter, 1663, page 31

[Footnote #6](#) - Carolina Charter granting Proprietorship to eight lords, 1669, page 42

[Footnote #7](#) - Florida Charter, 1763, page 65

[Footnote #8](#) - Hudson Bay Charter, 1670, page 69

[Footnote #9](#) - North Carolina Constitution, 1776, page 80

[Footnote #10](#) - North Carolina Constitution, 1789, and latter amendments, page 88

[Footnote #11](#) - Congressional Record, page 127

[The United States is still a British Colony; Part 1](#)

[The United States is still a British Colony; Part 2](#)

[The United State is still a British Colony; Part 3](#)

[Return to American Patriot Network](#)