

America had finally become a free country; this is until shortly before the start of the Civil War. Having lost the battle with President Jackson, the foreign investors of the Second National Bank were perturbed. Throughout America's early years, a close business relationship developed between the cotton growers in the South and the cotton manufacturing industry in England. Due to such business ties, the States swarmed with British agents, especially the Southern ones. These British agents carefully planted and nurtured political propaganda between the North and the South, which ultimately led to servile insurrection and the secession of South Carolina on Dec. 26, 1860. In South Carolina's declaration of secession, it stated: "They have encouraged and assisted thousands of our slaves to leave their homes: and those who remain, have been incited by emissaries, books and pictures to servile insurrection."

The political imbalance between the states in the South and the states in the North had more to do with economic policies than any moral issue of slavery. Even in the early 19th Century, the North's economy was primarily driven by factories and the South's economy was primarily driven by slaves on plantations. In 1828 the "Tariff of Abominations" was passed which greatly favored Northern industries over Southern plantations. Tension and arguments lasted for the next 32 years over how to deal with these taxes. Political propaganda eventually enticed South Carolina, who hurt the worst from industry-favoring tariffs, to secede from the Union. Other Southern states soon followed, commonly because they felt the North wasn't respecting the Constitution by denying them their property rights when their slaves were freed. Texas stated during its secession:

In all the non-slaveholding States, in violation of that good faith and comity which should exist between entirely distinct nations, the people have formed themselves into a great sectional party, now strong enough in numbers to control the affairs of each of those States, based upon an unnatural feeling of hostility to these Southern States and their beneficent and patriarchal system of African slavery, proclaiming the debasing doctrine of equality of all men, irrespective of race or color – a doctrine at war with nature, in opposition to the experience of mankind, and in violation of the plainest revelations of Divine Law.

The truth is that the North wasn't doing this for moral reasons, as is taught to school children today. They were simply stealing the blacks, under the guise that they have obtained "freedom," to work for cheaper wages than the whites would during the boom of the Industrial Revolution. The end of slavery was more an incidental result of the War than the reason for fighting it. Slavery, it can be argued, just changed definitions, as one can make a very valid argument that working for dirt cheap is equivalent to slavery.

On March 27, 1861, the event that initiated the movement towards the Civil War occurred, when the representatives for the Southern states walked out of Congress over the aforesaid matters. When these Congressional members walked out of Congress, it adjourned sine die, meaning it adjourned without a definite return date. This left less than the constitutionally required amount of Congressional members

to perform business as usual for America, making Congress as a whole legally powerless: Congress ceased to exist as a lawful deliberative body. Consequently, the only constitutionally lawful American authority that could declare war was no longer lawful, nor present.

Without the proper legal authority to do so, Abraham Lincoln executed Lincoln Executive Order 1, putting America under martial law (mob rule) on April 15, 1861. Congress did eventually assemble again, but did so under the military authority of Lincoln (the Commander in Chief) and not by the rules of parliamentary law or Constitutional law. This institution of martial law has not changed since. A 1973 Senate Report illustrated this situation well:

A majority of the people of the United States have lived under emergency rule.... And, in the United States, actions taken by the Government in times of great crises have – from, at least, the Civil War – in important ways, shaped the present phenomenon of a permanent state of national emergency.[1]

Knowing that his Executive Proclamation was unconstitutional, Lincoln, on April 24, 1863, commissioned General Orders No. 100[2]: a special code to “govern” his illegal actions while under martial law, giving the illusion that his actions were justified[3]. This code also gave the illusion that the laws of the District of Columbia and the provisions of Article I, Section 8, Clauses 17-18 were legally extended into the States, seemingly putting them under the same laws of war and private commercial laws as those of federal territories.

With the patriotic South absent, representatives of America’s former investors rushed into Congress, seeing an opportunity to corrupt the nation for their benefit, and helped the North illegally ratify two very important and damaging Constitutional amendments: a new 13th Amendment and the 14th Amendment. Today’s 13th Amendment is the new amendment because it replaced the old 13th Amendment (a.k.a. the Titles of Nobility Act), which was created shortly after the origins of America in order to prevent exactly what had happened after the South left.[4] The old, forgotten 13th Amendment, ratified on December 9, 1812, read: “If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honour, 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.”[5] When the South walked out of office, those with titles of nobility poured into Congress, creating the need for these nobles to replace any remembrance of the old 13th Amendment. Government officials still sometimes deny the existence of this old Amendment in order to hide American history from the American people, but it has in fact been found and verified.

The new, two part 13th Amendment was soon illegally ratified by Congress:

Section 1. Neither Slavery nor servitude, except as a punishment for crime where of the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.[6]

This amendment ended slavery, except for in the instance of crimes, of which were to be decided by the government, itself.

The new 13th Amendment was a stepping block for the 14th Amendment, which is the most important piece of legislation in terms of what was to come in American law. Here are the sections that most concern what we are discussing:

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. Section 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.[7]

American law is a tricky thing to understand. Almost all people don't understand what the 14th Amendment really means, and that is because the words used have legal definitions which typically aren't the definitions found in a normal dictionary. The use of words that have multiple legal meanings fuels the power of the 14th Amendment. For starters, there is a legal difference between the "United States" and the "united States." Legally, the "united States" are the unity of the sovereign States of America. The "United States" is actually referring to a corporation, a.k.a. "The United States of America." The "united States" is the abbreviated form of "united States for America." The "United States of America" is the name used in the Constitution to describe the federal government, not the States that are united. The purpose of the old 13th Amendment was to keep those with titles of nobility – in other words, representatives of Britain – out of the government of the United States of America – being the federal government – by not allowing them to be citizens of the united States, a Constitutional prerequisite for office.

Section 1 of the 14th Amendment was an attempt to tie the sovereign American of the united States to the United States federal government. Doing so required the change in the definition of what a Citizen

is: we see the case of “Citizen” was changed to “citizen.” The American “Citizen,” addressed in earlier parts of the Constitution, was replaced by the 14th amendment title of “citizen.” This was a necessary step for controlling the people because before this time, there was no tie between the federal government and the Citizen of a State. States were like countries of their own, only the federal government acted as a mediator between them. The 14th Amendment made people citizens of both their States and the federal government, subjecting them to both entities’ laws. The other key element is the use of the word “person” or “persons,” which is distinguishable in law from “people.” The word “person” has three legal definitions, the third of which being the confusing factor: “3. An entity (such as a corporation) that is recognized by law as having the rights and duties of a human being. In this sense, the term includes partnerships and other associations, whether incorporated or unincorporated.”[8] In short, person can also mean a corporation. So, looking back at the 14th Amendment, one can reword the first line “All corporations born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.” A 14th Amendment “citizen,” as we shall later see in much greater detail, can and commonly does refer to a corporation.[9]

The 14th Amendment didn’t truly rewrite the rights of the “Citizen,” it just refers to the rights of the “citizen,” which is different altogether. Schools teach that this amendment made everybody equal. Its purpose was to do just this; but this equality didn’t come with the condition that everyone is free. It was an attempt to lower everyone’s status to a “citizen,” which means subservient to the federal government. The popular belief that these two amendments made people free isn’t quite accurate. It simply was an attempt to remove everyone’s freedom from the federal government.

At the time, the Amendment didn’t affect people and, partially as a result of this, most people didn’t realize the significance of the wording and bought the propaganda that its purpose was to make the slaves equal, as uneducated Americans still do today. The real reason for the implementation of this Amendment was to set in place the first step in a gradual plan being implemented by America’s former investors, which wouldn’t be fully realized until the New Deal in 1933. The Amendment was a staging point which would set the course for new federal laws to be written, which would eventually end up rewriting all of American law, including the Constitution.

Being an attorney, Lincoln tended to make presidential moves that weren’t fully in the interest of the American people as a whole or respective to the Constitution.[10] When it comes to defying American interests, it seems that the most historically celebrated presidents are the most culpable. This is because the families that these Presidents did their favors for still have their economic foothold in America today. Lincoln accepted war loans from the same investors that Jackson patriotically broke away from, putting America back in debt.

He, however, did do one thing that was admirable: at the end of his presidency, he finally stood up to the bankers. After generously loaning both sides of the War, the bankers argued that, due to the present chaos in America, their American beneficiaries of the future couldn’t be trusted with the Constitutional

powers and the political and monetary system of free enterprise created by their forefathers. They wanted to regain a monetary and political foothold in America, using their powers as creditors to persuade Lincoln into assisting their plan by manipulating his will to win the War. In 1865, Lincoln declared his new monetary policy, which he contrived for the purpose of paying off war debts without accruing harmful interest:

“The Government should create, issue, and circulate all the currency and credits needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of consumers. By the adoption of these principles, the taxpayers will be saved immense sums of interest. Money will cease to be master and become the servant of humanity.... The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of government, but it is the government’s greatest opportunity.”

Had Lincoln’s policy been implemented, America would have found its way out of its war debts. Just five days after General Lee[11] surrendered and Lincoln won his War, he was shot. Neither Lincoln nor any future President ever repealed the martial law instituted during the Civil War.

The Private Laws of the District of Columbia

In 1871, three years after the illegal ratification of the 14th Amendment, the government defaulted on its war debts, forcing America into bankruptcy.[12] What resulted is considered the death blow to the united States for America.[13] On February 21st, England claimed what was theirs, according to international law, and incorporated the ten mile square that is Washington D.C.[14] England also incorporated the American Constitution and names for its new corporation, such as THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, U.S., and USA, as well as other titles, as declared in the District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871.[15] A point of interest in these copyrighted names is the implementation of the article “THE.” Before this time, America was a union of “united States,” not a union of “the united States.” The article “the” doesn’t exist when referring to other countries, i.e. Canada and Britain aren’t referred to as “the Canada” or “the Britain.” The British-controlled Corporation, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, exclusively uses the article “the” in its name, which is distinct from the “united States” or the “United States.” One other immense change to America simultaneously occurred: being a bankrupt nation, the united States retained only the power to settle civil disputes, not criminal matters, allowing room for the illusion that only Britain’s private, ever-changing laws appertain to America’s criminal disputes. British law literally attempted to fill the gap created by the bankruptcy without anyone

knowing, making it appear that everything was going just as usual. Since this point in history, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA has been governed entirely by foreign, private, corporate law and Washington, D.C. has been under British control.

The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is a corporation, whose jurisdiction is applicable only in the ten-mile-square parcel of land known as the District of Columbia and to whatever properties are legally titled to the UNITED STATES, by its registration in the corporate County, State, and Federal governments that are under military power of the UNITED STATES and its creditors.[16]

Being incorporated, people need permission to use Britain's imposed laws. These people, who use this British legal system for and usually against the American people, are referred to as attorneys, as opposed to lawyers. Yes, there's a difference. The word "attorney" comes from "attorn," which means to turn over to another; transfer.[17] In old England, the title of attorney meant one who attorned ("attorned" is the old English), which meant to transfer money, goods, etc. to another.[18] Attorneys served the king or queen in handling disputes regarding money/goods with their peasants. In modern times, attorneys transfer things of monetary value through court procedures to both other forms of money/goods and to new owners, being either persons or the government.[19] Attorneys have limited legal power because they are sworn to uphold the British, copyrighted law. A lawyer isn't limited like this. Many believe that one needs to get licensed in order to practice law – this is an utter fiction. One needs to become licensed if one wishes to become an attorney in order to avoid a copyright violation[20], and the way to do this is to pass the BAR exam and register with the American BAR Association. The American BAR Association is an appendage of the BAR Council, which is the BAR association of England. The term BAR is an acronym for British Accreditation Register[21]: the registry for those who have been accredited to use America's British copyrighted law.

Beyond this point in America's legal history, any laws that came about were private laws of Britain. Any sovereign Citizen is exempt from these private laws. Anyone who doesn't dispute being a 14th Amendment "citizen" is subject to these private laws. The 13th Amendment eliminated involuntary servitude, but it said nothing about voluntary servitude. The 14th Amendment was a gateway for voluntary servitude to take place. At this time, simply claiming to be a sovereign Citizen and not a 14th Amendment "citizen" was, legally speaking, enough to avoid being subject to Britain's private laws. How could the Brits get people to agree to be these citizens? The answers they found were implemented into a plan that materialized into the New Deal.

[1] Senate Report 93-549, 93rd Congress, 1st Session, 1973

[2] a.k.a. the Lieber Instructions and the Lieber Code

[3] "It is sometimes argued that the existence of an emergency allows the existence and operation of powers, national or state, which violate the inhibitions of the Federal Constitution. The rule is quite otherwise. No emergency justifies the violation of any of the provisions of the United States Constitution. An emergency, however, while it cannot create power, increase granted power, or remove or diminish the restrictions imposed upon power granted or reserved, may furnish the occasion for the exercise of power already in existence, but not exercised except during an emergency." - 16 AM.Jur.2d, Section 71, National League of Cities vs. Usery, 426 U.S. 833, 49 L.Ed.2d 245

[4] The creation of the Titles of Nobility Act was an important cause for the War of 1812 and was the direct cause for the burning of the Library of Congress during it.

[5] Notice the capitalization of "United" in the first instance and the conflict with the second instance. We will discuss why this was done soon.

[6] There is also much controversy regarding whether this amendment was ratified by members of Congress who had signed under duress, making their signatures invalid. Notice how the capitalization of "united States" changed from the old 13th Amendment.

[7] It will become apparent why a national debt is included in this package later on in history.

[8] Black's Law Dictionary 1178 8th ed., 2004

[9] The 14th Amendment was never properly ratified because it lacked the proper governing authority to do so. "I cannot believe any court, in full possession of its faculties, could honestly hold that the amendment was properly approved and adopted." (State v. Phillips, Pacific Reporter, 2nd Series, Vol. 540, pp. 941-2, 1975) Also see Utah Supreme Court Cases Dyvett v Turner, (1968) 439 P2d 266, 267 and State v Phillips, (1975) 540 P 2d 936. Also see Coleman v Miller, 307 U.S. 448, 59 S. Ct. 972. Also see 28 Tulane Law Review, 22 and 11 South Carolina Law Quarterly 484. Also see the Congressional Record, June 13, 1967, pp. 15641-15646.

[10] Also, being an attorney, he possessed a title of nobility, which according to the still technically valid old 13th Amendment made his reign as president illegal. We'll discuss more about why attorneys aren't in favor of the people soon.

[11] The Commander of the Southern army

[12] A statutory procedure by which a (usually insolvent) debtor obtains financial relief and undergoes a judicially supervised reorganization or liquidation of the debtor's assets for the benefit of creditors.

[Black's Law Dictionary 156 (8th ed. 2004)]

[13] This event did not truly destroy the united States for America, it just put in place a corporation that exists simultaneously, causing the people to forget that they are truly Citizens of the united States for America.

[14] 16 Stat. 419 Chapter 62

[15] Title 28 USC Section 3002(5) Chapter 176; 534 FEDERAL SUPPLEMENT 724

[16] Act to Provide a Government for the District of Columbia, Section 34 of the Forty-First Congress of the United States, Session III, Chapters 61 and 62, enacted February 21, 1871

[17] Random House Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2009

[18] Black's Law Dictionary 138 (8th ed. 2004)

[19] In the third part we shall discuss the processes that take place to perform these actions.

[20] Although the owners of the copyright wouldn't likely press charges for the sake of concealing this fact.

[21] a.k.a. British Accreditation Regency