

THE ORIGINAL 50 COLONIES – PART 1

Could it be that the United States never really freed herself from England? Or, if she did, might her freedom not have lasted all that long?

For starters, the Treaty of Paris, which supposedly “ended” the American Revolution, is a curious document. The treaty’s terms were extended by King George III (wasn’t England the loser?) and don’t really portray the U.S. as a winner of anything other than England’s recognition of the former 13 colonies as “sovereign and independent states.”

Beyond that, the treaty reads like a dictate from King George to those funny little colonies that had the nerve to rebel.

This monarchial-sounding document, for instance, established the United States’ borders. Shouldn’t we have established that as part of our spoils of war?

In addition to articulating the expectation of rather generous treatment for those colonists who chose to serve The Crown, Article 5 of the treaty states that Congress should “provide for the restitution of all estates, rights, and properties, which have been confiscated belonging to real British subjects.”

Article 9 states that “any place or territory belonging to Great Britain . . . conquered by arms . . . the same shall be restored without difficulty and without requiring any compensation.”

So those who conspired against the revolution—those who wished the colonies to remain under British rule, those who may have, directly or indirectly, shed patriot blood—were to have returned to them whatever they lost during the rebellion.

Wouldn’t we consider these loyalists to the Crown traitors to the cause? Should they not have been dealt with severely or, perhaps, shipped back to England?

Then, later in time, we have the interesting case of the original 13th amendment.

The 13th Amendment as it presently appears in the Constitution reads:

Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof 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 power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The “forgotten” 13th Amendment reads:

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.

In his article, “The Original Thirteenth Amendment,” David M. Dodge writes:

“At the first reading, the meaning of this Thirteenth Amendment . . . seems obscure, unimportant. The references to ‘nobility,’ ‘honour,’ ‘emperor,’ ‘king,’ and ‘prince’ lead us to dismiss this amendment as a petty post-revolution act of spite directed against the British monarchy.

“Even though the Treaty of Paris ended the Revolutionary War in 1783, the simple fact of our existence threatened the monarchies. The United States stood as a heroic role model for other nations, which inspired them to also struggle against

oppressive monarchies . . . The monarchies must have realized that if the principle source of that infection could be destroyed, the rest of the world might avoid the contagion and the monarchies would be saved.

“Their survival at stake, the monarchies sought to destroy or subvert the American system of government. Knowing they couldn't destroy us militarily, they resorted to more covert methods of political subversion, employing spies and secret agents skilled in bribery and legal.”

However, the forgotten 13th amendment's demise is still a mystery.

In an article from *The Idaho Observer*, as posted on the website <http://www.cancel-debt.net/13th-Amendment.html>, it is written that “The original 13th Amendment is found in copies of the Constitution published up to 1876. From that point on, the original 13th Amendment no longer appears and is replaced by the 13th Amendment that prohibits slavery. It is still a mystery as to how the slavery amendment, ratified under President Abraham Lincoln in 1865, replaced the title of nobility amendment of 1819 in all copies of the Constitution published since 1876.”

It may not seem a big deal on face, but there obviously was a concern in the U.S. that The Crown would find a way to once again manipulate and control our renegade nation—a troublesome part of its empire that, for a time, successfully extricated itself from the realm.

However, beyond Britain's plan to infiltrate the government with personages favorable to its purposes, one of the soundest ways to wrest control of the U.S. was to institute a national bank, a central bank so reminiscent of those European monarchial banks that profited by fractional reserve banking, which means that bankers would issue paper or fiat currency to *represent* gold holdings.

If the representation accurately reflected the gold value the bankers held, there would've been no resistance, but many of the colonists—or the original United States citizens—understood that, as the bankers had done in Europe, they would do again through a central bank in the U.S., that is, issue more fiat currency than was backed by gold reserves. It was a scam that many colonists wished to avoid. Today fractional reserve banking is still practiced by the Federal Reserve, which is led by Sir Alan Greenspan. This practice causes inflation, which is, in essence, a hidden tax.

Sadly, Alexander Hamilton, a Tory at heart, was able to push through the first national bank, though it flew in the face of the founding fathers' wishes. Undoubtedly the national bank has had a stormy history, but it now has morphed into the privately run Federal Reserve system: an entity, totally unconstitutional, that sucks the financial blood from this nation through a pipeline to The Crown.

Britain, therefore, may have granted the colonies freedom, not because its military (made up mostly of mercenaries) was truly defeated by the patriot forces, but because Britain saw the continued hostilities as a major financial loss.

The Crown's underlying strategy was to grant the rogues “freedom” but quietly take them back into tow through other means.

And The Crown did just that, as we shall see as this series progresses.

*Vyzygoth is a radio host persona. His identity is available by request at the news office. Send correspondence to vyzygoth@ij.net or readznews@aol.com. His radio show, *From The Grassy Knoll*, streams live Wednesday 5-7 pm on pascoradio.org. Archived shows can be accessed at vyzygoth.com.*