

Ben Fulford, George III and "the" Republic



By Anna Von Reitz

Ben Fulford recently lobbed this factoid at America:

"To get from here to there in concrete terms is the task that now lies ahead. A senior member of the secret space program has in his possession the original secret treaty between King George III and the Republic of the United States of America. He says a condition for unveiling the secret space program and the 5,000 patents hidden for "national security reasons" is the restoration of sovereignty to the American Republic and its people. Another condition is the replacing of admiralty law with Common Law for the People, he says."

Please note that King George III ruled from 1760 to 1820 --- a period of 60 years that included the aftermath of The French and Indian War and all the way through the American Revolution, the Treaties of Versailles, Paris, and Westminster, the adoption of the Constitutions, the War of 1812, the Treaties of Ghent..... George III is one of the longest reigning British Monarchs in history and he was in power throughout the entire saga that founded our nation and cemented Britain's role in our affairs--- all of it, beginning to end, bears his impress.

So when someone says there is a "secret treaty between King George III and the Republic of the United States of America" one must ask---- exactly when was this "secret treaty" penned and who or what was acting opposite of King George at the time?

And from there, either prove or deduce what was actually going on and with what authority it was transpiring?

Then, as now, when we have various organizations of differing kinds and differing constituents pretending to be "the" American States, there was a great deal of confusion, some of it deliberate--- and it requires more than a passing glance to discern who is acting in what capacity, where we are in terms of jurisdiction, and even who is involved in the conversation at any given time.

As we have seen, there is a tremendous difference between The United States of America --- the Unincorporated Government of this country --- and "the" United States of America --- the British Territorial United States Government, and again, between "the United States of America" and "The United States of America, Inc." --- a Scottish Commercial Corporation set up after the so-called Civil War..... and the "United States of America, Inc." --- a Roman Catholic Church non-profit corporation set up in 1925 in Delaware.....

You get the point. There is a Federation of American States occupying the land and soil jurisdiction of this country. There is an unincorporated government of the British Territorial United States doing business as the United States of America. There are, at this point, multiple commercial corporations and mercantile companies claiming to be some variety of USA..... and it was the same way back then.

Take no wooden nickels, accept no foreign offices of person-hood.

It's not only that the same or very similar names are used for all sorts of disparate entities over time, but the names in use change over time and come to apply to different entities entirely.

Thus, something called the "Republic of the United States of America" in 1778 is a very different entity and functioning on a different level and with different authority than something called the "Republic of the United States of America" in 1795, after the formation of the Federal Republic.

Before we can respond to Fullford's information or evaluate what such a document portends, we have to be able to examine it and know the dates and the signatories that acted upon it.

At one point, there were not only numerous immediate post-Colonial organizations formed among the "estates" on the American side of the issues, but numerous Tory organizations vying to represent American interests, too.

Some of the Tory organizations sounded remarkably similar in demanding concessions from the King and the Parliament --- only stopped short of formal separation from England.

The Papists were also in full hue and cry, and talk of "Republics" and naming things "Republics" was very much more in their line of thinking. For them, the Roman Republic was a much more present and viable template for the building of a new nation, and Classicists like Jefferson and Adams readily adapted this vocabulary, too.

The code name for George Washington was "Cincinnatus" --- after the Father of the Roman Republic.

Washington did indeed repeat the performance of Cincinnatus in refusing to rule as a dictator once the war was over, and upon his return to Mt. Vernon after serving as President, was similarly wreathed in immortal glory despite being King George's Cousin.

The Pope's men had been busy, too, in the years preceding the Revolution and had already selected a site for the new capitol on the border between Virginia and Maryland on the Potomac River and called it "Rome" many years before it was re-named "Washington, DC"-----so you can see that none of this was happening in a vacuum or without prior consideration and planning.

So exactly what or which "Republic of the United States of America" is Fulford talking about?

A British Tory organization of the time, approaching the British King with a "performance dependent" settlement offer? A Papist delegation of the same kind seeking a separate resolution to the hostilities? Or something that concerned the early British Territorial Government calling itself a Republic? Or does it hail from a later time period, after the formation and adoption of the Federal Republic? Or is it actually an agreement validated by the Federation of States?

There's no way to say without having the document in front of us, and so, no way to know if: (1) the document is a fake or part of some sidebar action taking place contemporaneously; (2) the document concerns the actual Federation of States; (3) the document concerns the Federal Republic in operation from 1787 to 1860; (4) the document concerns some unofficial Successor organization.

Perhaps the Senior member of the Secret Space Program -- which isn't secret and never really has been in some circles -- will come forward and produce the document for public examination, and we can then determine whether or not it raises new and legitimate points of discussion ---- or is just more British Wind.

You must all forgive me for -- apparently by turns -- expressing an idealism that is foreign to your assumptions ("She really believes we can stop a pandemic with our thoughts and some weird water?") and skepticism of an almost cynical kind.

This is the result of being party and witness to many things that you would readily agree are "miracles" and also being witness to many scams along the way.

It is entirely possible that King George III signed a secret treaty with agents of the actual Federation of States. Or with agents of the Federal Republic. And either one could be valid and recognizable as "the" Republic of "the" United States of America at any given time. Could be.

The time period and the names of the Signatories will tell the tale, and will also tell us: (1) the authority with which they acted; (2) the jurisdiction in which they were acting; (3) the impact -- if any -- on us, today.

See this article and over 2200 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

To support this work look for the PayPal buttons on this website.