

More Confusion About Common Law Courts --- Unanswered Letters 11 -- Reply to Sir David Andrew



By Anna Von Reitz

In keeping with the general ignorance about Common Law Courts, I got this one in my box today:

"Today I have listen to Sir David Andrew talk with Angela Stark on talkshoe and he said that is VERY wrong to use term Common Law Courts because he said they do not exist. Nany People have been jaild by using tern Common Law Courts he said.

Instead we should use COURTS OF COMMON LAW."

Not necessarily.

Common Law Courts are courts operating on the land jurisdiction. Courts of Common Law are operating on the jurisdiction of the sea ---- any time you see the word "of" you are talking about an incorporated, secondary entity operating in international jurisdiction.

Common Law Court = Land Jurisdiction = Ohio State

Courts of Common Law = Sea Jurisdiction = State(s) of Ohio

The reason "citizens of the United States" (that is, territories and District of Columbia) get in trouble when they try to operate "Common Law Courts" is that they only have access to "Courts of Common Law".

We; who claim our State National political status under Article IV, Section 2 of the Federal Constitution, get in trouble if we try to operate "Courts of Common Law" because we only have access to "Common Law Courts".

It depends, therefore, on the audience. If Sir David is talking to a bunch of Puerto Ricans, he is exactly right. If he is talking to Americans asserting their birthright status, he's 180 degrees wrong.

See this article and over 200 others on Anna's website here:www.annavonreitz.com
To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.