

Concerns Answered- Faith v. Bucks, Counties v. Boroughs

By Anna Von Reitz



This past week, I have had some important questions and concerns raised.

It's important to understand that the moment the churches, mosques, temples, and synagogues incorporated themselves, they became part of the problem and subjugated themselves to the secular commercial law.

The Roman Catholic Church, for example, has always had two sides to its structure, one sacred, one secular --- one ministerial, one administrative.

It's entirely possible to cling to the ministerial church and eschew the "secular church" --- which is another oxymoron, but does describe the situation that arises when a church adopts an incorporated business structure.

Most church, synagogue, mosque and temple communities have this same structure, because while they pursue their sacred functions, they also have to deal with the external world.

In this country, when threatened with taxation by the British Territorial Interlopers, most of these religious institutions chose to be labelled 201 or 501 (c) (3) corporations and in doing so, engaged in commerce and became subject to commercial law.

That is, they are no longer private religious institutions by definition.

They might as well be selling pickles under the Kroger brand name.

Many of these incorporated churches are literally selling souls, using Baptismal Certificates as well as Birth Certificates, as instruments in commerce.

If they define themselves as corporations and behave as for-profit corporations, they lose the protected status of religious institutions and have to be covered by legislated exemptions, instead.

This is precisely what has happened, here, in Europe, and throughout the world.

Institutions that are thought to be religious in nature have been converted into for-profit, albeit tax-exempted, corporations.

People are welcome to keep their religious ties and beliefs and practices, attend their traditional religious services, etc., but they need to recognize the difference between the religion and the business.

As we all know, our government maintains separation between church and state, and does not presume to monitor or censor anyone's religious beliefs.

We do, however, also maintain a line between religion and Big Business.

That is why we ask our Declarants when returning from the sea, to declare in favor of their religion and against the insidious foreign incorporation process that has served to control and undermine the principles of freedom of religion.

The churches and other religious institutions in this country have always been able to operate tax free, but when the British Raj Bully Boys came to town, they acted under Color of Law and threatened them with taxation -- which is against our Public Law.

The institutions fell in line, thinking that these men were part of our legitimate government.

By incorporating these institutions the British Raj gained subtle control of their affairs, limited their rights to free speech, and gained a club with which to beat these institutions and their leaders into submission as franchises subject to their own foreign corporate political agendas.

So, declare against this corporate interference in your freedom of religion. Do it with good faith and honor and good conscience; it doesn't mean you have to give up being Catholic or Lutheran or Jewish or Muslim, etc.

It means that you recognize the difference between the religion and the incorporated for-profit business that has been coercively attached to it, like a barnacle on the hull of a ship.

Another concern has been re-establishing the Counties in States where counties were never formally populated (like Alaska) and California where multiple sets of counties developed over time.

Let's begin with where "counties" come from and what is the basis of their legitimacy?

Counties in this country arise from prior British Territorial Administration of the Colonies before the War of Independence and from the Northwest Ordinance ever afterward.

The Northwest Ordinance sets forth the process by which new land masses can be populated and eventually become States of the Union under the Equal Footing Doctrine.

This process requires that new lands must first gain sufficient numbers of people inhabiting them, and then must be entered as Territories and administered and developed until such time as the Territory has sufficient infrastructure and population to apply for full enrollment as a State of the Union.

Part of the Territorial process is to define the boundaries of the new incipient State and establish the initial county borders within the Territory. All the Territories and Territorial States of States in the western United States have counties established by the Bureau of Land Management, which are patented under cadastral surveys.

This primary definition of a "County" delineates a specific portion of land and specifies the borders within which a specific population lives and conducts its business.

Alaska presents a somewhat problematic situation in that although the Bureau of Land Management fulfilled its obligations under the Northwest Ordinance, and established Counties for the Territory and later, the Territorial State of State, the initial Statehood Convention was hijacked by the Municipal United States Government and Boroughs were overlaid over the Counties.

The Counties exist on the map, but owing to non-disclosure, false registration processes, and ignorance, they were never officially populated until now, when Alaskans have returned to the land and soil jurisdiction and populated their Counties in the process.

I am attaching a copy of the Alaska Counties Map and ask that it be posted and that people all over this country print it off and also save it to their hard drives, so that it can't be "lost" again.



It was with some considerable difficulty that it was unearthed from the BLM archives in the first place and it has been consistently disregarded, misplaced, and misinterpreted even by people who live in this State and who suppose that it is irrelevant because the Counties here weren't occupied in 1959.

That is not the point. The point is that we are back on the land and soil ourselves, and we are populating our Counties now, as part of reclaiming our birthright.

It's hard to reclaim something if you don't know where it is, and can't point to a map and say, see, there it is and that's the name of it. Please tuck away copies of the map.

All those who have been hypnotized by the fact that the Municipal Government hurried in and established Boroughs, have been blinded to their own power and their own obligation to populate their Counties and self-govern.

Observe:

If I were a British Territorial U.S. Citizen temporarily residing in Alaska under the auspices of the Residence Act, I'd be "inhabiting" the Territorial State of Alaska.

If I were a Municipal citizen of the United States, temporarily residing in Alaska under the auspices of the Residence Act, I'd be "inhabiting" the Matanuska-Susitna Borough.

As I am a Wisconsinite more or less permanently living in Alaska, and having declared my intention to stay here and own land here, I am part of the population of the Matanuska-Susitna County; I am not here under the auspices of the Residence Act, and I

am enjoying the fact that as of [October 1st 2020](#), Alaska has been formally enrolled as a State of the Union and is no longer limited to so-called "Territorial Statehood".

In places like California, the development of Counties by the Territorial Government acting as a "State of State" franchise has continued even after the State was formally enrolled as a State of the Union.

The land and soil jurisdiction Counties are the ones developed and defined immediately prior to official Statehood. They have not changed.

Any "Counties" added to the "State of California" in the intervening years are merely administrative subunits of the franchise corporation.

As we regain our land legs and operate our own State Government again, we must strive to follow the logic of things.

There was a long period of time between the 1860's and 2018 when our American State Governments were not in Session and when no new States were added to the Union.

No actual States could be enrolled absent the pre-1860 States being in Session to enroll them.

As a result the only "States" that could be added in this long time period weren't actually States of the Union. They were "Territorial States" meaning State Trusts operated by Territorial State-of-State business organizations in our purported absence and the so-called interregnum of our lawful government.

Now that we are home at last, having overcome the deceit and impersonation foisted off on us by our Employees, we naturally resume where we left off and there is a great deal of housekeeping to do.

One important piece, the enrollment of the western and post-1860 States has been attended to as of [October 1st 2020](#): all the Territorial States developed after 1860 have been enrolled as States of the Union and are now properly in place on the land and soil, by Roll Call Vote of the properly declared and provenanced State Assemblies serving the pre-1860 States of the Union.

And all fifty (50) States are now in Session.

See this article and over 4500 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

To support this work look for the Donate button on this website.