

Counter-Offer to Manna World Holdings Trust, November 11, 2018



By Anna Von Reitz

1. Perhaps you could explain how Marduk had any legitimate right of control or ownership of the assets he transferred to you? Because to my certain knowledge, you are claiming control of assets that weren't his and aren't yours to meddle with. The law is: possession by pirates does not change ownership. He could not give you authority or legitimacy he didn't have himself. So let's see Marduk's chain of provenance and bona fides establishing his interest and role in assets like the V.K. Durham Trust and the D'Avila Trust all approximately 5,000 of the private trusts that have been swept up in a big bag and handed to you to dispose of.
2. Renaming a trust or group of trusts to create a new legal person, e.g., changing the name of Alpha and Omega Trust to Manna World Holdings Trust doesn't give you any new authority or grant any new authority to the trust you made up out of thin air. Remember that these trusts contain actual assets, not digits, and fall under the Law of the Land, not legal and statutory provisions.
3. I didn't credit or accuse you of creating the QFS--- simply using it with Marduk's help--- to purloin control of approximately 5,000 Special Deposit Accounts, the actual donors of which never elected you (or him) as trustees. This is a sticking point. Actual assets deposited by people and organizations in Good Faith in a bank should not be seized upon by anyone but the lawful depositors. Interference with these assets and normal bank protocols is a threat to all private property rights and also whatever public confidence people can still have in the banks.
4. You are not the only good person out there. I have met plenty of good solid people who are legitimate private trustees with proof of trusteeship over accounts you are now controlling as an Executor de Son Tort. You blame them for not deploying assets to help Mankind sooner --- but surely you know or have cause to know that these same Trustees have been blocked from having access to their accounts for decades? The Committee of 300, the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderburgers, the Roman Cartel, and the guilty banks were all too busy using these private assets to make money for themselves. The actual trustees AND beneficiaries went hungry to bed ---- some, like the intended beneficiaries of the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty Trust have been kept waiting for relief for literally hundreds of years and anyone who stepped forward as a Fiduciary to deploy the funding has been refused access, too. So it isn't like you can sit there and blame the people I am talking about. They have been victims as much as anyone else. Their Good Will should not be impugned for not doing something that they couldn't do through no fault of their own.
5. Generally speaking, the assets in the trusts you are seizing upon belong to private people, not "the People". Special Deposits belong to the Depositors, unless you can prove that the funds are the fruit of money laundering or other serious crimes---- and unless you have a receipt that says, "The People" on it, "The People" don't have anything to say. There are some trusts like those belonging to The United States of America [Unincorporated] and our member States that actually do belong to The People, but these are dedicated trusts in the National Interest.

In our case the plan is simply to transfer the assets to our International Trade Bank and from there disperse into fifty State accounts on a per capita basis. Each State Account will be assigned a competent Fiduciary CFO and from there, "The People" will be fully informed about their inheritance and enabled to make choices individually and via plebiscite. Each State Fiduciary issues a yearly online report and an abstract report. In this way each State is responsible for maintaining accountability to "The People" and reflecting the actual Will of the People in that State.

(6) Trust beneficiaries are not and cannot be "required" to appoint agents with plenary control over their assets, especially when the Donors didn't mandate any such condition. Rather, it's your job to liquidate or rollover the public trusts to the actual states and actual people and to return the private property trusts to their own trustees. If you want to help, you would be welcome by our Trust Association Members to do so. Everyone understands the need for disciplined and organized deployment of relief efforts and infrastructure development funding, so you might logically start with people who: (1) have valid claims and clear, public aims; (2) have already agreed to work cooperatively for the common good of all. I will point out that expecting one woman to act as Trustee of 5,000 trust accounts is sheer lunacy. The private trust trustees can help you as much as you can help them.

(7) As for getting four countries to release control of their trusts "back to their former trustees" --- there are no such valid trustees that I know of, because any valid Public Trusteeships have been usurped (in most cases) for over a hundred years. So why make such a reference to a system that was of the pirates, by the pirates and for for the pirates? It isn't like countries can go back to anything like a valid Public Trusteeship, and you know that. In virtually all cases, the purported trustees of the incorporated governments weren't even functioning in a fiduciary capacity--- and you presumably know that, too.

In the world I live in, rights go hand-in-hand with responsibilities. Anyone who doesn't take responsibility under The Prudent Man Standard has no right to act as a Public Trustee. By that standard virtually none of the incorporated governments on Earth even have Fiduciary Trustees--- the "United States" certainly hasn't bothered to have Fiduciary Trustees for decades--- and when you are talking about actual National Trust assets, Fiduciary Trustees are required. The United States of America [Unincorporated] does have Fiduciary Trustees in place, so we have our horses in front of our cart.

(8) As for the Indian Nations, most of them did sign deals with the Devil, but it is also true that most of those deals (similar to the U.S. Attorney General's claim to own all of us via donation) are fraudulent, void for non-disclosure, etc. We call such nations "dependent sovereignties" because some entity has to hold the responsibility in order to exercise the rights of the landlord, but many nations can co-habit the same geographical space.

We, The United States of America [Unincorporated], are the recognized landlords of this country since 1776. In 2015, we opened up the land jurisdiction to put an end to second class citizenship in this country. Those Native Americans who elect State Citizenship instead of U.S. citizenship have been free to come home to the land jurisdiction of this country since November 6, 2016, and once separated from the international jurisdiction of the sea, they own their own bodies, so also own soil.

Michael Stephen Young exercised this option in 2015, thus securing standing as an American and as a Tribal Chief in America. He waived his rights as a beneficiary of the Guadalupe Hidalgo Treaty Trust, formed a plan, established it as his Irrevocable Will on the Public Record, and has stood ready to begin implementation with our full support and approval for three years.

And here we are, looking at another bitter winter, still fuss-farting around and trading insults about this situation. A lot of good, worthy --- and needy --- people have been waiting over 200 years to see any benefit from that trust, and they are still waiting. One must ask if the trustees have any concern for the intended beneficiaries --- Native Americans, Hispanics and Cowboys and Traders in seven western states --- or sense of "reasonable urgency" in the performance of their duties at all. I certainly consider promptness an element of Fiduciary Duty and am bewildered how a Treaty Trust with us could remain in limbo, gathering interest and dust for over 200 years. And still isn't deployed.

(9) Since we are discussing actual, factual assets the legal/lawful requirements are a bit different than you suppose. For example, we don't need to be in good "legal standing". We need to be in good "lawful standing".

Actual assets exist in the realm of sovereignty, not the realm of legal fictions. We are the ones that give corporations licenses -- that is, corporations are licensed by us, not the other way around.

(10) It appears that you have your heart in the right place but are confused about various points of law and nobody is blaming you for that. It is confusing. You have also come out of ---and cut your teeth inside of--- a criminally malfunctioning system, so it's not like you have any experience or knowledge of what a correctly functioning world economy looks like or how it is SUPPOSED to function. Perhaps, just maybe, if we got together face to face we could iron it all out enough to MAKE A START.

See this article and over 1300 others on Anna's website here:
www.annavonreitz.com

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