

Oh, Let's Go At It Again....

By Anna Von Reitz



This morning I got a British historical diatribe in my "inbox" together with a request that I make a reply. For example, the writer claims that Pope Innocent "annulled" The Magna Carta, quite ignoring the fact that Pope Innocent had no such power to annul the words and acts of the Norman kings of Britain who held the land by conquest and force of arms, and who enforced The Magna Carta with no blessing from Pope Innocent required, for a thousand years and beyond.

The same writer would probably also claim that The War of Independence never happened or had no effect, and that the British King still has a right to rule here --- when in fact the British were very soundly beaten and the King himself fully admitted that our land and soil were ours and that we are free men in possession of our sovereignty and guaranteed our republican form of government.

No, indeed, there has never been a quibble from the British Government or the Government of Westminster claiming to own an iota of The United States or The United States of America ever since The War of 1812. What they do claim to own and control is their version of "the" United States (Trading Company) and their version of "the" United States of America (Trading Company).

And we won't quibble about that, because they've made a terrible lot of bad business decisions ---as is typical of their entire history --- and both their now-incorporated businesses formerly doing business as "the" United States, Incorporated, and "the" United States of America, Incorporated, are bankrupt.

One of the key bits of historical knowledge that British pundits are either unaware of, or choose to ignore, is that the Treaty of Paris 1783, like a all things dubbed "Treaty of Paris" in any other year, is a sea treaty, having nothing to do with land or soil ownership, and only concerning the business affairs of a commercial company interest in "the" United States of America (Trading Company).

This version of "United States of America" was the British owned portion of the original investment and trading company of the same name which existed before The War of Independence. The original United States of America (Trading Company) broke into two parts as a result of the war -- creating one British-owned

"United States of America" (Trading Company) and one American-owned "United States of America" (Trading Company.)

The same thing happened with "the" United States (Trading Company) which similarly broke apart as a result of the war into British and American components. The confusion that this has caused over the last two centuries can hardly be estimated, but when British apologists say that the Crown Temple owns and controls "the" United States or "the" United States of America, either one, this is what they are talking about.

Our American version, The United States of America (Trading Company) never incorporated, and is still alive and well, as is The United States (Trading Company).

Wouldn't it have been helpful, if they had bothered to add "Trading Company" or later, "Incorporated" to the names, so people could see what they were talking about?

And know that they were discussing the business affairs of four business entities, two British and two American, operating under very similar names? The only difference is that following The War of Independence, the American versions started using the names "The United States" and "The United States of America", while the Brits used "the" United States and "the" United States of America.

We contracted with the British version calling itself "the" United States of America to provide us with certain enumerated services and delegated the power to provide those services to them when we adopted "The Constitution of the United States of America" --- see it now? We were contracting for services from the British Trading Company, which, much later, incorporated as a franchise of the British Crown Corporation.

So that is what British writers are talking about when they claim that the Crown (British Crown Corporation) owns and controls "the" United States (now a bankrupt governmental services provider) or says that it owns and controls "the" United States of America (now another bankrupt governmental services provider). It doesn't mean that our country is bankrupt. Sovereign entities can't go bankrupt, and aren't eligible for bankruptcy protection, so you can be sure that our States of the Union are not bankrupt by definition, and our unincorporated American versions of The United States and The United States of America aren't bankrupt, either.

These bankruptcies involve the British Service Providers only, both of which are franchises of the British Crown Corporation, which the BCC has run into the ground while embezzling from the American People using a sophisticated personage and barratry scheme. The only silver lining to that cloud is that we have become their Preferential Creditors as a result and own every scrap of everything they ever claimed to own.

These are the facts and this is what happened --- and while the British writers are correct in saying that the Crown owns and operates "the" United States and "the" United States of America --- two British commercial corporations dba "the United States, Incorporated" and "the United States of America, Incorporated" ---- the only inconvenience that presents for us, the Americans, who are their Preferential Creditors, is gearing up and providing our own services.

Beyond that, I would say that there is a common British misconception that rights come from Constitutions or are granted by the Queen or dictated by the British Crown Corporation ---- none of which is true. Rights come to us from the hand of God, from Nature itself, and they are not the result of anyone's devising. Rather than creating any rights, Constitutions are meant to safeguard them by limiting the powers assumed by governments and by providing written guarantees that those governments will not Trespass on the rights and prerogatives of their employers.

In the present case, the Rotters have sought to evade their constitutional obligations by secretively "redefining" their employers as employees, but that won't stand the light of day, either.

Lastly, I would observe that there has always been an element of flimflam in what the Temple Bar proposes to do, which is to "represent" the actual physical world on paper, and try to use rules and procedures and definitions to control these papers. It's like creating a map of Georgia and pointing at it and saying that you "own" Georgia, when in fact, you own a map of Georgia.

That's what these fellows are engaged in, and in my opinion, it's delusional. Public Records establishing claims to land and homes are certainly more durable and reproducible than grocery receipts, but if you think of it, they do the exact same thing: they prove -- if they are correct -- that you paid for something. The salient question always is --- what did you pay for?

Broccoli, lettuce, dog food? Land, a land patent, or a land title?

Disturbingly, most people in this country (and elsewhere) own a land title and think that they own the land described by that title, but instead, by analogy, they only own a map of Georgia provided by the Temple Bar.

That's why, as Fiduciary for The United States of America, I stepped forward and claimed all the United States Land Patents and cadastal surveys and copyrighted titles to land that have been created to "describe" our land and soil assets. I claimed them for The United States of America and I rolled them into my own trust as the Secured Party Creditor of all these corporations, and I published my Irrevocable Will granting every American the return of their portion of land and soil assets.

This had to be done to put a stop on the British Flimflam described above.

As an example -- the British Crown Subcontractors literally paid people to wander around this country and make up fictitious land descriptions in a dazzling array of categories and organizational systems and all of them are "maps of Georgia" in one way or another.

We have Plat Maps and cadastral surveys, we have Townships and Sections, we have Lots and Blocks, we have Subdivisions, and then, we have Land Patents, and last, we have (mostly false) claims of "real estate" and "real estate descriptions" that include various copyrighted names and number systems, like "256 Sunnybrook Lane".

Imagine the horror of an American "home owner" who discovers that he bought a tenant interest in a property that had already been mortgaged to the hilt by the Queen's Government ---even though they never had any rightful claim or ownership interest in the property --- and even after he pays off all the Queen's debts, he will still only hold a tenant's interest in a "future lease purchase agreement"? And all he's really got in "equitable exchange" for all his time, labor, love invested in his home, is ownership of a copyrighted title describing his house and land.

What if I decide to call his house and land "999 Horror-struck House" and copyright that new "land description"? Will I then be the new owner of his house? You see how this works and where it leads.

Someone shows up and looks over the fence at your house and land, and they arbitrarily decide to call it, "40193 Happy Valley Lane" and they then match this description to a map description and they copyright this and claim to own your house and land based on their copyrighted description of it.

That's what a "land title" is --- someone else's arbitrary description of your land, which they've copyrighted.

Anyone smell the manure under British boots yet?

Well, they may own their copyrighted description of your land, but they don't own your land. The United States of America owns your land and your Fiduciary locked it in her trust and published her Irrevocable Will to make sure that everything ever used to "describe" your land is yours. All you have to do is come home and claim it.

Meanwhile, in reading the British screeds everyone is well-advised to take a jaundiced view. For example, when they claim that The Declaration of Independence is invalidated because it was signed by five "Esquires" of the Crown Temple --- no, that's not what it means at all.

There were actually three (3) Declarations of Independence published on the Fourth of July in 1776, and the Esquires signed as representatives of the International Jurisdiction of the Sea, just as members of the clergy signed as representatives of the Global Jurisdiction of the Air. This country declared its

independence in all jurisdictions--- air, land, and sea, and American representatives of each jurisdiction signed the documents in full agreement. A final example, "all constitutional rights are dictated by the Crown Temple" --- ??? No, there are no "constitutional rights" ---that is, no "rights" conferred by any Constitution. There are only constitutional guarantees and those are not dictated by the Crown Temple. Those are dictated by the stipulations of the contract itself. Take no wooden nickels. Never accept anything Brits say as gospel. And if you find yourself facing a dogpile, just stir it around a bit, and you will find the Brits at the bottom of it. Between their BS, omissions, and half-truths, you will eventually find the truth if you roll up your sleeves and look for it.

See this article and over 3700 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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