Regarding Limitations of Vetting Committees and Coordinators:

A Coordinator's job is to help people understand what the assembly process requires, for example, help them understand what a lawful election requires, and then help them achieve that goal.

The Coordinator is the go-between the Assembly and the Federation, a "point person" who goes back and forth between the Assembly and the Federation to answer questions and get assistance. Their role is supportive and educational, not political.

If a Coordinator feels so strongly about an issue that they have to get in the middle of it at an Assembly level as a member of the Assembly, then they need to resign from the Coordinator position and go have at it.

In our system....

Any candidate has a right to stand for an office if he or she is eligible and the people of each State have the right to a free and open election in which they and nobody else makes the choice to elect or not elect a candidate.

A Vetting Committee oversteps its bounds if and when it goes beyond evaluating eligibility of The Candidate —— for example, a Vetting Committee decides they don't like a candidate's attitude or personality, and they disqualify him though he meets all the factual eligibility requirements.

What next? We could have a Vetting Committee that doesn’t like black candidates or Hindu candidates or female candidates and everyone thinks it’s okay for them to disqualify otherwise eligible candidates based on their own likes and dislikes?
If we sink to that, what’s the point in having elections?

If a Vetting Committee prevents an eligible candidate from getting on the ballot, simply because they as a group don't like him, the Electorate gets short-changed. You, the Electors, don't get to see all the choices.

That’s not the American Way. That’s the CCP and Politburo and DNC and RNC way of doing things. They select and you elect from among their pre-selected choices.

We present all eligible candidates to the Electorate and the Electors choose.

Put another way—-

There is a big difference between the factual determination of eligibility for office and the subjective choice of who is or is not desirable or suitable for an office.

A Vetting Committee can determine the facts that establish eligibility.

It takes an Electorate to determine suitability.

Moving on.... about American State Nationals (ASN's) who are federally licensed or employed....

People who are licensed (doctors, nurses, dentists, real estate agents, etc.) and people who work directly for incorporated County, State, or Federal departments and agencies, as well as non-retired military personnel, are considered to be Dual Citizens by the Federales, and "Nationals" by us.

In the original State system they are only allowed to vote on in-State issues.

As you are establishing your Courts it is important to elect State Citizens as Justices, Clerks, and Sheriffs, so that they can address both in-State and international subject matter.

Then, from your Statewide Jury Pool, you select juries to consider in-State issues from among all eligible jurors, and juries to consider International issues (between your State and other States of the Union or foreign countries) from among all eligible State Citizens.
You should be aware of those who carry Dual Citizenship and have open talks with them about the possibility that there will be a conflict of interest between their Federal Licensor/Employer and the good of the State.

The role of the Assembly in such a situation is to uphold the State's rights and prerogatives, so as to check and balance Federal overreach.

Each National in Dual Citizenship status needs to think about that and agree that in the event of such a conflict of interest their part as a member of the State Assembly is to uphold State's rights.

If such a conflict of interest becomes acute and a Dual Citizen is forced to choose between their job or their licensed status and loyalty to the State, then each faces a hard decision, but it is one that must be honestly addressed and it involves quitting either the job and/or the license, or quitting involvement in the State Assembly regarding that issue.

It is a matter of personal honor as well as Constitutional principle to uphold Checks and Balances whenever possible, and if it is not possible, to withdraw and do no harm to the State.

Remember that the States are the only truly sovereign government entities present and all else derives from the States of the Union, including the Federal Government. Preserving the States and their rights means preserving the security and rights guaranteed to Americans from every walk of life and political persuasion.

So, whether you are free to act as a State Citizen, or you act as a British Territorial U.S. Citizen or as a Municipal citizen of the United States, all are first and best served by protecting the interests of the State at all costs.

-----------------------------

See this article and over 3900 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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