

The [Municipal] United States Corporation -- a Lesson About Larry Becraft



By Anna Von Reitz

Here's a good example of how attorneys deliberately avoid and obscure the actual truth and substance of things. Larry finds an obscure reference somewhere in my writings to the Act of 1871. It was probably a quote from someone else or part of a list of historical actions undertaken by Congress --- he doesn't say, so it's impossible to know where he picked this bit up, whether it is in context or not, but he quotes it as something I referenced:

Larry:

Contrary to your present denial, I have specifically quoted an article you wrote that was posted on Crackpot Arnie's website, which is as follows:

Claim 15. 1871: The Corporate Congress begins to set up shop for itself by creating a separate government for the District of Columbia. The initial effort fails but seven years later the Washington DC Municipality is created as an independent international city state run as a plenary oligarchy by the members of "Congress". Also in 1871, the Corporate Congress claimed to own all United States corporations— 41st "Congress"— Third Session, Chapters 62, 63, 64, and 65.

Anna:

Yes, Larry, Congress did do exactly what I said it did and what a lot of other patriots have said it did --- the fact that the unpopularity of their action forced them to repeal the original Act three years later, and caused them to cut it up and pass its substance in a piecemeal fashion in 1878 -- is the kind of hair-splitting and deliberate avoidance of the basic truth that does you no credit.

Here for your education --- AGAIN --- is the entire, truthful history of the Act of 1871:

1871 - Act of 1871 ---"An Act to provide a Government for the District of Columbia," ch. 62, 16 Stat. 419, February 21, 1871 ---which was repealed in 1874 and then passed piecemeal via these actions---- "An Act Providing a Permanent Form of Government for the District of Columbia," ch. 180, sec. 1, 20 Stat. 102, June 11, 1878, to remain and continue as a

municipal corporation (brought forward from the Act of 1871, as provided in the Act of March 2, 1877, amended and approved March 9, 1878, *Revised Statutes of the United States Relating to the District of Columbia . . . 1873-74* (in force as of December 1, 1873), sec. 2, p. 2); as amended by the Act of June 28, 1935, 49 Stat. 430, ch. 332, sec. 1 (Title 1, Section 102, District of Columbia Code (1940)).

It doesn't really matter, Larry, that the original Act was repealed and then passed in pieces later --- what matters is the substance of the Act, which is apparently what you wish to avoid and gainsay: the creation of the US Corp.

And it can only be the creation of the US Corp that we are looking at, Larry, because: the District of Columbia was set up in 1790 and fully chartered by 1801, so there was no need to do that in 1871 or 1874 or 1878.

Nowadays, Larry, it isn't necessary to dig up the entire history of the Act of 1871 to prove that the US Corp exists. It was emblazoned on every fork and spoon issued to the US Military throughout World War II, painted on canteens, and spray-painted on jeeps. There are thousands upon thousands of such "admissions" available to anyone who cares to look.

And as if that were not enough, there are many different commercial registries all over the planet. Dunn and Bradstreet is just one such registry that people can look up from their comfort of their computer console and see for themselves that yes, indeed, what we think of as "the government" is in fact functioning as a commercial corporation in the business of providing "essential government services".

A small sampling of around a hundred of the DUNNS numbers belonging to the US Corp are listed in the Appendix in the back of my book, "You Know Something Is Wrong When", and with a little poking on search engines like Manta.com, Edgar.com and Thomas.com people can discover the CAGE and EIN and other proofs of the commercial nature of such things as the "US GOVERNMENT" and the "BLM" and the "STATE OF OHIO".

People can also search the data bases of the State of Delaware, where most of these corporations maintain registration. It's all online, Larry. No need to try to obfuscate or hide the truth anymore.

And while people are at it, they can look up the Clearfield Doctrine, which very clearly enunciates the principle of the law which says that when a government steps down and functions in the capacity of a corporation, it is subject to all the same limitations as any other corporation.

As everyone, even Bob Hurt, can now see, Larry's hair-splitting does him no credit and serves no truth. He is simply obfuscating and trying to avoid admission of the fact that the Act of 1871 led to the creation -- howbeit, seven years later -- of the Municipal Corporation of the District of Columbia, more popularly known by its dba "US Corp".

Well, there it is, folks --- the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the Act of 1871, for your knowledge and enjoyment --- so that when some hair-splitting shyster tries to

tell you that the Act of 1871 was repeated in 1874 (which it was) you are prepared to tell him the rest of the story just as I told it to Larry.

And I trust that my credibility on the matter now stands heads and tails and nose and whiskers above anything Mr. Becraft might have (left) to say.

See this article and over 1000 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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