

# **The Lunatic Fringe Round Two, Gurus Be Damned**

## **A Further Reply to Bob Hurt, Larry, Et Alia.....**



by Anna Von Reitz

On Tue, Jan 12, 2016 at 9:17 AM, Bob Hurt <bob@bobhurt.com> wrote:

Anna:

I sincerely appreciate the energy you have expended in writing your assertions of what has happened to enslave the American people. However, I do not agree with many of your assertions, as you know, and neither does attorney Larry Becraft. Larry has clearly documented NUMEROUS falsehoods in your assertions, and he has documented them here:

<http://home.hiwaay.net/~becraft/1213Concession.html>

I invite you to write to me your rebuttal to his points of dispute in order to clarify that you made errors or that you have some explanation for how your assertions differ from apparent reality, and why people should believe you instead of demonstrable history.

Look at it this way. You, by spreading false information, merely prove yourself a crackpot and Pied Piper leading Americans astray. And you do that in spite of the fact that we have plenty of FACTUAL things wrong with government to explain to people without lying to them about history. So, why destroy your own reputation with lies and falsehoods?

Consider this point:

If you wrote those false things in ignorance, you have some excuse for your errors. But once you have facts proving your assertions erroneous, if you continue propounding the false assertions without making an effort to correct them in your distributed writings, that makes you a charlatan and deceiver who knowingly misleads readers (many of whom want to trust you).

THAT explains why Larry and I write as we do to expose your false assertions about history.

See Anna's reply here:

Larry Becraft hasn't really proven any of his assertions, Bob. He has just made them. I have read and responded to him, but the fact is, that he is misrepresenting what I wrote and attempting to twist it around by various means, and then "disprove" something I never asserted in the first place. This is a typical lawyer's trick. And Larry is a lawyer. He takes things out of context, shifts focus, reinterprets, and does his little shuffle dance and people are taken in by it. I am not.

Let me give you an example---- the infamous "Act of 1871".

This was the rat's first public attempt to set up a land base for what they had already done in 1864 by setting up the District of Columbia Municipal Corporation. The paper part was finished and they wanted to attach it to the actual land known as the District of Columbia. This was necessary to make "Municipal Law" equivalent to "Federal Law".

Most people don't understand what the Act of 1871 was about to begin with, and they make all sorts of claims about it. They also fail to note that it was repealed and that the intent was accomplished by the Municipal Corporations Acts a few years later.

The point is that this particular song and dance is widely misinterpreted.

So Larry goes in hopping and screaming and bringing forward the fact that this particular piece of legislation was repealed and there he conveniently drops it, as if the intent of the legislation was repealed or somehow not realized in fact-----when it was, in spades. He uses a technicality to obscure the truth and then fails to bring forward the additional facts and admit that, oh, well, yes, the District of Columbia Municipal Corporation was eventually tied to the District of Columbia and that in turn allowed the courts to interpret Municipal Law of the District of Columbia as Federal Law throughout the United States.

In fact, all those people who point to the Act of 1871 (whether it was repealed or not in that instance, it was passed in a slightly altered form and under a different name(s) in a piecemeal fashion later on, just like the Maternity Act which was repealed, reworked, and passed later) were correct in their assertions regarding the intent of the legislation and the legislators, and they and later generations of rats in Congress did in fact achieve their ends, so that we are living with the consequences today.

The same thing was done in England and in Canada and in Australia, so it isn't like we are stuck with a single instance of this being done or with a single basis for tracing the cause and the effect, Bob. It's not really arguable. But Larry argues it anyway.

Why? Because Larry is a lawyer, a loyal, life-long member of the Bar.

And the Bar is the source of all this garbage, Bob. They have been the foot soldiers in an economic "war" waged by the UK Corporation against the British Peoples, the

Americans, the Canadians, the Aussies, the Indians, the Germans, the Japanese, the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Greeks, and the list goes on.

Larry also isn't a very good researcher. The more arcane things that he simply can't find, he claims don't exist.

I leave you to ponder the likely end results of that approach to life and whether or not that is a more reliable stance to take than mine, which is backed up with a sworn, witnessed, and published affidavit.

At the end of the day, people have to look at the life they are living, the actual actions of the courts they are familiar with in their own experience, the oppressions of the IRS, the injustices they suffer, the inflation of their money, the whole "enchilada" of what IS. Based on what IS, they have to look at the facts presented and reach their own conclusions.

Just like you and Larry have to answer my question---- if I am a "crack pot" and "wrong" ---- why have I not paid income taxes in twenty years, despite many, many attempts of the IRS to punish me and "make an example" out of me? And why is it that I haven't been arrested for impersonating a judge, though I have been occupying the office for three years and publishing the fact?

For that matter, why is it that John Trowbridge's case wasn't tossed out in the first water? Why did it make it all the way to the United States Supreme Court? And why did it win?

A dentist won against the entire assembled and well-funded might of the U.S. Attorney's Office. How could that happen? And how could his case prove beyond any doubt that what I have been telling you and everyone else is fact and that what Larry Becraft has been teaching is nothing but sophisticated half-truths and "interpretations" of fact?

I will submit to you, Bob, that the proof is in the pudding and not in our discussions about the pudding's genesis or ingredients or whether I used Morton's salt or Sea Salt or pink Himalayan Salt in the recipe.

I will also suggest to you that Larry Becraft and Tommy Cryer, both lawyers, succeeded against the IRS for completely different reasons and with a much harder row to hoe than I have, because they did it while REMAINING in the character of Federal United States Citizens, and that the entire importance of their work and their arguments --- while not applying to me or anyone else claiming their birthright status--- is important for those who wish to remain in a capacity as Federal United States Citizens and plead these same issues from the standpoint of the United Nations.

The same object seen from different viewpoints can appear very different and yet be the same exact thing. If you don't believe me, go outside and look at your house with your nose pressed against the siding. Then move out to the curb and look. How does it appear now? Then hike down the street until you almost lose sight of it-----how does it appear now?

Has the house changed? Or has your view of it changed?

I submit to you, Bob, that my "house" is the same house whether viewed from my perspective or from Larry's. It isn't a matter of me being a "fraud" or a "crackpot"---- and if I were, you can be sure I would have been arrested years ago. It is a matter of everyone grasping the FACT that we Americans are either living in our native country or assuming a "residence" in another, and that according to where we "live" or "reside" we are subject to different laws---either organic or statutory.

I have chosen to live in my native country and to abide by its Organic Laws and no others. Larry has chosen to "reside" here as one of those "inhabitants" and/or subjects of the British Crown who are tasked to provide the rest of us with "essential governmental services", which also obligates him to live within the statutory law.

He has to keep his nose pressed against the siding, Bob. He isn't allowed to view the "house" from the curb, much less from down the street. Those of us who are not obligated to his regimen, however, are not "wrong" or "crackpots" or "lunatics" because we have a longer leash and greater ability to see the forest and not just the trees.

And the United States Supreme Court has recently and resoundingly agreed. Read the Trowbridge case and get a view of the "house" from halfway down the lane.

9 to 0, Bob. And Larry.

-----  
See this article and over 100 others on Anna's website here:[www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)