

Still More for the [Misled] Flag Officers:



By Anna Von Reitz

Well, you are not all misled, just some of you. And it is to you Misled Fellows that this is addressed.

Here's the accusation:

She is again obfuscating the facts about what the founding docs really were/are. The King's founding and the foundations America was built on (follow the money please) was just a business venture documented in the 1606 First Virginia Charter of claims and was never canceled. **Virginia** received three **charters, 1606**, another in **1609**, and the third in **1612**. The differences among the three **charters** lie primarily in the territorial jurisdiction of the **COMPANY**. He who owns the most land wins. He needed Real Currency so he claimed a share of all the Gold, Silver and Copper found in America by his surveyors and all that would mine for it. These shares would be passed on to his heirs in perpetuity. A good conquest businessman he was to even take care of his future family members. And all at the expense of the Native Americans.

Here's the answer:

Of course, the colonization was a business venture. Of course, the Virginia Company and the New England (Bedford) Company and several others as well were chartered by the King of the Commonwealth and other European Monarchs as well. So what?

The private business dealings underlying that progress has nothing whatsoever to do with the public business of our government as of 1776, other than the fact that the private British business interests were preserved by the Definitive Treaty of Paris, 1783, and again, all within the British Territorial Government doing business as "the" United States of America, operating "in our name" under our specific delegation of powers.

There's nothing exotic about any of this. The actual entities being referenced are clear throughout all the documents and the nomenclature is both specific and consistent throughout. Our country and our Federation of States has a Proper Name. That Proper Name is: The United States of America.

There is also "the" United States of America, which is the British Territorial Government doing business "in our name" and functioning under our delegated authority. That government functioned as a business which was later, by 1856, incorporated as "the" UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

And again, so what?

All that is about British corporations chartered to do private business and make investments in the New World and they were allowed to continue to function in their own Territorial jurisdiction even after The War of Independence. If you bother to read the first few pages of "You Know Something Is

Wrong When....An American Affidavit of Probably Cause" you will find that I years ago described this situation and what everyone got out of it.

It simply doesn't have anything to do with our actual government and our actual country, The United States of America.

The King is Arch-Treasurer of "the" United States of America, not The United States of America.

Get it through your head.

And though they are very similar names, as any lawyer worth their salt can tell you, "The United States of America" is a very different beastie than "the" United States of America.

Here's the accusation:

That's it! Except as a CYA Act the Congress agreed 1789 no one shall take an oath to " the Constitution for the United States of America" because the United States of America was hi\$.

And here's the answer:

No, again. As I explained yesterday, there are three (3) different Constitutions with three (3) different names.

The one passed in 1787 is the Original Equity Contract and Federal Constitution.

The one passed in 1789 is the British Territorial Constitution. Therefore it makes perfect sense that the 1789 version included the prohibition against taking an oath to the 1787 Constitution, and also, the 1789 Constitution included the Federal Judiciary Act, allowing the Territorial Government to have Sea Jurisdiction Courts.

Until you get your heads out of your pockets and realize that you are dealing with three different governments all operating on our shores, each providing different governmental services, you will be left making stupid assumptions.

The Constitution for the united **States of America**--1787-- (American Service Provider).

The Constitution of **the** United States of America - 1789 -- (British Territorial Service Provider).

The Constitution of **the** United States - 1790 - (Municipal Service Provider).

Do you think they created all **three** of these separate documents and passed them over a period of **four (4)** years for no reason?

Whenever you see "**the**" United States of America or the **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**, they are talking about the British Territorial entities and the British Territorial United States ---- meaning the Insular States and Possessions.

Absolutely none of this is talking about our actual country or the States or its civilian government at all.

Here's the accusation:

The only thing I may add is basic contract law is simple the articles were overwritten ie replaced by the new Contract ie Constitution. In international law a sovereign needs another sovereign to co-sign so the articles agreed to the change in terms to be able to conduct commerce internationally which was needed at the time to pay off debts.. Classic case of those with power writing a one-sided contract.

And here's the answer:

The Articles of Confederation were never "overwritten", and neither for that matter was anything else. The entities involved had no such powers. The States of America ceased to function in the wake of the Civil War. They were American business entities operated by the actual States and thanks to British betrayal and duplicity, the American States never "reconstructed" these businesses. Until now.

Here's the accusation:

Further, the names she uses are not even used on official docs nor internal ones. And all the capacities, characters and conditions she speaks of, not one is explicitly authorized. Sounds like she is actually doing PR that jailed Heather tried floating, as well the one who claimed she was in Illuminati, I and broke free. We did what we did because the Creator asked us to be evil so that you may see good. Remember, SHE came out initially saying it was all fraud. We were born free.

And here's the answer:

You are just too ignorant to know what the documents are or what they say. The language and the nomenclature is absolutely consistent in all the Federal Constitutions. The entities are named throughout the Congressional Records, throughout the Constitutional Conventions, throughout the Federalist Papers and it is all the same and exactly as I have described it. We have the documents and we have the dates when all these things were decided, named, and put into effect. We know why it is the way it is, and it all makes sense.

Our history is consistent. Our interpretation of the situation and the nomenclature fits.

And yours doesn't. You're just talking through your hat and making assumptions, which is a dangerous thing to do, when the fate of your country hangs on it.

Here's the accusation:

Now she is saying you are subject to a state and what they did was ok - LOL. Claim your political birthright. She attacked Phil and for claiming the proper and recognized birth right. Sounds to me like a well-planned long term psy-op courtesy of the master manipulators. aka Tavistock. They were behind this long term ie late 50s and beyond social transformation. My my my where we have gone in under a generation.

And here's the answer:

The problem is that because Phil is acting from wrong assumptions, just like you, he didn't claim his "proper and recognized birthright" as an American. He claimed his birthright as a British Territorial Citizen, instead.

And he's allowed to do that and so are you, but as I also explained --- it means that you are a British Pauper living on the clemency of the King and standing good for all his debts.

That's all well and good, if that is what you want to do and mean to do, but if not, it's time to get your heads out of your nether regions and listen up. You can always admit to making a mistake, but the only mistake you can't correct is the one you won't admit.

See this article and over 2000 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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