

Nomenclature and Ownership, Again

By Anna Von Reitz



Some people are confused by the fact that both the foreign corporations residing in the District of Columbia are "Municipal Corporations".

A Municipal Corporation is a kind of corporation just like a "Red Delicious" is a kind of apple.

A Municipal Corporation structure can be used to organize and administer military services just as well as it can be used to organize and administer civil services, so that is what we have going on here.

The District of Columbia as a whole is operated by a Municipal Corporation dba "the United States of America, Incorporated" while a separate enclave within the District of Columbia is carved out and operated as another Municipal Corporation dba "the United States, Incorporated".

One, the District Government, is devoted to military operations and military personnel populations, and the other, the Municipal Government within the Municipality of Washington, DC, is devoted to civil service operations and non-military populations providing government services.

So you have two Municipal Corporations organized for two different purposes and two different classes of "citizens" that are attached to the two different Municipal Corporations. Additionally, each of these Municipal Corporations are operated as franchises by different foreign governments.

The British Territorial United States Government and its U.S. Citizens attached to the United States of America, Incorporated, are engaged in military concerns and operations as a "community" within the District of Columbia.

The Municipal Government of Washington, DC, was originally chartered by the Continental Congress as the City of Washington, DC, and functioned under the direction of the American Federal Congress until 1860; it has since been run as a for-profit Municipal Corporation operated by the City of Rome, and its "citizens of the United States" are all the Federal Civil Service and Agency personnel, plus their dependents.

So while the District Government and the Municipal Government are separate and are run by separate parent corporations and have fundamentally different purposes and personnel, both are organized as Municipal Corporations.

The word "Municipal" is an adjective describing what kind of "Corporation" we are referring to.

This is the best, simplest definition of "municipality" that I have run across:

"The definition of a municipality is a community with a local government and specified boundaries. This includes towns, cities, or villages. These areas are formally organized by the larger state where they are located. They are given the authority to have their own laws and standards, as long as they are in line with the state's laws as well."

The definition demonstrates that we could call any organized local government a municipality, but in practice, the State of State organizations which have been busily defining "municipalities" always incorporate them as franchises of their own business organization and it is this enfranchisement that enforces loyalty to the parent corporation.

Thus, a municipality owes fealty to the corporation that creates it or the sovereign that charters it, even though it is technically organized and operated by the local people.

Now step back a moment and look at the world around you. Do you have any reason to suppose that a Municipal Corporation in Japan is different in character or purpose than a Municipal Corporation in Venezuela?

How about a C-Corp that sells shares and trades on stock exchanges -- is Mitsubishi, Inc. fundamentally different in structure or purpose than Ford Motor Company, Inc.?

The answer in both cases is, no, they are the same....all over the world, wherever you look, the various kinds of corporations that people use to organize their businesses and even their philanthropic activities are standardized.

A trust is a trust in China, just as it is a trust in Belgium. A foundation in Germany has the same characteristics as a foundation in South Africa.

This is because all of these business models have been defined and developed under the care and guidance of the Roman Curia. They are the same on a global basis because the Jurisdiction of the Air to which these Legal Fictions belong is global in nature.

At the end of the day, all these various entities belong to the Pope and are administered under Ecclesiastical Law.

The fact that this vast plethora of corporations ultimately belong to the Pope and that he has the sovereign right and responsibility to oversee their operations always comes as a shock, but there it is.

Who rules the Jurisdiction of the Air? The Pope.

A network of treaties makes this possible in a practical sense with the Treaties of Ghent and the Treaties of Utrecht being the principal agreements involved.

No chartered thing is sovereign. No incorporated thing is sovereign.

And when incorporated entities -- Municipal Corporations, for example -- function as governments, those governments are not sovereign, either.

So it boils down to which sovereign power (Principal) are these Municipal Corporations standing under? Ultimately, they are all standing under the Pope, by definition.

Our nation-states are unincorporated and sovereign entities. Their States, by which they carry on international and global business, are also sovereign and unincorporated entities in those venues.

The States' unincorporated Federation of States, doing business as The United States of America since 1776, is not itself a sovereign entity, but acts as an agent or instrumentality of the sovereign States to conduct mutually beneficial business in international and global jurisdictions.

Our nation-states are the sovereign powers that our American Government stands under, and their States operating individually or severally as the case may be, are the sovereign powers that we, Americans, stand under in international and global jurisdictions.

Thus, when it comes to the ultimate administration and ownership of Municipal Corporations run amok, we, acting on behalf of the American Principals, that is, our

States --- bypass the operators, the British Crown and the City of Rome, respectively, and go directly to the Pope.

People who are used to thinking of the Office of the Pope in terms of his sacred offices and administration of the Roman Catholic Church miss the point. He is also by far the wealthiest man on Earth and the busiest business executive. All incorporated entities belong to him and are subject to him, whether he takes an interest in their day-to-day administration or not.

His right and his responsibility to liquidate corporations that engage in unlawful activities is ironclad, fully and clearly stated in Ecclesiastical Law, and implemented by contracts and treaties.

Thus, when we have exhausted our remedies and grow tired of bad behavior on the part of incorporated entities, especially entities created as franchises of foreign Municipal Corporations, it's time to take it up with the Pope and with the Vatican Chancery Court, which decides issues of ownership.

See this article and over 4200 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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