No Precedence for State Republics—One Exception

By Anna Von Reitz



The exception is Texas.

Texas has a unique history.

Texas began as a regional province of Mexico — a very sparsely inhabited domain. So the Mexican Government offered generous land grants to encourage people to move to Texas,

640 acres per man, 320 each for his wife and every child, 80 acres per slave.

All you had to do was behave yourself under Mexican Law and convert to Roman Catholicism and you were given all this land. For people who were already Roman Catholics it was a no-brainer, and no big obstacle for those without strong religious conviction, either.

Soon would-be colonists from the United States began petitioning the Mexican Government to let them into Texas and the Mexicans agreed. 300 families affiliated with Mr. Austin, a lawyer and politician from Missouri, crossed the border and settled in what is now Texas.

They flourished. More colonists from the Caribbean and Louisiana and foreign countries joined them. Soon, the Mexican Government started treating Texas like a foreign country and imposing special tariffs and taxes on Texans. Resentment festered.

Fights broke out along the border and at seaports and soon, Texans were in open rebellion against Mexico. The rest of the story? The Texans won their independence from Mexico and formed their own independent country which they operated under a separate government modeled after the Roman Republic.

It was several years later that Texas became one of the Several States of the Union, so alone among the American States, Texas has a history of being a separate country with its own form of government— a Republic of Texas.

There is no history of any other "State Republics" prior to Statehood, so all these people chasing around and claiming that they are restoring "state republics" are talking wind. There were never any such state republics other than Texas. Hawaii was a separate Kingdom, but not a republic — a monarchy.

So. Once again, Americans are proving that they know nothing about their own history and that they are prey to all sorts of incorrect assumptions as a result.

Our state governments in the rest of the country begin and end as states having a "republican form of government" — which is to say, they were never Roman-style Republics, but were instead community-based governments operated by the common people themselves — not by a group of elite Senators.

Texas was the only state to ever adopt a Roman-style Republic and therefore the only State that could, in theory, be "restored" to being a Republic, and functioning as a completely separate country with its own language, coinage, laws, etc.

There are some Texans who cling to that idea and who aspire to rule over Texas as oligarchs—which is the end result of Roman Republics—but the fact is that they would lose the support of all the other States of the Union and be viewed as foreign insurrectionists and traitors.

Most Texans are not insurrectionists and are not traitors to this country as a whole, nor do they cherish dreams of being "Senators" and lording it over other Texans.

Most Texans just want what we all desire—to have the Hired Help back in order and leaving them, the Texans, alone to live their lives without subjection to arbitrary foreign "laws" and coercion imposed by run amok public employees.

Is that too much to ask?

Without being branded as an insurrectionist? Or a Tin Hat? Or a "Sovereign Citizen"?

We believe that all the ignorant talk about "state republics" is being promoted by enemies of this country and that they and their agenda should be avoided — first, because the Roman Republic failed disastrously and oligarchy is always despotic, and second, if these yahoos don't know enough history and law to decry the idea of "restoring" state republics that never existed, they certainly aren't competent to restore the actual government we are owed.

See this article and over 3800 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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