What Did You Expect the Supreme Court to Do?

By Anna Von Reitz

I awoke today to cries of anguish and shouts of joy, as the two misbegotten sides of the political spectrum erupted in response to the news that the United States Supreme Court declined to hear arguments from the State of Texas, et alia.

As I pointed out yesterday, there is a dangerous confusion caused by using the word "State" to describe "Confederate States" that are actually State-of -State business organizations, and not actual States at all.

This exact confusion is what happened here.

The case in question was being raised by the State of Texas, not Texas.

As I also pointed out, such a suit would have to be entertained in Original Jurisdiction, which is only accessible when one State attacks another State in international jurisdiction.

So, Original Jurisdiction can't be accessed by the State of Texas for the same reason that the State of Texas, as an incorporated entity, can't legitimately invoke sovereign immunity.

A State, as I keep preaching, is not "the same as" a State-of-State.

The United States Supreme Court knows this as well as I do, and knows that a State-of-State that functions under corporate private law in international jurisdiction doesn't have the standing to enter Original Jurisdiction.

Texas, not the State of Texas, would have to bring the suit for it to be in Original Jurisdiction, and that is not even possible.

Why? Because the Cause --- election tampering involving a foreign-owned corporation's private elections --- is miles outside of Texas' interests and jurisdictions.

That would be like me bringing suit because the corporation providing my lawn care services held new corporate elections and cheated, leaving me to work with Joey Brazos instead of Leon Helmdich.

As the Employer, I can tell the lawn care corporation that I won't work with Joey Brazos, because he is a known crook, and as a result, he doesn't have permission to come onto my property to provide any services.

But that is not a matter for the Supreme Court to decide. That's a matter for the Employer and Party-to-Contract to decide.

It's apparent to me and I hope that it is now apparent to you (and to the clueless State Attorney Generals) that the United States Supreme Court couldn't entertain the complaint brought by the State of Texas and seventeen other such "Confederate States" --- because none of them have standing to enter Original Jurisdiction.

Therefore, it is absolutely no surprise that despite the gravity of the situation, the Supreme Court turned them down. The Supreme Court Justices literally could not hear such a case, even if they wanted to.

Instead, the published statutes of the corporations in question, common sense, and the authority of the Commander-in-Chief will have to prevail.
And I have no doubt that it will.

As for all of you reading this, this is an excellent lesson.

Your State, your actual State of the Union, is calling you to get involved in self-governance, an occupation you are heir to and which you have been neglecting to your own detriment. Only your State has the standing to abide in Original Jurisdiction and only you have the right and responsibility to direct its affairs.

Go to: www.TheAmericanStatesAssembly.net and get started today.

See this article and over 2800 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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