

Answers to Common Questions and Misconceptions for the Jural Assemblies



By Anna Von Reitz

1. Misconception Number One: that colored people and women are not welcome to join State Jural Assemblies.

This idea derives from the fact that to be on safe ground legally and lawfully, the State Jural Assemblies need to go back and pick up where at least some of them left off -- in 1860. They need to re-establish a Quorum of Jurors qualified by 1860 standards, and that Quorum then needs to update the membership rules to officially include people of color and women.

Please note that in the days of slavery there were both white and colored slaves in this country, and "indentured servants" too --- none of whom could act as State Electors.

The real qualifier was land ownership and neither slaves nor indentured servants could own land, hence, could not act as Electors.

However, both black men and Native men who were Free and who owned land in a State, could act as State Jural Assembly Members and still can.

The important idea behind all this was that nobody not tied to the State by commitment to the Land of that State should have a voice in the affairs of that State.

If you think about this, it is a reasonable requirement: otherwise, people passing through the State could cast votes with no skin in the game. They could, with a large enough population of transients (known as "residents"), dictate to and obligate those people who are actually committed to living in and building their businesses in that State.

We see some attempt at this with the current Border Crisis, where people foreign to the State and with no actual material commitment to say, California, are influencing public policy and helping themselves to public assistance and dictating elections --- all with no substantial actual and material commitment to California.

This is why our States all require Electors to hold only one citizenship --- State Citizenship. They also require State Citizens to be landowners. Color requirements as such, don't actually exist in the American States and never did, except in limited portions of the Deep South.

The more potent issue in 1860 and today is the capacity in which we are acting.

The affect of having the Territorial Congress arbitrarily "confer" citizenships on people and then claiming that they are acting as "persons" via a process of undisclosed enfranchisement, has established a situation in which average Americans are now almost uniformly "presumed" to be in the condition of either indentured servitude to the Queen, or slaves owned by the Municipal United States Government, or both.

It isn't until we take action to Expatriate from any such presumed federal citizenship that we can actually own land in fact, and therefore qualify as State Citizens and as State Electors.

The question of the landownership requirement continues to be contentious. It has been argued in some States that our bodies are made of "dust" and "to dust returneth", and therefore all men and women are "landowners". This may serve the esoteric point, but doesn't answer the actual dilemma posed by non-landowners voting on issues that don't impact them, but which do impose increased tax burdens on landowners.

Women in Europe and America were able to own land and had been able to own land for centuries prior to 1860, so landownership was not the crux of the matter for women. It was more the prevailing idea that women were gentle and needed at home, ill-suited to the hurly-burly of politics and demands of public office, that kept them from being included in Jural Assemblies.

Now that two World Wars and the Civil War itself have convinced us otherwise, women have claimed (and earned) equal rights, and merely updating the old State Jural Assembly rules suffices.

It's a small burden to find 30 free men above the age of 21 who are claiming their birthright political status and who are land owners, to hold the first quorum meeting for each State Jural Assembly, but it is one that assures that the further actions of the Assemblies going forward are properly sanctioned and brought up to date.

And in no case does any of this prevent anyone at any time from: (1) expatriating from federal citizenship status, (2) participating in the State Jural Assembly organizational activities and meetings, (3) making sure that their Assembly is fully staffed, fully informed, and on firm ground going forward.

2. Misconception Number 2: that people have to give up things like Social Security payments or medical coverage owed to them by Federal Government agencies, if they reclaim their birthright political status.

Most Americans never knowingly left their birthright political status. This was merely a self-interested legal presumption being misapplied to millions of people based on equally self-interested falsification of registration documents and improper demands that we "apply" for Social Security, "register" to vote in what appeared to be public elections, and so on.

Having to take action to rebut this legal presumption is anti-intuitive to most people and the resulting confusion is paralyzing, especially when they assume that they will lose pension dividends and health care and other things of value that they are owed.

Fortunately, the only thing we lose is the ability to vote in private elections hosted by foreign corporations, which is quickly made up for, as we hold our own public elections, instead.

Once we return our Given Names (also known as Trade Names) to the land and soil jurisdiction of our States of the Union, we are no longer in La-La-Land, and we can no longer be "presumed" to be in the Queen's service or the Pope's.

All the franchises they have "gifted" us with are similarly under new ownership--- American ownership, not "U.S. Citizen" ownership.

The only impact this has is that both the Queen and the Pope and all their employees are now obligated to obey the Constitutions and the Public Law of this country again, with respect to you and your assets.

The magic words are: "I accept all gifts and waive all benefits."

"Benefits" are gifts that come with strings attached-- unseen, unstipulated, undisclosed contracts and conditions that you are "presumed" to know and accept when you accept "benefits".

Thus, when they mischaracterize Social Security Earned Dividends that you and your employers paid for as "benefits" they are claiming that you are acting in the capacity of a "U.S. Citizen" or "Citizen of the United States" --- and moreover, that you are a Federal Citizen in receipt of welfare.

Now, there are many people receiving "benefits" from the Social Security Administration as public assistance that they never earned. Some never contributed a dime and are receiving thousands of dollars in medical care and support payments every month.

Those of us who unknowingly signed up for Social Security and vested in this program meant for Federal Employees are not in receipt of "benefits". Anything we get back is an "earned dividend". The import difference is that "benefits" can be discontinued at whim, whereas "earned dividends" owed to former employees have to be paid.

The situation is analogous to going to work for a foreign corporation in a foreign country. While you are in that foreign country, you obey its laws. You also obey the internal "laws" of the corporation you work for.

When you quit or retire and return home -- what happens?

You are no longer living under the laws of that foreign country, and are back living under the laws of your own country. That's for starters.

The corporation you worked for still owes you every bit of your pension plan. That includes medical services (not benefits) and monthly dividend payments (not benefits).

It's the same way with Social Security and Medicare. They still owe you every jot, and they owe it to you as "earned dividends and services", not as "benefits".

Similarly, the franchises and ACCOUNTS held in YOUR NAME and created "for" you have been mischaracterized as belonging to "U.S. Citizens" and/or "Citizens of the United States".

These franchises and ACCOUNTS are toxic to you until you return home to the land and soil of your State of the Union via expatriation from any Federal Citizenship, and claim ownership of them as an American State National or American State Citizen.

It's the difference between "benefits" and "earned dividends" again.

As a "U.S. Citizen" or "Citizen of the United States" you are obligated to pay all the bills related to these franchises and ACCOUNTS created in YOUR NAME, but as an American State National or an American State Citizen, you are the inheritor of the assets and credits owed to these accounts.

Suffice it to say that as long as you cling to your identity as a "U.S. Citizen" or "Citizen of the United States", you are a Pauper by definition, obligated to function under foreign law, obligated to obey foreign corporation policies, obligated to pay for every whim of the British Territorial Congress--- but when you reclaim your birthright political status, you are owed the return of everything that is rightfully yours.

Your Trustees, the British Monarch and the Pope, have to act as your Trustees again ---and return your "borrowed" property, plus interest, leases, fees, etc.

So, you lose absolutely nothing of any importance when you return to your birthright political status, and you regain all that was stolen and commandeered, including your Constitutional guarantees.

As you will be conducting your own elections and dealing with your own issues and taking control of your own purse strings, you will not need to overly concern yourself with the circus in Washington, DC, and you will have no reason or desire to participate in their political parties.

The world will come back into focus and the tail will stop wagging the dog once enough people understand the circumstance and take the necessary action -- (1) reclaim your birthright political status; (2) join your State Jural Assembly and boot it up.

See this article and over 1500 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com
To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.