

Eric Williams' response 6-10-2016 from Anna Von Reitz



By Anna Von Reitz

Eric wrote:

Due to excessive length and time constraints I was not able to provide you the relevant details of my experience in Federal Court against the IRS. I have set down the content thereof herein below for your review.

However, of much greater importance is what I have provided herein thereafter, for your review and consideration. I do sincerely request that you read what I wrote in its entirety. If thereafter you would rather I refrained from further contact of you I will respect your advisement thereof.

The case was called, The Prosecutor stood and began his opening statement, "Citizens of the United States have an obligation to blah ... blah ... blah ..." At which time I stood to object. The judge said:

1. Judge: "Why are you objecting Mr. Williams, he hasn't said anything yet?"

Me: "Well, he said citizens of the United States have all the obligations he was mentioning, and that may be true, but I contend he does not have anything to put me in that class."

2. Judge: "Are you renouncing your citizenship?"

Me: "How can I renounce that which I never applied for?"

3. Judge: "Where were you born?"

Me: "At the time I was born I had just gone through a terrible ordeal, I was gasping for breath, I could not read or write, I did not know where I was or who I was or even what I was."

4. Judge: "What did your mother tell you?"

Me: "At the time I was born I did not understand the child mother relationship. I could not pick my mother from a lineup of one."

5. Judge: "What was on your birth certificate?"

Me: "At the time I was born I did not understand the importance of such a document. I do not know if one was created regarding my birth or not," and, pointing to the prosecutor, I said: "and he can't prove it."

6. Judge: "I am taking this matter under consideration and you will be notified"

Here it seems to be clear that the judge's questions, each and every one, individually, were intended to elicit from me an acknowledgment of citizenship' The judge's first and second questions indicated his presumption that I was then a citizen but was intent of renouncing such.

The third question indicated he would declare me a citizen based on my birth in the United States as most people born here believe.

The fourth question would elicit what most mothers tell their children in regard to their citizenship established by birth here.

The fifth question would reveal I was born in the United States and therefore a citizen due thereto.

None of the judge's questions were in regard to my filing any naturalization papers although such a line of questions might have been thwarted by my answer to his second question. However, his continued questioning of me was in his effort to get me to provide some manner of information that would enable him to declare me a citizen based on other issues than my self determination of my citizenship or political status.

Initially he presumed I was a citizen and that I was attempting to wiggle out of the charges based on the inability of the prosecutor to prove I was a citizen, which was why the judge proceeded to question me rather than calling upon the prosecutor to do so.

Anna's answer:

Your challenge works because if you don't know who you are, neither, obviously, do the prosecutor nor the judge. They certainly can't prove it if you don't do it for them. That said, your protest seems dishonest and an avoidance rather than a defense. I suppose we do what we have to do. I have also used Draconian tactics against the IRS in the past.

Such as forcing them to define what a "Withholding Agent" is, and then asking by what right and evidence they claim that I am a Withholding Agent against my will? If filing a 1040 for them for free is not a voluntary act, then surely signing a 1040 or other form for them under coercion is peonage---involuntary servitude in connection with a debt, albeit a public debt? Also, signing such forms requires one to sign under penalty of perjury, so by what right may the IRS or the Prosecutor or the Judge require anyone to commit a knowing act of perjury? How can I swear to being a "Withholding Agent" when I have asked them to define what a "Withholding Agent" is, and it is clear that I am not one and don't volunteer to be one? If I were to file a 1040 or other incriminating document upon the direction of the court, would I not be impersonating a public officer in violation of their own rules stated at 18 USC 912? Would it not be an act of extortion and racketeering for the court to demand that I falsify documents and would the result not be an illegal taking by agents of a foreign government? And is the Prosecutor not demanding that I commit an act of identity theft against myself and against my own best interest by forcing me to pretend that I am operating my own NAME as a public franchise and separate persona? And, come to think of it, what evidence do they have that I ever knowingly, willingly, and under conditions of full disclosure ever gave my consent to the creation of such a franchise named after me? And if I didn't give such consent, who did it in my behalf? Where is there any evidence that I knowingly and willing assumed the distinctly unsavory political status of a "citizen of the United States"? Why would any prudent man, born in a vastly more advantageous status do that?

I can go on all day with embarrassing and unanswerable and outrageous questions that leave the Tax Administrators and Judges trembling and anxious to find a reason----any reason---- to dismiss.

And then I just stand there innocent as the flowers in May and don't give them an out.

You can also revoke your election to pay, so long as you are not actually any kind of federal employee, an African American, welfare recipient, foreign asylum seeker, or voluntarily operating a public franchise of the UNITED STATES.

They are trying to get into the trust fund they established in your NAME and are trying to make you function as the Trustee and pay them whatever they demand for their "services". So you can also file a Form 56 and make the Judge your Trustee instead of letting the Clerk misuse him as an Administrator.

The methods and madness go on and I suppose that we are all justified in whatever remedy we pursue to fend off these charlatans and crooks in robes to prevent them from committing personage and barratry against us----but that does nothing to dismantle their cozy crime syndicate nor does it educate the public about the need to do so.

Eric:

I acknowledge that there is some possibility that the authorities have backed off in all the cases where my group members have served my N&Ds based on the Thirteenth Amendment because of the provision of the Naturalization Act but that does not address the point wherein I find fault in your application of that Act.

Anna:

The right not to incriminate oneself (which also means refusing to commit a crime, such as deliberate perjury) is just as valid as objecting by any means to the peonage forbidden by their own Thirteenth Amendment, but if you have spent any time in these courts, it is flamingly obvious that they do not function under The Constitution and are merely "federal debt collection agencies".

In my opinion the fundamental flaw in their system IS the Naturalization Act and their lack of any proof that any American ever complied with it. Thus the Public Law is brought to bear against their "private contracts" and the private contracts all lose----Driver Licenses, Voter Registrations, the whole kit and caboodle are out the door--- absent proof that you complied with the Naturalization Act.

Eric:

Additionally, I contend that a challenge based on a CONstitutional provision is more effective, more readily recognized and acknowledged and much more likely to be known of than an obscure Naturalization Act.

[See above.](#)

Eric:

As I recall, you contend that all state citizens are aliens to the United States and must therefore comply with the provisions of this Naturalization Act as such being the one and only means by which state citizens could become US citizens.

Anna:

Yes, but I don't contend that anyone is naturally a "state citizen" either--- so you are misstating my position. We are not born "citizens" of any kind and are under no obligation to serve as "citizens". If you look up the legal meaning of the word "citizen" you will see that a "citizen" subjects himself to the government and serves it, instead of the government serving him.

Our universal and proper status is that of a "State National". Why? Because our states are nation-states. We are Virginians, Ohioans, and so on, at birth, not "citizens of the United States" and absent our action pursuant to the Naturalization Act, we remain so.

Eric:

I argue that the fourth section of that Act provides that children of state citizens who have acknowledged US citizenship are considered to be US citizens. I think that this is a situation that is impossible to document because no one knows when or where they were born and because a high percentage of the population have been here for so long that they have lost track of their family origin and have no documentation to trace their lineage back to immigrants who were naturalized or to antecedents who were here on this land before the revolt ousting King George III. I remember when I was a child that my parents had documentation indicating the family lineage went back to the Mayflower, but I do not have a copy because it was stolen from me by my ex wife.

Anna:

In order for our parents to become "United States Citizens" of any stripe, there would have to be proof that they complied with the Naturalization Act as well, and as no such evidence exists, I would say that pretty much shoots your argument in the butt. As of 1888 the rats began naturalizing everyone who came through the door as "United States citizens" and only secondarily did they become citizens of the states where they were living. However, they did become "state citizens" and free to then become "state nationals"--- as the status of "citizen" has to be voluntary or it violates the Public Law and the international laws against involuntary servitude, press-ganging, and conscription.

Eric:

As an aside, I cannot perceive why any thinking person would choose to declare themselves to be any manner or style of citizen.

Anna:

Agreed. See above. And exactly why do you think that I am pushing anyone to claim to be a "citizen" of any stripe? In America, the government is meant to serve the people, not the other way around.

There is a current need for State Nationals to serve their own County and State level governments ---and in order to occupy those State Offices, they must temporarily (for the duration of their term) serve as "State Citizens"---but that is the price we all pay for self-government.

Eric:

Be all that as it may, the primary reason why I contacted you was not in regard to the Naturalization Act but rather, because of what must be done to salvage this country, working with the tools that are actually available rather than pie in the sky, such as John Darish's NLA Grand Jury fiasco or a July 4th election of officers to populate the de jure government as was suggested by one of my Group members. Is there any realistic possibility that the de facto government is going to permit themselves to be displaced?

Anna:

Only living people claiming to be State Nationals can "populate" the government owed to the land jurisdiction of these fifty nation-states, by volunteering to act as "State Citizens" for the purpose of jury duty, for example.

Unfortunately Mr. Daresh didn't see the need to expatriate from any "presumed" status as a United States Citizen before trying to convene a valid Citizens Common Law Grand Jury under American Common Law. Others are not so clueless.

One cannot act as a United States Citizen and as a State Citizen at the same time. They are mutually exclusive offices.

This is in fact the answer to your second query about "displacing" the current government of the United States---- the government of the Several States operates on the land jurisdiction and is mutually exclusive and separate from the government of the United States which operates in the international jurisdiction of the sea and always has.

As such, there is no conflict. There has only been a vacuum of power for a number of years owing to our failure to convene a properly constituted Continental Congress and take care of business.

Doing so requires us to "assemble" as jural assemblies, elect people who are acting as State Citizens to fill our vacated county government offices, elect state offices in the same way, and finally, elect State Deputies to serve as Delegates to our Continental Congress.

As you and everyone else should be aware , our government works from the bottom up, not the top down. Thus any attempt to simply elect new members to a separate "de jure" Congress and operate from the top down is provably unworkable and fraudulent.

It is absolutely necessary for the people to organize themselves as jural assemblies and so, to operate a County and State government on the land jurisdiction of their states. At each step, power diminishes.

The people hold all the power in our government. They delegate a portion of power to the counties for the elected county officers to administer. The counties delegate power to the state. And the states together contract and delegate some of their remaining powers to the federal government which is dead last on our Totem Pole of power sharing.

It should now be apparent that the government on the land has not organized and exerted its own sovereignty properly--- a problem that Americans are rapidly addressing now that they realize that what has been passing as a "state government" is merely a corporate "State of State" franchise of the UNITED STATES, INC. busily selling us an extra layer of government services.

These "State of States" such as the "State of Washington" operate entirely in the foreign and international jurisdiction of the sea and they are definitively not our state governments though they provide services to and for our state governments.

Eric:

And all this advocacy of returning to the common law? Does anyone ever consider why statutory law was adopted? The reason was because the common law does not work well in our modern electrified society. Does anyone today have any realization of the complete turnaround of human society because of electricity? The common law was phased out because of the vast difference in the beliefs of the common people who were called for jury duty. Without any guide, other than some admonishment of the judge, the jurors had nothing to guide them other than their very diverse personal opinions. They needed something more concrete. How would common law assure high rise apartments were safely constructed without building codes? How would travelers have confidence of safety enabling them to travel at sixty miles per hour without vehicle codes. Would you feel safe driving at night if there was no traffic code requiring tail and stop lights on the vehicles ahead of you?

The problem is not in the adoption of statutory laws, the problem is in the destruction of the power of petit juries to judge the laws validity and application independently of any instructions by any presiding judge. This is of primary importance in our actions to get our country back! And the NLA and others should be working on reestablishing the authority of the petit jury!

Anna:

If you had bothered to read what I have written on these subjects, instead of just lumping me in with whatever impressions you have of "patriots" in general, you would know that I fully admit the limitations and quirks and Draconian nature of the Common Law and do not advocate it as a panacea.

However, given a choice, I would rather entrust my fate to a jury of my peers instead of a jury of foreign bureaucrats. Also, I would prefer that jury to have the power of jury nullification --the ability to overturn any obnoxious, unjust, or unworkable "law" passed by the legislature---which is not available under statutory law.

I find it curious that you advocate jury nullification in one breath, deplore the Common Law which is our only access to jury nullification with the next, and then extol to glories of "petit juries" with the next.

You are clearly very confused.

Statutory law, as the name implies, is designed to deal exclusively with statutory entities--- "things" like corporations, cooperatives, government offices, foundations,

public transmitting utilities and so on, that are created and controlled by legislative acts. Petit juries-- by which I assume you mean juries of six instead of twelve-- are peculiar to statutory law and under our system of government never allowed to hear any issue related to the living people at all.

It is only by deliberately mischaracterizing the living people as "things" and as "citizens of the United States" that the use of petit juries has become common --another symptom of the corruption of the courts which has spiraled out of control.

The statutory law is appropriate when applied as it is meant to be applied to entities created by statute, but a scourge and a travesty against justice otherwise; through the wanton mischaracterization of the living people and the abuse of the statutory law to promote personage and barratry, our country has been robbed by foreign corporations and governments.

Therefore, let us agree that allowing the United States, Inc. to seize upon the given names of American State Nationals and allowing the British Crown to copyright our names to create corporate "persons" (trusts, public transmitting utilities, etc.) merely NAMED after us ----all to promote confusion of living people with incorporated entities and the practice of personage against us and our assets-- must be objected to and stopped.

Eric:

Then we have the issue of government funding. Neither you nor I are paying income tax. Putting aside the suppositions that tax money is being wrongly expended this still leaves us with the necessity to provide funding for the needed services of government. Yes, some small part can be funded through fees, but how would that fund the military?

Anna:

As Walter Burién has pointed out, the federal government corporation and its state-of-state franchises have via taxation, fees, and unlawful seizures accumulated vast amounts of wealth, the mere interest from which is more than sufficient to pay for all public services including defense which the American states ever contracted to receive.

Also, as I have pointed out, there is no "National Debt". In a debt-credit system, any such "National Debt" is immediately backed by an equal "National Credit".

The illusion of the necessity of continuing taxation and of such accounting sleights of hand as the "National Debt" reveals merely the extent of the corruption and self-interest of the governmental services corporations and agencies being fronted by both the IMF and the Federal Reserve.

Eric:

There is a way that is already in place and functioning, a "voluntary" way that would not require anyone to pay out any more money than they are presently paying, but first, we need to get you Anna, off your obsession with gold as money.

Anna:

Again, Sir, you appear to be addressing some other "Anna"---- since when have I been "obsessed" with any such thing? I suggest you actually sit down and read my commentaries on the subject of money.

Eric:

You need to acknowledge that every human society that has ever started with a gold coin money medium has been corrupted and has failed.

Anna:

And you, Sir, need to admit that every human society seduced into the use of credit as money has similarly failed.

Eric:

Did you read what I wrote in regard to what is the true and actual purpose of money? To facilitate bartering? That the purpose of money is to trade what we have to offer for what we need or want that is offered by someone else, perhaps on the other side of the planet.

Anna:

Am I a complete fool, so as to need you to tell me that? How old do you think I am? Six? Maybe seven? It's outrageous that you are presuming to address me about these topics and making all these assumptions without --apparently--- bothering to read as much as two paragraphs of what I have written!

Eric:

Going back to gold will, set the stage for the gold lending bankers to reestablish themselves in control of our monetary system and our society. We must nip that in the bud by staying away from gold money. Look around, for the past one hundred years we have survived fairly well without precious metal money. Yes, the paper we use has lost most of the value it had back then, but the fault is NOT the use of paper! The fault is in the assignment of the oversight of the monetary system to the central government. This is the exact same reason all societies have failed. We need to change that at this time when the monetary system is at its bottom. When the bankers are in disrepute causing them to not be considered the most desirable managers of our monetary system. At this time we must reassign ownership of the Federal Reserve from CONgress to the People of the United States. Change the name to The People's Central Bank, and assign management control to the Legislatures of the Fifty Several States, assembled, not assigned to any committee. In order for the operation of TPCB to be modified a majority of 75% of the Legislatures must, agree. I contend that this design will be most effective in preventing corruption of our monetary system. As an additional selling point, the conversion of the Fed as I have described, will enable the continuation of a monetary system that is already in place and established and understood by all of the 390 million you Anna, claim are present in our country.

Anna:

Strictly speaking, we don't have a "monetary system" in this country. If you would kindly bother to look up and understand the definition of "money" you will readily see that money must have intrinsic value as a commodity and you will also see that the United States has instead adopted a system of "legal tender" and has used commercial paper instead of money as a currency for over a hundred years.

I know that this must come as Big News, but there hasn't even been a public treasury in this country since the 1920's. The United States Congress most certainly does NOT own the Federal Reserve--- and any competent observer would say that you have it exactly backwards. If you bothered to actually read our book, "You Know Something Is Wrong When....An American Affidavit of Probable Cause" you could see how this came about in detail.

As it is, I will merely observe that since the Congress does not own or control the Federal Reserve, your grand plan appears to suffer an insurmountable defect from the start.

Your idea of a "People's Central Bank" has been tried before, not once, but several times in our history--and all such attempts have failed because the international banking community would have none of it.

I have to say that I find the idea of either the state or "state of state" legislatures being put in charge of such an undertaking completely laughable and am still holding my sides.

The inevitable shift from the exclusive use of commercial paper as currency back to the use of commodity based currency is required by the realities of the world market. Just as other countries can't require us to trade in gold, silver, or cola nuts, we can't require them to trade in legal tender.

So, if we want to trade with China, we will have to trade in gold or silver or some other commodity acceptable to them, ditto all the other countries in the world.

If, again, you bother to read our cartoon book which is in large print and designed to be easy to read--- my actual stance on the issues will become much more apparent.

I have for some time held the view that all forms of currency in use throughout the world are fundamentally flawed and merely a gigantic fraud amounting to idolatry.

Even commodity-based currencies are not admitting the whole truth and are taking recourse to an evidently dishonest premise by proposing to use "some" commodities to represent "all" commodities. This practice is inevitably given to manipulation and abuse whether the commodities used as the so-called "standard of value" are gold and silver or beer and bratwurst.

No, Sir, I do NOT advocate the use of legal tender and credit as currency and I equally am NOT "obsessed" by returning to a precious metals standard.

What I have proposed is that we all simply admit the truth.

And the truth is that in terms of commerce the only things of value in this world are labor and natural resources---including the commodities we transform into finished products.

I favor the establishment of a currency based on the total value of all labor and all natural resources. This would not be a "one world currency", but rather, a currency in open competition with all the national and private currencies that now exist.

As to the reasons I favor the establishment of such a currency and its delivery via block chain technology--- it's all too complex to go into detail here---but it has to do with basic honesty and with the realities of trading in commodities.

It's not safe for people to trade in a commodity if they are not also producers of that commodity.

As everyone on Earth is at least potentially a producer of labor and has an interest in the natural resources of his or her country, a currency based on all the natural resources and labor of the Earth counterbalances and discourages market manipulations and hoarding and currency deficiencies and surpluses and currency wars and all the other evils that the traditional systems are heir to.

With such a universal currency available to people, it no longer matters so much if there is a run on gold or a bust in the European housing market, because these ups and downs are adjusted against the total value of all labor and all commodities---and wherever there is a "down" there is immediately a corresponding "up".

Delivery by blockchain technology vastly expands the ability of people in developing countries to safely participate in the world economy and gain access to basic banking services, allowing them to trade what they have for goods and services they need with a minimum of infrastructure required.

If you really sit down and think about it, you will realize that there is a desperate need for the world to re-think its ideas about both money and credit and that neither system has yielded the kinds of results that humanity needs.

Eric:

We need to amend the CONstitution to forbid all levels of government from borrowing any quantity of money from any source for any purpose what-so-ever!

Anna:

Well, then, we might as well pack it in and close down the federal government, close our borders, and close our markets to all foreign trade--- because foreign trade requires credit and the federal government requires credit to operate. That's why the United States Congress was allowed to borrow in the first place and that reality has not changed in over 200 years.

Eric:

The People's Central Bank will be allowed to loan money only to borrowers of the private sector. All interest will be assigned to the four levels of government with no level being able to determine where its funding shall come from or how much it shall be provided. There are a few more details but this is sufficient to present the basic plan.

Anna:

Another pipe dream devoid of a grasp of practical reality? The interplay between the people and the government is a balancing act between our demand for services and the cost of those services.

We demand welfare and regulation and many, many other things---and then we gripe. That is not a responsible course of action, but that is what we do. Instead of acting like adults and strictly limiting the government's responsibilities and activities, and therefore limiting its expenses, people have invited the government to do everything for them instead.

I am convinced that left with no limit of credit, people will soon be expecting their loyal public servants to wipe their butts and make up their minds for them.

Given this scenario--- what exactly do you expect to happen when you cut off all ability of government to access credit? And what do you expect the people to do, but continue to demand government services without showing any corresponding willingness to pay for those services?

So the people will with one hand naturally deprive government of credit and funding, and with the other, continue to demand "government action" in all sorts of arenas that our government was never directed nor intended to enter upon.

The problem has been exacerbated by the willingness of the "governmental services corporations" to provide us with all the services we demand and to even sell us services we never thought to ask for, but the basic problem remains that as consumers of government services people have been totally uncritical and irresponsible and have not drawn the line between what constitutes a "valid" function of government and what does not constitute a valid function of government?

Those are the hard choices we have to make and stick with, not embrace some totally whack-job idea of nothing but private credit as a means of controlling public spending---that is, controlling ourselves and people who are supposed to function as our fiduciary officers.

Davy Crockett while serving in Congress famously refused to allocate funding for relief of a family that lost their home in a fire--- not for lack of generosity or compassion--- but because he rightly considered such action to be outside the authority delegated to Congress when spending the people's money. He felt and so do I, that the "general welfare" clause required disinterested benefit to the public at large---such as building roads and bridges-- and that if people once discovered any avenue to "vote themselves money from the public purse for private benefit" we would all be in a world of hurt.

Can you prove him wrong?

He gave the family money out of his own pocket and urged the churches and clubs and other private organizations to do the same, because private charity is not an authorized function of our government.

LBJ notwithstanding, it still isn't, and most of the money spent for such purposes has never reached the people it was supposed to help. More than 80% of all welfare gets

sopped up by government bureaucracy in this country and 98% of all foreign aid never makes it to the intended recipients at all. Clearly, we need to revisit what is and is not a valid government function, what works, and what doesn't.

This sorting process is just a small part of the backlog of work waiting for a properly seated Continental Congress.

Eric:

We don't need any gold!

Anna:

Obviously, if we want to continue trading with China and most of the rest of the world, we do, for reasons already explained. If they want gold in payment and we want what they are selling, we definitely need gold. On the other hand, they can't force us to trade with them, can they? So, while the issue of whether we need gold or not is up to us and our buying choices, their demand for gold in exchange for services and goods they provide is up to them.

Eric:

And also, on a different note, we must support Donald Trump, not that he is perfect, but if Hillary is elected we can kiss our country goodbye. She will appoint liberals to the Supreme Court, shut down free speech on the Internet, outlaw gun ownership and cancel the right to assemble.

Anna:

Actually, if you read the 14th Amendment of the federal corporation constitution, you will see that American State Nationals including State National Citizens who are serving as officers of the land government are disenfranchised from voting in their private corporate elections.

This has been the circumstance since 1868 and since the 14th Amendment actually makes it illegal for us to vote in their elections, consenting to vote is actually the strongest evidence they have that you are "assuming" some form of "United States citizenship".

We have already discussed the unfortunate burdens and results of accepting any kind of citizenship, so I will leave it to our Readers to decide whether the pleasure of voting for Vanilla-flavored feces over Strawberry-flavored feces is sufficient enticement to: (1) violate the long-established law of the federal corporation or (2) consent to being considered a "citizen of the United States" and therefore both a slave of that government and a chattel owned by the United States, Inc.

As for me I have neither paid federal taxes nor voted in federal elections for many years and that fact that I ever did is proof that I was not well-served by the public education process.

Eric:

Cheers,

I am Eric Williams, The Radical In The Twilight Zone