

# IMPORTANT QUESTION SUBJECT

## For Present and Former Bar Association Members



By Anna Von Reitz

For Former and Present Bar Members

Remember Eve in the Garden of Eden? Satan said that if she ate the apple, she wouldn't die.....and she didn't.....at least not right away.....?

Remember when your parents (who were deceived themselves) or a well intentioned employer told you that you "had to have a Social Security Number"? And that is true, if you happened to be applying for employment with the federal government. Then, of course, you would need to enroll in their retirement and employee benefits program....but not otherwise.

And it is the same thing with the Bar Associations telling new JD graduates that they have to have a Bar Card....which is true, if you want to be a prosecutor for the federal government corporations and their "federated state of state franchises" and an employee of the court, but otherwise not.

The pure fact is that there is no requirement for anyone to be a Bar Association Member to engage in the profession of law in this country and there never has been. I defy anyone anywhere to prove that there is any general requirement to be a Bar Member to use the court facilities, present cases, or offer effective counsel to others with or without pay.

The fact is that the perpetuation of these "mandatory" Social Security enrollment and Bar Association Membership half-truths are undertaken in self-interest by undeclared foreign interests. Look up the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) if you think I am lying. Also see Trinsey v. Pagliaro and the cases that Robert F. Kennedy fought pertaining to these issues.

Happily, quite a number of the best people working in the profession of law today have realized this and they are leaving the Bar to stew in its own juice. This is happening as a result of Bar Associations kicking members out for the sin of actually defending and protecting their clients' best interest, and it is happening as a result of lawyers waking up, going, "OMG!" -- and ripping up their Bar Cards accordingly.

The lawyers among us are now waking up along with the rest of the populace and realizing that they have been sold a total bill of goods, and that the Bar Associations and their members will be held accountable for their misdeeds.

The fact is that lawyers can function either as attorneys-at-law or they can function as counselors-at-law. These are "capacities" within the profession in which a lawyer can choose to work, just as you can choose to work in the capacity of a hotel manager or a hotel bartender and still be working in a hotel. Attorneys join the Bar to gain group insurance and bonding benefits. Also so their buddies in the fraternity will gang up on any outsiders.

Counselors pay their own insurance and bonds and otherwise don't have any reason to join the Bar, because they aren't involved in the disposition of public property or addressing issues related to public employees-- that is, they aren't working in administrative capacities as members of an administrative court.

Attorneys-at-law traditionally function as property managers involved in the administration of civil cases in Article I courts dealing with in-house legislative "laws" and statutes. This is why those working in administrative courts supported by the United States Districts, the Territorial States of States, and the Municipal STATES OF STATES are all required to be "attorneys" and Bar Members by their employers.

Attorneys work in administrative tribunals. Not judicial courts.

This fact accounts for these frank admissions about the nature of the federal territorial and municipal courts and their various state-of-state franchises operating on our shores:

"There are no Judicial courts in America and there has not been since 1789, Judges do not enforce Statutes and Codes. Executive Administrators enforce Statues and Codes. There have not been any Judges in America since 1789. There have just been Administrators." *FRC v. GE* [281 US 464](#), *Keller v. PE* [261 US 428](#) 1 Stat. 138-178

"Courts are Administrative Tribunals" *Clearfield Trust, et al v. United States* [318 U.S. 363](#) (1943).

Counselors-at-law traditionally function in judicial court capacities and have the duty to protect and defend their living clientele, unlike their attorney-at-law brethren who are limited to dealing with public property and public employees and incorporated "things", either belonging to or working for or working with the government corporations.

Naturally, when a counselor-at-law appears a number of things are different about the nature and tenor of the proceedings.

A counselor-at-law is not required to enter an appearance prior to a court date and may simply walk in with a brief explanation to the judge that he or she is working in the capacity of a counselor-at-law and providing effective assistance to the Plaintiff or Defendant.

Often, to further clarify things, the judge will ask if the counselor-at-law is a member of the Bar Association. If not, the proper response is simply, "I don't have a card (or more properly, a "ticket") with the Bar."

This is referring obliquely to the Bid Bond that the Bar Associations post in maritime cases involving incorporated entities, and is further signaling the judge that the Plaintiff or Defendant is appearing in the capacity of a living man or woman and that the court has to shift gears from bartending to hotel management-- or, as it actually is for these courts, from international sea jurisdiction to international land jurisdiction.

The first difference for the court's notice when a counselor-at-law appears is the explicit revelation of the capacity in which the Plaintiff/Defendant is operating.

If he or she is operating in their actual, living capacity as a man or woman standing on the land jurisdiction of the United States, they are owed all their constitutional rights and guarantees including a counselor-at-law who can advise them but not "represent" them, because they are presumed to be free people above the age of twenty-one and competent to make their own decisions. That's why they have hired a counselor-at-law instead of an attorney.

That is also why they are forcing the court to engage them as people under the Public Law of the United States or the General Session Law of the State instead of as "things" subject to the Private Administrative Law of any foreign territorial or municipal corporation or state of state or incorporated county franchise tribunal.

Attorneys represent "things" --- corporate franchises, wards of the state, bankrupt businesses, murdered victims of crime, mentally incompetent people, --all things that cannot "stand for" or answer for themselves. That is why they have to be "re-presented" by a substitute acting "for" them.

Counselors-at-law assist in presenting cases for living people.

Notice the difference: attorneys "represent" and administer the affairs of their clients often without regard for or even consulting with their clients. For example, they cut plea-bargains and waive rights and sell off property in whatever way best benefits the court. This is because they work for the court and the client is at best considered a public trust subject to the court's administration. And this is true whether you pay the blighter or not.

Notice that counselors-at-law "present" cases with and for their patrons, who administer their own affairs and make their own decisions throughout the proceedings, retain all their rights and prerogatives and do not willingly subject themselves to the court's administration.

Now, obviously, from the court's standpoint, it is very convenient to be able to dictate whatever happens in each and every case, so as to "administer" it as best suits the "public good" and the "good of the court" ---and the court's corporate employers, of course, without regard for any such niceties as equity owed to living people, or any rights owed to living people.

Just as obviously, it is a death knell to justice and an end to all freedom for living people to allow this state of affairs to go on.

When even the lawyers among us are so dumbed down and ignorant that they think the Bar Association has the power to obstruct them from pursuing their vocation, it's time to outlaw the Bar Associations, because they are clearly over-stepping any rational function or status that they have.

U.S. District, State of State and STATE OF STATE courts can demand whatever credentials they wish from people that they hire to represent their interests, just as other private and public interests can demand whatever credentials they desire from their employees.

Turning this situation around requires all of us, including the legal eagles among us, to wake up and take responsibility for what we are doing and what we are allowing. If a "State of State" Legislature

can pass a statutory "law" saying that all its court officials have to be Bar Association Members, our State Legislatures can just as easily pass a General Session law saying that none of our courts will allow Bar Association Members.

Pay attention to what I am telling you: State of Wyoming is a Territorial Franchise Court. STATE OF WYOMING is a Municipal Franchise Court. Both of these are foreign corporation franchises like the local Target store. They are limited to running administrative tribunals and they can require all the people in their "court system" to be Bar Association members until the cows come home, because these are private administrative tribunals.

But the Wyoming State Court belongs to the people of Wyoming and they run judicial courts of record that are superior to any private administrative tribunals and they can mandate that no Bar Association members are allowed to practice law in their venue ---thereby providing plenty of work for counselors-at-law.

That this great country and its people have been hoodwinked and pulled off course for so long by selfish private interests is an immense and horrifying Breach of Trust, but it is one that we can swiftly rectify by changing our own presumed political status and thereby changing the "presumed" capacity in which we choose to act in court and also changing the capacity in which our lawyers act.

All those former Bar Attorneys and those who are thinking seriously now of tearing up those cards? Learn the truth and set yourselves free of the imaginary shackles that the Bar Associations have placed on you. You can come into any court in this country in the capacity of a Counselor-at-Law and there is nothing any of the courts can say except, "Yes, of course...."

-----  
See this article and over 800 others on Anna's website here: [www.annavonreitz.com](http://www.annavonreitz.com)  
To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.