

## Pernicious Ignorance -- For Richard



By Anna Von Reitz

Just trying to come up with a male equivalent to the epithet your pal Deegan threw at me, so you could have a better appreciation of how that feels and what it means and just how "low-life" your buddy is. Feel free to take the message for what it is and edit as you like. I have had to deal with a lot of stupid people on this journey and even some truly wrong-headed fools who are incapable of learning, but I draw the line on trying to work with those that advocate violence and can't keep a civil tongue in their heads.

I never implied that "everyone's family was Christian", but those that are, came from only two major sources: Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholicism. Since my family came from Western Europe, their familiarity with the teachings of Yeshuah came via the Roman Catholic Church and for quite a number of centuries in that part of the world, virtually everyone who was Christian was Roman Catholic. These are facts so obvious and so widely known that it never occurred to me that I would have to explain the context of my comment to any adult. Nor that there is a profound difference between a Lutheran and a Jesuit.

The "documented proof" is right there in front of your face---and everyone else's. Look up the Great Seal of either the United States or the United States of America. What is the shield being used? The Belcher shield Coat of Arms. They are part of our array, not the Queen's. In the world of international government and politics, there is absolutely no doubt whose "recognized sovereignty" was used to represent the sovereignty of this country. In the realm of Monarchs and other Grand Poobahs, only those with "standing" are allowed to play on their chess board. As I have explained many times, in order to engage in international trade and commerce back in the 1700's, America needed to be represented by someone with the credentials the rest of the world would accept, and so William Belcher became that person and his Coat of Arms was extended to cover the American fleets. I also explained the source of his "recognized sovereignty" ---- the Norman Conquest ---- and the fact that he extended similar "recognized sovereignty" to all Americans.

The problem for you and your buddies is that you don't understand the complexities of the verbiage you are using, so you are confusing things. You are confusing the basic issue of the "sovereignty" of individual living men with the "recognized sovereignty" of Monarchs and nations and Heads of State. And also failing to appreciate all the attendant history and what it means. So when an ape-man like Deegan goes and beats his chest and says, "I am sovereign! I am king of me!" ---- nobody is contesting that, and frankly, nobody cares. William Belcher even made it possible for a low-life idiot scum like Deegan to claim "sovereignty in his own right" and exercise the other kind of "sovereignty" I am talking about. But certain people are so ignorant that they don't even follow the gist of the conversation and so miss the message entirely. Americans were given a great gift by William Belcher who did not seek to rule over them, but who --- much to the consternation of the other players --- set Americans free, even as William the Conqueror set his own ancestors free of feudal bondage.

The struggle that we are engaged in is basically a struggle between those who want a system of feudalism under a king and those who want a system that honors the "Natural and Unalienable

Rights" of every man, woman, and child. The Belchers already and long ago came down on the side of "Natural and Unalienable Rights" -- and paid with their blood for it.

I not only understand the concept of "Persons" I have been teaching that concept and all the rest that goes with that concept for many years to many people. If you had bothered to read what I have written on the topic you would know that.

So it is time for you to get a lesson --- there are in fact three kinds of legal fiction "persons --- unincorporated, corporate, and incorporated. There are indeed "States" and I invite you to deny that the conceptualization of "England", "Scotland" and "Ireland" is necessary prior to the conceptualization of "Great Britain" and the further conceptualization of the "United Kingdom". You and your friends are like school kids who just "discovered" the concept of "Great Britain" and want to deny the existence of everything that went before and everything that came after. Even worse, you want to deny the logical sequence of the developments just described. You want to put the UK in front of Scotland, for example, and it just doesn't work that way. I am not the "ignorant" one on the page, Richard. I am the one who directed your attention to The Definitive Treaty of Peace in the first place, remember? Uh-duh?

-----

See this article and over 1500 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.