

A Repeat of Answers Already Given



By Anna Von Reitz

Certain people who will remain unnamed and hopefully forgotten are tramping around pretending that they have valid questions that I haven't answered. In fact, I answered these questions (and more) a long time ago, and the replies are published. But just so that everyone sees the answers and knows that I answered them and that I have no purpose of evasion, here are the answers again. Would someone please make sure that Jeff Dougherty in Portland, Oregon, gets these plastered in front of his nose, so that he can stop pretending that I haven't answered?

1. Who swore you in as Judge? - please provide doc

The Chaplain of our State Assembly, as it happens, heard my Acceptance of Office, because the last competent judge in our Assembly died of complications of old age. Who hears your Acceptance doesn't matter. The fact that you Accepted the Office and that there were Witnesses to the fact --- that matters.

No documentation beyond the memory of those present and a written Witness Testimony exists; and it wasn't a "swearing" in. Land jurisdiction judges don't swear oaths at all, and if you read your Bible and knew your Land Law, you would already know this.

What oath did you take? and please provide a copy

As explained above, land jurisdiction Justices don't "swear Oaths" and NEVER have.

By what authority has made your husband Head of State?

Blood inheritance is what rules in the international jurisdiction of the sea -- this is the realm of Monarchs. It has nothing directly to do with the land jurisdiction that we are restoring, but since you ask --- he inherited the duty and responsibility from his ancestors all the way back to William the Conqueror. He didn't ask for it and didn't want it and avoided it most of his life. He came forward to challenge the Queen's bid to claim all our "abandoned" land as hers.

This was bad news for the Queen, but as Jim's ancestor, William Belcher, already granted you the status of being a "sovereign in your own right", it doesn't preclude 350 million other Americans from stepping forward and challenging her claim, too. Having Jim do it from a pre-established American sovereignty based on the Norman Conquest was simply a matter of demonstrating to the whole world that, yes, we are still here, and no, this land is not abandoned nor is it lacking valid sovereigns to operate in the international jurisdiction of the sea.

What impact did the 1783 Treaty of Peace have for We the People being recognized as sovereign people?

The language of the Treaty is complex enough so that many people -- apparently including you -- are deceived by it.

Among other stumbling blocks, even though it's purpose is to put the final touches on a peace process ending the Revolutionary War, the Treaty continues to call King George the "Prince of the United States" and also to name him the "Arch-Treasurer" thereof.

It speaks of the "free and independent and sovereign people of the United States" in almost the same breath that it speaks of "inhabits" remaining to provide essential services.

So what are we do make of all this?

The Treaty was written in 1783, but "the United States" -- which is the Municipal Holy Roman Empire Government and not "The United States" most people assume---was already established here by Benjamin Franklin in the 1750's when he applied to be Post Master and established a seat of government for it in Philadelphia.

So under the Treaty of Peace some thirty years later, they are agreeing that King George will act as the "Prince" (under the Pope) and the Arch-Treasurer of the Commonwealth and Municipal interests of "the United States".

This has nothing to do with our Union of republican states: The United States, which the King doesn't even deign to mention.

But in the second context, when speaking about the "free, independent, and sovereign people of the United States" versus the "inhabitants" thereof, as you can see down to this day, nobody living as a member of a Commonwealth and nobody subject to the Pope's Municipal Government can be considered "free", "sovereign" or "independent".

This references "the people" of the soil jurisdiction who are already recognized as "sovereigns in their own right" as "free, sovereign, and independent people of the United States" --- meaning free, sovereign, and independent people outside of "he United States" which is again, the Municipal Government.

The "inhabitants" remaining to provide "essential services" are British troops and loyalists and employees of the Holy Roman Empire, all working in various government-related jobs. They were allowed to remain here and work here to provide a continuity of services. Thus they are "inhabitants" --- temporarily "residing" here, but not part of the people.

In modern terms, these "inhabitants" then were fulfilling the same position as "US Citizens" now, even though the creation of "United States Citizens" (British) and "Citizens of the United States" (Holy Roman Empire) would not be more formally defined until the adoption of the Original Federal Constitution, "The Constitution for the united States of America", four years later.

What impact did the 1st Act of Congress 1789 have on the oath of office?

None at all, so far as the land and soil jurisdictions of this country are concerned, since none of us swear Oaths at all.

But both the international jurisdiction of the sea and the global municipal realm of commerce not only allow but require the swearing of oaths and the imposition of punishments, so, before the Congress could adopt the (British) Territorial Constitution called "The Constitution of the United States of America", in 1789, they had to change things to allow "swearing" and taking of oaths, yet make it clear that these pertained only to British Territorial and Municipal Officers and Offices. Which is precisely what the First Act of Congress in 1789 does.

What have you accomplished for the people of your home state Alaska?

My "home state" is Wisconsin, but as for Alaska---

Well, let's see, I kept the Queen from selling off her "tribute" rights and interest in our underground minerals to China, and I kept the Russians from claiming that the only valid land interests remaining in Alaska belonged to the Russian Orthodox Church here --- thereby forestalling their excuse to claim back Alaska as Russian land.

What have you done for your State of the Union that can compare to that?

Let's see what you can answer.

See this article and over 1600 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com
To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.