

Regarding the Treaty of Paris 1947



By Anna Von Reitz

What you are looking at is another attempted unlawful conversion of national authorities by the globalists, however, no government anywhere has any right to give away anything that we are owed. Ever. They can falsely claim that we "volunteered" to give up our birthrights, but cannot stand in the face of our denial of their actions. This is particularly true of The United States of America, as we never conformed, confirmed, not accepted any fall-out occasioned by or created by the British Territorial United States nor the Municipal United States (Roman Catholic/Municipal/Pontifical "Government") purportedly "in our behalf", including any such Peace Treaty, and we don't do so now.

Here are the kind of "citizens" that these vermin are offering to claim and subject to the tender mercies of the "UN Corporation" ---- not the United Nations organization. See the succinct definition of "U.S. citizens" given below:

"The U.S. citizens [citizens of the District of Columbia] residing in one of the state of the union are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an "individual entity". *Wheeling Steel Corporation v. Fox*, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L. Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773."

So are you a "U.S. citizen" and does any of this verbiage apply to you?

Note the key words of deceit --- "residing" and "individual" -- more words that have been twisted and corrupted into "words of art" by the legal chicanery professionals. British Territorial and Municipal "citizens" merely "reside" here in the actual geographically defined States temporarily. And we, the actual People, are said to "reside" --- also temporarily in their "States of State" and "STATES OF STATE" jurisdictions.

To illustrate: A living Californian walks into a STATE OF CALIFORNIA court. He is entering a foreign municipal "STATE" and for the time being, is considered to "reside" there. The same thing can be said if he enters a State of California court --- he is temporarily "residing" in the foreign domain of the British Territorial "State of California".

But flip that around, and any Municipal or Territorial "citizen" entering upon California's land jurisdiction is "residing" in California --- just there temporarily to provide "essential government services".

British Territorial United States and Municipal United States citizens cannot own land in our States and we choose not to own anything in their "states of states", so it is important that you deny "residing" in the State of Ohio or the STATE OF IOWA or wherever you happen to be, and draw the distinction that you live in California, or Ohio, or Iowa.

The word "individual" has also been much abused. They use the word "individual" as shown above to denote single franchises and single franchisees of their corporations, while we use it to describe single unique living people. These two usages of the same word which are almost diametrically

opposed then give rise to endless opportunities to confuse identities and capacities of both people and things.

To illustrate: "On the night of July 7th, 1951, JOHN MAYNARD DOE, was involved in a car accident that netted the largest single auto insurance claim in Arkansas history." translates in Federal-ese to "On the night of July 7th, 1951, JOHN MAYNARD DOE [Foreign Grantor Trust from Puerto Rico] was involved in a car accident....." Everyone automatically and reasonably enough assumes that "JOHN MAYNARD DOE" is a living man, when in fact, for the purposes of the MUNICIPAL COURT, we are talking about a constructive ESTATE trust "residing" in Puerto Rico.

In the same way, look at this: "The "individuals" involved, JOHN MAYNARD DOE and ELIZABETH "LIBBY" MAE HUNT, were severely injured." Again, we assume that only living people can be injured and interpret the verbiage accordingly, but in Federal-speak, two foreign ESTATE trusts have been "injured".

All this language is deliberately used to deceive and confuse and alienate people from their identity and their nationality and most importantly, their rights and their property assets. This can only be interpreted as deliberate and self-interested criminal activity on the part of politicians, courts, government agencies, international governments, banks, and military personnel involved in these schemes, which are capital crimes under the terms of the Geneva Conventions.

The attitude and practice of the Vermin has been ---- "Oh, it's against the law to shoot grouse? Well, we will just call them "Spruce Hens" instead and blast away...."

Still a grouse by any other name is still a grouse and it is still against the Public Law to shoot them.

And nobody can make you a "citizen" of the UNITED NATIONS or any other criminal organization absent your knowing and willing participation and agreement. I would strongly suggest that anyone raising this issue should be pinned to the wall and educated on the fine points. And just to be absolutely and doubly sure, you might all add a "Declaration" to your recorded documents making it perfectly clear that you do not subscribe to any element of the Treaty of Paris 1947.

See this article and over 1300 others on Anna's website here:
www.annavonreitz.com

To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.