

Let Those Who Have Understanding See



By Anna Von Reitz

Today I am posting a long and potent list of court decision citations kindly provided by Larry Moe, which taken together can lead to very mistaken assumptions if you are still in the dark about the nature of the federal government versus the actual government of this country.

First, read through these valuable citations which expose the nature of the federal and federated state and county courts, plus the need to establish jurisdiction ---and then engage your brain cells for my brief commentaries about each at the end.

"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)

"All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void." Marbury vs. Madison, [5 US \(2 Cranch\) 137, 174, 176](#), (1803)

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them." Miranda vs. Arizona, [384 US 436](#) p. 491

"When jurisdiction is challenged the burden of proof is on the government. Title 5 USC Sec 556(d)

"No sanction can be imposed absent proof of jurisdiction." "Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be 'assumed', it must be proved to exist!" Stanard v. Olesen, [74 S. Ct. 768](#)

"The law requires PROOF OF JURISDICTION to appear on the Record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings." Hagans v. Lavine, [415 U.S. 533](#)

"No state shall convert a liberty into a license, and charge a fee therefore." Murdock v. Pennsylvania, [319 U.S. 105](#)

"If the State converts a right (liberty) into a privilege, the citizen can ignore the license and fee and engage in the right (liberty) with impunity." Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham, Alabama, [373 U.S. 262](#)

1. In the first instance, Keller v. PE, the federal administrator alleges that there are no judicial courts in "America".

What they should have said is that there are no judicial courts in the "Territorial or Municipal United States"--that is, in federal jurisdiction-- but such a truthful and unobscured statement is too much to expect.

In America, the actual America, we have always had American Common Law Courts that are judicial courts, also known as public courts of record. They have been largely inactive and unstaffed since @ 1965, but they exist and they are used and they are peopled by living, breathing Americans standing on the land and soil they are heir to.

It is only in the foreign international jurisdiction of the Federal Territorial and Municipal United States that "courts" assume the character of in-house administrative tribunals and cease to have judicial authority. This is because these foreign courts are supposed to be dealing exclusively with incorporated franchises instead of living people and are incompetent to address living people as living people.

2. The Clearfield decision cited also says clearly that courts are administrative tribunals but falls short of saying which courts. Again, it should say "federal courts and federal franchise state of state and county courts" are administrative tribunals, but since they are talking from their perspective about their courts, they can be somewhat forgiven for not being more explicit.

3. In the Marbury v. Madison case, notice the small "l" on laws, which indicates legislative "laws" which indicates statutory laws of incorporated franchises infringing on the guarantees owed to our "vessels" in international jurisdiction. These are federal courts sorting out cross-jurisdictional claims, so again, all is not exactly what it seems. What is legislated as "law" by federal territorial and municipal corporation legislatures cannot abridge or overcome any Public Law on American soil, and most especially cannot abrogate the constitutional contracts owed by the federal subcontractors to the states and people. For example, the federal government corporations passed the National Defense Authorization Act in 2011, providing that U.S. citizens can be arrested and indefinitely detained, but if you are not a U.S. citizen and you are owed the guarantees of the actual Constitution no "Act" of the Territorial or Municipal United States Congress that abrogates your guaranteed rights can be sustained.

4. The next three citations concerning jurisdiction are sometimes ignored by State of State/STATE OF STATE and County/COUNTY courts, until you remind them that they have incorporated themselves as franchises of the federal territorial and municipal court systems and no longer have any discretion about obeying federal standards. That is, because they have adopted the status and nature of corporate franchises as "states of states".

5. In Murdoch v. Pennsylvania note that the word "state" is not capitalized, and the word "liberty" is used. This is very clearly talking about one of our states of the Union trespassing upon and licensing a federally mandated "liberty" granted to a federal citizen---for example, an attempt to license voting. Please note that Americans enjoy "freedoms" while federal citizens have "liberties", and that our actual states are referred to using the small "s" in the federal system of things. Actual states occupy a completely different jurisdiction than States of States, and just as they infringe upon us, it is possible for us to infringe upon them. I know some very good men and women who are sitting in jail in Colorado because they wouldn't believe me and wrap their heads around this point. We have our rights and turf, but the Federales also have theirs.

6. In the final quote, someone has again mish-mashed language -- a right is not a liberty. A right is a material asset. A liberty is a privilege granted by a higher authority. For a "citizen"-- a servant of the government -- the government is the entity conferring the privilege. So the right interpretation of this citation requires striking out the words in parenthesis and paying attention to what remains. We see that the word "State" is capitalized and that it is preceded by "the"--- a definite article. This could reference any one of the land jurisdiction States, or the concept of "State" in general, but not a State of State. We see also that it speaks of "citizens" which, as in the prior case, indicates that this is a cross-jurisdictional issue in which our States were attempting to tax or license or otherwise limit federal citizens living on American soil. An example would be a State levied "Poll Tax" on the right of a federal citizen to vote. From our perspective federal voting rights (as an example) are a privilege granted by the foreign federal corporations to their employees and dependents, but from their

perspective, these privileges are considered material rights. One man's trash is another man's treasure.

As these examples demonstrate, opinions issued by federal and federated state-of-state and county courts are written from their own perspective--- not from ours. When they talk about "courts" --in the absence of any further qualification-- they are talking about their courts, not ours. When they talk about "rights" they are talking about the rights of "citizens" -- not our natural and unalienable rights as people. When they talk about "liberties" they are talking about privileges enjoyed by federal employees and dependents, as when a sailor in the Navy is given "liberty ashore"-- not our freedoms.

These same presumptions apply to everything and anything published by the federal government corporations and by their state-of-state and federated counties and agencies, including their codes, their statutes, their applications, their regulations-- it is all and always written from their perspective, not ours. It takes no small effort to learn and to twist your perspective around to see what they are really talking about.

We are considered to be "non-resident aliens" with respect to their watery international jurisdiction. We are considered to be "non-citizens" and are referred to in their lingo as "United States Nationals" instead. Their "states" are what we recognize as "States of States" and "STATES OF STATES", while to them, our states are referred to like this--- "the California State" -- which represents the international land jurisdiction or simply "California", for example.

Attempting to read federal or federated state or county publications without being aware of their context is endlessly confusing and trying to use citations from their court cases often results in nonsense arguments because the words mean one thing to us, and something else to them.

Where, for example, would we be left if we took the statements in Keller v. PE (the first example above) on face value? We would believe and would have evidence seeming to support the idea that there are literally no judicial courts in America --- and we would be wrong, because the Federales are talking about their courts not being judicial courts and not referencing our courts at all.

The Judicial Power in this country was retained by the People. We didn't give that away to any foreign power. As a direct result, the Territorial and Municipal Courts function as administrative tribunals. That fact does not imply that our American Common Law courts are non-existent, invalid, or lacking judicial power when properly invoked by people having the standing to operate these judicial forums.

When the Bundys get their wish and an actual American County Court is invoked by Americans who have corrected their political status and elected their own justices and sheriffs and other officers of the court, it may be a rare event in the past fifty years, but it will not be lacking in judicial power and enforcement authority.

See this article and over 800 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com
To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.