

## A Useful Screed, But.... An Important Edit



By Anna Von Reitz

I have run across this particular article on numerous occasions over the years and it is indeed a very useful and enlightening article, except for two really grave semantic errors that are repeated ----the part where the writer claims that there are "no Judicial Courts in America" and again, where they claim that there are "no Judges in America".

If we are going to give people a solid education and reliable guides, it's important that we get it right and pay close enough attention to our reader's inexperience to describe the context of what we are really saying.

A better way to explain the situation is that there are no Judicial Courts in the Federal Government. All the Judicial Courts are supposed to be in America, instead. Our Forefathers kept every iota of authority and ownership related to the land and soil of our States inviolate. So when they created the Federal Government to operate in the foreign jurisdictions of the sea and air, they didn't create any Federal Judicial Courts. Why would they? They were not allowing the foreign Federal Government to enter their jurisdiction nor letting them exercise any authority over them and their assets at home on the land and soil of their States, therefore, the Federal Government had no need for any Judicial Courts.

There was only one exception: The Supreme Court of The United States. You will note that to this day, the Supreme Court Justices are the only "Justices" in the Federal System. This first and only Supreme Court was supposed to provide oversight for Federal Government operations and to act as a faithful Interpreter of the Constitutions for the members of the Federal Congress, the Territorial Congress, and the Municipal Congress.

Instead, with the incapacity of the States of America following the Civil War, this Supreme Court fell into disuse, a separate Territorial United States Supreme Court and later, a separate Municipal United States Supreme Court began operations under slightly different names. As these two subcontractors, Territorial and Municipal, fell into the obvious malpractice of unilaterally amending their own Constitutions, the intended role of the one Supreme Court faded away and the remaining institution(s) became increasingly political.

In 1991, the Municipal United States Congress moved to eviscerate what was left of the Constitutional Federal Judiciary, by amending the Federal Judge's Oath to make it meaningless and to remove any obligation of the Judges to render decisions "agreeable" to the Constitutions. In this way, whatever power that remained vested in the Federal Judiciary as a whole was undermined and frittered away upon the discretion of individual Judges, rendering the Judicial Branch of the Federal Government ineffective and unable to mount any credible restraining influence upon the members of Congress. The Checks and Balances built into the Federal System were thus eroded and the People of this country betrayed.

No greater duty of reform is set before us than the overturning and repeal of this infamous Congressional meddling with the requirements of the Federal Judge's Oath.

So, instead of there being "no Judicial Courts in America", in fact, all the Judicial Courts are in America-- and the situation is just the opposite of what the writer assumes. All Judicial Courts are in America and none are vouchsafed to the Federal Government except for the One Supreme Court which is not functioning as intended, and that is the way it has been since the very beginning.

This is an important distinction and one that has to be thoroughly understood by Americans in search of Justice in this country. The return of our Judicial Courts to full operation will automatically signal the shut down and withdrawal of all the foreign federal military and maritime courts. The issue has already been decided by Milligan Ex Parte in 1863. All we have to do is kick-start Old Bessie and get our own Judicial Courts organized and serving the people again, at which point the admiralty courts and administrative tribunals have already agreed to retract back to their natural limited status and stop trying to gain false jurisdiction over us "out of necessity".

Once again, people, we have to govern ourselves, or someone else will do it for us.

The other incorrect meme in this article is the statement that there are "no Judges in America". There are Judges in America --- far too many of them, in fact. Our Judicial Courts are run by Justices, but because we've stupidly let so many of our Judicial Courts fall silent, there are precious few Justices to serve the people who claim their birthright political status as American State Nationals and American State Citizens. I know, because I am one of those few Justices.

The title "Judge" is, in our American system of government, unique to the Federal United States courts and their jurisdictions, not ours, with the exception of the Postal District Court Judges, who are obliged to enforce the laws of the the land jurisdiction of our country and to enforce the international and global laws affecting the land jurisdiction owed to our States of the Union.

So, contrary to what this writer says, there are scads of Judges in America, most of whom should not be here.

These Federal and Federal franchise State of State Statutory Courts are taking up the work of the largely vacated Judicial Courts and striving to keep control of the situation by impersonating Americans so as to draw them into the foreign jurisdictions of the admiralty and statutory courts.

On one side of the issue, this is a worthy above-and-beyond service--- they are, after all, for the most part, protecting us from murderers, armed robbers, rapists, and other violent criminals.

On our side of the issue, however, they are operating under color of law, prosecuting Americans under known false legal presumptions, and abusing their positions of trust to defraud and pillage us. These are still foreign "carpetbagger courts" and they are still milking and bilking Americans under completely fraudulent premises.

The take-home message for Americans is to take exception and exercise the exemptions and protections owed to you as non-combatant civilians, and meantime, get off your duffs and take up the work of self-governance: correct and record your political status as American State Nationals and American State Citizens, join your State Assembly, educate yourselves, and take up the work of operating your own Judicial Courts.

Our Judicial Courts are simple to operate, all our land and soil Law is based on The Ten Commandments, there have to be actual Injured Parties presenting their own issues (the one exception being when the victims of crimes are too disabled to present their own case, or dead, in which case, the Public Prosecutor takes over in their behalf), and the jury is "king". Not the Justice.

In our Judicial Courts, juries have the unequivocal right of jury nullification. If an American Jury finds a law repugnant, unjust, impractical, or unworkable, it is free to nullify the law, as if it never was. In this way, Americans have insured themselves against legislative error and injustice, and have maintained their sovereignty. But with the lapse and relative scarcity of Judicial Courts and growing public ignorance, the foreign admiralty and commercial and administrative courts have crept in and raised both Hell and Havoc.

When Americans complain about these foreign courts they need only reflect that if they got busy and organized and educated themselves, they wouldn't be under the thumb and at the mercy of these increasingly corrupt federal and federated state-of-state courts.

Another fundamental difference that lies between our Justices and their Judges is the role they play in the respective courts --- Justices ensure a level playing field, fair rules of evidence, and keep the proceedings in order under the rules of Due Process. At the end of the proceedings, the jury renders a decision and the Justice reads it --- a process called "pronouncement". That's it. The Justice in an American Judicial Court doesn't address the facts or interpret the Law; the jury does all that. This is because in our courts, the people are sovereign and the juries in America literally act as the king.

This is in stark opposition to what goes on in a Statutory Court, where in fact the Judge acts as a Hired Jurist paid to interpret and enforce the statutory law in one of four possible specific venues and capacities. The Judge takes over the place of king and decides everything and the function of the jury is in the manner of a group of corroborating Witnesses, paid to sit and listen and nod their heads.

The only power that such a jury has is the power of "voiding error". If some jurors absolutely disagree with the conclusions of the Judge, they can void the judgement and the findings are inconclusive. Unless the Judge agrees that an error has been made (which is a rare occurrence, as this requires them to admit that they made an error) the whole issue can be re-tried.

Alternatively, if the Prosecutors bringing a claim are shown to deliberately lie or misrepresent material fact or to lie about the applicable statute or fail to bond the case or, or, or.... the Judge in a Statutory Court can throw the whole case out the door "with prejudice" and the issue cannot be raised again. If the procedure is not air-tight, the case is not air-tight, which is why procedure takes up such a dismal amount of time and attention in Statutory Court --- the object is to acquit the Judge, not to guarantee Justice.

We saw an example of this in the Bundy Case where Federal Agents outright lied and misrepresented fact, and the Judge reacted by throwing the whole thing out the door with prejudice. They endangered her by lying to her, so she was well-justified in this reaction, which just happened to serve the cause of justice, too.

With these caveats and insights as to where our American Judicial Courts exist and who is supposed to be operating them, and also the reasons why Judges (who should be relatively rare) are over-running America like lemmings on a stampede, read on:

#### **RIGHTS THAT CANNOT BE TAKEN AWAY.**

**We are NOT U.S. CITIZENS**

**STATUTES ARE NOT LAW – TO BE CONVICTED UNDER A STATUTE YOU MUST HAVE MY CONSENT.**

**We do NOT GIVE OUR CONSENT EVER. We are NOT U.S. CITIZENS, i.e. We are living Souls and not a dead entity written in all upper-case letters on a piece of paper or bond paper being claimed as a vessel owned by another living or dead entity.**

**A "STATUTE" is NOT a law! *Flournoy v. First National Bank of Shreveport*, 197 LA 1057. 3 So.2d 244, 248.**

**A "CODE" is NOT a law! *In Re Self v. Rhay*, Wn 2d 261, in point of fact in law.**

**A concurrent or "joint resolution of legislature is NOT "Law". *Koenig v. Flynn*, 258 N.Y. 292, 179 N.E. 705, 707; *Ward v. State*, 176 OKL. 368, 56 P.2d 136, 137; *State ex rel. Todd v. Yelle*, 7 Wash. 2d 43, 110, P.2d 162, 165).**

**STATUTE. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 4th Edition. The written will of the legislature, solemnly expressed according to the forms prescribed in the constitution; an act of the legislature.**

**U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION – The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the codes, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are "not the law". *Self v. Rhay*, 61 Wn (2d) 261.**

**U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION – ALL codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities ONLY, not human/Creators in accordance with God's Laws. All codes, rules and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process..." *Rodriques v. Ray Donovan*, U.S. Department of Labor, 769 F.2d, 1344, 1348 (1985).**

**Supreme Court 1796- This decision has never been overturned:**

**United States Supreme Court Decision from 1796- [*Cruden v. Neale*, 2 N.C. 338 (1796) 2 S.E.] "There, every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowman without his consent."**

**"There are NO Judicial Courts in America and have not been since 1789. "Judges" do NOT enforce Statutes and Codes. Executive Administrators enforce Statutes and Codes. *FRC v. GE*, 281 U.S. 464 *Keller v. Potomac Elec. Co.*, 261 U.S. 428 1 Stat. 138-178"**

**"There have NOT been any "Judges" in America since 1789. There have only been Administrators. *FRC v. GE*, 281 U.S. 464 *Keller v. Potomac Elec. Co.*, 261 U.S. 428 1 Stat. 138-178"**

**"The Supreme Court has warned, "Because of what appears to be Lawful commands [Statutory Rules,**

**Regulations and -codes–ordinances- and Restrictions] on the surface, many citizens, because of their respect for what appears to be law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance... [deceptive practices, constructive fraud, barratry, legal plunder, conversion, and malicious prosecution in inferior administrative State courts].” (United States v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179, 187, 76 S.Ct. 281, 100 L.Ed. 185 (1956);”**

**“The Common Law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land. The codes, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are “not the law.” (Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn 2d 261), They are the law of government for internal regulation, not the law of man, in his separate but equal station and natural state, a sovereign foreign with respect to government generally.**

**“A concurrent or ‘joint resolution’ of legislature is not “Law,” (Koenig v. Flynn, 258 N.Y. 292, 179 N. E. 705, 707; Ward v State, 176 Okl. 368, 56 P.2d 136, 137; State ex rel. Todd v. Yelle, 7 Wash.2d 443, 110 P.2d 162, 165).**

**All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not human/Creators in accord with God’s Laws. “All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process of Law..”(Rodriques v. Ray Donovan, U.S. Department of Labor, 769 F.2d 1344, 1348 (1985)); ...lacking due process of law, in that they are ‘void for ambiguity’ in their failure to specify the statutes’ applicability to ‘natural persons,’ otherwise depriving the same of fair notice, as their construction by definition of terms aptly identifies the applicability of such statutes to “artificial or fictional corporate entities or ‘persons’, creatures of statute, or those by contract employed as agents or representatives, departmental subdivisions, offices, officers, and property of the government, but not the ‘Natural Person’ or American citizen Immune from such jurisdiction of legalism.”**

**“A “Statute’ is not a Law,” (Flournoy v. First Nat. Bank of Shreveport, 197 La. 1067, 3 So.2d 244, 248), A “Code’ or Statute’ is not a Law,” (Flournoy v. First Nat. Bank of Shreveport, 197 La. 1067, 3 So.2d 244, 248),”**

**“A “Code’ is not a Law,” (In Re Self v Rhay Wn 2d 261), in point of fact in Law).” [http://www.soaringspirit.us/exposing\\_the\\_fraud.html](http://www.soaringspirit.us/exposing_the_fraud.html)**