

Please Cease and Desist -- That's THEIR Law, Not Ours

By Anna Von Reitz



I am in receipt of the latest teaching video entitled "The Elements of a Republican Assembly" sponsored by something calling itself "The Federation of America" --- which is self-evidently not our Federation of States--- and most of the information is either wrong or disingenuously focused on foreign law that has nothing whatsoever to do with republican assemblies.

Administrative law is the internal law of corporations, as the name might suggest, and the entirety of Administrative Code and the Administrative Tribunal system has recently been gutted by United States Supreme Court rulings reminding the Territorial Congress that they have no ability to delegate their own legislative powers.

So the only persons subject to Administrative courts and Administrative law are those employed by or dependent upon the corporations in question. We should not be wasting our time beyond setting up an effective and brief response procedure for our people to refuse summons and other inappropriate solicitations from administrative tribunals.

Administrative law has nothing whatsoever to do with "The Elements of a Republican Assembly" and everything to do with the rightful role of a Litigation Committee within a republican Assembly --- wherein we work out strategies to rebuff attempts to subject us to foreign corporate law (codes, rules, statutes, regulations, policies, etc.).

Due Process is primarily a commercial process which is basically all that remains for general society as a means of remedy until we get our own courts up and running, but we can't achieve remedy by entering their courts which are barely described as "courts" and more closely resemble collection agencies for predetermined creditors.

We have to redirect our people to international commercial courts, give them means to avoid "District" Courts and work out the procedures to make counterclaims and appeals directly to unprejudiced UCC judges outside the US system.

There are numerous points that I have to take exception to; Doug's teaching on the Supremacy Clause is mistaken and gives a totally inappropriate emphasis on the Federal Constitutions as if they alone define "the Law of the Land". This is a grave error.

The reason that the Constitutions make such a big deal of being "the Law of the Land" is that they are primarily written as guides for **Sailors**. Not Landsmen. The Supremacy Clause is there to give a proper reminder to the Sailors that while they are **on land** this is the Law of the Land **for them**, not us.

Our Law of the Land goes far beyond the Federal Constitutions and embraces the entirety of International Land Law, including international treaties, and our own American Public Laws pertaining to Land Law, including but not limited to Amendments to the Federal Constitutions which were created from 1787 to 1861.

Remember always that only about 8% of all Federal Law legitimately pertains to us, and only when we are engaged in federally regulated activity or we find ourselves in a legitimate federal enclave, like the District of Columbia or a Post Office or a military base.

Doug's teaching that our State and County Assemblies are subject to delegated authorities found in the Constitution are suggestive in ways that are not adequately explained and narrowed down to the two or three instances

where our State Assemblies have delegated responsibilities -- such as paying for Federal Services in gold and silver coin, while **our County Assemblies have absolutely NO INTERFACE with the Federal Subcontractors at all and don't operate in any international jurisdiction whatsoever.**

Don't give anyone, least of all our people, the impression that they are "generally subject" to the delegation of their own powers, especially when the Subcontractors are in default. The Federal Constitutions are **service contracts** and our States contracted for those services, so we do have a few responsibilities which are simply stated, but otherwise and apart from the 8% of circumstances cited above, neither our States nor our Counties nor our people are subject to delegated powers which exist ONLY in international jurisdictions.

The pervasive presence of the Federal Subcontractors in the Union States is unnatural and not part of the intent of the Federal Constitutions. They are here as part of an illegal mercenary occupation --- not a military occupation, and we are in the process of putting an end to that gravy train.

Doug's statements that Time Outs issued by Assemblies are "illegal" and "unlawful" for lack of Due Process is a plain misunderstanding of Due Process and where Due Process applies (contracts) and where it does not apply.

We are not under contract within the context of our participation in our own public government affairs and we do **not** require a court process to determine and publish and enforce standards of behavior and processes such as agenda setting, at our own public meetings.

Anyone who says that we are subject to ANY administrative process or commercial code foreign to our own in the conduct of our own assembly business has gotten "lost" in the maze of foreign law and no longer clearly sees and understands our own law and prerogatives.

The members of an assembly are equal in standing to anyone else in that assembly and the bulk of the members as represented by their direct votes in

any matter do not have to suffer attacks and disruptions and the misplaced polemics of confused people who think that they have the "right" to waste everyone else's time and energy.

This may apply to meetings where people are addressing their public servants, but it does not ---emphatically does not -- apply to meetings among equals.

Let's make this blindingly and forever clear to everyone reading this. I have the absolute right to appoint, direct, discipline, hire and fire, and otherwise train all Coordinators. I do not offer any volunteer an employment contract and therefore do not owe them any commercial "Due Process" --- if that isn't clear it sure as hell ought to be.

The six California Coordinators were given clear and fair instructions from the first and were given multiple chances to get their heads screwed on prior to being fired. THAT "opportunity to correct" is the essence of Due Process and fairness -- not any arbitrary commercial rote. They were told to let the past be past and work together as a team. They had the choice. They couldn't stop attacking Michelle and insisted on creating more drama and disruption instead.

So they are gone and that was my executive decision based on my direct experience and observation. Anyone who is told to let bygones be gone and who stands there and nods or remains silent in apparent agreement --- and then proceeds to do exactly the opposite for two months, is clearly operating in bad faith. They got three chances and I ground to a halt on the fourth. I gave them the "Due Process" I owed them, which is not a commercial due process, but a patient and kindly and repeated explanation of what they were doing wrong. The decision not to correct was theirs and theirs alone.

"Unrebutted affidavits" are foreign law, not American---again, you are **focusing on the wrong law** and failing to put that law in proper context as a **sidebar issue** we have to deal with in the Litigation Committees. Americans acting as Americans can't even make "affidavits" -- they aren't officers acting in any international capacity and instead must offer "Testimony in the **Form** of an Affidavit".

Our real job as Americans is to learn and apply **our own law**. Our **goal** is to set up **our own courts**. We now have a proper standard in the form of the "American Law and Procedure" multi-volume set, and that and the related American Common Law reference books we have identified are what we need to be **studying primarily** and promoting to our Assembly members.

It isn't our purpose in any Jural Assembly to muck about in foreign equity courts, learn commercial law, or statutory law or administrative law. **The only purpose in studying THEIR law is finding the best means to set aside their presumptions and make them stay in their box --- and that is a purpose best suited to discussions within the limited purview of the Litigation Committees.**

Please cease and desist until such time as you can better focus your efforts and define the context of your statements, as in the present form, they will simply detract from the main thrust of our effort to restore our American Common Law Courts.

Anna Maria

See this article and over 5400 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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