

Reply to Michael R. Hamilton in Regard to Continental Marshals Service



By Anna Von Reitz

Mr. Hamilton, my information on the subject of what the "founders" who started the Continental Marshals knew and didn't know comes directly from Bruce Doucette, who was in fact the one who started the whole ball rolling.

It was NOT the intention of those acting that night on a teleconference to create a Continental Marshals Service.

They had no idea that there was a separate, special, international jurisdiction involved that is the special province of international police officers called "marshals". They just wanted protection in place for the people and they thought "marshals" sounded good.

That is straight from the horse's mouth, and it was corroborated by three witnesses who were present during the initial and subsequent discussions.

I have never said otherwise and have had no cause to say otherwise.

The plain fact is that they were stumbling around without a clue and trying to form a security force akin to state militias for the land jurisdiction. Their idea was that the State Justices should have peacekeeping forces acting in support to protect the people----and they were correct----they just didn't realize that the state militias are the ones who are supposed to be providing that service.

Anyway, you can't cross jurisdictions and it makes absolutely no sense to confuse people by calling apples oranges.

We need Continental Marshals and we have them. That's the Good News.

There is a completely stupid and unnecessary controversy about this. That's the Bad News.

Those who want to serve in the state militias and give themselves fancy names and badges are free to do so. Those that can make the cut to serve in the Continental Marshals Service are more than welcome to submit their applications.

And that should, logically, be an end to it.

The "people" you reference haven't even been proven to be part of the "people"---- that is, their own state militias.

You haven't produced a single piece of evidence that the individuals voting on all this via a teleconference were verifiably (1) American state nationals who have surrendered their PERSONS and reclaimed their birthright political status, (2) that any vetting process occurred preventing U.S. citizens and even entire groups of Bar Attorneys from "voice voting" on the matter, (3) that the intent of the group as a whole was what you have supposed it to be, since it is clear that their intent did not match their actions, or (4) any proof of your idea that a handful of "the people" --- even those who actually are part of the "people"----can arbitrarily give Grand Juries totally new authorities and jobs, convert State Justices into international court justices so that they hold both land jurisdiction offices and sea jurisdictions at the same time, alter the structure of the American Government at whim, and make yourself petty little gods over the rest of us.

Accusing me of "lying" based on --- again --- your own completely unjustified assumptions isn't going to hold water any more than your similar accusations against Bella Haywood.

Unfortunately, Sir, the only one causing trouble, passing around falsehoods based on flawed logic processes, and dishonoring the high standards of the other State Justices----is you.

There have been zero sworn statements coming over my desk about Bella Haywood and none of the unsworn hearsay complaints have turned up anything substantive, either.

But there sure have been a lot of complaints coming in about you, Justice Hamilton, including sworn court testimony.

My advice to you is to pull in your horns and do what is right. You can never get into trouble by doing that, but you are cruising for a bruising otherwise, because we all reap what we sow.

See this article and over 400 others on Anna's website here:www.annavonreitz.com

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