

A Message To, For, and About Great Britain



By Anna Von Reitz

Here are some pearls from Ed Johnston---
16th American Jurisprudence Section 177
(16 Am Jur. 2d. Const. Law Sect. 256)

The State did not give the Citizen his rights and thus cannot take them away as it chooses. The State did not establish the settled maxims and procedures by which a citizen must be dealt with, and thus cannot abrogate or circumvent them. It thus is well settled that legislative enactments do not constitute the law of the land, but must conform to it.

From the 16th American Jurisprudence, Second Edition, Section 177:

"The general misconception is that any statute passed by legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes the law of the land. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and any statute, to be valid, must be in agreement. It is impossible for both the Constitution and a law violating it to be valid; one must prevail. This is succinctly stated as follows:

The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it.

As unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed. Such a statute leaves the question that it purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not been enacted. Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no right, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection, and justifies no acts performed under it... A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing valid law. Indeed, in so far as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. **No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it."**

Any court, government or government officer who acts in violation of, in opposition or contradiction to the foregoing, by his, or her own actions, commits treason and invokes the self-executing Sections 3 and 4 of the 14th Amendment and vacates his or her, office.

Please note that The Constitution is for inhabitants of the Federal United States LITERALLY the law of the land--- because when they come in from their watery international

jurisdiction, they are required to operate by the rules established by The Constitution on the land.

When reading Federal law, you must always read it from the Federal perspective. They operate in the international Jurisdiction of the Sea, so, of course, the national law they are obligated to respect when dealing with us is --from their perspective--- the Law of the Land. It's the same reversal when they speak of "inhabitants"---- we are "peaceful inhabitants of the land" (14th Amendment of the corporate Constitution) from their perspective, whereas they are "inhabitants" of the "maritime regions and insular states" from ours.

We did not suddenly lose our political status as one of the "free sovereign and independent people of the United States" under the terms of the Definitive Treaty of Peace 1783 because they called us "inhabitants of the land" in their private corporate "constitution" of 1868---- even though the two different uses of the same word in two completely different documents was no doubt meant to confuse identities and issues of political status that should never have been confused at all.

Why call a corporate "constitution" the Constitution of the United States of America, if you did not mean to confuse it with The Constitution for the united States of America?

Why call us "peaceful inhabitants of the land" if you did not mean to confuse us with the British Subject "inhabitants" referred to in the Definitive Treaty of Peace 1783?

This use of "deceptively similar names" has been carried on throughout the long effort to mischaracterize and defraud the people of the United States by operatives of the British Crown and the British government.

How better to undermine our lawful government, if not to do it under a veil of "friendship" and treaties promising "perpetual amity" and while acting in the guise of being our "Trustees" in the realm of international commerce and as our "allies" in war? Who could ever suspect our "Mother Country" of seeking our demise?

Foxes in the hen house doesn't begin to express the gravity of the international criminality and breach of trust that we have suffered at the hands of the Federal United States and the British Crown and the parade of "Royal Majesties" since Edward VIII stepped down---- and what is true for us is also true for Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Germany, India, most of Europe, Ireland, Scotland, Wales.....

The Enfranchisement Act of 1867 championed by Benjamin D'Israeli toppled the English government from within, engaged Queen Victoria in unlawful acts against the people of Britain and betrayed their established government all the way back to the Magna Carta. D'Israeli enslaved the people of Great Britain to finance the enslavement of the Indian Subcontinent under the Raj. As long as Queen was going rogue at home and secretly enslaving the people of Britain, what did she care about pillaging and betraying her allies in Europe, the Americans, the Australians and a few Canooks?

This is the thanks we all get from the British Royals for our sacrifices and loyalty through two World Wars and countless police actions ever since: press ganging, enslavement, inland piracy, unlawful conversion, personage, barratry, and fraud, fraud, fraud.

We are dealing with exactly the same criminality and the same evil that Gandhi faced in India, but unlike Gandhi, we are not facing it alone.

In evaluating this deceptive and perfidious Enemy of all free people everywhere, consider the lack of conscience and morality involved when a government taxes poor people for salt that they need to live and which they have harmlessly harvested from the sea for millenia? That's what the Raj did in India. That's what the British Crown is capable of.

That is what Prince William's throne is built upon. It's not his fault. He is inheriting the situation his Great-great-great Grandmother left him and he will be hard pressed to make sense of it or find a way forward out of this system of betrayal and criminality without a velvet boot up his backside pointing him the right direction.

It's our job to be that boot and make sure that this system of things is brought to a peaceful and sane conclusion in which still more innocent people do not suffer. Gandhi and Jesus have both showed us the way to defeat this Evil in high places---- millions of people must join hands and expose the cruelty and criminality and oppressive nature of the British government so that it becomes so embarrassing, so obvious, so insurmountably distasteful that both from within and without the denizens of Westminster are forced to relinquish their vile claims of ownership and control over the rest of us..

Now that we have identified at least a large part of The Problem, let us quietly and determinedly proceed to hold the Lord Mayor of London, the Lords of the Admiralty, and the Queen fully accountable for these outrages against the British people and against all the rest of us, too. We were all promised and guaranteed certain things and we all know what we have received instead.

As it was in the days of King John, it is again, when the leaders of the people must rise up and demand their rights or lose them, must expose the criminality we have lived with too long or condemn our children. It is time for the Natural Rights of Mankind to be asserted and for idolatry to end. They may kill our bodies, but they cannot kill our spirits; and they shall not win.

See this article and over 100 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com