

Repeat of What Anna Says About Contracts and Quantum Grammar



By Anna Von Reitz

Anna says all contracts created by men are bull. It's all hokum and fraud. We aren't competent to guarantee what we will be doing at ten o'clock tomorrow morning, much less thirty years from now when we are supposed to pay off a mortgage. That is the fact of the matter. And that means that nothing we promise to do has any binding force or true validity. It doesn't matter what language you use, or if it is grammatically correct or not. People have no control of their circumstance or life-span or any of the many, many contributing factors that go into whether or not a contract----even a contract made in "good faith"---can or will be kept.

Ever tried to enforce a contract against someone truly down on their luck? Do the words "blood out of a turnip" have meaning for you?

Therefore, all contracts made by men and even by our institutions--- governments, corporations, etc.----are rendered ridiculous and void the moment they are signed. If that is not obvious to everyone on this planet by now, it surely should be. All that a contract can be and all that it can represent is a "good faith intention". That's why a "loan" is not the same thing as a "debt" and why the moral obligation to keep your promises, if at all possible, matters.

Now, if it makes sense to you that Russell Gould somehow rules the world through the Post Office and that this is because certain keyholes and gates at the Vatican no longer line up with the constellations the way they used to, you don't need me. You need a psychologist. I don't think these guys -- Russell Gould and David-Wynn: Miller--- mean anything but good toward the world, but the fact is that they have gone down the rabbit hole and learned to think like most of the Pope's advisors and that is a real problem, because good intentions are no fit replacement for reality, and a dictatorship based on one man that was bad before is unlikely to be any better just because you change the man in charge. I have the same problem with Frank O'Collins. He apparently means well, but he was a Jesuit and he learned to think like a Jesuit and he can't break out of the mold. He is still stuck. He is still creating his version of the same bad old template pattern, making the same assumptions, and

therefore recreating the same problems he is trying to escape. And what does that get us? More of the same insanity.

Let me hop up and down on one leg, substitute numbers for letters to make a new code language, start writing mathematically correct grammar rules, and declare myself Queen of the World and see how many people buy into that. There's a reason that people won't believe it.

The entire rationale of the claim made by the Holy See back in 1302 was flawed to begin with and in responding to such a claim with new counter-claims all you do is build fraud upon fraud. You unavoidably bring forth a new fraud that is the derivative of the old fraud. Rabbits give birth to rabbits. Thus the Unity-States-of-Our-World Trust becomes Unam Sanctum 2.0.

If you believe and give credence to the Bible at all, you have to admit that no man can breach the covenants of God and you have to realize that Pope Boniface VIII over-reached himself and trespassed against two Divine Trusts that were not his to breach when he created the Unam Sanctum Trust. Both the Adamic Trust and the Abramic Trust owed to all people descended from Adam and Eve and to all the Sons of Abraham, respectively, were breached by Boniface's actions.

For fellows that advocate the adoption of mathematically correct grammar neither Russell nor David-Wynn appear to grasp the fact that if you start out with a breach of trust you end up with a breach of trust.

Similarly, replacing the current legal jargon which is aptly described as "legalese" with Quantum Grammar does not appear to be a net gain, because numbers can be manipulated and redefined as readily as letters and the use of such a language to try to construct valid contracts would be just as doomed to failure for the natural causes already cited and would be even less understandable for average people who would have to hire "experts" and then depend upon those "experts" to enforce and interpret and judge every aspect of any such agreements.

That would give those experts ultimate power over the outcome of all disagreements and the corrupting affect of such power is already known.

Just as we had the Big Fight, (known as the Protestant Reformation, in part), over the translation of the Bible from Latin to modern languages, we would have the Big Fight over translation of contracts into Quantum and then another Big Fight over their proper translation back into non-Quantum.

And worst of all, it would all be a Big Fight over interpreting and enforcing contracts, which are impossible and null and void by definition anyway.

Stop for five seconds and let the abject craziness of all this sink in and let me repeat: All human contracts are void by nature. Why? Because we don't have what it takes to make contracts, and neither do our human institutions and corporations, which have life-spans and limitations just like we do.

I know that Russell and David-Wynn think of Quantum as a way to overcome the Tower of Babel and reduce everything down to simple and irreducible terms and that is a noble enterprise so far as it goes, but neither one seems to have the scientific background to know and truly understand how prone mathematics can be to

manipulation and misinterpretation. Mathematics is just another language. It has the same flaws. Is it a better tool for making contracts than German or English or Peruvian? Arguably so, but why are we engaged in doing something as dumb and as dishonest as making contracts in the first place? Once you give up assuming and believing that you can make contracts when you clearly can't, the whole underlying miasma of lies and pain and purgatory and owing and usury collapses.

So, as Quantum is conceived as a better means of forming valid binding contracts, and as it is a literal impossibility to form valid binding contracts in the first place, let's just quit trying to do the impossible while we are ahead?

Let your yes be yes and your no be no. Live in the moment of Now, because Now is your only time and sure possession. Live now, love now, give to each other now. Neither store up riches upon the Earth, nor speak of any Future as a certainty.

Even the Great Writs and great documents like The Declaration of Independence and agreements like The Constitution for the united States of America are nothing more or less than expressions of Will and good faith intentions, so let us take our moral obligations to heart and question our commitments more deeply, understanding anew that they do not derive from some moldy bit of parchment, but from the hearts and minds of living men who give life and light and meaning to the words and principles of justice and compassion.

The efforts of Russell and David are well-meant, heroic, and well-taken. The efforts of the men who have helped them, too. But it is a fact that neither we nor our institutions are competent to make contracts. We can agree on things, we can express our intentions, we can testify as to our Will----but not make contracts. It may seem like a picky point to you, but I assure you that it is not. It is the difference between truth and falsehood.

Maxim of Law demands that fraud taints everything it touches. Whatever agreements we had with Britain were breached and Dishonored by the British Government and the Crown in 1822, less than fifty years after The Declaration of Independence. The proof is the Treaty of Verona of 1822 and the subsequent Treaty of Verona 1845.

On Tuesday our nation will begin to face the onslaught of a currency war mistakenly directed against us because of the misdeeds and criminality of British subjects residing on our soil and acting under color of law while pretending to "represent" us and our lawful government. These undeclared foreign agents include the members of the Bar Associations and international bankers who have defrauded and pillaged us without mercy while working for the British Crown.

Yes, these are things that I am griping about, but believe me, the worst firestorm of invective I could ever possibly pour down upon those responsible would pale into insignificant whispers when compared to the gravity of their sins, errors, and omissions. These false friends have done more damage to us and to our economy and to our reputation and to our good names than our enemies could ever hope for.

I want it very clearly understood that I am not a British subject of any kind and neither is anyone in my household. I want the world to know that we, Americans, have been defrauded and abused by these criminals in suits. If anyone wants the American Gold they will have to ask the Pope and Queen Bess where it went and I do

hope that the Chinese and Russian Governments fully understand that our nation has already been gutted by these thieves as their thanks to us for standing by them through two World Wars.

If Russell has any magic beans in his pocket this would be the moment to come forward. I don't think that any good suggestions or practical solutions or leadership initiatives would be turned down.

See this article and over 200 others on Anna's website here:www.annavonreitz.com
To support this work look for the PayPal button on this website.