

For England - 4.0 -- New "King" --- of the Commonwealth



By Anna Von Reitz

Well, well, well, and very well....

You have just realized that your country was irreversibly conquered by William the Conqueror in 1066, and that he very methodically patented every scrap of land, and then parceled it out to his loyal Barons making them "sovereigns in their own right" upon his death in 1087 A.D.

This created many small (and some not so small) separate kingdoms that created a patchwork across all the conquered territory.

It was William's strategy to create so many "kings" in England that no British king would ever be able to cause trouble again.

There was only one flaw. The Church. The Commonwealth.

The kings all made grants of land to the Church for the purpose of establishing "good works" and "productive estates" for the support of the poor, the sick, and the indigent.

Most often this meant off-loading barren and unproductive land, swamps, gravel pits, barren escarpments, etc., on the Church, knowing that the Church would make use of the monks and nuns and the same paupers that came to it for help as free labor to do all the arduous bit of draining and composting and building up and tearing down and other work associated with making bad land into something worthwhile.

Also as we have seen, William decided that his son, John, should inherit no land in England, and should remain firmly under the thumb of the Crown of Gaul. This was the result of certain unfortunate character traits that John possessed and which run in the family. The name "Lacklands" attached to John and his progeny as a nickname that stuck until 1213 when John's Grandson struck a deal with Pope Innocent.

Prior to this, the Church worked for the King, now the Church would have a King working for them in England.

So, "King John" became the Church's Overlord of the Commonwealth ---- King of the Commonwealth, not of England. Basically, a Steward for the Pope. And still not a true King of England.

Likewise, "Queen Elizabeth" has served in that capacity, too, and not as any true Queen of England. So, not only is she not British, she's not actually the Queen of your country.

Any one of the Norman Barons and all their progeny still have a stronger claim to the title---"King of England" and "King of Britain" -- than Greg Hallett, who is, once again, a descendant of King John, acting as King of the Commonwealth and an Overlord/Trustee serving the Pope.

So, if you Englishman, Scots, and Sons of Eire and Wales have a brain in your heads, you will protest this situation and rain hail and brimstone on the members of Parliament who have gone along with this undermining of your actual national governments and played footsie with Whitehall all these years, instead of taking care of your own country and people.

A determined and lawful and nationwide housecleaning and investigation into the issues raised is certainly in order.

I would give Greg Hallett a nice office overlooking the Thames, but I certainly wouldn't recognize him as my king. He's just another Frenchman owing his entire put-together to the Pope, so not really a suitable substitute for a British King, and certainly not a reasonable candidate to act as the Head of the Church of England.

There is this caveat, too, that all the French Barons who became "kings in their own right" in England, remain under the command of the King of Gaul, Guilleroy de Armentois du Lac ---- aka, James Clinton Belcher--- who is an American.

You have to laugh once you get a good look at all this. A German Queen on a "Commonwealth" throne, or worse, Chair of the Estates -- versus a French Baron, albeit, over a thousand years in the country, owing fealty to the French King of Gaul--- who is an American.

Right. One can only shake one's head, be grateful for the Norman Patent, because at least you have claims as Freeholders to own your own land, even if the issue of an actual British King remains at issue.

There are, of course, many scions of the French Barons still living in England and more scattered around the Earth, especially in Australia. Those who are awake are aware of the late King Michael Plantagenet, and there are others, all with the same French-based lineage as "King John" without the Papist duties muddying things.

Where is Merlin when you need him? We need some sort of a big stone and a sword to pull out of it, so that the people can see who their rightful King should be....

There is one other reasonable and worthy choice, affirmed by tradition, steeped in history, lineage, and Lawful Office: The Lord High Steward, John Talbot of Shrewsbury. He has every right to claim the actual throne of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales --- and in fact, he has done so.

However, we really do need a Sword in the Stone, some kind of publicity stunt to get people focused and thinking about who and what a true King of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales would be?

First off, he'd have no conflicts of interest or duties to foreign theocracies. He'd be a thorough-going son of the British Isles, a man in love with the people and the countries of Great Britain, a love of Law, a love of the Church of England, a man with only one axe to grind --- to protect and nurture and care for the land and people with fierce loyalty.

Not some internationalist punk with a glib line and a big smile, even though those are far easier to come by.

It should be perfectly apparent that you've been "gulled and cullied" for a long time, lied to about the true nature and offices of those who have masqueraded as your Lawful Monarchs. What you really need is an honest man with a valid claim to the throne, someone with the moral fiber to stand up for Britain, and the courage to do so.

I think you have such a one in the Earl of Shrewsbury, but you will have to elect him by Acclamation. Just like King Arthur.

See this article and over 2500 others on Anna's website here: www.annavonreitz.com

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