

International Law is Wrong, and Unlawful It is a Violation of our Constitution

*by: David-Kevin: Lindsay
21st December 2014*

Let's take about 5 minutes to examine the application of International Law, as some people are dangerously promoting.

1. God created all men and women free, with no power over any other man. (power is fundamentally defined as the ability to affect legal relations)
2. After Adam and Eve, people began to unlawfully exert and force power over other people.
3. Then people demanded a King, likely so they didn't have to protect themselves, and for the accompanying status. And for the security of having others tell them what to do, instead of the risks inherent with the freedom and duty to make one's own choices.
4. God said he would give them a king and if the king obeyed God's laws (and thereby the people under him) the people would flourish. If the king did not, they would suffer.
5. Kings have ruled since. In our English history, going as far back as recorded in 973 A.D., the kings, recognizing people were free, sought their permission (likely by majority), to rule and protect them, and they would be allegiant to the king.
6. Blackstone, Broom, Halsbury, Coke, and many other significant English jurists, recognized this as a "*fundamental contract*". It is the beginning of the relationship between the monarch and the people.
7. The obligations upon the Monarch to secure your Allegiance are:

A. the Monarch will protect you in the exercise of all your property (in Executive and Legislative capacities);

B. the Monarch will solve disputes in 'his' courts of justice, by giving justice in mercy, to ensure people are not tortured, or jailed for trivial offences or issues;

C. the Monarch will "*to the utmost*" of his ability, maintain and uphold the principles of the Christian religion.

8. These duties include the preservation of our fundamental common law principles:

A. everyone is completely free to do as they wish, restricted only by the rights and liberties of others, and any lawfully passed statute of the Monarch (meaning, the statutes cannot contravene God's laws);

B. do unto others as you would have done unto you;

C. do not do unto others as you would not have done unto you.

9. Have the Monarchs broken the laws? **Absolutely**. In large part because we do nothing about it and allow it to continue, in ignorance, stupidity, and apathy. But the solution is not to go running to International bodies whose sole existence is to subvert and undermine our sovereignty (and our Christian Constitutional laws and legacy).

10. Unfortunately, there is a maxim of common law that the Monarch cannot be impleaded in his own courts without his consent. In other words, if you have a problem with the Monarch breaching the original contract, you cannot go to sue him in the Monarch's own courts sitting with the Monarch's own judges, for they are sworn in allegiance to the Monarch, not you. No man can be a judge in his own cause. The *Coronation Oath Act* and contract fails to provide a mechanism for settling disputes involving the Monarch's breach of this original contract.

Judicial independence is subservient to all Oaths, including the Oath of Allegiance of all judges.

11. Judicial independence does not mean lack of judicial corruption. The judges will not allow anything that has the potential to threaten their perception of the 'peace, order and good government' of the country. Their belief, either due to ignorance of the money system or corruption, is that any judgement that would strike the *Income Tax Act* for example, or admit that it is voluntary, would cause the country's financial collapse as no one would pay taxes. This is completely false, as income tax pays primarily only usury or interest, but that does not change their perception and orders given to them. Many Constitutional issues are no direct threat to the power of the Monarch, and so there are victories.

12. So you will not win in the courts in any case that would achieve such results. Period. That is not pessimism, it is a reality.

13. So what are the options against unlawful taxation and theft of your labour, and similar Constitutional violations?

A. We can look to our own Constitution and laws for solutions.

B. We can look to some other country's laws for solutions (U.S.? - not).

C. We can look to international bodies for solutions.

D. War.

14. Most, if not all of us are aware of the reasons why taxes, especially income tax, are unlawful, and there are many. It is not my objective to go through them all nor debate them here. Only to recognize that these mandatory taxes are unlawful. Let's quickly examine these points A above to see what is the best solution available to stop this unlawful taxation (and underlying criminal, usury based monetary system).

A. *We can look to our own Constitution and laws for solutions*

15. Every Constitutional document in our history, recognizes the supremacy of God. Because the Monarch takes an Oath to uphold God's laws as a condition to obtaining allegiance, God's laws are supreme and her breach of contract (and thus God's laws) allows us to cancel all or part of it, as would any other contract - no one is above the law and the contract makes the law.

16. But as we cannot (and will not) obtain judgement in the Monarch's courts, we have no alternative but to refuse to comply with all statutes that violate God's laws. Failure to so do is a waiver of your Constitutional, contractual rights and freedoms in this contract.

17. **Blackstone, Broom, Halsbury, Coke, and many other significant English jurists, have all admitted that we all have a Constitutional power (and duty) to refuse to comply with statutes that violate God's laws.** It is part of our unwritten Constitution. We simply need to exercise this power and fulfil this duty. The more people that do not believe in God, and stand up for their beliefs, the more power the Monarch (and International bodies) exerts over us.

18. Our solution therefore, is in our own Constitutional law. There is a principle that one Constitutional provision cannot override another. Therefore, not only statutes, but the Charter, (including s. 1), the *BNA Act* etc., cannot override the *Coronation Oath Act*, or *Act of Settlement of 1701* and many other great documents.

19. Make no mistake, any time we take action that is a refusal to comply with someone (or some people) who are attempting to exert unlawful (or excessive) power and control over you, there are risks. People will lie, cheat, deceive or do whatever it takes to maintain their power and control. That does not make my position (nor our Constitutional law) wrong, it means we have to work harder to achieve justice. It is not easy - but your power to say 'no, I'm not doing what you tell me to do', is the foundation for all change in mankind's history. And maintaining our God-given rights and liberties - and duties that are the foundation of this country.

B. We can look to some other country's laws for solutions (U.S.? - not)

20. Looking to statutes, principles, and Constitutional laws of another country, to apply in your own country, is a recipe for eventual overthrow of your own government and laws.

21. Though we share a common history with England, including legal and Constitutional, our present laws and procedures are much different.

22. One can quote principles of law that courts have accepted in both countries, but the goal is to use Canadian cases, or even English cases, and historical documents and laws, not that the US.

23. The UCC for example, does not apply in Canada and anyone attempting to rely upon this document will quickly discover they are in deep trouble.

24. Sometimes, U.S. case law can be shown to illustrate differences or agreements between our laws, but ultimately they are not binding.

25. Looking to the U.S. is not an option. Unless you wish to become the 51st State.

C. We can look to international bodies for solutions

26. This one frightens me the most and is primarily advocated by secularists, atheists and people who refuse to support and promote our own Constitution. Most people in this line of thought rely upon the secular/atheistic U.N. and treaties and conventions, thereunder.

Remember the history of this evil organization, and consider the legal affects of relying upon it, similar to part B above.

27. Both the UN and its predecessor, the League of Nations, were born out of war - WWII and WW I respectively. The goal of having all countries bound together under the authority of a one world government, is clear and obvious. Why would Canada have to admit to a power of the UN (or any country therein) to make decisions controlling us? We can make our own independent decisions with other countries and don't need the UN to do so. Canada dealt directly with all other countries in the world prior to these wars and can do so without the U.N.

28. Even for those who don't believe this, it is inescapable that we have been incrementally marching towards a one world government since 1945. The more power international bodies have, the less power and sovereignty we as a country have. It is an inverse relationship. Canada has signed onto various treaties and conventions. Much like our own Constitution, these treaties for the most part, simply recognize that which already is. Constitutions do not create rights and liberties, they are there recognizing that they already exist and to protect them from extinguishment. As corporations exist for profit and limited liability, so are International organizations existing for the purpose of a one world government, power and control, with no ability of the individual men/women to do anything about, as there is no such voting process or other means of accountability to each man/woman. They are not in existence for the freedoms of men/women, despite their propaganda to otherwise.

29. **Most International treaties and covenants, must be passed by Parliament to be enforceable in Canadian courts, as I learned 15 years ago in Queen's Bench in Winnipeg, when I naively attempted to use such an International treaty (and never will again).**

5. Definition of "Treaty"

Canada adheres to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969, which can be described as a codification of public international law on treaties. The Convention defines treaty in Article 2 as follows:

- *"Treaty means an international agreement concluded between States in written form **and governed by international law**, whether embodied in a single instrument, or in two or more related instruments and whatever its particular designation."*

<http://www.treaty-accord.gc.ca/procedures.aspx>

30. As you can see, treaties are not governed by the common law, nor the Constitution of Canada. They are governed by International law, which most assuredly is not as free as our own laws. And who is going to rule on disputes using International law? The UN?

31. So when you have a problem, the question arises: who do you seek (if anyone) to remedy the problem? When you rely on International treaties and covenants, you must use the enforcement mechanisms in those documents - if there is any. If there is no enforcement mechanism, then they are as useless as a million dollar judgment against someone who is bankrupt.

32. Thus, your own politicians and leaders are no longer accountable, even if they break the treaties. You must seek out a remedy - but where? Geneva? New York? I don't think so. UN declarations etc. are secular in their underpinnings, not common law, and the common law principles will not apply to support anyone's position in any UN tribunal. Think about that.

33. **There is no International Court recognized under our Constitution.** Many trade agreements concede that countries allow some third body to settle their disputes. But whose laws do they apply? And they all cede some of our own sovereignty to some other organization who is not accountable to the people. This is a sure fire way of governments offloading their obligations upon others, and then claim that there is nothing they can do about - same with the U.N.

34. Coming full circle to the beginning. We have the freest system of law in the world. Why would you rely on International (or any other) law and their dispute mechanisms - if any? Moreover, even if our courts do apply some of these treaties, which is stronger and leaves YOU the most options:

A. our own Constitution (the freest in the world) which permits you to refuse to comply with statutes that violate our Constitution; or,

B. some secular International treaty or convention, where you are bound by the definitions and decisions of some other person or body, and who is not bound by our own Constitution?

35. Remember, there are only 2 possibilities:

A. either Canadian Constitutional and domestic law is primary and supreme, or

B. International law is primary and supreme. There is no other alternative.

36. Any theory that advocates or promotes International law over our own laws, is dangerous, and may even be treasonous. English law for example, prohibited them from joining the European Union, because it gave a foreign entity jurisdiction over the English, contrary to our common law. The Monarch had no lawful power to permit Parliament to do so, but the people did not object enough, likely because they did not feel the results directly. But it was unlawful to do so. Remember, politicians are not accountable for treaty, convention or UN violations as they are to our own Constitution and laws of our land.

37. These human rights (ie: given by humans and not God) agreements and treaties are already for the most part, if not completely, recognized in our own Constitution and laws. We simply need to compel governments to obey them. And we are not because not enough of us want to take the risks. Most do not wish to stand up for their beliefs. Submission = freedom is incorrect. Resistance is not futile!

38. If there is a violation, the solution is to refuse to support or comply with the Monarch and her statutes. Not to use International 'laws', most of which are not laws in the true sense of the word, but

rather, simply agreed upon definitions and agreements, and can be changed or withdrawn by parties at any time. **Many of this UN secular sponsored garbage, is actually undermining our own laws, customs and beliefs.** As with any fraud, it may look good, but remember who is in control - and it is not us, and we have no say in what happens there either.

39. The Monarch cannot withdraw from our Constitution, but can withdraw from all treaties, and conventions and agreements, at any time. Need I say more?

40. Don't use International 'laws' - use our own Constitution - before International bodies like the UN are telling us what to do in our own land even more than they are doing today.

41. Remember too that much UN sponsored crap is completely against our God's laws and the rule of law - such as multiculturalism, where in places like Vancouver, Christians who founded this land, are now a minority among the Asians. Soon, like the Muslims in England and Germany, and out east in Canada, they will start demanding application of *their* laws within Canada - 2 countries within a country is not possible. But it is quickly happening.

D. War

42. War is not an option, period. History says it all. It is a last resort only when all else has failed, and we are not at his point yet.

Our Constitution truly only recognizes God's laws as the basis for all forms of civil disobedience to statutes by the Monarch which are contrary to God's laws.

Use it or lose it.

Anyone who believes or advocates that they will obtain more rights and freedoms from the UN or any agreement signed thereunder, is either ignorant, a fool or a subversive. Let them pick the category they fall under. At least ignorance is curable!