

A treaty is not between a nation and people it can only be between nations ~Billy- Joe Mauldin

The following qualifies as one of the greatest lies the globalists continue to push upon the American people. That lie is: "Treaties supersede the U.S. Constitution".

The Second follow-up lie is this one: "A treaty, once passed, cannot be set aside".

HERE ARE THE CLEAR IRREFUTABLE FACTS: The U.S. Supreme Court has made it very clear that

- 1) Treaties do not override the U.S. Constitution.
- 2) Treaties cannot amend the Constitution. And last,
- 3) A treaty can be nullified by a statute passed by the U.S. Congress (or by a sovereign State or States if Congress refuses to do so), when the State deems a treaty the performance of a treaty is self-destructive. The law of self-preservation overrules the law of obligation in others. When you've read this thoroughly, hopefully, you will never again sit quietly by when someone -- anyone -- claims that treaties supercede the Constitution. Help to dispell this myth.

"This [Supreme] Court has regularly and uniformly recognized the supremacy of the Constitution over a treaty." - Reid v. Covert, October 1956, 354 U.S. 1, at pg 17.

This case involved the question: Does the NATO Status of Forces Agreement (treaty) supersede the U.S. Constitution? Keep reading.

The Reid Court (U.S. Supreme Court) held in their Opinion that,

"... No agreement with a foreign nation can confer power on the Congress, or any other branch of government, which is free from the restraints of the Constitution. Article VI, the Supremacy clause of the Constitution declares, "This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all the Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land..."

"There is nothing in this language which intimates that treaties and laws enacted pursuant to them do not have to comply with the provisions of the Constitution nor is

there anything in the debates which accompanied the drafting and ratification which even suggest such a result...

"It would be manifestly contrary to the objectives of those who created the Constitution, as well as those who were responsible for the Bill of Rights – let alone alien to our entire constitutional history and tradition – to construe Article VI as permitting the United States to exercise power UNDER an international agreement, without observing constitutional prohibitions. (See: Elliot's Debates 1836 ed. – pgs 500-519).

"In effect, such construction would permit amendment of that document in a manner not sanctioned by Article V. The prohibitions of the Constitution were designed to apply to all branches of the National Government and they cannot be nullified by the Executive or by the Executive and Senate combined."

Did you understand what the Supreme Court said here? No Executive Order, Presidential Directive, Executive Agreement, no NAFTA, GATT/WTO agreement/treaty, passed by ANYONE, can supersede the Constitution. FACT. No question!

At this point the Court paused to quote from another of their Opinions; *Geofroy v. Riggs*, 133 U.S. 258 at pg. 267 where the Court held at that time that,

"The treaty power as expressed in the Constitution, is in terms unlimited except by those restraints which are found in that instrument against the action of the government or of its departments and those arising from the nature of the government itself and of that of the States. It would not be contended that it extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the government, or a change in the character of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter without its consent."

Assessing the GATT/WTO parasitic organism in light of this part of the Opinion, we see that it cannot attach itself to its host (our Republic or States) in the fashion the traitors in our government wish, without our acquiescing to it.

The Reid Court continues with its Opinion:

"This Court has also repeatedly taken the position that an Act of Congress, which MUST comply with the Constitution, is on full parity with a treaty, the statute to the extent of conflict, renders the treaty null. It would be completely anomalous to say that a treaty need not comply with the Constitution when such an agreement **can be overridden by a statute that must conform to that instrument.**"

The U.S. Supreme court could not have made it more clear : TREATIES DO NOT OVERRIDE THE CONSTITUTION, AND CANNOT, IN ANY FASHION, AMEND IT !!! CASE CLOSED.

Now we must let our elected "representatives" in Washington and the State legislatures know that we no longer believe the BIG LIE... we know that we are not bound by unconstitutional Treaties, Executive Orders, Presidential Directives, and other such treasonous acts.

[Note: the above information was taken from Aid & Abet Police Newsletter, with limited revision. P.O. Box 8712, Phoenix, Arizona. Acknowledgment given to Claire Kelly, for her good assistance and in depth treaty research. The use of this information is not to be construed as endorsement of Aid & Abet Police Newsletter. Claire Kelly is a trusted and knowledgeable friend. - CDR]

Here's what Thomas Jefferson said on the right to renounce treaties: "Compacts then, between a nation and a nation, are obligatory on them as by the same moral law which obliges individuals to observe their compacts. There are circumstances, however, which sometimes excuse the non-performance of contracts between man and man; so are there also between nation and nation. When performance, for instance, becomes impossible, non-performance is not immoral; so if performance becomes self-destructive to the party, the law of self-preservation overrules the law of obligation in others".

pg 317 - "The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson," A. Koch & Wm. Peden, Random House 1944, renewed 1972. Jefferson also said in a letter to Wilson C.

Nicholas on Sept. 7, 1803, Ibid. pg 573

"Our peculiar security is in the possession of a written Constitution. Let us not make it a blank paper by construction [interpretation]. I say the same as to the opinion of those who consider the grant of the treaty making power as boundless. If it is, then we have no Constitution."

Further evidence: Excerpt from a letter from U.S. Senator, Arlen Specter, (R. Penn.) to constituent, November 3, 1994.

"Dear Mr. Neely: "Thank you for contacting my office regarding the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. ... I have signed on as a cosponsor of Senator Bradley's resolution [SR 70, which urges the president to seek the advice and consent of the Senate for ratification] because I believe that the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child is an appropriate step in the direction of promoting the well-being of

children throughout the world. [he goes on to mention concerns that the treaty would subjugate familial and parental responsibility to an international entity, which he denies]

"... Secondly, the Convention would not override the U.S. Constitution; rather, as in the case of any treaty, any provision that conflicts with our Constitution would be void in our country... "

[CDR Note: It is our belief that Arlen Specter would not have been as truthful regarding Constitutional Supremacy over treaties if he had a clue that this letter to a constituent would have found its way into the hands or eyes of the public.]

Logical deduction:

No law or treaty supersedes the Supreme Law of the Land. 'Supreme'... meaning 'highest or greatest'. What is higher than highest or greater than greatest, other than our Creator? The Constitution acknowledges our God-given, unalienable rights, and secures those rights in that acknowledgement.

The Constitution gives the US Senate authority to ratify treaties with other nations. Americans have been propagandized into believing that those treaties become the supreme law of the land superseding the Constitution. Let's examine this deception closely and dispel the myth once and for all. Article VI of the Constitution states:

Clause 2 - "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution [of any state] or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding."

Clause 3 - "The senators and representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executives and judicial officers, both of the United States and the several states, shall be bound by oath of affirmation to support this Constitution ."

Laws made in pursuance of this Constitution are laws which are made within the strict and limited confines of the Constitution itself. No federal, state, or international law, rule or bureaucratic regulation and no state constitution can supersede B or be repugnant to B this Constitution.

Treaties made under the authority of the United States... the United States (federal government) was authorized by and on behalf of the people and in pursuance of this

Constitution to enter into certain treaties with other governments. The United States (federal government) obtains its authority solely from the Constitution. It would be ludicrous to think that it has the power to circumvent (via treaties) that which grants it its authority.

In Clause 3, it is made clear that every elected official, both federal and state, is bound by oath to support this Constitution. Who can rightly, and genuinely claim to be given the power to destroy that which they are elected and sworn to uphold?

The powers granted **by** the Constitution cannot sanely be construed to provide the authority to usurp, pre-empt or eradicate it.

The U.S. Supreme Court as cited above correctly ruled that the supremacy of the Constitution overrides treaties. It should be noted that if any Court, be it a State, Federal or the U.S. Supreme Court, should ever rule otherwise, the decision would be repugnant to the Constitution and the ruling would be null and void. The answer to this question is self-evident.

The Constitution authorizes the United States to enter into treaties with other nations B the word Anation@ although not explicit, is certainly implied. The United Nations is an **Organization - a Global Corporate Bureaucracy**. The 'experts' in international law, commerce, banking, environment, etc.; and a cadre of alleged conservative / Christian-conservative leaders -- lawyer, Dame of Malta, Phyllis Schlafly being a prime example -- have been spewing forth propaganda to instill and further the myth of 'treaty-supremacy' for decades. Their 'expertise' is an illusion created apparently with hopes to instill a sense of inferiority in the 'common man' (their term) so we will all defer to their superior intelligence. Let's *not* go there.

Here's a perfect example of 'expert' propaganda on the supremacy question: On April 11, 1952, Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles (cfr), speaking before the American Bar Association in Louisville, Kentucky said... "Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land.... Treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, ...can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights." Mr. Dulles is confused about the People's rights. To repeat an earlier statement of fact: the Constitution doesn't 'give' us rights. The Constitution acknowledges and secures our inherent, Creator-endowed rights. What Creator gives, no man can take away.

The Dulles brothers worked (lied) long and hard to firmly establish the treaty-supremacy myth. And they realized it would have to be done by deceit -- propaganda. Admittedly by propaganda.

"There is no indication that American public opinion, for example, would approve the establishment of a super state, or permit American membership in it. In other words, time - a long time - will be needed before world government is politically feasible... This time element might seemingly be shortened so far as American opinion is concerned by an active propaganda campaign in this country..."

Allen W. Dulles (cfr) from a UN booklet, Headline Series #59 (New York: The Foreign Policy Association., Sept.-Oct., 1946) pg 46.

The question of "nationhood" in reference to the United Nations seems to have been addressed by the errant Congress. A quick fix apparently took place in the U.S. Senate on March 19, 1970. According to the Anaheim (Cal) Bulletin, 4-20-1970, the Senate ratified a resolution recognizing the United Nations Organization as a sovereign nation. That would be tantamount to recognizing General Motors as a sovereign nation. Are we beginning to get the picture?

Case Closed