



neverhadaboss.com

updates on the insane world of money and power

Government 'End Runs' Around American Rights—Are Illegal

Our republic is at great peril. What we associated as nebulous 'one world government' during the 1980s/90s (supported by elites), is now on the 'political front burner'. To that end, 'end runs' to circumvent the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and spirit of the Declaration of Independence are everywhere, posing lethal threats to our heritage and liberty.

Congress is showing willingness to give away our rights to a globalist cartel, passing laws and joining treaties, transferring US citizen's rights to global bodies (UN/WHO), with the power to decide the fate of our nation and ourselves—under 'rule of law'.

If we thought it was bad when police enforced dictates (without force of law), from a president or governor, consider 'legal' lockdowns conducted by UN troops. If this sounds farfetched, an imminent, pending WHO treaty has support in Congress to transfer United States sovereignty to the WHO—and complete control of US citizens.

Signing onto this treaty constitutes constitutional treason, aiding/abetting enemies of the 'Bill of Rights'. US Federal Government is subservient to 'citizens', unless it has to do with coining money, postal roads, etc, and, as such, is in no way, mandated by the Constitution to transfer the rights of citizens. What this is is 'absurdity beyond absurd'.

The US Constitution provides that the president "shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." Treaties are binding agreements between nations and become part of international law—but it is not within the scope of reality (even in the wet fantasies of fabulists), that by treaty, our rights could be given away to a 'globalist tyranny'.

Absurd 'end runs' apply to states as well as the federal government. Consider the 2nd Amendment: the 'Bruen' finding at the SC affirms that Americans have the right to both 'keep and bear arms'. A good finding, but already clear in the 2nd Amendment.

Other than the 2nd Amendment, what in the Bill of Rights ends at a state boundary? Nothing—neither does the 2nd. But a law is a law, so traveling through a 'blue state', if one is arrested for 'carrying concealed', one has to file a motion before a plea. What's the distinction between a motion and a plea? Motions come 1st and, if upheld, prosecutors offer drop charges because: if a motion wins on appeal, the law is struck down.

Trump's lawyers are inept, not filing a motion to recuse an 'end run' prejudicial judge before she makes a ruling. Once rulings are made, motions sound like 'sour grapes'.

When unconstitutionality is not taken on directly, we risk becoming Europe where cit-

izens are jailed for sharing peer-reviewed studies. The 'Bill of Rights' was purposely written in the 'negative' (what government cannot do), to curtail elite usurpation of citizen's rights. 'Misinformation' is not a crime. Although citizens misinform, government misinforms to control/silence citizens. 'Malinformation', restricting 'speech' unwanted by government, has no support within powers granted to government under the Constitution. Instead, malinforming citizens/restricting 'free speech' is a constitutional crime.

We see 'end runs from all sides' as the elite 'pick and tear' at the law of the land. For these crimes against liberty, there is no immunity/limited immunity granted by government—for those infringing on the rights of citizens. Under no circumstances can government grant immunity to block redress of grievances against government. It is a requisite constitutional duty of government to redress grievances of the sovereign people.

'End runs' are manifold and often purposed to hack away at the 2nd Amendment, which is the citizen's last line of defense against tyranny. So, when we see confiscations under 'red flag' laws, detention or arrest for 'carrying', state to state, or gun store harassment with bank accounts shut-down, this clearly amounts to 'aiding and abetting' crimes against the 'Bill of Rights'—and could be seen by courts as treasonous acts.

Same with shutting-down bank accounts for any actively questioning the narrative. With the 'Bill of Rights', the elite can't go after us directly (so far), so they conduct 'end runs' on social networks or ATF goons show up at your door with a smile and a survey.

We Americans have to face the fact that if we haven't thought through how we will act when called upon to act—it will be too late. Consider how laws that get passed by Congress (unconstitutional—yet laws), could, at least in the short run, render the 'Bill of Rights'—moot/mute. This uncaring transgression is an elite game with intention to take everything we hold precious—everything dear to our hearts—everything American.

Soon (God forbid), a US Congress, conducting 1 too many 'end runs', takes on the role of Britain before the Revolutionary War. That puts us back to the Declaration of Independence, where, as patriots, we may be forced to defend our rights with our blood.

Even if elites successfully take the Constitution/Bill of Rights from us, under a revisited 'Declaration of Independence, those same constitutional rights are what we would fight for—the same 'law of the land' under which we abided for the past 250 years.

We need to raise a big enough 'holler' to stop them—this side of violence. Maybe you don't want into their 'crosshairs', but when you see others 'again cancelled' for resisting the next lockdown, the WHO treaty, someone ordering the ATF off their property, or banks closing accounts of 'narrative dissidents', take the 1st step: tell that bank, in writing: that you are moving your account and lay out the reasons behind your action.

If enough of us do nothing—it's over. If enough of us do enough, its over for them. Within the limit of 2 pages, I'm not able to get to my original intention: 'bullet points' in the Constitution that each American patriot needs to know—as 'God-given rights',

For today, know that the word 'emergency' does not appear in the Constitution. Hence, no legal justification for 'emergency use' or 'martial law. In the Bruen findings, Clarence Thomas made the case that gun laws have to be adjudicated in terms of historical perspective—that's 1776 as opposed to now. With that perspective, there were no restrictions concerning firearms. It is required that the citizen/militia be well-armed.

Next time: Constitution 'bullet points' each patriot needs—burned into their souls. Along with some other things we can 'lean on' as we preform our duties as Americans.

You can get my articles by email, with a request: erik@neverhadaboss.com. Thanks.