Text of the announcement of 04 September 2018

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen,

honoured councillors and participants in the meeting,

Dear guests at home and abroad

Welcome to this Extraordinary General Assembly of the Constituent Assembly for Germany, today, September 4, 2018.

Since we have a number of important things to explain, I do not want to dwell on long prefaces either, but rather start straight away. The Council also asks for understanding that today's meeting is more an announcement than a regular assembly with a lengthy exchange of views, not least because of the late hour.

Everything legal that is said today we owe to two clever men and their co-workers. They resulted in important articles of the Basic Law and equally important contents in the first judgment of the Federal Constitutional Court in 1951.

Willi Geiger and Hermann Höpker-Aschoff apparently built important exit doors into the existing legal texts in the hope that at some point someone will find these things.

We found them and thank them on behalf of all the Germans for this forward-looking work, which we can use very well today. Both became presidents of the Federal Constitutional Court and dedicated their lives to upholding the first prescribed legal principles.

After a few general words, let's look together at what you left all the Germans.

First of all, I would like to reiterate the following:

This Constituent Assembly is your right and the right of us all!

What is a legal system in an original subject of international law anyway? Written right are the rules of natural legal entities within a state entity, which and which, solely by the legal entities can arise. This means nothing less than that this often quoted right is our claim to justice and reliability, because we have established and accepted it ourselves. In the absence of binding law for all legal entities in a state, the state is reduced to a self-appointed ruling elite that denies the holders of the rights their own law. If the law is lacking, the leading elite, which now sees itself and alone as a state or the state system, is only a lawless band of robbers of a fascist and dictatorial nature. That is exactly what the Federal Republic is today.

We have set out to establish the first common state of all German peoples. A state structure according to the rules of international law. A real original, i.e. a subject of international law born of itself and thus created by human legal entities.

The problems in this undertaking are just as obvious as the lack of understanding on the part of the general public. Because of these special circumstances, we have not only campaigned for the establishment of our state, but also against the historical disorientation of a large majority of the population in the Federal Republic, in Europe and the whole world.

We have started to work on the historical forgeries, which do not only concern the German affairs.

We have fought against the incomprehension of the vast majority in evaluating legal contexts and against the emissaries of the Federal Republic who, because of the ignorance of the masses, found German Reich groups, church planter groups, peace treaty groups or stateless groups and lead their own members consciously or unconsciously in the wrong direction.

We competed against the arbitrariness and lying of the ruling Federal Republic, as well as against the stupidity and arrogance of the entire press active in the Federal Republic.

Against the good people, who without hesitation would betray their own family for perverted and despicable goals.

This group is not to be underestimated in its hypocrisy and number and can probably be credited with 30 to 50 % of the total population. They keep this injustice system going against the interests of their own countrymen and against the possibility of their own survival, in ignorance and disregard of the true aims of these measures of mass immigration.

We competed against parts of the especially studied young generation, who are tempted to betray themselves by every Pied Piper with fairy tales.

Against the destruction of our people, as of all other peoples, their families, traditions, cultures and many other values that have made these peoples strong, important and valuable.

We have set out to stop the division of the world into administrative units of a small, mostly satanistic and paedophilic elite, organized in lodges, self-proclaimed and their henchmen, who are organized in public life and on blogs on the Internet.

We have fought against a private monetary system that has enslaved humanity for decades, for truly all wars, famines, misery and suffering, the desecration of our planet, the exploitation of our livelihoods in principle, such as the billionfold murder is responsible and guilty.

Despite these many difficulties, the people of the Assembly pursue with great passion the only important and right goal. Thanks to you alone, the Assembly is still full of strength and size today and continues to grow. Later on, people will look back on this Constituent Assembly with pride and respect.

And that's why you don't let yourself be distracted by any slogans, such as the Constituent Assembly is now too early, there is still an existing old state on whose territory no new state can be established, Germany is still occupied, Allies have the say here, a peace treaty would have to be agreed first, or also, first the communities would have to be set up, or the Assembly would have

made legal mistakes or it would not have certain rights, for example to issue decrees. Really exhilarating is also: everyone should do a denazification. It is also popular that the meeting would be installed by the system, or it would be a business model and it would destroy our old rights.

None of this can even begin to be proven.

These statements are either deliberately scattered to stop the meeting by the aforementioned leadership elites or they reveal a lack of understanding of legal contexts or a lack of overall historical knowledge.

Where do these misjudgements come from?

The misjudgements come about because an important point is always overlooked. Before making a legal assessment, everyone must first check whether the respective author or the issuing institution was or is at all entitled to enact the law. This very lack of scrutiny leads to the existing confusion regarding the validity of rights, constitutions and other records.

If, however, this justification can be proven beyond doubt, then the principle exists:

What is written there applies.

And there, for example, it states as valid international law that with the proclamation of this Constituent Assembly on 1 November 2014, but at the latest since 11 October 2015, all current, as all previous legal systems, constitutions, ordinances or comparable, all equivalent or equivalent legal documents are legally invalid. Thus the discussion about old German empires and their constitutions or ordinances, laws or orders is unnecessary.

Those who do not recognise this internationally recognised right of all peoples cannot claim a right for themselves either.

We nevertheless reserve the right to land and territory, such as the possibility of reinstatement of older legal elements, since it is not the state as an institution that is or has the right, but only the natural legal entities in the proven succession to their ancestors. They are the state and not the only form of organisation they have created and can create.

That is the explanation and now I will begin with the legal references, which are of crucial importance for our relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany in particular:

1) Article 146 of the Basic Law of 23 May 1949 - "This Basic Law, which shall apply to the entire German people after the completion of German unity and freedom, shall cease to apply on the date on which a constitution which has been adopted by the German people in their free decision shall enter into force.

There is no doubt that the Basic Law has never been and still is not a constitution relevant under international law, but an administrative document.

2) Article 133 of the Basic Law - "The Confederation enters into the rights and obligations of the administration of the United Economic Territory".

The FRG is therefore not a state, but clearly the trust administration for a united economic territory organised under private law. Hence so many privatisations of former state institutions.

3) Article 25 of the Basic Law of 23 May 1949 - "The general rules of international law are part of federal law. They take precedence over the laws (of the Federal Republic of Germany) and create rights and obligations directly for the inhabitants of the federal territory." Higher international law is undoubtedly above all state and federal law. This international law is above administrative law - confirmed the FRG itself by this article.

4) Judgment of the Federal Constitutional Court BVerfG 2 BvG 1/51 of 23 October 1951, Second Senate,

Principles 21 and 21 c - "A Constituent Assembly is an internationally recognised act under international law and has a higher legal status than the representative body elected on the basis of the Constitution (see Article 25 of the Basic Law). It is in the possession of the pouvoir constituant. It is incompatible with this special position that restrictions are imposed on it from outside. Its independence in fulfilling this mandate is not only in deciding the content of the future Constitution, but also in deciding on the procedure in which the Constitution will be drawn up.

The Federal Constitutional Court recognises the existence of overpositive law, which is also binding on the constitutional legislature, and is competent to measure the law by it.

It is not only essential to the democratic principle that there should be a representative body of the people, but also that the right to vote should not be withdrawn from those entitled to vote by means not provided for in the Constitution.

5) The rule of law for the emergence of a legal entity, i.e. a state - "The subject under international law (a state, here in Germany this would be the federal states) existed and consists through its legitimate, natural legal entities (citizens of the federal states, thus our grandparents or great-grandparents) and those in the legal consequence, (thus we as descendants) who in turn draw their inalienable and indissoluble rights from the subject under international law (the states or the state)".

6) On 18 May 1956, at the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, the US Secretary of State declared: "The Federal Republic of Germany and the so-called German Democratic Republic are not - either separately or jointly - an all-German government authorised to act and make commitments on behalf of the subject of international law known as Germany. The government of the United States does not and will not allow Germany to be forever divided into new separate states as a subject of international law."

7) The subject of international law, Germany "as a whole", is demonstrably in the legal status of the Constituent Assembly of 1 November 2014 for all territories within the internationally recognised borders of the 1943 Conference of Foreign Ministers in Moscow, the 1944 London Protocol, such as

the Potsdam Conference of 1945 and the Potsdam State of 31 December 1937, and thus de jure in the corresponding state of territory of 18 July 1990 and de facto in the state of territory of 29 September 1990.

8) UN Charter (UN Civil Pact / UN Social Pact) on the right of peoples to self-determination - Article 1 -

(1) All peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of this right, they freely decide on their political status and freely shape their economic, social and cultural development.

All peoples may freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources for their own purposes, without prejudice to any obligations arising from international economic cooperation on the basis of mutual benefit and international law. Under no circumstances must a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence.

States Parties, including States responsible for the administration of non-self-governing and trustee territories, shall promote and respect the right to self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

9) Judgment of the Higher Administrative Court of Münster, judgment of 14.02.1989 (18 A 858/87), NVwZ 1989, 790 (ZaöRV 51[1991], 191) (p.310[89/1])

"A new state acquires its international legal personality irrespective of its recognition or non-recognition by the mere fact of its emergence. The statement in the recognition that the state was created is only of a "declaratory nature".

10) Federal Law Gazette II, page 855 / 890 of 23 September 1990, with legal effect from 29 September 1990.

"The territorial scope of the Basic Law of 23 May 1949 has been "abolished" by deleting Article 23 of the Basic Law. A new area of application was not inserted into the law, whereby a preamble does not belong to the respective law. Furthermore, a new text has been added to Article 23, which, in accordance with international legal rules, once again nullifies the entire law.

Because of the above-mentioned events and legal relationships, we still have the legal status dejure of July 18, 1990, or de facto of July 29, 1990, and therefore we always refer to the Basic Law of May 23, 1949.

Now follows a summary for a better understanding of what has been said so far and the core of the statement.

So there can be no question of it and in the further evaluation it is a flawless false statement that the Federal Constitutional Court, as it claims, would not be responsible for the dissemination and promotion of the Constituent Assembly.

The court is not competent only on the basis of its powers within the Federal Republic of Germany or its activities there. In doing so, it completely disregards its overriding obligations.

Our application was therefore not submitted on the basis of the FRG regulations, but according to the rules of superordinate law.

According to the valid law superior to the Federal Republic of Germany, to which the court has expressly committed itself, a competence and an obligation is undoubtedly present.

The Trust Administration of the Federal Republic of Germany, which consists of the federal parties, has signed the United Nations Charter and is thus subject to these legal principles. This also applies to all elements of this Confederation and thus also to the Federal Constitutional Court.

Point (3) of the UN Charter (UN Civil Pact / UN Social Pact) on the right of peoples to self-determination - Article 1 - (1) alone is sufficient to document the competence.

Remember: States Parties, including those responsible for the administration of territories without self-government and trust territories, shall promote and respect the right to self-determination in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

It is therefore completely irrelevant whether the FRG is or would be an administration, an NGO or a state. This obligation applies to all assumed legal situations.

The fact that the FRG refuses to fulfil its own obligations fits into the picture which the FRG has given and given in particular at the moment, but also before the government of Merkel.

In 1990, the parties brought their material values to safety at the expense of the people and engaged in a game with the real rulers of this world. There has never been talk of representation for the Germans, not since Konrad Adenauer and also not with the new parties, because they maintain this injustice with their participation in the FRG and the system of non-governmental organisation.

Now to the application procedure with the Federal Constitutional Court.

On July 3, 2018, the meeting served a motion on the Federal Constitutional Court to issue an immediate order which is neither subject to appeal nor limited in time. This request has the background of not depriving the court of its own capacity to act and giving it the opportunity to issue this order itself before the meeting orders it itself and the court dismisses it.

With regard to the court's obligation to pass a decision, this has already been explained earlier.

The Court's reply of 12 July 2018 contained the file number 2 BvG 1393/18 with the content that our Assembly had lodged a constitutional complaint, accompanied by a contested and temporary injunction.

This unintentional or intentional error was clarified by us in the briefs of 18 July 2018 and 01 August 2018.

In the Court's letter of 15 August 2018, the Court acknowledges its misjudgement in the designation of the nature of the proceedings, but argues as if our Assembly had nevertheless filed a constitutional complaint.

This is either embarrassing or the usual procedure, as it also applies e.g. in district courts. If the courts receive a rejection, they act as if they have received an opposition or an appeal.

However, the fact that this Federal Constitutional Court is trying such a cheap number vis-à-vis a Constituent Assembly is remarkable and is indicative of the state of the entire legal system of the Federal Republic.

On August 29, 2018, the meeting sent a now simpler motion together with the main motion of July 3, 2018, as an attachment to give the court the opportunity to participate again and also for the last time.

Through the exchange of correspondence, the Assembly attained an important legal status and thus achieved a further stage victory.

Since this exchange of correspondence, this Constituent Assembly has been a confirmed and permanent component of the legal system of the Federal Republic of Germany. No one can legally declare another Constituent Assembly on the territory for the duration of this Constituent Assembly.

In addition, the process is legally binding. The Federal Constitutional Court verifiably testifies to the legally effective existence of this Constituent Assembly through its written statements, to the Assembly and, above all, through its replies to other people who demanded our motion.

It's all very complicated, some people will now say. Therefore, the Constituent Assembly provides people with a brief and understandable legal phrase that is completely sufficient to clarify their own legal status.

This law says:

According to its own legal principles, the Federal Republic of Germany, like all bodies belonging to it, is subject to the higher rank of this International Constituent Assembly, whose legal status it documents in a binding manner by its laws and regulations and recognises as the law above it.

The most important laws and regulations are in detail:

(a) Article 25, Article 133 and Article 146 of the Basic Law of 23 May 1949

(b) UN Charter (UN Civil Pact / UN Social Pact) on the right of peoples to self-determination - Articles 1 - (1 to 3)

(c) Judgment of the Federal Constitutional Court BverfG 2 BvG 1/51 of 23 October 1951, Senate II, Principles 21 and 21 a,b, and c, Principles 27 and 29

Nevertheless, the Federal Republic of Germany deliberately refuses and suppresses its media coverage of the meeting. As of today, the following tasks and objectives therefore arise for the further course of this Constituent Assembly for Germany:

1) The status of the Constituent Assembly remains unchanged. By a decision of a plenary assembly, the First Council has the power to order and establish the capacity of the Federal State of Germany to act at any time and without further decision.

2) All published and unpublished contents, drafts and texts of the draft constitution for the full constitution remain and are archived for a later date. Amendments to the core constitution of 04.04.2016 continue to apply, as does the core constitution itself. Article 146 of the Basic Law has already been successfully implemented by the vote and the count to the core constitution on 30 June 2017. The Basic Law has thus expired once again.

3) The most important task of all participants of the Assembly is to spread the Assembly over the entire area until this goal has been achieved. Suitable concepts, documents and ideas for dissemination are currently being developed. All people are called to cooperate.

4) The currently existing internal structures are oriented towards the above-mentioned sole objective of informing all Germans about the existence of their Constituent Assembly.

With this in mind, we are stepping up our efforts from the Assembly, as we are doing through every available media network, with the intention of ensuring nationwide dissemination.

Many of you had written to the BVerfG and received letters back from there. There the BVerfG describes that it is not competent. Of course it does and it has already confirmed in its own judgement of 1951 that a Constituent Assembly is above the elected government and that the people themselves have the constituent power. That is exactly what pouvoir consituant means and that is exactly what this judgment says.

None of us has received a letter stating: "Check your legal opinion", because the BVerfG knows very well what a VV means, what its task is and what power it is.

According to the BVerfG's own description, the Federal Constitutional Court is very much obliged to promote and support a Constituent Assembly, because this would also show that it is willing to actually observe what UN and international law, as well as the Federal Republic itself, has signed and recognised and to which the Federal Constitutional Court belongs and thus also shows that what is international law also applies to the Federal Republic.

But in the end, as the pouvoir consituant, we are the ones who must ensure that it can be implemented, and we must do so by disseminating it and bringing it to the outside world.

It is not the street battles that are to be aimed for, but the knowledge of the masses what right they have and that this right is already there.

Even a FRG cannot oppose a constituent power of the people, which would not be internationally condemned and would already seal its AUS.

It is no coincidence that we know of many countries that hold or have held a Constituent Assembly, even if the starting situations were different.

Let us recognise our strength and our right and implement it for the benefit of all.

Everybody, help. It is your assembly - your right and your future.

Thank you for your attention.