

# THE HISTORY OF THE DECEPTION

This is not all the nuts and bolts, but should be enough for you to get a handle on it.

The term 'Law' originates through the fiction of ownership, its original meaning was 'Lord'; the landlords 'word' was law; the true term, that law is used in place of, is 'Axiom', meaning a self-evident truth that requires no proof, a universally accepted principle or rule. The axioms of the land, the natural axioms, that all of mankind are bound by, are inalienable and immutable across the entire earth.

We have 2 major styles of law in the world. - Roman/Civil law and Common law.

**Civil law** or **statute law** or **Legislation** is largely world-wide with an emphasis on government regulation, judge controlled decisions, individually varying decisions and the belief that government exercise uncontrolled legislative authority. This is administered through Magistrates Court, County Court, Tribunals etc.

"The law is subject to all the fluctuation in practice which grows out of the different principles of interpretation....much certainty of law is lost..."

**Common law**, now largely restricted to Canada, the US and Australia, has created a fixed rule of decisions in order that rights and property may be stable and certain. It has always preferred the court/jury decision and repudiated outside authority. It has been equated with stability and just equality and "has great superiority over civil law as a practical jurisprudence regulating the affairs of society. It excludes private interpretations and controls the arbitrary discretion of judges."

Simply put: Civil law/statute law/Legislation is government law.

Common law is the people's protection against government law.

The control of the "State" by the "Church" can be traced back to the 18<sup>th</sup> Dynasty in Egypt around 1550 BC with the deposing of the Amun Priests by the pharaoh Akhenaten, and their subsequent take over of control of the throne once Akhenaten was gone by the Amun Priests under the control of the High Priest, Ay, during the reign of the boy pharaoh Tutankhmen and into and through the 19<sup>th</sup>- 21<sup>st</sup> Dynasties from 1300 BC - 945 BC.

This persisted for the next 900 years until the next pivotal moment when Julius Caesar became Emperor of Rome and united with Cleopatra, instigating, in particular, the solar calendar of the Egyptians over the previous lunar calendar of the roman empire.

Up until then, from around 509 BC, The Roman Republic, officially the Senate and People of Rome, was run through public representation of the Roman people, under what we might today call a form of Common law, but, like almost all organisations involving man, overtime it was infiltrated and corrupted by those seeking money and power and morphed into the ***Lex fori***, the law of the forum.

The early "church" traces itself back to Mithraism, which has strong imagery connections to Isis and ancient Egypt, and was popular among the Imperial Roman army from about the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD.

According to Catholic tradition it was founded in the first century by Saints Peter and Paul and, as now as a sovereign entity, the Holy See, administered by the Roman Curia (Latin for "Court"), which is the central government of the Catholic Church, is headquartered in, operates from, and exercises

"exclusive dominion" over the independent Vatican City State enclave in Rome, of which the pope is sovereign, and although the Holy See is sometimes metonymically referred to as the "Vatican", the Vatican City State was distinctively established with the Lateran Treaty of 1929, between the Holy See and Italy, to ensure the temporal, diplomatic, and spiritual independence of the papacy.

Today, the Holy See maintains bilateral diplomatic relations with 183 sovereign states, signs concordats and treaties, and performs multilateral diplomacy with multiple intergovernmental organizations, including the United Nations and its agencies, the Council of Europe, the European Communities, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and the Organization of American States.

But back just before the turn of the century, most likely because of Julius Caesar's union with Cleopatra, there became a clear distinction between Church and State, the state now being a cesspool of rich, corrupt and power-hungry families. At that time the illusion was, that the State held power over the newly formed church, but all that was going to change when, *exactly at the end of the 4th century AD following the Edict of Thessalonica in 380 AD*, "Christianity" becomes the state religion.

The shift of power all started with the Justinian Deception, ***The Justinian Code*** or ***Corpus Juris Civilis (Corpus of Civil Law)*** ("Body of Civil Law") issued from 529 to 534 AD by order of Emperor Justinian I, Eastern Roman Emperor, that served to secure the status of Christianity as the state religion of the empire, uniting Church and state, with the very first law in the Codex requiring all persons (citizens) under the jurisdiction of the Roman Empire to hold the Christian faith, thus making anyone who was not connected to the Christian church a non-citizen.

Or, to put in the alternative - 'Citizens' owe allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church. And this is controlled through the 'person's' legal name (IN CAPITAL LETTERS) that identifies a "person" for legal, administrative and other official purposes and given for the purpose of registration of the birth and which then appears on a birth certificate.

But a 'legal name' is not a proper name, nor is a 'SURNAME', the name by which the 'legal system' and Rome claims authority 'over' and 'above' the living being. But because most people back then couldn't read or write, they had no idea they were being deceived.

The ***Corpus Juris Civilis*** was revived in the Middle Ages during Western Europe and was "received" or imitated as private law. This revived Roman law, in turn, became the foundation of law in all civil law jurisdictions and influenced the canon law of the Catholic Church: it was said that *ecclesia vivit lege romana* – the church lives by Roman law. What is more correct is; the church rules by Roman Law.

If Rome holds the legal titles of the countries of the world, which it does, then it alone is the debtor, but if Rome has the ability to confer the legal title to a third party debtor, (you) through the name "AUSTRALIA" and "COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA, Rome becomes the benefactor of all such countries. This knowledge to confer such legal title, being the debtor of the world, to the unsuspecting masses, we the people, is the key to the success of their deceit. Rome transfers itself from the world debtor to the world creditor via the **Justinian Deception**, the incredible grammatical deception that you are/were never meant to know.

And as the pope was the ruler over the citizens, over time, he was often called upon to intervene in quarrels, affirm monarchs, and decide jurisdictions.

In the 11th & 12th C Civil law began to encroach on the Anglo-Saxon system that had prevailed in England and the Vatican was not pleased.

An uprising of the English common folk against the arbitrary personal & land control of the English nobility, resulting in the Magna Carta – proclaimed the great fundamental of common law.

From 1154, Henry II, of the House of the Plantagenets, held the English (Catholic) throne, and, in the tradition of the Norman Kings who had come before him, Henry II was keen to dominate the church, the same way he did the state. When the Archbishop of Canterbury, Theobald of Bec, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in England, and the Pope's appointed representative, died in 1161, Henry saw an opportunity to reassert his rights over the church in England and, without consulting the pope, Henry appointed Thomas Becket, his English Chancellor, as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162.

He did so probably believing that Becket, in addition to being an old friend, would be politically weakened within the Church because of his former role as Chancellor, and would therefore have to rely on Henry's support. But his plan did not have the desired result, as Becket promptly changed his lifestyle, abandoning his links to the King and portrayed himself as a staunch protector of church rights.

Henry and Becket quickly disagreed over several issues, including the treatment of clergy who committed secular crimes: Henry argued that the legal custom in England allowed the king to enforce justice over these clerics, while Becket maintained that only church courts could try the cases.

The matter came to a head in January 1164, when Henry forced through agreement to the Constitutions of Clarendon, 16 constitutions aimed at decreasing ecclesiastical interference from Rome. Under tremendous pressure, Becket temporarily agreed, but changed his position shortly afterwards and Becket ultimately refused to ratify the proposals.

The argument between Henry and Becket became both increasingly personal and international in nature and neither man was willing to back down. The situation worsened when, on 8 October 1164, Henry called Beckett before the Royal Council, only to find Becket had fled to France to seek sanctuary with Henry's enemy, Louis VII.

The pope tried to intervene but over the next 6 years matters escalated until in 1170 the pope authorised Becket to lay an interdict on England, forcing Henry back to negotiations and, finally, Becket returned to England. But just when the dispute seemed resolved, Becket excommunicated another three supporters of Henry, and consequently, four of Henry's knights secretly went to Canterbury and hacked Becket to death on 29 December 1170.

This event, particularly in front of an altar, horrified Christian Europe but Henry took no action to arrest Becket's killers. International pressure on Henry grew, and in May 1172 he negotiated a settlement with the papacy in which the King swore to go on crusade as well as effectively overturning the Constitutions of Clarendon by signing the Compromise of Avranches, which removed from the secular courts almost all jurisdiction over the clergy, except high treason, highway robbery and arson, and marked the reconciliation of Henry II with Catholic Church.

But the king still had to be punished, had to pay his penance and publicly make peace with the church, which he did four years later by performing penance at Canterbury Cathedral, beaten by 80 monks while wearing a sack cloth and ashes and spent the night in vigil at St Thomas Becket's tomb.

The crown passed to Henry's son, Richard the Lionheart, who ruled for 10 years, before it was passed to Henry's youngest son, John, who also tried to appoint his own Archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton. But the pope, Pope Innocent III, was having nothing of that and accused John of impious persecution, and that he tried to enslave the entire English Church.

The pope laid an interdict (1208-1214) wherein no religious services be performed for anyone, but when that didn't stop John, the pope excommunicated him. This was at a time when if you weren't with church you were lost forever, so eventually John caved in and wrote a letter of concession to the pope, hoping to have the interdiction and excommunication lifted.

The act of submission was made to PANDULF at Dover on the 15th of May, 1213

I, John, by the grace of God, 'king of England and lord of Ireland, from this hour forth will be faithful to God and St. Peter and the Roman church and my lord pope Innocent and his Successors who are ordained in a Catholic manner: I shall not bring it about by deed, word, consent or counsel, that they lose life or members or be taken captive, I will impede their being harmed if I know of it, and will cause harm to be removed from them if I shall be able: otherwise as quickly as I can I will intimate it or tell of it to such persons as I believe for certain will inform them. Any counsel which they entrust to me through themselves or through their envoys or through their letters, I will keep secret, nor will I knowingly disclose it to anyone to their harm. I will aid to the best of my ability in holding and defending against all men the patrimony of St. Peter, and especially the kingdom of England and the kingdom of Ireland. So may God and these holy Gospels aid me.

I myself bearing witness in the house of the Knights Templars near Dover, in the presence of master H., archbishop of Dublin; master J., bishop of Norwich; G., the son of Peter count of Essex, our justice; W., count of Salisbury, our brother; W. Marshall, count of Pembroke; R., count of Boulogne; W., count of Warren; S., count of Winchester; W., count of Arundel; W., count of Ferrieres; W. Briwer; Peter, son of Herbert; Warin, son of Gerold; on the 15th day of May, in the 14th year of our reign.

This oath of fealty was renewed to Nicolas, Bishop of Tusculum at London on the 3rd October with a golden Bulla, and with the actual performance of liege homage here promised to the Pope. The form of the oath of homage was traditional. It is uncertain whether the concession of the kingdom was suggested from the Papal side, or spontaneously proposed by John, but it is clear that the form of John's oath was dictated by Pandulf.

John I: Concession of England to the Pope 1213

“John, by the grace of God, king of England, lord of Ireland, duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, count of Anjou, to all the faithful of Christ who shall look upon this present charter, greeting.”

A “Charter” is a grant from the government of ownership rights in land to a person, a group of people, or an organisation such as a corporation. A basic document of law of a Municipal Corporation granted by the state, defining its rights, liabilities, and responsibilities of self-government.

“We wish it to be known to all of you, through this our charter, furnished with our seal, that inasmuch as we had offended in many ways God and our mother the holy church, and in consequence are known to have very, much needed the divine mercy, and can not offer anything worthy for making due satisfaction to God and to the church unless we humiliate ourselves and our kingdoms:-we, wishing to humiliate ourselves for Him who humiliated Himself for us unto death, the grace of the Holy Spirit inspiring, not induced by force or compelled by fear, but of our own good and spontaneous will and by the common counsel of our barons, do offer and freely concede to God and His holy apostles Peter and Paul and to our mother the holy Roman church, and to our lord pope Innocent and to his Catholic successors, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom Ireland, with all their rights and appurtenances, for the remission of our own sins and of those of our whole race as well for the living as for the dead; and now receiving and holding them, as it were a vassal, from God and the Roman church, in the presence of that prudent man Pandulph, subdeacon and of the household of the lord pope, we perform and swear fealty for them...”

Fealty - a feudal tenant's or vassal's sworn loyalty to a lord, formal acknowledgement of loyalty to a lord. Subservience.

“..... to him our aforesaid lord pope Innocent, and his catholic successors and the Roman church, according to the form appended; and in the presence of the lord pope, if we shall be able to come before him, we shall do liege homage to him; binding our successors and our heirs by our wife forever,

Liege - concerned with or relating to the relationship between a feudal superior or sovereign (the pope) and a vassal (one who serves – in this case King John and his successors). “Binding our successors and our heirs by our wife FOREVER!”

“... in similar manner to perform fealty and show homage to him who shall be chief pontiff at that time, and to the Roman church without demur.

To whomever is pontiff at the time, i.e. to today's pope.

“As a sign, moreover, of this our on we will and establish perpetual obligation and concession we will establish that from the proper and especial revenues of our aforesaid kingdoms, for all the service and customs which we ought to render for them, saving in all things the penny of St. Peter, the Roman church shall receive yearly a thousand marks sterling, namely at the feast of St. Michael five hundred marks, and at Easter five hundred marks-seven hundred, namely, for the kingdom of England, and three hundred for the kingdom of Ireland-..”

John was in effect renting the land (England) from the pope.

“...”saving to us and to our heirs our rights, liberties and regalia; “

The rental included the regalia, the position of ‘king’ AND the crown.

“... all of which things, as they have been described above, we wish to have perpetually valid and firm; and we bind ourselves and our successors not to act counter to them. And if we or any one of our successors shall presume to attempt this, whoever he be, unless being duly warned he come to his kingdom, and this senses, be shall lose his right to the kingdom, and this charter of our obligation and concession shall always remain firm.

And the Pope's Response:

"This offer and concession so piously and wisely made we regard as acceptable and valid, and we take under the protection of Saint Peter and of ourselves your person and the persons of your heirs together with the said kingdoms and their appurtenances and all other goods which are now reasonably held or may in future be so held: to you and to your heirs, according to the terms set out above and by the general advice of our brethren, we grant the said kingdoms in fief and confirm them by this privilege, on condition that any of your heirs on receiving the crown will publicly acknowledge this as a fief held of the Supreme Pontiff and of the Roman Church, and will take an oath of fealty to them. Let no man, therefore, have power to infringe this document of our concession and confirmation, or presume to oppose it. If any man dare to do so, let him know that he will incur the anger of Almighty God and of SS Peter and Paul, His apostles. Amen, amen, Amen.

King John had made a contract with the pope; he would be 'king' with the crown, as would his successors, provided he paid the yearly amounts as determined in the concession.

John's concession in effect made England a fiefdom of Rome, with the pope the land-lord of England.

Fiefdom – 1. an area of land, especially one that is rented and paid for by work

2. an area or type of activity that is controlled by someone.

John signed the concession and the pope lifted the interdiction and excommunication. And the penalty if John (or any of his successors) didn't pay the money and broke the agreement? He/they would lose the crown to the pope forever.

The fees were massive and King John and the Sheriff of Nottingham (yes, the legend of Robin Hood) placed increased pressure on the Barons of the land through taxes. But his Barons could not afford the taxes and eventually King John caved under pressure and signed the *Magna Carta Libertatum*, commonly called *Magna Carta*, a charter of rights written in heavily abbreviated medieval Latin (the convention for legal documents at that time), that insisted, among other things, that the English church shall be free of ecclesiastical appointments fixed by the king. It was agreed to and sealed, with the royal great seal, on 15 June 1215.

The Magna Carta gave a surety of ownership to the freemen of England. Inheritance, land, earnings were all protected and the Crown could no longer dispossess a freeman at their will, but only under just laws. It was not perfect but it was a huge step towards a just system.

Although it concerned the medieval relationship between the monarch and the barons, rather than the rights of ordinary people, the *Magna Carta* is often cited by politicians and campaigners, and is held in great respect by the British and American legal communities, Lord Denning describing it as;

"the greatest constitutional document of all times – the foundation of the freedom of the individual against the arbitrary authority of the despot".

But in doing so, King John was refusing to pay the fees to the pope, so he broke the terms of his charter with Rome; he broke the contract!.



Remember, the penalty for breaking the 1213 agreement was clearly defined - the loss of the crown (right to the kingdom) to the Pope and his Roman Church.

And so, on August 24, 1215, Pope Innocent III formally and lawfully took the crown from the royal monarchs of England by an act of declaration in which he annulled the *Magna Carta*; later in the year, placing an interdict (prohibition) on the entire British Empire.

From that time until today, the English monarchy and the entire British Crown belonged to, and is owned by, the Pope.

The *Magna Carta*, was ultimately 'reissued' by King Edward I in 1297, but this time confirming it as part of England's statute law, even though the crown was resigned and surrendered to the Pope (Pope's legate). As for the *Magna Carta*, only three of the original clauses of *Magna Carta* are still 'law'. One defends the freedom and rights of the English Church, another confirms the liberties and customs of London and other towns, but the third is the most famous:

“No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled – nor will we proceed with force against him – except by the lawful judgement of his equals or by the law of the land. To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice.....”

But a “free man” is NOT a ‘free’ man. A “Free man” is a man who has been freed to tend a plot of land under Feudalism or serfdom.

Five years later, on 18 November 1302, Pope Boniface VIII issued the ‘Unam Sanctum’, a papal bull in which he claimed the souls of all the people on the planet for the Catholic Church.

This is still in effect today and is the core foundation for the current Justinian deception;

Back in medieval England, as the decades passed from 1215, civil law again crept in, and the fact the crown and monarchy must now be rented from the Pope ultimately led to conflicts in the House of the Plantagenets between two branches, the House of Lancaster and the House of York, which ultimately led to the Wars of the Roses between 1455 and 1487.

This resulted in Henry Tudor, Henry VII, descended from Edward III via his mother through the House of Beaufort, a legitimate branch of the House of Lancaster, seizing the throne under the right of conquest when his forces defeated King Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth Field (22 August 1485), the culmination of the Wars of the Roses eliminating the male lines of both families when Richard III died in battle.

Now remember Henry II's contract;

“binding our successors and our heirs by our wife forever, “

Henry VII was a descendant by blood of King John, so the contract applied to him as well.

Henry VII was the last king of England to win his throne on the field of battle. cementing his claim to the throne by marrying Elizabeth of York, daughter of Richard's brother Edward I, in 1486, thus restoring the power and stability of the English monarchy after the civil war by symbolically uniting the former warring factions under the new Tudor dynasty.

To secure the crown even further Henry VII arranged for his eldest son, Arthur, to marry Catherine of Aragon, but when Arthur died, Catherine was married to Arthur's younger brother, Henry, who would become Henry VIII.

However, in 1534, during the reign of King Henry VIII, in response to the Pope's refusal to annul Henry's marriage to Catherine, the "English Church" (*Ecclesia Anglicana* in Latin - merely indicating that it was still part of the one Catholic Church but localised in England), through a series of legislative acts, culminating in the See of Rome Act 1536, became independent of, and enforced the separation from, the Holy See and Rome, with Henry declaring himself Supreme Head. Henry VIII was trying to do exactly what Henry II had tried.

From 1536-41 Henry VIII engaged in a large-scale dissolution of the monasteries, priories, convents and friaries in England, Wales and Ireland, which controlled most of the wealth of the English (Catholic) church and much of the richest land. He appropriated their income, disposed of their assets, and sold them off, mostly to pay for the wars. Needless to say the Catholic Church was not amused. In the Catholic narrative, Henry's action was sacrilegious, a national violation of things consecrated to God, and evil. The pope's tenant was selling off the farm!

King Henry VIII, expatriated the whole Catholic faith completely from all of England, even had the head cut off the pope at the time... Then had the Church of England established and proclaiming the Church of England as the one and only lawful church of England...

It is most likely that is why in 1540 Pope Paul III approved the foundation of the religious order of the Jesuits, headquartered in Rome, to protect the financial assets of the Holy See.

As a side note: Today, it is the Vatican through the Jesuits who in effect are financially controlling the people of the world through the banks and under the claim of the 'Unam Sanctum' of 1302. It is estimated the Catholic Church in the State of Victoria alone is worth more than \$9 billion.

Back in England, the 1547 to 1553 reign of the boy King Edward VI saw the Church of England become more influenced by Protestantism, but his successor, Queen Mary I, was determined to return the whole of England to the Catholic faith and thus the fractured and schismatic English Church was linked anew to continental Catholicism and the See of Rome.

But when Mary died in 1558 and Elizabeth I became queen, she reverse her sister's re-establishment of Catholicism by Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity aimed at abolishing the authority of the Pope in England and making it a crime to assert the authority of any foreign prince, prelate, or other authority.

During the first years of her reign many English Catholics worshipped along side their Protestant neighbours, until this was formally forbidden by Pope Pius V's 1570 bull, *Regnans in Excelsis*, which also declared Elizabeth was not a rightful queen and should be deposed, formally excommunicated her and any who obeyed her. After all, he owned the crown legally because King John had broken the contract by signing the *Magna Carta*.

And here is where it becomes extremely relevant as, in response, the "**Act to retain the Queen's Majesty's subjects in their obedience**" passed in **1581**, made it high treason to be reconciled to "the Romish religion", Catholicism, with the climax of Elizabeth's persecution of Catholics reaching its zenith in 1585 with the Act against Jesuits, which made it high treason for any Jesuit



priest to be in England at all. Basically, under English Law, Catholicism was outlawed, as was the Jesuit control of finances in England.

When Elizabeth died in 1603 the crown went to James VI of the House of Stuart, also a blood descendant of King John, who commissioned a new bible, the Authorizes King James Version written with Christian values instead of Catholic, this was the first real break away from the Catholic Church, because a new foundation could be laid without any Catholic influence on April 10, 1606.

He also established a charter with the goal of establishing 'settlements' or 'colonies' on the coast of America. The two companies, the "Virginia Company of London" and the "Virginia Company of Plymouth" established an area of overlapping territory in America with the two companies not permitted to establish colonies within 100 miles of each other.

The word "colony" comes from the Latin word *colōnia*, used as concept for Roman military bases and eventually cities. This in turn derives from the word *colōnus*, which was a Roman tenant farmer. The terminology is taken from architectural analogy, where a column pillar is beneath the (often stylized) head capital, which is also a biological analog of the body as subservient beneath the controlling head (with 'capital' coming from the Latin word *caput*, meaning 'head'). So colonies are not independently self-controlled, but rather are controlled from a separate entity that serves the capital function

The contract was to establish colonies in what is now the USA, and the latin word for serfs, or servants is COLONI. So these were 'colonies', under fealty and allegiance to the crown, and who legally owns 'the crown' – the pope.

James I was engaging in a contract with and for the crown, for the pope, to claim land in the new land discovered by Christopher Columbus, who sailed under the auspices of the Catholic Monarchs of Castile and Aragon, in 1492 - ON BEHALF OF THE POPE.

As corporations, the companies were empowered by the Crown to govern themselves, and this right was passed on to the colony following the dissolution of the third Charter in 1621. The Virginia Company failed in 1624, but the right to self-government was not taken from the colony. The principle was thus established that a royal colony should be self-governing, and this formed the genesis of democracy in America.

And that is part of the deception, because legally the United States of America are still 'owned by James I, and in allegiance to the pope through James I and the 1606 charter.

James I of England was also notable for creating the **King James Bible (KJB)**, an English translation of the Christian (Catholic) Bible for the Church of England published in 1611. The King James Version has been described as one of the most important books in English culture and a driving force in the shaping of the English-speaking world, however, copyright of 'The Bible' remains with the Catholic Church – the English Translation (The King James Bible) is STILL a Catholic owned text, and swearing on the King James Bible is swearing to the Catholic Church, the Justinian Deception, the See of Rome, the Pope and the Vatican.

Further religious conflict occurred when the Catholic Church made a come back with King Charles the First in 1625, under the St Edwards Crown. King Charles the First married a Roman Catholic and allowed the Catholic Church to infiltrate all official offices and the Church of England itself, which of course bought a now United Kingdom of Great Britain, Scotland and Ireland, back under

the influence of the Vatican, and religious conflict between Charles I (1625–49) and other "High" Anglicans and Calvinists that formed a strand of the anti-monarchical tension between the king's court, with strong "Papist" elements, and a Parliament in which the Puritans were strong.

From this period came the Petition of Rights 1627, demanding the return and protection of Common Law, Habeus Corpus 1640, Bill of Rights 1689, all of which extended the rights gained under the Magna Carta. The Bill of Rights in particular placed a demand on the Monarchy to honour its role to protect the freeman of England. Consequently William & Mary swore upon their lives and bound their future monarchy to defend the people's rights forever.

This split religious ideology was one of the major factors behind the consequent English Civil War, in which almost all Catholics supported the King, but the victory of the Parliamentarians meant a strongly Protestant and anti-Catholic regime under Oliver Cromwell.

But the pope would not take that lying down and the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II (1660–85) also saw the restoration of a Catholic-influenced court like his father's. This resulted in the introduction of the Cestui Que Vie Act 1666, an attempt to further deceive all living beings by pronouncing them as dead under the rule of the SEE/SEA, with the state becoming the trustee holding all titles to the people and property until a living man comes back to reclaim those titles.

#### The Cestui Que Vie Trust

A Cestui Que Vie Trust is a fictional concept. It is a Temporary Testamentary Trust, first created during the reign of Henry VIII of England through the Cestui Que Vie Act of 1540 and updated by Charles II, through the CQV Act of 1666, wherein an Estate may be effected for the Benefit of a Person presumed lost or abandoned at "sea" and therefore assumed "dead" after seven (7) years. Additional presumptions, by which such a Trust may be formed, were added in later statutes to include bankrupts, minors, incompetents, mortgages, and private companies.

The original purpose of a CQV Trust was to form a temporary Estate for the benefit of another because some event, state of affairs, or condition prevented them from claiming their status as living, competent, and present, before a competent authority. Therefore, any claims, history, statutes, or arguments that deviate in terms of the origin and function of a CQV Trust, as pronounced by these canons, is false and automatically null and void. A Beneficiary under Estate may be either a Beneficiary or a CQV Trust.

When a Beneficiary loses direct benefit of any Property of the higher Estate placed in a CQV Trust on his behalf, he do not "own" the CQV Trust; he is only the beneficiary of what the Trustees of the CQV Trust choose to provide.

As all CQV Trusts are created on presumption, based upon original purpose and function, such a Trust cannot be created if these presumptions can be proven not to exist.

Since 1933, when a child is borne in a State (Estate) under inferior Roman law, three (3) Cestui Que (Vie) Trusts are created upon certain presumptions specifically designed to deny, forever, the child any rights of Real Property, any Rights to be free, and any Rights to be known as man or woman, rather than a creature or animal, by claiming and possessing their Soul or Spirit.

The Executors or Administrators of the higher Estate willingly and knowingly: convey the beneficial entitlements of the child, as Beneficiary, into the 1st Cestui Que (Vie) Trust in the form of a Registry

Number by registering the Name, thereby also creating the Corporate Person and denying the child any rights to Real Property; and, claim the baby as chattel to the Estate. The slave baby contract is then created by honoring the ancient tradition of either having the ink impression of the baby's feet onto the live birth record, or a drop of its blood, as well as tricking the parents to signing the baby away through the deceitful legal meanings on the live birth record which is a promissory note, converted into a slave bond, sold to the private reserve bank of the estate, and then conveyed into a 2nd and separate CQV Trust, per child, owned by the bank.

When the promissory note reaches maturity and the bank is unable to "seize" the slave child, a maritime lien is lawfully issued to "salvage" the lost property and is monetized as currency issued in series against the CQV Trust. claim the child's soul via the Baptismal Certificate.

Since 1540 and the creation of the 1st CQV Act, deriving its power from the Papal Bull of Roman Cult leader Pope Paul III, 1540, when a child is baptized and a Baptismal Certificate is issued, the parents have gifted, granted, and conveyed the soul of the baby to a "3rd" CQV Trust owned by Roman Cult, which has held this valuable property in its vaults ever since.

Since 1815, this 3rd Crown of the Roman Cult and 3rd CQV Trust representing Ecclesiastical Property has been managed by the BAR as the reconstituted "Galla" responsible, as Grim Reapers, for reaping the souls.

Each Cestui Que Vie Trust, created since 1933, represents one of the 3 Crowns representing the three claims of property of the Roman Cult: Real Property (on Earth), Personal Property (body), and Ecclesiastical Property (soul). Each corresponds exactly to the three forms of law available to the Galla of the BAR Courts: corporate commercial law (judge is the 'landlord'), maritime and canon law (judge is the banker), and Talmudic law (judge is the priest).

What is the real power of a court 'judge'?

Given what has been revealed about the foundations of Roman Law, what is the real hidden power of a judge when we face court? Is it their superior knowledge of process and procedure or of magic? Or is it something simpler and far more obvious?

It is unfortunate that much of the excitement about Estates and Executors has deliberately not revealed that an Estate, by definition, has to belong to a Trust—to be specific, a Testamentary Trust or CQV Trust. When we receive legal paper or have to appear in court, it is these same CQV Trusts which have our rights converted into the property contained within them. Instead of being the Trustee, or the Executor, or Administrator, we are merely the Beneficiary of each CQV Trust, granted only beneficial and equitable use of certain property, never legal title.

So if the Roman Legal System assumes we are merely the beneficiary of these CQV Trusts, when we go to court, who represents the Trustee and Office of Executor? We all know that all cases are based upon the judge's discretion which often defies procedures, statutes, and maxims of law. Well, they are doing what any Trustee or Executor, administering a trust in the presence of the beneficiary, can do under Roman Law and all the statutes, maxims, and procedures are really for show because under the principles of Trust Law, as first formed by the Roman Cult, a Trustee has a wide latitude, including the ability to correct any procedural mistakes, by obtaining the implied or tacit consent of

the beneficiary, to obviate any mistakes. The judge is the real and legal Name. The judge is the trust, itself.

We are the mirror image to them—the ghost—the dead. It is high sorcery, trickery, and subterfuge that has remained “legal” for far too long.

‘Legally’ therefore we are considered to be a fiction, a concept or idea expressed as a name, a symbol. The legal person has no consciousness because it is dead; it is a juristic person, ENS-LEGIS, a name/word written on a piece of paper. That is why you always need representation when involved in courts and legal matters, because you’re dead. In this way, all people are seen to be in custody of “the Crown”, now owned legally by the pope.

Meanwhile, back in England, it was Charles' brother and heir, James, Duke of York who became Britain's first openly Catholic monarch, James II, in 1685.

As a consequence, protestant fears mounted as James placed Catholics in the major commands of the existing standing army, dismissed the Protestant Bishop of London and dismissed the Protestant fellows of Magdalen College and replaced them with a wholly Catholic board. The last straw was the birth of a Catholic heir in 1688, portending a return to a pre-Reformation Catholic dynasty.

James’s Roman Catholic sympathies and belief in the divine right of the Crown, resulted in what came to be known as the Glorious Revolution, during which James II fled England and the disgruntled parliamentarians, deeming James to have abdicated (although they effectively deposed him) offered the throne to his eldest daughter, Mary, who was Protestant.

She accepted it on condition that she could reign jointly with her Dutch husband, William of Orange, who became William III and, as part of the ‘coup’ a Declaration of Right was presented by the Convention Parliament to William III and Mary II in February 1689, inviting them to become joint sovereigns of England. It was restated in statutory form as **The Bill of Rights**, also known as the **English Bill of Rights**, an Act of the Parliament of England, receiving Royal Assent on 16 December 1689. **The Bill of Rights** lays down limits on the powers of the monarch, clarifies who would be next to inherit the Crown, and sets out certain basic civil rights of individuals, including the prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment and the reestablishment of the right of Protestants to have arms for their defence within the rule of law.

The **rule of law** is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as:

"The authority and influence of law in society, especially when viewed as a constraint on individual and institutional behaviour; (hence) the principle whereby all members of a society (including those in government) are considered equally subject to publicly disclosed legal codes and processes."

The rule of law implies that every person is subject to the law, including people who are lawmakers, law enforcement officials, and judges and that freedom in society means being subject only to laws made by a legislature that apply to everyone, with a person being otherwise free from both governmental and private restrictions upon liberty.

But: The phrase "the rule of law" refers to a political situation, not to any specific legal rule.

What does that mean?

The “rule of law” is not law, it is a presumption of law, it is an influence and implication, a colour of law, that depends on ‘legislation’ and that all members of society are considered to be subject to that ‘legislation’.

Further, being considered to be subject to ‘legislation’ does not mean lawfully or legally one is bound to that ‘legislation’; one must consent to “the rule of law” (legislation) or it does not apply.

The final nail in the coffin of Catholic control and rule was in 1701 with the passing of the **Act of Settlement**, designed to settle the succession to the English and Irish crowns on Protestants only.

The **Act of Settlement 1701** excludes any Catholic or anyone who marries a Catholic from the throne and strengthens the **Bill of Rights (1689)**, both of which are still in effect in all Commonwealth realms today.

Why is this relevant?

Because you as a police officer, and police in all states, are being deceived and do not uphold "Law", they uphold the ‘legislation’ imposed without the consent of the people.

‘Legislation’ (and the ‘rule of law’) is not "law" in the Commonwealth of Australia until it has been given Lawful assent (Showing Line of Authority to the Imperial Crown) and proclamation, which has not happened since before Queen Elizabeth II took the throne.

The proper Law in the Commonwealth of Australia is Imperial Law (Imperial Acts) and the Common Law, which is not only ignored but also broken countless times every day by all Police Officers.

As the **Act of settlement 1701** is still current, all "lawful" representatives of the "Crown" in the Commonwealth of Australia must have a clear line of Authority to the Imperial Crown. (This includes Parliamentarians, Court Officials, Police and Armed Services).

But you do serve the crown, right, all Police Officers within the Commonwealth of Australia display it on their uniform and badge?

Exactly right, you do serve ‘a’ crown, but it is not the Imperial Crown, it is the St Edwards Crown; made in 1661 for Charles II from a lump of gold thought to be melted remains of the medieval crown thought to date back to Edward the confessor circa 11th century. It is a Catholic Crown, the crown with which Queen Elizabeth II was coronated.

William III was succeeded by his sister-in-law Anne as an ‘Anglican’ Queen of Great Britain and Ireland until her death in 1714, when she was succeeded by her second cousin George I of the House of Hanover, who had been ruler of the Duchy and Electorate of Brunswick-Lüneburg in the Holy Roman Empire from 23 January 1698, meaning he was obviously Catholic, so, given the **Act of Settlement 1701** excludes any Catholic or anyone who marries a Catholic from the throne, how did he get the crown?

Further, in August 1701, George was invested with the Order of the Garter, first instituted by King Edward III on 23 April 1344. But the order of the garter was granted by the Popes and it was a title which represented "Holy Roman Emperor". Many Emperors and kings have the Garter, it is bestowed specifically from the Templar's Crown Temple Church, the Queen being the representative

Grand Patroness with the responsibility of knighting. It is impossible for someone to hold the title of order of the garter if they are not Catholic.

The Temple Church is a church in 'the City of London' built by the Knights Templar as their English headquarters. During the reign of King John (1199–1216) it served as the royal treasury, supported by the role of the Knights Templars as proto-international bankers. After the destruction and abolition of the Knights Templar in 1307, King Edward II took control of the church as a Crown possession. It was later given to the Knights Hospitaller, Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem (also known as the Knights of Malta), the most important of all the military orders of the Roman Catholic Church, of which Queen Elizabeth II is a member (of Knights of Malta) and has vowed allegiance to the Pope through the largest insider trading club on the planet, the Sovereign Military Order of Malta.

The Sovereign Military Order of Malta (SMOM) took control of the power and wealth of the Poor Fellow-Soldiers of Christ and of the Temple of Solomon from within the Roman system and controlled the banking and military power for the Vatican for hundreds of years through the first central bank, the Vatican Bank.

The Hospitallers leased the Temple to two colleges of lawyers, one college moved into the part of the Temple previously used by the Knights, and the other into the part previously used by its clergy, and both shared the use of the church. It is jointly owned by the Inner Temple and Middle Temple Inns of Court, bases of the English legal profession.

When the Jesuits were suppressed by the Pope in 1773, they used their covert power over England to have the Rothschild family become guardians over the Jesuit South American stolen wealth instead of depositing it in the Vatican Bank. This action started a banking war between the Vatican and the Jesuits who used the Rothschild family as the anti-Vatican Bank. The Rothschild's eventually became the guardians of the Jesuit treasury in 'The City of London'.

The American Revolutionary War or War for Independence from England, 1775 to 1783, saw both countries borrowing from the world banks to sustain the 8 long years of fighting. Then in 1812 war was declared against the United Kingdom by the United States, this war lasted for around 2 years, again both sides having to borrow even more money from the banks.

In 1798 the Roman Catholic Jesuits subordinated the SMOM and secured South American wealth by using Protestant banking houses to form an alliance with the Venetian influences over Britain like the Pallavicini family, who control the Monarchy and Rothschilds. After suppressing the Jesuits in 1773, the same fate befell the Vatican itself when the Jesuit Order took control of the Papacy in 1814 and enacted revenge once for their persecution.

The American Revolutionary War led to the signing of the treaty of Ghent in 1814, and finally there peace between the United States and United Kingdom, but huge debts had been racked up by both parties due to both the Wars. The treaty of Ghent also put an end to forced slavery, but consensual slavery, i.e. Citizenship, was still ok.

The Jesuits took over Londinium (The City of London) in 1825 aided by the Rothschild family who had become the most powerful economic force in England. In 1840 the Jesuits put the Haus Sachsen-Coburg und Gotha bloodline into the position of Monarchy of Great Britain, this house



known today as the Windsor House, which still 'rules' the UK and the Commonwealth Nations including Australia.

The Order of Malta and the recognised protestant divisions all play a role commanded by the Jesuit Order. This includes The Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of Saint John of Jerusalem controlled by Queen Elizabeth II.

When you take a look at many of the influential positions of power today, whether it is in banking, military, pharmaceutical or intelligence, you will always find Knights of Malta, who are mainly involved in working for and with the Black Nobility (royalty without an active throne), the Vatican, and the various Papal and Royal Orders, especially with the Jesuits who are ultimately in control of the Vatican and the Military Order of Malta.

The American debt led to the Lincoln Administration in the 1860's, being controlled by the world banks, seizing the United States of America, and it led to Lincoln's assassination. This was the beginning of the military occupation of the United States of America, which led to the implementing of marshal Law under the rules of war, and Lieber code, General orders 100, was issued as the rule book for the occupying force, the United States military.

Lieber Code, Article 26 shows how the take over of the people's court's in America was achieved, and the people were conned into changing their allegiance to the occupier, as citizens of the Administration, which classified the people as belligerent, or disloyal to their own country, and as Citizens, the people placed themselves into admiralty jurisdiction.

When you look at who controls the financial world you will find it is the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem, Order of Malta and Opus Dei through the City of London Corporation and The Worshipful Company of Mercers and the more recent The Worshipful Company of International Bankers.

Queen Victoria knew this and perhaps she saw an opportunity to keep the money lenders out of our temple, by constituting the Commonwealth of Australia, giving the people ownership of the Commonwealth of Australia and our right to self determination but still under her Imperial Tudor Crown.

The Hague conventions in the early 1900's were called because the world banks, which had the armed forces of the United States at its disposal, declared a silent war and were preparing to call in the loans they made to the United Kingdom with military force. Hague IV, War on Land, in 1907, gave the world Banks the right to use military force to seize and militarily occupy all the dominions, territories of the United Kingdom (such as 'Australia') and the United Kingdom itself as surety for the debt owed by the United Kingdom, and we agreed to the terms of occupation.

We were once under the imperial crown in a kingdom of Australia the people forgot about.

The next year, in 1908, we became occupied militarily by US navy acting for the banks when the Great White Fleet sailed around the world and did just that, seized all dominions and territories belonging to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, all Commonwealth Nations, simply by flexing their military might, with no resistance at all, in fact the people were completely unaware, and most still are, that they are being militarily occupied, under the rules of war and Lieber Code Article 1.

Marshall Law is in place, suspending all domestic law. Article 26, allows them to force our courts to change their allegiance, and ultimately their jurisdiction to military, bringing admiralty Law. So from 1908 we were occupied under the rules of war and the Hague conventions of 1907, Hague IV, War on Land, and the occupier also has a right under the rules of USUFRUCT to recover debt.

But occupying military power is bound to all conventions and treaties whether signed into them or not while they are here, there are quite a few including and especially all those of the Hague, Geneva, Nuremburg and Ghent. Hague IV, War on Land spells out exactly what they can and cannot do... and at this point they were following the rules.

1914 saw the start of the first Great War, WW1, and most able men, including 42% of the male population between 18 and 42, some 461,000 plus subjects of the Commonwealth of Australia, including the indigenous, jumped to defend the Imperial Realm. At the end of what would become known as the Great War, the Commonwealth of Australia Imperial Armed Forces, had suffered the highest loss of life per capita, out of all countries involved, more than 62,000 plus fallen and 156,000 wounded, gassed or taken prisoner, that was more than 50% of the nearly 417,000 men, which was 42% of the male population between 18 and 42, so our commitment was quite high, and our ANZAC at times were used as cannon fodder; our men died on foreign shores defending our Realm, the Imperial Realm.

After the war, in 1919, when the heads of government of the great powers met at Versailles. The Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia at the time, Billy Hughes, insisted he be the representative of Australia and petitioned King George V to allow it. Billy Hughes knew a new map of the world would also be drawn up and insisted he be there, also knowing very well the significance of speaking for ourselves would be showing on an International stage, in front of the world, that the Commonwealth of Australia had come of age and was ready and able to stand on its own as a sovereign nation and Kingdom and speak for itself.

They had before them a blueprint for restoring prosperity and global disarmament in the form of U.S. President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points of the treaty of Versailles. The last point being the development of the League of Nations. A less known fact today was the influence on this treaty garnered through Wilson's right hand man, a Jesuit and IMF propagator, Colonel Edward Mandell House, the most important political figure of the twentieth century.

Colonel House never held public office, but he controlled the Wilson administration, brought the U.S. into the Great War, prolonged World War I, helped write the Treaty of Versailles that led to World War II, aided the Bolsheviks, helped J.P. Morgan organize the Council on Foreign Relations, and was a close personal friend of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

King George V was also, styled, titled, coronated and crowned as King of Australia, separate to all his other Styles and titles, Styles and Titles Act 1927, but King George V was very limited in what he could do considering he was under administration but he at least made sure our occupiers played by the rules in play, the treaties which form International Law.

In 1927 a foundation stone for the United Kingdom Of Australia was laid at the shrine of remembrance in Melbourne, sealing it in Law forever.

In 1931, the Commonwealth of Australia Parliament, which at that time was heavily influenced by our occupiers, the USA, and lead by the league of Nations, which later became the United Nations,

started changing the people in a number of ways, Our Schools curriculum began to change, Our history began to be rewritten.

1931 also bought the introduction of the IMF (International Monetary Fund), a system based on debt, or better known as credit, the IMF had started the ball rolling for the enslavement of the people to Rome by the Bankers.

After the death of King George V, King Edward VIII was next in line to the throne of the United Kingdom but he renounced it in 1936 before he was to be coronated, renouncing the crown not only for himself, but also for his decedents.

Enter George VI, who didn't take the Imperial Tudor Crown as Queen Victoria and King George V did at their coronations, rather he took the St Edwards Crown, a Catholic crown, which became known as the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a different Line of Authority under a different Crown to that of Queen Victoria and King George V under the Imperial Tudor Crown which supposedly represents the Christian people of the United Kingdom of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland under the crown, not the Bankers and certainly not the Catholic church.

The St Edwards Crown, on the other hand, does not represent the same thing as the Imperial Crown, for it is actually a Catholic Crown, so the two different Crowns cannot represent the same thing, they are different faiths and belief systems altogether, and if you look at all the Imperial Acts between 1688 and the early 1700's, you will see that the Catholic influence was not welcome within the Imperial Realm.

In 1936 the people of all Commonwealth countries including the Kingdom of Australia were still subjects of their respective Imperial Crowns, yet after only 15 years after the death of King George V, our Parliament, influenced by our military occupiers though the people, subjects of the Imperial Tudor Crown, were ready to be offered Citizenship under the Crown of King George VI, the Catholic St Edwards Crown, Naturalization and Citizenship Act 1948, never being told exactly what it meant to become Citizens, that by applying for birth certificates for their children, what they were actually doing was begging the Government to take their children as wards of the State, and also the state's property as Citizens.

On paper it looked as though the people kept their subject of the Crown status, The Naturalization and Citizenship Act 1948 did in fact state the people had two statuses, A subject and Citizen... but in actual fact you cannot be both... but the subject status on paper would later be removed in 1973... leaving the people as citizens only

Citizenship is under Roman law, it does not exist under the Imperial Crown, tied to Rome through your allegiance to the St Edwards Crown... therefore Roman Law... and therefore to the Vatican.

Not only does the birth certificate make you a ward of the state, it also make you the states property as Citizens

The people ceased being the "People" as mentioned in the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution preamble, "Under the blessing of almighty God" and no longer have standing at law to use either of them for their protection... Even if the Commonwealth of Australia wasn't occupied militarily.

Due to the change of allegiance to another Crown, a Catholic Crown, the people were no longer loyal to their Crown and Kingdom, dishonouring and disrespecting their God, and a change of allegiance, under the rules of war, gives right for the occupying military to place the burdens of War directly on the belligerent or disloyal... The Lieber Code will also tell you what they can do to the belligerent or disloyal for any reason... and they wouldn't even be breaking the rules in play.

Moving on to 1953, Queen Elizabeth II became Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, coronated once publicly, on a fake coronation stone, which was a farce, and again 3 days later properly... but the second time it wasn't public, nor was it to the Imperial Realm or Crown, she took the same foreign Crown and same foreign line of authority and same foreign God as her father, King George VI... as clearly displayed on her Heraldry, clearly not the Imperial Tudor Crown and line of authority as Queen Victoria and King George V. She is a foreign Queen under a foreign Crown with a foreign Line of Authority.

But the people have forgot what a crown was. The queen said it was her crown. But the St Edwards Crown is CATHOLIC. But the people accepted the crown and citizenship under that crown, under The Vatican

But even if Queen Elizabeth took the Imperial Crown, she would still not be our Queen unless she took the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom of Australia... and coronated in Melbourne on our coronation stone for the United Kingdom of Australia... Which never happened...

So she is not our Queen by any stretch of the imagination, she is a foreign Queen under a foreign Crown with a foreign Line of Authority..

Moving forward, to 1973, the Commonwealth of Australia Parliament, under the Imperial Crown and Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900uk, was closed down by Gough Whitlam in a secret meeting with Queen Elizabeth II, due to having no people to serve, not that they served the people anyway at that point, and a Corporation named the "Australia Government", began administrating the Commonwealth of Australia due to there being no people, no head of state and of course on Government.

The Australian Citizenship Act 1973 made no mention of Subjects at all, so former people, Subjects of the Imperial Crown were all by this stage, No longer subjects of any Crown, but Firmly under the St Edwards Crown as citizens of Rome.

This is why the Police around the country do not enforce law of the land., the Common Law, instead, This is why the Courts in our country are disregarding or ignoring the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900uk and enforce and administer and enforce enforce Roman Admiralty Law, and why Rome, through the United Nations has such a tight grip on our Commonwealth and Kingdom of Australia.

And thats how they perpetuate the deception; it has ALWAYS been about the Roman Catholic Church and people being slaves to the church, through religion, and/or through Roman Law, the ***Corpus Juris Civilis***, and the banks.

The Governor General, Attorney General, Prime Minister, all Members of Parliament, Senators, Magistrates, Mayors, Local Council Members and everyone else in an official position all serve the occupying Military and United Nations, all serve the Vatican.

Forget law... we are militarily occupied, under the rules of war Marshall law is in place. You must be peaceful, non combative and comply with the military (Police) when ever you interact with them.

Further, in 1973, Gough Whitlam, signed the Lima Agreement and signed Australia over to the foreign: UNIDROIT Treaty of Rome, handing the Equitable Title of the mineral and energy wealth of Australia to a foreign power, seated in Rome. In effect, this created a foreign contractual system of governance in our Country as opposed to common law under our Commonwealth of Australia Constitution. So lets not kid ourselves here... the Australian Government is a foreign De Facto administration under a foreign Crown.

That done, in 1974 Our “government” then registered “Australia” as a corporation with the American Securities Exchange Commission, “Australia” then became a private corportion in a private foreign domicile.

1993-95 The ‘government’ signed off on hundreds of agreements written into Agenda 21-30, complete with a Planetary Depopulation Genocide program, aided by mandatory vaccination as per the 267-page document written in 1967 by Henry Kissinger.

2017 the Australian Government changed the definition in the Constitution of the words ‘father’ and ‘Mother’ replacing them with the word ‘parent’ - “Pair -rent”. The definition of the word ‘parent’ diminishes the legal standing of the lawful right of the fsther and the mother. This was done under the cover of the ‘Same sex marriage Amendment’.

2018 The compliance of “Australia” to make available for sale all Australian natural resources , being forests, water, oceans and fish stock, minerals, gas etc – to the prioroity of corporate interest under the TPP – The Trans oacific Partnership agreement being a foreign jurisdictional power that our ‘government’ have signed over to as the “Australian New World Government”.

Still doubt it?

In 1982 the pope arrived at gatwick Airport in the UK, the first visit of a pope to the UK in centuries. What was the first thing he did – he kissed the ground (an act of asserting it was HIS homeland). Next an audience at Wembley Stadium where they sang “He’s got the whole world in his hands”. And on this six day visit (yes, 6 days) he and the (Anglican) Archbishop of Canterbury Robert Runcie, knelt in prayer together at the Place of Matyrdom, the spot where St Thomas-a-Becket was murdered by 4 knights in 1170, the event that triggered the whole King John and the *Magna Carta* charter.

Coincidence? No, nothing they do is without purpose.

The Archbishop of Canterbury answers to the Queen, and the Queen is answerable to the pope.

And since Catholic Influence has been outlawed within the Imperial Realm, which is where the Commonwealth of Australia sits, it means the Catholic St Edwards Crown, pursuant to **The Bill of Rights**, and the **Act of settlement 1701**, is therefore unlawful within the Commonwealth and cannot be relied on for "A line of Authority".

Therefore Police do not have Lawful Authority within the Commonwealth of Australia and are all breaking the "Law" and acting unlawfully in carrying out their "Duties" as a police officer. This is known as personation under **Crimes Act 1914**.

TO PERSONATE: primarily-legal term, crim. Law, meaning 'to assume the identity of another person without lawful authority and, in such character, doing something with intent to deceive to his prejudice, or to the prejudice of another, without his will or consent. It is also used when charging a person who portrays themselves as a police officer.

“The bare fact of personating another for the purpose of fraud, is no more than a cheat or misdemeanour at common law, and punishable as such.”

2 East, P. C. 1010; 2 Russ. on Cr. 479.

Make no mistake, the Commonwealth of Australia is Under the Imperial Crown, usurped by those behind the St Edwards Crown (The Vatican) to control the masses into enforced slave labour through and by the banks and ‘governments’ etc. But that ‘law’ is not the law of this land of Terra Australis, it is the law of “Australia” - Norfolk Island.

You see, the protestant/catholic conflict still continues! It is just that the ‘catholics’, the Jesuits, have used ‘legislation’ and their financial clout to deceive the protestants, the protest-ants, the people, and trick them into contracting their souls away via ‘the rule of law’.

The people have been unlawfully ‘removed’ from the Commonwealth of Australia by way of changing the people's status at Law by allegiance, from British Subjects under the Imperial Crown to ‘Australian Citizens’ under the St Edwards Crown, under Roman law, therefore removing the people's rights and Imperial Law Under the Imperial Crown, and putting the people into a system of ‘law’, the ‘rule of law’ and under a ‘Government’ foreign to the Commonwealth. This is why the ‘Government’ (the Jesuit controlled banks and the Vatican), acting under the foreign St Edwards Crown, is not only controlling foreign forces against the people, they also now control the courts.



## More background

### Law of Men. (The First Crusade)

The law of most of the modern world is based on ancient Roman law (the State is God), the Jesuits have made enormous efforts, to both establish, and justify this prejudiced corporation (State), designed to subjugate the poor, and protect the rich and powerful from prosecution or conviction.

The Roman Catholic knights Templar (Knights of the Military Order of the Temple of Solomon) established the Temple bar; initially constructing a building on what is now Chancery Lane, a round church patterned on the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. An inscription on the Round recorded that it was consecrated by the Patriarch Heraclius on 10 February 1185, in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It is thought that King Henry II was also present on that day, one of a line of monarchs installed and instructed by the Roman Catholic Church from its inception to its removal in 1649, when it was replaced with William II, Prince of Orange, the son of stadtholder Frederick Henry, and Amalia of Solms-Braunfels.

The knights Templar (established 1129 AD) became widely detested and only existed under that title for a short period, and were publicly disbanded in 1312, however as referenced in the poem of 1596 they remained in all but name under the Roman Catholic Church order without let, the real masters of the Templar, who established the modern adaptation of the Templar's, with the Jesuit order (the soldiers of Christ (1534)), today the Jesuits are the largest order in the Catholic church, with almost 19,000 members.

The foundation of Roman law is a two tier legal structure, the original model being, Roman citizens, and none citizens, this is identified in the definition of a human being: a 'Human Being', also known as "Human", is a term deliberately created in the 16th Century to update the naming of perpetual slaves to the Lords of the Land from the 13th Century term "Serf". Human is derived from two Latin words humi meaning "land, soil, country, on the ground" and anus meaning "rectum, (marriage/pledge) ring, old". Hence the word Human literally means "married/bound to the land/earth" and Human Being legally means "land creature" also known as chattel.

Ballentine's Law Dictionary (1930): human being: See MONSTER: Monster: A human being by birth, but in some part resembling a lower animal. A monster hath no inheritable blood, and cannot be heir to any land.

This definition makes it clear, as a human being, you have no inheritable blood, and cannot own land; in the modern sovereignty system, you can own nothing of value, you are the keeper, and tax payer (lease payer), of your property, house, car, children, even yourself, you always remain under the legal ownership of the sovereigns, or those of inheritable blood.

You become a serf or monster of this country at birth, when your parents apply for a "certificate of live birth" this registers you as the possession of the state which places you upon a ship of commerce, this citizenship is used to bind a living man to the policy of the granting corporation as an incorporated legal entity. This gives presumption the government has control over you, which is why they allow themselves to charge you taxes, put you in prison, or make you follow their contrived laws. It gives them ownership over you, much the same as a Lord who owned his surfs and the land they worked. If they did not have a presumption of this type of control then they would not be able to tax you on your holdings. The tax is basically, what you owe the corporation for using their land,

property, and infrastructure. You never truly own your property, which is why you are always, charged taxes, in effect rent upon it. The sovereigns can of course own land and property, and have blood lines that inherit, as the aristocracy, royalty, church hierarchy, the so called noble families, these are the owners in modern Roman law system, dominating the world today, while in reality these legal untouchables are the true criminals; noble in title only.

Before the clinic psychopath, depraved mass murderer, and thief William I (1066. Propagated as William the conqueror, but in truth known commonly to his peers as William the Bastard), the agent of the Roman Catholic Pope, England was split into many realms, and tortious relief through peer arbitration based upon the axioms of the land often labelled natural law, allodial land utilization and an honest monetary system existed throughout the realms ( You can see the coins of [Albien here](#)), no invented sovereign power could steal your lands or tax them.

From 1066, all that changed, the entire population of England was enslaved, no longer free men and women, they could own nothing and were subject to the dictates of a despot, as the first Catholic crusade swept over the people and lands of England, greedy for the wealth and property of its people and the ruthless extermination of all freedoms.

The new King installed a feudal system, he built castles throughout the lands, installing land barons imported from Normandy to subjugate the people, and over the next twenty years butchered almost all of the people, the purpose of this crusade for the Papacy was to remove the Islamic structures of society, whatever the professed religion, the physical evidence of coins suggests Islam from 750's. It was the natural law systems of society that threatened the death cult of the Roman Catholic Church; these freedoms could not be tolerated within the Vatican model of Christianity, exposing the frauds they established upon the populations in Europe, so they orchestrated the murder of the population of Albien (Britain), through the force of arms, the sword of contract murder, planned starvation and the destruction of everything that was found, beyond whatever was worth stealing. William the Bastards foreign feudal lords dominated the people, he removed all the inherent power and freedoms they had enjoyed before Catholic sovereignty arrived.

They established the fraud of 'ownership' and with it the Star debt system, of the Law Merchant, which is the basis of the modern system of admiralty law and the laws of negotiable paper (instruments), bankruptcy, insurance, and of sales, this is intermixed with Roman Law (the State is God), Maritime Law (international law of war and commerce) known today as the Uniform Commercial Code, all imposed to prevent men/women from gaining the protection of the true unalienable axioms of the land and the immutable protection of the inherent power of the individual, within the reciprocal responsibility and obligation each for the other, of a duty of care.

William the Bastard commissioned a catalogue of the papal sanctioned crowns new assets and called it the Domesday book, because all belongs to the Crown, ultimately being the Papacy until the end of time. This book would have had little personal value to William as he was illiterate, but it allowed the newly created corporation to realise its assets. The monarchs soon felt threatened by the Church cult of Roman and established Mortmain, the dead man's hand, so people couldn't pass their land on to the church or anyone else without the King's permission.

The law of Mortmain also called the Statute De Religiosis, which has been connected loosely with the modern probate law, being a process by which property of a descendant is retitled. Probate is derived from the Latin probatus, meaning "a thing proven".

The original concepts of the Statute of Mortmain demonstrated the intention of a King to prevent the Church from acquiring lands in such a way that the king and other principle lords lost feudal services and dues.

A corporation, like the church could easily avoid rendering customary feudal services and payments. A corporation never rides out fully armed and prepared for battle in the service of an overlord. A corporation, civil or ecclesiastical, never dies intestate; its lands never escheat to an overlord. A corporation is never a minor heir; its lands are never administered by an overlord as a ward-ship. Unlike an individual, a corporation never seeks permission – or pays for permission – to marry. A corporation never dies; it never pays relief as the heir who seeks thus to reconstruct (relever) his ancestor's feudal contract with an overlord. So corporations results in the overlord, or king losing out substantially in revenues, in an ever escalating manor.

So if lands fell into the hands of a corporation without this statute, it was as if they were held in the hands of a dead man, the wealth of the lands remained with the dead man or corporation.

The Statute of Mortmain served, then, the interests of the king fully as much as those of the barons. Henceforth, while the Statute was enforced, no corporation, civil or ecclesiastical, could hold land in England except under certain conditions:

- 1 by a grant made prior to the Statute; or
- 2 by the authority of an act of parliament.

Mortmain as a Statue is now reversed, but as a term is still as it was, being a legal term that means ownership of real property by a corporation or legal institution that can be transferred or sold in perpetuity. It means corporations are excluded from the probate system of land use, and perpetuates the corporate state or Crown (Roman Catholic Church) ownership of the lands, and to utilise some land you must buy the lease on it, and pay tax (rent) to the crown upon the lease. The lease itself is not inalienable, and this is made clear from the modern probate, and eminent domain of the legal system.

They confuse people with the issue of lease ownership, people for example leaving their lands to the Church, or the state, when in truth, all they are leaving in this system is the purchased lease for the 'estate' or property, you are the 'tenant', land tenure means the landholder does not have absolute possession but derives the right from some other person. Tenure originates from its sense in feudalism; so used, tenure is the antithesis of allodial, being the absolute utilization of land or resources without obligation to others.

The conclusion of this is a prohibition upon the perpetual ownership of personal property (allodial land utilisation) for a flesh and blood individual of the indigenous population, and the absolute and perpetual ownership of everything contained within the country, as belonging to a corporate entity, being the Crown in the case of Britain.

William the Bastard (Conqueror), was named as man of the millennium on 24<sup>th</sup> December 1998 by the now late Cardinal Basil Hume head of the Roman Catholic Church in England, which was later confirmed by the Vatican.

During the middle Ages in England the church acquired the lease on substantial amount of real estate. As the church and religious orders were recognised as a legal person separate from the office

holder who administered the church land (such as the abbot or the bishop), the land would not go to the king on the death of the holder, as the corporation of the church and the religious orders would not die, as an incorporeal legal entity never lived.

In addition, as the land was held in perpetuity, it would never escheat (ownership of the land reverted to the immediately superior feudal lord.) or pass by inheritance (and for the Church no feudal incidents or taxes would be payable upon it).

This was in contrast to feudal practice where the nobility (who were required to pay taxation for their lease) would hold land on grant from the king, who acted as the representative of the Crown Corporation, in return for service, especially service in war. This meant that the church over time gained a large share of physical land in many feudal states, and so was a cause of increasing tension between the church and the feudal administrators.

The Pope, as Vicar (substitute or representative embodiment) of Christ, claims ownership of everything and everyone on earth, as stated in the Treaty of Verona October 3<sup>rd</sup> 1213.

The Pope is known as 'Pontifex Maximus' which means Greatest Bridge-maker, high priest of the Ancient Roman College of Pontiffs, originally a college of the polytheistic state religions; the title emphasizes the civil authority of the Pope and the continuity of imperial power. This clearly demonstrates the Roman Empire never fell, but changed form, from a physical force of control, to the control of the minds of the people, subjugation of the mind is so much better at controlling the masses through force of arms.

In 1213 the feudal Barons, led by Stephen Langton the Archbishop of Canterbury, rebelled against the taxation and dictatorial system, and forced at the end of a sword, King John to sign the Magna Charta, establishing boundaries and redress for the feudal lords. In reality the Roman Cult had forced King John to sign over 'ownership' of England to them and required the King to be bound by legislation to hold him and his descendants to the contract.

Henry VIII dissolved the hold of the Roman cult, between 1536 and 1541, which release allowed the industrial revolution. The Roman Catholics Church were loan sharks to the sovereigns of Europe, but wished to expand their business to the lower ranks, and to regain control of Britain, so they repeatedly attempted to charter the Bank of England; the line of Stuart generation after generation refused, nothing succeeded, until the manufacturing of a civil war that finally saw King James I deposed then executed.

The English Civil War (1641–1651) was a series of armed conflicts and political machinations between Parliamentarians (servants of the Roman Catholic Empire) and Royalists (feudal lords loyal to the monarchy). The first (1642–46) and second (1648–49) civil wars pitted the supporters of King Charles I against the supporters of the Long Parliament, while the third war (1649–51) saw fighting between supporters of King Charles II and supporters of the Rump Parliament. The Civil War ended with the Parliamentary victory at the Battle of Worcester on 3 September 1651.

The usury monopoly of the Church was now in the process of establishment, and subsequently to the 'Glorious Revolution' as it is known; later that century saw the establishment of a new line of ascension to the English throne with the banker William of Orange, this line was established only as Stewards, never monarchs. In truth William was Steward as the representative of the feudal Lords, never the people, of course all sovereigns by definition stand against the people.

This line of Stewards was installed by the Roman Catholic Church; William's first act was to immediately charter the Bank of England.

The American Colonies were established by the feudal Lords and their Stewards, without Roman Catholic sovereignty, but with Roman Catholic support, and so the bulk of the revenue extracted from these colonies was not going to the Church, but to the feudal lords and monarch.

The English King and his Lords were greedy, conscienceless individuals, and their descendants remain so, who organised with the Roman Catholic Church against the indigenous population to claim dominion over the lands of America, by deceiving and murdering an estimated 100 million natives, the 'American Indians', as their exterminators titled them.

The Roman Catholic Church plotted against the feudal Lords dominion in America, and organised a rebellion against British rule in 1775.

The "Founding Fathers" deceived the colonists, and led them into a war against their own freedoms (limited as they were). They, the founding fathers, almost being members of the Bar (British Accreditation of Regency: which means, to officially recognize a person or organization as having met a standard or criterion as a person or group of people ruling on behalf of a monarch (representative of the Pope) who is unable to rule because of youth, illness, or absence, in person.), lawyers, trained and educated by the Roman Catholic legal structure, were all under the Pope's control.

Their lies and frauds would now affect the American colonies and the people who lived on the lands. They establish a sovereign model, and most importantly a corporate model, of politics, law, ownership and commerce. They removed allodial land rights, and put in place the same land ownership system, as was already established in Europe, the foundations of the destruction of all freedoms were laid within the confidence trick of the constitution.

They established the ten square miles within Washington DC, an area owned as an independent State by the Roman Catholic Empire, the seat of sovereignty and the location of the corporate organization and administration, for the exploitation and indoctrination of the American people. Established in 1790, and within the Constitution, it provides for a federal district, distinct from the states, to serve as the permanent national capital. The centres of all three branches of the federal government (federal means treaty: a formal contract or agreement negotiated between political entities).

They established eminent domain, upon the population, which is the power to compulsory purchase, or expropriate property, in corporate law it is the inherent authority of the sovereign State to seize a citizen's (slaves) private property, expropriate property, or seize a citizen's rights in property with due fiat (money whose only value is a grant of perceived value from the State) monetary compensation, but without the utilizers consent. Not only land, but homes, cars, jewellery, gold anything they wish.

Templar law holds the peoples of the world in subjugation, while holding the sovereigns above reproach. For example: the criminal, and mass murderer, the secret Jesuit Tony Blair (also a member of the Temple Bar, as is his wife), manipulated and deceived, within his position of authority, empowered through the subjugated minds of the population, the extermination of over a million, mostly defenceless, man, women and children, he gave license to subjugated subordinates to go into the world and exterminate their fellow man with impunity, as he himself acts with impunity,

demonstrated from the fact he has received no punishment, on the contrary he has been handsomely rewarded by his Jesuit and Zionist masters, who then placed him in defence of the Palestinian people, this a conscienceless slaughterer of his fellow man, who holds no regard for anything of value (i.e. a human life), a perfect choice for the sovereigns.

Just as the founding fathers of America were mainly lawyers who had received their ability to practice law under the Temple Bar of England, the companies which subjugated and ran other British Colonies were also orchestrated by lawyers of the Temple Bar.

It was all originally run and administered out of the 'City of London', which contains two Enclaves, the inner and middle Temple, and administers its own laws. London was not founded by the Romans but originally established by King Llund of the throne of Lloegres- founder of Lundein (London) before 54 BC, it is now governed by the City of London Corporation, established as the surreptitious central authority of England by the Roman Catholic church, with the motto, '*Domini dirige nos - O Lord guide us.*', also known as the Square Mile, or City, which is excluded as one of the 32 boroughs of London as it is an independent State, it is the police authority for the city, it also has responsibilities and ownerships beyond the City's boundaries.

The Square Mile of London is the Crown of England, the Sovereign Monarch, (originally the Steward: a care taker, just a representative spokesperson of the landed gentry), is subservient to its authority, as is the national government. The controlling power is split into three groups who were party to the Charter of the Bank of England, one third is held by the Monarchy, a third by the Roman Catholic Church in Rome, and a third originally the landed gentry who held the public shares; these were quickly stolen by the Rothschild family. The independent State of the City is the usury centre of the world, the independent State of the 10 square miles of Washington D.C is now the military centre, and the independent State of the Vatican the religious centre.

The Vatican is situated by the seven hills in Rome, west of the river Tiber, covering a total of 110 acres, in addition to this Castel Gandolfo, the papal summer palace outside of Rome, as well as other buildings located in Rome but outside the Vatican City, are endowed with extraterritoriality (exemption from the legal jurisdiction of Italy), the Vatican has a seat on the united nations as a sovereign state.

Their control is not total, but within a trinity of sovereignty, the old blood line Monarchs (like the Bush family, the Queen, etc.), the financial powers (like the Rothschild family, its members being the Clinton family, Adolf Hitler, Winston Churchill by marriage, etc.), these powers being both Zionist and Jesuit, the federal reserve is Zionist, the Bank of England was established by the Jesuits, but is now shared by the three sovereigns (parasites), the Queen, the Roman Catholics, and the Rothschild Zionists, and the final religious sovereign is the Roman Catholic Church itself.

The History of the British extends from around 1500 BC to the present day. There is no history of any nation on Planet Earth that has been so disgracefully abused and so completely distorted and mangled as that of the British Nation. The appalling mess that the 3500 years of British national record is now in is a National disgrace, and an intentional and premeditated undertaking to maintain and expand ignorance and confusion.

The Crown itself is a corporation sole (a legal entity consisting of a single ('sole') incorporated office, occupied by a single ('sole') man or woman), that represents the legal embodiment of the Executive Government. Like any corporation, the Crown is an artificial person (in this case, coextensive with a



natural person, being the Black Pope) which can own property and has certain rights as provided by law to business entities. In the case of Commonwealth realms, the rights and powers of the Crown vary from state to state, because each national or state Crown is a separate corporation sole, generally incorporated to the original Crown structure. Note the use of titles to confuse and mislead the population, such as commonwealth, inferring common ownership, when none exists, or Bank of England which sounds part of the government, when it's a private company.

In this model the Crown holds ownership of all the assets of the corporation, being the entire corporate entity of the nation under its incorporation. For example the Crown Jewels of England would belong to the Crown, as opposed to the sovereign head of state. Just as the public buildings and infrastructure do not belong to the population, but again to the Crown, further the very land of the entire nation is the property of the Crown, the concept of Federal lands in the US was developed in parallel to that of the Crown lands in Canada and Australia, being the sole property of the Crown corporation, even the ownership of the individual people of the nations are the property of the Crown, as they are incorporated upon registration of live birth, however the Queen as the head of state still retains reserve powers, but these powers are never exercised. (They present outwardly a fiction of the structure being a democracy, and placate the population with almost meaningless voting, having control over all parties, (a single party in effect), and they themselves selecting the candidates, this renders what small value extant in honest representative rule, entirely worthless).

The country is governed by servants of the Crown or its figure head of that State the monarch, having sworn an oath to serve the Crown, not an oath to serve the indigenous population, including prison warders and police officers who are directly employed by the Crown, and not by the Prison Service or Police Authorities. In a related way, there is the Crown Prosecution Service in the criminal courts whose lawyers are called Crown Prosecutors. They are a corporate enterprise operated by officers of the BAR Association, under military authority. That is why the non-incorporated people could never be judges, as they aren't lawyers who have been admitted to the BAR. And this is why a friend who happens to know a lot about the law can't represent you in court, for example.

Those working within the intelligence services such as MI5 and MI6 are also Crown Servants. Only Crown Servants sit as Members of Parliament, as if they refuse to swear an oath to the Crown, they would receive no pay for their office, while being still permitted to hold their office, but rendered impotent, also MPs receive on retirement, or a sinecure job (a paid job requiring no work).

This follows on to what they are paid in, being fiat money (meaning its value is only from the official sanction of the Crown, it has no intrinsic value), so the money in itself is a fraud, just a corporate certificate of debt. This fiat money system now function almost without exception in every nation on Earth, enforced through the legal and political corporate establishments, as they make it a criminal corporate offence to create any currency in competition to the fiat system, they love monopoly, and function from a perspective of deception, extortion, and fraud.

Natural law does not need legal experts, or a thousand volumes of text books filled with loop holes and technicalities, it needs no one who requires a year's wages for a day's work, or to lies on your behalf, or expresses third party lies against you.

Natural law is known within everyone, it may not be exercised, but it is in existence, within each rational being.

## **The Vatican and more info**

The Vatican rules over approximately 2 billion of the world's 6.1 billion people. The colossal wealth of the Vatican includes enormous investments with the Rothschild's in Britain, France, and the USA, and with giant oil and weapons corporations like Shell and General Electric. The Vatican solid gold bullion worth billions, is stored with the Rothschild controlled Bank of England and the US Federal Reserve Bank.

The Catholic church is the biggest financial power, wealth accumulator, and property owner in existence. Possessing more material wealth than any bank, corporation, giant trust, or government anywhere on the globe. The Pope, who is the visible ruler of this colossal global wealth is one of the richest men on Earth. While two-thirds of the world earns less than two dollars a day, and one-fifth of the world is under fed or starving to death, the Vatican hordes the world's wealth, profits from it on the stock market, and at the same time preached about giving.

Like Vatican City, London's Inner city is also a privately owned corporation, or city state, located right smack in the heart of Greater London. It became a sovereign state in 1694 when King William III of Orange privatized and turned the Bank of England over to the bankers. By 1812 Nathan Rothschild crashed the English stock market and scammed control of the Bank of England. Today the city state of London is the world's financial power centre and the wealthiest square mile on the face of the Earth. It houses the Rothschild controlled Bank of England, Lloyd's of London, the London Stock Exchange, all British Banks, the branch offices of 385 foreign banks, and 70 US banks. It has its own courts, its own laws, its own flag, and its own police force. It's not part of Greater London, England, or the British Commonwealth, and pays no taxes. The city state of London houses Fleet Street's newspaper and publishing monopolies. It is also the headquarters for worldwide English Freemasonry and headquarters for the worldwide money cartel know as the Crown.

Contrary to popular belief the Crown is not the Royal Family or the British Monarch. The Crown is the private corporate city state of London. It has a council of twelve members who rule the corporation under a mayor called the Lord Mayor. The Lord Mayor and his twelve member council serve as prophecies or represent who sit in for thirteen of the world's wealthiest, most powerful banking families. This ring of thirteen ruling families includes the Rothschild family, the Warburg family, the Oppenheimer family, and the Schiff family. These families and their descendants run the Crown Corporation of London. The Crown Corporation holds the title to worldwide Crown land in Crown colonies like Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The British Parliament and the British Prime Minister serve as a public front for these ruling crown families.

Like the city state of London and the Vatican, a third city state was officially created in 1790 as the first Act of the Constitution America. That city state is called the District of Columbia and located on ten square miles of land in the heart of Washington. The District of Columbia flies its own flag, and has its own independent constitution. Although geographically separate, the city states of London, the Vatican, and the District of Columbia are one interlocking empire called Empire of the City.

The flag of Washington's District of Columbia has three red stars. One for each city state in the three city empire. This corporate empire of three city states controls the world economically through London's inner city, militarily through the District of Columbia, and spiritually through the Vatican.

The constitution for the District of Columbia operates under a tyrannical Roman law known as Lex Fori which bares no resemblance to the US Constitution.

When Congress passed the Act of 1871 it created a separate corporate government for the District of Columbia. This treasonous act allowed the District of Columbia to operate as a corporation outside the original constitution of the United States and outside of the best interest of American citizens.

A sobering study of the signed treaties and charters between Britain and the United States exposes a shocking truth that the United States has always been and still is a British Colony. King James I was famous, not for just changing the Bible into the King James version, but for signing the First Charter of Virginia in 1606. That charter granted America's British forefathers a license to settle and colonize America. The charter also guarantees that future kings and queens of England would have sovereign authority over all the citizens and colonized land in America stolen from the Indians.

Although King George III of England gave up most of his claims over the American colonies, he kept his right to continue receiving payment for his business venture of colonizing America. If America had really won the war of independence they would never have agreed to pay debts and reparations to the King of England.

Americas blood soaked war of independence against the British bankrupted America and turned its citizens into permanent debt slaves of the king. In the War of 1812 the British torched and burned to the ground the White House and all US government buildings and destroyed ratification records of the US Constitution.

In 1604, a corporation called the Virginia Company was formed in anticipation of the imminent influx of white Europeans, mostly British at first, into the North American continent. Its main stockholder was King James I and the original charter for the company was completed by April 10th 1606.

The Virginia Company owned most of the land of what we now call the USA. The Virginia Company (The British Crown and the bloodline families) had rights to 50%, yes 50%, of all gold and silver mined on its lands, plus percentages of other minerals and raw materials, and 5% of all profits from other ventures. The lands of the Virginia Company were granted to the colonies under a Deed of Trust (on lease) and therefore they could not claim ownership of the land. They could pass on the perpetual use of the land to their heirs or sell the perpetual use, but they could never own it. Ownership was retained by the British Crown.

The original Organic American Constitution reads: "The Constitution for the united states of America".

The altered version reads: "THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA".

When Americans agree to have a social security number the citizens of the united states surrender their sovereignty and agree to become franchises of the United States (The Virginia Company of the British Crown).

Everything in the "United States" is for sale: roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, water, prisons, airports etc. (Executive Order 12803)

The 'Crown' that owns Virginia (USA) is the administrative corporation of the City of London, an State independent of Great Britain and wholly owned by the Pontiff of Rome. Since 1213, the Monarchs of England have been puppet Monarchs under the Pontifex Maximus of the Holy Roman Empire, a corporate body over which the pontiff of Rome is CEO. Since 1300, when the Crown of Great Britain (England) was made a sub-corporation of the Crown of the City of London, the Monarchs of England, as CEO of the Crown of Great Britain have been agents for the Crown of the City. Thus, the real Crown was obfuscated from the eyes of the 'colonials'. But, anyone who cared to look and reason could have seen this scheme even in the late AD 1700s.

The 'common law' of England, since the incorporation of the British Crown around AD 1300, has been Roman Municipal Law, a type of Roman civil law designed to rule over debtor States. The Anglo-Saxon common law, which used only 'God's Law', ceased to exist with the implementation of the feudal system where all people were subjects of the corporate Crown, and after the Pope's Papal Bull, Unam Sanctam 1302 where he declared: "Furthermore, we declare, we proclaim, we define that it is absolutely necessary for salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff." Subject means slave, as does 'citizen' and 'freeman'.

Roman Law uses the law of the sea because all human institutions in the Roman system are make-believe ships at sea (incorporated bodies).

The 'all caps' spelling does not make the 'legal identity name' (strawman). It is where the family name has been converted into a 'surname - primary name'. The all caps only signifies that the name carries with its use the status of slave pledged as chattel in bankruptcy of the State.

Pure truth, free from pervasive inflection; conditioned or indoctrinated ignorance; manipulated, edited and homogenized insanity, saturating the minds of the sleepers, perceived as the truth by the majority.

Why is the world so corrupt, drowning in lies, hate, torture and mass murder?

The answer is the crime of Usury.

This is not new, it has existed as long as men have wished to have something for nothing, a concept that will always leave someone else deprived of what they deserve, a person the Usurers feel is beneath them for been foolish enough to be tricked, they call and view these people by many names, sap, Punta, goyim, sucker, investor, peasant, sub-human, the electorate, comrade etc. in so doing, viewing the victim as the one at fault.

The liars seek to justify Usury, diminish its significance, reduce its facets, simplify its elements down to one, the charging of interest; another lie!

The elements of Usury are many. To understand Usury is to understand the true enemy of the truth; the true enemy of freedom; the true enemy of justice; the true enemy of every human being in existence.

Apathy is the most powerful ally of these thieving bankers, corporate agents, sovereigns and bureaucrats, to which end they poison, medicate and educate the population into a state of enforced ignorance of all dangerous truth, replaced with conditioning and indoctrination of easy lies, this is the most effective weapon they wield, even worse is the wilful, wanton, desired ignorance practiced by the majority of the general populations of the industrialised nations.

Arrogant with misinformed delusions, confident and defensive of a system of which they have no understanding; this would best describe the average British, American or European, they protect and indulge in usury, they worship the fiat monies of the world, coveting and hoarding it without limit.

All money is in truth a representation of physical effort, personal energy, even when the money system is corrupt this principal is still the foundation of the value of money, so the majority physically work in exchange for a token of labour (money), while the corrupt manipulate, swindle, and exploit their positions of trust or opportunity and prey on the powerless in effect draining away your physical exertion, your physical energy, allowing them to receive the benefit as opposed to the generator of the physical wealth; the very definition of a thief.

The understanding of money is a secret the elite international banking mafia do not want the majority to know about, 99% of all the money of the world is fiat-debt. What does that mean? The paper printed to represent money, has absolutely no value other than official sanction: official corporate authorization. It functions purely on the blind trust of the poor, the blind greed of the rich and the total public co-operation and collusion of the establishments of population control with the banking mafia.

Many think we use representative paper money, (redeemable for gold or silver on demand) but the banking mafia created the second world war to make representative paper outside of America redeemable only for the gold backed American dollar, as, at its conclusion, this was engineered as the only currency holding gold, then in 1971 they removed the dollars link with gold, an action blamed on the cost of the Vietnam police action experiment, but actually due to the Ponzi economic structure of usury and the requirement of the doubling of debt every ten years or so, to maintain interest payments. Making the dollar fiat made all global currency redeemable for itself, creating true fiat money worldwide. The seed of fiat money is representative money, a seed if interest bearing that will grow into the enslavement of man on Earth.

The first creation of the truly modern banking system was the bank of England, which is a private company, it pays no tax, is not accountable to the government, while the government is accountable to it, it is the instigator of income tax, and most importantly is the originator of the currency, the fiat English pound, which it makes for the cost of printing and then lends at interest. Its brother company the federal reserve, which is also a private company, which pays no tax, is not accountable to the government while the government is accountable to the FED, and is the originator of the fiat American dollar, and owned by the same families as the bank of England, prints the dollar for the cost of printing and lends it at interest. It is conservatively estimated that profits exceed \$150 billion per year and the Federal Reserve has never once in its history published accounts. Take any national bank, the story is identical, only four now remain independent, Syria, Cuba, Iran and North Korea, out of more than 200 nations; (an interesting list when you consider whom the media and puppet governments are manufacturing an axis of evil against, under the control of the banking mafia).

The fiat dollar functions as a taxation system, they print dollars and purchase goods from the rest of the world, then blackmail, threaten, intimidate and manipulate or just bribe the nations of the world into holding dollars, only been exchangeable for oil and American government bonds, vast sums are held around the world. In effect the banking mafia are stealing the commodities for the cost of printing, the pound and the yen are also within this umbrella as sub currencies, which is the reason they don't compete.

If interest free representative paper money was in use it would be honest only as far as the link was honest, if a 100% link was enforced this would be honest money (of course it wouldn't be enforced for long, with a world of greedy men in power), and if honest would represent a credit based financial system. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with a fractional reserve structure if interest free, as you would be getting an advance upon your labours, and after repaying that advance would balance the account, creating no inflation, causing no devaluation of savings, and would give no ability for the banksters to create boom and bust economics to steal assets, as long as no one held a monopoly on money, loans or labour.

The dollar will collapse due to the requirement of the doubling of debt to maintain interest, which will bury the world under the incredible debt it represents, the thieves are planning to establish a new dollar that is backed by gold, a representative note, as the original dollar was, this will ultimately replace the existing dollar, which will then spiral unrestrained into hyper-inflation and eventually hold the value of its weight in paper alone, in effect removing the burden of repayment, voiding almost a century of I.O.U's. If the people of the world allow this, if they accept the loss then once more accept the new version of the dollar, they would be true slaves, how long would it be before they again removed the link from gold?

In other words only gold and silver as a currency can exist as truly accountable created money (although in theory any commodity that is a store of physical labour would work), the creation of money from the printing press is a debt based system, (fiat being the very opposite of representative paper), a system that creates money for no effort from the bankers, while reducing the value of the tokens for labour the fiat money represents constantly, reducing the purchasing power of the tokens, reducing the infrastructure and services of government, reducing the resources of the natural world, reducing personal freedoms, there are things that increase, personal debt, national debt, tax, indoctrination, conditioning, ignorance and apathy.

In truth the money they create is not money at all, it's debt, redeemable for another identical piece of debt paper only, it cannot be circulated until somebody borrows it, whether the government or an individual, this is devolution of the understanding of worth. It is a note of debt created by a private bank and repaid with value from the effort of the population, as they print more interest bearing debt paper they create inflation in line with the interest rate, as they increase the amount of circulating debt the price of goods are forced up, the producers, wholesalers, retailers and tax system are forced to raise the cost, as they are forced to repay the interest on the debt. The prices go up only because the value of the money goes down. If the banking mafia wish to create a boom, they give out debt freely, so the economy grows from the influx of fiat money, when it's grown enough they create a bust, they restrict the giving of debt, the money stops flowing and the banking mafia foreclose or buy everything for pennies; a familiar cycle.

At the present time gold is at around \$1592 (18/05/2012), gold's real price (as deflated by the CPI) is still lower than the peak of every rally since 1972. In order to test the 1980 high of \$850 the nominal value would need to trade at \$2,177. The banking mafia are maintaining a false gold and silver price, to maintain the delusion of value for the printed, valueless, fiat debt money, this is a gift for every intelligent human being with the ability to invest in gold and silver, exchange your worthless paper for the true asset of gold and silver.



Consider this, the English pound is so named because it represented a pound in weight of pure silver, and 240 silver pennies weighed one pound. So even given the cost of silver is false, in respect of fiat money, the denomination has devalued from a fiat value today of approx. £281 (it's original value) to £1 (18/05/2012) since the banking mafia and corrupt establishments began debasing the money supply, around 0.35%.

So we have gone from silver coins (true accountable money), to representative paper (redeemable for true accountable money), to fiat paper a certificate of debt (merely a promise to pay on a debt, a worthless promise as it turns out), don't be fooled by fiat money when considering gold, they are deceiving you in to accepting the pricing of gold in dollars, to do so is to accept the unacceptable. How can you judge true accountable money against 'a promise to pay on a debt'?

When the bankers create the new representative dollar, if you wish to trade for this dollar it would be wise to immediately redeem it for gold or silver, every individual and community on Earth should redeem the metal and mint coins, true accountable money, as people have to begin to recognise that labour is the true generator of wealth not the token created to represent it. If not they will, in the not too distant future once again remove the link and create true fiat money, eventually manifesting yet another version of the dollar and another and another as long as the people are willing to give their labour and resources for a promise to pay on a debt, from a group of lying, cheating, thieving, murdering, Satanists, 'the thieving bankers'.

The power driving the divisions of men, the destruction of nature, the perversion of education and history, the retardation of technology, the cultivation of wars, torture, engineered genocides and poverty, the management of the information around the world, the enslavement through debt and taxation of the populations, detached by concepts of geographical separation, is the power granted by the act of usury, empowering a few individuals to enslave through usury capitalism.

Usury capitalism is the enslavement of the people of the world through, debt, a slave of debt is 75% more productive than a physical slave, you don't have to waste resources housing, clothing, educating or feeding them and they will work harder, longer and more conscientiously. The main advantage is they are motivated by greed, which can be nurtured through the media.

The Zionists prefer Usury communism however, not communism, which has never existed, without Usury the concept of communism would be unnecessary, the entire concept and implementation of communism is a creation of the Zionists.

Usury communism, is the enslavement of the people of the world through government, a physical slave, the advantage over a debt based slave is in control, far more control of the slave is permitted, they are more like commodities, to be bought and sold, harvested and abused, the disadvantage is they are motivated by fear, which can be nurtured through the media.

So you may ask what is the Zionist movement? Zion is a hill near Jerusalem, in Biblical times emblematic of the house or household of God. It is the establishing and developing of a Jewish state: a worldwide movement, originating in the 19th century that sought to establish and develop a Jewish nation in Palestine. Since 1948 its function has been to support the state of Israel. In addition they are working towards the establishment of a single world government, a single digital financial system, and a single religion, the worship of Baal, (Ka'Baal'a).

This is a paragraph from the USA Banker's Magazine, August 25 1924

"Capital must protect itself in every possible manner by combination and legislation. Debts must be collected; bonds and mortgages must be foreclosed as rapidly as possible. When, through a process of law, the common people lose their homes they will become more docile and more easily governed through the influence of the strong arm of government, applied by a central power of wealth under control of leading financiers. This truth is well known among our principal men now engaged in forming an imperialism of Capital to govern the world. By dividing the voters through the political party system, we can get them to expend their energies in fighting over questions of no importance. Thus by discreet action we can secure for ourselves what has been so well planned."

### **More**

What is a court?

Court - A term through legislation used to describe the judge himself or herself, from Curia (the court of), court itself is from cohors (a group or company of). So a court is: the group or company of the man/woman acting as judge.

Judge – from Judicem (to Judge the) judge from ancient Hebrew 'to Govern' (to rule by right of authority)

So Court – the group or company of (man/woman acting as judge) to rule by right of authority.

The Judge or collection of judges sit on the Bench.

The bench – old English 'Benc' – old Frisian 'Benk' – old high German 'Bank' – Germanic 'Bank-i', the Bench was the term for the Bank, as originally the money lender used benches to contract loans, so you go to the bench, or bank to become indebted, in modern usage a bank is a mass, a large amount, a heap.

So a Judge sits for the Bank, being the accumulated wealth, so the Judge sits on behalf of those with accumulated wealth.

So Court – the group or company of (man/woman acting as judge) to rule by right of authority on behalf of those with accumulated wealth.

Those who 'act' to give 'legal' advice:

Attorneys - who 'attorn' the land to their Lords. The word attorn means to acknowledge the relation of a tenant to a new landlord.

Solicitors – who 'solicit', they entreat or petition or beg the landlord for those who are not mentally competent.

Lawyers means 'law' trader, the 'landlords' trader.

The attorneys and barristers are collectively known as the Bar, from the passing of the Bar examination to act as a barrister. Bar - British Accreditation of Regency: This means, to officially recognize a person or organization as having met a standard or criterion as a person or group of people ruling on behalf of a monarch (representative of the Pope) who is unable to rule because of youth, illness, or absence, in person.

Bailiff – an overseer of a landed estate or farm.

Latin Baillier (Bailiff) – to hand over.

Bail – the resources of a person accused, or another person taking the responsibility for the accused, standing as surety to appear at an appointed time.

Jurisdiction (of equity an exclusive expression) - the committee plea jury dictates of twenty three peers in a true community or in the Jewish tradition twelve peers.

Natural equity:

Do not encroach upon another man/woman or their resources.

Do all you have agreed to do.

Critical discourse based on:

Allodial Use or Ownership?

Ownership can only be established through the inalienable right to - only own what you yourself create.

This is a problem if you wish to buy and sell what you yourself did not create, such as the earth itself and the resources of the earth.

Usufruct – Latin: usus et fructus (and the fruit of the use of), the right granted by the 'legal' owner of a property to derive profit, or benefit from that property. This is a type of servitude 'ius in re aliena' (another man 's right in the thing), the usufructuary never has possession of the property.

This concept can be taken further as the usufructuary can rent the property, or resources they have taken, encroaching natural equity, and derive rental payments through that fraud.

For Jefferson, "eating up the usufruct" means extinguishing the next generation's ability to share equitably in the benefits of a natural resource. No individual or society has authority to cause such extinction, whatever personal or collective they may allege ..."

## **The Nature of Government**

*“Only psychopaths want to run other people’s lives.”*

"To be governed is to be watched, inspected, spied upon, directed, law-driven, numbered, regulated, enrolled, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, checked, estimated, valued, censured, commanded, by creatures who have neither the right nor the wisdom nor the virtue to do so. To be governed is to be at every operation, at every transaction noted, registered, counted, taxed, stamped, measured, numbered, assessed, licensed, authorized, admonished, prevented, forbidden, reformed, corrected, punished. It is, under pretext of public utility, and in the name of the general interest, to be placed under contribution, drilled, fleeced, exploited, monopolized, extorted from, squeezed, hoaxed, robbed; then, at the slightest resistance, the first word of complaint, to be repressed, fined, vilified, harassed, hunted down, abused, clubbed, disarmed, bound, choked, imprisoned, judged, condemned, shot, deported, sacrificed, sold, betrayed; and to crown all, mocked, ridiculed, derided, outraged, dishonored. That is government; that is its justice; that is its morality." - Pierre-Joseph Proudhon

Government is Latin for mind control, to ‘govern- mentally’ the individual, as the administrative bureaucracy which controls a corporate state.

“If the State loses its grip over your mind, it loses the key to its very survival.” Lew Rockwell

It consists of:

1. Legislators - people who write and pass laws of the landlord/s, holding all in ownership, being the estate of the corps of government, the dead legal entity of corporation, through the *political system* (citizenry system), creating corporate policy.
2. Administrators - people who execute the corporate policy of the landlord/s (law) through the *bureaucratic system*.
3. Arbitrators - people who apply the corporate policy through the *judicial system*.

"Control of thought is more important for governments that are free and popular than for despotic and military states. The logic is straightforward: a despotic state can control its domestic enemies by force, but as the state loses this weapon, other devices are required to prevent the ignorant masses from interfering with public affairs, which are none of their business...the public are to be observers, not participants, consumers of ideology as well as products." — Noam Chomsk

Law is the policy of the issuing corporation and only applies upon the land ‘owned’ by the landlord, being their jurisdiction, binding all tenants and occupants in citizenry; the State claims ownership of all the land within its corporate borders, and all resources and life upon it.

The foundation of this claim is derived through the ‘simple trust’ which is created as the original claim of ‘ownership’; which is generally the result of genocide in order to remove the previous occupiers of the land. This for example was the case in Britain; the Church Corporation through its agents, attacked the indigenous people of Britain with a 20 year genocide, from 1066 to 1086, at which point the Domesday book was compiled to catalogue the assets of the corporation. Similarly in North America the Corporation orchestrated the murder of around 100 million indigenous people to remove their occupation of the land; genocide is the method commonly applied, just as the corporation did in Australia and South America, etc.

The originating corporation is the Vatican, all State corporations are incorporated through the Church, as inherently you can only own that which you create yourself, no one could then own the land or resources; the individual could only occupy the land and make use of the resources, no legal fiction could exist without its positive imposition. The Creator of the Earth is the only owner, therefore to claim the land as ‘owned’, the Church claims a man as a God, ‘Christ’, and further claim the Pope is the substitute of ‘Christ’ on Earth, therefore God on Earth, God is the Creator so owner, all claims are then subordinate and authorised as a grant through the Pope.

“I believe that all government is evil, and that trying to improve it is largely a waste of time.”  
H.L.Henken

The Legislators of the Legislative System

“It is hard to imagine a more stupid or more dangerous way of making decisions than by putting those decisions in the hands of people who pay no price for being wrong.” Thomas Sowell

The government regulates, restrains, supervises, or controls the individual through their imposed citizenship, for the good and welfare of the Corporation of State; that is the legal definition of all government.

“Government cannot grant you a thing. It can only place limits on that which was rightfully yours to begin with.”

“There is nothing that the State currently provides through theft and coercion that free human beings cannot provide at a lower cost and higher quality through voluntary interaction in the marketplace.” Justin Stout

All corporate governments without exception are ‘government de facto’, meaning a government of fact, not one that can exist in equitable nature, all governments work in opposition to the inherent power of the individual, all impose through the threat of violence, all extort, all subjugate, all enslave, and they all claim to be a government de jure; which is a concept without basis in fact, it is impossible to have an equitable system with the structure of any government that is based upon removing or subverting the inherent power of the individual. The justification generally applied is collective right, which is the fraud of representative democracy. To understand this further please read: The Nature of Democracy

“Government is in reality established by the few; and these few assume the consent of all the rest, without any such consent being actually given.” Lysander Spooner

A government de jure, is a government based upon a superior and inferior man, one man or group grant rights and entitlements, and impose the obligations of duties, through their fictional authority of a collective right; the inferior man is compelled through the fear of the threat of violence to comply.

“No matter how peaceful, humanitarian and tolerant you are, no matter how well-meaning and honourable your goals – if you ask for a new government law, program or plan, ultimately that program will be paid for with the property taken by force from others and the law will be enforced at the point of a gun.”

### The Administrators of the Bureaucratic System

Bureaucracies are excessive, meaning evil, multiplication of, and concentration of power in, administrative bureaus or administrators. A bureau was originally a kind of cloth from Old French burel woollen cloth, from Old French bure, from Late Latin burra shaggy cloth; possibly connected to a sack such as a burlap sack used to collect things.

There is a word in Arabic with the same meaning of woollen cloth, as a blanket placed on the back of a camel, ‘*dajjarl*’, was used to hide a disease to deceive a man buying the camel.

The term -‘cracy’ or -‘cracies’ is from the Greek word ‘-kratia’ "power, might; rule, sway; power over; a power, authority,".

*“In the non-commercial bureaucracies of government, everything is a guess. You don’t know how much to spend on what, whether there is any rational point to what you are doing, whether this plan or that plan succeeded or failed, where to cut if you have to, which managers or sectors are doing a good job and which are failing. The public sector is faking it all of the time.” Jeffrey Tucker*

Bureaucracies are a hierarchical system that compulsively creates more and more rules. There is little incentive to improve efficiency. They create more and more jobs for rule-creators, rule-enforcers, and rule interpreters. This is how they grow and expand their influence.

The bureaucratic organizational structure is based on following rules and obedience to higher authority; this is in contradistinction to a system where the officers of a government have a coordinate authority, meaning to act in harmonious combination where power is equally distributed.

In bureaucracies if you have obeyed the rules you have done a good job. Very little else matters. Bureaucratic organizations tend to attract workers who obey orders and follow rules, as well as those with the psychological defect of needing to control others. The major growth of bureaucratic influence occurs, however, by the influence rule-creators have on other bureaucratic organizations. Entire industries are created to obey the rules. To the extent that these bureaucratic rule-makers can convince others to obey and accept not just the rules themselves, but the bureaucratic, rule-obeying, hierarchical structures themselves, these bureaucrats become the greatest Value Destroyers in history.

Government is a disease masquerading as its own cure.” Robert LeFevre

When the primary objective of human interaction becomes obeying rules (especially those imposed by force), value is destroyed in at least six ways.

1. Little attention is paid to efficiency.
2. The products or services the customer wants to voluntarily purchase, or are compelled to purchase, receive little attention compared to other organizational goals.
3. Individual initiative is thwarted and innovation stagnates.
4. When bureaucrats enforce rules by threat or force of arms they trample upon the inherent power of the individual, and their reciprocal obligations and responsibilities in equities to those around them to engage in equitable, peaceful, voluntary exchange.
5. Imposed regulation, registration and taxation compliance, add enormously to the cost of production, and the establishment of infrastructure and services to comply with the demands of the bureaucrats, such as accountants, certifications, inflated administrations, these cost are born by the end consumer of all production, perverting the real value.
6. The innate inherent power of the individual is stripped away, devaluing the individual; the greater the authority conferred to the bureaucracy, the more contempt and imposition is suffered.

Some bureaucrats may couch the order in nice language, but at the root they perceive themselves as an order-giver and you as the obedient slave of that order. Bureaucrats hate diversity. Bureaucrats hate independence.

They believe your life, money, and body are theirs to regulate and use as they decide, if you are under positive law you are simply chattel, owned property, the time has arrived to remove positive law

Hierarchical systems attract sociopaths or psychopaths at the apex, who act without accountability and from their own perspective of holding power over others, with a desire to ever expand their power upon those around them. "To achieve world government, it is necessary to remove from the minds of men their individualism, loyalty to family traditions, national patriotism, and religious dogmas."-Brock Adams, Director UN Health Organization

The Arbitrators of the Judicial System



“No law can give power to private persons; every law transfers power from private persons to government.” Isabel Paterson

The arbitrators of the Corporate State settle dispute; however equitably a dispute can only exist between like entities, such as between living corporeal men and women, bureaucratic arbitrators do not settle such disputes; they exclusively arbitrate disputes between corporations.

A corporation is a dead body citizen, an incorporeal entity, a legal fiction, an instrument of commerce; men use this instrument of a bastardised corps to escape accountability, liability and to hoard resources perpetually from generation to generation in the colour of law, as estate is amassed in death there can be no inheritor; holding all as the property of a deceased citizen. Corporation is further applied generally without the consent of the individual; to allow the arbitrators to act in arbitration of dispute between living men and women against corporation, the system has to hold them as chattel in the corporation of citizenship, which is a vessel on the sea of commerce, a straw man.

Arbitrators just as all bureaucrats are within a commercial enterprise, all modern courts are private for profit trusts, and a trust is a generic corporation, they are law merchants.

“Government is a parasite that sucks the lifeblood from those it claims to serve. It has no industry and always follows the same pattern: to grow until it crushes everything in its path. It is the most devious and voracious parasite that has ever come into existence and it is entirely man-made.”

Wordpower

Anarchy

“Anarchy is no guarantee that some people won’t kill, injure, kidnap, defraud or steal from others. Government is a guarantee that some will.” Gustave de Molinari

The defence of those who propagate, perpetrate and promote government is “the alternative is anarchy!”

“Saying that we can’t survive without government, is like saying that animals can’t survive without farms.” Chris Reid

Anarchy means anti-overarching, so anti hierarchy and so free of hierarchical ‘leaderships’, therefore there is an absence of government or law, this does not mean there are no alternative systems to either government or law, just the alternative systems used free of government and law are not presently used or widely considered.

Anarchy is a lack of obedience to an authority, authority is "invention, advice, opinion, influence, command," from auctor "master, leader, author". Therefore anarchy is the lack of obedience to an imposed superior, to comply with their dictates and commands.

“A man is no less a slave because he is allowed to choose a new master once in a term of years.”

Lysander Spooner

Anarchy is an absence of a leader, a system of anarchy is therefore not based in a hierarchical structure. [To consider the alternative system please read the essays in this section, society.](#)

“Governments have no inherent authority other than the degree to which they can intimidate other to obey them with the threat of their monopoly on force.”

## Government Creates Society, Culture or Civilisation?

Society means "friendly association with others," as a "group of people living together in an ordered community", government removes community, and regulates through fear.

“The danger is not that a particular class is unfit to govern. Every class is unfit to govern.” Lord Acton

Culture is "cultivation through education", as the "the intellectual side of civilization". Government impose the Prussian school of education upon the masses, which is based on memorisation and regurgitation of authoritative based information, this form of education is called indoctrination. This is in contrast to the comprehension of factually based knowledge, as is gained through a classical education based upon the trivium, a method of education which is restricted to the education of only the elite who pay for private schooling or those wise enough to home school their offspring.

“Government is the coldest of all cold monsters. Coldly it lies; and this lie slips from its mouth: ‘I, government, am the people.’

Everything government says is a lie, and everything government has it has stolen.” Nietzsche

Civilisation; meaning the act or process of bringing out of a savage or uneducated state; Corporate bureaucrats view people from less-developed lands as barbaric and in great need of cultural edification, this is simply an excuse to impose the corporate system, which allows them to subjugate, control and enslave that ‘savage population’.

“The Great Lie is that this is civilisation. It’s not civilisation. It has been the most bloodthirsty brutalising system ever imposed upon this planet. This is not civilisation, this is the Great Lie. Or if it does represent civilisation, and that is truly what civilisation is, then the Great Lie is that civilisation is good for us.” John Trudell

Government is the product of a ‘cult’, a tended cultivation, to produce the worship of authority.

Government cultivates a mental condition of authority worship, a superior dominating all individuals, whether conceptual or personified, being worthy, being honoured, being all powerful. It is the result of ownership, and the structure of hierarchy, it pretends protection and threatens violence if you refuse to comply with their thefts, impositions, subjugations, regulations, registrations, monopolies and legislations. In a nut shell all government is the establisher and maintainer of monopoly, intimidation, coercion, extortion and violent abuses.

“No region can be secured otherwise than by arming the people. The possession of arms is the distinction between a freeman and a slave. He, who has nothing, and who himself belongs to another, must be defended by him, whose property he is, and needs no arms. But he, who thinks he is his own master, and has what he can call his own, ought to have arms to defend himself, and what he possesses; else he lives precariously, and at discretion.” James Burgh

## Usury

The simplest way to grasp the concept of usury is to understand it as:

‘the premeditated theft of the fruits of the physical labours of others’.

Interest is one form of this crime, taxation another but reflect on this principle to quickly understand any usurious transaction. Traditionally usury was simply understood to be the practice of charging a fee for the use of property, whatever that property. Interest is the form of usury attached to money, rent to property, and tax to autocracy.

Firstly who is guilty? To furnish someone with a usurious transaction is obviously Usurious, the accepting of a Usurious transaction as the consumer is also Usurious and finally the legal witnessing of a usurious transaction is also usurious, all are guilty and in defiance of the moral and ethical values of any intelligent human being with any regard for a human life.

The practice of Usury will ultimately enslave humanity, stripping back any community all the way to the family unit leaving you as an isolated individual easily controlled and manipulated. It will remove moral and ethical actions from the population and in due course result in the complete destruction of society. Degenerating in to war and exploitation of the weak and powerless, the annihilation of the defiant, the removal of freedom, the control and perversion of knowledge, the creation of monopolies, the removal of diversity, the increasing demands upon every individuals physical efforts to maintain a basic level of subsistence as the majority of the effort is redirected to the Usurers, the erosion of public services, the promotion of the vilest and most degenerate individuals to positions of celebrity or power and finally the removal from the truth and promotion of lies as facts. The effects of Usury are very evident within the world today, even more evident than any other influence or practice.

Soy, what is Usurious?

The paper money system of the world is based on debt, no note is printed except as the representation of a debt, whether public or private, a debt on which the bankers extract interest, this means all fiat money, (debt paper) is usurious, to accumulate and hold the certificate of any debt (like the English pound or the American dollar) in exchange for your efforts is usurious, the exchange of this debt paper as quickly as is practical into physical money, (in effect cashing in the debt) of gold or silver, or the purchase of goods to escape the usury is necessary, to horde paper debts is Usurious.

The monopoly systems of gambling manifest by the usurious banking system of the stock markets, the futures markets, the investment markets, the commodities markets, the bonds market, the insurance market, the pensions markets and the currency exchange markets are all without exception Usurious, to reap the rewards of someone else’s fruits and think yourself a sharp investor, ultimately of course a very poor investment upon realising your truth.

Many feel enraged by the progressively more debased actions of the Usurers, who through the empowerment of the population by indulging in Usury have taken total control of; the media world wide, the political establishments worldwide, the creation of the monies of the world for the cost of printing, which they lend at interest, and the establishment of obscene monopolies stripping the Earth of diversity, natural beauty and ecological environments, poisoning the air we breath, the water we drink and the food we eat, physically enslaving enormous numbers of human beings.

Income tax, value added tax (VAT), all tax is usurious, to pay it is usurious, to understand this you must firstly understand how income tax, and any other form of tax was started, who tax is ultimately collected for, and what the thinly veiled lie of democracy truly represents, how the Zionist financial industry with the Jesuits controls the entire planet and what are the goals and values of the groups in control of the financial industry, because there certainly not goals and values for the benefit or safety of the mass population of this tiny planet.

If you recognize the truth and understand the absolute requirement to refuse any usurious transaction even at the cost of your liberty, even at the cost of your accumulated wealth, even at the cost of your social standing, even at the cost of your public reputation, even at the cost of your physical life!

If the true enemy is clearly understood, the evidence and history laid bare, the systems and institution exposed for what they truly represent, this will empower the powerless. As the true adage states, 'the truth will set you free.'

Jesuits like Tony Blair and Zionists like Paul Wolfowitz work towards the establishment of a new world order; a two tier system, where human beings can be owned, sold, and harvested as commodities. Classified as sub-human the majority will exist without power, dignity or rights, (this has been true for the majority of the world anyway, but the extent of this abuse will increase dramatically), as they establish a financial system, held exclusively within a computer system (digital money), the birth of a new world. Hell manifest physically on Earth, satanic rule not predominant as now but total, without any positive confrontation or balance, the ultimate Usury.

Consider the ramifications of the realization of such a system, the establishments would have absolute dominance of your earnings, everything you accumulate and everything you pay for, they not you would have the power to extract from you digital account whatever they wished, they could establish how much tax they wanted to embezzle, the power to isolate or starve an individual would be held by them, through the retrenchment of your digital account. Every individual would be totally reliant upon the bankers, in the hands of the Zionist banking mafia, the abuse would be ceaselessly escalating, balanced only by the despair this would generate.

Apathy is the most powerful ally of these Zionist bankers, enforced ignorance of the truth replaced with conditioning and indoctrination is the most effective weapon they wield.

Arrogant with misinformed delusions, confident and defensive of a system of which they have no understanding; this would best describe the average British, American or European with regard to the financial and political mechanisms and objectives.

We are viewed as economic slaves, our human energy is taken, the fruits of our efforts stolen, drained away almost as fast as we can generate it, the more established this usurious system is allowed to develop the greater the efforts will be required to maintain a basic existence for every individual.

## Police

I do not need to address the multitude of serious breaches of the Commonwealth Imperial Constitution and Imperial Laws covered under the Crimes Act 1914, other than state the fact that the Commonwealth Federal Constitution denies the States the Authority to maintain a 'force' of any kind. As a consequence, police forces around this Country are nothing more than armed debt-collectors for the States, for the Vatican, enforcing imposed 'legislation' under the colour of Law, under a Crown foreign to the Commonwealth of Australia, with the threat of financial deprivation (extortion), imprisonment, and/or violence against their own people.

These illegal activities against our original law are actually crimes, very serious crimes at that, but not only are they crimes, they could be very well construed as treachery against the people. At the very least it leaves police open to numerous criminal offences.

### CRIMES ACT 1958 - SECT 81

#### Obtaining property by deception

(1) A person who by any deception dishonestly obtains property belonging to another, with the intention of permanently depriving the other of it, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to level 5 imprisonment (10 years maximum).

(2) For purposes of this section a person is to be treated as obtaining property if he obtains ownership, possession or control of it, and "obtain" includes obtaining for another or enabling another to obtain or to retain.

(4) For the purposes of this section, "deception"—

(a) means any deception (whether deliberate or reckless) by words or conduct as to fact or as to law, including a deception as to the present intentions of the person using the deception or any other person; and

### CRIMES ACT 1958 - SECT 82

#### Obtaining financial advantage by deception

(1) A person who by any deception dishonestly obtains for himself or another any financial advantage is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to level 5 imprisonment (10 years maximum).

(2) For purposes of this section **deception** has the same meaning as in section 81.

Now you know why the **VICTORIA POLICE ACT, 2013 Section 51** is divided into **51(a)** and **51(b)**.

Victoria Police Act, 2013

51 Duties and powers of police officers

"A police officer who has taken and subscribed the oath or made and subscribed the affirmation under section 50 has—

(a) the duties and powers of a constable at common law; and

(b) any duties and powers imposed or conferred on a police officer by or under this or any other Act or by or under any subordinate instrument.

You may think police are acting under 51(a) to serve the people of Victoria, and maybe they do that 5-10% of the time, but the stark reality is, that 90-95% of the time, police are a hired gun complicit in exploiting the people of the State of Victoria for the benefit of the financial coffers of The Vatican.

And you may be fine with that, however, that said, please understand that unless a police officer can provide written signed contracts between living beings and the corporate entities POLICE DEPARTMENT (Vic) ABN 63 446 481 493 trading as VICTORIA POLICE and/or STATE OF VICTORIA - PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA ABN 57 505 521 939, both of which act unlawfully under the St Edwards Crown and are ultimately controlled by the Vatican, there will be personal consequences to their actions when they are dealing with sovereign living beings.

### **What is a Birth Certificate?**

Are you a human? No you don't want to be a monster, that's what a human is by legal definition...  
Are you a person? No you don't want to be a corporation... also by legal definition...  
You are man... mankind... nothing else...

You are only to answer to the name given to you by your mother and father... you cannot change your name or go by any other...

You accept no titles... like Mr or Sir...

Your birth documentation should be straightforward and transparent, however it soon becomes the most complex and secretive paper trail imaginable. This alone suggests a long history of corruption. The process involves a maze of secret Trusts and various parts of legislation, focused on claiming your Estate.

When you are born (given life), a “Record of Live Birth” is created as evidence of your Life. It is your Affidavit of Life, with details that identify your living standing. It records your given name as a unique “Title”, i.e. John, to your Estate. (Your Estate is the “land”, or property, of your mind, body, and soul, and all the physical and intellectual property that derives from your living energy, including your in-born unalienable rights.) Your Mother’s autograph establishes the origin of your Estate (an Estate must come before a Trust). In Common Law (the Law of the “Land”), your Mother and the State are automatically Trustees in an “expressed” Sovereign Trust with you as the Beneficiary. You are the holder in “expectancy” of your Estate, which will descend to you as of right when you attain the “age of majority” (20), unless ...

Soon, your parents are told that you “must” be registered. They are under no such lawful obligation, but the State is insistent for reasons undisclosed. According to Ecclesiastical Law an Estate can only be held in Trust by a man. But your Mother was asked for her maiden name, constituting “Maternity”. [**MATERNITY**. It is either legitimate or natural. The former is the condition of the mother who has given birth to legitimate children, while the latter is the condition of her who has given birth to illegitimate children. Maternity is always certain, while the paternity (q.v.) is only presumed. – Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856 Ed.] Therefore, all naturally born children are



illegitimate (bastards) with uncertain fatherhood, having no paternal holder of their Estate. When registering, an “Informant” (unknowingly) makes an accusation as to your illegitimacy.

**[INFORMANT.** A person who informs or prefers an accusation against another. – Black’s Law Dictionary, 2nd Ed.] The Status of Children Act 1969, 2. says ‘For the purposes of this Act marriage includes a void marriage’. So you are legally a bastard without rights. **[BASTARD.** 4. Considered as nullius filius, a bastard has no inheritable blood in him, and therefore no estate can descend to him. – Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856 Ed.] Moreover, your “given name” (Title) is recorded in the “still-born” column. [A stillborn child is one ... incapable of living ... if they do not in fact survive so long as to rebut this presumption of law, they cannot inherit. – Black’s Law Dictionary, 2nd Ed.] The State can now legally claim your Estate, making you a “Ward of the State” in an “estates for life” Foreign Situs Trust. **[ESTATE.** 9.-2. The estates for life created by operation of law are ... 4th. Jointure. ... The estate for life is somewhat similar to the usufruct of the civil law. – Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856 Ed.] “Jointure” (joinder) is similar to “usufruct” (right to derive income from property of another).

The Record of Live Birth is used to issue a Birth Certificate Bond, certifying that a property “Title” is registered as a Security. It is like a Warehouse Receipt for the baby, the delivered goods.

**[WAREHOUSE RECEIPT.** A warehouse receipt, which is considered a document of title, may be a negotiable instrument used for financing with inventory as security. – Black’s Law Dictionary, 7th Edition]. At the same time, your “given name” and family name have been registered as a tradename. Only corporations have a “last name”. A legal “person” has been issued by the State as a franchise child of the parent corporation.

The Bond is sold to the World Bank (Bank for International Settlements, created in 1931 by the Vatican) as Settlor of the Trust. Your value to society is calculated using actuarial tables. Your Bond becomes a registered Security, which the Treasury uses as Surety for Treasury securities such as Treasury Bonds, Notes and Bills.

So you have been **monetized**. The people truly are the “Credit of the Nation”. However, in the corrupted system, the people’s credit is effectively “human capital”, or “livestock”.

Although the State can seize the baby as a “Ward of the State” if the State’s “investment” is threatened, its greatest value is realized from the “matured” working adult. The perpetrators of this deception know that you could one day discover the truth and invoke your Power of Attorney from the age of 18. Property Law Act 2007, Section 22.(1) ‘Person between 18 and 20 years may do certain things, ... (c) accept appointment, or act, as an attorney, 22.(2) ... has the same effect as if the person were 20 years old.’ In short, you can attain the age of majority (20) by declaring your own Power of Attorney from the age of 18. But if they can somehow “kill” you off, again, legally speaking, they can continue to hold your “deceased Estate” Titles: real property (lands), personal property (life), and spiritual property (soul).

When you reach full legal age under the Admiralty Maritime jurisdiction, which is the “Law of the Sea”, you become eligible to “register” your Estate as a “vessel” navigating on the “sea of commerce” with you as the Master (Mr/Mrs/Ms). Your “vessel” will have a legal “person” NAME such as MR JOHN DOE, and as the Master you will be the liable “owner”, while the State retains the “legal title” with the “powers of management” as the Registrar.

You will probably “voluntarily” forfeit your Estate. You may start work and register as a “taxpayer”, or you may enroll as a “voter” on a voting register. If you decide not to register, you have “gone to sea”, and if you are missing for seven years you are declared legally dead. The same process is applied to ships and mariners lost at sea. To avoid court proceedings, the Cestui Que Vie Act 1666, simply declared that everyone is dead after an absence of seven years, unless they return to claim their Estate. After seven years, you “died” without a will “Intestate”, so someone is appointed to manage your Estate/Trust. The Public Trust applies to the Family Court to manage your Estate under the ‘Protection of Personal and Property Rights Act 1988, Section 11. Form PPPR 6 Application for order to administer property’.

Under the first Sovereign Trust established by your Mother, you are the “holder in due course” of your Estate, and a future Creditor. As a private man/woman, you are the Executor/Beneficiary of your Common Law Estate Trust, and all oath-bound officials are your Public Trustees. But under the new Foreign Situs Trust, the State gains the “legal title” (right of possession) to your Estate, while the legal “person” only has the “equitable title” (right of use). The legal “person”, as a creation of the indebted State, is also a Debtor. Any man/woman who mistakenly takes responsibility for the legal “person” NAME and its debts steps into the role of the State as the liable Trustee. The State has turned the tables on you.

The People, by registration (legalisation), are employed by the State as debtors for a private banking cartel, which is upheld by a private Bar Association Guild (Law Society). While “acting” in the legal fiction “role” of your corporatised NAME, you will receive endless presentments (bills), which that employee of the State, the legal “person” (Strawman) is obliged to settle.

But the theft of your Estate is based on **false presumptions** that cannot be proven in fact. The fundamental flaw is that in order for a Birth Certificate to be issued, a man or woman must first have been born on the land. Plainly, you are not really dead, so you are still the living “**holder in due course**” of YOUR Estate Title. Under the Cestui Que Vie Act 1666, IV ‘If the supposed dead Man proves to be alive, then the Title is revested.’

Remember that only **you have a “birthday”** on which you were born into the world from your Mother. Whereas the artificial legal “**person**” **has a “date of birth”** on which it was registered by the Registrar. These two events usually have different dates! (see your Registration Print-out)

Maxim of Law: “He who fails to assert his rights has none”.

## Marriage

### Matrimonial Agreement

The detrimental term 'Marriage' is hierarchical, meaning 'marry age', so of an age to marry, 'marry' means 'male persona - to wed', 'Wed' means pledge, a 'Pledge' is a bailment of goods to a creditor as security for some debt or engagement. There are two varieties of pledge; chattel and land. When you pledge in contract as a written, witnessed agreement you bail yourself as chattel to the creditor as security, becoming subject to their control. This means the one paid becomes the possession of the one paying, or the one providing security takes possession of the other.

Husband means 'master of the house', wife means 'woman'; while a groom is someone who looks after horses. Not wild and free horses, but horses that are owned, tacked up and ridden or used, for show and for service. Horses that are broken and held in imposed servitude, when the groom wants to use them he fits a bridle (bridal), which is fitted into the horse's mouth as a method of inflicting pain to control the horse.

Marriage is a contract, a contract is a positive law fiction; no living soul can be a party to a contract, as they are exclusively between legal fictions such as corporation, when you sign a contract it is as the representative of your straw man of citizenship, a legal fiction which makes a living soul the agent of a corporate fiction.

If you remove the fictions of contract, then agreement must be substantive, so free of all fictions, and reciprocal, so equitable, the inherent nature of written bonds demands a witnessed signed reciprocal agreement, meaning it binds both parties equally, unlike a contract which does not.

In contract you could for example bind one party to be in effect chattel, meaning property, where you could dictate upon them within the contract of marriage, but this would be impossible within natural reciprocal agreement.

Within a matrimonial bond the male may want, in the future, a second wife, and if so this would be a part of the original agreement or an amendment introduced later but signed by both parties with witnesses, and of course would be in reciprocation, this would mean his first wife would be able to take a second husband (even in advance of her husband if the stipulation was in place), and further so would his second wife as it would also be in reciprocation.

For example if the man wanted his wife to wear head covering as a stipulation within the agreement he would also be required to do so. If he required her to ask permission of him to leave the house, he would be required to ask permission of her if he wished to leave, etc.

### Dowry

No 'right' can be established within any substantive agreement, as all rights are a grant from a superior to an inferior, this is not possible with equals, if you create a binding agreement you have a different structure to that which may exist within contract, within contract 'bribes' (given to persuade or induce - mahar) are called consideration.

Consideration is an inducement to enter into a contract. This is why prostitutes within the Wahhabi concept can be paid to enter into nikkah (matrimony) and are divorced after the sexual acts have been completed keeping the mahar (bribe) through the contract concept as settlement. Mahar is not within the Qur'an.

This concept of dowry can be subverted further, where the family of the girl sell her into matrimony with a bride price, like you would sell an animal, prostitution networks in the various Wahhabi region purchase girls from parents to use as prostitutes using this bride price, and pimp the child out using short nikkah contracts through the mahar concept.

Control of the dowry belongs to the bride in theory; although in practice control often transfers to the husband and in-laws, and grooms sometimes extort large dowries. Dowry deaths are a widespread problem in Pakistan; often referred to as "stove deaths", to blame the deaths on accidents, they kill a bride by setting her on fire as the preferred method; this is the same in India. During 2004 to 2009, an estimated 3,379 dowry killings occurred in Pakistan.

If the dowry (contract bribe) is given where the bride pays the husband as a basis of a marriage contract, then "dowry murders" become even more common place, this occurs when a new wife is murdered by her husband or in-laws if they are unhappy with her, (or simply to steal the dowry), rather than sending her back to her parents, which would force the in-laws or husband to return the dowry to the bride's parents. Another aspect of this reversal of dowry in contract is the desire for parents to have male offspring, giving rise to the widespread murder of infant girls.

### Divorce

There is no need of any 'right' to divorce, all natural agreements can be undone in the same manner they were established, this is inherent, no need to be granted anything. The agreement was created through a written agreement witnessed and signed by both parties and witnesses, and it is undone in the same manner.

A wife dissolving the agreement of matrimony cannot demand maintenance for herself but she can take half of all resources generated between husband and the wife within the period of the bond, this proportion is simple to establish if the resources of each party is detailed on the day the bond is established and again determined on the day of the dissolution of the agreement. The true purpose of the dowry is to subvert the reciprocation of the matrimonial agreement, by claiming the woman was paid in advance for the settlement of divorce, allowing the man to hoard all resources and leave the woman with little to nothing.

In the past the provider of resources was mainly the man, the woman used the resources to create a home, clothe the family, feed them etc. Within the axioms of the land for this reason the father took the children as their main guardian, unless they were conceived outside of a written witnessed agreement, then the mother kept the children. With a community in place that fosters equity and prevents monopoly, usury and slavery, an equal division of responsibility could be established, both parents are required by the child and neither should be denied that responsibility.

The biological father is responsible for his children if they are proven to be his, in the case of no agreement being in place, or if disputed; only upon failing in their obligations toward the child would sole protection be held. Children that have reached an age able to make rational choices may decide for themselves their main residence.

### Breaking the agreement

Breach (the act or a result of breaking) of contract is a legal cause of action in which a binding agreement or bargained-for exchange is not honoured by one or more of the parties, similarly

breach of reciprocal agreement incites relief, which maybe stipulated within the original agreement or established through arbitration.

Ideally if the agreement is broken the relief should be written within the bond, which is the yoke that ties the couple together. For example if the male beats the female (or vice versa) the bond is broken, the agreement no longer holds, it would void the bond, if the injured party wished to remain bonded it would only be after relief of the tort (wrongful act) was established in full as stipulated within the bond, only then would it be possible for the bond to be reinstated solely at the discretion of the injured party.

If infidelity was proven by one party this would break the bond, if abandonment was proven by one party that would break the bond, if subjugation and fear ruled over one party by the other that would break the bond, etc.

### Marriage License

A license exists as a grant from a superior to an inferior, accorded by a competent authority to solemnize (to observe with rites or formal ceremonies) the marriage contract, granting permission, and exists exclusively within the fictional 'world' of contracts.

A license is used to author the union, and the author controls that union, in some corporate States a bridegroom and bride must take blood tests before permission is authored by the agents of the State, additionally they are generally charged a fee to obtain a license, and they may have to declare their intention for a period of time in advance of the license being granted.

The marriage license originates from the Vatican Church Corporation, imposed upon Christians until the corporate system established the secular license diluting their monopoly and extending its application.

Many beg their superiors to grant them a fictional licence, for example gay marriage, where men marry men or women marry women, in reality they need no fiction or superior to grant them licence, they only need to enter into a matrimonial bond, as two consenting adults as long as they do not encroach upon any other, it is a private matter between themselves, in truth to impose restrictions upon others to prevent what you may dislike yourself, such as the idea of a man laying privately with another man in sexual congress, is an encroachment against those souls that would be a tort and they could seek relief of you.

The fruit of the union of a man and a woman cannot innately exist between the union of a man and a man or a woman and a woman, therefore that fruit should not be given into the custody of such a union externally. The argument that they could make good parents is not relevant as they have no innate capacity to produce offspring, unlike a barren heterosexual couple.

A Matrimonial Bond (Conceptualised within a bonded community):

A bond is a self-imposed reciprocal agreement, it establishes the intentions of the couple toward each other before the yoke of the union is consummated. It details the specific relief that each tort (wrongful act) will demand if a breach of the agreement is committed.

Each bond can be unique to the parties involved, within a basic structure, a tort is a tort, and therefore it is within what relief each tort demands that variation may exist.

If the relief for a tort expressed is considered too extreme by either party they are free to refuse to sign the bond, but relief is only imposed if a tort is committed, if your intention is never to commit any tort then no relief, no matter how severe, should ever be worth concern.

In a substantive (meaning free of all fictions) system no hierarchy can exist, as a substantive structure stands by itself, therefore if within your expressed relief for a particular tort, imprisonment is stated, the cost of that imprisonment rests upon the surety bondsmen of the culpable party, if no surety exists then the cost rests upon the complainer or the charity of others, but not upon a fiction of a community, or any other external fiction of State, government, or corporation.

If relief is expressed beyond the physical abilities of the injured party and culpability is proven, then a rex (to put a wrong to rights) can be hired to execute such relief through a warrant of the tortious moot. A tort is a wrongful act that causes mental distress or discomfort, or tortious injury, against another through a proven intentional action. No fiction of any sort, such as corporation, State, or government can therefore suffer a tort, as they have no mind to either suffer or inflict distress.

The relief stated within this bond can be tailored specifically to the couple entering the union; in the example below the relief presented can be made more severe or less, and other actions can be added that the couple consider torts. The details of the tortious acts presented can also be increased to provide greater clarity if desired.

Betrothed means ‘be the act of truth’; Carnal means ‘of the flesh’; Union means ‘action of joining one thing to another’: “Be the act of truth to the flesh, joining one to the other in bond agreement”.



## Courtesy Letter to police

Dear police officer and contracted member of VICTORIA POLICE,

Who do you serve?

Let me start off by first addressing your personal willingness to serve ‘the Victorian community’ and uphold ‘the law’ to promote a safe, secure and orderly society, as per;

Victoria Police Act 2013,

Section 8 Role of Victoria Police

“The role of Victoria Police is to serve the Victorian community and uphold the law so as to promote a safe, secure and orderly society.”

I acknowledge you making the commitment to serve ‘the Victorian community’. It is not an easy decision to make, to deal with the many problems prevalent in today’s society. I also acknowledge that you were, and are, so committed to that commitment that, pursuant to **Victoria Police Act, 2013**, you swore an oath or affirmation.

Victoria Police Act 2013

Schedule 2—Oaths and affirmations

Sections 50(2) and 192(2)

FORM 1

### OATH OR AFFIRMATION FOR POLICE OFFICERS

I [insert name] [swear by Almighty God/do solemnly and sincerely affirm] that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady the Queen as a police officer in Victoria in any capacity in which I may be appointed, promoted, or reduced to, without favour or affection, malice or ill-will for the period of [insert period] from this date, and until I am legally discharged, that I will see and cause Her Majesty's peace to be kept and preserved, and that I will prevent to the best of my power all offences, and that while I continue to be a police officer I will to the best of my skill and knowledge discharge all the duties legally imposed on me faithfully and according to law.

However, here is where you, and we, the people of the State of Victoria, have been deliberately deceived.

You do not actually serve the people of the State of Victoria at all. Sadly, you may not be aware that you have been previously misinformed and/or falsely educated, even deliberately misled and lied to.

For example, what or where is “Victoria”? It is not “The State of Victoria”, as is defined clearly in **The Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (Imp)**. “Victoria” is not defined in the **Victoria Police Act, 2013** nor any other ‘legislation’.

And who is Victoria Police, who is she?

You see, using lower case letters also implies a common law living being. So how do we know it doesn't?

Victoria Police Act 2013

## PART 2—VICTORIA POLICE

### 6 Victoria Police

#### Division 1—Constitution, role and functions

The police force of Victoria is constituted by a body established by this section known as Victoria Police.

Note: Victoria Police is a special body under section 6(1) of the Public Administration Act 2004.

Let me dissect this 'legal document' a little further.

- “The police force of Victoria” - there is no such legal entity, there is only POLICE DEPARTMENT (Vic) ABN 63 446 481 493 trading as VICTORIA POLICE.
- “...established by this section known as Victoria Police.” - The absence of the comma between 'section' and 'known' changes the meaning to one that 'the section is known as Victoria Police. An oversight or error, no, deliberate deception and misleading.
- The next key is in the note - “Victoria Police is a special body under section 6(1) of the Public Administration Act 2004”

Ok, so it's a special body under another 'Act', so let's check that out.

Public Administration Act 2004

### 6 What are special bodies?

(1) Subject to subsection (4), for the purposes of this Act the following are special bodies—

(k) *Victoria Police*

It is circular logic – “Victoria Police” is a “special body” is “Victoria Police”. Therefore it has no definition and is simply deceptive legal gobbledegook.

And here is where it gets really interesting, as there is actually no definition of what a 'body' is (let alone a 'special body') in the **Public Administration Act 2004** nor in the **Victoria Police Act 2013**.

So let's look at the 'legal' definition of a 'body'.

*“The principal part of anything as distinguished from its subordinate parts, as in the main part of an instrument. An individual, an organisation, or an entity given legal recognition, such as a corporation or "body corporate." A compilation of laws known as a "body of laws."*

So which of these actually is Victoria Police?

- she can be the individual, or
- an organisation, or

- a corporation, or a body corporate.

I am sure you understand that “Victoria Police” is not the corporate entity VICTORIA POLICE that you are employed by, they are two separate entities. So why the duality and how/where is the deception of joinder of these two entities, and why does the ‘legislation’ use the lower case “Victoria Police”?

The first clue is in the use of CAPITAL LETTERS and is called the Justinian Deception.

***The Justinian Code*** or ***Corpus Juris Civilis (Corpus of Civil Law)*** ("Body of Civil Law") is the modern name for a collection of fundamental works in jurisprudence, issued from 529 to 534 AD by order of Emperor Justinian I, Eastern Roman Emperor, that constitute the foundation documents of the Western legal systems to this day. Numerous provisions within the Code served to secure the status of Christianity as the state religion of the empire, uniting Church and state, with the very first law in the Codex requiring all persons (citizens) under the jurisdiction of the Roman Empire to hold the Christian faith, thus making anyone who was not connected to the Christian church a non-citizen. Or, ‘Citizens’ owe allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church.

Citizen - A person who, due to place of birth, nationality of one or both parents, naturalization, or other reasons (for example, **citizenship** of parents) has sworn loyalty to a nation and is a member of a political community or of a civil state, such as a country or state, and is entitled to all the civil rights and protections thereof and owes allegiance to its government.

And this is controlled through the ‘person’s’ ‘legal’ ‘name’.

**Legal name** is the ‘NAME’ (IN CAPITAL LETTERS) that identifies a person for legal, administrative and other official purposes. A person's first legal name generally is the name of the person that was given for the purpose of registration of the birth and which then appears on a birth certificate.

A ‘legal name’ is not a proper name, a ‘legal name’ includes a surname. So what is a surname?

**sur-** a prefix **meaning** “over, above,” “in addition,” - the part of a name which is not given in baptism, the name over and above the Christian name.

They are called surnames, a “cognomen”(an extra personal name given to an ancient Roman citizen), because originally they were written over the name in judicial writings and contracts. So a ‘SURNAME’ is the name by which the ‘legal system’ claims authority ‘over’ and ‘above’ the living being and who therefore remains subject to the power of Rome.

The ‘legislation’ uses the lower case “Victoria Police” because the use of ALL UPPERCASE TEXT is not defined or recognised in The Oxford Styles Manual, (the governing book of the English language) – meaning that although one may be able to read it as English, it is in fact, not English.

The ALL CAPS (‘gloss’ or ‘glossa’) can however be found within the 'Oxford Styles Manual', under 'foreign-languages', named 'Ancient-Latin'.

**“This is proper English descriptive text”**

The all uppercase LATIN-TEXT appearing on any document is a “GLOSSA”, it is not English, it is an illustrative text (Picture-Symbol) and not a descriptive text such as English.

## **“THIS-IS-PROPER-WRITTEN-SIGN-LANGUAGE-USING-THE-GRAMMATICAL-RULES-OF-LATIN-TEXT”**

(Identified in Article 11:147 of the Chicago Manual of Styles, SIXTEENTH EDITION).

According to the Blacks Law Dictionary 4th Edition;

“DOG-LATIN, is the language of the illiterate, it is the: LATIN-ALL-UPPERCASE-TEXT usurped into the English Descriptive text, appearing under the grammatical rules of Descriptive English Text, (*ALL UPPERCASE SYMBOLIC TEXT without the hyphens*) and not appearing under the true correct grammatical rules of Latin and done in order to deceive the illiterate, being the ignorant masses. meaning that, by using a Glossa in a document, in this case DOG LATIN, the author is trying to conceal or confuse the real facts.”

## **“THIS TEXT IS DOG LATIN BEING LATIN TEXT BASED ON THE GRAMMATICAL RULES OF ENGLISH”**

This is known as: Debased Latin: “DOG-LATIN, language of the illiterate: Blacks Law Dictionary 4th Edition”

“DOG-LATIN” is noted as criminal under the English Dictionary, identified as: “Dog Latin, being a debased form of text”. Debase synonyms appear as **Criminal** and **Immoral** and **Evil** and as a **counterfeit**, along with many more declensions.

The ‘legislation’ uses lower case letters because the use of the ALL-CAPITALLED ‘symbols’ would be a deliberate criminal, immoral, evil and counterfeit act by the constructor of this instrument. So, instead, they use the lower case “Victoria Police” to deliberately mislead and confuse the reader.

Is it really important, does it make a difference?

Yes, it does.

Gage Canadian Dictionary 1983 Sec. 4 defines Capitalize adj. as:

“To take advantage of – To use to ones own advantage.”

So then claiming use of the ‘legislation’ under the name of VICTORIA POLICE is a deliberate criminal, immoral, evil and counterfeit act by the corporation VICTORIA POLICE to mislead and confuse the people of the State of Victoria.

It is also employed to take advantage of the people of the State of Victoria so as to financially defraud them into giving money to the constructor on the pretence they, the ‘accused’, have breached some ‘statutory legislation’.

The second clue is in the ‘legislation’ itself.

You swore an oath to act as a ‘police officer’, that is in lower case letters, which is an indication of common law, as is ‘Victoria Police’ (a common law organisation), so really you have sworn an oath as a member of the State of Victoria, to uphold the common law of the people.

Common Law of England to be enforced.

An Act for the Regulation of the Police Force 8-01-1853

Section 4; Police Regulation Statute 1873

Section 9 to the Police Regulation Act 1928, under Section 10:

“Every constable shall have such powers and privileges and be liable to all such duties as any constable duly appointed now has or hereafter may have earlier by the common law or by virtue of any Act of Parliament now or hereafter to be in force in Victoria.”

That is also reflected in the **VICTORIA POLICE ACT, 2013 Section 51(a)**.

Victoria Police Act, 2013

51 Duties and powers of police officers

“A police officer who has taken and subscribed the oath or made and subscribed the affirmation under section 50 has—

(a) the duties and powers of a constable at common law; and

(b) any duties and powers imposed or conferred on a police officer by or under this or any other Act or by or under any subordinate instrument.

And I am sure that’s what you thought you were swearing an oath to, and you were, but does it have any power or authority under ‘legislation’, and what does Section 51(b) mean?

Section 51(b) is you swearing to the ‘legal’ duties imposed on the common law police office by the **VICTORIA POLICE ACT, 2013** and any other “subordinate instrument”, that is ‘legislation’. This is you ALSO agreeing to the duties imposed on you by your employer, the money-making corporation POLICE DEPARTMENT (Vic) ABN 63 446 481 493 trading as VICTORIA POLICE.

And it is reflected in the **Police Regulation Act 1958 Section 11**.

**Police Regulation Act 1958 Section 11.**

“Every constable shall have such powers and privileges and be liable to all such duties as any constable duly appointed now has or hereafter may have either by the common law or by virtue of any Act of Parliament now or hereafter to be in force in Victoria, and any member of the police force of higher rank than a constable shall have all the powers and privileges of a constable whether conferred by this Act or otherwise.”

The constable is the common law man serving the people. But look at what has been added.

“either by the common law or by virtue of any Act of Parliament”.

The two, common law and Acts of Parliament, are now clearly separate and mutually exclusive.

Also this;

*“any member of the police force of higher rank than a constable shall have all the powers and privileges of a constable”*

Members of the ‘police force’, no matter how high their rank, are accorded the powers of a common law constable as well.

In effect, you are a servant to two masters. But which has supreme authority?

As proven by the precedents set by various judges, **common law supersedes statutory law**.

But who is it you are actually serving?

According to the **Victoria Police Act, 2013, Section 8**, the Act under which you swore your oath:

“The role of Victoria Police is to serve the Victorian community and uphold the law so as to promote a safe, secure and orderly society.”

Let us dissect that.

The role of Victoria Police (the common law organisation), of which you are a common law member, serves ‘the Victorian community’, whoever or whatever that is, and upholds the common law. In fact, as Victoria Police is a common law organisation it can only uphold common law. Victoria Police and/or its members has no authority to uphold ‘legislation’.

If Victoria Police serves ‘the Victorian community’ then ‘the Victorian community’ is the master, and the master gives the orders, I.e. ‘the Victorian community’ tells you what to do.

However, there is no definition in the **Victoria Police Act, 2013** as to what or who ‘the Victorian community’ actually is.

From a purely legal perspective ‘the Victorian community’ is not ‘the people of the State of Victoria’, in fact ‘the Victorian community’ is not defined in the **Victoria Police Act, 2013** (which is a legal document) at all, nor any other ‘legislation; ‘the Victorian community’ has no legal definition whatsoever – it does not exist at law, it is a non-entity.

So, under the ‘legislation’, ‘the Victorian community’ is a non-existent master.

But it is even more of a deception, because in the oath you swore pursuant to **Victoria Police Act 2013, Schedule 2—Oaths and affirmations** you did not even swear to serve the non-lawful and non-legal fiction ‘the Victorian community’, you swore to serve “our Sovereign Lady the Queen”. Who, or what, is “our Sovereign Lady the Queen”?

The implied entity “our Sovereign Lady the Queen” is not “Her Majesty, *Queen Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God Queen of this Realm and of Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith*” as is clearly determined under our Federal Constitution and/or under our State Constitution.

Like ‘the Victorian community’, the implied entity “our Sovereign Lady the Queen” is also not defined in the legal document **Victoria Police Act, 2013**, nor any other ‘legislation; “our Sovereign Lady the Queen”, whoever or whatever that is supposed to represent, has no legal definition whatsoever - it does not exist lawfully or legally, it is a non-entity.

So, “our Sovereign Lady the Queen”, is another non-existent master.

So who do you really ‘serve’ if there is no lawful or legal master to serve under the **Victoria Police Act, 2013, Section 8**?

You can only serve the master as implied in **Victoria Police Act, 2013, 51(b)**, the private corporation, POLICE DEPARTMENT (Vic) ABN 63 446 481 493, trading as VICTORIA POLICE, that uses ‘legislation’ created by another corporate entity, STATE OF VICTORIA -



PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA ABN 57 505 521 939, to deceive and defraud the people of the State of Victoria and extort money from them through innumerable ‘statutory offences’.

HOWEVER, as has been shown above, VICTORIA POLICE is not Victoria Police, and thus VICTORIA POLICE has absolutely no authority other than if a living being specifically contracts with it.

Let me repeat and unpack that:

**POLICE DEPARTMENT (Vic) ABN 63 446 481 493, trading as VICTORIA POLICE, has absolutely no authority over a living being other than if that living being specifically contracts with it.**

What does that mean for you?

In effect you are a ‘hired gun’, a private subcontractor, acting as a revenue raiser for a private corporation, extorting monies through ‘legislation’, ‘statutory offences’, ‘INFRINGEMENT NOTICES’, and intimidation, under the demands and impositions of your superior officers.

Is that what you thought you were swearing an oath to, is that what you committed to? I doubt it. How much time do you spend preventing or stopping actual crimes compared to the hours you spend revenue raising for private corporations through issuing ‘INFRINGEMENT NOTICES’ related to ‘statutory offences’? How is that serving the people of the State of Victoria?

And that is just the first part of the deception.

Lets further unpack you ‘oath’ or ‘affirmation’ as per **Victoria Police Act 2013, Schedule 2—Oaths and affirmations, Sections 50(2) and 192(2), FORM 1, OATH OR AFFIRMATION FOR POLICE OFFICERS**

Victoria Police Act 2013, Schedule 2—Oaths and affirmations,

Sections 50(2) and 192(2), FORM 1,

OATH OR AFFIRMATION FOR POLICE OFFICERS

“I [insert name] [swear by Almighty God/do solemnly and sincerely affirm] that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady the Queen as a police officer in Victoria in any capacity in which I may be appointed, promoted, or reduced to, without favour or affection, malice or ill-will for the period of [insert period] from this date, and until I am legally discharged, that I will see and cause Her Majesty's peace to be kept and preserved, and that I will prevent to the best of my power all offences, and that while I continue to be a police officer I will to the best of my skill and knowledge discharge all the duties legally imposed on me faithfully and according to law.”

What does “legally discharged” mean?

*“A discharge is the act or instrument by which a contract or agreement is ended.”*

So, this is the legal terminology. It does not mean ‘lawfully’, it only relates to the ‘legal’ corporate world, not to the lawful rights of you, nor the people of the State of Victoria, unless there is a contract.

What does “Her Majesty's peace” mean? And who is “Her Majesty”? It could be any queen of any country, a person, even the name of a dog? There is no definition in the **Victoria Police Act 2013**

as to who or what “Her Majesty” is, nor what “Her Majesty’s” concept of “peace” is, or whether that concept is legal or not, or even lawful.

What are the lawful and legal implications of “prevent to the best of my power all offences”, what does that mean? Well, let’s check that out.

Victoria Police Act 2013,

## 9 General functions of Victoria Police

(1) The functions of Victoria Police include the following—

- (a) preserving the peace;
- (b) protecting life and property
- (c) preventing the commission of offences;
- (d) detecting and apprehending offenders;
- (e) helping those in need of assistance.

Remember, these are common law functions that only apply to the common law organisation ‘Victoria Police’, to Section 51(a) and do not and cannot apply to ‘VICTORIA POLICE’ as implied by Section 51(b).

It means you have powers and authority to prevent offences, common law offences, but no power or authority to judge or punish an alleged offence that has allegedly already occurred. Also, under 9(d), that you are authorised to perform the function of apprehending someone who has committed a common law offence against another living being, but not to apprehend or detain a living being for a ‘statutory offence’.

For instance, you may have the power to stop a speeding car, you believe may cause an action endangering life or property, by flashing your lights, so causing them to pull over, but, once that car has pulled over, your power and authority is voided.

You have no power or authority to serve an ‘INFRINGEMENT NOTICE’.

You may observe a car go through a stop sign or traffic light, and be of the belief this was a dangerous act that potentially could have resulted in harm or damage through an accident, but you only have power to prevent such an offence, not to pull them over and issue an ‘INFRINGEMENT NOTICE’ after the alleged ‘offence’.

You may notice a car swerving on the road, and, believing the person is intoxicated and that they are driving in a manner that may result in an accident that may cause harm to the ‘driver’, another living being, or damage to property, by flashing your lights so cause them to pull over.

But, once that car has pulled over, your power and authority is voided – you have prevented that potential offence and your power is gone.

Further, the Australian Government Law Reform Commission states the following at 15.89:

“The common law privilege against self-incrimination entitles a person to refuse to answer any question, or produce any document, if the answer or the production would tend to incriminate that person.[123] Although broadly referred to as the privilege against self-incrimination, the concept

encompasses three distinct privileges: a privilege against self-incrimination in criminal matters; a privilege against self-exposure to a civil or administrative penalty (including any monetary penalty which might be imposed by a court or an administrative authority, but excluding private civil proceedings for damages); and a privilege against self-exposure to the forfeiture of an existing right (which is less commonly invoked).”

Your powers are thus quite limited.

So what does “discharge all the duties legally imposed on me” mean?

It means you have signed a written contract with the private corporation, POLICE DEPARTMENT (Vic) ABN 63 446 481 493, trading as VICTORIA POLICE, to be complicit in the unlawful deception and defrauding of the people of the State of Victoria so as to extort money from them through innumerable ‘statutory offences’.

Legally does not mean lawfully, and these potentially unlawful ‘legal’ duties are imposed on you by POLICE DEPARTMENT (Vic) ABN 63 446 481 493, trading as VICTORIA POLICE, as part of that contract.

**Impose:** *to establish or bring about as if by force, bind, burden, charge, command, compel, conscript, constrain, dictate, encumber, enjoin, extort, force upon, impel, leave no option, oblige, order, put in force, require, require compliance, bring under rule, coerce, constrain, control, domineer, enslave, force, make submissive, oblige, subject to authority, subject to control, subjugate, subordinate*

As I said, in effect you are a ‘hired gun’, a private subcontractor, acting as a revenue raiser for a private corporation, extorting monies through intimidation, ‘statutory offences’ and ‘INFRINGEMENT NOTICES’, under the demands and impositions of your superior officers.

AND YOU ARE PERSONABLY ACCOUNTABLE!

But you are a public servant, covered and protected under the **Public Administration Act 2004**, right?

Wrong –

**As a living being you are personally liable for all your actions!**

Public Administration Act 2004

PART 8—MISCELLANEOUS

106 Act not to apply to certain persons

(1) Except to the extent that a provision of this Act otherwise expressly provides, this Act does not apply to a person in his or her capacity as, or to the appointment or employment of a person as—

(i) a police officer, police reservist, police recruit or protective services officer under the Victoria Police Act 2013;

Perhaps you think you are covered under the **Victoria Police Act 2013?**

No, to the contrary! And I direct your attention specifically to 74(2).

Victoria Police Act 2013,

Division 8—Liability for tortious conduct by police and protective services officers

72 What is a police tort?

- (1) For the purposes of this Act, a police tort is a tort committed by a police officer or protective services officer in the performance or purported performance of the officer's duties.
- (2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a tort includes—
  - (a) detrimental action (within the meaning of the Protected Disclosure Act 2012) taken by a police officer or protective services officer in reprisal for a protected disclosure within the meaning of that Act; and
  - (b) any other prescribed action or conduct.

Victoria Police Act 2013,

Division 8—Liability for tortious conduct by police and protective services officers

73 What is a police tort claim?

- (1) For the purposes of this Act, a police tort claim is a claim for damages or other relief in respect of an alleged police tort.
- (2) A police tort claim includes—
  - (a) an action for damages under Part III of the Wrongs Act 1958 in respect of an alleged police tort; and
  - (b) a counterclaim for damages or other relief in respect of an alleged police tort committed by a police officer or protective services officer that is made by a person in a legal proceeding brought by the officer against that person; and
  - (c) any other prescribed action, claim or proceeding in respect of an alleged police tort.
- (3) To avoid doubt, subsection (2) does not limit what is a police tort claim.

Victoria Police Act 2013,

Division 8—Liability for tortious conduct by police and protective services officers

74 Liability of the State for police torts

- (1) Subject to this section, the State is liable for a police tort.
- (2) The State is not liable for a police tort if the State establishes on a police tort claim that the conduct giving rise to the police tort was serious and wilful misconduct by the police officer or protective services officer who committed the police tort.
- (3) If a police officer or protective services officer commits a police tort for which the State is liable, the officer—
  - (a) is not liable to any person for the police tort; and
  - (b) is not liable to indemnify, or to pay any contribution to, the State in respect of the liability incurred by the State.

(4) The State is not liable for a tort committed by a police officer or protective services officer that is not a police tort.

So, what is a tort?

A **tort**, in common law jurisdictions, is a civil wrong that causes a claimant to suffer loss or harm resulting in legal liability for the person who commits the tortious act. It can include the intentional infliction of emotional distress, negligence, financial losses, injuries, invasion of privacy, and many other things.

A **civil wrong** or **wrong** involves the violation of a right, because wrong and right are complementary terms, and is a cause of action under the law of the governing body. Tort, breach of contract and breach of trust are types of civil wrong.

Tort law, where the purpose of any action is to obtain a private civil remedy such as damages, may be compared to criminal law, which deals with criminal wrongs that are punishable by the state.

Remember, although there is no master to serve under common law other than Almighty God, you signed an oath under **Victoria Police Act 2013, Schedule 2** as a member of the common law organisation 'Victoria Police' and you are acting at all times under common law, which does not include anything under Section 51(b), therefore you are not covered or protected by Section 51(a) for any actions you take under Section 51(b).

**Meaning you are still personally liable for all you actions!**

How can that be?

"It is an ancient principle of the Common Law that a person not under arrest has no obligation to stop for police, or answer their questions. And there is no statute that removes that right. The conferring of such a power on a police officer would be a substantial detraction from the fundamental freedoms which have been guaranteed to the citizen by the Common Law for centuries."

Justice Stephen Kaye - Melbourne Supreme Court ruling - 25 November 2011

When you issue someone a penalty notice, 'INFRINGEMENT NOTICE', summons, or arrest them for minor "safety" or traffic matters, you are acting under **Victoria Police Act 2013, 51(b)** but are still duly accountable under **Victoria Police Act 2013, 51(a)** especially if you cannot prove you have authority under **Victoria Police Act 2013, 51(b)** via a written contract between the parties, to issue someone such a penalty notice, 'INFRINGEMENT NOTICE', summons, or arrest them for minor "safety" traffic matters, or other 'statutory offence'.

"(Police officers) have no power whatever to arrest or detain a citizen for the purpose of questioning him or of facilitating their investigations. It matters not at all whether the questioning or the investigation is for the purpose of enabling them to ascertain whether he is the person guilty of a crime known to have been committed or is for the purpose of enabling them to discover whether a crime has or has not been committed. If the police do so act in purported exercise of such a power, their conduct is not only destructive of civil liberties but it is unlawful."

Regina v Banner (1970) VR 240 at p 249 - Full Bench of the Northern Territory Supreme Court

Remember, you have contracted with a private corporation, POLICE DEPARTMENT (Vic) ABN 63 446 481 493, trading as VICTORIA POLICE, to impose, as directed by them, the 'legislation' of another private corporation, STATE OF VICTORIA - PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA ABN 57 505 521 939, and, unless that living being to whom you have issued a penalty notice, 'INFRINGEMENT NOTICE', summons, or arrested for any minor "safety" or traffic matters, or other 'statutory offence', has contracted with either of the aforementioned corporations, and you can provide written evidence of that contract in a court of law, there is a high probability that you are committing a tort and breaking the true "Law"?

**AND, IN THAT SCENARIO, YOU ARE, AND WILL BE, PERSONABLY  
ACCOUNTABLE FOR ANY AND ALL ACTIONS YOU TAKE.**