The Grand Deceptions

By Veronica: of the Chapman family
(as commonly called)

Version 1.14 [April, 2011]

Let's start with one basic Truth: THE UNIVERSE (whatever it is!) IS THE TRUTH.

- Now let's add another Truth: ***Life exists within the Universe***
- And another: ***Life exists, within the Universe, on Planets*** (at the very least!)
- Which is the same thing as saying: ***Life exists where it can be supported by the Universe.*** (AND NOT WHERE ***– OR IF -*** IT CAN'T!)
- Why is this important to consider?

There are 1.7 million examples of SENTIENT Life on Planet Earth

- Can these life forms exist without FULL Support from Planet Earth?
- What would happen if ANY ASPECT of this Full Support did not exist?

IF – ***ANYTHING*** – NECESSARY TO SUPPORT A LIFE FORM, DOES NOT EXIST WITHIN THE – ***BASIC*** - RESOURCES PROVIDED BY PLANET EARTH, THEN THAT LIFE FORM – ***CANNOT*** – EXIST ON PLANET EARTH

- Yes or No?
- Would it ever get started? Would it survive if it did?

Anything – NOT- provided by ***the basic resources of*** Planet Earth is supernumerary – i.e. ***in***essential to 'life':

- Money
- Legalese
- Religion
- Politics
- *(Which, by the way, are all exactly the same thing)*

And, what is worse, is that THEY ARE ALL DECEPTIONS.

- They all thoroughly depend on “mis-placed faiths”
- Resulting in nothing more than “mind prisons” (David Icke’s description being ‘prisons-without-the-bars’)

Start in reverse order: Politics. What is it?

- "Faith placed in something" … or someone … your MP … your 'Government'
- Faith placed in SOMEONE ELSE to ***<u>represent</u>*** YOU
- (On the gross assumption that you actually need 'representing', of course … i.e. that you are incapable of representing yourself … yourself)
- Is this faith placed correctly (reasonably), or mis-placed? What do you think?
- (After 800 years of 'Parliament', this sounds like a very – sick – joke … to me)

So what about the next one: Religion. What is it?

- “Faith placed in something” … or someone … your Vicar … your Priest … an ‘Almighty’
- Faith placed in SOMEONE ELSE to ***save*** YOU
- (On the gross assumption that you actually need ‘saving’, of course … i.e. that you are incapable of saving yourself … yourself)
- Is this faith placed correctly (reasonably), or mis-placed? What do you think?
- *“If one person has a delusion, it’s called ‘insanity’, if billions have the same delusion, it’s called ‘religion’”*

The next one: Legalese. What is it?

- "Faith placed in something" … your 'Parliament/Congress' … to create Statutes
- Faith placed in SOMEONE ELSE to ***represent*** YOU (in Court, or in your daily affairs, etc)
- (On the gross assumption that you actually need 'representing', of course … i.e. that you are incapable of representing yourself … yourself)
- Is this faith placed correctly (reasonably), or mis-placed? What do you think?

Well, that's THREE "faiths mis-placed in something", so what about the last one: Money?

- Well, what IS Money?
- No … it's NOT "***What we use to buy things with***". "Buy" (and "sell", and "commerce", etc.) equate to "money" … so that definition is circular and eats its own tail (whatever a Dictionary might say!)

“Money” = “Credit” (See your Bank Statement!) . What is “credit”?

- OMG! “Faith placed in something”!
- (I’ll fully explain this in later screens)
- Is this faith placed correctly (reasonably), or mis-placed? What do you think?
- (I know what -I- think! *"If one person has a delusion, it’s called ‘insanity’, if billions have the same delusion, it’s called ‘’money’”)*

Now please explain to me why we need these "mis-placed faiths"?

- Planet Earth does not provide them from its own BASIC resources (Planet Earth is not that stupid!)
- No other life form (of the 1.7 million SENTIENT life forms) recognises them – and manages to survive quite happily without them
- Could there be something that this 1.7 million is missing? Or are we missing something? What do you think?

Could we be sufficiently far-sighted such as to jettison “Money”, “Legalese”, “Religion” & “Politics” … into the dustbin of history?

- What do you think?
- Should we do that?
- Could we do that?
- Or is it better to eat our own tails chasing ‘shiny silver & gold-coloured & paper things’ endlessly?

“Money” .vs. “Freedom”

- It’s all very simple.
- ***They are <u>mutually exclusive</u>***
- If you want “Money” … you can’t have “Freedom”
- If you want “Freedom” … you can’t have “Money”
- ***If you want both, you end up with what we currently have … so we have the “Freedom” to have this meeting, to discuss all our “Money woes & lack of Freedoms”. Is that what you want?***
- **You need to get your head around this**
- *(By “Money” I mean ‘a Monetary System’)*

Vic Beck points out the obvious … DUE TO TAXATION, **YOU CAN NEVER AFFORD WHAT YOU, YOURSELF, MADE**

- Your Employer says what you did was worth (say) £1,000 … and pays you that
- Thus, what you did is 'worth' £1,000
- After Tax you only actually receive £750
- So you will never ***physically*** receive enough 'credits' to buy what you, yourself, created … because your £750 will not 'buy' something 'worth' £1,000
- (Of course 'worth', 'buy', 'money' etc. are all ***imaginations*** anyway!)

“Legal” .vs. “Lawful”

- Are you “law-abiding” … or “legal-abiding” (or both)?
- Do you know the difference?
- There are THREE things we call “Law”. What follows is a short analysis of them, and their essential characteristics

Laws of Nature (including Laws of Physics, Chemistry, Thermodynamics, etc), i.e. "lawful":

- a) Mankind does ***not*** make them. Mankind observes them and their effects, then enumerates and evaluates them; in most cases being able to devise mathematical formulae to express them, utilise them and inter-utilise i.e. apply them. Examples: The Law of Gravity (Newton's Laws), Boyle's Law, Maxwell's Laws, Charles' Law, Ohm's Law, etc.
- b) They apply universally and unilaterally without fear or favour. No 'Courts' are required.
- c) There is no penalty for breaking them because they cannot be broken.

The Common Law i.e. The Law-of-the-Land:

- a) Mankind ***does*** make them, *based entirely on Common Sense*. Thus they are universal and unchangeable. (What you know to be right, fair, honourable and just, is what I know to be right, fair, honourable and just. And will always be so).
- b) They are applied by Courts, called Courts de Jure (Courts of Justice). A serious attempt at fairness of application is by means of a Jury of 12.
- c) There is always a penalty for breaking them because they can be broken if one is prepared to accept the consequences.

The Legislated Rules of Societies (Statutes), i.e. "**legal**", created by Parliaments & Congresses:

- a) Mankind ***does*** make them. Mankind changes them in accordance with its own desires, wishes, needs, etc. Mankind can wipe them away (repeal them) at the stroke of a pen.
- b) They are applied by Courts, called Courts de Facto (Courts of Arbitration or Tribunals, etc). They are not applied equally because they always depend on 'judgment'. It is often said "There is one law for the rich and one law for the poor". "One law for you and one law for us" is generally achieved by decisions that emanate from One Highly-Paid Psychopath (so-called Judge), or Three Gobsmakingly Naïve Plonkers (so-called Magistrates, generally led by a Minor Psychopath). These tyrannies being precisely what the Magna Carta 1215 idea of a Common Law Jury of 12 avoids – as best it can.
- c) There is always a penalty for breaking them because they can be broken if one is prepared to accept the consequences.

Comparison between "Lawful" and "Legal"

- We can see that 2a is the same (to all intents and purposes) as 1a. And that 2b attempts, as far as can reasonably be expected, to emulate 1b. We can see that 2c is necessary in order to support 2a and 2b. Thus to use the same word, "Law" to describe both Natural and Common Law is more or less realistic.
- However, from the foregoing, we can see that 3a, 3b and 3c are the exact inverse of 1a, 1b & 1c. And yet the same word is used to describe them in common parlance! This is surely totally unrealistic, however ingrained it has become. It is similar to using the same word to describe both "fire" and "water".
- The deception is that LEGAL and LAWFUL are the same thing.
- They are not.
- In point of fact, as shown previously, ***they are exact opposites***.
- Thus a "Law-abiding citizen" is actually a "Legal-abiding citizen", ***which is not the same thing at all.***

"Legal" operates, ***entirely*** via paperwork, on "Names" (Legal Fiction 'persons')
"Lawful" operates ***naturally*** (Natural Law), or on Humans (Common Law)

- A Deed Poll can detach one "Name", and associate a different "Name", but the Human Being remains exactly the same
- In a Common Law Court (Court de Jure) a Witness will be asked to indicate someone … irrespective of that Human's "Name" (Think: Identity Parade!)
- The Deception is: *To make you believe that YOU are YOUR NAME … when you are* ***NOT! YOUR NAME IS NOTHING MORE THAN A FICTION … for the convenience of "Legal", to operate on you WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT***

Rough ‘Justice’?

- Can you be jailed? (Yes)
- Can your DNA be taken (Yes)
- Can your Local Council, the Crown Prosecution Service, or a Utility Company (etc) be jailed? (No)
- Can your Local Council, the Crown Prosecution Service, or a Utility Company (etc) have its DNA taken? (No)
- How can any HONOURABLE ‘adjudication’ take place between these two Parties … when you (a Human Being) ***have just about everything to lose***, and ‘they’ ***have virtually nothing to lose***?
- The ‘playing field’ is stacked VERTICALLY against you
- “Sacrifice is the measure of credibility” – what have ‘they’ got to sacrifice? What is their credibility? So-called ‘justice’? IT’S ABSURD!
- The very fact that your DNA can be taken PROVES that YOU are NOT a Legal Fiction … so when the Policymen take it, ***thank them for proving YOUR point by forensic evidence! “My DNA was taken, therefore I, the Human, CANNOT be their ‘Named Defendant’”***

What IS The Common Law?

- No <u>DELIBERATE</u> harm to anyone else, and as much precaution (as is reasonable) to prevent <u>ACCIDENTAL</u> harm from your actions
- No <u>DELIBERATE</u> loss to anyone else, and as much precaution (as is reasonable) to prevent <u>ACCIDENTAL</u> loss from your actions
- No <u>DELIBERATE</u> breach of another's peace, and as much precaution (as is reasonable) to prevent <u>ACCIDENTAL</u> breaches from your actions
- No <u>DELIBERATE</u> deviousness or mischief in your PROMISES, AGREEMENTS and ARRANGEMENTS , and as much precaution (as is reasonable) to prevent <u>ACCIDENTAL</u> occurrences
- Fundamentally: To ACT RESPONSIBLY TOWARDS ALL OTHERS, and to be prepared to TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL YOUR ACTIONS
- In other words just plain, ordinary, **Common Sense**

Where does The Common Law come from?

- Common Sense of Land-dwellers to live together in peace
- Our ancestors had exactly the same problems as we all face today, and exactly the same degree of Common Sense – ***particularly at times when the alternative (barbarism) was fairly rampant***
- (All power to them … to be able to still remain in touch with their Common Sense … under those conditions!)

How is <u>**The**</u> (Common) <u>**Law**</u> made?

- By the Verdicts of Juries of 12, after hearing the evidence from both sides, which must be based on FIRST-HAND knowledge, and using their Common Sense to try to put themselves in the same situation, and to decide what they, themselves, would do in those circumstances
- By UNREBUTTED(!) STATEMENTS OF TRUTH (Affidavits), based on FIRST-HAND knowledge, and signed under penalty of perjury
- ***That's it! There is no other way, because FIRST-HAND evidence is the only acceptable evidence while "All are equal under The Law"***
- Note: It therefore takes Twelve Humans to 'LAWFULLY overpower' One Human
- **THE BOTTOM LINE IS - ALWAYS - UNLESS THE WARRANT OR ORDER STEMS FROM THE ABOVE, IT IS <u>UNCONSTITUTIONAL</u> AND <u>VOID</u> IN LAW.**

How do you know whether or not you are abiding within the Common Law?

- You ask yourself: ***"Would a Jury of 12 – APPRAISED OF ALL THE FACTS, AND ALL THE TRUTH - agree with me, or not?"***
- ***("Do I feel that my actions are HONOURABLE?")***

What is the hierarchy on Planet Earth?

- 1) The planet itself, including the resources it provides to support all Life Forms.
- 2) NON-SENTIENT Life, i.e. plants, etc. – which support all other Life Forms
- 3) SENTIENT Life, which comprises sub-categories to consider:
  - 3a) Humans
  - 3b) All other animals, birds, fish, insect life.
  - 3c) Other REAL entities such as germs, viruses, bacteria, etc

But what else have we got? Well, we have the ***FICTIONAL*** things, don't we? How about:

- 4) 'Government' i.e. "The Crown"
- This requires Humans (3a) to RECOGNISE it. If no-one recognised "The Crown" it would not exist
- (Are we back to "faiths placed or mis-placed in things"?)

And then, how about:

- 5) Sub-fictional and ‘role playing’ Entities
  - 5a) CORPORATIONS
  - 5b) Judges, Magistrates, Lawyers, Solicitors, Politicians, Policymen, Bailiffs, etc.
- Which require “The Crown” to recognise them (via “legals” i.e. Statutes)
- But – don’t forget – ***"The Crown" requires Human recognition <u>in the first place</u>***

Finally, we come to the lowest of the low:

- 6) Members of Staff (of CORPORATIONS) – which require the CORPORATION to recognise them … which requires "The Crown" to recognise it … which requires Humans to recognise "The Crown"
- Oh boy! Just how low can you get?
- So … when you get some arrogant demand (letter) from a Member of Staff of a CORPORATION, what is your appropriate reaction? What do you think?
- Let's face it, this Member of Staff sits at (6), when even plants reside at (2) … or germs reside at (3c) in the overall hierarchy

In point of fact … since EVERYTHING is CORPORATIONS … … INCLUDING Members of Parliament, The Ministry of Justice and the Policy Forces, etc:

- Judges, Magistrates, Lawyers, Solicitors, Politicians, Policymen, Bailiffs, etc. are merely Members of Staff of CORPORATIONS, and reside at (6) … not (5b)!
- They are Public SERVANTS and – as a Member of the Public – you are their MASTER/MISTRESS … they are there to do what YOU tell THEM … not the other way round … otherwise the tail wags the dog
- As a Human Being, you are SOVEREIGN!

A Society. What is it?

- ***"A group of like-minded people who come together to deliberate, determine, and act towards common goals"***
- Q: How do they know whether or not they are 'like minded'?
  - A: By inspecting the published 'common goals'
- Q: What IS 'a group of like-minded people'?
  - A: A Membership. A Society has Members, WHO JOIN – OF THEIR OWN FREE WILL – after inspecting the published 'common goals', and deciding that they agree with them
- Q: What happens if, after a period of time, a Member decides that the direction the Society has subsequently taken is not what he or she can agree with?
  - A: They can resign of their own free will (without recriminations!)

What is a Statute?

- ***"The Legislated Rule of a Society"*** i.e. the 'legals' deliberated, determined, and acted upon (Acts …) by the Legislative Body of the Society (… Parliament/Congress, etc.)
- Members CONSENT to these rules by JOINING
- Non-Members are unaffected
- Your Doctor does not need to obey the Legislated Rules (Statutes) of the Law Society
- Your Solicitor does not need to obey the Hippocratic Oath and the Legislated Rules (Statutes) of the British (or American, etc.) Medical Association
- Your Postman does not need to obey either sets of Legislated Rules (Statutes)
- Did ***you*** CONSENT to become a Member of the Society whose Legislated Rules (Statutes) your Parliament/Congress 'acts'? **When was that?**
- Parliamentary/Congressional Statutes = (nothing more than) Company Policy (THE MINISTRY OF JUSTICE CORPORATION, to be exact) … hence the term "Policymen" to refer to the enforcers of it … on NON-MEMBERS

Here's a picture of a £10 note:



- What does it say (under "Bank of England")?

It says: "I PROMISE TO PAY THE BEARER ON DEMAND THE SUM OF TEN POUNDS"

- Have you ever SEEN "THE SUM OF TEN POUNDS" …
- … or have you only ever seen notes like this, ***PROMISING*** "THE SUM OF TEN POUNDS" ?

It was a Promissory Note … in other words an IOU … from the Bank of England

- Gosh … just think how many "SUMS OF TEN POUNDS" the Bank of England has agreed that it OWES!
- Which it NEVER actually PAYS (does it?)
- It is promising the "pot of gold at the end of the rainbow"
- Do we need it? That's the question, surely?

The First Quarterly Bulletin, from the Bank of England in 2008, Page 103 (PDF Page 105, bottom/left paragraph):

- ***"...banks extend credit by simply increasing the borrowing customer's current account, which can be paid away to wherever the borrower wants by the bank 'writing a cheque on itself'. That is, <u>banks extend credit by creating money</u>."***
- Translation of ***'writing a cheque on itself'.*** is: ***MONEY IS CREATED OUT OF THIN AIR*** (by means of a Human's Signature)
- I guess that includes the Bank of England, since all it has ever done, since 1694, is to promise the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow
- NOTICE: How it talks about "***the borrowing customer's account***" & "***the borrower***"!? THEY CREATE 'MONEY' OUT OF THIN AIR, AND CALL YOU 'THE BORROWER OF IT'! (Talk about sleight-of-hand! It's WONDERFUL what words can do, isn't it!?))

Montagu Norman, Governor of The Bank Of England, addressing the United States Bankers' Association, NYC 1924

- "Capital must protect itself in every possible way, both by combination and legislation. Debts must be collected, *mortgages foreclosed as rapidly as possible*.
- "When, through process of law *[he meant "legal"]*, the common people lose their homes, *they will become more docile and more easily governed* through the strong arm of the government *applied by a central power of wealth under leading financiers*.
- "These truths are well known among our principal men, who are now engaged in forming an imperialism to govern the world. *By dividing the voter through the political party system, we can get them to expend their energies in fighting for questions of no importance.*
- "It is thus, by discrete action, we can secure for ourselves *that which has been so well planned* and so successfully accomplished."
- NB: This quotation was reprinted in the Idaho Leader, USA, on 26th August 1924, and has been read into the Australian Federal Hansard twice: by John Evans MP, in 1926, and by MD Cowan MP, in the session of 1930-31.

If you don’t pay a ‘demand’, a Court de Facto will consider you to be ‘depriving’ whoever makes the demand

- We have already seen that “Money”, Legalese”, “Religion” & “Politics” are the same thing, namely “faith placed in something”
- Can you ***deprive*** someone of their ‘beliefs’?
- Can you ***deprive*** someone of (say) their ‘Religious beliefs’? (It’s not easy to deprive a Jesus freak of their belief in Jesus. You are welcome to try)
- So how can you ‘deprive’ someone (or something) of their ‘Money belief”?

The Signature (Mark) made by a Human Being

- Starts the "money out of thin air" creation process
- Along with a Date and an Amount, creates an IOU/Promissory Note
- Financial Institutions will take this note and (upon the successful completion of "credit checks") will "monetise" it … which comprises typing numbers into a computer database (these days), or – formerly – writing numbers onto a paper accounting ledger
- The Title (Mortgage) Deed PLUS Mortgage Acceptance pages comprise a Promissory Note – WHICH – MUST – PAY IN FULL – for the property ***right at the start of the purchasing-via-a-mortgage process***

Mortgages: One of the biggest SCAMS of all time! (1)

- A Title (Mortgage) Deed is YOUR authorisation to hand possession of something YOU FULLY OWN to some other entity (Financial Institution)
- The Land Registry will accept this authorisation, and will lodge the Charge against the property
- CAN YOU AUTHORISE POSSESSION – TO SOMEONE ELSE – OF SOMETHING YOU DO – NOT – YOURSELF - OWN?
- (Do not own OUTRIGHT?)
- “No” is the answer! You can only do what you like with YOUR OWN PROPERTY – OWNED OUTRIGHT!!
- You NEVER have the RIGHT to do this with SOMEONE ELSE’S property (if you are a joint-holder, you have to get agreement from the other joint-holders)

Mortgages: One of the biggest SCAMS of all time! (2)

- NOTHING will happen until you sign the Title (Mortgage) Deed
- BUT YOU ARE TOLD –NOT- TO DATE IT
- Thus it is ***not*** a valid Promissory Note ***when you send it back***
- BUT: They have your signature on the Deed … and filling in the date is easy-peasy in order to create a true Promissory Note
- So, all they have to do is to "monetise" your Promissory Note – WHICH PAYS FOR THE PROPERTY IN FULL – and means that YOU ARE THE SOLE OWNER, WITH FULL TITLE – and the date can be added to the Deed (by them). This can then be sent to the Land Registry, who will apply the Charge in favour of the Financial Institution (and they have you by the short & curlys!)
- But – if you HAVE FULL TITLE, AND HAVE PAID IN FULL (via your Promissory Note) (AND YOU MUST HAVE DONE THAT, IN ORDER TO GAIN FULL TITLE, since no-one has the right to authorise a Charge on anything which they do NOT own), why do you need to make REPAYMENTS, and why is there any need for the Charge?
- There is no need for either … IT'S A SCAM!
- What would be 'fair', would be to pay the Financial Instruction a reasonable fee (a couple of £grand) for the facility of "monetising" your Promissory Note … and that should be that!

Any so-called 'debt': If all else fails … (use some Tesco Value paper, and) write a Promissory Note!

- You can make it a bit fancy (with a 'Spirograph' graphic around the edges, for example)
- Write the Amount in words and Numbers
- For the Date, you can say: ***"On the date that a sum, paid by the Bank of England to the bearer on demand, is shown to have taken place in real terms"***
- Get it Notarised (costs £40 - £50) ***by <u>signing it</u> in front of a Notary Public***
- Send it to whoever is making the demand, pointing out in covering letter, that:
  - 1. The Statutory Definition of a Promissory Note is "Cash" … it has to be in order to make banknotes "cash"! (Obvious!)
  - 2. The Bills of Exchange Act 1882 says that *"If payment is tendered, but is rejected, then that debt no longer exists"* (Obvious!)
- **Can we get away with it? That's not the point! People outside the Freedom Movement (and many inside, as well!) think 'we are trying to get away with something'. WE NOT TRYING TO GET AWAY WITH ANYTHING! We are trying to PREVENT THEM from 'getting away' with their blackmails & extortions & frauds & deceptions, etc. Writing a Promissory Note brings the deception of IOUs to the forefront ("legal tender" .vs. "lawful tender"!)**
- **The objective is to become FREE … not to 'get rich'!**

The Court System … choc full of ‘problems’

- Largely because people do not know the roles that Judges & Magistrates have agreed to play via their SOLEMNLY-SWORN Oaths of Office
- Added to this, the fact that Grand Juries were abolished in 1931
- Plus the role allocated to the Crown Prosecution Service
- The ‘system’ is FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED, and irretrievably ‘broken’ – such that ‘tinkering with it’ only makes things worse (as far as true, honourable, - real unbiased - justice is concerned!)

The solutions?

- Bring Judges back to their Oaths of Office, and don't let them extend their so-called 'authority' past this Oath. This would limit them SOLELY to running Courts de Jure (and no further Statutes would be required. EC Regulations would also be redundant)
- Abolish Magistrates and the Crown Prosecution Service, and re-convene Grand Juries
- Abolish "Politics", "Religion", "Legalese" and "Money (especially "Money" … which takes all the others with it!) into the dustbin of history
- (Then, suitably enlightened) Establish SOVEREIGN Republics for England, Wales and Scotland? And possibly Northern Ireland (however it might be better to give that back to the Irish? After all, it IS theirs)

How do you bring a Judge or Magistrate back to their Oath of Office?

- By reminding them of it
- By asking, up front – before answering any questions whatsoever – ***"Are you prepared to act under your Oath of Office … <u>AT THIS TIME</u>?"***
- The results of asking this question can only be described as 'spectacular'. It will create either 'pregnant silence' – or a very loud, enraged, rant
- **Note: A Judge will have 'legal' knowledge. If he or she has any knowledge of LAW, they will invariably not let on (unless seriously 'pushed').** (A so-called Judge has been heard to say: "Judges make the Common Law", which – or course – is patent nonsense … he was making it up as he went along)

The Judge's and Magistrate's Oaths of Office

- 1. ***"I, ____________ , do swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law."***
- So that means they are bound by the Queen's Coronation Oath ("Under God … so help me God …")
- 2. ***"I, ____________ , do swear by Almighty God that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second in the office of __________ , and I will do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of this realm, without fear or favour, affection or ill will."***
- So that means that they are BOUND to "do right to all manner of PEOPLE" … i.e. Humans … NOT CORPORATIONS!

Judges don't even 'hear' Civil Disputes in COURTROOMS!

- Civil Disputes are the vast majority of Court de Facto Hearings (e.g. Mortgage Possessions?)
- They take place in a small-ish room – WHICH IS ACTUALLY JUDGE'S CHAMBER! (Rented for the day!?)
- **(But they don't tell you that!)**
- So … even 'Court Rules' (if they meant anything!) don't apply!
- "A table at McDonald's" would do just as well
- Neither side is required to take an Oath ("To tell the truth, the whole truth, etc")
- ALL 'evidence', presented against you, is HEARSAY – and the so-called Judge will accept it – EVEN IF IT IS ILLEGIBLE!

Oaths: BE VERY CAREFUL! Don't be fobbed off!

- Asking a Judge or Magistrate "If they ***have taken*** an Oath" is absurd … of course they have!
- Asking the Courts Service "If Judges and Magistrates take Oaths" is absurd … of course they do!
- … to say: "Of course they do!" is one of the major ways they like to use in order to fob you off … because these are NOT the questions
- THE QUESTION IS: ***ARE THEY <u>ACTING UNDER</u> IT – <u>AT THE TIME OF THE HEARING/LISTENING/CONSIDERING/MAKING AN ORDER</u>?***
- VERY SIMPLY BECAUSE – IF THEY WERE – THEY COULD –NEVER- DO WHAT THEY INTEND TO DO … namely to 'find in favour' of a mindless, soulless, corrupt (e.g. Social Services), compassionless, incompetent-often-to-the-point-of-imbecilic (e.g. Department of Work and Pensions, Department of the Environment) CORPORATION, based entirely on computerised HEARSAY EVIDENCE (Garbage Out = Garbage In) … ***as opposed to FIRST-HAND KNOWLEDGE directly from the Mind Recall of a Human Being, who knows EXACTLY what happened, and will swear to it on penalty of perjury!***

Why are these Oaths so important?

- Because they derive from the British Constitution … which means that only a Court de Jure, with a Jury of 12, is a CONSTITUTIONAL kind of Court
- Thus, when attempting to run a Court de Facto, they CANNOT be acting under a CONSTITUTIONAL Oath of Office!
- In point of FACT, Courts de Facto are ENTIRELY UNCONSTITUTIONAL (they have been plucked out of the Judiciary's arseholes), and consequently they actually amount to TREASON (against the British Constitution, and hence you & I, The People) …
- ***… particularly if run under a Constitutional Oath!***
- IF – ANYONE – EVER - ATTEMPTS TO RUN A COURT ***WITHOUT*** A JURY, ***THEY ARE COMMITTING TREASON***

What do you do if a Judge, Magistrate, Policyman, Bailiff says “Yes, I’m acting under my Oath of Office”?

- What do you think?
- It was SOLEMLY-SWORN. It should be ingrained on their soul!
- TELL THEM TO REPEAT IT – HERE AND NOW – FROM MEMORY – **VERBATIM**!
- If they can do that, then ask them to explain what it means
- If (AS NORMAL) ***they can’t – or they fluff their lines, hesitate, etc*** – tell them *if they can’t even remember it, then they can’t possibly be acting under it*. AND THEY LIED TO YOUR FACE.

Stone’s Justice’s Manual, Section 1-382 (Magistrate’s Court Jurisdiction)

- (a) to try any summary offence. (Council Tax is not a summary offence, e.g. Common Assault).
- (b) as examining justices over any offence committed by a person who appears or is brought before the court. (In the case of Council Tax, no offence has been committed; it's a liability hearing).
- (c) subject to SS 18-22 of the Magistrates' Courts Act 1980, to try summarily any offence which is try-able either way. (Council Tax is not a summary offence).
- (d) in the exercise of its powers under s 24 of the Magistrates' Courts Act 1980 to try summarily an indictable offence. (Council Tax is a Civil Dispute, not an indictable offence e.g. GBH, dangerous driving, rape, etc).

What are Magistrates, and what is the Crown Prosecution Service, anyway?

- Along with the Crown Prosecution Service, Magistrates are a cost-cutting attempt to provide the functionality of a Grand Jury, and to dispense so-called 'justice' on the cheap (and not 'cheerful')
- But Grand Juries do not decide the outcome, they only decide whether or not a *prima facie* case has been made, such that a Full Trial is warranted
- At such a Trial, the Trial Jury (of 12 'impartials') decide the outcome ("Guilty" or "Not Guilty")
- Magistrates attempt to be a "Jury of three" … which is NOTHING LIKE GOOD ENOUGH FOR EVEN BASIC JUSTICE … and simply provides the opportunity for up to three would-be tyrants a platform for their 'sadistic pleasures'
- The CPS, acting as 'paid, so-called professional, individuals' (and thus with an axe to grind), cannot possibly do an impartial job to the standard of unpaid, volunteering, impartial, Grand Jury Members who have absolutely no axe to grind

YOU ARE NOT ALONE! (see 3rd line from the bottom!)

- Subject: FW: Online Enquiry from the Magistrates' Association website
- From:"Leora Ronel" <Leora.Ronel@magistrates-association.org.uk>
- Date:Thu, 23 Sep 2010 10:24:01 +0100
- To:<xxxx@aol.com>
- CC:"Barbara Tetteh" <Barbara.Tetteh@magistrates-association.org.uk>
- Dear John,
- The oath of office is as follows:
- I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second, in the office of Justice of the Peace and I will do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of the realm without fear or favour, affection or ill-will.
- If you need more information, you may like to look at our website page about becoming a magistrate which has further facts.
- http://www.magistrates-association.org.uk/whybecome.php
- kind regards
- Leora Ronel
- Membership Communications Officer
- __________________________________
- The Magistrates' Association
- 28 Fitzroy Square
- London W1T 6DD
- T 020 7383 3146 (direct)
- T 020 7387 2353 (switchboard)
- Leora.ronel@magistrates-association.org.uk
- -----Original Message-----
- From: Barbara Tetteh
- Sent: 23 September 2010 09:49
- To: Leora Ronel
- Subject: FW: Online Enquiry from the Magistrates' Association website
- And another..........
- Barbara Tetteh
- Records Administrator

Court Procedure (based on Birkenhead, Hereford, etc)

- Small, dedicated, disciplined, peaceful group (10 or so … absolutely no more than 20)
- One is a "Negotiator" … someone who understands the situation inside out, and is prepared to 'negotiate' with the Policymen (could be whoever has been 'summonsed')
- *No-one else in the group ever speaks*, but they always do what the Negotiator *requests*, quietly, calmly, peacefully
- When the Judge/Magistrates are told they are under Citizen's Arrest (*for not acknowledging their Oath of Office*), the Negotiator explains the position to the Policymen
- He or she explains that is is NOT THEIR JOB to decide that the Judge/Magistrates are innocent – and thus 'rescue' them – but to carry through the arrest, take statements from everyone – AND LET A **FUTURE** COURT DECIDE ON THE GUILT/INNOCENCE
- That is their 'standard procedure', and that's the way THE LAW works … Courts ALWAYS decide on guilt/innocence … NOT Policymen
- If, after all 'negotiation' has been exhausted, the Policymen WILL STILL NOT do their job, everyone leaves peacefully at the Negotiator's request
- The amount of time this will take will leave the Court & Policymen in the position of NOT wanting it to happen regularly

HMCS Flagship: The Northampton Bulk Clearing Centre

- More ‘justice on the cheap’
- Unpaid Demands from Utility Companies, Policymen, and Local Authorities are sent there to be rubber-stamped into Warrants … by Deputy District Judges.
- A Deputy District Judge is a SOLICITOR … who ‘performs the rubber-stamping role’ between 5 and 15 days per year
- They will rubber-stamp ANYTHING … including typographical errors, and errors of substance. There are many examples. It is quite obvious that they don’t read, nor do they consider (let’s face it, they *are* only Solicitors, after all!), ANYTHING. (Hence it is a waste of time arguing with them)
- Their so-called Warrants amount to nothing more than toilet paper. If a Bailiff calls he will almost certainly be wielding one of these toilet paper Warrants. Tell him to go and get signed confirmation that the Signatory Judge was “acting under their Oath of Office at the time”

Orders. What are they?

- In case you don't 'get it' ... Judges & Magistrates are CONTINUALLY Arbitrating WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT, applying STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS on you, when you have not agreed or promised to be bound by them, and expecting you to SERVICE their ORDERS for free ... when no business supplies its major products for free. If they want to consider you to be a Legal Fiction 'Person' i.e. a SMALL CORPORATION, then they should expect a bill from that CORPORATION ***for servicing any Orders*** they issue. Like all other businesses. No? I think: "Yes". If a Court orders stationery, it expects to pay the Suppliers, doesn't it? And who sets the amount to charge? The SUPPLIER sets the amount ... and the Court Staff shop around for the cheapest. That's normal (honourable) business practice. Anything else is either: Blackmail, Extortion, Racketeering, Fraud, or just plain ole Theft ... or whatever you want call it.
- Policymen, Servicemen, and Members of Staff all get paid – VIA THEIR WAGES/SALARIES – for ***servicing Orders***
- NO-ONE ***services Orders*** for free – but Judges & Magistrates expect YOU to, ***and they have no right to expect that***

What do you do with a Bailiff?

- Well, they are morons and thugs, so the question is: "What do you do with a moron who is also a thug?"
- Never, EVER, open the door under any circumstances.
- Tell him he is a Public SERVANT, and that – as a Member of the Public – and therefore his MASTER/MISTRESS - you don't require his SERVICES. And – if he thought you did, then ***he is sacked***.
- (As previously noted) Tell him to go away and get the Signatory Judge to confirm, ***in writing***, that they were "Acting under their Oath of Office **<u>at the time</u>** of signing the Warrant")

What do you do if a Bailiff threatens to return with a Policyman?

- Tell him the Policyman will also be a Public SERVANT, and that you will still remain the MASTER/MISTRESS, and will be perfectly happy – ***and perfectly within your RIGHTS*** - to sack the Policyman as well. (And keep sacking them until one does the job he or she is paid for! Say you will demand to speak to 'superiors' until this happens)
- All of this does tend to confuse (to some extent) a moron/thug

If you get to "Bailiffs knocking" …

- It's a good idea to have a **NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF IMPLIED RIGHT OF ACCESS** on your front door. This applies to both Bailiffs and Policymen (and TV Licence as well, btw)
- You can also post up the Policyman's Oath. And have a copy on the inside as well. Thus, if the Bailiff actually manages to return with a Policyman, you can say (through the door): ***"Your Oath of Office is posted on the door. This is what you SOLEMNLY SWORE to do in order to obtain your Warrant Card. READ IT CAREFULLY … and re-consider it carefully … <u>especially the bit about 'fundamental human rights'</u> …and then you will realise that you should not be here"***

The Policyman's Oath

"I, … of … do solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm that I will well and truly serve the Queen in the office of constable, with fairness, integrity, diligence and impartiality, upholding fundamental human rights and according equal respect to all people; and that I will, to the best of my power, cause the peace to be kept and preserved and prevent all offences against people and property; and that while I continue to hold the said office I will to the best of my skill and knowledge discharge all the duties thereof faithfully according to law."

- Get the Policyman to read it out loud. Repeat "fairness, integrity, diligence, impartiality" a few times.
- Stress the word "fundamental" in "fundamental human rights" … which does NOT mean (therefore) any Human Rights Act … but means "indefeasible"
- Tell him that "according to law" means ***"read the whole paragraph and think about it"***

Notice of Removal of Implied Right of Access (1)

To all that it concerns

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL AND NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT APPLIES

Notice of Removal of Implied Right of Access

You are advised to read the following notice thoroughly and carefully. It is a lawful notice. It informs you. It means what it says.

I hereby give notice that the implied right of access to the property known as <address> [<postcode>], and surrounding areas, has been removed, along with all associated property including, but not limited to, any private conveyance in respect of the following:

Notice of Removal of Implied Right of Access (2)

1) ANY employee, principal, agent, third party or representative or any other person acting on behalf of or under the instruction of HER MAJESTYS COURT SERVICE, or any other CORPORATE BODY (i.e. Company) howsoever named and,

2) ANY POLICE OFFICER who is acting for the CORPORATE POLICE and NOT ***acting as a Constable for and on behalf of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and her people as expressed in the Oath of Office of all POLICE men and women***, that is as Public Servants, upon your Oath of Office to serve "with fairness, integrity, diligence and impartiality, upholding fundamental human rights and according equal respect to all people; and that I will, to the best of my power, cause the peace to be kept and preserved and prevent all offences against people and property"

Notice of Removal of Implied Right of Access (3)

COMMON LAW JURISDICTION APPLIES EXCLUSIVELY

Please also take notice that the land known as England is a Common Law jurisdiction and any transgression of this notice will be dealt with according to Common Law. Any and all access to the above mentioned properties shall be by strict invitation only and shall be subject to terms and conditions, available by written request.

We do not have, and have never had, a contract. And any permission that you believe you may have from me is hereby withdrawn. If you believe that you have power of attorney to act on my behalf you are hereby fired, and any consent that you believe you may have, tacit or otherwise, is hereby withdrawn. If you feel so inclined as to enforce statutes as a consequence of this matter I will report your conduct to ALL relevant bodies and will pursue Proof of Claim in affidavit form, under your full commercial liability and under the penalty of perjury.

Notice of Removal of Implied Right of Access (4)

You are deemed to have been served this notice with immediate effect.

In sincerity and honour, without ill-will, frivolity, or vexation,

Veronica: of the Chapman family(*), as commonly called, English Sovereign.

Without any admission of any liability whosoever, and with all Indefeasible Rights reserved.

(Obviously substitute your own common calling!)*

Common Assault

- Occurs if you ever ***"Feel that your personal safety is under threat"***
- It does NOT have the be PHYSICAL … it can be MENTAL
- Thus, if someone else is in the house, when a Bailiff or Policyman threatens to break down the door, that 'someone else' HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF A COMMON ASSAULT. And, in these circumstances, it is a good idea to point it out. *(A Policyman MAY, possibly, understand)*
- After all, a bashed-in door would leave other occupants UNPROTECTED … especially if it is pointed out to the Policyman: ***"Listen, mate, this is not your fight … is it? Your DUTY is to KEEP THE PEACE … not to conspire to breach it. You are well out of your solemn duty & jurisdiction. Unless, of course, you are prepared to guard the door until it is replaced"***

"Policyman-on-doorstep" Routine

- ***"Do you have reason to suspect that there is a wanted person on these premises, and have you obtained a LAWFUL Warrant of Entry in order to arrest that person?"***
  - "No"
- ***"Do you have reason to suspect that there are stolen goods on these premises, and have you obtained a LAWFUL Warrant of Entry in order to search for them?"***
  - "No"
- ***"Do you have reason to suspect that there are illicit drugs on these premises, and have you obtained a LAWFUL Warrant of Entry in order to search for them?"***
  - "No"
- ***"Do you hear a fracas going on – such as to give you cause to believe that someone's life or limb may be in danger?"***
  - "No"
- ***"Then your sole point in being here is to prevent breaches of the peace … MY PEACE INCLUDED! You do that by arresting the Bailiff for UNLAWFULLY breaching my peace"***

Debt Collectors & Bailiffs (1)

- The first thing you receive is a Demand "acting on behalf of someone else" (often accompanied by a toilet paper Warrant, rubber-stamped by a Deputy District Judge at the Northampton Bulk Clearing Centre (already discussed)
- But ... what's the REAL situation?
- As a Human Being, IN (COMMON) LAW, you are bound only (in honour) by obligations to which you have SPECIFICALLY agreed

Debt Collectors & Bailiffs (2)

- Did you SPECIFICALLY agree to deal with the Debt Collectors or Bailiffs?
- No? Then what right do they have to bother you?
- Answer: No right whatsoever
- If someone pays off a debt on your behalf, they would be stupid not to have contacted you first, in order to agree (specifically):
  - (a) That you agreed that you actually owed the debt
  - (b) That, if they paid it off on your behalf, you would pay them back … ***and thus create an obligation on your part***

Debt Collectors & Bailiffs (3)

- But they don't do that, do they? They just waltz in, buy up the debt, and then start making demands with menaces.
- Utterly DIShonourable, of course … but they have no other choice … if they contacted you first, you would tell them to keep their noses out of your PRIVATE ARRANGEMENTS
- So they are steeped in DIShonour from the word "Go"
- And you can tell them that
- And, if you do that long enough, and hard enough, they generally give up (which often means selling it on to another firm. You just have to apply the same techniques with all of them)
- (Selling it on twice more, seems to be the limit for them)

Debt Collectors & Bailiffs (4)

- If they say ***"They are acting as Agents"*** (normal!), you can say ***"I don't deal with Agents. I'll deal with the Organ Grinder, not the Monkey. Go back to whoever you are Agents for, and tell them that's the situation. Now get off my doorstep, you have no right to be here"***
- There are ongoing 'moves' to use the fact that they are eventually forced to give up … to say that their original claims were – ***therefore*** – fraudulent … including those of the Originator
- And to use this to create Statutory Demands for compensation due to their frauds/blackmails/extortion attempts/racketeering
- (Being arrogant) Debt Collection Agencies ignore the Statutory Demands … which leaves their firms wide open to being Wound Up as insolvent.
- They have got away with all of this for far too long … it's long past time to take back our own Country

Debt Collectors & Bailiffs (5)

- Even the Bills of Exchange Act 1882 says (the obvious) "Once a debt has been paid, that debt is extinguished"
- So, when a firm of Debt Collectors/Bailiffs buys a debt … it's PAID OFF … EXTINGUISHED … according to the BoE Act 1882! (THEY PAID IT OFF FOR YOU!)
- Which is why it would be CRUCIAL for them to <u>contact you first</u>, and to establish an obligation to pay them back (i.e. create a NEW debt agreement specifically with you)
- And you can tell them so

Stopped/Arrested by the Policymen (NON-COMMON LAW only i.e. for Statute violations ONLY!)

- You have two options (depends on your circumstances):
  - 1. (If you can afford the time … to spend in the cells!) DON'T GIVE THEM YOUR NAME, under any circumstances (say ***"I haven't got one!"***) (doesn't matter even if you have ID on you & get searched … FOR THEIR PURPOSES YOU STILL HAVE TO ADMIT TO YOUR NAME)
  - 2. If you DO give them your Name (in order to get out of their clutches as soon as possible), then you'll need to sign something. After your Signature, write ***"signed under force & duress, so does not count IN LAW"***. They won't like this, but they will have to accept it (compromise?). DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, say anything, or admit to anything. DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES, 'make a Statement'!
    - ***"Have you arrested me, yes or no?"*** … ("Yes")
    - ***"Have you cautioned me, yes or no?"*** … ("Yes")
    - ***"Have you charged me, yes or no?"*** … ("Yes")
    - ***"Then you have reached the limits of your function. I do NOT propose to enter into a Pre-Trial Trial with you. You are not a qualified Judge or Magistrate, are you? I will say anything I need to say in Court"***
    - (In Court, it is: ***"Are you acting under your Oath of Office at this time?")***

That'll do (for now … well almost)

- In order to be free, you have to think "free" 24/7/365 … and act free 24/7/365
- And no-one else can do that for you
- You have to question EVERTHING (yes … including what I've said!), and think it through for yourself
- You have to take PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY for EVERTHING you do, and to point out to everyone else that they need to do the same (that their 'office or uniform' does not protect them … any more than *"Only obeying orders"* protected Nazis, at Nuremberg, after WWII. Pilots, spraying us with Chemtrails, have no excuse in Law. They should have found out exactly what they were spraying … before doing it … and refused)
- EVERYONE'S responsibility – as one SOVEREIGN Human - to any other SOVEREIGN Human - is ***UNLIMITED***!
- Currently we are working on the Commercial Lien process in order to utilise the foregoing statements to create Common Law protections. There are (pretty good) reasons to believe that a Commercial Lien is our ultimate defensive 'clout' … while 'they', and the system, still remain under the sad illusion/delusion of "money"

Finally … in conclusion …

- There is a lot more to this, of course
- One major thing is to keep it out of Court, if possible. By means of writing letters, which cause the Protagonists to think twice about taking the matter that far
- Particularly in the cases of demands emanating from Financial Institutions
- To this end the DebtBust Application was written … available via …

debtbust.fmotl.com

… this application will write the letters for you.

- There are now THOUSANDS doing this in the UK alone. There is every reason to suspect that (NOW!) when a DCA receives one of our letters, they groan "Oh no! Not ANOTHER one!" … and put it to one side … being unable to deal with it
- WE HAVE –NEVER- HAD **ONE** REPLY – FROM **ANYONE** – **THAT ACTUALLY MADE SENSE**

Handy links?

- They all end in ***fmotl.com*** **(and note lowercase!)**
- ***reality.***
- ***forum.***
- ***radio.***
- ***debtbust.***
- ***freedom.***
- ***lien.***
- ***contempt.***
  - ***(… for a link to enable this Presentation to be downloaded)***
- And, obviously, lots more detail in my book *"Freedom Is More Than Just A Seven-Letter Word"* (available via Amazon (Google finds it) … or any Bookshop via its ISBN 978-1-906169-67-1 *(now in its 2nd Edition)*
- **Good luck. But remember: DO NOT DO ANYTHING TO ENGAGE ANY OF THIS UNTIL YOU ARE CONFIDENT THAT YOU HAVE OBTAINED THE CORRECT MINDSET, AND CAN WORK OUT ALL THE ANSWERS YOU MAY EVER NEED (WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT COMES TOGETHER WITH THE MINDSET)**