

Open courtesy letter to police officers of the State of Victoria
and members/employees of VICTORIA POLICE

5 September 2019

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 your ‘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.

By now you may be wondering how and why this deception has been perpetrated?

Well it has been in place for a LONG time.

THE HISTORY

Much of Great Britain was incorporated into the Roman Empire in 43 AD, and, following the Edict of Thessalonica in 380 AD, Christianity (Catholicism) became the state religion. But, at that time, there was a clear distinction between Church and State. At that time the State held power over the church, but all that was going to change.

And it 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, then it alone is the debtor, but if Rome has the ability to confer the legal title to a third party debtor, (you) 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, is the key to their success. 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.

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.

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 Fuedalism 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, 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!

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, on April 10, 1606, 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 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 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.

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.

‘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 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.

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.

The next year, in 1908, 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.

In 1918, when the heads of government of the great powers met at Versailles in 1919, 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, Edward House, the most important political figure of the twentieth century.

Colonel House 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Moving forward, to 1973, the Commonwealth of Australia Parliament, under the Imperial Crown and Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900uk, was closed down due to having no people to serve, not that they served the people anyway at that point, and a Corporation named Australia, began administrating the Commonwealth of Australia due to there being no people, no head of state and of course no 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.

Further, in 1973, Gough Whitlam, 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. So lets not kid ourselves here... the Australian Government is a foreign De Facto administration under a foreign Crown.

This is why the Police around the country do not enforce law of the land., the Common Law, instead, they 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.

So you see, in effect, you serve the Vatican.

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 such as yourself do not have Lawful Authority within the Commonwealth of Australia and you are all breaking the "Law" and acting unlawfully in carrying out your "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, our first law, and which is still in place, as is the original government and courts etc, they have never been abolished, only ‘forgotten’ on purpose, or rather 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.

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.

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 you 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 think you are acting under 51(a) to serve the people of Victoria, and maybe you do that 5-10% of the time, but the stark reality is, that 90-95% of the time, you 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 you 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 your actions when you are dealing with sovereign living beings.

We thank you for reading this letter and trust you are now fully and truthfully informed, and that you make your choices of action with your heart, wisdom and conscience.

Regards,

THE MOOT COURT OF TERRA AUSTRALIA INCOGNITO

