

Introduction To The Law

by Bernard Weckmann

Here is a list of frequently asked questions. There is not enough room to cover everything. All I can do is skim across the surface and encourage you to do your own research. This introduction was written for Australia but the principles apply in any Common Law jurisdiction such as the UK, the United States, Canada and New Zealand. This introduction is the edited version of a series of posts which I originally published on the website of the International Flat Earth Research Society.

How did we become - literally! - slaves of the government?

All law is contract. In essence: he who makes the laws becomes the ruler of those who accept his laws. The key here is: **accept**. If you do not accept the "laws" they do not apply to you!

The bag of dirty tricks at the disposal of the government - courtesy of Jewish and Freemasonic shysters - is bottomless. Come to think of it: "dirty" is not strong enough a word - "diabolical" is more fitting.

Living men and women are subject only to God's and Nature's laws. In order to legally interface with living men and women and to get a grip on them those sinister forces that manipulate the government - a fiction - have to turn us into fictions, too.

"Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them."

*S.C.R. 1795,
Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators (3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed. 57; 3 Dall.
54), Supreme Court of the United States 1795*

Thus we have been made citizens, vessels, persons, corporations: in brief we have become dead things, mere resources. Having been transformed into fictions with some legalese hocus pocus the government can now interact with us via its corporate rules - aka statutory law.

Here is how the fraud works:

When you were born your parents registered you with the authorities because that's what they were told to do. Don't blame them - they are victims of the system, too.

Your birth certificate is actually an unrevealed commercial instrument. This instrument is the property of the government which created it. The name on this instrument resembles yours with one crucial difference: it is in capital letters. John Average, the name of the living man thus becomes JOHN AVERAGE which is the designation for the commercial instrument.

JOHN AVERAGE is fictitious but it is the real John Average who is made to assume all commercial liabilities of the fictitious JOHN AVERAGE. The problem is that John Average doesn't know any of this.

How does that work in practice?

A simple example: as per statutory law of Australia possession and/or use of cannabis is prohibited. If John Average is caught with cannabis the police will charge JOHN AVERAGE with possession of a prohibited substance and the court will fine or jail JOHN AVERAGE but it is John Average who pays or goes to jail because he doesn't know the difference between the two.

It is JOHN AVERAGE who has been pledged by his government as collateral for the nation's debt to the bankers but it is John Average and his millions upon millions of his fellowmen who lead lives of slavery to pay off a debt that is intentionally designed to be unpayable so that the scam can be made to continue forever and ever.

What is a statutory law?

"A set of rules created to regulate a society carrying the force of law by the consent of the governed". Please note the keywords ".....by the consent of the governed".

Does statutory law apply to you?

Ask yourself the following question: "Have I, one of the governed, knowingly and voluntarily consented to accept the statutes created by the government?" If the answer is YES, then the statutes are law for you. If you never consented they are entirely irrelevant.

What is a contract?

The simple definition of contract is: "A pledge or pledges exchanged between two or more parties that the law will enforce". The contract can be written or verbal. To be enforceable it must meet certain criteria; to wit:

1. Full Disclosure:

each party must specify exactly what the pledge comprises, and everything that pertains to it, incl. potential "escape" clauses. Nothing must be intentionally hidden.

2. Equal Consideration:

a contractual consideration is 'something of value'. This could be money, an item or service of value. All parties must consider this exchange to be equal in value. Trading glass beads for a Rolls Royce is not equal value - unless you really treasure the beads more than a RR.

3. Lawful Terms/Conditions:

nothing which is unlawful can be a part of a lawful contract (murder, for instance, or robbery or fraud are unlawful and can therefore not be part of a lawful contract).

4. Consent:

all parties must consent to the terms/conditions of the contract; consent can be expressed by means of a signature, by a gesture such as a hand-shake or by conduct.

5. Competence:

all parties must be competent. For instance, under-age people cannot enter into contracts

If even one of the above criteria is missing or defective the entire contract is null and void from the start.

Do you have a contract with your government which meets the above criteria and in which you waive your unalienable as well as inalienable rights (they are not the same)? You don't? I thought so! Further, are you a living man or woman? Or a commercial instrument? Well, there is your answer!

Who is to blame for the way things are?

For the most part we only have ourselves to blame. Yes, you and me! The sovereign status you were born with is an unalienable right. It CANNOT be taken away from you neither can you give it away. We have free will and can at any time withdraw our consent to any contract. And in as far as the government's contracts with us are defective ab initio it follows that there never was a lawfully binding contract in the first place.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is inescapable. No matter how unpalatable: he who fails to use his God-given intelligence and free will, he who fails to vigorously assert and courageously defend his rights, be it from ignorance or fear, will lose his freedom to those who will take advantage of him. If you refuse to accept the responsibility for your own life somebody else will do it for you! As they say: use it (*your sovereignty*) or lose it!

Let us now have a look at the different kinds of law there are:

Nature's Laws

These would be self-explanatory. Jump off a high building without a parachute, jump into a river infested with crocodiles, stop eating and drinking, touch a high-voltage live wire and you are flouting Nature's laws and she will sort you out!

Common Law (also known as the Law of the Land)

Common Law is often described as based on God's Law. It seems highly likely to me that God has indeed implanted moral laws into us which impel most of us to act ethically. Nevertheless, exactly like all other types of law these moral laws do require your consent. Common Law is man-made and based on contracts.

All of us are sovereign men/women and as such we are making law all the time without even thinking of it as creating law. These laws are private laws. Let me give you a everyday example. In my house, for example, you cannot smoke because I say so; that is one of my laws. You must abide by it or leave when asked. If you do not leave when asked to do so I can throw you out - using force if necessary. If you were an honoured guest I might make an exception and allow you to smoke - but that is a privilege which I can revoke at any time without having to give an explanation. In your house, of course, you make the laws. If you were a nudist you might make it a law that everybody has to walk around naked. I have to abide by your law or leave.

But in the public arena neither you nor I nor anybody else can impose his/her laws on others. Here we need to get together, formally or informally, and work out solutions - i.e. compromises - that are acceptable to all. The result of this communal effort is **Common Law**. Not common as in: "vulgar", "unrefined", "inferior" but common as in: "shared", "belonging to a community". Common Law goes far back into history and each and every human community, from the most archaic to the most advanced civilization, has its own Common Law.

Common Law is a social contract, albeit unwritten, with our fellowman in which we pledge to act in such a way that each of us can enjoy maximum freedom while respecting the rights of others to do the same. We were born into the contract and raised in it. As we were not in a position to give our consent or understand anything our parents, for better or worse, stepped in, assumed responsibility and taught us the rules and guidelines of our society.

If that is not common sense then I really do not know what is. Under Common Law you are free to do anything you please, as long as you do not infringe on the life, liberty, property and rights of others. In other words: my rights end where yours begin.

You may ask: what about the psychopaths amongst us who opt out of this unwritten contract? Yes, you can opt out! But if you do not honour the laws that are designed to protect all of us you can no longer claim the protection of the very same laws that you violate. Common Law is binding on all of us.

Intentional violation of Common Law constitutes a breach of the peace, i.e. it's a **CRIMINAL ACT**, punishable in Common Law courts. If a Common Law court does not bring you to justice you are fair game for ... well, anybody, really! That is what outlaw means!!!

In conclusion: the right and the power to create law and to administer justice belongs to The People. If there is a conflict or controversy the matter is adjudicated in Common Law courts (de jure courts) by juries, i.e. by us The People. The magistrate or judge is no more than an umpire. It is the jury that decides! No judge or magistrate can lawfully interfere with a jury and no government can interfere with Common Law, let alone abrogate it. Common Law, however, is not static; it can and does evolve and change with the times, yes, but only according to the will of the People!

Alas, the reality is that Common Law has been fraudulently supplanted by the following:

Equity Law - Commercial Law - Maritime Law - Admiralty Law aka The Law of the Sea

The types of law mentioned above, often used interchangeably, are "color of law", i.e. they are not laws but statutes, made to appear to be law. Never mind their high-faluting designations: statutory law is nothing more than the rules and guidelines of societies, organizations and commercial companies and thus lawfully binding only on members of that society/organization/company whether it is the boy scouts, the local orchid club, Rotary Club, McDonalds or, yes, the political entity that you think of as your country and your government!

McDonald's, for instance, cannot compel you to abide by their rule to wear their work uniform unless you are one of their employees. Right? Right! And your government cannot compel you to abide by its "company rules" to wear a seat belt, or pay taxes or vote or what have you - unless you are an employee! And here's the rub: that's exactly what you are because you have been turned into an "employee" with their legalese mumbo-jumbo.

Flout the government's corporate statutes and you will be taken to court and punished because you have been turned into a government "employee" without your consent and have become liable for breaches of a contract which you never knowingly and voluntarily signed! How's that for justice?

Regardless of where you live you will find, upon close examination, that our respective countries have far more in common than you might think: we are all living in a kind of concentration camp courtesy of the international banksters and their sock puppets, the governments of the world. The barbed wire of the camp is the law. The guards are known as police well, you get the idea.

My own country, Australia, the land that Nature or - if you will - God created is a Common Law jurisdiction. Wherever the aboriginal owners of the land still have native title it is their traditional Common Law that prevails; elsewhere it is the Common Law that the British settlers brought with them.

The political entity known as the "Commonwealth of Australia" on the other hand is a commercial outfit, incorporated in the United States, which is yet another corporation. All Australian States and their myriad agencies are also commercial outfits as is proved by the fact that all of them have ABNs, that is Australian Business Numbers.

As far as I know almost all of the world's governments are incorporated in the US. As such all of them come under the jurisdiction of the **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)** which is the commercial code of the "mother corporation" - the USA Inc, owned by the Rothschilds. In fact, courts themselves are corporations. They are concerned with the application of Commercial Law, not necessarily with truth and justice!

What is a Common Law court?

A Common Law court is a court where a jury, i.e. a panel of twelve men/women administer justice and make laws and, equally important, annul bad laws wherever necessary. This is the sanest and most balanced form of justice because it does not depend on the idiosyncracies, prejudices or agendas of single judges. Common Law courts are the only lawful courts. All others are merely legal. Yes, there is a difference between lawful and legal!

*"It cannot be denied that the practice of submitting causes to the decision of twelve men was universal among all the northern tribes (of Europe) from the very remotest antiquity."
Crabbe's History of the English Law, p. 32.*

*Until the word "juror" was adopted, jurors were actually called judges, for the role they played in Common Law jurisprudence. "...the judges, for so the jury were called."
Crabbe's History of the English Law, p 55*

We The People have the power. Juries are the sole authority in Common Law and that is the reason that those who have hijacked the courts (Jews and Freemasons) have, over the last few hundred years, replaced our Common Law surreptitiously and incrementally with their lesser laws. They understand very well that in a Common Law court they wouldn't last five minutes.

What is a de-facto court?

De-facto courts, aka as courts of summary judgement, are courts which operate without a jury. Most courts these days are de-facto only. They operate exclusively on the basis of "color of law" - in other words: they are make-believe courts. In order to gain jurisdiction over you they need your clear and unequivocal consent and unless such consent is given, either expressed or implied, they have no authority. If they proceed without your consent, which is what they almost always do, they are acting unlawfully and are liable for their criminal conduct. Judges arrogantly presume to make law. Their judgements are legal but **NOT** lawful. They sure as hell are not makers of law but usurpers!

De-facto courts are registered businesses which offer for sale their services as arbitrators in legal controversies. And that is all they are!

If McDonalds offers to sell you some of its products do you have to accept? Of course not! Neither do you have to accept the invitation (they euphemistically call it a summons!) to do business with a de-facto court! But unlike McDonalds police and courts will force themselves and their services upon you using misinformation, manipulation, intimidation and outright lies and in many cases brute force, i.e. unlawful arrests and unlawful court proceedings!

In Common Law jurisdictions such as Australia, New Zealand, the UK, Canada, the USA and a few others you have the inalienable right to demand a trial by a jury of your peers. If the court does not grant you what you are entitled to you do not have to grant them what they desperately need and want to get jurisdiction: consent! You do not have to deal with a de-facto court, unless of course, you want to.

What is legalese?

Lawyers use a special kind of language, "legalese", which they employ to make their utterances sound highly erudite and profound when, in fact, they are mostly obfuscation, crap and lies. This abstruse jargon is designed to confuse and ensnare you into agreeing with them on something by making it sound like English.

Let's have a look at an example: "Do you understand the charges?" sounds like a simple and straightforward question, doesn't it? To you and me "understand" has the same meaning as "comprehend" and so you may answer "Yes, I do!" But to the court the word has a far more sinister meaning - sinister for you, that is - because it means "to stand under, to submit to". Your YES has just signalled to the court that you accept the charges (yes, you have just pleaded guilty!) and you accept the court's jurisdiction. They did not tell you that, of course. That would give the crooked game away.

Or take this example: you receive a summons or notice to appear. You are led to believe this is a court order and you have to comply. It isn't and you don't have to. In their own legal dictionary, Black's Law Dictionary, a summons is defined as an "invitation" and the word "must" means "may". How's that for sneakiness?

Do you have to know legalese to avoid their traps? No. Due process of law requires that the defendant "comprehends" the charges against him. He cannot be expected to comprehend anything if it is expressed in a language which he does not speak. And languages do not come any weirder than legalese. Take, for instance, the word "attorney". It comes from a Latin root which means "to twist". An attorney is quite literally nothing but a twister of words and facts. For once their description of themselves is honest.

In the Harry Potter books and movies you will come across the term "parsel mouth" - a speaker of snake language. That is exactly what lawyers are, parsel-mouths - they speak with forked-tongues. Be aware of their language but do not sink to their level by trying to speak it. Compel them to speak yours!

What is the function of police?

The only lawful function of police is to act as peace officers. That means they are empowered to interact with you, i.e. apprehend and detain you, only if they observe you committing a crime, have reason to suspect that you have committed or are about to commit a crime. Should they enforce or attempt to enforce mere statutes they are acting ultra vires, i.e. outside the scope of their powers AND - very important to know - outside their immunity.

They are now liable for their unlawful conduct and can be sued. Some police officers do indeed act as lawful peace officers; Alas, most are as clueless about the law as their hapless victims. So you must teach them the law and assert your rights.

When can you be arrested?

To be valid a warrant **MUST** be signed with a wet signature (i.e. hand-signed) by a judge or magistrate who **MUST** have an oath of office which is on file; there **MUST** be certified proof of a valid bond to indemnify the party to be taken into custody. Administrative procedural warrants are null and void ! Warrants signed by a Justice of the Peace are null and void !

A warrant **MUST** specifically name the party in his or her proper given birth name and the capital crime alleged to have been committed.

A warrant **MUST** be based on an affidavit executed under oath by the accuser, who **MUST** be named, stating therein **FIRST HAND** knowledge or **FACTS** which constitute a capital crime causing loss or damage to a named party.

The warrant **MUST** name the party to be arrested, or describe him or her sufficiently to establish identity.

Warrant and affidavit **MUST** be offered for inspection upon request.

The arrested person **MUST NOT** be hand-cuffed unless he or she has attempted to escape or unless it be necessary in order to prevent his or her doing so.

The arrested party **MUST** be taken before a magistrate when demanded, and not be held for any other purpose (no photographs, no fingerprinting, no DNA samples!).

There is no immunity in a false arrest case. Good faith is not a defense to sustain false arrest under a defective warrant.

Should the warrant state as cause to issue, a mere civil/statutory infraction or “offense” which fails to rise to the level of a capital crime the arrest is unlawful, to wit: a violation of Common Law rights.

Unlawful arrest is a crime: **ASSAULT, BATTERY & TRESSPASS** and may be charged under the law.

Is resisting arrest an offence?

If the arrest is unlawful, i.e. you have not committed a breach of the peace, the attempted arrest is assault and your resistance is legitimate self-defence.

Should you get a lawyer?

This is a question only you can answer. But consider this: all members of the **BAR** association (lawyers/solicitors/barristers) owe their allegiance to their professional association and to the court. By hiring a lawyer you declare yourself not competent to handle your own affairs and you give your lawyer power-of-attorney to act on your behalf (and that is almost always for his and the court's benefit and to your detriment)

What is the significance of signatures?

We, the living men and women have been fraudulently turned into the surety for government-created commercial instruments. Your birth certificate - with your name in caps - is a major player in the commerce game but it is not the only such instrument.

Almost every time you put your signature on a piece of paper it becomes a commercial instrument. For instance, whenever a cop presents you with a summons for this, that or the other alleged offence he wants you to sign for it, of course. Most people believe that this is a confirmation that you received the summons. The cop himself may believe this.

Most cops are as clueless regarding the law as their victims. They, too, are pawns in a game they do not really understand and, if they do understand, cannot extricate themselves from.

In plain English: The only lawful function of a cop is that of a peace officer. But most of the time they act as enforcers of mere statutes which, essentially turns them into hookers, roaming the highways and byways soliciting business on behalf of the government.

The signature they compel you to supply is more than just a confirmation that you received the summons. With your signature you have accepted liability for the alleged offence and you have accepted the offer to enter into a contract with the government via its agencies such as police/courts etc. etc. That piece of paper has become a commercial instrument that can be monetized by the government (in the form of a court-issued fine). Money is really all the government is interested in!

For downloadable material visit the page [LAW](#) on my blog www.thechosentites.wordpress.com