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Freedom of Speech | Question 2–1

The Australian government, it's agents and it's agencies have no right at all to govern any people without their individual written consent, with full disclosure and all terms clearly laid out, as in all lawfully binding contracts. This country was not 'settled' lawfully, with consent, agreement or contract, but by vicious and brutal force, murder and slavery. The basis of the Crown's invasion of this country was that it was not occupied, and as that fraud has been unequivocally established, it is fact that the government currently claiming authority over the Australian people have no authority whatsoever over those that did not consent, in essence, they are an occupying force, and any legislation against our freedom of speech is unlawful.  The invasion perpetrated on the Original Tribal People's was not lawful, the 'Commonwealth's' or 'Crown Corporation'  occupation is unlawful, and therefore so are all laws created by such a corporation, without a lawfully binding contract. If it was permissable, lawful or acceptable for any corporation to attack a Sovereign nation and claim ownership and authority through slavery, genocide and child abuse we are all in danger of being slaves to whomever has the military might to do so.

Question 2–2

Any 'law' that encroaches on the inalienable rights of a Natural Human man or woman's freedom of speech is unjustified and unlawful.  Individual consent and contracts can be the only reason for a law to be enforceable and justified.

Freedom of Religion | Question 3–1

General principals that should be applied to help determine whether a law interferes with freedom of religion can only be justified under the common law of DO NO HARM. Any other restrictions are not enforceable or lawful. Any laws that impinge on our alienable rights are not lawful.

Question 3–2

One piece of legislation that springs to mind in terms of unjustified 'laws' is the 'law' against cannabis. The bible stated that all 'God' made was "good" and that the "leaves of the trees were for the healing of the nations". This legislation is unlawful, and the fact that the US government has patented cannabis points out the hypocrisy of governments legislating to control others while protecting their own corporate interests, knowing cannabis cures cancer.

Freedom of Association | Question 4–1

Any law that interferes with another's personal choices and freedoms is unlawful except by individual agreement and consent by those that choose to be governed.

Question 4–2

The 'VLAD' legislation in QLD is unjustifiable, unjust, and unlawful. All laws enforced against any individual's will is a crime, there not being a valid contract between the 'Crown's' corporation and it's agents with the individuals in this country, the Australian and State governments did not have consent to govern, but rather invaded this country and punished people for not voting for a predermined list of candidates.  That is a monopoly, enforced with property acquisition and violence, and therefore is not lawful.

Freedom of Movement | Question 5–1

Any law that inhibits freedom of movement by any person that has not committed a crime (where there is a victim, not just a corporate entity such as the 'Crown'; REGINA) is not lawful.  We are free beings and without a lawful contract between the Commonwealth and individuals there is no consent to restrict movement. Driver's licenses are unlawful. It is not a crime to drive therefore it cannot be a crime to drive without consent unless the government considers us as slaves, which is unlawful.

Question 5–2

Drivers licenses, body scans at airports, random stops by police, vehicle registration are all unjustified, as are the 'fines' that are enforced, as the crown does not have the consent to make laws for all peope it does not have a contract with.  These 'laws' have no basis in justice, but are revenue raising excercises by the 'state'.  Permission for these unlawful and unjustified impingements of freedom can only come from the individual natural human man or woman.

Property Rights | Question 6–1

Any 'law' passed by the government with regard to vested property rights is unjustified, the principals applied to help determine whether or not a a 'law' is justified is if there is a contract, consent, individually, by the parties.

Question 6–2

No one shall arbitrarily be denied of his property.  Although the local governments, by voted referendum, twice, are NOT LAWFUL, state governments and agents thereof have been stealing homes and property through land tax legislation. Homes have also been taken by means of this unlawful legislation that is taxation, fines, and the Public Trust's involvement in Mental Health legislation. This legislation denies the Natural Human man or woman to be denied a home and security, often earned after years of work and unlawful taxation,  therefore UNJUSTIFIED.  An example of a law that interferes with our natural born rights being unlawful is the Australian government's legislation on superannuation. Vast funds are lost to large corporations rather than given to the beneficiaries, the natural born human woman or man who has worked to obtain these funds for retirement.

Retrospective Laws | Question 7–1

The foundation of legal relations is a 'contract', an agreement of the parties. In order for an agreement to be a contract (or a variation of an existing contract) it must be supported by consideration and full disclosure; (the "whole truth" about any matter which the other party should know in deciding to contract). The agreement must also be sufficiently certain and complete to be enforced, and the parties must have intended their agreement to be a contract. The absence of any of these elements will signify either that there is, in law, no agreement or that the agreement is not enforceable as a contract.

The most important decision a person could make is whether ***or not****,* he or she would employ the services of someone to 'take care of their affairs', to represent them or to govern them. As proof of this fact I would like to point out that there are contractual agreements in law that are sighted and witnessed regarding Enduring Power of Attorney agreements and similar positions of 'representation', such as an Executor. The fact that the Australian government, it's agencies and sub-corporations do not have written consent from individuals and People's to govern them means there is no contract, proving their perceived authority stems solely from violence, threats and human rights abuses.

If there is a contract between the parties,  there is agreement, a contract, consent.  Our Inalienable rights are not negotiable, inalienable rights are true 'law', and without lawfully binding contracts governments and their laws and legislation has no lawful basis.

Question 7–2

All Commonwealth 'laws' are null and void because the 'Crown' did not have a lawfully binding contract between the Original Tribal People's and the invaders. This Country is a crime scene, and the invaders now include natural born Australians.  This is known as TREASON.  The mental health act is a shame on Australia and breaches all human rights treaties and the Magna Carta, it is not justified, and it is not lawful.

Fair Trial | Question 8–1

There cannot be a principal or criteria applied to help determine whether a law limits the right to a fair trial is justified!  There is no LAWFUL excuse for a  government to make such laws, and if the government attempts to do so it will be breaching all human rights treaties and liable for damages, just as any fascist government has been.

Question 8–2

Any legislation passed without the consent of the individual is unjustifiable. Parking fines, speeding fines, drug possession fines, driving related fines, registration relating fines are all examples of unjustified and unlawful processes which deny the Natural Human man or woman a fair trial. Star Chambers were outlawed once because they were unjust, and now the Commonwealth, 'Crown' governments employ it on a day to day basis, pushing those most disadvantaged into more poverty, unjustly and unlawfully. The 'Mental Health act' should be abolished and is the most degrading of our laws,  without lawful contract all mental health legislation is null and void.  The 'Family Court' and the procedure of it are criminal and most unjust to all, it is most certainly an unjust, unlawful 'star chamber', and must be abolished.  
To obtain any remote chance of  justice in the current system you must have money to take the matter to a 'High' Court, hire a lawyer, barrister or similar.   Property disputes between the unlawful local governments all end with the home owner losing money or property without fair trial. Clearly an unjust system, unjustified, unlawful.  Any legislation  regarding the individual's personal choices is not lawful. Humanity has freewill, inalienable rights, that cannot be ignored or legislated against.

Burden of Proof | Question 9–1

In Common Law, there must be a Victim, a Witness, and an expert confirming that someone was harmed, such as a doctor, and a jury of peers for the accused to be judged by, NOT an individual 'magistrate' or 'judge'. I have asked many judges for thier proof of authority over me, and every one of them runs out of the court room like a coward, because they have no lawful authority and they know it!   Without this criteria there is no case, and therefore shifting  the 'burden of proof' is not justified or lawful.  The 'crowns' desire to acquire more riches cannot justify disadvantaging a living Natural Human man or woman, and it must not.

Question 9–2

All laws that place a Natural Human in distress, denying him or her of his inalienable rights, property or consent is unjustified, which is ALL legislation except for trials with the defendant having a jury of his peers.  Anything else is a Star Chamber, outlawed, unlawful and unjustifiable.  The 'Mental Health Act' is an unlawfully imposed legislation that denegrates the human being, and is most certainly criminal. I propose that whomever created and approved this legislation should be jailed. Not lawful, not just, not justifiable.

Privilege against Self-incrimination | Question 10–1

There is none, without contract there is no lawful excuse, no justification.

Question 10–2

Any 'law' that doesn't have the consent of the individual. Without consent there is no justification for any law or legislation, and the consent is not implied.

Client Legal Privilege | Question 11–1

Lawfully binding contracts, agreements, with all terms laid out in transperancy.

Question 11–2

Any 'laws' that abrogate client privilege are not enforceable without a lawfully binding agreement, without such these 'laws' are not enforceable.

Strict and Absolute Liability | Question 12–1

If the 'law' does not have the consent of the defendant, if the defendant has not given permission to be governed, the law is not justified, without such permission, a contract, the 'law' is not enforceable.

Question 12–2

Any 'laws' that disadvantage a Natural Human cannot be justified or lawfully enforced without the consent of the accused, not with violence or threat of incarceration or property loss, but only with willing consent.

Appeal from Acquittal | Question 13–1

Question 13–2

Procedural Fairness | Question 14–1

Our Natural born rights,  inalienable rights, are not given to us by government, therefore this fascist government cannot make any changes that could possibly deny someone of their inalienable rights. Any legislation that disadvantages any being cannot be inforced or justified. Perhaps the government should be re-educated in what it is to be a natural human with rights, choices and freedoms, and the deception that is the 'legal person' (corporate personage) be abolished. Why do judges bow and leave the courtroom when they are asked for proof of authority? Beause they have no authority over anyone who proclaims himself to be the natural man or woman with inalienable rights.

Question 14–2

All commonwealth legislation deny procedural fairness, because without contracts and consent to be governed the actions taken against the individual is thuggery and therefore criminal.  Just as our country was invaded by murderers and thugs of the 'Crown'.

Delegating Legislative Power | Question 15–1

Only the individual can delegate power to others with regard to their own life's choices and freedoms, via lawful contract. There is no justification for any being to control anothern otherwise.

Question 15–2

Any law that does not have the agreement or consent of the individuals effected by such a law is unlawful without a binding contract.  There is no justification to delegate power over others at all, ever.

Authorising what would otherwise be a Tort | Question 16–1

There is none, and the principles to determine such a matter would be that Human Rights are NOT negotiable! Human rights cannot be legislated against, and the individual must not be disadvantaged in any way. Again, consent is the basis for all lawful contracts, and without consent their is no lawful justification for encroaching on another's rights, for any reason at all.

Question 16–2

The 'mental health act', the most barbaric torturous 'act' ever introduced. Shame on the creators of this 'legislation', they We should be held accountable, and are accountable, the 'act' itself being a 'tort' against the people, unjustified and unlawful and the crimes perpetrated in the name of this act will go down in history as the most unjust and most heinous.

Executive Immunities | Question 17–1

We are all equal under the law! There is no justification of immunities for selected individuals.

Question 17–2

Politicians in Australia today are criminals, they are terrorist organizations that legalize their own crimes, and they have made the Australian people their enemies.  Hitler and other evil men in times past have attempted to protect themselves from prosecution when their crimes were realized, and in this day we have Tony Abbott claiming that Australian's cannot take legal action against government agents??  No man or woman should be exempt when they have caused a living human being harm, if they are an employee of a corporation or not!

Judicial Review | Question 18–1

Question 18–2

Others Rights, Freedoms and Privilege | Question 19–1

All commonwealth 'laws' encroach on the natural freedoms and privileges of the Natural Human. There is no justification of lawful authority to make such laws without a lawfully binding contract. Contracts are the basis for all legal dealings, and in the absence of a contract there is no consent.  It really is that simple.

Other comments?

“**The search is on for a new fundamental basis of the legitimacy of Australian laws” ... 'Justice' Michael Kirby.**

I assert that the Australian government, it's agents and it's agencies have no right at all to govern any people without their individual written consent, with full disclosure and all terms clearly laid out, as in all lawfully binding contracts. This country was not 'settled' lawfully, with consent, agreement or contract, but by vicious and brutal force, murder and slavery, which are crimes. The excuse of the Crown's invasion of this country was that it was not occupied, and as that fraud has been unequivocally established, it is fact that the government currently claiming authority over the Australian people have no authority whatsoever over those that did not consent, in essence, they are an occupying force, employing traitors, against the Australian people.

The federal constitution, written in 1900, explicitly stated that Aboriginals would not be counted in any state or federal census, does this government wish to further denigrate our Native Tribal Peoples by forcing them to be subject to whatever fairy tale the 'Constitution' represents?

**What is the 'Crown'**

Elizabeth Mountbatten/Battenberg commonly referred to as 'Queen Elizabeth II, is the 'legal' and political entity known as the Crown. In 'legal' terms the 'Crown' is a 'Corporation Sole'. A **corporation sole** is a legal entity consisting of a single ("sole") incorporated office, occupied by a single ("sole") person. A corporation sole allows corporations (often religious corporations or Commonwealth governments) to pass without interval in time from one office holder to the next successor-in-office, giving the positions 'legal' continuity in terms of subsequent office holders having identical powers to their predecessors. A corporation is defined as a large company or group of companies acting as a single company.

The concept of the 'Crown' was created under the feudal system, a combination of legal and military customs in medieval Europe, broadly defined, it was a way of **structuring society around relationships derived from the** **holding of land in exchange for labour**.

**Feud: a prolonged and bitter quarrel or dispute.**

In England all rights and privileges were ultimately bestowed by the 'ruler'. Land was granted by the 'Crown' to lords in exchange for feudal services and they, in turn, granted the land to lesser lords leaving the less fortunate no choice but to be the slaves of the 'Crown' for the privilege of having somewhere to live, which until this system emerged was the right of all.

The Crown corporation spread it's darkness to many lands, and all natives from these lands tell the same story of evil that the Original Tribal People of Australia tell. The 'Crown's' brutal 'reign' explains why there is so much inequality in our country, Australia being a subservient colony or a vassal of the British Crown, a corporation, “living in a prolonged and bitter dispute”, in a modern day 'feudal system'.

I utterly reject all proposals and claims to authority made by this criminal corporation and consider that these last few centuries, in the future, will be counted as one of our darkest historical times, if we survive the political, environmental and industrial stupidity that has destroyed so much of the most sacred and ancient of landscapes and culture.

**Genocide and slavery**

Over 200 years ago this beautiful land, our home had been a nation of approximately 500 native tribes using 700 different dialects in what we now think of as communities, all having their own customs and cultures, and their own hereditary lands, living in complete harmony with their environment. There were no jails, no police, no guns, and no government, and the Native people thrived.

After the invasion, as of 1788, Australia was regarded by the British as a colony of 'settlement', not of conquest because the Natives were not considered to be human by the 'Crown'. The Native's land was over-run by British colonists on the premise that the land belonged to no-one (‘terra nullius’). Clearly this was an incorrect and certainly fraudulent report. And this fraud was the excuse the 'Crown' required to begin the genocide of the Native people.

The Native Tribes were not given a choice, the invaders demanded compliance with astonishing violence, claiming for themselves and *their* *'lords'* what was the spiritual, inherited home of these Native Peoples for untold thousands of years previously. The Natives were massacred, taken as slaves for labour and the women as sex slaves, their children stolen from their parents by government agents, their water and food supplies poisoned with arsenic and strychnine, all at the behest of the 'Crown's' henchmen.

After the invasion the land was colonised by convicts, often skilled in their trades, those skills were used to build infrastructure for the 'Crown', alongside the Native Originals who had been kidnapped for the same purpose, slavery. These unfortunate individuals had been severely punished, essentially, for their poverty, and clearly used as slaves for the term of their 'Crown' imposed incarceration. Compulsorily taken from their homeland for convictions over very trivial crimes that very often had been the result of the desperate poverty of England at the time, and sentenced to be extradited to this already occupied land.

In 1873 the English novelist Anthony Trollope visited Australia, and the devastation of the Tribal Peoples, to him, was most evident. "There has been some rough work", he wrote: “We have taken away their land, have destroyed their food, made them subject to our laws, which are antagonistic to their habits and traditions, have endeavoured to make them subject to our tastes, which they hate, have massacred them when they defended themselves and their possessions after their own fashion, and have taught them by hard warfare to acknowledge us to be their master”. Most certainly when the author said “we”, he was referring to the English.

**More Crown injustice**

Without their consent, original Tribal Australians were considered to be 'wards of the state' until, by referendum, the 'white' population voted on allowing voting or citizenship 'rights' to the Tribal Peoples in the 1960's. But, still, Queensland natives were forced to live on reserves until 1971, and were not able to own property until 1975.

The first law in Western Australia to officially sanction the removal of children was the Industrial Schools Act of 1874. It stated that, ‘any Indigenous child “surrendered” to an institution could be detained there without parental consent, or contracted to employment after the age of 12 until the child reached 21 years.

Indigenous people were removed from their traditional lands to enable the British government between 1953 and 1957 to detonate nine atomic bombs and carry out 700 "minor trials" at Marilinga,Monte Bello Island and Emu Field in Central Australia. The fallout extended over a wide area. These tests left 120 square kilometres of traditional land permanently contaminated and causing many Indigenous people to sufferer the disastrous effects of radiation following these tests for generations to come.

Cruelly, voting was made *compulsory* for the Original Owners in 1983, forcing them to choose a master from a predetermined list of white men who were clearly unaware and uneducated in the ways of their historical Tribal predecessors, leaving the Original Tribal Peoples further enslaved to the occupying regime, and the will of ignorant men.

The Australian government has not evolved since these horrendous crimes committed by our British forefathers and that is because it operates on the same system; money before people.

Children are still being taken from their parents, people are still held in prisons for victimless 'crimes', and governments continue to pass legislation, acts and statutes that continually disadvantage those most vulnerable; without lawful authority.

The 'justice' system is a farce based on trickery and implied consent, deviously concealing the fact that the 'Crown' have discontinued our inalienable right as people to be recognised as 'Natural Humans' and are now, in the narrow sight of the 'Crown', only considered to be 'legal persons', virtual corporations that have no human rights, via our 'birth certificates', or 'bondage certificates'.

'Star Chambers', once abolished due to the unjust process, are employed today by the 'Crown' and it's henchmen.

The electoral procedure employed is a legal trap by a corporation to continue the slavery, an implied agreement, without full disclosure, based on unlawful legislation making it an offence payable to not *agree* to be governed.

Local governments have no authority, not being lawfully recognised by the Australian people via referenda, twice, and yet if council rates are not paid home owners have their homes taken from them by force by government agents.

The Australian government has supported and financed terrorism plots against many countries, including Iraq and Syria, colluding with the British and US governments, killing and maiming many thousands, demanding with the threat of incarceration, an income tax of Australian citizens to pay for these crimes.

Clearly, the sole reason for the assumed authority of the Australian government, is the legalisation of it's own crimes and it's monopoly on weapons.

**Contracts**

**Without contracts, agreements and consent we are left with thuggery**

The foundation of legal relations is a 'contract', an agreement of the parties. In order for an agreement to be a contract (or a variation of an existing contract) it must be supported by consideration and full disclosure; (the "whole truth" about any matter which the other party should know in deciding to contract). The agreement must also be sufficiently certain and complete to be enforced, and the parties must have intended their agreement to be a contract. The absence of any of these elements will signify either that there is, in law, no agreement or that the agreement is not enforceable as a contract.

The most important decision a person could make is whether ***or not****,* he or she would employ the services of someone to 'take care of their affairs', to represent them or to govern them. As proof of this fact I would like to point out that there are contractual agreements in law that are sighted and witnessed regarding Enduring Power of Attorney agreements and similar positions of 'representation', such as an Executor. The fact that the Australian government, it's agencies and sub-corporations do not have written consent from individuals and People's to govern them means there is no contract, proving their perceived authority is a farce.

It is every natural human being's right to agree or not to agree to such contracts, and without consent from Australians as individuals there cannot be a government who claims to govern *all*. Decisions can not be made for us by governments that did not have our consent via written or verbal contract to begin with, and most certainly can not be *lawfully* enforced through property acquisition, violence or imprisonment.

I again quote Justice Michael Kirby; “..it may be said that they, the people, are the ultimate source of legitimacy of all law in Australia.” Justice Kirby was correct, the law must come from the people, and if the people, individually or as communities do not wish to contract there is no lawful basis for governance or the legislation thereof.

Clearly, the Original Tribal Peoples did not consent to a British governance, they did not, in fact, consent to be governed at all. Our Tribal Peoples are victims of horrendous crimes, the crimes of the Crown corporation and it's agents, historically and presently. The Commonwealth "Crown" is a criminal organization.

As Australians we must be vigilant not to allow invasion, genocide and slavery to be considered a legitimate basis of governance lest we further, as a nation, become victims of these draconian beliefs. We must acknowledge and protect the individual's natural born rights, choices and freedoms and investigate the crimes of those who would be traitors to the Australian Peoples.

Not only is it unlawful for a corporation, even if it is masquerading as a government, to make decisions for people without their written consent, especially those that have had their lands, culture and families taken from them by that same corporation, but it is unjust!

I reject the 'Crown's' corporation/s, it's agents and agencies' assumption of authority over me.

I reject their claim of authority to makes laws, acts and statues that deprive myself, and others of what are **inalienable rights**.

I reject it's titles, I reject it's acts of terrorism against the Australian people and it's victims abroad.

I will not condone the 'Crown's' crimes against humanity, and I will not serve the enemy of my People.

I reject the constitution as I did not sign a contract giving the Australian constitution authority foregoing my *inalienable rights*.

I will not vote for a slave master, a lord or a 'queen'.

I reject the 'Crowns' claim of ownership over Australia, it's land, it's assets and it's People, and assert that the 'Crown' is a gang of thieves and tyrants, now and historically.

The Original Tribal Australian's are a free people, they are the guardians of this land. They left no gaping holes in this land, did not poison waterways and left no 'carbon footprints'. White man could have learned so much, but chose, rather, to live in constant feud and ignorance.  The 'Crown' is a psychotic Corporation that will not stop until it devours all.

The 'Crown's' illegitimacy has been unveiled, and with it all of it's crimes. Will the government prosecute that which it swears allegiance to? Of course not, the 'Crown' is it's master, the 'Crown' is the government, so these most horrendous crimes go, not only unpunished to this day, but celebrated.

In the absence of a binding contract from every individual Natural human, it must be known that there is no implied consent, there is simply ''no contract''. Anything less than consent is an act of war.
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