

SO AM I A NUTTER & WHAT IS A SOVEREIGN?

So, what is lawful rebellion? (or being a freemen on the land)

I'll try to give a little basic background to it.

(Please note it's not comprehensive it's just a rough guide)

In the year 1215 the first of our constitutional rights were set down on paper, it was called the Magna Carta, this was basically an oath from the crown (King or Queen) to uphold the rights of the people set down in it and to look after the peoples best interests, in return for the crowns promise to the people they agreed to be ruled by the crown, so it was a contract between crown and people basically, and it became the law.

The crown had to uphold the rights and common law as did the people, not to cause death, harm, or loss to another, or be fraudulent in your contracts (in other words be honest and true).

In 1689 the bill of rights was set down on paper, this basically sealed all the rights given in the Magna Carta plus a few more, both documents contain our UK common law written down and formed our law.

These two documents are the main fundamental parts of our UK constitution, yes we do actually have one, many claim that the UK has no written constitution, this is not true. We have the most respected constitution in the world, it is the basis of the constitutions of the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and India.

Rather than being one written document we have several that make up the UK constitution, the primary of which is the Magna Carta and the 1689 bill of rights. (the freeman movement in Canada seems to be gaining respect from some Canadian policemen) Part of both the Magna Carta and the 1689 bill of rights states that they cannot be repealed because they are such well-made laws and rights!

""Lord Justice Laws on 18th February 2002: "The special status of constitutional statutes follows the special status of constitutional rights. Examples are the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights 1689...Ordinary statutes may be impliedly repealed. Constitutional statutes may not...." "

Now our ancestors were not daft, they knew there could be a problem one day if the crown became unjust, or turned into some sort of dictatorship, or parliament was acting against the people, or was full of corruption, or was not allowing the crown to keep its oath.

So in article 61 of the Magna Carta it was written that if this ever happened you could petition the crown to sort out the crowns problem (or parliaments if it was them), the crown had 40 days to fix it or dissolve parliament.

If in the 40 days nothing was fixed the petitioner could go into rebellion against the crown and parliament lawfully until the problem was resolved.

Because this was lawful and the petitioner had a right to do it he would go into "lawful rebellion", he would no longer have allegiance to the crown or parliament because they had become corrupt etc, he would be a hindrance and a rebel, and fight to end the corruption or injustice within the system, it was law that he could do this, and he was actually obeying the law by doing it, because it is the peoples duty to fight corruption and uphold the law.

So that's the basics of it.

Because our constitution cannot be repealed it is still valid law.

Now, to do this today you first send an affidavit (a sworn oath of truth, the most powerful lawful and legal document you can get) to our Queen, stating that the crown or in this case our government acting for the crown and its MPs are breaking the constitutional contract (and they really are breaking it), and ask for it to be fixed within 40 days, this is witnessed and counter signed and sealed by a credible witness (I used a solicitor).

I did not make my oath lightly, I took an oath to defend the crown when I joined the army, I was now withdrawing my oath of allegiance, it may sound strange to some but I had a lump in my throat doing it, it was made in good faith.

It is then sent to the queen, then if in 40 days the problem is not fixed a second affidavit is then sent to the Queen, this time saying that the problem is not fixed and therefore the crown or government acting for the crown has broken the contract with the people, and you are therefore no longer going to obey or be ruled by a corrupt crown or government, you are now in lawful rebellion.

Now contrary to what any government officials may tell you this is lawful, and it is a binding oath sworn before God (and the witness), it is my right, your right, everyone's right to do this, but only if there is a genuine breach of the contract.

The powers that be want you to believe that we have no constitution and anything we do have has been repealed, or 90% of it anyway, it's in their interests to have you believe this so they can get away with anything they want without the people stopping them.

As you can see from the statement by Lord Justice Laws it is our constitution and cannot just be scrapped by parliament or our self-serving MPs and politicians, it is still valid law no matter what our politicians say, they have never ever had the right to repeal any of it.

Some of the breaches we are using for entering lawful rebellion are, corruption in parliament and our government, we all know this is happening, It's not just one party its them all.

Our past and present government has allowed and is allowing foreign powers (the EU) to rule over us. The European Union, this is a hugely corrupt system and its not working in anyone's best interests except the EU politicians and their powerful business associates, the EU is a dictatorship, run by un elected leaders, look into it and you will see this is true.

When our government handed over our sovereignty to the EU they committed treason!

This is 100% true, they really have committed treason, take a look at the Ukip website for some very interesting facts and figures etc., it is beyond belief what the EU gets up to (I'm just using Ukip as they have collected a lot of info, not because they are the exception to any other party).

The EU is our peoples greatest enemy, second to that is our own government and most of the mainstream parties, I know that the police are supposed to be non-political but you all have freedom of thought and I am sure you must realise what a corrupt bunch of leaders we have (done worry I'm not looking for comments on this! lol)

When our government does something wrong they just pretend they haven't done it, if it gets to hot a subject they stick a gagging order on it (D notice I think is the correct term?).

Lawful and Legal? What's the difference?

There's lots of talk on the freeman sites (and other sites) about being Lawful and legal and the difference between the two, but there's not much in the way of a basic guide so it ends up confusing, some will know the difference but for those who don't here we go. Basically anything in our constitution including common law is lawful (true law).

Any acts that parliament have passed are legal, these will be in the form of acts or statute laws, these "legal" acts should not contradict common law or what's in our constitution, some of them do but we won't go into that.

We had a system in place that could not be changed (common law and our constitution), so if parliament wanted to pass new legal acts etc. it had to find a way of doing it and making it enforceable. The Royal navy already used a legal system called Admiral law to keep its sailors in check and make sure its members obeyed officers and the navy rules, all navy members had to swear an oath to obey it etc. it became a legal contract and so it was enforceable. It was only used on ships and within the navy but it worked and was ready made so parliament adopted it (or a version of it), now parliament had a system to use to make new "legal" laws.

For it to work people had to think it was lawful, we did not know any different so we just took it as being right and obeyed, but none of us have ever sworn an oath to parliament or the crown to be in the navy and obey admiralty law (unless you have been in the navy I guess), so there is no binding contract between legal acts or statutes and the people, we have been getting duped into obeying them.

A statute law or act in legal terms is defined as "an act given the force of law by the consent of the governed", note it says consent, so if you don't consent to it and there is no contract between yourself and the other party it is not law.

So now you see why freemen (and those claiming to be freemen) will say I do not consent, and there is no contract between us, I have broken no law when you are going to arrest them or make them obey an act or statute legislation.

I have served my lawful affidavits to the crown and I am not in the Navy or under admiralty law, so I am a freeman on the land.

When the queen made her coronation oath it was to uphold the people's rights and common law and do her duty for our country and its people.

When you made your oaths to the queen it was to her so she could uphold her oaths and the law.

When I swore my oath I did it lawfully and honourably in good faith, and for the right reasons, so please don't write us all off as nutters, I urge you all to please give us the benefit of the doubt when dealing with freemen.

If the person you are dealing with has filed their affidavits and is genuinely in lawful rebellion under article 61 of the Magna Carta (they should be able to show you proof), I urge you to please follow common law when dealing with them, they are truly under the jurisdiction of common law only, not acts of parliament or statute law.

By trying to hold a genuine freeman on anything other than a breach of common law you would truly be breaking common law yourself, and your oaths were to uphold our queen and common law.

I genuinely hope this has given you a little better understanding of what we are doing and why.

Thanks go to Rebel Leader <http://www.freedomrebels.co.uk>
for allowing me to use this article to explain what a freeman/woman on the land is.

<http://www.commonlawcollege.co.uk/>

EDUCATE YOURSELF