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IN PROTECTION OF AUSTRALIANS’ RIGHTS IN GENERAL AND THE RIGHTS OF HOME OWNERS AND FARMERS IN PARTICULAR.

AUSTRALIANS AND FARMERS ARE MISLED BY THE MAYNES, WALTER, ‘FLORA’ APPROACH.

An Essay by
Kenn d’Oudney

On the Futility of Flora’s Approaches to Courts and Queen; Flora’s Incorrect Written Declarations and Notions in Its Newsletters and Circulars and Its Apocryphal ‘History’ of ‘Common Law’.

This Critique is written for an under and post-graduate, professional and general readership.

May readers accept our comments as they are intended: constructive, made in a spirit of amity, concern for, and solidarity with, Australians.

PART ONE

I. ON THE TEST OF LEGITIMACY:
WHEN IS A GOVERNMENT ILLEGAL ?
WHEN IS A COURT ILLEGAL ?
WHEN IS A STATUTE ILLEGAL ?

The Restoration of the Rule of Law and legality to the status quo is simple to achieve and is explained herein.

The people of advanced civilised societies experienced the Twentieth Century fraught by the threat of engulfment by totalitarian statist concepts propagandised everywhere, and the raging tumult of militaristic régimes. With exemplary sacrifice in lifeblood and resources, Australia participated successfully in the upholding of the Western civilised, constitutional, compassionate democratic way of life. Yet, now again today, all that is conducive to the well-being and happiness of the populace is at risk, this time from enemies within.

In a perfect world, “Utopia,” inhabited by perfectly incorruptible beings and where mistakes are never made, laws passed would be immaculate and no safeguards or checks upon them would be required. In a perfect world, of course, laws themselves would be superfluous. Generally, government attempts to enact legislation that is approved of by or is acceptable to the majority of the population. However, in the real world (not Utopia) majority assent of itself does not invest legislation with legitimacy or virtue, regardless of its support, e.g., the Nürnberg Nazi Race Laws.

Today, corrupted or unthinking politicians and their beholden government employees, the justices (judges), are implementing measures sought by those with totalitarian ambitions. The courts and others employed in the justice system currently adopt a modus operandi illegal and judicable* on numerous grounds, and engage in outlandish enforcement of illegitimate statutes and regulations.

*Definition. judicable, that which may be tried by jury in a court of law.
The consequences of failure by citizens to restore legality to their government are inexorable: they incur a disastrous termination of the Australian way of life, the “lucky country” and its cherished heritage. In such circumstances, the duty of all responsible adults is self-evident. It is incumbent upon the people at large to exert all the resistance of which they, collectively and as individuals, are capable, to eradicate lawlessness and bring to justice those participating in government criminality.

For all Time, each successive generation of men and women has to find the moral conviction, and courage, to save themselves. The Torch of Freedom is rekindled and passed on. Whatever its specious camouflage, resurgent tyranny* must be recognised, exposed, and annihilated. The sooner, the better, for then the process of Resistance and Restoration is less sanguine.

*Definition. Tyranny is defined as oppressive rule administered with injustice; the cruel and arbitrary use of authority.

The active descent into turpitude by politicians and state personnel is conduct manifestly in breach of existing laws, Principles, and constitutional constraints. It is in flagrant contravention of the universally applicable secular natural law and morality by which civilisation is created and the legitimacy of government is measured. Antidemocratic ‘government’ is definitively criminal: it engenders and commits crime; and increasingly brings strife, impoverishment, misery and fear to the people. It denies recognition of all humans’ inherent dignity and rights.

This brings us to the particular case of the Australian agriculturalists. In considering the ways of government (which consists of the executive, legislature and judiciary), it is indispensable for people first to know the means by which the legitimacy of statutes and governments’ acts are judged. These means are explained herein. The general good of all Australians must include justice and fair treatment for farmers. If farmers are deserving in their cause, and they are, then the correct legal course of action would be effective in producing the results desired by the farmers. This essay answers the question, “What is this correct legal course?”

These issues are global, not parochial: this calls for an appreciation of the “bigger picture” set within the dictates of law and morality. To this end, one appraises whether the writings about law and “common law” are correct and whether the correct legal course is pursued in their approach, by Sue (editor of Flora) and Lindsay Maynes, David Walter, Catherine Burns, Peter Spencer et al. (Illegal legislation has been ‘passed’ curtailing farmers’ land use, and infringing property ownership rights. The acronym indicates “farmers’ land ownership rights in Australia.”) Flora adherents are active, circulating writings, and have made submissions to courts and the Queen.
Corollary to this look at Flora’s approach, is consideration whether farmers’ energy, resources and time could be, and hence should be, better spent.

Statist measures are being taken by Western politicians to fall in with the ambitions and scheme initiated by the few individuals and families who are de facto private owners of all the ‘national’ Central Banks and the World Bank. This program is for the establishment of global dictatorship (New World Order; One World Government) through the United Nations Organisation and the International Monetary Fund over national governments and populations. The program is explicit regarding progressive collectivisation (ownership by the state) and use-control of all land, homes and property.

Ref. Economics video documentaries; e.g., themoneymasters.com; fraudulent fractional reserve lending; usury, private banks’ interest on issuance of ‘national’ currency and credit, etc.

One does not ‘judge’ these intensely grave matters by personal opinions or politics. Insofar as this critique relates to farmers, statutory and judge-made law, issues of human and civil rights, parliament’s intentions, and Flora’s activities, these are weighed by universal secular Principles which form the Code by which all human conduct is judged and governed.

Although these Principles comprise general knowledge, the facts explaining Principles are not intuitive. They have to be taught and learned. However, on receiving this information there is an almost intuitive positive response to it in people everywhere, who realise that achieving the society which is compassionate and civilised (as opposed to despotic and barbarous), wherein justice is equally available to all citizens, does rely upon adoption and implementation of Principles, a timeless, unique natural and common law Code. It is therefore an uplifting subject, the perusal of which all decent, intelligent people find rewarding.

These Precepts are understood even by people who are unable to read and write. Principles are, incidentally, nothing less than the Foundation of Civilisation, the basis of the Rule of Law, and are adopted by all legitimate Constitutions. Adherence to this Code beneficially influences every aspect of life in the human society. These Principles are derived from the universally applicable, supreme secular moral code of Natural Law, Equity and Justice, which came to be called legem terræ*, forming the pan-European people’s common law.

* Note. terræ is pronounced terry, the æ as in Cæsar; seize.

Definition. A ‘constitution’ is a code of laws and customs established by the people of a nation (as distinct from government and/or bureaucrats) for the guidance and the legal and lawful control of its government by which to preclude tyranny and lawlessness; a constitution may be amended only at the behest and by the active participation of the great mass of the people (not by government). Being the legal means of controlling and limiting the power of government, a constitution is categorically not merely a document denoting the
hierarchical administration and departmental organisation of government, though it may also contain this.

For insuperable reasons of justice, law and morality, the central tenet and sole legal justice system of legem terræ common law is judicium parium, the straightforward workings of which are explained below. (Much of the law is written in Latin, but is easily explained.) For the reasons given (below) judicium parium is the only system which is legitimate for the dispensation of justice in all causes (lawsuits), civil, criminal and fiscal. It is inscribed as such into articles of Magna Carta, the Great Charter Constitution, and adopted by all the legitimate constitutions.

Legem terræ common law of the land defines and prescribes this practical means (judicium parium) and establishes the Principles for judging the justice, and hence the legality, not only of government statutes and regulations but also whether ‘guilt’ or ‘innocence’ are inherent or absent in the motives and acts of men and women. Judicium parium is the practical Mechanism of Equal Justice for confronting, punishing and deterring crime, whatever its source, upholding and protecting the innocent, and enabling the realisation of the legal and secular moral aspirations of true Civilisation.

**THE TIMELESS, UNIVERSAL SUPREME LAW AND THE SCIENCE OF JUSTICE.**

Legem terræ common law is the term given to the timeless, universal secular law governing humankind.

Applicable in all times and places, legem terræ common law is not geographically constrained to a particular culture, religion or people, or limited to a set time or era. All men and women are subject to and bound by legem terræ law of the land, including executive, legislature, and the judiciary. Common law is common in the sense that it is common to all mankind, people everywhere share it in common; it applies to everyone without exception: all are subject to it; and it is the duty of all people to recognise and uphold the supremacy of the common law of mankind.

From commonplace interactions and the experiences of life, a sense of fairness is acquired by children at a very young age, and possessed by adult humans (see Justice Sir William Jones: Jones on Bailments; and, TRIAL BY JURY: Its History, True Purpose and Modern Relevance ISBN 9781902848723). This sense of fairness bestows on humans everywhere, i.e., universally, an understanding of what is called **natural law and justice**.

Natural law may be described as the Science of Justice. It is comprised of the Principles embodied in the basic components of Truth, Justice and Equity. The Universal Sense of Fairness is, like other senses, not imparted or taught to children by adults: it is not a case of “Let me tell you, children...” Certainly, the conscientious adult, teacher and parent will spare no effort in bringing young
people into the advantageous awareness of how to behave in society; but this can be and frequently is perverted by prejudices and failures of character in grown-ups; or in the “thieves’ kitchen,” and so on.

The Sense of Fairness is not taught; but it is learned. The Universal Sense of Fairness is acquired almost intuitively. *Humans cannot avoid learning the principles of natural law.* Children sense that they do not like nasty things done to them and that other people feel exactly the same. They gather this from simple experiences of emotional and/or physical pain; from their receipt of petty injustices; and from assimilating the reactions of others to acts of unfairness inflicted against them.

The Universal Sense of Fairness is virtually infallible in teaching humans everywhere to understand natural law and justice. Children learn fairness even before they learn the language with which they can explain or define it. Indeed, it is necessary for people to be conscious of the sense first, in order to understand the true meaning of the words by which fairness is described.

Children learn that when one person has a sandwich, it is that person’s possession, and others should not take it away from him without his assent. They come to understand further that the willing exchange of the sandwich for a toy or other object of desire, means that a ‘transaction’ of ‘ownership’ has taken place, and that the sandwich cannot fairly be reclaimed unless by another mutually agreed transaction. Such are the fundamental principles of natural law, and they govern the greatest interests of individuals and society.

In this way, all people learn the constituents of Equity (i.e., fairness) and the commandment (i.e., rule of action) of natural law: the precept “do-as-you-would-be-done-by,” or as it is often written, “do unto others as you would they do unto you.” Founded on this pure sense, legem terrae common law became the pan-European constitutional law and justice system and was largely unwritten until inscribed as articles of Magna Carta in England in 1215. (Similar, earlier charters do exist; viz. the charter of Henry the First.)

It is the Sense of Fairness which endows humans universally with conscience, the faculty or principle by which we distinguish right from wrong in regard to our relations with others. Adults know when they are recipients of acts of unfairness or injustice; and similarly, they know when they do such wrong to others. Hence (save for convicts, the aged, infirm and lunatics), *all adult people qualify to be empanelled as jurors to judge both the justice of the law and the intent, criminal or innocent, of the acts of others; and may likewise be judged by others in the common law’s sole Justice System: judicium parium, the Trial by Jury.*

Equity is defined as moral justice and the spirit of fairness; which, to be legal, governments’ written laws (statutes) are required to reflect. That is to say, unjust laws embodying tyranny cannot be enacted legally anywhere (cf. International
Law; Crime Against Humanity; the Nuremberg Precedent, etc.). Because statutes are fallible and imperfect written expressions, they require interpretation.

The superiority of natural law is witnessed, and confirmed, by the fact that the written law must be interpreted by the natural. Because natural law and the Sense of Fairness are reliable and universal, the judiciary is governed by the rule that, for the interpretation and determining the meaning of the words comprising a written law, the language of statutes and constitutions shall be as closely as possible construed consistently with natural law. Whenever written law (statutes) cannot be construed consistently with natural law and justice, the written law infracts common law, rendering the statute abrogate and illegal.

Through this conception of fairness, adults know what constitutes justice, and what justice requires. Whilst outside of the jury situation, adults behave (whether fairly to others or not) according to what they consider to be in their interests, within the jury, when ordinary citizens randomly chosen and disinterested in the case, know the facts from which a verdict is to be inferred, they arrive at the same conclusion or verdict, unless there is reasonable doubt ceded by the inconclusive nature of the evidence. Citizen-jurors are aware that they rely on their rights being upheld by judgements of jurors just such as they, to whom they are an example. So, whereas there is the strongest of incentives to judge truly and well, there exists no reason at all for disinterested citizens to render any verdict but the one which is fair and true.

Hence, regarding aspects of justice, equity and fairness in respect of people’s treatment of one another, all adults are qualified to try and to judge each other’s behaviour—with the obvious exception of government representatives and employees: prosecutors, judges, police and prison service, etc. These latter are remunerated and feel themselves compelled to enforce the legislation of their employer, the government, regardless of its potential injustice; because failure to do so incurs impeachment, punishment and/or expulsion from their jobs. These inevitably-biased people cannot but make incompetent judgements on the justice or otherwise of their masters’ laws. It must be stressed nevertheless, that the enforcement of any injustice is a common law crime and where acts constitute enforcement or abetment of tyranny they are also punishable under domestic and International Law. (See ratified U.N. Principles, 1948.)

_Legea terrae_ common law defines crime as an act of injustice committed with malice aforethought. Trial of an accused by a Jury of his or her peers (social-equals) is a central tenet of common law. Trial by Jury serves the people both as a system for the enforcement of just laws, and also, of paramount importance, as a constitution of itself, in that it provides democratic and lawful control of the wayward measures and powers of abusive governments.
Again, note that crime is an act of injustice committed with malice aforethought: crime is committed when a premeditated act infracts the rule and criterion “do unto others as you would they do unto you.” Everyone knows it when they are treated unjustly and likewise know when others are recipients of acts of injustice and crime. Well-known examples of common law derived from natural law and justice and put into writing are, “Thou shalt do no murder,” and “Thou shalt not steal,” and “Thou shalt not bear false witness [lie].” Theists like to call natural law and justice “God’s Law.”

When the above-described principles are given exposition in writing, they take on the aspect of a philosophical, legal, constitutional and historical text, but these matters are not the dry preserve of academics and lawyers. Far from it; for this knowledge creates the Culture of the People, and is the Great Australian and Western Heritage. These Principles are the building blocks of the way of life conducive to the greatest good, peace and happiness of humankind. Adoption of these rules establishes the civilised society in which equal justice for all prevails, quashing crime; emasculating tyrants, deposing despotism, emplacing the Rule of Law Justice System which governs government and the people. This Culture and system of justice defines and creates Civilisation. Without it the people are perpetually subject to what some call “the law of the jungle.”

In all times and places, when human communities are in ignorance of, or deny, these tenets of legem terræ, then the dolorous barbarity of illegal governance, tyranny and despotism, government of might over right and the rule of force against justice, arises. The concomitant of all such régimes is carnality, cruelty and corruption within government, the state and its functionaries; inequity in the laws; varying degrees of injustice, strife, crime, misery, exploitation, enslavement and suppression amongst the people. The obtainment of justice for even trivial matters becomes convoluted, expensive, problematic, and frequently impossible. Eventually, outright subjugation of the mass of the population to the caprice of leading ‘politicians’ and the punitive, harsh circumstances of complete enslavement become the general modus vivendi; viz. this totalitarianism is nowadays sometimes referred to as “the Gulag State.”

Knowledge and understanding of judicium parium, the Trial by Jury Mechanism of Equal Justice by which the Civilised Society is created, have long been in the possession of humankind. Judicium parium is the sole peaceful means known to mankind by which the rights of the weakest innocent citizen prevail over a massive and potentially oppressive state power.

With this constitutional system operating, farmers and indeed all Australians would have no unjust interference in their lives from the legislation of local or national politicians. Constitutional legem terræ common law prescribes that for any charge or offence, however serious or trivial, no person shall be dispossessed, fined, punished or in any way disadvantaged, except
according to the lawful judgement or sentence of a unanimous jury of adult jurors randomly chosen according to common law principles, of his or her social-equals in judicium parium: the Common Law Trial by Jury.

“Nullus liber homo capiatur, vel imprisonetur, aut disseisetur, aut utlagetur, aut aliquo modo destruatur; nec super eum ibimus, nec super eum mittemus, nisi per legale judicium parium suorum, vel per legem terræ.” Magna Carta, 1215, Article 39.

That is to say, government only has executive power to act against a person, his property or liberties by the authority of, and according to the lawful sentence of a common law jury following a legal Trial by Jury. The judicial rôle is the preserve of jurors. Indeed, until the Latin-derived word ‘juror’ was adopted, jurors were actually called the judges, in recognition of their rôle. “...the judges, for so the jury were called...” See p. 55 of Crabbe’s History of the English Law, etc. In Trial by Jury, the Foreman or woman of the jury is the principal presiding officer.

The Great Charter defines and prescribes legem terræ Trial by Jury (judicium parium) for all causes, civil, criminal and fiscal, thereby instituting Equal Justice. It contains primarily inscription of the universal common law. This is why the Great Charter Constitution is revered as a veritable monument in the achievement of Civilisation by mankind.

Although Common Law can be written approximately, it is not ‘a written law’. That law which is written down and enacted by parliaments and congresses becomes a statute: as such, it is not ‘common law’. Note that it is one of the Juror’s Duties definitive of Trial by Jury, to judge the justice of those laws which governments write down and seek to enforce on the People. Likewise, the judiciary is an arm of government. Whatever a judge ‘rules’, it is an act of and by government. It is not ‘common law’.

By contrast, Common Law is expressed as the decisions of Jurors dictated by their conscience in the Trial by Jury: that is, the judgements (judicium; judgements, verdicts and sentences) produced by Jurors’ sense of right and wrong and fairness in the treatment of fellow citizens in every act of the enforcement of law. The Common Law Trial by Jury Justice System is the mechanism through which Common Law is created, expressed, and the enactments of civilisation, liberty and equal justice are achieved. The People’s Jury in Trial by Jury forms the Supreme Legislature and Judicature.

LEGEM TERRÆ IS THE COMMON LAW AND VICE VERSA.

The members of the legal profession who are Members of the Democracy Defined RESTORATION Campaign have learnt from this educational campaign and point out that the universally applicable legem terræ common law and the proper workings of the Trial by Jury Justice System have not been taught at law schools for a generation or more. The situation in regard to Equal Justice is still more degenerate in France, Germany and Continental Europe (EU).
The genuine common law must be differentiated from that which modern government has corrupted by legislation; a counterfeit which is “common law” in name only.

The word terræ is the Latin for: “of the land.” As a legal term and familiar expression, legem terræ common law is strictly limited in meaning to denote that “the law of the land” is specifically the people’s common law excluding all statutes and regulations made by government. That is, common law is the Law and Justice System of, and over, all People: it governs government, prescribes and defines the Trial by Jury Justice System, and, whenever there is conflict of causes, the decisions of Juries in legem terræ common law Trial by Jury overrule all statutes of government and rulings of judges. The Jurors in Trial by Jury vet, make, decide, judge and enforce the law in every case, which includes the sentence, this latter being part of the law in the Rule of Law.

“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.

It is a profoundly damaging modern malicious fiction of premeditated obfuscation, public miseducation and propaganda to invent for ‘legem terræ’ as a so-called ‘meaning’, “all the laws in force within a country” or similar. As shown herein, it is most certainly NOT that! On the contrary, to the eternal chagrin of scheming ambitious politicians and the self-important judiciary, legem terræ is the supreme law over the statutes and courts of government. Legem terræ embodies all power, providing the methods, means, criteria and the Trial by Jury mechanism for judging the justice and the legality of all governments, laws, courts (judges), and the motives and actions of all people.

Whereas statutes may express some of the common law, this latter itself contains no statutes of governments, nor rulings of judges. Legem terræ common law became the pan-European, and subsequently pan-Occidental phenomenon which prescribes and defines Trial by Jury as its central tenet and sole justice system.

Sir Matthew Hale: “The common law is sometimes called, by way of eminence, lex terræ, as in the statute of Magna Carta, chap. (article) 29, where certainly the common law is principally intended by those words, aut per legem terræ; as appears by the exposition thereof in several subsequent statutes; and particularly in the statute of 28 Edward III, chap. 3, which is but an exposition and explanation of that statute. Sometimes it is called lex Angliæ, as in the statute of Merton, cap. 9, Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari,’ etc. (We will that the laws of England be not changed.) Sometimes it is called lex et consuetudo regni (the law and custom of the kingdom); as in all commissions of oyer and terminer; and in the statutes of 18 Edward I, and de quo warranto, and divers others. But most commonly it is called the Common Law, or the Common Law of England; as in the statute Articuli super Chartas, chap. 15, in the statute 25 Edward III, chap. 5 (4) and infinite more records and statutes.”
1 Sir Matthew Hale’s History of the Common Law, p. 128. Emphases added.
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Crabbe: “It is admitted, on all hands, that it (Magna Carta) contains nothing but what was confirmatory of the common law, and the ancient usages of the realm, and is, properly speaking, only an enlargement of the charter of Henry I, and his successors.” Crabbe’s History of the English Law, p. 127.

Blackstone: “It is agreed by all our historians that the Great Charter of King John was, for the most part, compiled from the ancient customs of the realm, or the laws of Edward the Confessor; by which they mean the old common law, which was established under our Saxon princes.” Blackstone’s Introduction to the (Great) Charters; Blackstone’s Law Tracts, p. 289.

Coke (a High Court judge): “The common law is the most general and ancient law of the realm. The common law appeareth in the statute of Magna Carta, and other ancient statutes (which for the most part are affirmations of the common law) in the original writs, in judicial records, and in our books of terms and years.” 1 Coke’s Institutes, p. 115.

Coke: “They (Magna Carta and Carta de Foresta) were, for the most part, but declarations of the ancient common laws of England, to the observation and keeping whereof the king (the government) was bound and sworn.” Preface to 2 Coke’s Institutes, p. 3.

N.B. To judge the law, i.e., its fairness, validity, applicability, and legal meaning (interpretation), the Jurors are the sole legal judges prescribed by constitution and common law. For example, see the following from Gilbert:

“This position” (that the matter of law was decided by the justices [judges], but the matter of fact by the pares [peers, i.e., jurors]) “is wholly incompatible with the common law, for the Jurata [jury] were the sole judges both of the law and the fact.” Gilbert’s History of the Common Pleas, note, p. 70.


Today, the private and state controlled mass media, publishing, governments, bureaucrats and state education are active in falsifying the lexicons, and re-writing and obscuring the timeless precepts of law, history, culture and justice which were inspiration and basis to the democratic achievements of the people’s past; viz. demonstrated above, the falsification and obscuration of the meaning of pivotal legal terms such as legem terræ common law. There is nothing new in this “re-education” activity, except perhaps the degree of speed and intensity with which it is being carried out. The reach of pernicious propaganda is much facilitated with a television in nearly every household.

In this way, it is intended that the future course of history will be bent into allowing the execution of morbid schemes and the ambitions of a supra-national financial-corporate oligarchy which is largely covert and not accountable to any public body. Without sensible resistance from the people, the ascending tyranny will succeed. Wars, coups, assassinations, global financial crises, strife, crime, misery, poverty, famine are physical manifestations already caused by this hidden government, unseen but not felt.
II. UNDERSTANDING THE ETERNAL CRITERION OF JUSTICE: WHY THE ONLY LEGAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IS TRIAL BY JURY.

All societies govern by their Justice System. The power to punish carries with it ALL power. It remains a universal eternal criterion of justice that the validity and justice of laws and all acts of their enforcement require to be judged, not by those who make and enforce the laws (government), but by those who voluntarily agree to abide by the laws (all the adult citizens).

People who do not uphold this tenet are then promoting unlawful rule by a tyrannical élite. Unwittingly, or for self-advantage, they serve despots, abet tyranny, and are the criminal enemies of freedom and equal justice.

Because the fairness and justice of the laws and all acts of law enforcement require to be judged by those who agree to abide by the laws, according to natural law, common law, constitutional law, and the paramount requirement for Equal Justice, the Common Law Trial by Jury of ordinary adult citizens in which the jurors judge the justice of the law and every act of enforcement is the only justice system which is legal and just everywhere, for all process of law, civil, criminal and fiscal.

That is the reason why Trial by Jury is installed by all legitimate constitutions as the sole justice system for all crimes (unimpeachable), civil, criminal and fiscal. Trial by Jury comprises a complete constitution of itself, providing legal control by the people of the modus operandi of government. (See Juror’s Duties, etc., which follow.)

On the aforesaid grounds, there is NO legal enforcement of ANY law but by the Trial by Jury. It is uniquely in the nature of Trial by Jury that juries fulfil the function and purpose of law in a democratic society. These are to maintain Justice by protecting the citizen from injustice and crime of all kinds, whether perpetrated by the state or by other citizens; and to uphold the rights, freedom and legitimate interests of all.

“Among the Gothic nations of modern Europe, the custom of deciding lawsuits by a jury seems to have prevailed universally.”


III. TRIAL BY JURY OR TRIAL-BY-JUDGE?

According to common law Trial by Jury, the citizen is presumed innocent until evidence proves guilt and criminal intentions (mens rea) beyond a reasonable doubt in front of a jury of impartial disinterested fellow citizens. That is to say, if a juror deems the accused did NOT act with malice aforethought, he or she is definitively Not Guilty. (In the case of one person injuring another innocently or accidentally, the civil law suit and the Trial by Jury award appropriate compensation for damages.)

By contrast, in the Continental ‘corpus juris’ ex parte [one-sided] trial-by-judge system largely (politically) adopted in Australia (and the UK by EU dictat),
when charged by a judge, Dutch, German, French, Italian, Spanish, etc., citizens are prejudged ‘guilty’ unless they can prove their innocence to the very judge by whom they are accused and detained, and whose personal and career interests are served by his being shown not to have been incorrect in bringing the accusation.

Furthermore, judges regard themselves as, and are, bound to enforce the laws, even when doing so is an act of extreme injustice. Once a law has been passed and interpreted for enforcement by the courts, then, unlike jurors, in the routine of court cases judges are not permitted to dispute or judge the justice of law and its enforcement.

The motive behind, and explanation for, judges’ boundless treachery are the same today as they have always been, and they confirm that the indispensability of Trial by Jury is eternal: the judiciary is responsible, not to the People, but to the government; judges are dependent for careers, salaries and by impeachment, on the legislature: to remain judges, they must reliably enforce unjust legislation.

(Australian farmers take note:) The courts’ current unlawful modus operandi is to facilitate the tyranny manifest in the judiciary’s antidemocratic enforcement of inequitable statutes and regulations, which otherwise citizen-jurors en masse would emphatically annul. To allow these compromised, unconscionable government employees to dictate the law, utterly surrenders all the liberties, rights, property and money of the People to the arbitrary will of renegade, antidemocratic politicians. Any person who would propose or support such a system of depredation, humiliation and subjection of the people, suffers from lack of education and knowledge of human behaviour and political history, or from acute antidemocratic mens rea (criminal intent).

The correct constitutional and sole legal rôle of government in the justice system is executive, not judicial: that is, government carries out the judgements, sentences and decisions of the Jury. That government which is legitimate upholds Common Law and its Constitutional Trial by Jury Justice System.

Knowledge of history is valuable insofar as it may help us to form correct calculations about our present. Only by knowing the path whence we came can we discern the direction and gradient towards which we are inclined. The transitions of once-advanced communities from wealth to poverty, from knowledge to ignorance, from humanity to savagery, from freedom to slavery, can occur without dramatic events, as silent revolutions with minimal commotion.

Like statistics, facts by themselves are of no value and yield little meaning. Those employee-reporters, journalists and textbook authors who supply facts perform only the facile part of the writer’s office. It is the writer’s challenge and task to perceive and reveal the abstract truth when politicians, bureaucrats and others dissemble to conceal it. In politics, where ego, power and wealth are at the epicentre of transactions, human motive must always be taken into account.
when searching to expose the rich vein of verity from amongst the plain ore of facts, events and appearances.

The employee-editor of the news, information and education disseminated by the press, T.V. and radio media, is for obvious reasons bound to slant reportage and opinion in favour of the interests of those who are his (private or state) employers. At best this leads to gross distortion of truth; otherwise, to plain lies. Across the West, party politicians, legal ‘commentators’ and run-of-the-mill journalists ‘parrot’ the delusive inventions of scheming legislators and paid bureaucrats, whose deceptions reveal that their authors, like their adherents, have never appreciated political rights and, while attaching themselves to the name of ‘democracy’, have never understood its definition and basis.

From this derives explanation for the fact that the philosophical and practical foundations of democracy, i.e., the European, Australian and American People’s legem terræ common law and its central tenet and sole justice system, the Trial by Jury, are rarely publicly propounded today and are totally misrepresented by government-licensed lawyers and state education. With Trial by Jury refined into the modern petit jury form of twelve or fifteen by pan-European People’s common law (constitutionally recognised by England’s King Alfred the Great, 871 - 899; and later by Emperor Conrad of Germany two centuries before the first issuance of Magna Carta; see Blackstone, 3; p. 350), by its etymology, history and signification, democracy derives from the Hellenic Athenian Constitution of government by Trial by Jury, to which the Hellenes attached the epithet demokratia, democracy. See Democracy Defined Campaign Philosophy web-Page One.

**THE JURORS:**

**UNANIMITY; CHOSEN BY LOT; ANNULMENT (‘Nullification’).**

In Common Law Trial by Jury, the Verdict of a jury can only be a **unanimous** verdict. A ‘majority’ is not ‘a jury’. Hence, according to Common Law Trial by Jury there are no ‘majority verdicts’. However, there are other ineluctable common law reasons why Unanimity is required to pronounce ‘guilt’...

Even a single Juror dissenting from the finding of a guilty verdict is the manifestation of serious doubt; and the criterion of “beyond a reasonable doubt” is required for the finding of ‘guilt’ of a crime. Consider that the Jurors know they are there to protect **themselves** and society from the villainy of others. The common law crime of injustice (i.e., any act of intrinsically malicious motive, mens rea) such as tyranny, murder, rape, bodily harm, mental cruelty, torture, robbery, theft, extortion, arbitrary dispossession, usury, fraud, and so on, receives the universal condemnation of men and women in juries in all times and places.

There is no (good) reason for the invention of ‘majority verdicts’: even the covert undiscovered felon called to serve on a jury enforces the just laws with
alacrity, for not to do so would reveal his insalubrious character to the other
jurors with numerous malconsequences to himself. Naturally, common law
juries continuously enforce the just laws with unanimity because it serves their
interest to protect themselves by doing so; and only laws which are just are
those which should and must be enforced.

The present-day unjust system whereby “hung juries” occur, derives from
the obstruction and perversion of the course of justice perpetrated by
government and judiciary: the so-called ‘majority’ verdicts are a base, judicable
ploy in corrupt facilitation of the enforcement of inequitable and frequently
venal (money-motivated; unlawful) legislation, in an abuse of power to reflect a
partisan agenda of legislatorial-majority interests to the negation of the
legitimate rights and interests of others.

Unjust laws and acts of enforcement are crimes per se which require
annulment by juries: those responsible for unjust laws and prosecutions require
to be Tried by Jury for their crimes (cf. Crime against Humanity; the
Nuremberg Precedent, etc.).

The protection of minorities depends absolutely upon the honouring
of the sovereignty of every single Juror to decide the Verdict. (It also depends on other
common law criteria such as the Random Selection of Jurors, etc.) If the
governing body imposes any law or regulation which is inconsistent with the
People’s sense of justice and fairness, it requires annulment by jurors in Trial by
Jury, even by a single juror (unanimity required), who may be part of a minority
race or group unfairly discriminated against by the law.

In this way, the people protect themselves from injustices, tyranny, crime
and potential holocaust. They hold their own rights and liberty in their hands,
ever conceding them for a moment to those who might seek to gain through
arbitrary, despotic government.

Through the Common Law Trial by Jury, sovereignty not only resides with
the people as a collective whole, but importantly, it is also embodied ‘divisibly’
with every adult citizen, thereby demonstrating how the Common Law Trial by
Jury Justice System is the foundation of all just and legitimate government; and
Trial by Jury is the definitive, active principle of democracy: the people rule.

ETYMOLOGY (linguistic derivation)
Hellenic Greek, Demokratia, Democracy.
demos, the people; kratos, sovereignty*, power; kratein, to rule.
*Perseus Digital Library, Tufts University. See Democracy Defined Essay EIS#10, “We the
Chambers Dictionary, etymology, demos, the people; kratein, to rule;
MSN Encarta. Democracy, demos, the people; kratein, to rule;
etc.
From the etymology comes the definition: Democracy, the form of government in which the Sovereign Supreme Power is vested in the Common People; the emancipation and ethos of society produced by the power of Juries of ordinary citizens in Trial by Jury, to vet, make, decide and enforce the law; the people rule.

In order to understand the meaning of the word, it is essential to know first that democracy embodies the people’s responsible control over government and law through the Trial by Jury. The people control the government, not the other way around. The people rule. This is democracy. The power, right and duty of Jurors to decide the verdict according to their convictions and conscience has been established in common law since time immemorial, at least since the pre-historical incipience of “The Judgement of Equals” — that is, the Trial by Jury Justice System. This is because it is a definitive part of the Juror’s Duty to uphold Justice by protecting the ordinary people, the meek and innocent, from the crimes of lawlessness and injustice inflicted by those in positions of power.

This protection against crime is the purpose of Trial by Jury, which is put into effect by the Juror pronouncing the Not Guilty Verdict to annul the criminal act of the enforcement of cruel or unjust laws, bad governance, and the prejudices, corruption or incompetence of judges; and likewise by the cost-free private prosecutions (see below) by ordinary citizens in Trial by Jury of malefactors including those who acquire positions in government and abuse their power. No one is ‘immune’ to or ‘above’ the common law, heads of state notwithstanding. (Ref. Article 61 of Magna Carta; see Campaign Philosophy webPage One.)

One should bear in mind that it is a common human failing for persons in authority to acquire in varying degrees the propensity to abuse their position and cause suffering to fellow men and/or women. Hence, Trial must be by the Jury of social-equals, not by a government judge, tribunal or employee. Every adult citizen and juror has the principal duty and social obligation to resist crime, including those crimes which are visited upon the people by those acting in the name of government. To combat such crime, it is the duty of jurors to judge the legality and justice of every statute and regulation being prosecuted, and likewise to judge each act of enforcement. To this end, common law requires Jurors before trial to receive simple instructions on “malice aforethought,” to apprise them of the means by which crime and guilt are defined, recognised and innocence is established, along with the other Duties of Jurors; ref. below.

It should be noted that the duty of the common law Juror to judge the justice of the law and annul the enforcement of such law as the juror deems unjust, apocryphal or otherwise unlawful, places the common law superior to statute law.

In every case, all law which is enforced but has not been judged on by Jurors in the Common Law Trial by Jury — such law is potentially tyrannical; the act of its enforcement is always despotic and illegitimate. Such acts of enforcement anywhere are illegal and unlawful; ref. the Universal Criterion of Justice.
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NOTES: (i) A. Annulment by Jury is the proper term (not ‘jury nullification’). Annulment by Jury expresses active authority; a positive action taken by a jury over something that the jury is empowered to annul.

B. By contrast, the words “jury nullification” are linguistically incompetent because such wording expresses the opposite of the meaning intended by the user of the words: for, “jury nullification” first indicates that something is done to a jury; that the jurors are passive recipients of an act of ‘nullification’; namely, that the jury is nullified, null and void. Because use of the unclear, incorrect expression has become quite widespread it is necessary sometimes to explain the proper term, but since the words “jury nullification” convey a meaning quite the opposite of what the user of the words means, the expression should be removed from the Educator’s vocabulary.

(ii) Annulment by Jury describes the beneficial phenomenon which brings justice by saving the innocent from the oppression of unjust prosecutions. The expression ‘jury nullification’ has been invented by people antithetical to and in derision of Trial by Jury, and subsequently it is spread about by people who do not understand the importance of words and the (subconscious) effect that they can have upon people. To individuals who have not yet been educated on this subject, the term ‘jury nullification’ can set up all sorts of wrong ideas and prejudices which may be difficult to eradicate. In other words, use of the wrong terminology ‘jury nullification’ assists the enemies of the sovereign duty and right of the citizen in Trial by Jury to annul unjust laws and illegal acts of enforcement.

(iii) Note that, in particular, many lawyers and judges like to use the wrong term which suggests that the jury is nullified... For self-interested ulterior motives, these people want to gain a final overthrow of constitution, justice, Trial by Jury and the Rule of Law. (Because the wrong expression has become widespread, sometimes in campaign literature one has to add, or use, ‘jury nullification’ to make sure people gather that annulment by jury is actually the phenomenon under discussion.) It is constructive to get people used to hearing the correct term.

ANNULMENT-BY-JURY AS CRIME PREVENTION.

Consider that the unjust, venal, crime-engendering, politically-partisan, inequitable, inherently-illegal statutes extant today; the enforcement of injustices by incompetent or prejudiced judges; and, the prosecutions which are unfounded or do not adduce convincing evidence — all these must be emphatically annulled by the Juror (one or more jurors) rendering the Not Guilty Verdict. For Justice to be upheld, the Foreman or Forewoman of the Jury then pronounces to the court the Verdict of Not Guilty.

Yet, in the corrupted, illegal ‘trial’ format seen today, a jury may be said to be ‘hung’ when unanimity cannot be agreed upon, and the government prosecutor may go for new trials in front of different juries until obtaining the government-desired ‘guilty verdict’. Nowadays, only with a unanimous verdict of Not Guilty
may the cause not be re-tried. For the reasons given, ‘majority verdicts’ are illegal: crude contraventions of justice and of legem terræ common law.

According to the civilised, constitutional and supreme universal legem terræ common law, government may only act against a party, his (or her) goods, or person, according to, and not more than, the lawful sentence of a jury following Common Law Trial by Jury. Where a juror cannot in all good conscience find ‘guilt’, the accused must be pronounced Not Guilty. For whatever private reason, or one which may have been debated by the jury in the privacy of the jury room (such as judging on the justice of the law or the act of enforcement; or the lack of conviction produced by the tenuous nature of the evidence, etc.), this Not Guilty Verdict must be returned to the court by the Foreman or woman of the Jury, who, along with all the jurors, should be instructed prior to trial regarding this important matter.

It defeats the entire object of Trial by Jury to have the decision of a sworn juror ‘overruled’ by ‘majorities’ or judges making ‘rulings’. Judges have no judicial authority, otherwise the Trial is not by Jury, but is trial-by-judge. See the explanation and ruling of Chief Justice Vaughan in his recognition of, and accord for, the finding of the Not Guilty Verdict in the famed Old Bailey trial of Mead and Penn, who later was Founder of Pennsylvania.

See Campaign Philosophy web-Page Two.

**KING ALFRED THE GREAT (LAWGIVER) RECOGNISED CONSTITUTIONAL LEGEM TERRÆ COMMON LAW TRIAL BY JURY.**

The Principle of Unanimity was understood, and definitively and constitutionally established by King Alfred the Great in the following way:

King Alfred had Justice (judge) Cadwine hanged because Cadwine had a man named Hackwy put to death by hanging, without the unanimity of the jury of twelve men. In this case, three jurors pronounced the Not Guilty verdict against nine. Cadwine removed the three and selected three others who would also pronounce ‘guilt’.

Similarly, King Alfred had Justice Frebern hanged, because Frebern hanged a man called Harpin when the jurors were still in doubt as to their verdict. Alfred established that when there is a doubt, it is in the interests of all people that justice should save rather than condemn.

See “The Mirror of Justices,” compiled and published by Andrew Horne in Old French. The Mirror was written within a century after Magna Carta. It contains an account of Alfred’s acts and judgements, thought to have been originally composed by him.
In addition to the absolute requirement of unanimity, from these examples we see that jurors require always to be chosen by lot (chance) from the whole body of adult citizens; and that the selection shall be made in some mode that excludes the possibility of choice on the part of the prosecution and government.

To protect all the People against any government bent on injustice, it is the vital principle of Trial by Jury that government legislation shall be subjected to the judgement of a tribunal taken from the whole people indiscriminately, without any choice by the government, and over which choice the government exercises no control. If government can select jurors, it will select those favourable to its prosecutions and enactments, excluding from juries those whom the law treats unjustly. Exclusion of any men and women from eligibility is an illegal selection of those not excluded.

Juries must be randomly chosen in order that they represent diversity of views amongst the people of the country. The Principle of Unanimity combines with the principles of Random Selection and the principle of Impartiality which forbids the selection of jurors being influenced or made by any officer of the government. Together, these principles protect minorities and groups from the partisans of a potentially oppressive government which seeks to impose unfair laws.

The Common Law Trial by Jury guarantees the universal right of individuals to judge the justice of any law that is to be enforced on the people and their peers (social-equals), so that arbitrary government and bad law are rejected and innocent liberties are preserved. If the Trial is to be fair, it is essential that it be by a jury of peers, a citizen’s equals. Hence, common law excludes from juries those who would prejudice proceedings, including: A.) those who make statutes and regulations; B.) those who could gain materially or in particular benefit from the law or its enforcement; and C.) those who are connected in some way with plaintiff or defendant, their objectivity possibly being compromised.

The common law governing jury selection further ensures fairness: the choice is made by discussions and discreet votes of ‘the triers’ themselves (the fellow jurors); never by prosecutors or convenors, i.e., judges. The plaintiff, defendant and their counsel may make representations to the jurors against the inclusion of a particular citizen on the panel of jurors, on the above grounds, A, B and C.

Such are reasons and considerations why Guilt can only be pronounced by a jury unanimous in its verdict.

The modern politicians care greatly for respect they maintain is due for their legislation which attempts social engineering by claimed political ‘correctness’, suppressing freedom of expression, speech and the press. Its attention to detail distracts to obscure the legislation’s incorrigibility—its untruth and incorrectness beyond reform—which itself provokes widespread unrest and friction. According to decency and remain legal, politicians’ dicta must instead follow the constitutional democratic justice system, leaving citizen-juries to
decide in each case, if indeed there be a case at all, to enforce only that which
common law’s common sense and fairness prescribe.

Abuse and denial of Trial by Jury by politicians and judges is the very
embodiment of immorality, crime and anti-constitutional decadence. Politicians’ biased laws, which are invariably imposed today to promote a
crude antidemocratic agenda, together with the associated illegal rulings of
their unprincipled career judiciary, are a tried and tested source of division,
progressively increasing social turbulence by which ever harsher legislative
measures become engrained and the complete loss of liberty inevitable.

Our political ‘leaders’ and their camp followers undermine and destroy
democracy while they allege in all enthusiasm to support it. As with all people
of criminal inclinations, these fellows show complete indifference to truth, as
much from a desire to conceal it, as from the incapacity to recognise it.

The names of ‘liberty’ and ‘democracy’ are misused by legislators as a
pretext for suppressing everything which makes liberty valuable to the People:
for politicians’ measures obstruct and pervert the administration and course of
justice; undermine tasteful values and the pursuit of excellence; stifle
competition and oppose variety; discourage development of personal initiative,
trade, skills, craft, and ordinary people’s accumulation of property and financial
independence. Vast taxation and resources are maladministered and squandered
to produce nothing of authentic merit. Politicians and state bureaucrats
‘sacredly’ maintain the forms and formalities of legislative “freedom” — while
denying its substance. They do not understand and cannot see liberty as liberty,
but as articles of institutionalised population-control law.

Already complex and mixed, our Western society is being propelled by its
sordid political masters into a vortex of crime, mistrust and confrontation,
concomitant with intermittent riot and violence. This is the familiar formula, the
historically repeated environment which enables the demagogue to emerge and
take control, with all the adverse results thereby entailed.

Modern legislatures shackle the population with thousands of pages of new
illegal restrictions and ‘laws’ every year, of dubious intentions, committee-evolved
double-talk, and outright despotism. After the trauma of World War II, great hopes
were raised for the future of mankind by U.N. member countries’ recognition of
the values scripted into the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948).
Eleanor Roosevelt, respected widow of the U.S. president, in her speech to the
U.N. assembly to inaugurate the Declaration, acknowledged the significance of
Magna Carta by expressing the wish that the U.N. Declaration would become “a
new Magna Carta for the world.” Would that it were so ! One appreciates those
good intentions voiced, but it must be understood now and for all time:

The significance, unstated and therefore probably not understood by Eleanor
Roosevelt, of the traditional European legem terræ common law constitution,
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that is, of Magna Carta, the U.S. and Australian Constitutions, etc., is in their installation of Trial by Jury as the sole justice system, and through it, the sovereign legal empowerment of ordinary citizens as Jurors to judge their laws and liberties for themselves.

This Principle and Eternal Criterion of Justice is acknowledged not only by those impartial intellectuals learned in the esoteric aspects of history and law (viz. presidents, chief justices, academics and legal authorities referred to herein) but by all men and women who have an understanding of human nature.

“The Jury has the Right to determine both the law and facts,” according to U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Samuel Chase.


IV. THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLE DERIVES FROM THE ETERNAL CRITERION OF JUSTICE (ITEM II):

“All powers of government, executive, legislative and judicial, derive from the sovereign people, whose right it is to designate the administrators of the state and, in final appeal, to decide all questions of social and national policy according to the requirements of the individual and common good.”

To renge on such a Principle is to commit the Crime against Humanity of promoting strife, ruin, tyranny, misery and disaster. This paper outlines the legal and moral justification of the Trial by Jury Justice System by which “to decide all questions” in the civilised society.

V. THE OVERALL, “BIGGER PICTURE.”

Rather than ‘watchdog’ protecting the interests of the people, the Rule of Law and upholding Justice, the judges’ criminal participation in the onward march of illegal government promotes the criminality which is trampling the decent, civilised Australian way of life. Flora associates, from their writings however flawed, do show themselves to be aware of the courts’ willingness to sustain the illegitimate legislation of an antidemocratic agenda; viz. Flora quoting Judge White’s alleged observation, “Soviet Russia would be proud of these laws.” Yet, Flora are prepared to deal with the courts, the very villains whose criminal dereliction of their professional, civic and moral human duty is at the nub of the problem. All adults, Flora notwithstanding, should be aware that the duty of law-abiding citizens is to denounce, arrest, prosecute and try criminals, not to appease and yield to their lawlessness, thereby encouraging it.

Let us recall, Trial by Jury was created specifically to bring despots and participants in illegal government to justice, to eliminate and obtain redress for their criminal activities and schemes. Trial by Jury remains the only responsible, peaceful means of doing so, for it unites all the people behind their Justice System, which is backed by the complete apparatus of the Rule of Law.
and enforcement together with the people’s armed services, thus creating
government of the people, by the people, for the people: democracy.

In the timeless cause of Equal Justice, predictably, the people’s pan-European
and pan-Occidental legem terræ common law (e.g., expressed as Article 61 of the
Great Charter Constitution, Magna Carta of 1215) recognises and permanently installs
the people as the legal force to police, arrest, indict, try, punish and otherwise
obtain redress over wrongdoers acting as, or in the name of, government.
See “Magna Carta, Article 61;” Democracy Defined Campaign Philosophy; URL below.

The authentic Trial by Jury Justice System operates either
(i) as a means of cost-free* private civil, criminal or fiscal prosecution to
establish rights and punish or obtain redress for wrongs, including those
committed by persons in government, or
(ii) as a right by which to establish a person’s innocence in defence from
prosecution.
*According to common law, cost-free prosecutions can be brought by private
citizens to a Trial by Jury. It is not the ‘preserve’ of the state prosecution service
and the legal profession. However, vexatious and malicious litigation which
wastes the court’s (i.e., the jury’s) time can be decided upon and fined by juries.
See “The Workings and Results of the Trial by Jury Justice System;” URL below.

VI. NOTA BENE:
If a citizen is unable to obtain Trial by Jury for either of the aforesaid
purposes (i) and (ii), that fact establishes The Illegality of the Status Quo.

It then becomes the principal duty of every adult (Flora and farmers
notwithstanding) to restore legality to society by campaigning for Restoration and
Universal Adoption of Constitutional Common Law Trial by Jury. Whereas all
injustices, crimes and wrongs from petty tyranny to genocidal holocaust may flow
from denial of the genuine Trial by Jury, it is only from the society based on Trial
by Jury that Equal Justice, Civilisation and definitive democracy can emerge.

Never let it be forgotten that throughout the History of the World right up to
date, ALL THE GREATEST CRIMES have been and are being perpetrated by,
and in the name of, government.

~
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PART TWO
VII. WHAT IS THE AUTHENTIC TRIAL BY JURY JUSTICE SYSTEM?

THE JUROR’S DUTIES IN TRIAL BY JURY.

Trial by Jury was constitutionally emplaced for the purposes of:

A.) not only ascertaining guilt or innocence of the accused and where necessary for apportioning retribution, but also

B.) of transcendent importance, as a barrier to protect the vast mass of innocent citizenry from the crimes of arbitrary government, i.e., unjust laws, tyranny; and from the corruption, prejudices and incompetence of fallible justices (judges). Trial by Jury enables the people to judge authoritatively what their liberties and laws are (as explained below), so that the people retain all the liberties which they wish to enjoy.

Wherever Trial by Jury takes place, be it in the U.S., the U.K., Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and numerous other countries, it is DEFINITIVE of Trial by Jury that, after swearing to convict the guilty and acquit the innocent, in finding their Verdict,

The Jurors Judge:
~on the justice of the law, and annul, by pronouncing the Not Guilty Verdict, any law or act of enforcement which is deemed unfair or unjust according to the juror’s conscience (i.e., sense of right and wrong);
~in addition to the facts, and
~on the admissibility of evidence (evidence not being pre-selected or screened-out by government or judge and/or prosecutor).

Jurors Must Judge:
~that the accused acted with malice aforethought, i.e., mens rea, a premeditated malicious motive, in order for them to find guilt (‘guilt’ is a characteristic inherent or absent in motives and actions: it cannot be ascribed by legislation*);
~on the nature and gravity of the alleged offence; and where guilt is unanimously found,
~on mitigating circumstances if any (provocation; temptation; incitation); and
~set the sentence (with regard to its being fit and just).

* There is no moral justice nor political necessity (i.e., deterrent value) for punishing where there was no mens rea. (As noted, where one person injured another innocently or accidentally, a civil law suit and Trial by Jury award appropriate compensation for damages.)

N.B. For jurors not to do the above, or for someone other than the jurors to make any such decisions, is another process: call it ‘trial-by-someone-else’ if you will, or ‘trial-by-the-judge’— but this travesty cannot be defined as Trial BY JURY.
“There is only one Trial by Jury. It is mere falsehood to call a procedure ‘trial by jury’ if the accused and any of the matters related to the case under judgement are tried by someone other than the Jury. There is no process and no meaning to the words Trial by Jury other than that which the words themselves prescribe.”


Consider Harlan F. Stone, U.S. Chief Justice 1941-1946, on the Juror’s Duty in the Trial by Jury Justice System, as follows:

“If a juror feels that the statute involved in any criminal offence is unfair, or that it infringes upon the defendant’s natural God-given unalienable or Constitutional rights, then it is his duty to affirm that the offending statute is really no law at all and that the violation of it is no crime at all, for no one is bound to obey an unjust law.”

“That juror must vote Not Guilty regardless of the pressures or abuses that may be heaped on him by any or all members of the jury with whom he may in good conscience disagree. He is voting on the justice of the law according to his own conscience and convictions and not someone else’s. The law itself is on trial quite as much as the case which is to be decided.”


By contrast, here is Flora’s approach: Editor Sue Maynes’s e-mail:

“This government are enjoying watching people like John [Wilson] jump up and down about juries, because it means he is not focusing on the bigger picture. And if we don’t get the bigger picture clarified, then his jumping up and down can go on until he disappears in the hole he creates. No skin off their nose whatsoever.”

While ridiculing John Wilson, Flora associates’ (i.e., some of the affected farmers), abysmal response is one of tunnel vision seemingly induced by self-interest in pursuit of farmers’ monetary compensation by litigation. They are either ignoring or incapable of perceiving the “bigger picture.”

Flora does not denounce and indict the current lawlessness of the Australian courts. Instead of campaigning to raise righteous indignation in every Australian citizen for the de facto loss of their country, and motivating the mass of the people to appropriate actions to restore Trial by Jury as their means of just ascendance over wayward politicians and judges, in purblind self-interest Flora ignores the bigger picture. In obsequious subservience, Flora attempts to appease and treat with those very officials of the corrupted antidemocratic illegal statist government, the enemies of justice and the people. Flora thereby encourages the very influences which illegally aggrieve and damage farmers and antagonise every citizen of probity.

Rather than resistance to the state perversion and obstruction of the course of justice, and campaigning against the malicious criminal intentions and actions of politicians and judges, Flora capitulates to institutionalised illegality.

Flora adopts incorrectness, impotence, and the dangers implicit in pursuing their self-interest in the corrupted Australian courts and justice system, at the
cost of deserting Principles and morality, ignoring the tenets of law and justice, forsaking Australia’s legal heritage, and obtusely failing to understand that ALL power resides in an aroused populace. Government may only act as the people permit, and the esteem of the people can alone bestow authority.

The courts (judges) to whom Flora is applying for ‘justice’ are the very people selected and richly rewarded to enforce the legislation of parliament without regard to whether the measures are unjust, arbitrary, and hence tyrannical and illegal.

Furthermore, in an ultimate dismal irony, Flora’s hopeless present course is unable to achieve results which are permanent. This is because, whereas NO parliament or judge can supersede the decision of the JURY, parliament certainly can legislate to reverse the decisions of judges on law. So, Flora’s approach to courts cannot safeguard farmers’ rights against the whim of politicians even temporarily, still less for future generations.

Furthermore, the circulated writings of Flora and associates consist of incorrect statements on “common law,” wrong ‘advice’ and choices, misinformation, adverse decisions and proposals. Regardless of whether farmers now receive some compensation, the outcome of their being led by Flora into the current wrong way of proceeding will ultimately have been an exercise in futility and fruitless selfishness. For it turns its back on the supreme secular moral and constitutional laws which bind government and judiciary. Flora’s is an act of tergiversation which invites and encourages all the injuries and injustice of which rogue government is capable.

For ease of reading, here is a transcription of the Plaque:
“Near this site William Penn and William Mead were tried in 1670 for preaching to an unlawful assembly in Grace Church Street. This tablet commemorates the courage and endurance of the Jury, Thos (Thomas) Vere, Edward Bushell and ten others who refused to give a verdict against them although locked up without food for two nights and were fined for their final Verdict of Not Guilty. The case of these Jurymen was reviewed on a writ of Habeas Corpus and Chief Justice Vaughan delivered the opinion of the Court which established The Right of Juries to give their Verdict according to their Convictions.”
IN PROTECTION OF AUSTRALIANS’ RIGHTS IN GENERAL AND
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According to legem terræ common law it is the juror’s duty in Trial by Jury to judge the justice of the law and every act of enforcement, and to render the Not Guilty Verdict whenever conviction or punishment of the accused would be unfair, according to the juror’s conscience. The Juror acquits any persons accused under an arbitrary, unjust or apocryphal statute, regulation or prosecution (unanimity required to protect minorities). Trial by Jury is the central tenet and sole justice system of the People’s legem terræ common law of the land, which is superior to statutes or regulations made by national or local governments and the rulings of judges.

The only peaceful mechanism known to mankind for obtaining equal justice in ALL causes is the Trial by Jury. This is “the bigger picture,” the overall solution to crime, government injustices, despotism of every type, and the complete answer to tyranny including that being experienced by the farmers.

Trial by Jury constitutes the sole means for securing the Australian democratic way of life; the rights to liberty, property, privacy, to have and be part of a family, to live in unmolested tranquillity and enjoy the pursuit of happiness; for the sovereign people to decide and enforce their laws and liberties for themselves.

VIII. LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT UPHOLDS
THE DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE.

The democratic Principle of our traditional Western Constitutions’ Trial by Jury is that it is the Will of the People represented by indiscriminately chosen Jurors, not the will of the court or the current transient government, that must determine what laws shall be established, maintained, and how they are enforced. In this way, Trial by Jury is the common law’s Mechanism of Authority by which all the rights of all the People are protected, and on which all rights depend. Hence, Thomas Jefferson’s “anchor”:

“I consider Trial by Jury as the only anchor yet imagined by man, by which a government can be held to the principles of its constitution.”

Lawyer Thomas Jefferson; U.S. President; Author of the Declaration of Independence; co-Founder of the Democratic Party.

Flora and Australian farmers reject a focused unceasing campaign for RESTORATION of the Trial by Jury Justice System upon which all rights depend, and litigate instead for their self-interests (money; compensation) within the corrupted, illegitimate statist system. Flora participates in, aids and abets the current Australian crime of illegal government.

By denial of Trial by Jury, ALL the rights of ALL Australians, not just the farmers, are under terminal threat from politicians. The treatment by government of the farmers provides but one example of rising tyranny bitterly experienced by countless citizens. Be aware that the farmers would have no difficulty in maintaining their legitimate rights if they first upheld the Trial by
Jury Justice System for all. There is not a single jury to be found in Australia (or probably the entire World) of common law randomly-selected jurors that would unanimously suppress farmers’ private ownership and use rights.

Moreover, under the parameters of the common law governing the authentic Trial by Jury, ‘guilt’ cannot be prescribed by legislation. According to common law Trial by Jury, ‘guilt’ is defined as an act of injustice committed with malice aforethought, and is an attribute inherent or absent in motives and actions. Even with the most incompetent litigant’s or counsel’s presentation of the issues, it remains a virtual impossibility for Jurors unanimously to find ‘guilt’ in farmers going about their normal business.

IX. A CONSEQUENCE OF ACCEPTING ILLEGAL GOVERNMENT: CONSTITUTIONAL DESPOTISM’S TRIAL-BY-JUDGE.

Australians and farmers, beware! There is always a price to be paid for dealing with criminals, whether they be governments or any persons who contravene, or do not uphold the tenets of equity and the universal secular common law and justice. Ultimately, it is lethal. That is why Trial by Jury is constitutionally emplaced to protect you.

Current affairs and history relate a chilling litany of the judiciary’s desertion of the principles of equity and justice in complacent careers of depraved cruel enforcement of grotesque injustices on citizens innocent of any crime (no mens rea). Apparently ‘cultured’, judges past and present nevertheless ‘justify’ and enforce the most abject of legislation, e.g., Nürnberg Race Laws; despotic statist* ‘constitutions’; complicity in the establishing of an agenda biased in favour of particular individuals against the legitimate interests of others; primitive ‘religious’ oppressions; massively crime-generating inherently illegal commodity ‘prohibitions’; etc. This is the interminable calamity of terrorising governments’ trial-by-judge.

Definition. statist, one who believes in absolute control of the People by government officials in all aspects of life, social, economic and other; as opposed to the democrat [not party-political] who, as shown herein, believes in control of the government by the People. To achieve this end and protect the innocent from arbitrary government, the democratic person uncompromisingly insists and requires ordinary citizens as jurors in Trial by Jury to have the final say and control of every act of law enforcement.

Without Trial by Jury — no matter how many new ‘Bills of Rights’, ‘European Conventions on Human Rights’ or fabricated ‘constitutions’ — when it comes to true justice, these legislative contrivances are figments: worthless, shaming pieces of paper — fine-worded fatal “Munich guarantees.” This is so because judges are governments’ paid and bound obligants, who continuously, unconscionably, and judicably enforce injustices and infract the laws and tenets which normal human decency and democratic constitutions emplace.
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The trial-by-judge technique of tyranny requires to be truthfully explained to populations everywhere, for the injustice it embodies, the servility it imposes, and the maelstrom of crime, corruption, misery and strife it always engenders. Given the choice, nowhere is this trial-by-judge uncivilised mode acceptable, even to people in the rudest state of development; still less to citizens in a condition of relative enlightenment. Trial by Jury is relevant to every race, nation and society on Earth, bar none.

**X. FLORA AND JOHN WILSON’S APPROACH IS WRONG.**

We have considerable trepidation for John Wilson in his forthcoming “trial.” Instead of educating the population and campaigning for socio-political RESTORATION of the Constitutional Trial by Jury Justice System, JW is making the same fundamental mistake as Flora associates: they are all choosing to work *within the present illegal, anti-constitutional system*; in supplication on their knees to crooks and tyrants whose criminality and acts are visibly dismantling Australia. Working *within* the present corrupted system, JW will not receive any process remotely like a real Trial by Jury.

It is certain that, whatever temporary or small concessions they might gain, without the RESTORATION of the authentic Trial by Jury, neither farmers nor John will receive the protection of the People and the due results of Equal Justice. Unless the *genuine* Trial by Jury takes place, with Jurors performing all their duties and responsibilities (as above), the annulment of unjust prosecutions cannot generally come to fruition, let alone achieve the associated objective of the expunction of apocryphal legislation. This is because, even though the jury-box is full of citizens, today we have definitively the trial-by-judge: a beholden government employee is lucratively remunerated to enforce the will and intentions of politicians expressed as ‘legislation’, regardless of its injustice and breaches of principles, rights, liberty and equal justice. If they demur from this tyrannical task they swiftly cease to be judges.

The process which people nowadays are misled into imagining is a “trial by jury” is NOT Constitutional Trial by Jury, because all the Jurors’ duties (above Item VII) which define the process as being a Trial *by Jury*, are denied, interfered with and obstructed by the courts (judges).

**TAKE BUT ONE EXAMPLE:**

If the evidence is controlled, screened, pre-selected and its admissibility is decided by someone other than the jurors, then the outcome or verdict can be predetermined by someone other than the jury; and the process is an illegal masquerade. If the judge excludes the evidence by which the injustice, invalidity or corruption of a law is established, then the juror, despite being “informed” of his or her power to annul prosecution, could not begin to do so.
However, in the *authentic* Trial by Jury it is the jurors who decide on the admissibility of evidence... To ascertain the truth, the jurors must see all the evidence and decide which evidence is relevant. Jurors cannot try an issue unless it is they who determine what evidence is admissible.

Where before jurors swore simply and justly “to convict the guilty and acquit the innocent,” government has inserted the words, “according to the evidence,” into jurors’ oaths. This violates natural law, legem terrae common law, Magna Carta, and honesty, because this wording duplicitously means “only that evidence which the government [i.e., the judge] allows the jury to receive.”

If the government can dictate the evidence, and the jury is required to find the verdict according to that evidence, then government can dictate the verdict which the jury must reach. In that case, the trial is really a pretence, not a “trial” at all. It is also a rigmarole of a pretended “trial” by the government, not by a jury. This sums up the corrupt process which takes place today. It is a shameful calumnious criminal subterfuge.

In genuine Trial by Jury, the jurors and only the jurors decide on the admissibility of the evidence. It is one of the most serious *crimes* it is possible to commit, and an immoral act, knowingly to withhold from jurors evidence which, if they saw it, would change the verdict. Yet, today, jurors are permitted only to consider such evidence as the judge chooses to allow, *a process:*

(i) in which all evidence is screened out from consideration by the jurors if it “disputes” the legality of the law, i.e., the validity and effects, the foundation and veracity, the equity or the justice of the law;
(ii) which pre-judges and condemns countless INNOCENT people (by definition, no malice aforethought, no *mens rea*: NOT GUILTY); and,
(iii) which is a *trial-by-judge,* not a trial by the jurors, i.e., not Trial by Jury.

Other contemporary violations of common law Trial by Jury are witnessed in governments’ exclusions of numerous classes of eligible adults from jury selection pools; manipulative ‘administrative selection’ methods; ‘packing’ of juries; voir dire; changed, duplicitous jurors’ oaths; judges’ misinstructions to juries, denying or forbidding the Juror’s Duty to judge the justice of the law and the act of enforcement; judges’ instruction that the law must be upheld as the judge dictates it to the jury, regardless of the Juror’s conscience and opinion of the law; in perjurious, unlawful support of apocryphal legislation, judges misinform juries by falsely assigning ‘guilt’ to innocent citizens (by definition and according to common law, no malice aforethought: Not Guilty); etc. The list continues and is exceedingly long, these actions by judges constituting *judicable tampering.* On those occasions where a “trial by jury” purports to be enacted, the seditious subterfuge which actually occurs is a *trial-by-judge...* and a more corrupt, one-sided, unjust rigmarole would be difficult to invent.
XI. CHURCHILL’S VIEW.

The Juror is sovereign in Trial by Jury. Trial by Jury defines civilisation and democracy, sine qua non. Constitutions and governments which deny the Common Law Trial by Jury Justice System install constitutional despotism. Only as long as juries of ordinary citizens have the final say, government remains the servant, not the master, of the people. This is explained by Winston Churchill, as follows:

“The power of the Executive to cast a man into prison without formulating any charge known to the law, and particularly to deny him the judgement of his peers is in the highest degree odious and is the foundation of all totalitarian government, whether Nazi or Communist.”


NOTES. (i) Trial by Jury is also known as “the judgement of pares” or “peers.” The words ‘pares’ and ‘parium’ mean ‘equals’ in the sense of social-equals. “per judicium parium suorum” translates as “according to the judgement of his or her equals.” Peer from Latin ‘parium’ means ‘equal’ as it does in the word ‘peerless’ meaning ‘matchless’ or ‘without equal’.

(ii) The words parium, pares or peers meaning ‘equals’ should not be confused with the later English word ‘peer’ meaning ‘lord’ or ‘titled person’. Ignorance of the Latin has caused some people to misconstrue meanings and incorrectly claim the Charter balanced justice only in favour of “the barons,” whereas correct translation from the Latin conveys a conspicuous egalitarianism. See Magna Carta Essay on the URL below.

(iii) Totalitarianism is an illegal form of government; viz. the Nuremburg Precedent. It is only by the people maintaining control of the justice system through Trial by Jury that government is prevented from assuming despotic, totalitarian power.

XII. MAY EVERY CITIZEN BEWARE !

“If a juror or any citizen accepts as the law that which the judge states, then that juror or citizen has accepted the exercise of absolute authority of a government employee and has surrendered a power and right that was once the citizen’s safeguard of liberty.”

Bancroft’s History of the U.S. Constitution.

“The saddest epitaph which can be carved in memory of vanished liberty is that it was lost because its possessors failed to stretch forth a saving hand while there was time.”

Ibid.
Complacent, insouciant, ignorant servile populations of Westerners, e.g., Americans, British, Germans, French, Italians, Spanish and other Europeans, New Zealanders, Canadians and Australians, have allowed antidemocratic politicians to strip them of their legal protections which are universal, inherent and inalienable: the Juror’s Rights and Duty and the Trial by Jury Justice System. People have permitted institutionalisation of despotic attitudes. Oppression has taken root and become widespread even in the former great bastions of democracy.

Trial-by-judge is the system which denies the common law Trial by Jury. Trial-by-judge is the National Socialist (NAZI), Stalinist, Soviet, fascist and communist system of judicial oppression, by which primitive tyranny thrives; massive injustices are routinely enforced on innocent people; and citizens are intentionally put into permanent fear and servitude.

*Neither in the United States, Britain, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, nor in all of Europe and elsewhere, have legislatures ever been invested by the People with authority to impair the powers, to change the oaths, or abridge the jurisdiction of jurors to govern government; nor to remove the universal Right of the accused to the Trial by Jury of peers for any charge or offence whatever, however serious or trivial.*

©Kenn d’Oudney.
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Kenn d’Oudney is the author of books and essays including the following:
Kenn d’Oudney est auteur de livres et essais y compris les suivants:
Kenn d’Oudney ist Autor von Büchern und Essays einschließlich der folgenden:

**MYTHS DISPELLED: AN OPEN LETTER TO JAMES MADISON (descendant).**
Essay: read it and see for yourself how the Constitution’s Justice System is *supposed* to work to protect rights, liberty, property ownership and use, and achieve equal justice for all... and discover... THE ILLEGALITY OF THE STATUS QUO.

“Hi Kenn:
*What a magnificent article! I intend to incorporate parts of it into my speeches and writings.*

*Yours in freedom and justice,*”
Professor Julian Heicklen,
Jury Rights’ Activist;
Coordinator, Tyranny Fighters; U.S.

“Kenn d’Oudney is a brilliant writer and researcher when it comes to Democracy and Trial by Jury. The best source of common law is Kenn d’Oudney.”
Dr. John Wilson,
Jury Rights’ Activist;
co-Founder & Chairman, Australian Common Law Party.

“Superb. Should be read in every law school.”
John Walsh, Barrister-at-Law,
Author; Constitutional lawyer (U.S. & Australia).

**MAGNA CARTA, THE GREAT CHARTER CONSTITUTION**; freely downloadable information about pan-European legem terræ, the Common Law, whose central tenet and sole justice system is the Trial by Jury, defining the *true* European and pan-Occidental Constitution;
[http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedmaterial.htm](http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedmaterial.htm)

“Thank you for your excellent work on Magna Carta. What a masterly exposition.”
JOHN GOURIET, Chairman, Defenders of the Realm; Battle for Britain Campaign supported by the Duke of Wellington; Edward Fox, OBE, and Frederick Forsyth, CBE.

“Kenn, Your rebuttal is masterly. Your essay is a very good read.”
ROBIN TILBROOK, Chairman & Party Leader; English Democrat Party.

“Thank you so much for this contribution. It is very much appreciated.”
ASHLEY MOTE, MEP (Member of the European Parliament); Vice-President, Alliance of Independent Democrats in Europe.

“Thanks, Kenn. I’ve circulated this.”
SIMON RICHARDS, Campaign Director; Freedom Association; Founded by John Gouriet; the Viscount de L’Isle, VC, KG, PC; Ross McWhirter and Norris McWhirter, CBE.
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THE REPORT, CANNABIS: THE FACTS, HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE LAW 9781902848204, co-authored by Joanna d’Oudney; Foreword by a Nobel laureate former Official Adviser to the U.S. government; endorsed by a Professor of Physiology Fellow of the Royal Society, academics, doctors (of a variety of disciplines) and judges (U.S. & U.K.); 260 large-size pages; http://www.democracydefined.org/lreport.htm

“You have done a splendid job of producing a comprehensive summary of the evidence documenting that the prohibition of the production, sale and use of cannabis is utterly unjustified and produces many harmful effects. Any impartial person reading your REPORT will almost certainly end up favouring the re-legalisation of cannabis.”

NOBEL LAUREATE PROFESSOR MILTON FRIEDMAN, former Economics’ Adviser to U.S. government; Author, video and TV series writer and presenter; Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace; Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago.

“You represent a worthy part of the fight in many countries for the logical and beneficial use of cannabis. I thank you for that.”

PROFESSOR PATRICK D. WALL, M.D., Author; Professor of Physiology, UMDS St. Thomas’s (Teaching) Hospital, London; Fellow of the Royal Society; DM, FRCP.

“I did enjoy reading it. THE REPORT should contribute much.”

THE HON. JONATHON PORRITT, Bt., former Adviser to U.K. government on Environment; Author; Founder, Friends of the Earth; TV series writer and presenter.


SO YOU THOUGHT CANNABIS PROHIBITION HAS NO EFFECT UPON YOU?

THE REPORT ISBN 9781902848204: Part (chapter) Two contains the unprecedented (new) Cannabis Biomass Energy Equation (CBEE; Modern Uses) which proves the clean-combusting cannabis-product pyrolytic CH3OH is the production-cost-free, i.e., FREE, immediate non-polluting, renewable, total world replacement for fossils and uranium, whilst simultaneously significantly increasing world production of staple seed food (protein-rich; no relaxant in seed). The CBEE exposes the bankowner-corporate-government monumental ulterior motive behind fraudulent prohibition. ‘Prohibition’ is a venal, cartel-fabricated subterfuge; a false fuel-energy MONOPOLY.

The CBEE Formulation proffers CH3OH oil-gasoline-type fuel combustion for all power-station, industrial, land, sea and air transportation and domestic energy supply, with ZERO net atmospheric increase of CO2; viz. the CBEE thereby simultaneously demonstrates governments’ mendacity in their claims to wish to reduce carbon emissions, and proves the “eco” and “carbon taxes” to be fraudulent: a criminal government imposture completely without foundation. The misuse of exorbitant, world-economy-depressing fossils and uranium as ‘fuel’ is potentially catastrophic, legally and economically unjustifiable, and requires to be prohibited forthwith.

See pyrolysis diagrams, photo, equation, etc.

Part Six of THE REPORT, PROHIBITION: THE PROGENITOR OF CRIME.

“To cause crime to occur is to be accountable for the crime, morally and legally. To consent to any measure is to share responsibility for its results.”
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Legalised, cannabis grows anywhere: the benign herb’s foliage and flowers come free or at an insignificant price, but yielding no revenues to government and no profits to corporations. However, prohibition creates the Black Market: the Economic Effects of Prohibition (scarcity + enforcement, etc.) augment “street” value by 3000% plus, making all Black Market associated crime inevitable. The political commodities’ prohibition, the War on Drugs, rather that is to say, the politicians who pass and the judiciaries who maintain the legislation engender (cause) and are culpable for not less than 75 - 80 percent of all crimes (official statistics) throughout the West.

EXONERATIVE FINDINGS OF FACT; Official Empirical Research; THE REPORT collates the medico-scientific Findings of Fact and Conclusions of the government-funded clinical studies conducted by world-respected research and academic institutions into non-toxic, non-addictive natural herb cannabis (differentiated from pharmaceutical laboratory toxic product THC). The investigations’ empirical evidence exonerates cannabis from all allegations of ‘harm’ and ‘impairment’ (including tests on simulated driving) exempting cannabis from all legislative criteria of control (‘prohibition’). All citizens persecuted thereunder are due Amnesty and Restitution (as for other Wrongful Penalisation).

MEDICATION: Efficacious in over 100 adverse medical conditions (viz. Official Pharmacopoeias) including applications which are life-saving, preserve eyesight, Curative and/or Preventive, and with potential cheaply to replace numerous lines of lucrative but ineffective, debilitating, addictive, toxic pharmaceuticals, rendering massive financial government-corporate ulterior revenue and profit motive (trillions) behind apocryphal prohibition by perjurious derogation. + Medical Case Histories.

Six Parts (chapters) include expert documentary, legal, academic, scientific, technical, medical, economic, social, criminological, philosophical evidence, and that which is based on grounds of equity, vindicating all private cultivation, trade, possession and use, and which further exposes perjury and venality behind prohibition ‘legislation’, all acts of enforcement constituting crime per se.

Part Seven, RESTORATION: JUSTICE AND THE CONSTITUTION, exposes corruption, ineptitude and injustice in the justice process; examines Law: natural law, supreme secular legem terræ Constitutional common law, treaties, statutes; quotes presidents, judges, lawyers and chief justices.

THE REPORT is regularly presented pre-trial by defendants to courts (judges) who routinely forbid all Findings of Fact, evidence and defences which “dispute the legality of the law” before the jury. The official and expert evidence in THE REPORT establishes the apocryphal, illegal nature of the legislation. THE REPORT quotes legal grounds (national and international) which demonstrate numerous infractions of laws by the prohibition legislation, and which show all acts of its enforcement to be crime per se. All citizens persecuted thereunder are due Amnesty and Restitution (as for other Wrongful Penalisation). This textbook demonstrates in the law: injustice, inequity, invalidity, adverse effects, venal ulterior motive, perjury, fallacious derogation, and the inherent illegality of law which creates the Black Market and engenders all associated crime.

The outcomes of this procedure of presenting THE REPORT as documentary evidence to the judge have proved beneficial in the extreme for defendants.
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TRIAL BY JURY: ITS HISTORY, TRUE PURPOSE AND MODERN
RELEVANCE ISBN 9781902848723, with endorsements and edited section
authored by U.S. lawyer Lysander Spooner;
http://www.democracydefined.org/2trialbyjury.htm
SRC Publishing Ltd., London, world distribution by LULU of North
Carolina.

THE CONSTITUTION TREATISE: Why the d’Estaing (‘European’)
Constitution-Treaty Is the Antithesis of Democracy ISBN 9781902848747,
see website for endorsements by U.S. & U.K. cognoscenti;
http://www.democracydefined.org/5constitution.htm

“The d’Oudney analysis is as insightful as it is comprehensive. It will stand for years to
come as the definitive critique of the European Constitution prepared by Giscard d’Estaing
and others. I look forward to sharing the d’Oudney analysis with my colleagues.”
HOWARD PHILLIPS, Founder, U.S. Constitution Party; three-time presidential
nominee; Chairman, Conservative Caucus.
SRC Publishing Ltd., London.

WE THE PEOPLE AND THE MATTER OF WORDS; freely
downloadable, indispensable information for the creation and sustainment of
legitimate government and society;
http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedmaterial.htm

DEMOCRACY DEFINED: ON THE ETYMOLOGY, HISTORY AND SIGNIFICATION
OF THE WORD DEMOCRACY; the Sciences of Etymology, Semantics, Semasiology,
and Philology determine whether your country is a definitive democracy or your government
is a despotism. Viz. The word ‘democracy’ is widely abused and ‘defined’ incorrectly:
Democracy is a state of society realised neither by referenda (mass voting for new laws), nor
by suffrage (electoral voting for representatives), nor by the representatives’ majorities’
legislative voting. Electoral voting, majority rule and ‘consensus politics’ neither create nor
define democracy. This essay summarises the unique signification and inestimable value to
the human race of genuine Constitutional Democracy.
http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedcampaign.htm#democracy

9-11 TRUTH LINKS COMPENDIUM; exposition with select video analysis & lectures;
contributions by professors, architects, scientists, Federal Aviation Authority experts, former
CIA, FBI, military and government officials, firemen, reporters and other eye-witnesses
present; freely download this Compendium which serves as an introduction to the subject, and
as a source of additional references for those already familiar with the 9/11 Truth Movement;
http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedmaterial.htm
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THE VALUE OR OTHERWISE OF LAW DICTIONARIES; part of the contents of a
forthcoming book to be published by SRC Publishing. It is nevertheless, for the time being
anyway, downloadable for free;
http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedmaterial.htm

ON REFERENDA AND MAJORITY RULE; part of the contents of a forthcoming book
downloadable for free;
http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedmaterial.htm

RADIOACTIVITY FROM CROPS FED WITH PHOSPHATE ‘FERTILISER’ IS THE
PRINCIPAL CAUSE OF CANCER; some Findings of Fact downloadable for free,
extracted from THE REPORT ISBN 9781902848204 (referred to above);
http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedmaterial.htm

CHIEF JUSTICE VAUGHAN’S RULING; on perhaps the most famous trial in history;
Juror’s Rights and Duty and the Old Bailey Commemorative Plaque;
http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedcampaign2.htm#intervention

WHY THE LEGAL PROFESSION CANNOT DEFEND YOU; consider some of the
judicable breaches of common law and Constitution to which modern government resorts in
order to enforce its inequitable, illegal and money-motivated statutes;
http://www.democracydefined.org/democracydefinedcampaign4.htm#lawyers

http://www.democracydefined.org/

The Home Page of the not-for-profit Educational Campaign for
RESTORATION and UNIVERSAL ADOPTION of
CONSTITUTIONAL COMMON LAW TRIAL BY JURY.

Further reading on the website:
The Democracy Defined Campaign Philosophy is endorsed by academics, attorneys,
doctors (of jurisprudence, medicine, homeopathy, philosophy, etc.) and judges (U.S. & U.K.).
Join the Campaign! Download and distribute free posters and educational pamphlets.
Membership gratis.