

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

By

Veronica: of the Chapman Family

(Portsmouth, England, October 2018)

Endorsed By The Freeman Movement

freemanmovement.com



Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

First Edition 2018

The content of this book is based on the works of many others, such as 'radicals' - who have been trying to tell us all the truth for centuries, and also includes a certain amount of critical thinking, based of rationale, logic, and reasoning by the Author. The result is simply the presentation of a set of facts, and therefore cannot possibly be copyrighted. The Author not only asserts absolutely no copyright claim whatsoever, Readers are actually encouraged to copy, disseminate, and re-publish the information by all possible means, should they wish to do so. No permission to do so need be sought.

Acknowledgements

(I hate doing this because I'm bound to miss someone out, but ...) I'm deeply indebted to Americans Larken Rose, and Mark Passio (and Lysander Spooner) for most of the insights herein, which describe the Anarchistic Principles and point of view. Most of the thoughts I document come from them, dovetailed by myself into my research in the Freeman-On-The-Land Movement in the United Kingdom. My claim is to have merged their 'Anarchy' seamlessly with the principles of the English Common Law.

My thanks go to a number of people who have directly – or indirectly – contributed to this book. To the BoEVAT Brothers (Peter and Richard Drabble) for their BoEVAT Remedy. To Mike Bridger, for his experiences in dealing with legal matters both in and out of Courtrooms. To Ray St. Clair for the cover artwork and constant encouragement, as well as his own experiences inside and outside of Courtrooms. Also to Stuart Hill, Acting First Minister of Forvik, for – firstly Forvik itself – and for documenting his experiences with Scottish Courts, while trying to prove conclusively how the Shetlands and Orkneys were not Scottish, not subject to Scottish (nor UK) jurisdiction, and could never have been.

Lastly – but by no means leastly – to Roland Geen for managing to talk me into doing it, in the first place.

Well – almost lastly! Because I wish to dedicate this work to two friends who are no longer with us, but have both played their significant parts in the process of my understanding and learning. I dedicate this work to Guy Taylor RIP and to Cliff Bell RIP – both sadly, sadly missed. YOU, GENTLEMEN ... WERE THE BEST!

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Other works by the Author

Freedom ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

(ISBN 978-1-906169-67-1)

And further related information at:

<http://info.FMOTL.com>

Henry David Thoreau

Henry David Thoreau (1817 – 1862) was an American essayist, poet, philosopher, abolitionist, naturalist, tax resister, development critic, surveyor, and historian.

He once said what is probably the most profound statement of all time, when he stated:

***”For every 1,000 hacking at the branches of evil,
there is only 1 striking at the root”.***

In the same way as it is today, Thoreau looked around and saw problems everywhere. The difference between Thoreau and others is that he realised there was a fundamental, underpinning, cause – for ALL the evils he observed.

He realised that there was a ROOT to the evil. And he further realised that most of the others were simply attacking ‘branches’, which had been spawned from that root.

An Arborist, or Gardener, will cut off the branches of a tree or shrub (or bush), ***in order to stimulate growth***. It’s called ‘pruning’.

And so it is with ‘evil’. If one attacks one *aspect* of (i.e. ‘hacks at one branch’ of) ‘evil’, *ignoring the ‘root of evil’*, then what will happen is that time, energy, and resources will be expended – possibly to the point of near exhaustion (since one is generally railing against a far bigger foe, who has far more in the way of resources).

One may succeed, eventually, to ‘hack off the branch’. And, while congratulating oneself on a job well done, ‘evil’ will be plotting to re-create itself some other way – probably to the

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

exact same end – just in smaller increments ... which isn't obvious but amounts to the same (eventual) thing.

Or 'evil' may simply 'change tack', and start up another enterprise ... in the same way as poking back a lump in a bean bag – which will simply create a new lump elsewhere. In fact this is highly likely and – what's more – could easily mutate to something even more insidious, in the way that a 'superbug' learns how to overcome antibiotics.

And that's if the 'activism' succeeds. Which is highly unlikely. For example, I'm very hard pressed to remember one single Petition which actually succeeded in changing anything in the course of history.

The reason is simple. 'Evil' is NASTY. It is perpetrated by NASTY people. Petitioning NASTY people to "*Oh please be NICE! Just this once! Oh PLEASE!*" (which is what you are actually doing) ... is rather a silly thing to imagine would ever work.

Isn't it?

Is it likely that 'demonstrating' – in front of the NASTY people proposing some kind of NASTY regulation – are suddenly going to be NICE people and change their minds?

I don't recall very much of that happening – if ever.

But I DO remember a lot of people shouting and waving banners, and leaflets and flyers, ALL TO NO AVAIL IN THE END.

I remember a lot of that.

There is no point in trying to appeal to the ‘human side’ ... of people who do not possess a ‘humanity’ ... to which any appeal could be made.

You are ‘hacking at the branches of evil’ ... and the result is generally to ‘stimulate the growth’ (of evil).

Which is not very clever, is it? And that certainly wasn’t your intent, was it?

So, what can you do? Well, Thoreau told us: STRIKE AT THE ROOT.

If a tree or a shrub is diseased, and has to be removed, how do you do that? Do you cut off its branches? No ... you UPROOT it (you ‘strike at its root’)!

And, furthermore, it is a truism to say that any problem is only soluble once that problem itself has been completely defined. Until that time, there is no guarantee that any proposed solution will actually fix the problem (as opposed to just creating more problems, and havoc!)

All of which points us to the fundamental issue: WHAT IS THE ROOT?

And then ... how do we ‘strike at it’?

Before we can answer those questions, we have to consider some fundamental aspects of MORALITY. Because MORALITY is the antithesis of EVIL. Therefore, if we can define MORALITY, then we can define EVIL as “EVERYTHING MORALITY IS NOT”.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Self-Ownership

Our search for the ROOT of Evil starts with the concept of 'self-ownership'.

'Self-ownership' is synonymous with 'sovereignty'.

(How do you know you are 'sovereign'? Did you ever feel aggrieved that someone did something to you - that you did not like? If that ever happened to you then ... YOU ARE A SOVEREIGN. If you were not a sovereign, then you would not have felt aggrieved)

And everything that is MORAL flows automatically from that point onward.

Because – if you own yourself – then you are responsible for yourself.

And if you own yourself, then no-one else owns you (you are certainly NOT owned by 'evil'!)

And, therefore, anyone who thinks they might own you are patently wrong – because they can't ... and therefore they don't.

So how, therefore, could anyone 'have authority over you'?

Well, the simple answer is: They can't ... no-one can ... unless – that is – and until – YOU SPECIFICALLY GRANT IT.

But, until you specifically grant it, no-one can have any authority over you – because everyone is equal – and no-one is more 'equal' than anyone else. And anyone who reckons

themselves to be more equal than YOU will only get away with it whilst YOU allow them to!

Does that mean you can do whatever you like?

Well, of course not. Not if you want to live peacefully, that is.

If you want to live peacefully, to live your own life, in more or less the way you wish to live it, then it is incumbent upon you to act peacefully towards everyone else, at all times.

Why? Simply because it is the *responsible* i.e. MORAL, thing to do.

‘Self-ownership’ does not abrogate the need to act responsibly at all times. ‘Self-ownership’ fully recognises the ‘self-ownership’ of (the sovereignty of) everyone else.

And, hence, there is a Duty of Care towards everyone else.

Implicit in these concepts is the Non-Aggression Principle. This Principle comprises the true MORALITY OF LIFE ... in two distinct statements, and one additional definition:

- (1) There is NEVER any moral justification for VIOLENCE, but
- (2) If violence occurs (i.e. when someone ignores (1), above), then there is a moral justification for the use of force (including destructive force) to counteract that violence (i.e. the Principle of Self-Defence).

Where ‘violence’ is defined (specifically) as: “**The INITIATION of destructive force against a living creature**” (i.e. a true ‘crime’).

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Under these Principles, there is peace ... until someone deliberately causes trouble.

Obviously there will always be those who cause trouble, and (2) is there to resolve the situation back to peace once more.

So why would you grant 'authority' over you?

Only when you chose to. Only when it made sense.

Example: Someone makes a proposition, and you decide you like the idea. And you decide to help, and your help is accepted. But the help you provide is determined by whoever proposed the idea. So, in this case, you are 'deferring' to the 'authority' of whoever had the idea ... simply because it was their idea, and they were in the best position to understand how the idea could be developed.

You grant authority BY CONSENTING TO IT.

AND ONLY BY CONSENTING TO IT.

'Authority' grabbed without your CONSENT violates the Principle of Self-Ownership i.e. your Sovereignty.

Because CONSENT is innate to Sovereignty/Self-Ownership.

When writing The American Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson declared: "*Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*"

But that is impossible. It can't happen.

If you are 'governed' ... then you can't 'consent'. The two are mutually exclusive. You either 'consent' OR you are 'governed', because ONCE YOU ARE 'GOVERNED' ... YOU NO LONGER HAVE ANY 'CONSENT'.

Therefore '*Consent of the governed*' and "*Policed by consent*" are two very clever and a very deceptive oxymorons.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

They may have fooled Thomas Jefferson ... but don't let them fool you.

Democracy

And that's why 'democracy' is totally IMMORAL and thoroughly ILLEGITIMATE.

Because it violates Sovereignty/Self-Ownership.

'Democracy' is the mechanism utilised to create 'Governments' ... which are themselves IMMORAL and ILLEGITIMATE (as will be explained later).

'Democracy' and 'Government' are both IMMORAL and ILLEGITIMATE. To assume that anything 'decent', 'honourable', 'fair', 'just', and/or 'worthwhile', could come from such a combination is living in a dream world.

(And to 'assume' is to make an 'ass' out of 'u' and 'me')

Because two 'Wrongs' can never equal one 'Right'. Two IMMORAL ILLEGITIMATES cannot equal one MORAL LEGITIMATE.

'Democracy' is exactly the same thing as 'Gang Rape'. There is no difference between the two. A group of (say) three men decide – as the majority – to rape one woman (the minority). She therefore has to suffer her fate, because the 'democratic will of the majority' deems it to be so.

Note - October, 2018: As the result of a 'Democratic' Referendum in 2016, 48% of the United Kingdom (the Remainiacs) have subsequently ACTED AS IF – and continue to ACT AS IF - they have been Gang Raped.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

There is an 180 degree difference between DEMOCRACY and CONSENT.

Example: There are five people deciding what to have for lunch. Three prefer a Chinese, and the other two prefer a pizza.

Under 'democracy' the three are the majority, and so **all five have to have a Chinese takeaway**, including the two who preferred a pizza.

Under 'consent' the three who wanted a Chinese takeaway have that, and the two who wanted pizzas have pizzas.

That's the difference.

Don't ever fool yourself expecting anything OTHER THAN corruption to be endemic in any system based on the ILLEGITIMACY of 'democracy'. That would be impossible (by definition).

But – if everything were based solely on CONSENT – then nothing would work!

Tesco, Sainsbury's, Waitrose, ASDA, Somerfield's, Morrisons, the Automobile Association, the Royal Automobile Club, Green Flag, Poundland, Iceland, Lidl, all High Street Shops, all Village Shops ... just about everything Online (e.g. eBay, Amazon, BT, Virgin, Talktalk etc), etc. etc. etc. ... all Petrol Stations, Garages, etc. ...

... ALL OPERATE SOLELY ON THE PRINCIPLE OF 'CONSENT'.

You are telling me they don't work?

No-one is FORCED to do any business with any of these organisations. You entirely CHOOSE (by CONSENT) those you wish to purchase from – and what you wish to purchase.

None of these organisations are FORCED to be in business, serving you. They do it based entirely on their FREEDOM to engage in such business.

In fact – if you ask them – they will all tell you that they MANAGE TO OPERATE IN SPITE OF “the diktats of (democratic!) Government”!

Please don't tell me that “nothing works entirely by consent”. It's all around you. All you have to do is to open your eyes ... and 'think'.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

But – we need Government ... because people can't be trusted without someone imposing Rules on them!

That is patently untrue. A 'Free Market' - the Laws of Supply and Demand – impose Rules which all of those organisations previously mentioned MUST follow – in order attract 'custom' - and, consequently, stay in business.

As I wrote previously – they manage to do this IN SPITE OF 'unilaterally-imposed' arbitrary rules issued by 'Government'.

Furthermore, in the United Kingdom (and what used to be Colonies) we have the most precious concept ... called The English Common Law.

The English Common Law embraces all of the concepts of fairness and honour which has been devolved and handed down to us over the centuries. The English Common Law is based on the customs and traditions of our forefathers, and simply put, embraces pure Common Sense.

And we have a Court System which employs the English Common Law to resolve disputes such as slander and libel, and to decide on the guilt or innocence of someone accused of a crime, by means of a Petty Jury of 12 ordinary people. (And, while it is true to say that this mechanism is not 100% perfect – possibly because people can't be FULLY trusted? No-one has ever devised anything better and more consistent in the maintenance of justice. The record of the Petty Jury mechanism has proved to be infinitely superior to any Judge or Bench of Magistrates – in terms of honour, fairness and integrity).

But – there's more, isn't there?

Where – precisely – does ‘Government’ come from, in the first place?

Who is it that actually forms the ‘Government’?

The answer is, of course, ‘Members of Parliament’.

And where do these Members of Parliament come from?

That answer is, of course, ‘the people’.

‘The people ... who (apparently) ... can’t be trusted’.

So, the system is: **To take ‘people who can’t be trusted’ (in fact those who are generally the LEAST TRUSTWORTHY of all ...) ... and place them into a position whereby they make up the Rules for everyone else to follow?**

And ... you expect that system to work? Without MASSIVE corruption?

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Can someone else 'join' you - to a 'club' - without your consent?

No – obviously they can't. Because to do so would violate the Principle of Self-Ownership/Sovereignty.

If I am sovereign, then only I can decide which 'clubs' I apply to join, and those clubs will decide on whether or not to accept me as a Member.

Applying this Principle to 1973, we can see that the Prime Minister (at the time) Edward Heath joined the European Common Market (as it was called) ... BUT NO-ONE ELSE IN THE UNITED KINGDOM DID because Ted Heath did not have the Right to 'join' others to the 'club' without their express consent.

And that consent was never expressly sought.

No-one has ever been SPECIFICALLY asked whether or not they wanted to apply to join a 'club' that was based in Brussels (and Strasbourg).

All that people have ever been asked was: Did they wish to CONTINUE to be members of the 'club' based in Brussels under (a) The original conditions or (b) The re-negotiated conditions. This question was asked in 1975 regarding a 'club' that people have never agreed to join, in the first place.

And then, in 2016, people were asked whether or not they wished to LEAVE the 'club' based in Brussels, even though they never SPECIFICALLY agreed to join it in the first place.

Furthermore I, myself, have never applied to join any 'club' run from the Houses of Parliament in Westminster. But –

somehow – apparently I have been ‘joined’, such that (apparently) the ‘rules of this club’ (which they call ‘legislation’ and ‘statutes’, etc) apply to me. They place an obligation on me without my consent which violates my Self-Ownership/Sovereignty. But no-one cares – except me.

Although, in actual fact, everyone CARES. Not about me, but about themselves. What they fail to realise is the information contained in this book, which explains the reasons for the mess that is known as ‘The System’.

And unlike the ‘anti-democratic’ Brussels European Union, which provided a mechanism called ‘Article 50’ to enable club members to rescind their membership, the ‘club’ run from Westminster does not even have the integrity and honesty to provide an equivalent. So – apparently – once you are ‘In’ the ‘Westminster club’ (even though you never applied to join in the first place) you can’t get ‘Out’ - you can’t escape. ‘Democracy’ is so WONDERFUL that there’s no escaping it!

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

So why is 'Parliament' ILLEGITIMATE?

Can you give something - to someone else – that you did not possess in the first place?

Well ... you are welcome to try ... but you won't get very far. You'll be accused of stealing.

So, when you vote (under the Democratic Mechanism), what are you actually doing, and what can you convey upon whoever you vote for? Well, what you are doing is conveying the Rights that you possess to someone else who – you hope – understands your point of view, and will use the conveyed Rights for your personal benefit.

BUT ... you are ALSO saying (and this is what you forget) *"In my wish to get what I want, I don't care about the possible harmful effects my choice may have on the sovereignty of others. As a matter of fact, as long as I get my way, they can go to hell, for all I care"*.

OK ... so assuming you don't care what happens to people who may – for perfectly sound reasons of their own – disagree with you ... you achieve your goal of electing your chosen Representative (Member of Parliament or Local Council, etc).

What Rights did you possess in the first place, such as you could have transferred them to your MP or Local Councillor?

Do you have the Right to Freedom of Speech? Yes, you do. So that's a Right you possess and can award to someone else – someone whom you feel may do a better job – then you can yourself - of speaking up for your point of view.

What else? Do you have the Right to ‘Create Legislation’? To make rules that others MUST follow (else be fined, imprisoned, etc)? No ... you don’t, do you? You don’t have that Right ... and you don’t know anyone who could ever claim to have been born with such a Right.

Do you have the Right to take the property of others (their money) without their express consent? No ... you don’t, do you? You don’t have that Right ... and you don’t know anyone who could ever claim to have been born with such a Right.. You actually know full well, such acts are called ‘stealing’ i.e. ‘theft’.

So those are Rights that you *can’t* convey to your chosen Representative.

And, before they were elected (democratically), did they possess those extra Rights? No, they didn’t ... they were just ordinary people – like everyone else – when they were simply ‘candidates’ on the Electoral Ballot.

So it can be reasonably argued that these Members of Parliament did NOT have the “Right to Create Legislation” NOR the “Right to Take People’s Property Without Consent” BEFORE they won their seats in Westminster, and NO-ONE FROM THE ELECTORATE could have conveyed such Rights, because no-one within the Electorate possessed those Rights in the first place.

We can see where the Rights to Freedom of Speech came from, but where did the “Right to Create Legislation” and the “Right to Take People’s Property Without Consent” come from?

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Was it because they “obtained a majority” – in order to claim their seat? Mathematically, zero multiplied by any number is still = zero. So whatever their majority was, it doesn’t matter. Because the “Right to Create Legislation” and the “Right to Take People’s Property Without Consent” was ZERO, and so multiplying ‘any majority’ by it ... was still ZERO.

We are still at a loss to ascertain where the “Right to Create Legislation” and the “Right to Take People’s Property Without Consent” comes from, such that Members of Parliament could LEGITIMATELY (and MORALLY) “Create Legislative Rules” (which everyone MUST follow, on pain of some kind of ‘violence’ for failure to do so), and to arrange to “Take People’s Property Without Consent” ... without it being considered ‘stealing’?

If you are a bit stuck for the answer to that conundrum, then so am I!

Actually, I’m lying. I’m not in the least bit stuck for an answer. I know exactly where those Rights originate. The correct answer is that – in the year 1295 or thereabouts – when the first Parliaments were formed, these Rights WERE – AND STILL ARE – PLUCKED OUT OF THIN AIR.

In other words ... these Rights don’t, actually, exist.

But ... they are used day after day – without thought – all over the world.

No wonder the United Kingdom – AND THE ENTIRE WORLD – is in such a mess!

Groups of people, calling themselves ‘Parliaments’ and ‘Congresses’ grabbing Rights out of nothing at all.

(The late Lord Denning – a High Court Judge of serious note – once said: “*You can’t build something out of nothing*”. He was referring to the fact that anything based on a Void Order was also intrinsically void, but the same could easily be applied to ‘Parliaments’ – as fully explained, above. Sure – you can build a ‘Parliament’ from nothing ... but you can’t make it LEGITIMATE).

The most ABSURD thing you will hear some people say – especially Lawyers, Judges and Politicians, etc. – is that “*Parliament is sovereign*”. This statement is so stupid beyond reason. ‘Parliament’ isn’t even LEGITIMATE – so it could not possibly be ‘sovereign’!

ONLY ‘THE PEOPLE’ - EACH AND EVERY ONE OF US - ARE SOVEREIGN.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

So why is ‘Government’ ILLEGITIMATE?

Because the very definition of ‘a Government’ IMMEDIATELY defeats the MORALITY of the Non-Aggression Principle.

A ‘Government’ of any size, type, or nature. Because ‘to govern’ IMMEDIATELY defeats the MORALITY of the Non-Aggression Principle.

Because ‘to govern’ means to:

- (A) Set rules which MUST be obeyed by everyone (irrespective as to whether such rules really apply or not, and
- (B) To THREATEN to INITIATE ‘some kind of’ DESTRUCTIVE FORCE (i.e. ‘violence’) if the rules are not obeyed. (This could be a fine, or imprisonment, or both)

So (B), above – which is intrinsic to ‘governing’ – comprises the penalties included in all Acts of Parliament – which immediately breach the MORALITY of the Non-Aggression Principle. Anyone who may, for whatever reason, disagree, **is automatically placed under threat.**

‘Governing’ is impossible without COERCION.

Going back to the original example, if those who wanted pizza just went out and bought pizzas, when the democratic decision was for Chinese takeaway, then the pizza eaters would be fined. That’s the way ‘Government’ and ‘democracy’ works (or, of course, strictly speaking, DOESN’T work!)

So one aspect of the ROOT OF EVIL is the DUAL ILLEGITIMACY of 'Democracy' and 'Government'.

But, there is another very important, and intrinsically associated, aspect.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Money

‘Cash’ is banknotes and coins. ‘Cash’ cannot be ‘money’ for the simple reason that about 93% of all ‘money’ is simply numbers on computer databases. And, as such, is not coins and banknotes.

‘Money’ can be CONVERTED INTO coins and banknotes (‘cash’) by Banks and other Financial Institutions. But 93% is never converted.

And ‘cash’ is also not ‘money’, because it is REAL, **and ‘money’ is NOT real.**

‘Money’ is ‘credit’ (or ‘debit’). This is obvious from any ledger or balance sheet.

The definition of ‘credit’ is: **‘Faith placed in something’.** (Look it up).

‘Money’ is, therefore, nothing more than ‘faith placed in something’. ***Exactly the same as any religion.*** (And maybe it is worth noting here that one is free to choose to believe in any religion, or not – according to one’s conscience).

Coins and banknotes are real, physical, objects that REPRESENT that ‘faith’.

They are NOT that ‘faith’, they are merely REPRESENTATIONS OF that ‘faith’.

This is because ‘faith’ is an imagination. An idea. A concept. A belief. (Look it up)

Coins & banknotes are nothing more than Tokens for a Monetary/Belief System, such that these ‘beliefs’, or ‘faiths’, can be conveniently passed around the physical world.

However, since ‘money’ is nothing more than a belief, it is hard to see how anyone could claim to have been ‘deprived of it’. Any more than someone could claim to have been ‘deprived of religious faiths’, because the two are exactly the same.

The PROMISE, printed on a Bank of England note, is meaningless, worthless and valueless. For the simple reason that it ‘promises to pay’ (for example) ‘a sum of £10’.

But ‘a sum of £10’ is nothing more than the imagination of ‘credit’.

Thus ‘a sum of £10’ does not exist in the physical world. No-one has ever seen ‘a sum of £10’, and never will, because it simply does not exist.

All that exists are pieces of paper PROMISING to PAY THIS NON-EXISTENT SUM ON DEMAND. A promise that has not ever, cannot, and will not ever, actually be fulfilled. Because the source material is simply a belief. ***A belief that is, in point of fact, totally unnecessary. The Bank of England might as well promise you the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow – for all the difference their promises make.***

Because the whole ‘idea’ of a ‘currency’ is one MASSIVE Grand Deception. A Grand Illusion that, for centuries since its inception, has pulled the wool over the eyes of everyone on this planet.

If one person has a delusion, it is called ‘insanity’

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

If 7 billion (at the time of writing) have the same delusion, it is called 'money'.

A banknote is nothing more than Promissory Note. An undated IOU. It is, therefore, 'worth' as much as any Promissory Note/IOU written by anyone i.e. precisely NOTHING. In fact a Promissory Note written by someone else is usually larger in size, and consequently 'worth' more in 'paper' (because it contains more tree fibres).

The concept of 'money' has only ever had but one single purpose. TO CONTROL YOU. To keep your nose in the trough, or to the grindstone. To keep you locked inside a prison-with-invisible-bars. So you are in a prison, but do not realise it, because you cannot see the bars. In a Mind Prison.

But this absurd 'belief' contributes absolutely nothing *in practice*, except to generate 'greed'.

(If a worthwhile Belief System is necessary, then try 'honour', 'integrity', 'openness', 'being candid', 'respectful', and so on. These imaginations are worth far more than avarice, deviousness, bullying and browbeating engendered by the Monetary Belief Religion).

In a 2008 Quarterly Bulletin, the Bank of England published a speech which pointed out that "**Banks make 'money' by 'writing cheques to themselves'**"

Bulletin Page = 103

PDF Version Page = 105

Bottom paragraph left:

Money, or bank intermediation

So far I have focused entirely on credit. Where does this leave money (or Money), the starting point for much traditional monetary analysis?

Well, much that I have said about banks — their capacity, in the short run, to lever up their balance sheets and expand credit at will; their role in providing liquidity insurance to investment vehicles and corporates — turns precisely on their liabilities being money. And for this reason, banks are after all decisively different from other intermediaries.

As transactions balances and so the means of exchange in our payments system, the moneyiness of bank deposits lies at the core of credit intermediation. Subject only but crucially to confidence in their soundness, banks extend credit by simply increasing the borrowing customer's current account, which can be paid away to wherever the borrower wants by the bank 'writing a cheque on itself'. That is, banks extend credit by creating money. This 'money creation' process is constrained: by their need to manage the liquidity risk — from the withdrawal of deposits and the draw-down of back-up lines — to which it exposes them.⁽¹⁾ Adequate capital and liquidity,

(pound no
where, in a
supply of t
shock to th
companies;
others to r
circulates i
services ar

Second, ar
in themsel
shocks, ca
and Aggre
monetary
of short-te
path and li

-
- (1) See Kashyap
explanation in
Vol. 52, No.
(2) Acharya, V.
liquidity', C
(3) See Goodhart
Lecture at
Vol. 47, No.
economy:
at the Inflation
Cambridge

Extract: "...banks extend credit by simply increasing the borrowing customer's current account, which can be paid away to wherever the borrower wants by the bank 'writing a cheque on itself'. That is, banks extend credit by creating money."

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Interest

Let me repeat that last quotation:

"...banks extend credit by simply increasing the borrowing customer's current account, which can be paid away to wherever the borrower wants by the bank 'writing a cheque on itself'. That is, banks extend credit by creating money."

That's the Bank of England explaining how 'money' comes into existence (how 'New Money' is created out of thin air).

This occurs whenever someone takes out a Loan (e.g. uses their Credit Card, or accepts a Mortgage).

And the 'money' created ... goes into the overall Money Supply.

So ... it is there – in the Money Supply – for the Borrower to 'find' (by working for it, or some other means – such as investment), and to make repayments on the Loan.

So that is the basic mechanism. And – as it stood – could work.

But we've missed out one crucial aspect ... called '**Interest**'.

The Borrower not only has to find the 'money originally created' in order to make repayments, but also an additional amount to cover what is known as 'Interest'.

And the question – ignored by EVERYONE – is: WHERE DOES THE 'NEW MONEY' - TO COVER 'INTEREST' - COME FROM?

The Capital Amount loaned goes into the Money Supply and therefore (in theory) can be found by the Borrower, and repaid. BUT HOW DOES THE INTEREST AMOUNT – which is **additional** to the Capital Amount – get into the Money Supply (such that it can be found, and included in the repayments)?

Is the Interest Amount created – along with the Capital Amount – at the time of the creation of the Loan?

No ... it's not.

IT COULDN'T BE.

IT COULD NEVER BE.

How *much* would you create – at time of the Loan? You would have no idea, because Interest Rates often fluctuate.

And – even if you could create New Money to cover the Interest repayments – WHO WOULD YOU PAY IT TO?

Who COULD you possibly pay it to?

Do you think there is 'someone' who receives all of the New Interest Money and somehow 'funnels' it into the Money Supply - so that Borrowers, working hard, can find it?

Well ... there's no-one like that. It's impossible.

So ... can I say it, please?

NEVER IN HUMAN HISTORY, ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD, HAS EVER – OR COULD EVER – ANY AMOUNT - EVER HAVE BEEN

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

**CREATED, ALONG WITH ANY LOAN,
WHICH WOULD PROVIDE THE FUNDS FOR
ANY INTEREST PAYMENT.**

**And you really need to think very hard about that
previous statement, until it sinks in.**

But ... Borrowers DO manage to find enough to make
repayments on Loans.

So ... where do the Interest Amounts come from?

There are three answers (a) Robbing Peter to pay Paul, and (b)
The constant creation of New Money via New Loans, and (c)
The Injections of Debt-free 'Money' via Grants and Benefits,
etc.

'Robbing Peter to Pay Paul' is the same thing as saying
Borrowers are rendered bankrupt, and their homes are re-
possessed.

Which is a pretty violent way that Interest Amounts are
created.

The constant creation of New Money via New Loans,
including the use of Credit Cards, does support additional
'money' - which is used to cover Interest. And it explains the
desperate clamour to offer Credit Cards to all and sundry.
However, it is pretty foolish, because this method just
engenders even more Interest requirements at a later time and
so – ultimately – is - 'arithmetically' - a lost cause.

The 'gentle' and 'sensible' way is by the Injections of Debt-
free 'Money' via Grants and Benefits, etc. For example, Old

Age Pensions (in the UK), Winter Fuel Payments, Council Tax and Housing Benefits, Jobseeker's Allowance, etc.

AND, CONSEQUENTLY, THE MORE PEOPLE CLAIMING BENEFITS, THE EASIER IT WILL BE FOR MORTGAGE PAYERS TO FIND THE EXTRA FUNDS TO PAY INTEREST AMOUNTS.

So ... let's give a CHEER to all the Old Age Pensioners, 'Scroungers' and 'Benefit Cheats'! They are doing a seriously grand job on behalf of everyone with a Loan, Mortgage, or Credit Card! Because they are responsible for the 'gentle injection' of Debt-free 'money' into the supply ... which helps to cover the Interest Amounts of Loan – and most importantly, Mortgage - Re-payments.

(Provided, that is, the Claimants spend the funds received, and don't just hoard it!)

Always assuming, of course, that it is 'grand' to support the insane and absurd Evil of a 'Monetary Belief Religion' (something which we are all forced to do, until we wake up to the fact that it is all a completely unnecessary fraud).

The Reader may remember that 'money' arrives into the UK from abroad, when a UK company sells a product overseas. And, maybe, the Customers pays in Pounds Sterling, or in some other currency.

Any Pounds Sterling, used to pay for the goods or services abroad, are 'Old Money', which left the Money Supply at some time in the past, when a UK company bought a foreign product, and paid in Pounds Sterling. This kind of 'money' may very well boost the UK economy as a whole, but it does nothing to support EXTRA DEBT-FREE 'money', which is

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

required to service Interest payments, because it will have originally been created on the basis of a loan.

If goods and services are sold abroad, and paid for in another currency, this will be 'Old Money', that has circulated out of a foreign country, and is circulating back in. Again, created abroad on the basis of a loan OR created as 'New Money' BUT IN THE SAME WAY ALREADY DESCRIBED (i.e. the three methods that have been explained above).

Simply because there is no other possible way.

Thus, only 'New Money' arriving from abroad that has been created DEBT-FREE assists the payments of Interest on Loans and Mortgages. The exact same arguments apply anywhere in the world.

Debt-free ‘Money’

In 1694 the ‘Government’ at the time wrote a Royal Charter, and authorised the Monarch at the time (William III) to sign it into Legislation.

This Charter created the Bank of England, and tasked it to ‘create money’.

By the principles of logic, rationality and reason ... if the ‘Government’ could ‘authorise’ the Bank of England to ‘create money’ ... then the ‘Government’ must have had the capability to ‘create money’ itself.

You can’t convey a Right that you don’t – yourself – possess.

We’ve already been through all that!

But, let’s back up a second. “You can’t convey a Right that you don’t – yourself – possess”. But there is a corollary, which is: “If you DO manage to convey a Right, then you must have possessed it in the first place”.

We are now considering ‘The Right to Create Money’. And the question is, ‘Who has the Right to Create Money’?

And the only logical, rational and reasonable answer to that question – since ‘money’ is no more than ‘faith placed in something’ is – EVERYONE.

But, if that were the case, then it wouldn’t ‘work’ as any kind of mechanism. If anyone could just make it up (out of thin air) as and whenever they need it.

But we have to be consistent.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

So, we have to say the answer to the question ‘Who has the Right to Create Money?’ is EVERYONE or NO-ONE.

And that’s the logic, rationale and reasoning we are using here. To claim that – if the ‘Government’ could enable the Bank of England to ‘create money’, then the ‘Government’ must have been able to ‘create money’ itself. On the basis that either both the Bank AND the ‘Government’, or NEITHER the Bank NOR the ‘Government’.

Nevertheless, the net result of the above analysis is that the idea of ‘Government BORROWING’ ... is pure, complete, and utter NONSENSE!

The ‘Government’ never needs to ‘borrow’, because it always has the ability to simply ‘CREATE’.

And, furthermore, the idea of the ‘Government spending the Taxpayer’s money’ is absurd because the ‘Government’ has the ability to CREATE as much as it ever needs to SPEND.

This fact renders all Income Tax, Council Tax Road Tax, TV Licence TOTALLY UNNECESSARY.

And, in any case, ‘Pounds Sterling’ (the British Currency) **is a function of ‘Government’!**

And, furthermore, where else – in the world – would Pounds Sterling come from?

The European Union? No – they use Euros.

The United States? No ... they use US Dollars.

The World Bank, or the Bank of International Settlements? Why would they be interested in Pounds Sterling – as opposed to all the other currencies in the world? No ... the Bank of England have already told us how ‘money’ is made, and where it comes from ... ‘Banks create it out of thin air’ ... and therefore ‘Governments can create it out of thin air’!

SO THERE IS NEVER ANY NEED – AND NEVER HAS BEEN ANY NEED - FOR ‘GOVERNMENT BORROWING’.

They actually admit that – in a roundabout way – by saying that “*They borrow from the Bank of England by selling Treasury Notes to the Bank*”.

But – apparently – it’s the ‘greatest trauma in the world’ to create these ‘Treasury Notes’ (in order to pay for things ... like Nurses, and Doctors, and Policemen, etc)

Whereas – in point of FACT – all they have to do is to type a few numbers into a computer database (these days).

And that is how ‘Government’ creates Old Age Pensions, and funds institutions such as the National Health Service and Jobseeker’s Allowance, etc. By doing what Banks do ... by creating ‘money’ out of thin air. They do it all the time.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

The Root(s) of ‘Evil’

At this point we have identified some of the fundamental Roots of ‘Evil’.

The ILLEGITIMACY of ‘Democracy’, ‘Parliament’, and ‘Government’ - strongly connected to – and associated with – the absurd idiocy of the Monetary Belief Religion – all wrapped up in the gullibility of those who say absurd things, such as “*It must be obeyed, because it’s the law!*”, under the naive assumption that someone claiming to ‘make rules for everybody to follow’, could ever actually have such a Right to do such a thing!

The whole being an enormous greenhouse fostering greed and corruption, on scale which is actually quite difficult to imagine.

So that has answered the question: “What is the Root?”

Now we need to answer the question: “What can we do about it?”

Well, then main thing to do is actually ‘What NOT to do’.

DON’T VOTE. DON’T EVER VOTE.

DON’T EVEN REGISTER TO VOTE.

When envelopes have arrived, informing the Author that “**By Law the Author cannot ignore this letter, and MUST respond ... because Your Vote Counts**” ... the Author DOES NOT OPEN THE LETTER. But instead writes back on the envelope “THERE IS NO COMMON LAW REQUIRING ME TO PARTAKE IN ANY POLITICAL PROCESS” ... and

marks it “RETURN TO SENDER”. It is then re-posted into the nearest Letterbox.

At the time of writing, the Author has yet to receive any physical, follow-up, visit after having received a number of such letters. As and when a personal visit may occur, the Author has prepared a sheet of paper to hand out. It explains that the Author is an Anarchist, and therefore takes no part in any Political Process, in exactly the same manner as having a ‘religious’ conscience i.e. Anarchy is as much my Religion as, for example, Christianity is to others.

Here is a copy of the Notice:

European Convention on Human Rights, Article 9 - Conscience and Religion

Provides a right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This includes the freedom to change a religion or belief, and to manifest a religion or belief in worship, teaching, practice and observance, subject to certain restrictions that are “in accordance with law” and “necessary in a democratic society”.

Relevant cases are:

Kokkinakis v. Greece [1993] ECHR 20
Universelles Leben e.V v. Germany [1996])app. No. 29745/96)
Busicarini and Others v. San Marino [1999] ECHR 7
Pichon and Sanjous v. France [2001] ECHR 898
Leyla Sahin v. Turkey [2004] ECHR299
Leela Forderkreis E.V. and Others v. Germany [2008] ECHR
Lautsi v. Italy [2011] ECHR 2412
S.A.S. v. France [2014] ECHR 695

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

As an Anarchist, my conscience does not enable me to partake in any form of Political Process ... which therefore excludes voting and even registering to vote.

My actions are entirely PEACEFUL, and thus “in accordance with law of the land”.

Voting cannot be “necessary in a democratic society” because said “democratic society” has always functioned without a 100% vote.

Anyone who is prepared to state that “Your Vote Counts” is either incurably naïve or utterly stupid.

Stick like glue to the Non-Aggression Principle, and refuse, henceforth, to take part in any Political Process or Ritual.

If enough people said – to their ‘Government’ - “*We see you for what you are – THOROUGHLY ILLEGITIMATE and NOTHING. And from now on we are going to completely IGNORE you*” ... then ‘Government’ would wither and die on the vine, just as would any plant or shrub.

But ‘Government’ doesn’t like that. It cannot stand being *ignored*. Because it is not based on the LEGITIMACY of

‘Live and let live’. It is based on the ILLEGITIMACY of The Principles of Dictatorship Disguised by ‘Democracy’.

All your ‘Activism’ (e.g. petitioning, demonstrating) actually achieves nothing but to enable the NASTY people to laugh at you behind their hands. They LOVE that situation, content in the knowledge that you’ve been brainwashed into thinking that those actions are your only options. That, and ‘voting’ (which has been discussed).

They know that, while you waste your time, energy, and resources on ‘Activism’, you will eventually wear yourself out, and achieve precisely nothing. YOU CERTAINLY WON’T BE DOING ANYTHING TO TAKE BACK CONTROL OF YOUR OWN COUNTRY ... and YOUR OWN LIFE!

The ‘trick’ - if there is one – is to realise all of this. And to realise that you actually have a much more powerful option. And all you have to do is to remove yourself from the psychological ‘prison’ in which you have been placed (by ‘education’, which actually comprised ‘indoctrination’), and you would be able to see your more powerful option.

WHICH IS TO COMPLETELY IGNORE ‘THEM’.

TO STEP OUT OF THE ‘BOX’ - IN WHICH THEY HAVE PLACED YOU.

NOT TO PLAY THEIR GAME (OR GAMES) ANY MORE.

Those ‘games’ are only Mind Games.

Mind Games - whereby you allow them ‘authority’ over you, without realising that you have no need to do that. That you possess the ability NOT to do that.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

When ‘They’ tell you that you ‘MUST’ do something (‘MUST’ fill out this Tax Form, ‘MUST’ fill out this Registration Form, etc.) ... YOU DON’T. You DON’T ‘comply’. You can write back, on the envelope, marking it ‘RETURN TO SENDER’, and asking “*Which Common Law requires me to comply?*”. There will not be one, because the Common Law only requires you to live in peace. It requires no more of you than that.

The Common Law is the same thing as ‘Lore’, pronounced the same, and commonly thought of in terms of ‘Folklore’. The Common Sense of the MORALITY of living in peace.

The Common Law comprises a smallish number of defined crimes – where crimes are acts which are considered to be immoral, such as murder, theft, etc. A sample list can be found at the bottom of

<http://www.FMOTL.com/info/PrivateProsecutions.htm>

The Common Law requires that any circumstances not obviously covered, are decided by the Jury of 12 ordinary people, using their innate Common Sense to come to a Verdict, after hearing all of the presented evidence.

The Common Law trumps any ‘Statutory requirement’ i.e. anything in any Act of Parliament. It can do so by means of a process known as ‘Jury Nullification’. This is when the Common Law Jury of 12 refuses to convict an Accused person - who has been charged under some Statutory requirement. This happened in the United States, during the Prohibition Era. Many people were taken to Courts, charged with ‘selling liquor’, but Juries consistently refused to convict. Eventually the Prohibition Regulations had to be repealed, because they couldn’t be made to work.

And so, you will need to protect yourself against this ‘evil’.
The remainder of this book will provide you with ammunition
with which to protect yourself.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

The BoEVAT Remedy against the Roots of Evil

This acronym means ‘Bills of Exchange’ and ‘Value Added Tax’ ... because it combines the Bills of Exchange Act 1882 with the United Kingdom’s VAT Rules to create a problem for those who issue Penalty Charge Notices, and other things such as Council Tax.

Background

The Bills of Exchange Act 1882 defines how financial transactions must take place in ways which try to ensure that no-one defrauds anyone else. It defines that any demand for payment must be made on an Invoice, which clearly states the reason for the demand, the amount of the demand, the date of the demand, and who is making the demand.

AND THE ‘WHO’ MUST BE A REAL, NON-FICTIONAL, PERSON WHO SIGNS THE INVOICE IN WET INK.

99% of all demand documents – these days – do NOT meet those criteria. But they ARE the criteria defined in (what they call) LAW.

Consequently a valid argument in any Court would be that “*I have not yet paid because I have not yet received a valid Invoice*”.

However, because the Utterly Corrupt Courts System has an Overriding Rule Zero (“THEY DON’T OBEY THEIR OWN RULES”) making that valid argument will invariably carry no weight ... and the argument will be simply brushed aside.

However, if the VAT argument is added, the Utterly Corrupt Courts System finds it much more difficult to brush the

argument aside because – by doing so – they would be acting to undermine Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs.

And we are in the position of bringing the VAT argument into the equation because it is something that they have all forgotten about ... ever since the start of VAT.

Value Added Tax is supposed (according to the rules) to be added to EVERY FINANCIAL TRANSACTION ... for Goods AND Services. Businesses ‘register’ for VAT and, because of their ‘registration’, they are entitled to re-claim any VAT they have paid out.

(For that reason 95% of VAT goes goes round in a circle and comes all the way back to the start. It is the most INEFFICIENT system any one could ever devise)

However, what it means is that EVERY INVOICE SHOULD ALSO SHOW VAT ... even if the status of the transaction is ‘Zero-Rated’ or ‘Exempt’. It needs to specify that – in addition to those items defined by the Bills of Exchange Act.

And just think how many times – and in how many circumstances – you get a ‘demand’ THAT BEARS NO MENTION OF VAT?

A demand that you are expected to pay – with ‘menaces’ if you don’t!

Apart from the fact that 99% of all demands contain a printed ‘squiggle’ in place of a wet ink signature, there is no mention whatsoever of VAT. This renders the demand COMPLETELY ILLEGAL. In a way that – we have discovered – a Court can’t just brush aside.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

And so the Drabble Brothers (Peter Thomas and Richard) have devised the BoEVAT Remedy. This has now been tested in a Southampton Court ... and has shown to successfully nullify a Parking Fine attempt by a firm called Parking Eye.

Details are on their website <http://www.BoeVAT.org.uk>, including very simple templated letters that can be downloaded for free. There are also descriptions of instances of success ... for example ‘cancellations by Parking Eye’ ... and also the case in Southampton Court ... which resulted in the case being ‘stayed INDEFINITELY’ (details below).

The reason why the BoeVAT Remedy works is because you “agree to pay” the demand. This removes ALL CONTROVERSY and – since Civil Courts operate on the basis of ‘resolving controversy’ – it has nothing to do, if there is no controversy.

And they know that. BUT THEY COULD NOT SIMPLY DISMISS THE CASE ... for reasons I will give below.

The reason is that – while you “agree to pay” (thereby removing controversy) you add a few conditions WHICH SIMPLY REFLECT THE LEGAL POSITION DEFINED BY THE BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT and THE VALUE ADDED TAX RULES.

And by adding these conditions you have done TWO things:

1. NOT added one iota of controversy ...
2. ... but created what is currently an insurmountable problem for any Claimant.

The Judge can't award the case to you ... because by doing so he or she would invalidate every PCN (Penalty Charge Notice), Council Tax Demand, Court Fine, TV Licence Demand, Road Tax Demand etc. etc. etc. i.e. every demand that was not properly Invoiced and showing the VAT position.

But the Judge can't award the case to the Claimant without allowing the Claimant to COERCE YOU INTO BREAKING THE LAW.

The Courts don't obey many rules – but even the most psychopathic of Judges or Clerks would balk at making a ruling to the effect that someone can be “legally bound to BREAK THE LAW”!

So the case was “stayed” ... INDEFINITELY – that being the Court's only viable option.

See <http://www.BoeVAT.org.uk/success>

WARNING: TO USE THE BoEVAT REMEDY SUCCESSFULLY YOU NEED TO STAND UP TO THE INTIMIDATION AND CALMLY STICK TO YOUR GUNS. If taken to Court - and you have followed the exact same templates as downloaded from [**BoEVAT.org.uk**](http://www.BoeVAT.org.uk) - you can conjoin yourself to the Southampton Case **D4FC175X 16th October 2017.**

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Handling the Roots of Evil in Public

There is a golden rule. The corruption and illegitimacy of 'Government' (and all of its Agencies) OPERATE ON NAMES.

NOT ON 'PEOPLE' i.e. Human Beings.

The whys and wherefores of this are fully covered in the Author's other book *Freedom ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word*.

So ... NEVER QUOTE YOUR NAME! (EVER!)

Without knowing your name, The System is without 'teeth' and fairly 'powerless'.

AND, IN LAW, YOU ALWAYS HAVE THE RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT.

Rice .vs. Connolly 1966 Queens Bench Division

This Appeal took place in 1966, and the result is listed in the Police Operational Handbook. The text of the judgement is as follows: **"Held: although every citizen had a moral or social duty to assist the police, there was no relevant legal duty to that effect in the circumstances of the present case, and the appellant had been entitled to decline to answer the questions put to him and (prior to his arrest) to accompany the police officer on request to the police box to establish identity; accordingly, in the circumstances, 'wilful obstruction' by the appellant was not established, although he had been obstructive, because no obstruction without lawful excuse had been established"**

Which, in English says: **If you are innocent, then you don't have to say anything to the Police ... and they cannot charge you with 'obstruction' just because you refused to speak.**

YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT.

And 'silent' means that you do not have to utter a sound, or impart ANY information whatsoever.

So, when you are asked for your 'Name and Address' you can EITHER make no sound at all, OR you can say "*No Comment*". And repeat "*No Comment*" in answer to any question (even if asked if you are going to give "*No Comment*" as the answer to every question ... just answer even that one with "*No Comment*").

Now, you don't want any violence. And, if stopped (for example) by the Police, they will raise to situation into violence against you without too much thought. It tends to be their nature, because they have lots of 'backup', 'resources'. 'muscle' and 'technology' at their immediate disposal. (And, obviously 'might' is ALWAYS 'right'! Well .. it obviously is, in their world. Certainly they are never into philosophical discussions and debates. It's always dismissed with "*Be that as it may ...*")

So, when threatened in any way whatsoever, it is best to fall back on knowledge that you can beat them in Court. This is explained later.

What you must NEVER do, is to give them any more ammunition against you, than they already think they have.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

This means that you NEVER – EVER – UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES – DISCUSS ANYTHING with them. YOU NEVER ANSWER ANY QUESTION.

All too often innocent people fall into the trap of believing that – by explaining what they did, the Policeman will understand that they did nothing wrong. They don't remember, that the Policeman has a quota to fulfil, and doesn't care WHO helps him to fulfil that quota. And if you help him to fulfil that quota – by saying something that allows him to trip you up – then he won't think twice about using you to help him with his quota.

So don't help him.

The Police Force were created in order to solve crimes. The method for solving crimes is: INVESTIGATION, and the GATHERING OF EVIDENCE. Then making Arrests on the basis of evidence gathered, and laying the Charges for the Court System to process. Once they have laid the Charge(s), their job has been done – until such time as they may be called into Court in order to provide Witness Testimony.

The method defines that 'Arrests' and 'Charges' should only ever be made once the INVESTIGATION and EVIDENCE GATHERING has created sufficient evidence such as to warrant a 'Charge'.

Or, to put it another way, 'Arrests' should only ever be made if the 'Charge' is known ... because all of the necessary evidence has been gathered.

So, there is never any excuse for an 'arrest' and "*Oh ... we'll work out what the charge will be later ...*" ... which is often what ACTUALLY happens ... because of the 'quotas' that they are given to fulfil.

The rules are very simple; YOU ARE COMPLETELY INNOCENT OF ANY WRONGDOING – UNTIL – YOU ARE FOUND GUILTY OF SOME WRONGDOING.

And the Policeman is NOT the Jury that has the ability to pass a Verdict upon you.

SO DON'T ALLOW HIM TO BE YOUR JUDGE AND JURY.

Do you get out of your car when he tells you to? **No, you don't.** When you stop, you lock the doors on the inside, and wind the window up, so that he can't get his hand inside to take your Ignition Keys. Leave a gap through which documents can be passed and so that 'conversation' is audible.

Don't answer any questions. He can see the Car Registration Number, and from that he can know which address to send any Paperwork.

You can say, either by the roadside, or at the Police Station: "***I don't answer questions. Charge me. Take me to Court. I don't care what for ... just do it ... if that's what you want. Otherwise - why are you detaining me? Are you detaining me? What for? Am I free to go? Just make up your mind and get on with it. You say you have arrested me 'on suspicion of X'. Well, I'm not going to discuss X with you. If you suspect me of X, then charge me with X, and I'll have my day in Court, Otherwise let me go. No, don't bother to offer me a Caution, because I won't accept it. I won't sign for it. I won't sign for ANYTHING. I won't even sign for the personal effects that you STOLE from me without my consent. You took them without my signature ... you can give them back***

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

without my signature. I do NOT grant you Power of Attorney OR Jurisdiction over me, and I NEVER will."

Repeat all that over and over again, answering "No Comment" to any question you are asked.

At the Police Station, when you are told that you 'Need to make a Statement', **you tell that that you don't**. You can say: "**Have you arrested me?**". If they have, they will say "Yes". You can ask "**Have you charged me?**". If they have, they will say "Yes". Then you can say: "**Fine. In that case I'll say anything I need to say directly to the Judge and the Jury. You've done all you can. Are you detaining me any further, or am I free to go?**".

Your objectives are (a) To give the Police the absolute MINIMUM to use against you and (b) To get away from their clutches, confident that you can beat them in Court.

You *cannot* rely on them accepting your innocence. Actually it is never their decision, anyway. Otherwise there would never be any need for the Court System ... would there? If the Police could decide on whether you are guilty or innocent, why would Courts exist?

If you are ever arrested, they are forced to read you your Rights. The first thing they will say is: "**You do not have to say anything, but ...**". Well ... take them at their word! When they complete it with "**Do you understand?**", you can EITHER say ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ... or "**You just told me I didn't have to say anything, and then you ask me a question in order to prompt me to speak, Well, your answer is No ... I DON'T STAND UNDER. Now, I'm going to take you at your word**".

Just point to your sealed lips, every time he asks you another question.

Police Bail and Police Caution

Don't EVER accept either. REFUSE TO SIGN.

If you go back and read what was said above, about how the method of Police Procedure is supposed to work, no Arrest should take place until a Charge can be laid. At that point, the Court will either grant bail, or place you On Remand.

There is, therefore, IF PROCEDURE IS BEING FOLLOWED, **never any need for Police Bail**. So, if you accept it, they will 'dangle you on a string' and make your life very inconvenient for as long as they choose.

The sensible option is to refuse it. They will then *threaten* to charge you. They may even put you back in the cell, in the hope that you will get fed up – want to go home – and co-operate.

JUST HANG ON, FOR A LONG AS NECESSARY – COMFORTABLE IN THE KNOWLEDGE THAT THEY WILL EVENTUALLY HAVE TO GIVE UP AND LET YOU GO.

Because that is their only REAL option – provided you absolutely refuse to sign.

And never accept a Police Caution. It is very simple. IF they have enough evidence to Charge you, then they WILL Charge you. At which point they will have to let you go, and let the Court System take over the case.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

They only ever offer a Police Caution IF THEY KNOW THEY DON'T HAVE ENOUGH EVIDENCE TO CHARGE YOU!

And – if that's the case – WHY ALLOW THEM TO JUST FULFIL THEIR QUOTA, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME COLLECTING A CRIMINAL RECORD?

The same applies as to the Police Bail: JUST HANG ON, FOR AS LONG AS NECESSARY – COMFORTABLE IN THE KNOWLEDGE THAT THEY WILL EVENTUALLY HAVE TO GIVE UP AND LET YOU GO. Because, again, that is their only REAL option – provided you absolutely refuse to sign for the Caution.

Handling the Roots of Evil in Court

General (Including the experiences of Veronica: of the family Chapman)

There are books of rules covering all kinds of Court Procedures. The two main ones are the Civil Procedure Rules, and the Criminal Procedure Rules.

They are both ‘massive’ tomes – but their contents are almost irrelevant because there is one Overriding Rule Zero: THEY DON’T OBEY THEIR OWN RULES.

If they obeyed their own rules, then we could learn those rules, and we would win many arguments in Court. Because we could use Common Sense, and, in doing so, demolish most of the corruption that is used against the ordinary person.

But, because of Overriding Rule Zero, we have are limited to a few POWERFUL arguments that even their endemic corruptions cannot avoid. One of those, the BoEVAT Remedy, has already been discussed.

But there are still a number of things we can use to defend ourselves. The major ones are:

1. Knowledge of how important the NAME (YOUR Name) is to Court Procedures;
2. Knowledge of how important a SIGNATURE OF OBLIGATION is to Court Procedures (Any time you sign your Name, you create an agreement, which will generally create some form of ‘obligation’ on your part. In the case of Court Procedures, if you sign to accept Bail, then you have agreed an obligation to the Bail Procedures. If you have refused to sign, then the

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Court cannot hold you to the Bail Procedures ... but they can, instead, just hold you On Remand in prison. That's always your choice. However, you have to remember that they would be reluctant to spend the money to keep you On Remand for some absolutely petty offence.);

3. Knowledge of the 'power' of using the phrase '**Power of Attorney**';.
4. Knowledge that when told to plead 'guilty' or 'not guilty', there is actually a third option which is '*There is no case to answer*'.

Combinations of those things above can tie cases up in knots, such as to get them dismissed, or rendered effectively powerless.

The Name is crucial, because ALL procedures are actually targetting The Name (NOT the Human Being). The reasons for this are amply covered in the Author's other book *Freedom ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word*.

So, the first thing the Court MUST do is to 'Get you to admit to your Name'. They do this by simply asking you: "***Are you Mr. or Mrs. So and so?***".

If you respond "***No, I'm not a Name, I'm a Human Being***", they have a problem. The Author has, on two occasions, stood next to someone who has said that. The result in each case was that we were told: "***In that case you have no business with this Court***", at which point we just got up and left the Court.

As we turned to go, the Judge said: "***I am going to make out a Warrant for the arrest of Mr. So and so***". And we were perfectly happy with that, because the Warrant would be 'to be taken to Court' and – when in court and asked: "***Are you Mr.***

or Mrs. So and so?”, we would respond: ***“No, I’m not a Name, I’m a Human Being”***.

And we would continue to do that as many times as necessary.

It seems as though that thought must have – eventually – occurred to the Judge, because my friend heard no more about it.

In the second case, above, demanding to inspect a Signature of Obligation (when one knows one has not signed anything) is likely to cause some consternation. It may very well be that the Court Procedure continues as if they could provide that signature, and it may even result in a decision to seize property, etc. But is unlikely that those orders will actually ever be carried out. Especially if one makes a formal complaint to the appropriate Regulation Authority.

The third and fourth cases, above, tend to be associated. When asked to plead ‘guilty’ or ‘not guilty’, in a Magistrate’s Court, there is actually a third option, which is “There is no case to answer”.

The Magistrate’s Court always forms the ‘pathway’ to a Higher Court, such as a Crown Court for the processing of what are known as ‘crimes’.

(Precisely what a ‘crime’ is – and what it is not – is the subject for another discussion elsewhere)

The Criminal Procedure Rules define ‘crimes that are not really crimes’ - such as Speeding Offences and Parking Offences, etc – as only ‘tryable’ in a Magistrate’s Court.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Whereas REAL crimes – such as murder – are ‘tryable’ only in a Common Law Court, with a Jury of 12, such as a Crown Court, or a Central Criminal Court (the Old Bailey).

And then there are offences which can be ‘tried’ in either Court (Magistrate’s or Crown).

But the path always starts in a Magistrate’s Court. And, from there, some matters can be passed up to Crown Court. ‘Murder’, for example, will always be passed on to Crown Court, because it is a Common Law crime and MUST be assessed by a Jury of 12 – and there is nowhere in a Magistrate’s Court for a Jury Box.

If – when asked whether or not you plead ‘guilty’ or ‘not guilty’ in a Magistrate’s Court – and you respond: “*There is no case to answer*”, you are doing a number of things. A number of things which they don’t very much like.

First of all, by refusing to make a plea, you are REFUSING THEM JURISDICTION OVER YOU. (And they know that).

And you are saying to them: “***If you really want to take this further, then you will have to move it up to Crown Court, because I don’t accept your arbitration***”.

Which puts them in a bit of a bind. You’ve told them that you are not granting them jurisdiction, and in many cases they know that the Crown Court won’t accept the matter (e.g. the Crown Court won’t accept trivia, such as Speeding, Parking, etc).

So, they either have to pass something ‘trivial’ to Crown Court – which they can’t obviously do, because it would make them look stupid – OR ... dismiss the case!

OR ... **do what they normally do**, which is to say: ***“In that case we will enter a plea on your behalf”***.

And this is where the **Power of Attorney** comes in, because your response can be: ***“I specifically DO NOT grant you Power of Attorney to act on my behalf, and I never will. Consequently, if you enter such a plea, then it must be on your own behalf, and you will take the consequences of any judgement. Do I make myself clear?”***.

The silence that results will be proof that you have made yourself clear. You will be even more sure of it when you hear someone shout: ***“Case dismissed!”***.

Experiences of Raymond: of the family St Clair

[He writes] I think some of this might be THE Solution - the glaring obviaity is that they CANNOT break the law to try and convict you.

My experience with Council Tax over the last 8 years (Can Pay, Won't Pay!) has shown that once you get past the Magistrates and get yourself a decent District Judge on the bench, then you actually stand a chance. Because they DO seem to observe the rules - I have been before District Judges W, G and S. And here are some of the very lovely things they said regarding my cases ...

District Judge W:-

I made an application for the Council's Liability Order to be struck out, due to the fact that I was challenging the lawfulness of it, and presented some of the facts. Amazingly the Council didn't object to my application (I was ready for a set-to with

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

them). Then, in the next breath they made an Application - there and then - in the Court - to "re-open" the Liability Order. I jumped up and objected in the strongest terms citing that the law required that I be given "reasonable notice" (14 days) of this application.

Judge W mused for a moment and then looked at the Council's Solicitor and said: *"Yes, I am minded to agree with Mr. xxx (Me) in that reasonable notice is required. Your Liability Order is 'quashed', and your application is denied."*

I thanked the Judge and walked out feeling the knives in my back from the Council's Solicitor, Head of Revenues and another gimp they brought with them.

I think that to-date I am the only person on record to have a Council Tax Liability Order quashed by a District Judge - on the grounds that it wasn't signed sealed or delivered.

District Judge G:-.

Same council, same case one year later in Staines court (Don't ask why)

By now the Council have a Barrister in tow, and after a lengthy dissertation by Mr. J the Barrister, in an attempt to rebut one of my points, Judge G said this: *"Yes, I've listened to you very carefully, Mr. J, and I am afraid he [points at me] has a valid point that you have failed to counter to my satisfaction. What's more .. "* (He now looks at the Head of Revenues from the Council) *" ... you have to understand that from time to time people like him [points at me] will stand up and attack and challenge the system of taxes in this country. and ... I can only believe that such actions are a good thing for society in general!"*

(I nearly fell off my chair when he said that - he adjourned it all off for another three months, to give me more time to prepare my case.)

District Judge S:-

Same council, Same case, 6 months Later in Redhill Court

Myself and my 'lay advisor' had batted a point of law to the Judge, and he handed it to Mr. J the Barrister - who then 'went off on one' for about 20 minutes, and tried to convince Judge S that our point was moot - because the 'Law of Agency' applied in Council Tax collection.

Judge S looked at him for a moment, looked at our representation and said: "*Well Mr. J, I've listened to your proposition with some intent and I am sorry to have to tell you that it will be strange day if anyone on this side of the bench ever buys that argument*"

(Again - you could have knocked me down with a feather!)

So it seems to me that at least SOME Judges out there are 'doing the right thing'

8 years later and the Council Has Given up – I didn't even get a bill this year [*Veronica says: It was 2014 when Ray wrote this*]- they KNOW I will challenge it and I think they are tired of wasting TEN GRAND to try and collect TWO GRAND - its a commercial decision for them, methinks.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Experiences of Michael: of the family Bridger

[He writes]

Example 1. February 2012. Abducted from home by nameless thugs (no warrant of arrest, no warrant cards & no insignia on uniform).

At the Police Station, answered no questions, and signed the paperwork 'Vi Coactus'.

[Veronica says: Vi Coactus is a legal term meaning 'having been forced' or 'under duress'. Whether or not a Policeman would realise that it wasn't a real name is anyone's guess]

When in the Magistrate's Court, the Clerk asked for "*Name, address & date of berth?*". Never answer questions. Answer a question with a question: "***Madam, can you show me the Power of Attorney by which you have been authorised to deal with this matter?***". She was struck dumb for 10 seconds. Fines were issued with alternatives of prison time or seizure of property. **Nearly seven years later we see: Fines not paid, man and property not seized.**

Example 2. July 2017. Sat in the public gallery in Basingstoke Magistrate's Court. The Magistrates stood to leave, someone said: "*All rise!*". A friend and I remained seated in the public gallery. Immediately, a mature usher began shouting: "***STAND UP! STAND UP! STAND UP!***". The Clerk of the Court (a large former rugby player?) RAN the length of the Courtroom, leaned down so that his nose was nearly touching mine and shouted: "***STAND UP! STAND UP! STAND UP!***" To which I responded: "***I CAN NOT HEAR YOU! I CAN NOT HEAR YOU! I CAN NOT HEAR YOU!***" (THAT is a classic legal joke for those who know).

He walked and I remained seated. Throughout the day.

Example 3. In a Magistrate's Court, Mike was once threatened, by a Clerk of the Court, with being held under 'Contempt of Court'. Mike responded: "***Madam, before you could do that, you would first have to prove that this is a Court of Law***".

Silence rained for about 30 seconds while the Clerk did an impression of a fish out of water, and then continued as if no threat had been made, and nothing whatsoever had been said.

The reason, dear Reader, is that a Court of Law is only valid if has been 'Constitutionally-convened'. And since *Halsbury's Laws of England* defines the *Magna Carta Treaty* of 1215 as one of the founding documents of the British Constitution, 'Constitutionally-convened' must mean 'as defined by the *Magna Carta*' i.e. Verdicts to be decided by a Jury of One's Peers. A Magistrate's Court does not contain a Jury Box, and therefore could never claim to be 'Constitutionally-convened'

Experiences of Stuart-Alan: of the family Hill

Background [By Veronica]

Stuart is the Acting First Minister of a small 'small sovereign State', known as Forvik.

See the website **<http://www.forvik.com>** for more details.

Briefly, it is a small island, within the Shetland Islands, which contained a croft. The island covers a land mass of about 2.5 acres in the North Sea. The Owner of the croft, and the island, had no use for it, and 'gifted' it to Stuart, who decided to use it as a 'microcosm' - to challenge the authenticity of Scotland's claim of jurisdiction over the entire Shetland Islands.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Stuart disputes Scotland's claims, based on his extensive researches which have been documented in his book *Stolen Isles: Shetland's True Status* (available on Amazon), and from the website

<http://www.SovereignShetland.com>.

Over the years, Stuart has progressed his claims in many ways, which have resulted in Hearings in Highest Courts in London and Edinburgh. His claims have continually been rebuffed BUT ON THE MOST SPURIOUS OF GROUNDS! Never once has his claims ever been rebuffed by reasoned argument or any substantial proof! At one point, in Scotland, a 'finding' against him was based solely on the wording of one single glossy magazine article, which stated '*Shetland is a part of Scotland*' without providing one iota of proof.

In his own words, Stuart now describes some of the experiences he has received.

[Stuart now writes about Overriding Rule Zero: THEY DON'T OBEY THEIR OWN RULES, based on him simply asking the question in a Shetland Court: "How does Scotland have jurisdiction in this Court?"]

In the Scottish system Sheriff = Judge or Magistrate,
Procurator Fiscal = Prosecutor (elsewhere it is the Crown Prosecution Service)..

In a recent case I challenged the jurisdiction of the court on the basis that Shetland is not part of Scotland. The Sheriff claimed he had jurisdiction because of the result of the Scottish Independence Referendum.

What that has to do with the question is anybody's guess?

At the next hearing, before going into the dock, I started to protest that he had heard no proof of his jurisdiction, and before I knew it I was being taken to police cells in handcuffs. I had taken the precaution to have no identifying documents on me, and refused to identify myself to the police, so they ordered me to strip and put on anti self-harm shorts and top.

After about 45 minutes the Sheriff, the Procurator Fiscal, the Clerk, the Usher and a Police Officer arrived and crammed into the cell. There followed what was alleged to be a 'hearing' in the cell. I continued to refuse to identify myself as STUART ALAN HILL. Bearing in mind that I had no access to any papers, that press and public were excluded, and that they were unable to identify me, this could hardly be described as a fair hearing.

Anyway, bail was withdrawn and I was put on remand for 28 days.

I was in a G4S prison van within 30 minutes, and on my way to the airport [in the Shetlands] and Peterhead Prison [200 miles away, across the sea, in Scotland]. Still no formal identification. Five hours later I protest to the prison reception desk that I'm not the person on their sheet, so they put me back in the prison van, only to drag me back again when they realised that I was not from a local police station, but would have to be sent back to Shetland.

They asked me to open my case, which I refused, so they broke the lock and were able to find court letters with my name, so finally took me in.

I was able to get a bail review hearing after 17 days [in Peterhead prison], so back to the court. I didn't know at the time that two cases were listed in my name, one for the bail

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

review and another for contempt of court. I only knew about the bail review. The Sheriff started by saying that if I had been convicted of contempt of court, I would have received a 28 day sentence. I had served just over half of that, so the matter was dealt with. I was bemused – I knew nothing of any contempt of court charge.

The Procurator Fiscal then deserted the case (probably because he knew I had uncovered a raft of collusion and corruption involving him and the police). The Sheriff said “*You're a free man Mr. Hill*”. I certainly didn't feel like a free man as I was taken back to police cells in double handcuffs!

It was another two hours before I was released, during which time I believe the contempt of court hearing was held in my absence. However it happened, I ended up with a back-dated prison sentence of 28 days without any kind of hearing.

Nothing had happened between the second court hearing and the bail review to give the Procurator Fiscal reason to drop the case – he had all the information at the time of the hearing. Rather than drop the case then, it seems he preferred to see me spend some time in jail.

When their reactions get so extreme, I know I'm getting somewhere!

I sent the police details of 47 criminal acts carried out by the police, Procurator Fiscal and Sheriff. The police wanted to treat them as a police complaint. But when I pointed out that I was alleging conspiracy between all three organisations and gave them a copy of my book *Stolen Isles* to back up my allegations, they had to concede that it must be put before 'a much higher authority', although they did not specify which.

Meanwhile, it continues. [*As at the time of writing, October 2018*] In my latest case. Having taken over 10 months to decide to make a prosecution, which makes it time-barred anyway, the summary of evidence ends with the words “The accused was neither cautioned and charged or made aware by The Police Service of Scotland that a report has been submitted to the Procurator Fiscal for the consideration of prosecution. This was done in liaison and agreement with the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service ***due to the anticipated press attention the accused would have likely drawn to the case***” (My emphasis).

In other words, there was a high level conspiracy to depart from due process to avoid adverse press attention. Lovely. Do they obey their own rules? Only when it suits them.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Anarchy

The word comes from the Greek ‘Arch’, which means ‘king’ or ‘someone who rules’ e.g. ‘Monarch’ (one king), ‘Patriarch’, etc. The prefix ‘An’ negates, therefore ‘Anarch’ means ‘No king’.

‘Anarchy’ simply means no overarching(?) rule-makers, such as ‘Government’.

‘Voluntaryism’ is another way of saying the same thing, because it means that one ‘volunteers’ for those projects one agrees with, and takes no part whatsoever in those one does not agree with. One could, possibly, refer to it as ‘Consentism’.

Current Anarchists base their thinking and arguments on the concepts of Self-Ownership/Sovereignty and the corresponding Non-Aggression Principle.

And that’s it.

There IS no more.

Everything else is ‘up for grabs’.

It’s called: Freedom.

Anarchists get asked: “***Well what is your plan then? How do you think Anarchy will operate?***”. The answer to that is:
THERE IS NO PLAN!

THAT’S THE WHOLE POINT!

There.

Is.

No.

Plan.

That's the difference between Anarchy and everything else!

Under a Plan, or a System (e.g. Communism, Democracy, etc.) people are constrained in some way, in order to fit the Plan. Under Anarchy, NO-ONE IS 'TOLD' WHAT TO DO, because there is no Plan.

The idea is that – in the same way that Supermarkets and High Street Shops can organise themselves, and their customers, entirely by CONSENT – so it should be possible for Human Beings to be sufficiently intelligent to be able to organise everything else entirely by CONSENT ...

... IF LEFT ALONE TO DO THAT ... AND NOT HARASSED BY ILLEGITIMATE 'GOVERNMENTS', AT EVERY TURN.

The problem comes when 'certain' people take Anarchy to mean that they can do whatever they like, without regard to anyone else. This, of course, flouts the basic Non-Aggression Principle, and consequently people such as that are not Anarchists.

However, such people will always exist, and – in consequence – it will be necessary for something like a Peace Force (or Forces) to exist, in order to curtail breaches of the peace.

Anarchy ... Is More Than Just A Seven Letter Word

Peace Forces would be funded by those who volunteer to fund them. Those who fund the Forces would be protected by the Forces.

Those who refused to fund the Forces would be left unprotected, to sort themselves out in whichever way they wanted.

Similarly with Fire Protection Services (Firemen), Medical, etc.

In other words, the general use of voluntary-contributed 'insurance' schemes to cover all requirements for 'protections'. With the Anarchists completely free to choose those services he/she wished to fund, and which TYPE of service they wished to fund e.g. maybe to fund a Homeopathic Medical Service, rather than one controlled by Drugs Cartels and the British Medical Association.

All that is being suggested is that EVERYTHING could be organised on the same principles as High Street Shops, Petrol Stations, Supermarkets, etc. - where no-one is forced into anything, and can freely choose what to purchase, how to purchase it, and where to purchase it.

As opposed to being constantly dictated to by a Parasitic Ruling Class – who are no better (indeed, generally much worse) than everyone else.

That's Anarchy.

Everyone – except psychopaths – are Anarchists at heart.

They just don't realise it.

This book is the work of author, Veronica: of the Chapman family.
It is endorsed by the Freeman Movement.
freemanmovement.com