

# OPEN LETTER TO ROMLEY STEWART FROM ROBERT SUDY



Romley Stewart [commented on a post](#) <sup>1</sup> under the profile [Justinian Woodlands](#): <sup>2</sup>

"I have nothing to do with Rob Sudy... He has sworn an oath to the BAR... and when I asked him to confirm he refused to answer.. He also refused to answer questions about the DOG-LATIN and refused to state his name on his Birth Certificate as I have.. I hear that he lost some court cases and then joined the BAR but I don't know the real story yet... He can advertise and hate my research all he likes, its all advertising and makes people look for themselves... He said the courts have nothing to do with God... Why is a Bible in the Court??? ... so I no longer respond to him because he refused to answer questions... He is probably paid by the BAR to debunk the truth .."

In the interests of fairness and intelligent negotiation, I'm delivering you this public response Romley Stewart. This is, despite the fact that you've demonstrated sadly, you are not the caliber of man to return the honor of such gentleman-like responses, or engage in intelligent, referenced debate. Your only response was to cowardly block me on facebook, and then cowardly talk shit behind my back, so I can't embarrass you with my responses, rather than adopting a more mature intellectual response. It matters not if you can't see me, everyone else will still learn of your deception. This "BAR" you keep harping about must be truly evil. I'll keep that in mind if I ever encounter this organisation. In the meantime, it is fitting that the public be provided with a competent critical analysis of your work, after all, the effort you went to, if nothing else, is quite obvious. Any honest writer would welcome any such criticism, and respond intelligently to the issues raised, but not the infallible Romley Stewart. After your spam on my Australian Paralegal Foundation webpage, I got the impression that you don't really want a response, because all the questions you raise there have already been answered in my book, and I repetitively referred you to the relevant chapters throughout our last interaction. The problem is not that I didn't answer, but that you openly refused to read it.

I quote:

---

<sup>1</sup>

[https://www.facebook.com/JustinianDeception/posts/317263215409125?comment\\_id=319320255203421&reply\\_comment\\_id=319372705198176&comment\\_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R6%22%7D](https://www.facebook.com/JustinianDeception/posts/317263215409125?comment_id=319320255203421&reply_comment_id=319372705198176&comment_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R6%22%7D)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/JustinianDeception>

"As I already said, READ my detailed and referenced response, instead of repeating gobbledygook. You came here to contest something, and yet have no idea what has already been authoritatively covered. I'm not here to waste time repeating myself to the ignorant. Chapters 9-14. Read it and respond to it. All of your questions have already been responded to by the courts, but you would rather hear yourself speak than read the response. Denial is not something I can help you with cobber. I'm not interested in engaging you in rabbit holes or any other abstract speculations, nor your personal opinions, warped biases, and what you personally consider "authorised". Unless it is about something I have cited in my book, we have nothing to discuss. Me, my choice of beer, my dogs favorite snack food, my own meandering opinions, (and whether my name is written in Old English font with an 60 degree italic lean) are very irrelevant to this subject."

**So the problem rather, Romley Stewart, seems to be that you can't bear to even consider fact-checking your own theories, for fear of being shown to be wrong. If you were actually searching for "the truth" you would be capable of such discernment, but unfortunately your search has been one of personal confirmation, not the truth. There are too many omissions of fact in your Justinian Deception, omissions that effortlessly debunk the premise of your book on their own. You would realise this if you read my response to your book, but unfortunately you either seem incapable of such self-criticism, or because it is effectively a faith-based belief, your cognitive dissonance makes it too painful for you to consider any alternative.**

**It follows then, that you do not care whether your conclusions are factually correct, as long as they appear, without any scrutiny, to confirm your hypothesis. When someone raises the prospect of serious inconsistencies in your story, you simply engage in denialism, instead of honesty and integrity. Those are the actions of a deceiver, Romley Stewart.**

**Even with my analysis, I've welcomed academic criticism and analytical thought, offering a \$100 reward for fact-checkers to spot any legal inconsistencies. This is because I'm looking for truth, verifiable facts, not confirmation bias, wishful thinking, or denial of reality. I'll not only admit it if I'm wrong, I'll pay a greenback for legitimate criticism. It relies not on whether they answer questions like it's a scripted sales pitch, (like you demanded of me) or really, any of their own personal opinions, but rather, it relies on citable, court-admissible, unambiguous evidence.**

**"Talking to Sudy is a waste of breath... you can't talk to the ignorant.. .. its pointless."**

**No Romley Stewart, I'm not ignorant at all, I'm just not easily led. I'm a critical thinker, and require evidence for outrageous claims. The more outrageous the claim, the more evidence I require. I rely on verifiable facts, not emotive superstitious speculation. In fact, I'm so unignorant that I can author a comprehensive 500 page fully referenced analysis about these theories, explaining each of the contentions in detail, from the perception of those who are so convinced, AS WELL as from the perceptions and judgments of the courts. Meanwhile, it seems your cognitive dissonance prevents you from holding two such starkly opposing views simultaneously. You can only express ONE SIDE of the story, which, quite ignorantly, happens to be your own meandering opinions.**

Any ignorant person can write down their own opinions, it takes a very unignorant, open-minded person to take in both sides of a story like I have. This can only occur when one doesn't have the added burden of those painful cognitive dissonance symptoms you exhibit, mostly because my conclusions are not faith-based. Either side of the story are not even my own personal opinions, but accurately reflect, one, the perception expressed by the courts, psychiatry and law enforcement, and two, the perception expressed by theorists like yourself. That's the opposite of ignorance.

Your comments incognito as "[Kodey Woodlands](#)"<sup>3</sup> on the [Australian Paralegal Foundation website](#)<sup>4</sup> were quite peculiar. Your multiple one hundred line paragraphs (with just as many question marks) with no breaks, was nearly the most difficult and painful thing I've ever had to read. Your rant complained about bad grammar, and claimed some expertise in this field, while asserting endless speculations and attempting to organise them into different theoretical abstracts.

I actually had to break it up into smaller paragraphs to make it legible enough for myself to read, let alone comprehend, the format is really quite absurd. I only went to grade 5 myself, but I'd be ashamed to post such a mess of bad grammar and expect someone to be able to read it, let alone consider the writer some sort of authority on "grammar". My homeschooled 10 year old son even cringed at it.

Anyway... besides the paranoid conjecture and adhd-like multiple lines of questioning your rant contains, there are also many unreferenced assertions claiming to be fact, each that are merely your own conclusions based on your other conclusions based on your other conclusions based on your other conclusions, all that you'd reached inside your own mind. It really is such a tangled, unintelligible mess that it hardly deserves a response, and if one was given it would have to be more than a simple, single response, with the hundred odd question marks you typed. A court would have to reject it for filing errors. A normal person wouldn't even bother responding, but then again I'm not normal. :)

**Through all the gobbledygook, I managed to find a few questions that appear to burn holes in your brain, so I will respond to each...**

**(1) is all uppercase text (Symbolic text) proper written english?**

I note that you have provided no evidence to establish that all uppercase text actually IS this "symbolic text" you refer to, yet you question me whether I believe it is proper written English. Seems a bit backwards. I've not only read, but published a written analysis of the Justinian Deception, and no legitimate argument has been presented that would make me question that it isn't proper written English.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100014078327684>

<sup>4</sup> <http://para-legal.org.au/sovereignfreemam-debunked/the-freeman-delusion-free-e-book-by-robert-sudy/>

**(2) can you get a Magistrate or anyone that has pledged an oath to the BAR to answer that simple question? That is the question that no magistrate or judge or high court judge will answer! Kerby refused to answer!!!**

Your notions about capital lettering is not a question that relates to law, so there is no viable point in even asking a magistrate. Do you usually ask a butcher how to fix your car? They might trim roses on the weekend, but that doesn't make the magistrate an authority on roses. That question, as well as other irrelevant considerations, like why female praying mantis rip their mates head off and eats it, are considered by the law to be "frivolous", and therefore it is an abuse of process for a court to even spend time discussing it. If it was for some reason relevant to a case, one party could, conceivably, call in an "expert witness" on etymology and the magistrate could then accept his evidence, but it's not a magistrate's field of expertise to comment either way.

As I already stated in our last interaction: "Neither I nor the courts have any obligation to respond to any of your weird beliefs, they are not something that has any basis in law to be able to respond. Nothing we say can rebut your faith-based belief system, with its conspiratorial ahistorical narrative. All we can do is cite the judgment authorities. AGAIN, whether YOU personally AGREE OR NOT is quite irrelevant, the authorities are binding on EVERY COURT in Australia."

In fact, as a Tradesman Signwriter with three decades of experience in business, and someone that spent four years studying the history of lettering styles at Tafe in my apprenticeship, I am actually more qualified to answer your question about lettering than a magistrate or indeed anyone in the legal profession. Adding to my tradesman qualifications, the 5-year development of my E-book, a comprehensive analysis of the main Sovereign Citizen groups operating in Australia and throughout the world, and their theories, which has in fact, made me one of the foremost experts in this field in Australia. This development might well have me subpoenaed as an "expert witness" in the future regarding the Sovereign Citizen concept that capital lettering has some hidden meaning. With this in mind, you are in effect, ignoring a walking, talking piece of evidence, a court admissible authority on the very questions you pretend to be struggling with.

**(3) As far as finding anyone that's pledged an oath to the BAR, no I can't, simply because nobody that I've ever heard of has ever pledged an oath to the BAR. Supreme Court lawyers make an oath of allegiance to the Queen, but there is no other oath. What you are really talking about there, is a U.S. Sovereign Citizen belief based in a conspiracy theory involving the "original Thirteenth Amendment" and not anything to do with Australia, or indeed, lawyers. [You could learn more here if you really wanted to.](#)<sup>5</sup>**

Same response applies to the question of whether I MYSELF have sworn any such non-existent oath. I'm not a Supreme Court lawyer that is required to take an oath of allegiance anyway, so the question is even more absurd, and obviously based in your own paranoia, and gullibility.

---

5

<https://www.facebook.com/notes/freeman-delusion-the-organized-pseudolegal-commercial-argument-in-australia/lawyers-swear-an-oath-to-the-bar/531184713885796/>

**(4) Is "Rob Sudy" the name appearing on your Birth Certificate? Do you have a driver license? and if you do, is the name appearing on your driver license a proper noun appearing in proper written English?**

Yes, Robert Sudy is my family birth name, and names are usually referred to as a proper noun. I am not adopted or anything else if that's what you're asking. I am an authentic Australian citizen born in Australia to naturalised migrants. Yes both documents are written in legible English, and no, there are no other languages on my licence or birth certificate. Quite ironically, my daughter's birth certificate from Western Australia, has all the names in lower case, not capitals.

You went on to claim that:

"All of the wins I have had in the Courts were all done without file numbers, that's right, no files existed... because I was told that the BAR wanted me to be quiet about the DOG-LATIN..."

If you had any sort of "WIN" it would logically have a file number, or no such win would exist. You are basically admitting you have absolutely no evidence for anything you say, while insisting we should just take your word for everything, including your other unreferenced interpretations, like your imaginative fabrication that "DOG-LATIN" has something to do with capital lettering. If you gave the real meaning of dog latin, people could easily google pics of centuries old dog latin verses, all written in lower case. Why not tell people the truth? Oh, that's right, "never let the truth get in the way of a good yarn" hey.

"The man that came up from Sydney was a thirty year Crown Prosecutor... he requested silence on the research into the grammatical and biblical standing of the Government and its Courts... He also wanted the false ABN's of the Queensland Justice Department, not to be published... The meeting with the Crown prosecutor and his friend was videoed but he kept the video for his own reference and said that he will never publish it... "

Hmmm... Did by chance, this man hitch-hike from Sydney with a backpack, crash on the couch and eat all your food? Just sounds like someone I know, with similar claims of being a thirty year Crown Prosecutor. His reputation is impeccable, so I can't tell you his name either.

"Rob Sudy is like the ABC reporter that interviewed me about the false ABN's and he was also given a letter by the Registrar of the Cairns Court admitting that the ABN's were false but that night, I was cast over national television as a Terrorist... "

No, I am nothing like the reporter. I am an established researcher of pseudolegal theory, a subject he probably knows little about, as I do about his field. I'm not familiar with the article either, but if he related you to the Sovereign Citizen Movement, a distinct group that is currently on the Terrorism Watchlist, the reporter is quite correct. Most of the theories you assert in your Justinian Deception, and others that you assert on social media, (including your "oath to the BAR" nonsense above) are all fundamentals of the Sovereign Citizen Movement. They have no basis in law, or anywhere else, but in the ideology of the Sovereign Citizen Movement, and their predecessors the Posse Comitatus.

It is also shared by the Montana Freeman, Roger Elvic's Redemption Movement, Freeman on the Land Movement, Moorish Law, OPPT, Lose the Name, Ucadia, Love for Life, OSTF, and many other groups, collectively known as OPCA (Organised Pseudolegal Commercial Argument) litigants.

"What did I do wrong? reported what I thought was a mistake by the Court and the Government and I spoke to ABC because they asked me what I had found... I was then threatened by the head of CIB and 4 other people, 3 from south, two from the Gold Coast and one from Sydney..."

As I said, I know nothing about the case, but it is certain if you go around accusing authorities of fraud, let alone fraudulently selling your soul to Satan, it is bound to cause a response. If you don't want controversy, you shouldn't start one.

"Rob Sudy has not debunked anything with any evidence, he places his evidence on cases that have been finalised in their corrupt courts..."

As is invariably the case with most Sovereign Citizens, you seem to think your distorted understanding of life, and knowledge of Australian law, overrules anything the courts, and generations of learned scholars say. You also fail to see that the "corrupt courts" you refer to, are bound by law to uphold the very authorities cited in these cases. In fact, if any court, unconstitutionally ruled in opposition to any of the High Court precedents cited, criminal charges of perverting the course of justice would inevitably apply to any judicial officers involved. It follows then, that this "corrupt courts" (sic.) obligation to precedent, far outweigh any obligation to your crazy notions. Your warped theories offer no threat at all to the status quo, because the courts are bound by law to reject them.

The copout above that I cite "cases that have been finalised in their corrupt courts..." is quite ridiculous, when you think that these "corrupt courts" ultimately have the final say on these matters. It's delusional. You run around screaming "WHY WON'T THEY ANSWER THIS QUESTION!?" while the courts have already unanimously responded, and you insist on ignoring their response. That's very self-defeating. The courts are obliged to precedent regardless of anything you have to say, and burying your head in the sand regarding the obligations of a court does not prevent this, it just makes you uninformed and ignorant, as well as stupid. At your age you should of well grown out of childish ignorance, sticking your fingers in your ears and chanting "Lalalala I can't hear you", but here we are hey... Hate to burst your bubble, but if you cross your fingers behind your back in court, it's still perjury too.

"but the question has nothing to do with the matter, its got to do with the jurisdiction of two written languages appearing on one document.. That is the question that no magistrate or judge or high court judge will answer! Kerby refused to answer!!! and Sudy believes THIS TYPE OF TEXT is English when there is no proof..

This statement makes it obvious you have not read my detailed response, published as "[THE ROMLEY STEWART DECEPTION](#)" by Justinian" <sup>6</sup> where all of these questions are addressed, and all of your

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/groups/506741482996786/527896477547953/>

notions debunked. If you would of read my response, you would notice that debunking your story required no decision from the "corrupt courts" either, because your inconsistencies are not a matter of law, but of fact.

When one considers your distorted personal interpretations of "DOG LATIN" (meaning: a secret language games for kids) "GLOSSA" (meaning: foot notes or margin notes) and that "American Sign Language" (meaning: "hand signs" for the hearing impaired) is not "symbolic text" or any "foreign language", your book nearly debunks itself.

All that was required was to re-include the omissions you intentionally made, and references you intentionally didn't provide, all because they didn't fit with the narrative. Most people change their views to suit the facts, while you attempt to change the facts to suit your views.

It follows then, that since you have not provided any legitimate evidence that there are in fact "two written languages appearing on one document" you are contemplating, and demanding I answer questions about, something that doesn't even exist.

## The full thread <sup>7</sup>

**"Before you can claim freedom, you have to find yourself in order to make such a claim of freedom... One must find their way back to "Eden", one must know their political standing, their correct name because if you know not ones own name, than you are surely lost! ... How can you claim freedom when you don't know who you are? ... The key to freedom is the key to the Garden of Eden... The deception is in the words..."**

Without even guessing this was Romley Stewart incognito, I replied...

"Excellent question... I think I'll have to have a think about that very esoteric assertion when I'm feeling deeply spiritual and nostalgic. In the meantime, I know for a fact is that question has nothing to do with the courts, or anything remotely to do with law, or the legal system, and I can easily prove that raising that issue won't make an iota of difference to the judiciary or the police. If you really want to test your theory, the stare decisis authorities every magistrate is obliged to uphold for that ratio decidendi are contained in the link. If you READ the information provided, directly from hundreds of judgments in the higher courts, your comment would seem somewhat delusional, in hindsight. I hope you find what you are looking for, but you won't find it in OPCA theories."

(I was actually referring to Pickin v British Railways Board (1974 -U.K.) HL an authority that was recently upheld in BarrettLennard -v- Bembridge [2015] WASC 353. Links can be found in Chapter 35 of my book)



"In earlier times many learned lawyers seemed to have believed that an Act of Parliament could be disregarded in so far as it was contrary to the law of God or the law of nature or natural justice, but since the supremacy of Parliament was finally demonstrated by the Revolution of 1688 any such idea has become obsolete. This passage has been cited with approval in various courts in Australia. Any moral principles derived from scripture do not detract from the sovereignty of Parliament. Nothing in the coronation oath detracts from the supremacy of Parliament or from the efficacy of laws passed by Parliament. These grounds are entirely without merit; they have no reasonable prospects of success. I would refuse leave to appeal in respect of these grounds."

That answers your "Why are Bible's in courts then?" assertion. Australia is a purely secular nation, no particular religious group has any more validity than any other. Nobody has any obligation to a particular religious denomination, Christians generally swear on the Bible, but for those who are non-religious, the associated affirmations (as opposed to oaths) apply. Other religions and their devotees, such as Muslims for example, are entitled to take their oaths on the Quran, to Allah, or as their particular faith dictates. Members of Parliament that are Muslim do the same with their parliamentary oaths. It is after all, pointless for me to swear on someone else's belief, when I know that Bugs Bunny is clearly in control of all other deities. The Commonwealth has no powers to impose any sort of religious belief, Section 116 of the Constitution states: "The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion, or for imposing any religious observance, or for prohibiting the free exercise of any religion, and no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the Commonwealth."

"I notice that there are two birth certificates? one for the given name and one for the surname??? ...I did also notice that the certificate states: Name and Surname, meaning two names? so is it us that assumes by mistake that our true name is the combined names adding the given name and the family name together when in fact that is not stated on the state birth certificate?"

I don't know where you "notice" this "second birth certificate", I've only got the one, as do most people. I don't have a baptismal, naming or christening certificate, what you are referring to as another birth certificate further on. It is not a birth certificate, but a christening certificate, and if someone left the surname out on yours, there is no way to know it's you and not some other little Romley. Like millions of other Australians, I'm not Catholic or Anglican, and was never christened. But ultimately, this means nothing in terms of my status as a person, or a citizen. It is a religious institution recording religious ceremonies, not a birth registry recording births. Likewise, it doesn't "mean two names" but two parts of a name.

"I noticed that on the other certificate of birth it states that the full name that joins the both names together is the property or in the custody of the Registrar General? .. (Written in the margin and signed by the Governor General), that means the State owns the name that is joined together (Incorporated)?? with the family name...."

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://para-legal.org.au/sovereignfreemam-debunked/the-freeman-delusion-free-e-book-by-robert-sudy/>



**Registration of anything does not alter ownership. Refer to Chapter 26 of my book. Lose the Name claims a similar "Crown ownership" of names, ignoring completely that the Crown Copyright Guidance for all Birth, Deaths and Marriages Certificates is found on the National Archives website.**

**In section 1 it clearly states: "The Crown does not assert any rights of ownership in the contents of the forms." Refer to Chapter 70 of my book.**

"I assume that if you claim your name to be the State name, like "John Peter Smith", the state can assume that name to be incorporated as a "person-corporation" and legally assume that the one holding such a name is the state owned "person" being the corporation??...

**A single "person", or individual, is NOT EVER a corporation. A corporation can only be a group of individuals, not one individual. Refer to Chapter 11 of my book.**

"All the facts seem to be correct on the Birth Certificate but a lot of people seem to read it wrong I assume... If you are in court ask the magistrate if he would like me to hold the state account, being the full name, for a compensation charge, the magistrate seems to decline the offer and lets you go? .. no big deal... I did notice that the Courts have Bibles sitting in them too? .. what are they there for if its not spiritual? ..

**Refer to Chapter 35 of my book. Pickin v British Railways Board (1974 -U.K.) HL an authority that was recently upheld in BarrettLennard -v- Bembridge [2015] WASC 353.**

I can remember Jesus saying: "In my name you shall be saved" well I assume that the Christian name is the only name one should hold if you want to be saved from the dogs of the LEDGERS and the underworld administrated by the men in black dresses morning the dead as they walk into their "Chambers" (Tombs) ha ha ha.... I think the joker card is the SURNAME!!!... lol ... , and that seems to work OK for me??? .. You look a bit like Jesus, I thought you might know some of that stuff that Jesus warned about names and that one must know how to read the SIGNS being: Engraved Images!!!??? found on Grave Stones!. .. If you go to the Church where you were Christened, they also have a Birth Certificate that looks just like the State Birth Certificate and that also has no other name appart from your Given name or Christian name .. so I wonder why people claim the Surname or Family name, (As you may have done) as a part of their name when there is no written evidence that such a name that is joined to the given name exists??? ... but I notice that people that hold the full state owned name get treated like shit by the Government? .. I notice that trust Law is not like normal law, it deals with credits and debts, and charges but the charges can only be issued to the State owned account such as the name that is incorporate with the family name into a "person" ... ??? I assume that the real public are the Christian name holders that don't assume the family name as a part of their name and they are the creditors in the Government trust system? ..There are not many of them I can tell you! lol... I might be wrong but seems to be working so far... The lawyers back away from that stuff for some reason? .. I think if you assume the SURNAME as a part of your name, you might be stuffed, or assumed lost at sea in a legal sense maybe, and you get salvaged in order for the State to assume salvage rights over your estate maybe???

**The Cestui Que Vie Act 1666 does not declare us "lost at sea" Refer to Chapter 35 of my book.**

(Could be why they removed Grammar and Latin from Australian schools in 1966, to dumb the Australian for a massive grammatical fraud???) . All the people you got here seem like people that are trying to work out how our government is fucking over the people of Australia and you seem to be saying they are bad people or something or calling them nuts??? ... these are the real Australians that care about what the government is doing to the people ..

**Go the patriotic crap, gonna start waving flags too? It is not Australian at all, the OPCA ideas you and these other people mentioned preach are not even new, they were invented by the U.S. Posse Comitatus Movement and Roger Elvic in the 1980's. What you are condoning, is Aussies using the failed legal strategies and beliefs of a U.S. white supremacist cult. And you don't even know it. \*shakes head\* Refer to Chapter 65 of my book. Your belief system has been identified as a potential source for the last of three key elements that motivate ideologically driven violence in "lone wolf" terrorists, and the collective of individuals that comprise these groups, declared the number one terrorist threat in most nations, including Australia. Refer to Chapter 8 of my book.**


Its a shame that more people don't hold the Government and the Courts to account I recon... they need policing too!!... I did also notice that names on Court Documents appear in all caps text? that does not exist in the English Styles Manuals but it is identified in the Chicago Manual of Styles as a foreign SIGN language and it appears in the Blacks Law Dictionary as a debased text if it does not follow the grammatical rules of Ancient Latin ..That was a real head twister finding that!!! ha ha ... and that question will never be answered by a Magistrate, they go funny looking when you ask them if they can read English! ha ha .. and then when they say they can, you hit them with that Question!! ha ha ... Is that a proper name appearing in English!!! ... sure is funny? ... anyway, someone has to keep the plebs under controle so the Lawyers and Magistrates gotta do their thing to the pagans and keep them paying again!!! ha ha ha ...

**The references you cited do not in the least establish capital lettering as a foreign sign language, a glossa, or dog latin, let alone in any way support the three interpretations you invented in your wild consiratorial fancy. Refer to The Romley Stewart Deception.**

(1) is all uppercase text (Symbolic text) proper written english? and (2) can you get a Magistrate or anyone that has pledged an oath to the BAR to answer that simple question? unless you are saying that "ALL UPPERCASE SYMBOLIC TEXT LIKE THIS" is googleygook? than I will agree with you. (3) Do you have a driver license? and if you do, is the name appearing on your driver license a proper noun appearing in proper written English? .. Can you answer thoes simple questions because if you can, you are smarter than a 30 year Crown Prosecuter that I will not name here, however, he flew up from Sydney to talk about these two questions relating to the grammatical standing of the DOG-LATIN text (Debased Latin meaning Criminal in the Webster's Dictionary) and requested silence on the grammatical standing of the DOG-LATIN appearing on Government and Court documents for fear of, (In his words) "the City of London losing control of the masses". Is "Rob Sudy" the name appearing on your Birth Certificate? ... Andforeign: have you sworn any oath to the BAR? .. (City of London) .. If you want to publish the copyright written material of other people without expressed consent than you have to defend your actions so ... answer the questions so I know your grammatical ability to read common English....

Further more, in relation to the name appearing on the driver license (Queensland) Magistrate : Pinder, (Cairns Magistrates Court) also refused to answer the simple question relating to the appearance of the all uppercase text where the so called name appeared. the matter went into an Estopple by conduct, and the police were warned by Magistrate Pinder, to leave me alone and never touch me again because the Question relating to the grammatical identification of the text "could not be said"... No file number existed on any document relating to such court matters...If you can't answer these questions, I recommend that you don't publish any written content or graphics created by the Justinian Deception or Romley Stewart without expressed consent. Romley Stewart, has agreed to remain quiet to an extent about the DOG-LATIN deception, however, when other people speak about such content, it gives good reason to respond because the agreements were silence on both sides of the political standing... I assume that you hold a surname so I can only assume that you have agreed to hold the debtor accounts of whoever you represent or pledged an oath to...

As I already said, READ my detailed and referenced response, instead of repeating goobleygook. You came here to contest something, and yet have no idea what has already been authoritatively covered. I'm not here to waste time repeating myself to the ignorant. Chapters 9-14. Read it and respond to it. All of your questions have already been responded to by the courts, but you would rather hear yourself speak than read the response. Denial is not something I can help you with cobber. I won't respond further unless you can quote me from my book. :) By the way, I WILL be publishing quite an extensive range of screenshots from Romley Stewart, I'll be describing the basic theories he endorses, and the courts perspective of them from his own case. If you are suggesting that investigative journalism is somehow contrary to law, that citing photographed comments he has publically made to his indoctrinated "flock" and generally making his beliefs more public knowledge, I think you ought to get a grip. In the interests of fair education and public awareness of hoaxes, I will be publishing any content I find appropriate to the issue. Read my work and learn a thing or two.



**"OPCA litigants appear, engage in a court drama that is more akin to a magic spell ritual than an actual legal proceeding, and wait to see if the court is entranced and compliant. If not, the litigant returns home to scrutinize at what point the wrong incantation was uttered, an incorrectly prepared artifact waved or submitted."**

---

PARANOIA

- Associate Chief Justice J Rooke  
(Court of Queen's Bench, Alberta Canada)

"I don't know who you are, your book is unauthorized.. have you sworn an oath to the BAR? is "Rob Sudy", the name appearing on your birth certificate? and do you believe DOG-LATIN is english? .. I couldn't be bothered to read any more of your ebook, its a wast of time, it doesn't answer the questions that you also can't answer or a Magistrate can't answer. And as I say, what is a "sovereign citizen?" If there are any Court File numbers in relation to Romley Stewart matters, that would be good to know... Even the ERGON ENERGY Matter, that Ergon Energy lost in Court against: Darran John Brace, and Gregg Lawyers, no longer exists even though we still have a copy of the original documents from Gregg Lawyers, and a file number!!!, The Queensland Court appears to have Lost the file!!! ... lol .. thats because if a Court registrar holds false files, or tenders it as a counterfeit, they are looking at up to seven years in prison... No court matters relating to him in relation to all the "driving without a license charge" have file numbers, and now there is no record of any of such court matters!!! .. you see, the court you assume to be a court is not a court! its a private entity like McDonalds or Microsoft! but you think its a Court!...It publishes its wins but conceals its losses because it is obligated to conceal because its a corporation or company or non organization... lol .. I am sure you will get the same questions from the Justinian Deception site and you will still not answer such simple questions that even the seven criminals that sit on the High Court bench refuse to answer.....These are questions that many people are starting to ask now... The swearing in of the Governor General was "assumed" and why I wonder??? .. , you can download the PROCLAMATION on the net, is it signed with a name?... Not even Louise Brice could answer that Question in writing or by speaking direct! ..

**Assumed? So you mean the Letters Patent relating to the Office of the Governor General that were assented by the Queen on 21 August 2008, and recorded in Special Gazette No. S179 (dated 9 September 2008) didn't actually happen? Wow hey. Refer to Chapter 52 of my book.**

however, it was nice that she spoke about the way the signature appeared but was lost for words when there was no valid name under her "mark", however, when pointed out that SIGN was no part of the English language, she did not answer the question in writing, she left the office..... ... that is another simple question too or did some court rule say you can sign documents without authorization now? is that the new "corporation" rule??? ... .. and is the ABN of the Queensland Justice Department been fixed now and not piggybacked to a small private unsuspecting company such as MENA COLLECTIONS or THE GREAT BIG FOOT???.... That letter confirming the fals ABN came from: Mark Thomas Morrow, head Registrar of the Cairns Court, however, he left too after his letter was published admitting to the false ABN's of the Justice Department... mmmm ... Are the so called Court Rulings you refer to, the ones ruled in the courts that are proclaimed by a false Governor General proclamation and a court that is identified by a false ABN (Australian Business Number???) ... I wonder who is really tendering the gooblygook? MR SUDY... Are these the questions answered in 9-14? ... and if you agree that unauthorized documents are valid when even Magistrate McFadden ruled tha t the ERGON ENERGY Queensland State Owned Power Company power bills are invalid! but can be "Claimed" as an "offering" (Offer and acceptance, UNIDROIT rules I assume Re: 1973 Whitlam Signed Australia over to the UNIDROIT Treaty of Rome) than you must agree with the counterfeit Courts that you quote from? .. Romley Stewart, writes under the name appearing on the Birth Certificate, meaning: Authorized! .. but can you make that claim? ... no wonder you can't answer these questions and than pass it off as gooblygook... lol ... because you don't even

know your own true given name or undersign it... rendering your ebook as unauthorized... and not worth the paper or the electrons that it appears on."

As I said, I'm not interested in engaging you in rabbit holes or any other abstract speculations, nor your personal opinions, warped biases, and what you personally consider "authorised". Unless it is about something I have cited in my book, we have nothing to discuss. Me, my choice of beer, my dogs favourite snackfood, and own meandering opinions, (and whether my name is written in Old English font with an 60 degree italic lean) are very irrelevant to this subject...

The REFERENCES speak for themselves...With extracts carefully compiled from hundreds of cases in Australia, and judicial analysis of over 1000 OPCA cases just in Canada and Australia.

I couldn't give a flying fuck about you or your line of questioning, neither I nor the courts have any obligation to respond to any of your weird beliefs, they are not something that has any basis in law to be able to respond. Nothing we say can rebut your faith-based belief system, with its conspiratorial ahistorical narrative. All we can do is cite the judgment authorities. AGAIN, whether YOU personally AGREE OR NOT is quite irrelevant, the authorities are binding on EVERY COURT in Australia.

So if you can cite me a single matter where a case was dismissed and the reasons cited in the final judgment were based in acceptance of the strawman myth, I will let the DPP know they should appeal. In fact I'll pay you \$5000 for the information, with an OPCA promissory note. :P

Until then, you are speaking goobleygook, and your mental health issues are becoming obvious for all to see, with your lengthy rants with no substance. (This is also something I've covered in my book. :) Anyway, I do appreciate you dropping by, if only to give the readers a perfect example of the psychoanalytic conclusions reached unanomously by those who have studied the OPCA phenomena. (discussed in chapter 3) :)

"We all know where you stand now.. you answered every question...Thanks!... lol ... You are a "Resident!" .. ha ha ha ... You don't even know your own name!!! .. (Too afraid to answer in public, but you will also be warned not to answer such questions!) .. and people like you (Persons) that are incorporated with their Family names, are subject to your own; UNIDROIT Authority, and for good reasons, because Children need to be controled... You got a license: .. is that your "name" ??? lol ... you signed it! your claimed it, you consented to it, it must be! ..... Can you read? do you know the difference between Symbolic text and Discriptive text? .. lol ... you think it all means notheing? well you would have been warned to never mention the grammatical standing of the BAR documents, because they are counterfeits! but "you" don't have the ability to see the glitch! because you claimed yourself to be a "pleb" the evidence is with your claim over your License ... your ebook is a joke written by the jokers...the babylonians!.. the masters of dribble text, yes! DOG-LATIN, (Blacks Law Dictionary 4th edition, the debased emmoral criminal text of the BAR, the Jokers... and I mean that in a legal sense... Unauthorized, and is just another BAR diversion from the real law of grammar... the only law is the rules of the language used! and the deception is played on thoes like you that don't know the such rules as evident her... Your book: the ebook for the plebs when they have their "plebiscite" all the "plebs" must go and vote! ... .. lol ... So you swore an oath to the BAR did you??? ... ha ha ha ... you should know that

any member of a corporation can not harm the corporation they "serve" (Servant-slave) no matter what crime you may have committed... so ... now that you are a "citizen" of the City of London, ("City" is just the: "City of London") your loyalty must be with such a foreign entity... The City of London is only the "Administrator" and is subject to the directions of the creditor... Am I wrong???... The creditor is another alien political standing over the debtor via the agent with total authority over the dead administrator...Am I right? (Trust law???) the highest court judge sitting on the real Australia but "in" the quasi: AUSTRALIA, such as French, is just the highest ranking "pleb!" that upholds the lie for the people that cant read english and wind up as the debtors of their own estates... ... but he is worse than you because he knows the answers to the questions I asked you... You don't know yet! but when you do find out, if you ever do, you have the choice to stay in fraud or leave.. yep, 14 days to come to terms with where you want to politically stand... and if you are a dog, your sole (Not soul) will remain with the water and never find its way home... you see, the world of LEGAL is the world of the DEAD.... your in your life after death right now and this is the only chance you have to save yourself and find your way home to life ... All a bit too much for you to understand? than what is the "Bible" doing in your court rooms??? appart from it being a Quasi counterfeit, its still your Bible! ... I am sure you will get your warning from your own side to be careful what you write... because the BAR must tell the truth or remain "silent" and if you are a member of the BAR... than you should be careful uttering your claims to the public if you can't answer questions relating to such claims... In relation to every case you mention, not one is authorised, it cant be, because its fictitious... a presumption... one fact could destroy the Judge!

You are obviously suffering mental health issues, I think you should see someone about that. I didn't even read your comment, it only makes me feel sympathetic that your belief system is causing you so much inner turmoil. But that is none of my business, neither does it have any relevance to my work, or the obligations of the courts.

You will come to whatever conclusions you will, based on your own world view.(and you do)

There are several FACTS the reader can gain from all your comments, since it is mostly unintelligible conspiratorial gibberish:

- \* None of your comments in any way take anything away from the validity of the authorities cited in my book.
- \* None of your comments in any way establish any validity to claims of courtroom success.
- \* None of your comments in any way establish anything but the strength of your own belief, and that is quite irrelevant to me, and the subject matter.





I can read the delightful glee in your words  
""We all know where you stand now.. you answered every question...Thanks!... lol ... You are a "Resident!" .. ha ha ha ... You don't even know your own name!!! .. (Too afraid to answer in public, but you will also be warned not to answer such questions!) .. and people like you (Persons) that are incorporated with their Family names, are subject to your own; UNIDROIT Authority, and for good reasons, because Children need to be controlled..."

The strangely ironic thing about your glee, is that you are laughing at yourself. There is no legally recognised or provable difference between our two legal status'. You have no rights or privileges that I am not likewise equally eligible, so your whole point is very moot. What you are scoffing at, (even though it's only valid in your own mind) applies equally to yourself. One does not "contract" themselves as a citizen. The obligations to law is statutory, not contractual. Refer to Chapter 23 of my book.

There is no way to divide ones human self from their person, they are "indivisible" according to the High Court, as also demonstrated by the mountain of associated case law. Refer to Chapter 9-14 of my book.

**I've now debunked your book, and replied to all your comments.**

**Your serve, Romley Stewart. 😊**

**In the usual form of procedure and evidence as in a court, you must either concede to the evidence, or provide REAL EVIDENCE to the contrary. On each point I've raised.**

**You have 14 days to respond accordingly, or you will be in commercial agreement by your acquiescence. (lol)**

**Good luck. 😊**

**I've included a copy of "THE-ROMLEY-STEWART-DECEPTION" in this PDF for your enlightenment...**



# THE-ROMLEY-STEWART-DECEPTION

By Justinian I 😊 **Debunking** The Justinian Deception <sup>8</sup>

[Romley Stewart](#) <sup>9</sup> discovers the "GLOSSA"...

The Justinian Deception by Romley Stewart is a captivating work of fiction. <sup>10</sup>

I say fiction because that is all it is, a conspiratorial bedtime story about a world ruled by Rome through the secret use of grammar. There are no references cited that establish his storyline as fact, only a couple of cherry-picked obscure verses to which he applies his own distorted interpretation to fit the narrative. It is jam-packed with innuendos, abstract speculations, unanswered questions, superstitions, personal religious bias, more warped interpretations, and possible theories, but facts are hard to come by. It also adopts other myths already covered in Section Two of [Freeman Delusion](#),<sup>11</sup> like the basic maritime admiralty myth, [Chapter 34. LOST AT SEA - THE CESTUI QUE VIE ACT 1666](#); [Chapter 32. AUSTRALIA IS A FOREIGN CORPORATION REGISTERED WITH THE US SEC](#) and most others, and portrays them from the perspective of the "Glossa" narrative.

Ultimately, it is a story about a desperate search to establish that all capital lettering means something, because that is where it began. "Rohan walked in and said: I found something in the: [Chicago Manual of Styles](#), that identifies the all uppercase text as a "GLOSSA" and from that find, we found Justinian, of 530 AD, and the GLOSSA, that now gave us the ability to place a name with the all uppercase text."

(1) There is not a mention of how the name of his "tale" is associated with the Eastern Roman Emperor Justinian I, only his own conspiratorial speculation that this person created "Glossa" to enslave humanity. Apparently it was Accursius though, a Roman jurist "around 1230 in the Hohenstaufen Dynasty of the Roman Empire" that completed the "Justinian GLOSSA Corpus Juris Code, laws of the Dead Corporation System". There is no mention of what the *Corpus Juris Civilis* is, anything about its history, continuation, or revival. There is not even a single reference to the many fine literary works written about the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, to add a touch of credibility.

(2) The second glaring absence, is the meaning of a "Glossa". He sidesteps around it citing every narrative-fitting definition of a similar root word "gloss", except the actual meaning of a "Glossa". The term has a specific meaning that in all honesty, looks to be intentionally omitted. Again, there is not a single reference to the many fine literary works written about "Glossa's" to add a touch of credibility. I should tell him his page requires a "Glossa" for references, but he doesn't have any, and understanding what that might possibly mean would only confuse him further.

(3) The third point, identical, is the meaning of "Dog Latin". He again sidesteps around it citing only the narrative-fitting Blacks Law: "the language of the illiterate" and how since "Dog Latin" is considered

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/groups/290861717996493/>

<sup>9</sup> Romley Stewart on Facebook

<sup>10</sup> <https://justiniandeception.wordpress.com/>


<sup>11</sup> <https://www.facebook.com/groups/506741482996786/>

"debased Latin", therefore it is "criminal, immoral and constitutes a counterfeit". Again, the term actually has a specific, first meaning, that in all honesty, looks to be intentionally omitted. And likewise, not a single reference to the many fine literary works written about "Dog Latin" to add a touch of credibility.

There is a reason why he makes so many omissions, it is simply because the facts omitted are **inconsistent with his narrative**, which is to establish that all capital lettering means something. After reading this analysis, it becomes obvious to the reader that he has cherry-picked a couple of terms out of context, and without even understanding what they mean, ran with it for his story, simply because it **mentioned a possible association with all capital lettering**. His very imaginative, lengthy extrapolations on these terms is really quite an absurd, paranoid delusion.

**His basic premise is: "The: SECRET-FOREIGN-SIGN language hidden in plain sight. "DOG-LATIN": The poison in the text: It is a poisonous gloss that corrupts the essence of the text."**

(4) He snatched this ambiguous beauty from the 4<sup>th</sup> Edition of Blacks Law Dictionary: "**GLOSSA VIPERINA EST QUIE CORRODIT VISCERA TEXTUS. 11 Coke, 34. It is a poisonous gloss which corrupts the essence of the text**". It's a perfectly vague passage to promote further speculation, well, paranoia more so, since it is based on previous conclusions. Again, the associated lengthy extrapolations, warped personal opinions, and spooky insinuations, but not one reference to judicial meaning of the phrase cited.



**(1) The Corpus Juris Civilis** ("Body of Civil Law") is the modern name for a collection of fundamental works in jurisprudence, issued from 529 to 534 by order of Justinian I, Eastern Roman Emperor. It is also sometimes referred to as the Code of Justinian, although this name belongs more properly to the part titled Codex Justinianus. The work as planned had three parts: the Code (Codex) is a compilation, by selection and extraction, of imperial enactments to date; the Digest or Pandects (the Latin title contains both Digesta and Pandectae) is an encyclopedia composed of mostly brief extracts from the writings of Roman jurists; and the Institutes (Institutiones) is a student textbook, mainly introducing the Code, although it has important conceptual elements that are less developed in the Code or the Digest. Justinian found himself having to enact further laws and today these are counted as a fourth part of the Corpus, the Novellae Constitutiones (Novels, literally New Laws).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Charles M. Radding & Antonio Ciaralli, "The Corpus Juris Civilis in the Middle Ages: Manuscripts and Transmission from the Sixth Century to the Juristic Revival" (Brill, Leiden, 2007).



The work was directed by **Tribonian**, an official in Justinian's court. His team was authorized to edit what they included. How far they made amendments is not recorded and, in the main, cannot be known because most of the originals have not survived.

The text was composed and distributed almost entirely in Latin, which was still the official language of the government of the Byzantine Empire in 529–534, whereas the prevalent language of merchants, farmers, seamen, and other citizens was Greek.

By the early 7th century, the official government language had become Greek during the lengthy reign of Heraclius (610–641)

<sup>13</sup> New Greek legal codes, based on [Corpus Juris Civilis](#), <sup>14</sup> were enacted. The most known are: [Ecloga](#) (c. 740)—enacted by emperor Leo the Isaurian, <sup>15</sup> [Proheiron](#) (c. 879)—enacted by emperor Basil the Macedonian and Basilika (late 9th century)—started by Basil the Macedonian and finished by his son emperor Leo the Wise. <sup>16</sup> The name "Corpus Juris Civilis" occurs for the first time in 1583 as the title of a complete edition of the Justinianic code by Dionysius Godofredus. <sup>17</sup>

The Corpus Juris Civilis was translated into French, German, Italian, and Spanish in the 19th century. <sup>18</sup> However, no English translation of the entire Corpus Juris Civilis existed until 1932 when Samuel Parsons Scott published his version The Civil Law. Unfortunately, Scott did not base his translation on the best available Latin versions, and his work was [severely criticized](#). <sup>19</sup> Fortunately, [Fred. H. Blume](#) did use the best-regarded Latin editions for his translations of the Code and of the Novels. <sup>20</sup> A new English translation of the Code, based on Blume's, was published in October 2016. <sup>21</sup>

<sup>13</sup> George Long, in William Smith, ed., A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, (London: Murray) 1875 [http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/secondary/SMIGRA\\*/Codex\\_G\\_et\\_H.html](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/secondary/SMIGRA*/Codex_G_et_H.html)

<sup>14</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corpus\\_Juris\\_Civilis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corpus_Juris_Civilis)

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/178179/Ecloga>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.doiserbia.nb.rs/img/doi/0584-9888/2004/0584-98880441099S.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> Kunkel, W. An Introduction to Roman Legal and Constitutional History. Oxford 1966 (translated into English by J.M. Kelly), p. 157, n. 2

<sup>18</sup> Hulot, H. et al., Corpus iuris civilis. Le Digeste, les Institutes, le Code, les Nouvelles 14 vols (1803-11); Otto, C.E., Schilling, B., Sintenis, C.F.F., Das Corpus Iuris Civilis in's Deutsche übersetzt... 7 vols. (1831-39); Vignali, G., Corpo del diritto, corredato delle note di D. Gotofredo... 10 vols. (1856-62); Rodriguez de Fonseca, B. et al., Cuerpo del derecho civil... 2 vols. (1874)

<sup>19</sup> See Timothy Kearley, Justice Fred Blume and the Translation of the Justinian Code (2nd ed. 2008) 3, 21.

<http://www.uwoy.edu/lawlib/blume-justinian/files/docs/historyajcrev-1.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> Kearley, Timothy G., "From Rome to the Restatement: S.P. Scott, Fred Blume, Clyde Pharr, and Roman Law in Early Twentieth-Century," available at Social Science Research Network. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2737986>

<sup>21</sup> Bruce W. Frier, ed. (2016), The Codex of Justinian. A New Annotated Translation, with Parallel Latin and Greek Text, Cambridge University Press, p. 2963,

## (2) The “Glossa”

Romley Stewart obviously read the definition of “Glossa” in [Blacks Law Dictionary](#) it is where he sourced the name **Accursius**, yet he neglected to give the stated definition.<sup>22</sup> **Although he should have used Greek scholar and translator Irnerius** as an example instead of **Accursius**, because he had more influence on the early concept of a “Glossa”. (not that he even mentioned what one was) **Irnerius'** technique was to read a passage aloud, which permitted his students to copy it, then to deliver an excursus explaining and illuminating Justinian's text, in the form of “Glosses”. Irnerius' pupils, the so-called **Four Doctors of Bologna**, were among **the first of the "glossators"** who established the curriculum of medieval Roman law. The tradition was carried on by French lawyers, known as the **Ultramontani**, in the 13th century.<sup>23</sup>

**(Lat. glossa). Interpretation; comment; explanation;** remark intended to illustrate a subject, especially the text of an author. See Webster. In Civil Law. Glossae, or glossemwta, were words which needed explanation. Calv. Lex. The explanations of such words. Id. Especially used of the short comments or explanations of the text of the Roman law, made during the twelfth century by the teachers at the schools of Bologna, etc., who were hence called glossators, of which glosses Accursius made a compilation which possesses great authority, called Glossa Ordinaria. These glosses were at first written between the lines of the text (glossae interlineares) , afterwards, on the margin, close by and partly under the text (glossae marginales). Cush. Introd. Rom. Law, 130132.<sup>24</sup>

**A gloss** (from Latin glossa; from Greek γλῶσσα (glóssa), meaning 'language' or 'tongue') **is a brief notation, especially a marginal one or an interlinear one, of the meaning of a word or wording in a text.** It may be in the language of the text, or in the reader's language if that is different. The word "gloss" was first used in the 1570s to refer to the insertion of a word as an explanation, the concept of a note being inserted in the margin of a text to explain a difficult word.

**A collection of glosses is a glossary. A collection of medieval legal glosses, made by glossators, is called an apparatus. The compilation of glosses into glossaries was the beginning of lexicography, and the glossaries so compiled were in fact the first dictionaries.** In modern times a glossary, as opposed to a dictionary, is typically found in a text as an appendix of specialized terms that the typical reader may find unfamiliar. Also, satirical explanations of words and events are called glosses. The German Romantic movement used the expression of gloss for poems commenting on a given other piece of poetry, often in the Spanish Décima style.

**Glosses were originally notes made in the margin or between the lines of a text in a classical language; the meaning of a word or passage is explained by the gloss.**

---

<sup>22</sup>[https://books.google.com.au/books?id=PNQgVoT2\\_aQC&pg=PA542&lpg=PA542&dq=poisonous+glosses+in+law&source=bl&ots=A6kmXQ-thX&sig=BYEI-zScNEgxSr2fLgYtpon07rY&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewiik8flkMXWAhUJJMAKHUyCA38Q6AEIRDAI#v=onepage&q=poisonous%20glosses%20in%20law&f=false](https://books.google.com.au/books?id=PNQgVoT2_aQC&pg=PA542&lpg=PA542&dq=poisonous+glosses+in+law&source=bl&ots=A6kmXQ-thX&sig=BYEI-zScNEgxSr2fLgYtpon07rY&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewiik8flkMXWAhUJJMAKHUyCA38Q6AEIRDAI#v=onepage&q=poisonous%20glosses%20in%20law&f=false)

<sup>23</sup> Campbell, Lyle. 2004. Historical Linguistics: An Introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

<sup>24</sup> <http://legaldictionary.lawin.org/gloss/>

As such, glosses vary in thoroughness and complexity, from simple marginal notations of words one reader found difficult or obscure, to interlinear translations of a text with cross references to similar passages. Today parenthetical explanations in scientific writing and technical writing are also often called glosses. Hyperlinks to a glossary are today the most often used variation of a "gloss".<sup>25</sup>

**As I said earlier, Romley Stewart's "Justinian Deception" badly needs such a "Glossa" to hold all its missing references. It's common practice really, I suppose we call it a footnote.**

**"Gloss : "word inserted as an explanation, translation, or definition,"** c. 1300, glose (modern form from 1540s; earlier also gloze), from Late Latin glossa "obsolete or foreign word," one that requires explanation; later extended to the explanation itself, from Greek glossa (Ionic), glotta (Attic) "language, a tongue; word of mouth, hearsay," also "obscure or foreign word, language," also "mouthpiece," literally "the tongue" (as the organ of speech), from PIE \*glogh- "thorn, point, that which is projected" (source also of Old Church Slavonic glogu "thorn," Greek glockhis "barb of an arrow").

Glosses were common in the Middle Ages, usually rendering Hebrew, Greek, or Latin words into vernacular Germanic, Celtic, or Romanic. Originally written between the lines, later in the margins. Both glossology (1716) and glottology (1841) have been used in the sense "science of language."<sup>26</sup>

"From the Ancient Greek γλῶσσα ( glōssa , " tongue " ) ; compare -glossia. gloss- ( chiefly anatomy ) tongue, speech , language. **Usage notes. An obsolete or foreign word requiring explanation.**<sup>27</sup>

**In the medieval legal tradition, the glosses on Roman law and Canon law created standards of reference, so-called sedes materiae (literally: seat of the matter). In common law countries, the term "judicial gloss" refers to what is considered an authoritative or "official" interpretation of a statute or regulation by a judge. Judicial glosses are often very important in avoiding contradictions between statutes, and determining the constitutionality of various provisions of law.**



Ironically, the one point that caught his attention in the first place, that inspired wishful thinking, the mention of **SMALL CAPITAL LETTERING** being used, is not always the case for glossa's either. The **Glosas Emilianenses**, which are glosses added to this Latin codex, are now considered the first phrases written in the **Castilian language**. Note that **lower case lettering** is used as a gloss, even back then.

<sup>25</sup><https://en.wiktionary.org/w/index.php?title=Special:Search&search=gloss+%28annotation%29&searchToken=5om57txaz9io6ujptegd8h9in>

<sup>26</sup> [http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?l=g&p=14&allowed\\_in\\_frame=0](http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?l=g&p=14&allowed_in_frame=0)

<sup>27</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gloss\\_\(annotation\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gloss_(annotation))



## **This brings us to Romley Stewart's most cited little gem, Article 11:147 of Chicago Manual of Styles.**

He asserts that the "sign language" mentioned here means a "symbol" or as he puts it: "Ancient Latin, being an illustrative text". It clearly says: "The written transcription of a sign is called a gloss." In usual form he again extrapolates on this point to absurdity, and again omitting any inconsistencies. He then applies his literal but false interpretation of these passages to the written language, insisting that it is proper use of written English grammar to add the described hyphens, breaks and stopples (full stops). "One rest in relation to sign language constitutes a stopple between the signs, whereas, one rest in written English constitutes the joinder between the two words. Two rests are needed to confirm the stopple between words appearing in written English text, whereas only one rest will cause the stopple between words appearing as signs." etc. **It's clearly written there for all to see. What a discovery!**

**So he concludes: "So lets translate: "The cat sat on the mat" into the Latin, in relation to article 11:147 of the: Chicago Manual of Styles, to see what happens:**

**"The cat sat on the mat" = "THE-CAT-SAT-ON-THE-MAT"**

**Now from DOG-LATIN to English:**

**"THE CAT SAT ON THE MAT" = "The. Cat. Sat. On. The. Mat."**

**As you can see, the second sample translated into nothing readable, its babble, that's why the second sample is called: "DOG-LATIN" or "Dog Latin" being the language of the illiterate. It is debased."**

**"COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" = "Commonwealth. Of. Australia" ...??? Does it grammatically exist in fact? Notice the full stops after each word? So lets translate the "Commonwealth Of Australia" into correct: American Sign Language, under the correct grammatical rules of Latin Text:**

**"Commonwealth Of Australia" = "COMMONWEALTH-OF-AUSTRALIA". There is no ALL UPPERCASE TEXT constituted in the English Grammatical rules. It does not exist, and there is also no "unhyphenated" strings of SIGNES in the LATIN or American Sign Language."**

**"A car drove by". The translation into ASL (American Sign Language) appears as:**

**"VEHICLE-DRIVE-BY" ... Did you notice the "hyphen"? ... One rest in Written LATIN and American Sign Language, constitutes a break between the two signs, (Words) where as in relation to the English grammatical rules dealing with English Text, one rest constitutes joinder between the two words. Two rests or one rest and a full stop constitutes the break in relation to the written English Grammatical rules. Two different sets of very different grammatical rules!"**

**The basis of his argument: "This means that when LATIN or American Sign Language is used without the "hyphen" it renders nothing in fact, leaving only an ignorant presumption that such ALL UPPERCASE TEXT is valid. This is just word science. If you operate English text or Latin text in breach of its relating Manuals, you void warranty! just like operating an automobile in breach of its manuals. You void warranty."**

Incidentally, this assertion evokes influence from **David Wynn Miller**, or **Mary Elizabeth Croft**, who also share this conclusion regarding the use of hyphens, and existence due to grammar.

Now, let's get back down to the missing facts, and put some perspective and context to this cherry-picked screenshot and reference, which is in fact the one reference he cites constantly to establish his narrative.

**Now, the reader has to take into consideration one very important, bubble-busting oversight.** This section of Chicago Manual of Styles is describing the proper use of American Sign Language. Well, he obviously didn't know what that was, cherry-picked in isolation to its context, so he just speculated, as usual.

### **American Sign Language is actually the language of the deaf.**

When it mentions a "sign" it refers to an associated hand signal, not a symbol, and not another language as theorised. **"The written transcription of a sign is called a gloss."** means exactly that, **how to write a hand signal.**

**Now you can understand his precious citation, that is self-explanatory really, once you realise what a "sign" really is:**

**11.147** *Glosses in ASL.* The written-language transcription of a sign is called a *gloss*. Glosses are words from the spoken language written in small capital letters: WOMAN, SCHOOL, CAT. (Alternatively, regular capital letters may be used.) When two or more written words are used to gloss a single sign, the glosses are separated by hyphens. The translation is enclosed in double quotation marks.

The sign for "a car drove by" is written as VEHICLE-DRIVE-BY.

One obvious limitation of the use of glosses from the spoken/written language to represent signs is that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the words or signs in any two languages.

**11.148** *Compound signs.* Some combinations of signs have taken on a meaning separate from the meaning of the individual signs. Various typographical conventions are used to indicate these compounds, including a "close-up" mark or a plus sign. Depending on the transcription system, the sign for "parents" might be glossed as follows:

MOTHER<sup>^</sup>FATHER or MOTHER+FATHER

**11.149** *Fingerspelling.* For proper nouns and other words borrowed from the spoken language, the signer may fingerspell the word, using the handshapes from a manual alphabet. (There are numerous fingerspelling systems.)



“Sign languages are typically transcribed word-for-word by means of a gloss written in the predominant oral language in all capitals; American Sign Language and Auslan are written in English. Prosody is often glossed as superscript words, with its scope indicated by brackets.

[I LIKE]NEGATIVE [WHAT?]RHETORICAL, GARLIC. = "I don't like garlic."

Pure fingerspelling is usually indicated by hyphenation. Fingerspelled words that have been lexicalized (that is, fingerspelling sequences that have entered the sign language as linguistic units and that often have slight modifications) are indicated with a hash. For example, W-I-K-I indicates a simple fingerspelled word, but #JOB indicates a lexicalized unit, produced like J-O-B, but faster, with a barely perceptible O and turning the "B" hand palm side in, unlike a regularly fingerspelled "B".

### (3) "Dog Latin" is also known as [Cod Latin, macaronic Latin, mock Latin, or Canis Latinicus](#).<sup>28</sup>

It refers to the creation of a phrase or jargon **in imitation of Latin**, often by "translating" English words (or those of other languages) into Latin by conjugating or declining them as if they were Latin words. Unlike the similarly named language game Pig Latin (a form of playful spoken code), [Dog Latin is more of a humorous device for invoking scholarly seriousness](#).<sup>29</sup> Sometimes "dog Latin" can mean a poor-quality attempt at writing genuine Latin.

**Pig Latin is mostly thought of as a secret language game for kids.** In pig Latin, one takes a word, i.e., bibliophage, moves the first letter to the end of the word, and adds an "ay" sound. So, we get ibliophagebay. The most famous examples of this exercise are the words "ixnay" and "amscray" produced from "nix" and "scram" - so famous that today they're considered slang words in themselves. There are some additional rules about what to do when the word starts with a vowel.

The formalized modern game has its roots in centuries long past and may even predate **Shakespeare**. In Love's Labor's Lost (act V, scene 1), we find the following exchange:

**Costard: Go to; thou hast it ad dungill, at the fingers' ends, as they say.**

**Holofernes: O, I smell false Latine; dunghill for unguem.**

**This is a play on a Latin proverb, a nonsensical multilingual wordplay was well known in Shakespeare's time - and now it had a name, false Latin, which had become "dog Latin" by the 18th century and "dog Greek" not long afterwards. Edgar Allen Poe used the term "pig Greek" in 1844. [All of these terms were meant to signify "bad" Latin or things that sounded like Latin but weren't.](#)**<sup>30</sup>

**Thomas Jefferson [mentioned dog Latin by name in 1815](#): "Fifty-two volumes in folio, of the acta sanctorum, in dog-latin, would be a formidable enterprise to the most laborious German."**<sup>31</sup>

**[At first the idea was simply to amuse, using puns, Latin endings appended to English roots, and so on.](#)**

The first instance of a term describing a language purposely modified to confuse the listener is in **Walter Scott's Kennilworth (1821)**, where a character says, "**A very learned man ... and can vent Greek and**

<sup>28</sup> <http://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/CanisLatinicus>

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.bartleby.com/81/5146.html>

<sup>30</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dog\\_Latin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dog_Latin)

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/16784/16784-h/16784-h.htm>

**Hebrew as fast as I can 'thieves' Latin."** The expression referred to the argot of the underworld, sometimes used in conversation to confuse outsiders. In the mid-19th/early 20th century it also meant the lingo used in carnivals and circuses to prevent a "mark" from understanding what the carnies were saying. <sup>32</sup>

**A verse in similar vein, from [Ronald Searle's Down with Skool](#):** <sup>33</sup>

**"Caesar adsum jam forte  
Brutus aderat  
Caesar sic in omnibus  
Brutus sic in at"**

**(which, when read aloud using traditional English pronunciation of Latin, sounds like...**

**"Caesar 'ad(had) some jam for tea  
Brutus 'ad a rat  
Caesar sick in omnibus  
Brutus sick in 'at (hat)"**

**(but which means in Latin...**

**"Caesar I am already here by chance  
Brutus was present  
Caesar thus in all things  
Brutus thus in but"**

**Kids developed their own secret code, which by 1866 was called "hog-Latin."** In **The Galaxy** of that year we find the following: **"He adds as many new letters as the boys in their "hog latin," which is made use of to mystify eavesdroppers. A boy asking a friend to go with him says, "Wig-ge you-ge go-ge wig-ge me-ge?" The other, replying in the negative says, "Noge, lge woge."**

The term "pig Latin" appeared in the same decade and seems to have gradually vanquished other claimants (double Dutch, etc.) as the term of choice. The modern system of dropping the first letter, etc., is almost certainly an invention of the 20th century. Proving that silliness knows no bounds, one can find on the Internet today a translation of the Bible into pig Latin. Google even has a pig Latin translator in its language tools. <sup>34</sup>

**Ankindmay isway oomeday!**

---

<sup>32</sup> Percival Leigh (1840). The comic Latin grammar <https://books.google.com/books?id=x4A9anfJ1G4C&pg=PA152>

<sup>33</sup> Willans, Geoffrey; Searle, Ronald (1953). Down with Skool!. London: Max Parrish <https://books.google.com/books?id=BcAUySObyaoC&pg=PT50>

<sup>34</sup> <http://www.straightdope.com/columns/read/2163/whats-the-origin-of-pig-latin>

## (4) “GLOSSA VIPERINA EST QUIE CORRODIT VISCERA TEXTUS.”<sup>35</sup>

Romley Stewart would of loved these tidbits too:

[Glossa Viperina Est Quae Corrodit Viscera Textus](#): a viperine gloss which eats out the vitals of the text. 10 Coke, 70; 2 Bulst. 79.<sup>36</sup>

["To their false glosses that opposeth his own sole and single authority. Christ, by taking away their viperine glosses that did eat out the bowels of the text..."](#)<sup>37</sup>

[Any viping gloss that may be put upon it..."](#)<sup>38</sup>

[Viperine describes a snake](#), an identical meaning to the "poisonous" description in 11 Coke, 34.<sup>39</sup>

[Maledicta expositio quae corrumpit textum](#): a cursed construction which corrupts the text. 2 Coke, 24; 4 Coke, 35; 11 Coke, 34; Wingate, Max. 26.<sup>40</sup>

**These phrases are quite simple to understand, now that one knows what a "Glossa" really is.** They describe the actions of a glossator placing a glossa on a manuscript, with an interpretation that is flawed, contrary or inconsistent with the source text, presumably added to confuse or cause the reader to adopt a certain unfavourable interpretation. This was much the case in various interpretations of holy books, with the glossator adding notes from the perspective of his own philosophy, school of thought, sect or denomination, especially during the Schisms and the Reformation.

**We now know (a) the real meaning of "Glossa"** and that it is not a secret symbol language invented by Justinian, or anyone else. Your name appearing on your licence in capital letters is definitely not a "Glossa" margin or footnote, it doesn't even have any relation to the term. (b) how hand signals for the hearing impaired are written is also very irrelevant to the way a name is written on a licence, (c) that "Dog Latin" is a word game, for kids it has nothing to do with unhyphenated capital lettering, and likewise, proper English in all capitals doesn't require any hyphens to be valid.

---

<sup>35</sup> Blacks Law Dictionary 2nd Edition <https://openjurist.org/law-dictionary/glossa-viperina-est-quaе-corrodit-viscera-textus>

<sup>36</sup> <http://legaldictionary.lawin.org/glossa-viperina-est-quaе-corrodit-viscera-textus/>

<sup>37</sup> John Trapp - A Commentary Or Exposition Upon All the Books of the New Testament [https://books.google.com.au/books?id=M0g7AQAAMAAJ&pg=PA75&lpg=PA75&dq=taking+away+the+viperine+gloss&source=bl&ots=0Ag4QI32\\_Z&sig=vL3VAqzbd1pz7N38pozhnThNIFY&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewihIMXyjsXWAhXC7hoKHaMJDGMQ6AEINzAF#v=onepage&q=taking%20away%20the%20viperine%20gloss&f=false](https://books.google.com.au/books?id=M0g7AQAAMAAJ&pg=PA75&lpg=PA75&dq=taking+away+the+viperine+gloss&source=bl&ots=0Ag4QI32_Z&sig=vL3VAqzbd1pz7N38pozhnThNIFY&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewihIMXyjsXWAhXC7hoKHaMJDGMQ6AEINzAF#v=onepage&q=taking%20away%20the%20viperine%20gloss&f=false)

<sup>38</sup> Vaughan Thomas - The legality of the present academical system of the University of Oxford <https://books.google.com.au/books?id=15GU7gXWGIYC&pg=PA51&lpg=PA51&dq=viperine+gloss&source=bl&ots=nyXu8bqjxc&sig=NnfVdmSHD8TXc5ZWr0qN3UkcENE&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKewiqT-Gci8XWAhVEOBQKHUNDAwiQ6AEIQjAK#v=onepage&q=viperine%20gloss&f=false>

<sup>39</sup> <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/viperine>

<sup>40</sup> <http://legaldictionary.lawin.org/maledicta-expositio-quaе-corrumpit-textum/>



So in conclusion, this work of fiction contains multiple cover-ups and omissions that establish that **Romley Stewart** is not only very wrong, but quite possibly suffering mental health issues in relation to his false convictions. If I was the magistrate I would recognise this, under NSW provisions I could even dismiss the charges and instead organise a treatment plan. This would include telling police to "**leave him alone**" or in other words, take into consideration his unfortunate mental health condition in any future interactions.

There is no doubt Romley Stewart would continue in his convictions, nobody has refuted his assertions.

Until now.

**Romley Stewart** 10 months ago

I have been threatened by Police not to speak or post or hold a facebook page or speak of anything about the government, police or the Justice Department. I am sorry I can no longer speak, I have had my children subject to horrible threats by police and facebook threats. I was bashed by police in the back so hard that I was bleeding internally for two weeks. I have become afraid for my life and the well being of my children, we have all been subject to terrible treatment by the Cairns Police and the Court. I can no longer respond or speak about this research relating to the foreign American Sign Language appearing on police and Court Documents any longer. I discovered this information relating to the false ABN's of the Justice Department, the hidden foreign Sign Language appearing on Court and Police documents and the discovery of two Birthing Certificates, and in good faith, I went to the Police and the media believing that I was doing the right thing. I had no idea that the corruption was so large and so complex and that exposing such a complex system would become so dangerous. I have pleaded guilty to all charges as "warned". I have never been involved with any form of terrorist group, never had a drink driving charge, or drug charge or violence related charge in my life, the Rifles found by police were my Grandfathers and my dads brother's, left at my place when my father passed away, they were between 40 and 60 years old and never used for the last 40 years. (There were no bullets and they were not "weapons", they were all legally bought) I have not fired or owned a gun since I was 18. I owned an air rifle, just like every boy in my street did. I have never stalked the Police, I only ever posted a request to have the police that entered my property without an arrest warrant and harassed my daughters, address in order to send them a charge for a breach of a contract filed with the court in MAY 2015. To this day, I still don't know their address, or phone contact, rendering "stalking" such police officers as impossible. The charges against me, admitted by the Charging officer, MCLEISH, were in "revenge" for all the Driving without a License charges that Police lost in court, relating to questions relating to the all uppercase name (ACCOUNT) appearing on the fraudulent QUEENSLAND DRIVER LICENSE. The court hearing on the 20/11/2015 before Magistrate SPENCER, was caught on video and the Police threatened that if such footage is released, "I will not know what hit me". A NOTICE TO PUBLISH, in relation to such a video, has been issued to the registrar general: David John, Queensland. The Police raided my home and took all my computers, camera's and the phone that contained the interview between ABC Reporter James Thomas, being the reporter that published a false story that I was a "Terrorist" and a "Freedom Fighter" and a "Sovereign Citizen" on national television. The interview done by Phone text, was done by text because I did not trust the ABC to publish the "said" information truthfully, relating to the False ABN's of the Queensland Justice Department and the deregistration of the business name: QUEENSLAND, by Nonie Miriam Harris, and the fact that the Queensland Police Service was reregistered as a Non Governmental Organization, with DUN & BRADSTREET, and that their such company identification information could not be found. When the Police discovered that the interview was in text form, they raided my home taking all my computers, camera and "phone" in order to conceal the true nature of such an interview. The Police need the public to assume me to be a terrorist in order to stop me from publishing damaging information relating to their corrupt system of Governance, by the use of a foreign hidden language usurped within their documents in order to deceive the Public into surrendering their sovereign rights to a foreign corporate private banking entity. I have been gagged by the threats made by Queensland Police. If I speak any more about this matter, relating to fraud within the Queensland System, both my children and I will, in their words: "Will not know what hit us" and for such reasons I must decline to comment any further in relation to such matters ... Romley Stewart. 20/11/1956.

[Show less](#)

**TO-READ-MORE-ON-THIS-INTERESTING-PHENOMENA-DOWNLOAD**

**(THE-FREEMAN-DELUSION-THE-ORGANISED-PSEUDOLEGAL-COMMERCIAL-ARGUMENT-IN-AUSTRALIA)**

**BY (ROBERT-SUDY) [HERE](#)**