Australian Pseudolaw Argumentation *(An analysis by Robert R. Sudy – January 2023)*

As observed by ***Donald J. Netolitzky KC*** in *"A Rebellion of Furious Paper: Pseudolaw As a Revolutionary Legal System",* the pseudolaw memeplex has six core concepts**:**

Everything is a contract
(2) Silence means agreement
(3) Legal action requires an injured party
(4) Government authority is defective or limited
(5) The strawman duality
(6) Monetary and banking conspiracy theories

The object of this article is to characterise 100 most commonly used individual Australian pseudolaw arguments or motifs, in order to group them into an identifiable indicia or species of pseudo legal thought, consistent with the format of these observations. It is hoped that this analysis or summary will begin to simplify the vast content of the encyclopedia, providing a larger perspective, more of a comprehensive overview of the phenomenon as opposed to the nuances of the many individual arguments. Plentiful reference material and explanation for each contention is contained in the various hyperlinks to pdf files of articles published on the Freeman Delusion website.

1. Everything is a contract

Pseudolaw adherents will interpret almost any direction by a police officer, or an invitation by a court for compliance with court procedure, as the formation of a ***contract***. Hence, they will refuse simple court directions and processes, such as to pass the bar, sit, stand, ***enter a plea***, or even acknowledge or confirm their identity. They do not wish to make joinder in contract, believing this is what gives authorities their ***Jurisdiction***. Authorities use *"statute law"* which to the adherent is "*Maritime Admiralty Law"*, (the law of the sea, of commerce and contracts). They believe that for a statute to be enforceable, either a contract must already exist, (through the shackled *strawman duality*) or the officer is merely offering them an invitation to joinder in contract right there.

Hence they become rather pedantic over the use of words and terms and even gestures, believing that certain commonly used words are also very serious legal terms or ***Legalese*** deceitfully intended to trick the unwitting denizen into this alleged joinder. Whenever police or court officers use the word *"understand"*, (eg: asking *"Do you understand?"*) they are talking in legal code for "Do you ***stand under*** our authority?" The adherent is not ever *"driving*" a "*vehicle"*, (these are legal terms) they are "*travelling"* in their *"automobile*" or "*private conveyance"*. So when asked, they reply that they are "***not driving only travelling***", expecting this response affords a reasonable excuse to unregistered and unlicenced fines. They do not register their vehicles with the appropriate state authority, as that "***Regis***" *-tration"* would mean the formation of a contract transferring the title of the *"automobile*" to the king. The word ***Includes*** holds special significance, as it is taken by the theory as having an exhaustive as opposed to expansive function, so adherents use it to attempt to create an exemption, claiming they are not whatever definition actually is in the statute, (eg: "*person"* or *"driver"* or *"vehicle*" etc.) If they find themselves *"under duress"* in signing bail agreements or other documents, they will add "*V.C.*" or "***vi coactus***" in a prepared attempt to later disregard and nullify the agreement.

"The overall result is that the perceived role of contracts is greatly expanded in the Pseudolaw Memeplex, to the point this concept permeates much of day-to-day life and interactions. Literally, everything is a contract."

2. Silence means agreement

This curious pseudolaw belief contends that a notarized document, sworn affidavit, "*notice of understanding intent and claim of right"* or other paperwork that is served by the offeror, becomes a valid contract or agreement of the parties after the expiry of an allotted time period. It is claimed that the terms are accepted by acquiescence, due to the offeree's silence, non-response or inability to rebut the contents of the document within the given time. The initial document is accompanied by a *"fee schedule"* outlining the prescribed penalty amounts for various breaches of particular parts of the proposed contract, which is then invariably followed by a "*notice of default*" announcing that the contract has been activated and the *"fee schedule"* now applies. This "***unrebutted affidavit***" strategy has no basis in law, as it is a century-old principle of the common law of contract that silence to an offeror's invitation to contract is not on its own sufficient to imply agreement. However, the associated 3-5 letters strategy has sometimes been successfully used to intimidate people not familiar with law into compliance, which has earned it the rather fitting title *"paper terrorism"*.

> *"Another consequence of the Silence Means Agreement rule is less benign for those who accept it. When coupled with the Invisible Contracts concept, pseudolaw practitioners perceive themselves as surrounded by innumerable potential contract offers, any of which may entrap an individual in onerous binding obligations. The result is a kind of legal nightmare, where one must obsessively seek out and positively reject every contract offer."*

3. Legal action requires an injured party

As most pseudolaw adherents wilfully disregard the authority and enforceability of legislation, it necessarily limits the number of offences they believe they can be charged for, to common law offences and civil matters, both which require a victim or complainant to pursue legal action. Generally, those offences known as "victimless crimes" are statutory enactments codified into law. Pseudolaw theory teaches that there is only three ways to "break the law", and that is to: 1. cause harm to people, or 2. their property, or 3. breach a contract, each of which require a victim or complainant. So in a nutshell, as a result of this wilful ignorance of the applicability of legislation, adherents conclude that any acceptable legal action requires an "injured party", often using the Latin term "***corpus delicti***" (body of the crime) referring to the principle that a crime must be proved to have occurred before a person can be convicted of committing that crime.

> *"Thus, the No Injured Party rule means government, or, for that matter, anyone, has no legal right to interfere with another until someone or something has been actually harmed. This rule is the (purported) theoretical basis for why one could own dangerous goods such as explosives and narcotics, possess and use firearms, or drive while intoxicated. All these things are legal, until someone is hurt."*

4. Government authority is defective or limited

> *"The next element of the Pseudolaw Memeplex is an explanation for why the legal authority of government is not as expansive or extensive as is conventionally communicated and taught. This element is the one component of the Pseudolaw Memeplex which shows marked variation between host communities. That is not a surprise since the details of the Defective Or Limited State Authority explanation usually derive from the history of the local jurisdiction, or the nature of the pseudolaw host group."*

There are a variety of views in different Australian pseudolaw groups as to their reasoning why government authority is defective. Each strain of pseudo legal thought is accompanied by the notion that any legislation enacted past a certain point is invalid for varying reasons, or that it does not apply to the individual.

(1) Common Law supremacy
(2) Original sovereignty
(3) 1919 sovereignty
(4) The Crown as a body politic
(5) The development of Australian nationhood
(6) Other constitutional misconceptions
(7) Corporate Government
(8) Religious beliefs and conspiracies

(1) Common Law supremacy

This is the most basic of the "government authority is defective" concepts, and also appears to run concurrent through many of the overseas phenomena. The argument proceeds on the premise that a form of "natural law" is superior to all other forms of law and authority. Adherents generally call this "***common law***" but it is not the body of judicial decisions we speak of when referring to the common law. It is a reference to the medieval times that produced the philosophical roots of the rule of law, such documents as ***Magna Carta and Bill of Rights***, enlightenment era intellectual thought surrounding unalienable individual rights, ***the consent of the governed*** instead being obtained individually, and the metaphysical concept of the ***social contract*** being an actual physical, binding contract.

Adherents draw a distinction between what they call "common law" and "statute law" and believe they are only subject to the former, since legislation requires the "consent of the governed" to be democratically valid. The argument follows that the enforceability of "statute law" is subject to a form of on-the-spot contractual arrangement requiring individual agreement, as opposed to already having force of law. This can be seen in the pointless terrified screams of *"I DO NOT CONSENT!"* when adherents attempting the ***freedom of travel*** and the "***not driving just travelling***" strategies are finally arrested by police. They also draw a distinction between the terms ***lawful and legal***, with "common law" being a "lawful" obligation, while "statute law" merely being a "legal" obligation, requiring their contractual agreement with authorities.

Common law adherents generally insist on "*a* ***trial before a jury*** *of their peers*" and that *"justice shall not be sold*" in refusing to pay court or filing costs. The concept of jury verdicts is very important to common law theorists, coexisting with the notion that whatever they consider to be "bad laws" can simply be erased by ***jury nullification***, and that individual laws are invalid without being first approved by a *"referendum of the people*". They see the magistrate as little more than a simple clerical scribe, and real law is set by juries. Consequentially, they ignore the doctrine of judicial immunity, often threatening to "***arrest the judge***" so they can be "***hung for treason***" or "***slavery***" for failing to uphold the "true law" by disregarding or striking out their frivolous motions for a jury trial. They will claim that a "***coram is not a judge***" and that they demand to be tried in a "***chapter III court***" *according to the Constitution*".

This is a remarkable position, considering they inherently disregard any reliance by the judge on ***previous judicial authority*** in their matter, despite it often being binding on the court, as equally as they disregard "*statute law*". The concept of common law supremacy is not consistent with established doctrines of

constitutional law, such as the principles of *Parliamentary Supremacy* and *Responsible Government*, both supported by the binding decisions of the High Court. To "*expose"* this *"judicial corruption*" adherents often record the hearing with their mobile phone ***camera or voice recorder*** either quite openly or discretely to avoid detection, and later upload it to social media or YouTube. This strain of pseudo legal thought is accompanied by the notion that any laws applied to them without their expressed consent are invalid.

(2) Original Sovereignty

Among the three methods of acquisition of foreign land recognised by British law, (*conquest, cessation and settlement*), the latter occurs when a colony is founded in a land in which there are no settled inhabitants or a settled system of law. In such a case, English law is immediately in force in the new settled colony, and only those laws are applicable. It was hence decided by the Privy Council that it was a *"settled*" colony under the doctrine of "*terra nullius*". While the doctrine was finally overturned In the historic *Mabo* decision in 1992, the question of Indigenous sovereignty was never engaged. The only outcome was the recognition of native title to the use of land for ceremonial or customary purposes, as the Crown's radical title only conferred sovereignty, and sovereignty did not extinguish native title by default. Similarly in *Walker (1994),* which rejected the coexistence of *Customary Aboriginal law*, and many other examples. Throughout the ***Aboriginal challenges to jurisdiction***, the common theme has been that *"sovereignty was never ceded",* and that the culture, language and connection with country *"exists, and is continuing*". While indisputable in fact, these arguments have never been successful in law, mainly due to the principle stated by Gibbs J. in *New South Wales v. The Commonwealth [1975] HCA 58* (at 14), that the acquisition of territory by a sovereign state for the first time is an act of state which cannot be challenged, controlled or interfered with by the courts of that state, and that the principle precludes any contest between the executive and the judicial branches of government as to whether a territory is or is not within the Crown's Dominions. Consistent with this principle, the High Court has consistently held that they lack the jurisdiction to enquire into the actual acquisition of Aboriginal sovereignty. Every other court in Australia simply refers to those binding authorities of the High Court in rejecting the argument. Several enactments and documents have also been unsuccessfully but continuously referred to in relation to self-determination, such as James Cook and Arthur Phillip's orders and journals, as well as the common ***Pacific Islanders Protection Acts*** and ***Letters Patent 1836 (SA)*** arguments. The 1967 Referendum was a huge moment for Indigenous Australia, however, certain myths also exist as to its effect, such as whether it gave Indigenous people the right to vote in federal elections, the right to Australian citizenship, the right to be included in the census, and whether, up until the referendum, Indigenous people were classed as fauna, governed under the "***Flora and Fauna Act***".

The introduction of imported pseudolaw concepts to Indigenous rights activists and their communities, (primarily by Mark McMurtrie of the "*Original Sovereign Tribal Federation*") created a unique variation on the concept that government authority is defective or limited, along with a strawman duality status of "*Original Sovereign*" as opposed to an "*Aboriginal*" or "*Indigenous*" citizen. The variation also turned the absence of any formal treaty with Indigenous people into a contractual notion, (or rather, the absence of it) concluding that without any such contract or treaty, no legislation can apply to Indigenous people. Also adopted were the foisted unilateral agreement strategy, requests to bring forward the injured party in simple offence matters, as well as monetary and banking conspiracy theories with their recent commercial lien for zillions to a mining company. This group and doctrine was the driving force behind the protests in various cities, as well as in Canberra in January 2022, which tragically led to the doors and facia of the Old Parliament House being set alight and destroyed.

(3) 1919 Sovereignty

The *Institute of Taxation Research* and the *Institution for Constitutional Education and Research* compiled *"Australia: the concealed colony!"* which purported to be *"a report to the United Nations on the continuance of the application of British law within the territory of the independent sovereign nation Australia".* In summary, the argument proceeded on the premise that Australia became a sovereign nation with the acceptance into the *League of Nations* in 1919 with the signing of the *Treaty of Versailles*, from which point the imposition of foreign law (such as the *Commonwealth Constitution*) on Australians was a breach of international law. A letter addressed to vexatious litigant John Wilson, allegedly attributed to former Chief Justice of the High Court ***Sir Harry Gibbs*** was used to gain support for the proposition. This strain of pseudo legal thought is generally accompanied by the notion that any legislation enacted past 1919 is invalid being contrary to ***International law***.

(4) The Crown as a body politic

There is a misconception in relation to the development of ***the Crown*** as a political entity, with many holding a 1600's *Calvin*-type perspective, (when real power was vested in the monarch directly, and allegiance was "owed in a personal sense"), as opposed to the later *Isaacson v Durant* view, (of the Crown as the monarch's body politic, and allegiance being "owed to that body politic"), which was understood by writers at the time of Federation. In contrast to the 1919 sovereignty argument, this pseudolaw contention seeks the restoration of a medieval interpretation of the Crown long passed into history. This can be seen in various forms, like vexatious litigant Brian Shaw's assertions that "***the Crown was removed***" from public office and judicial oaths, (and other provisions), as opposed to the amendments being entirely consistent with *Isaacson v Durant* and constitutional reality. Another would be demanding authorities show them a *"****proclamation certificate***" signed by the monarch. Ironically, with any Commonwealth legislation that has actually been reserved for Her Majesty's pleasure by the Governor General, it is noted that the ***Royal Sign Manual*** is placed on the top of the Bill, which to the adherent means the Act never received assent, as they claim it should be underneath, at the end of the Bill. These strains of pseudo legal thought are generally accompanied by the notion that any legislation enacted past these Victorian and Western Australian amendments, (as well as without the personal assent and proclamation by the monarch), is invalid being contrary to the Constitution.

(5) The development of Australian Nationhood

Similarly with adherents' understanding the evolutionary historical events that progressively led to the sovereign independent nation we see today, from a group of British colonies. I have grouped the following three areas together under this general subject matter: (a) The path to complete independence (b) The divisible Crown and (c) The Australia Act, as these concepts are usually combined as a single philosophy.

(a) The path to complete independence

Beginning with the *Australian Constitutions Act 1850* granting legislative power to the colonies, followed by the *Colonial Laws Validity Act 1865* to remove any doubts as to the validity of the legislation passed by the colonial parliaments, came the *Constitutional Conferences* of the 1890's and Australia was born, then a ***dominion of the British Empire***, with the former colonies becoming states of a federation, under the *Commonwealth Constitution Act 1901.* Cracks appeared in the *British Empire* itself with the *Anglo-Irish treaty* of 1922, requiring a change in the titles of the Crown and of Westminster, with the *Royal and Parliamentary Titles Act* in 1927. Agreements reached during the *Imperial Conferences* resulting in the *Balfour Declaration* the

prior year, were then brought into law with the *Statute of Westminster 1930*, adopted by Australia with the *Statute of Westminster Adoption Act 1942.* This adoption ended all responsibilities of the United Kingdom in relation to the Commonwealth from 1939, but state ties remained until the passing of the *Australia Acts* in 1986. The development of Australian nationhood did not require any change to the Constitution, but rather, the abolition of limitations on constitutional power that were imposed from outside the Constitution, such as the *Colonial Laws Validity Act 1865*, restricting what otherwise would have been the proper interpretation of the Constitution, by virtue of Australia's status as part of the British Empire. When the Empire ended and national status emerged, the external restrictions ceased, and constitutional powers could be given their full scope.

Also unlike the 1919 sovereignty argument, the pseudolaw contentions related to the development of Australian nationhood seek restoration of the British Empire, based on a denial of, or an inherent opposition to independence, and/or changes to the constitutional relationship with the United Kingdom. This can be seen in various forms, such as insisting on the significance of the ***Lion and the Unicorn Seal***, (as opposed to the 1973 *Great Seal* of Australia), the ***red ensign flag***, (as opposed to the *Flags Act 1954* blue ensign), and references to the ***preamble to the Constitution*** and the 1901 ***Quick and Garran's commentary*** as the most accurate guide to understanding current events. It invokes elements long passed into history, such as appeals to the ***Privy Council***. The significance of the existence of Old Parliament House is also relevant, as it is believed that when it closed, so did the "Commonwealth". Adherents question the constitutionality of the removal of the words "***The Commonwealth of..***" from currency and government departments since the 1970's, concluding that the *"Australia"* and *"Australian Government*" that exists in place of the "*Commonwealth of Australia"* is a completely separate new entity that was nefariously created to usurp the Commonwealth. They dub themselves "***Commonwealth Public Officials***" and stand to protect the Commonwealth from this tyranny. This strain of pseudo legal thought is generally accompanied by the notion that any legislation enacted past a certain point in time is invalid being contrary to the Constitution.

(b) The divisible Crown

Notions of allegiance as the factum upon which nationality laws and status turned were accommodated to international realities consequent upon the disappearance of the British Empire. The post-war legislation in both countries recognised that the metaphysical indivisibility of the Imperial Crown no longer made constitutional or political sense, and that the sovereign now had several and distinct politic capacities. Those realities were reflected in the *Royal Styles and Titles Act 1953* following an agreement reached at a meeting of British Commonwealth Prime Ministers that "*the Style and Titles appertaining to the Crown are not in accord with current constitutional relationships within the British Commonwealth."* The notion of an indivisible Imperial Crown gave way to the recognition of the divisibility of the Crown, with recognised distinctions between the office and title ***Queen of Australia*** and the office and title "*Queen of the United Kingdom*". References to the sovereignty of the United Kingdom and the Church of England were subsequently removed with the *Royal Styles and Titles Act 1973*, leaving a discrete Australian monarchy. This strain of pseudo legal thought is generally accompanied by the notion that any legislation enacted past 1973 is invalid being contrary to the Constitution, including the ***Governor General's Letters Patent***. Closely tied to this contention rejecting the amendments to the Royal titles, is the rejection of the ***Great Seal of Australia***, which was enacted at the same time.

(c) The Australia Act

The remaining ties with the Australian states to the United Kingdom were severed with the passing of the ***Australia Act*** *1986*. The pseudolaw adherent views this legislation as replacing or subverting the *Commonwealth Constitution*, as opposed to its true purpose, to bring the states in line with the constitutional position already enjoyed by the Commonwealth since the *Statute of Westminster Adoption Act 1942*. It is insisted that a referendum should have been undertaken, despite the fact no provision of the *Commonwealth Constitution* required amendment to even invoke the use of section 128. There was argument that the *Australia Acts (Request) Act 1985* (Qld) was invalid, (and therefore also the *Australia Act 1986)* as its effect was alter the entrenched provisions relating to the ***Office of Governor*** of Queensland, which first required approval in a State referendum, and in the High Court in *Marquet*, Kirby J raised a minority dissent that the *Australia Act* was not a valid exercise of Commonwealth legislative power, as section 106 guarantees that a State constitution may be altered only in accordance with its own provisions. However, these arguments have never been successful, with the High Court concluding that it was sufficient that the Act had been passed in reliance on section 51(xxxviii), which gives the Commonwealth parliament power to legislate at the request of the State parliaments. This strain of pseudo legal thought is generally accompanied by the notion that any legislation enacted past 1986, (but is more often linked to the 1973 point), is invalid being contrary to the Constitution.

(6) Other Constitutional Misconceptions

There are a variety of common flawed constitutional arguments in relation to a number of provisions. ***Section 115*** is used to support the notion that fractional reserve banking is unconstitutional as debts must be paid in *"silver and gold",* despite the provision only applying to states. ***Section 92*** is used to support the right of freedom of travel unhindered across state borders, despite the plentiful case law defining the restriction. ***Section 100*** is used to support water rights despite the fact it only restrains the Commonwealth. Overlooking the words "***until the Parliament Otherwise Provides***", many provisions, including ***Section 3*** is used to wrongfully insist the Governor General must still be paid in British Pounds today. The words "***for the peace, order and good government***" are used to insist laws must prove to actually be beneficial for the peace, order and good government, or they are invalid, and a misreading of *Covering Clause 8* concludes that ***Australia has no State borders***. That ***speed cameras*** must be tested in compliance with the *National Measurement Act 1960*, that the ***The Australian Tax Office is not a Legal Entity*** and therefore tax is voluntary, or that ***section 51(xxiiiA)*** protects against mandatory vaccination as it would be *"civil conscription*".

Similarly, a flawed understanding of the division of legislative powers in a federal structure, leads to misconceptions of the ***legislative powers of states***, with adherents often raising the premise of inconsistency under ***section 109***. A good example can be found in Wayne Glew's consistent argument that ***councils are unconstitutional***, and states cannot legislate regarding councils because local government is not recognised in the Commonwealth Constitution. David Walter's ***fee simple alienation*** argument identically ignores the plenary power of the state parliaments. Queensland in particular, has a number of state-based arguments, such as the ***abolition of the upper house*** of the Parliament being unlawful, that the ***Office of Governor*** was altered in breach of the entrenched provisions of the *Constitution Act 1867*, and the government was replaced with a company called the ***Brigalow Corporation***. Similarly, a misunderstanding of two Victorian decisions led many to wrongfully claim the ***Police powers*** to request licence details from the driver of a vehicle was unlawful.

(7) Corporate Government

The US *Posse Comitatus* believed that the Federal Government was usurped by a British conspiracy around the time of the 13th Amendment (that ended slavery), and the 14th Amendment (that introduced federal US citizenship), replacing the original "de jure" American government with an illegitimate, tyrannical "de facto" *THE UNITED STATES*. It was contended that the Federal Government was a trading corporation, a *"British ship in dry dock in Washington DC."* who used a form of British Maritime Admiralty law to contract away the American people's God-given rights. *"They didn't free the slaves, they made everyone a slave..."* was the conclusion. For these "organic citizens", the US was peopled by two nations, there was a republic where whites enjoyed unalienable rights superior to those held by people of colour and Jews. The latter were denizens of a separate quasi-nation, a "corporation" created by the 14th Amendment, and all the while, legitimate Americans were also "tricked" into adopting this inferior legal status. Much of the theory surrounding the strawman duality relies on the premise that government is a corporation, and attaches a "corporate" legal person to physical humans, in order for government authority to have effect. The "corporate US government" concept was also adopted by Australian pseudolaw adherents, and repackaged to suit localised arrangements. The main concept currently circulating, is the belief that ***Australia is a foreign corporation*** registered on the US *Security and Exchange Commission*, which to those unfamiliar with laws regulating the offering of shares within the US appears to confirm the belief. There is also the fact that all government departments have an Australian Business Number (ABN) which adherents claim proves their corporate status. It is generally believed that this "corporation" was created by the Whitlam government, and came into existence around 1973. Consistent with the US school of thought, it is believed to have replaced the original de jure *"Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia",* with an illegitimate, tyrannical de facto *"AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT*", with a paper Queen and a corporate seal.

(8) Religious beliefs and conspiracies

There has been a tendency to link various pseudo legal schools of thought to Christian fundamentalism, which has led to some rather disturbing conclusions. Some groups believed the Papacy owns all of humanity through the Papal Bull ***Unam sanctam***, and more recent theories like those of Ross Bradley, refer to the significance of a decree made by Pope Francis concerning criminal law in the Vatican, *"Motu Proprio*" as superseding all government authority. Others such as *Ucadia* have taken the complete opposite approach, contending that the *"evil Papal cult"* controls the courts acting as priests in the abolition of sins, and one can simply "*change jurisdiction*" for their own protection. Many groups have inherent anti-Catholic and anti-Freemasonry beliefs. For example, Steven Spiers "*United Kingdom of Australia*" holds that the use of a "*Catholic* ***St. Edward's Crown***" by Elizabeth II meant she has no line of authority. Similarly, others claim the ratification of the Rome-based UNIDROIT treaty by the Australian Government was the unlawful imposition of "*Roman law*" on the people of a Protestant nation. The conspiratorial concepts are generally Protestant-based, invoking certain repealed provisions of the ***Act of Settlement 1700*** and the subsequent emancipation by the ***Roman Catholic Relief Acts***. According to this belief, the monarch made a promise in her ***Coronation Oath*** to "*uphold the laws of God*" and *"protect her subjects from popery"*, and contend the very basis of the nation was created "***humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God***", and therefore the ***Laws of God*** remain superior to any man-made laws. Linked to this notion, is a flawed interpretation of the "***religious freedoms***" afforded by section 116 of the Constitution. This strain of pseudo legal thought is generally accompanied by the notion that legislation can be disregarded as invalid for varying reasons, primarily being contrary to ones inspired interpretation of biblical instruction.

5. The strawman duality

As observed by ***Donald J. Netolitzky KC*** the strawman duality is comprised of the following six aspects.

> ***(1)*** *Physical humans are bound or linked to a non-physical legal person doppelganger: the "Strawman".*
> *(2) Government has inherent authority over the non-corporeal "Strawman" doppelganger, but not a human being. The link between the physical and legal parts of the duality is a channel for government authority.*
> *(3) The government attaches the "Strawman" to the physical human via a concealed contract that involves birth or identification documentation.*
> *(4) The "Strawman" is identified by an all upper-case letter name (e.g. JOHN SMITH), and that is why government and legal documentation capitalizes names. Those materials do not actually refer to the associated human being.*
> *(5) Government authority can be negated by denying you are the "Strawman", and/or by breaking the "Strawman" contract.*
> *(6) A human is only subject to "Common Law" once the "Strawman" is removed.*

The strawman doppelganger, said to be represented by ***all-capital letters*** is considered by the theory to be a ***corporate entity*** or juridical person, as opposed to a natural person, which is not a status a single individual can actually acquire, only groups of individuals. A natural person can create a company or juridical person, but this is an adjunct to, rather than a replacement for, the legal personality of the human being. As recently confirmed by Cash QC DCJ in *R v Sweet [2021]*, a human being is also a legal person, and the criminal law applies to a person regardless of their status in law, referring to the 1836 *Murrell* decision where it was held that the law applied to an Aboriginal man who, at the time, would have had no other legal rights. Cash QC DCJ further explained that the law has at times recognised categories of person who did not possess a legal personality, who could be bought and sold, and who had no rights under the law. Even women were thought not to possess a legal personality, and children were the property of their fathers. If it were possible today to renounce ones legal personality, they would become a human being without rights, mere property, and such an outcome is antithetical to our society and system of laws. The "***flesh and blood living man***" is both protected by law and liable under law, so neither renouncing legal status nor citizenship can protect an individual from criminal liability. In situations where at least one parent is an Australian citizen, babies born in Australia possess both legal personality and citizenship before their umbilical cord is cut. Pseudolaw adherents generally try to avoid any state contracts, including citizenship, and attempt to extinguish it with foisted unilateral agreements, which they call "***leaving the citizen ship***" But due to efforts to combat statelessness, most nations including Australia place conditions on the renunciation of citizenship, that approval only be granted upon a person's acquisition or possession of another nationality. The notion that government attaches the strawman to the physical human via birth documentation as a channel for government authority is based on a warped conspiratorial reading of the ***Cestui Que Vie Act 1666***, which compels a correction in legal status from being declared "lost at sea" after 7 years of age, without which most people automatically become "wards of the state" in a type of indentured servitude offered by government. The US cases ***Penhallow v Doane's Administrators and Cruden v Neale*** are also referred to by adherents to support the notion that government can only act against a physical human through their strawman. The UK-based *"Lose the Name*" group promoted a variant of the strawman duality claiming that due to Crown Copyright, it is "***illegal to use a legal name***".

Here in Australia, Romley Stewart Stover created a localised variant with the ***Glossa and Dog Latin*** concepts, asserting that the all-capital letter surname is a "symbol" created by the evil Justinian to enslave humanity. Steven Spiers promotes a cherry-picked biblical passage confirming that even God hates these legal fictions, as he is "***no respecter of persons***". Another localised variant appears to be forming in some groups contesting the development of Australian nationhood and the Crown, as described above. Particularly those of the Rod Culleton, Brian Shaw, Peter Gargan and Wayne Glew camps, in that they see themselves as *"British Subjects*" (to loosely apply the term) as opposed to "*Australian Citizens*" under the 1948 Act, believing that this former status affords them certain inalienable rights that the latter has contracted away, which has comparisons to the classic US *Posse Comitatus* position in relation to the introduction of federal citizenship by the 13th Amendment, seeking to return to the previous status of "*State Nationals*".

6. Monetary and banking conspiracy theories

There are basic three categories of this concept, the first is based on the notion that "real money is backed by gold, unlike worthless fiat currency". It is associated to fractional reserve banking, where banks lend more money than they actually hold on deposit, leading to a theory that banks "*create money from thin air",* and a borrower therefore has no obligation to repay the imaginary ***book-entry credit***. A variation on this contention claims that the borrower's signature creates the money, and therefore the same process could be used directly to pay debts. Another argument contends that the ***securitisation*** of some loans by banks means they will be repaid twice if the borrower continues repayments. The second relates to paying loans and debts paid with ***Promissory notes***, created by misinterpreting the legal operation of section 89 of the *Bills of Exchange Act 1909*. The third is commonly known as "***Accepted for Value***", (or "A4V"), which is linked to the strawman "Birth Bond" account, a secret government-operated bank account. A closely related financial attack is the ***Commercial lien***., which is usually an attempt to secure "monies owed" due to foisted unilateral agreements. The ***Uniform Commercial Code*** is also occasionally used in material.

Conclusion

The Australian Pseudolaw Memeplex provides any anti-government group with an attractive mechanism that purports to both separate and immunize the adherent from government authority, while also providing a way to *"stick it to the man*" with the use of fee schedules and other foisted unilateral agreements. The details and nuances of the "*Defective Or Limited State Authority*" analysis allows the researcher to note the marked variation between localised pseudolaw host communities, that ultimately derive from either Australian historic political events, or the nature of the host group itself. The original, traditionalist, conservative position remains with certain Australian groups that demonstrate similarities with the US *Posse Comitatus* philosophies. That particular belief set is super-nationalist, patriots who seek to reform and restore a Commonwealth of Australia that lost its way. You can identify this aspect in groups like the Great Australia Party (GAP) who's main political goal was to *"Restore the Commonwealth".* Similarly with both the Indigenous and the religious-based pseudolaw groups, they have a goal of "restoring" the nation to what they perceive were better times, and they use pseudolaw concepts as a mechanism to cause legal and political reform, and/or legitimize revolutionary and reactionary activity. In contrast, other groups are more like a social parasite and criminal population who seek a life of "do as I please and take what I want". With the memeplex having long since evolved to suit localised environments and systems, it can no longer be linked to a specific political/social/cultural belief defined by the right-wing "*sovereign citizen*" ***nomenclature***, with the ideology having been purposefully repackaged to appeal to a largely left-wing population, but ultimately, certain concepts in the Pseudolaw Memeplex are attractive to individuals and groups anywhere on the political spectrum.

Robert R. Sudy (author) Website: **Freeman Delusion: The Organised Pseudolegal Commercial Argument in Australia** Email: **robertsudy@freemandelusion.com** * Like the page on **Facebook** Public group **Australian Pseudolaw** * Follow me on **Twitter** * Subscribe on **YouTube**.