

Affiant:

David Shayler the Christ

Respondent:

Elizabeth Windsor
The Queen
Windsor Castle
Windsor
Windsor and Maidenhead
[SL4 1NJ]

AFFIDAVIT

A verified plain statement of fact, duty and law

Notice to agent is notice to principal, notice to principal is notice to agent

1. I, a man commonly known as David Shayler the Christ, hereinafter 'Affiant' and 'I', am competent to state the following matters that they are true, correct and complete, presented in good faith, and not intended to mislead.

Definitions

2. Herein, 'man' includes woman, natural person and human being and is synonymous with 'freeman'.
3. Words have their natural meaning unless otherwise defined.
4. If any, the term 'UNITED KINGDOM' means the corporation, and all agents, employees, subdivisions and representatives thereof, without any implied submission to the UNITED KINGDOM or such private corporate 'statutes.'
5. The Law is also known as 'Common Law' or 'Natural Law', which is enforceable and without exception, as opposed to man-made rules which are not but are sometimes wrongly referred to as 'law'.
6. The Common Law should not be confused with 'common law', as defined by the Encyclopedia Britannica, see page 81, The Third and Final Testament, Part 1, (downloadable at: <http://www.bookofthelaw.org/index.php/downloads>).
7. 'Maxim of Law' is synonymous with 'Principle of Law'.
8. A list of Principles of Law can be found from pp28-50, The Third and Final Testament, Part 1.

Law

9. A Principle or Maxim is so called because its dignity is chiefest, and its authority most certain, and because universally approved by all.
10. Nothing against reason is lawful.
11. It has been said, with much truth, 'Where the law ends, tyranny begins'.
12. The rule of Law is paramount and mandatory, where 'rule' means 'highest authority'.
13. From context. 'Law' here is the Law of God, set out in God's Bible:

Jesus said unto him, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment.

And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

On these two commandments hang all the Law and the prophets.

Matthew 22:34-40

14. Under the constitutional documents of English law:
 - i. God exists in the form of the oath, sworn before God
 - ii. There is an Established church or religion of which you, the Queen, are governor and I, as Christ, am the head.
 - iii. The holy book of this religion is the King James Bible, which states the Law of God. It is also known as 'The Book of the Law'.
15. In law, 'Love your neighbour...' becomes a duty of care to another man:

The rule that you are to love your neighbour becomes in law you must not injure your neighbour; and the lawyer's question: 'Who is my neighbour?' receives a restricted reply.

You must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions which you can reasonably foresee would be likely to injure your neighbour. Who, then, in law, is my neighbour?

The answer seems to be - persons who are so closely and directly affected by my act that I ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected when I am directing my mind to the acts or omissions that are called in question.

Lord Atkin, *Donoghue v Stevenson*, [1932] AC 562, leading judgment, 26 May 1932

Quoted at page 60, *The Third and Final Testament*, Part 1.

16. The 'person' referred to here must by reason be a natural person or man because 'Love your neighbour...' is the Law of God and God's Law does not recognise a 'person' when it is a legal fiction (see also Black's Law definition of 'person', discussed below).
17. Although in his dissenting opinion in *Donoghue*, Lord Buckmaster stated that 'it is difficult to see how any common law proposition can be

supported to formulate [the plaintiff's] claim', he failed to mention or deal with the Common Law principle of 'Love your neighbour...'.

18. Upholding Doroghue's appeal, Lord Macmillan specifically dealt with this omission quoting Lord Esher in *Emmens v Pottle* [CA 1885]:

Any proposition the result of which would be to show that the common law of England is wholly unreasonable and unjust, cannot be part of the common law of England.

Quoted at page 60, *The Third and Final Testament*, Part 1

<http://swarb.cc.uk/emmens-v-pottle-ca-1885/>

19. This 'authority' in case 'law' demonstrates that the 'Love your neighbour...' principle of the Common Law takes precedence over any other judicial precedent in case 'law', made under 'English law'.
20. It records therefore that which already exists under the Common Law: a man's authority to reject the contractual offer of a constitution or statute at any time and instead be judged on his duty of care to his fellow man.
21. 'The common law of England' is therefore synonymous with The Law (of God).
22. Philosophers call the 'Love your neighbour...' principle -- also expressed as 'Do as you would be done by' -- as the 'Golden Rule' as it has no exceptions.
23. Because, it has no exceptions -- it is paramount and mandatory -- it is 'law'. The exception proves the rule.
24. The 'Love your neighbour...' principle acquires the force of law because it conforms to reason.
25. It therefore follows that our contractual relationship with government -- dictated by statute and constitution -- cannot take precedence over a principle of Common Law. This is supported by the following principles of Law:

If ever the Law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later

That which is against Divine Law is repugnant to society and is void

26. Research into the human brain has shown that psychopaths lack brain activity in the areas associated with empathy or compassion: they are incapable of understanding the true affect of their actions on another man or woman.
27. To fail to obey the Law of 'Do as you would be done by' is therefore indicative of the mindset of a psychopath who will work only in his or her own interests at the expense of the rights of others.
28. A psychopath is unlikely to act in the common good and therefore has no right to hold office or exercise authority over others.

Magna Carta

29. On 15th June 2015, you, the Queen -- as well as the Prime Minister, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Princess Royal, who have all sworn on oath of fealty to you -- attended the Magna Carta Memorial Monument, Runnymede, Windsor Rd, Old Windsor, Windsor, Surrey, as part of the 800th anniversary of the original signing of the document.. It has plaques specifically commemorating: 'Freedom under Law'; 'the rule of Law'; and the 'Principles of Law'
30. As the highest power in the land under the Law, given authority through the oath, you, the Queen, consented to the still existing terms of Magna Carta, which recognise God and his Law as paramount and distinguishes between the 'person' of a baron and 'freemen'.
31. The principles behind the document therefore continue to guarantee the rights, freedoms and liberties of the Common Law to all freemen of the realm and their heirs 'for ever':

1. *FIRST* We have granted to God, and by this our present Charter have confirmed, for Us and our Heirs for ever, that the Church of England shall be free, and shall have all her whole Rights and Liberties inviolable. We have granted also, and given to all the Freemen of our Realm, for Us and our Heirs for ever, these Liberties under-written, to have and to hold to them and their Heirs, of Us and our Heirs for ever: [...]

29. NO Freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his Freehold, or Liberties, or free Customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any other wise destroyed; nor will We not pass upon him, nor condemn him, but by lawful judgment of his Peers, or by the Law of the land. We will sell to no man, we will not deny or defer to any man either Justice or Right.

32. Any right inviolably given to 'all freemen' is by reason given to a 'freeman'.
33. In this case 'The Law of the Land' has to mean the Law of God, which can be guaranteed because it is eternal and unchanging.
34. The phrase was coined to distinguish between the two systems of law in existence, the Common Law and civil 'law', which includes admiralty and maritime 'law', so is also known as 'the law of the sea'. This interpretation is also supported by the following Principle of Law:

The Law of God and the law of the land are all one, and both favour and preserve the common good of the land

35. 'The Law of the Land' cannot be interpreted in its more modern and misused meaning of 'the collected body of laws of any given country', because:
 - i. This would be a misinterpretation of the word 'laws' which primarily must be interpreted as 'the two commandments of God's Law' before being considered in its misused way where it is falsely held to be synonymous with legislation.

- ii. Legislation is constantly changing. Magna Carta could not insist that anyone be bound by 'laws' or legislation yet to be passed when it was signed.
 - iii. The concept of Parliamentary legislation did not exist when Magna Carta was signed into law.
36. Under the Law, it is clear that any man has a greater claim to hold land under the Law than any 'person' claiming 'absolute title' under civil law as 'person' and 'absolute title' are both legal fictions.
 37. According to the Bible, God gives man – not persons -- dominion over the earth.
 38. Leviticus, Chapter 25, verses 8-24 contains the following statements of Law:

'Count off seven sabbath years—seven times seven years—so that the seven sabbath years amount to a period of forty-nine years. [...]

'Consecrate the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout the land to all its inhabitants. It shall be a jubilee for you. [...]

'If you sell land to any of your own people or buy land from them, do not take advantage of each other. [...] Do not take advantage of each other. [...]

'The land must not be sold permanently, because the land is mine and you reside in my land as foreigners and strangers. Throughout the land that you hold as a possession, you must provide for the redemption of the land'.
 39. All title to land is a legal fiction. It is unlawful to in any way permanently buy or sell land or take advantage of anyone with regard to its distribution.
 40. Any man can and may hold land, subject to the Law.
 41. An English man's house is his castle. He therefore has the right to use force against anyone trying to enter his property without consent or lawful authority.
 42. Subject to the Law, the True Sovereign – not you, the Queen -- adjudicates in any dispute over the use of land.

Legality v reality

43. A Principle of Law states: 'Legality is not reality'.
44. Although Parliamentary legislation cannot impose a duty on anyone without their consent, it is nevertheless worth examining the real meaning behind the definition of 'person', to which legislation refers.
45. In order to include a man in the contract 'law' of statute, the government creates a legal 'person' with the same name as you but adding a title, among them, 'Mr', 'Mrs' 'Dr' or 'Queen'. This is usually done by registering the birth with the state in return for a birth certificate.

46. For the purposes of determination under English contract 'law', this 'person' has ostensibly the same status as a corporation.
47. Since a corporation is usually some form of document or register incorporating individual men and women into a society, a person is a piece of paper.
48. Pieces of paper do not have inviolate rights under the Law.
49. Any rights accorded to a piece of paper are a 'legal fiction' because a piece of paper cannot suffer harm, loss or injury, necessary to establish an infringement of a man's rights under the Law.
50. Black's Law dictionary has changed its definition of 'person' over the years, which has only served to confuse the issue.
51. A lack of clarity to a reasonable man in written law means that it cannot carry the force of the Law.
52. Black's Law, 3rd edition, defined 'person' as 'legal fiction'.
53. Black's Law, 9th edition, offers the following definitions:
 - a. 'human being also termed natural person'
 - b. 'an entity (such as a corporation) that is recognised by law as having most of the rights and duties of a human being. In this sense the term includes partnerships and other associations, whether incorporated or unincorporated'
 - c. 'artificial person', 'fictitious person' defined as 'an entity, such as a corporation, created by law and given certain legal rights and duties of a human being: a being real or imaginary, who for the purposes of legal reasoning is treated more or less as a human being'
 - d. persona ficta *Latin 'false mask'+Historical . 'A fictional person such as a corporation'

Black's Law, 9th edition
54. It is still clear that there is a difference between a real man created by God -- whether you choose to call that man a human being or a 'natural person' -- and the 'person', a title created by a state with the intention that a man be judged under the same legislation as a corporation -- which Black's Law defines as a fictitious or artificial person, in other words a legal fiction.
55. The reason a corporation cannot have all the rights and duties of a human being or man -- as conceded by Black's in the definitions above -- is that a corporation cannot reject legislation in favour of its Common Law rights whereas a man or a natural person with a conscience can.
56. From historical context cited above, it is also quite clear that the person is a role or fiction -- a mask -- we adopt by consent to enter into English statute and contract 'law'.

57. The person is a mask you adopt to play a role. Once you no longer consent to play that role, you cast off the mask or person in a way that you cannot cast off your status as a real man or woman.

Persons or corporations under the Law

58. Two Principles of Law state:

The Law is no respecter of persons.

The status of a person is his legal position or condition.

59. The Law of God makes no provision for corporations as they are incapable of love or taking responsibility for their actions. In fact, they display all the characteristics of a psychopath, working solely in their own interest without conscience.
60. By this reasoning, the person is a contractual offer made under legislation to which a man can refuse consent, whether the legalese behind the legislation defines him as a 'man', a 'human being' or a 'natural person'.
61. A man can refuse to consent to legislation, which is not binding and is only a contractual offer.
62. If you insist that you are a real man -- a truth -- no one can judge you as a legal fiction.
63. This is backed by the following Principles of law:

Where truth is, fiction of law does not exist

Fiction of law is wrongful if it causes loss or injury to any one

Consent makes the law. A contract is a law between the parties, which can acquire force only by consent.

The Coronation Oath

64. A Principle of Law says: 'To swear is to call God to witness, and is an act of religion'.
65. In the context of God's Law, 'religion' means 'binding together with God (again)'.
66. If you swear an oath before God, then it is axiomatic that you are aware that you accept God's authority -- you are effectively asking God to witness your actions and judge you, should you fail to abide by that oath and not be brought to justice by man.
67. If God is able to witness all that you do and judge you, it is clear God has the authority.
68. Once you have recognised God's authority, it follows that you are bound by God's two commandments, on which hang 'all of the Law', see page 68, The Third and Final Testament, Part 1.

69. On 2nd June 1953 during your coronation at Westminster Abbey, witnessed by the nation on television, you freely swore the oath to serve God and His Law:

The Archbishop standing before her shall administer the Coronation Oath, first asking the Queen:

Madam, is your Majesty willing to take the Oath?

And the Queen answering: I am willing.

The Archbishop shall minister these questions; and The Queen, having a book in her hands, shall answer each question severally as follows:

Archbishop: Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the Peoples of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Pakistan, and Ceylon, and of your Possessions and the other Territories to any of them belonging or pertaining, according to their respective laws and customs?

Queen: I solemnly promise so to do.

Archbishop: Will you to your power cause Law and Justice, in Mercy, to be executed in all your judgments?

Queen: I will.

Archbishop: Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the Laws of God and the true profession of the Gospel? [...]

Queen: All this I promise to do.

Then the Queen arising out of her Chair, supported as before, the Sword of State being carried before her, shall go to the Altar, and make her solemn Oath in the sight of all the people to observe the premises: laying her right hand upon the Holy Gospel in the great Bible (which was before carried in the procession and is now brought from the Altar by the Arch-bishop, and tendered to her as she kneels upon the steps), and saying these words:

The things which I have here before promised, I will perform and keep. So help me God.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oath_of_office#Coronation_Oath_2

Quoted at page 69, The Third and Final Testament, Part 1

70. God's Law is not specifically mentioned in the judicial oath of office:

Judicial Oath

I, [NAME], do swear that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth in the office of, and I will do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of this realm (colony), without fear or favour, affection or ill will. So help me God

71. It does though mention 'God' and 'laws', which in the context of mandatory Law, as opposed to optional legislation, is most fittingly interpreted as 'the two commandments of God's Law', as supported by your oath above which mentions: 'Law and Justice'; 'the Laws of God'; and the 'true profession of the Gospel'.

72. 'Usage' is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as:

- a. The action of using something or the fact of being used;
- b. The way in which a word or phrase is normally and correctly used;
- c. Habitual or customary practice, especially as creating a right, obligation, or standard.

<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/usage>

- 73. As already established, the rule of the Law, 'Love your neighbour as you love yourself is the Golden Rule without exception and therefore 'Law' as recognised in English case 'law' in *Donoghue v Stevenson*.
- 74. By reason, 'usage' in this context most appropriately refers to the 'rights[s], obligation[s] [and] standard[s]' of the Law because legislation cannot create rights; obligations or standards.
- 75. Mention of the word 'Sovereign' in the judicial oath means any man swearing this oath has accepted that you, the Queen, have the highest authority under the Law in your society by virtue of swearing the Coronation Oath.
- 76. It does not mean that you, the Queen, have absolute sovereignty.
- 77. The real man behind the legal fiction of Recorder Lydiard (see below) and the officers of Surrey Police will also have sworn the oath of allegiance to the highest authority under the Law in the society of the UK, you, the Queen:

The Oath of Allegiance

I, [NAME], do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God.

The Promissory Oaths Act 1868

- 78. To do their duty to you, they must uphold 'Law and Justice' because you swore to do this (see Coronation Oath above).
- 79. In the context of the Law and the Bible in which it is written down, Jesus Christ is the 'heir' -- as in the 'heir of all things' (see Hebrews 1:2) -- and your successor, according to law.
- 80. The same reasoning regarding God's Law applies to any man who has sworn the official oath:

I, [NAME], do swear that I will well and truly serve Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth in the office of [...] So help me God.

The Promissory Oaths Act 1868

- 81. On 24th August 2010, I swore under oath a statement of law, duty and fact before God, which I sent you, the Queen shortly after. In that affidavit, I swore that I am the Sovereign under the Law:

No one has brought just reason to challenge my statement that I am God, incarnated as Holy Spirit and Man, and therefore sovereign.

82. On 6th October 2010, having received no reply, I swore before God under oath and before two witnesses that I had received no reply and sent that document to you, the Queen, shortly after, alerting you to the fact that the Affidavit remained unopposed and unrebutted and would become set in law.
83. On 4th February 2011, still having received no reply I swore before God under oath and before two witnesses that I had received no reply and that document to you, the Queen, shortly after.
84. I alerted you to the fact that the truth of my Affidavit had become law as -
- when the opportunity was offered -- it had not been rebutted by the monarch, the highest authority in law in the UNITED KINGDOM, prior to the arrival of the Christ.
85. As you failed to rebut any point made in that sworn statement, the facts and law set out therein have become '*stare decisis*' - beyond judicial decision -- under the higher Law and therefore '*res judicata*' under the legal system.
86. In my extensive research, I have found no evidence indicating that any one else is the Chosen One of God also known as Jesus Christ; Yeshua Meschiach; the Mahdi; the True Confucian Man; and the Final Boddhisatva, among others.
87. In my extensive research, I have not found any evidence I am not the Chosen One of God and I believe none exists.
88. As far as I am aware, no one has brought a challenge or any counter-claim in law to my statement that I am the Chosen One of God.
89. I am therefore the Sovereign under the Law and hold the Royal Prerogative, which you must not call upon, quote or use without my expressly given authority.
90. A Principle of Law says: 'Punishment is due if the words of an oath be false'.
91. There are no rules under the Law for producing affidavits. A statement sworn before God and two witnesses is an affidavit which carries the force of the Law because it mentions 'God' and has two witnesses, a test of the civil 'law'.
92. This is supported by A Principle of Law:

This is a maxim of the civil law, where everything must be proved by two witnesses.
93. Notaries public have refused to hear the oaths of Freemen, proving they have failed to perform their duties to hear the oath without discrimination, according to the Law of God.

94. Notaries public have sworn an oath to the Queen; are servants of the Queen and must therefore have been instructed not to hear the oath according to the Law.

The Unlawful Eviction, Runnymede Freeman Village, 16th September 2015

95. On the morning of 16th September 2015, I was conveyed by a friend to Runnymede Freeman Village, arriving at a point in the late morning to find officers of the Law from Surrey Police outside the property, the land a number of men and women -- myself among them, from November 2012 to unlawful removal on 16th September 2015 -- have been enjoying according to law.
96. The officers of Surrey Police presented a legal instrument known in your society as a 'General Form of Judgment or Order', reference: B00SM101, dated 16 June 2015 --hereinafter referred to as the 'Order' -- against a number of named persons.
97. I was not named on the document, nor was the 'artificial person', or 'legal fiction', 'Mr David Shayler'.
98. As an unsigned document, it has no basis in Law, does not meet the test of an enforceable judgment under the Law and therefore cannot be enforced in law (see below also).
99. When asked, each and every officer of Surrey police consented to the proposition that they would not vacate their house simply on receipt of an unsigned document.
100. Because they then allowed others to suffer this violation of their rights, they failed the 'Do as you would be done by' test of the Law, demonstrating that, in this instance, they were incapable of compassion, a behavioural trait of the psychopath.
101. Men and women I knew from the village were trying to peacefully resist removal, kidnap and other violations of the Law so I tried to go to their aid as I have a duty under the Law to help those having their rights undermined.
102. I was prevented from entering the village at the usual right of access points and from entering through a gap in the iron fence, erected by agents of the corporation and legal fiction, Orchid Runnymede -- without my consent or the consent of other men and women who stay at Runnymede Freeman Village -- about 40 yards down from the grounds of the Commonwealth Air Force Memorial.
103. Although the officers of Surrey Police told me there was a 'possession order' (their words) they were unable to produce any document which conformed to law.
104. I therefore acted lawfully by trying to peacefully disrupt the bailiffs in attendance -- who were in the process of harassing, cowing, assaulting, kidnapping and falsely detaining men and women. They were unable to produce authority or lawful reason for their actions.

105. Officers of Surrey Police told me they were there to prevent a 'Breach of the Peace', a concept that exists under the Law to protect men and women from harm and harassment and other violations of their rights by other men and women and 'persons', see <http://www.inbrief.co.uk/offences/breach-of-the-peace.htm>.
106. Since the very presence of the bailiffs and servants of the 'security' company was without authority or lawful basis, they acted as 'persons' whose actions constitute a breach of the peace (as well as harassment, cowing or intimidation, assault, kidnap and false detention and imprisonment, among others) of the free men and women in question.
107. The 1361 Justices of the Peace Act -- from which the legal concept of Breach of the Peace comes -- is a statute which can only carry the force of law with the consent of a man or 'natural person'.
108. I told officers of the Surrey Police to do their duty under the Law and arrest those who had no lawful authority for their presence and they refused to follow out this act which conformed to law.

Police oath with reference to unlawful eviction

109. The officers failed to do their duty under law, violating the oath they swore to the people and the peace:
- I, ... of ... do solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm that I will well and truly serve the Queen in the office of constable, with fairness, integrity, diligence and impartiality, upholding fundamental human rights and according equal respect to all people; and that I will, to the best of my power, cause the peace to be kept and preserved and prevent all offences against people and property; and that while I continue to hold the said office I will to the best of my skill and knowledge discharge all the duties thereof faithfully according to law.
110. In *Donoghue v Stevenson*, it was established that English law is the Common Law which enshrines a duty of care to other men and women. To act 'according to law', an officer therefore has a duty of care to a man or woman.
111. The police oath makes no mention of a 'person' or 'persons' so a officer of the Law has no duty to the legal fiction of a 'person' and by extension, the statutes which concern 'a person' or 'mask'.
112. The police oath also makes fealty to you, the Queen, who at your coronation swore to uphold 'Law and Justice' and the 'Laws of God'.
113. Having sworn fealty to you, the Queen, an officer of the Law submits to your oath to maintain the Law of God.
114. Since the bailiffs and other agents of the unlawful entity, Orchid Holdings Ltd, had no lawful authority, any arrests made by officers of the Law constitute breaches of that Law and meet the three tests of false arrest and false imprisonment:
- i. wilful detention;

- ii. without consent;
- iii. without authority of law.

115. At 10:41, 22nd January 2014, I sent an email to Ian Rennie, the general secretary of the Police Federation -- to which all officers of the Law belong -- at email address: gensec@polfed.org, making mention of the Law, as opposed to legislation, and the duties of an officer of the Law, as follows:

To perform your duties according to the oath of office you swore, you will need to ensure that every member of the Police Federation sees my research into the Law, the Third and Final Testament, and understands their duties to the Law.

Those officers who enforce legislation act unlawfully, particularly with regard to the God plant, cannabis sativa, which can quite literally save the day.

I have allowed a period of grace for you to prepare for the enforcement of the Law so your officers should be up to speed with their duties by now.

Those who cause harm, loss or injury to a man or woman will be subject to the full penalties of the Law.

To spell this out clearly, any officer violating the Law will in the first instance have his pension taken away.

<https://www.scribd.com/doc/201405611/Email-Ian-Rennie-General-Secretary-Police-Federation>

116. There can be no dispute that the representative body of the officers in question was informed about the Law and the penalties for violating that law.

Why 'Recorder Lydiard' quoted in B00SM101 has no authority under the Law

117. The still existing clauses of Magna Carta make it clear that any man acting or speaking against a freeman must have authority under the Law: 'by lawful judgment of his Peers, or by the Law of the Land', (see clause 29 quoted above and the correct interpretation of 'Law of the Land in this context).

118. A servant is not the peer of a freeman because a freeman has no master other than God and is free to act on conscience according to law, whereas a servant has a human master and has to obey orders and instructions or face penalties under the rules of the society he lives under.

119. A servant has a master and a slave has a master. Although slavery as it existed under the Mosaic covenant (see page 12, The Third and Final Testament, Part 1) has no specific modern parallel, *Easton's 1897 Bible Dictionary* defines 'slave' as 'servant':

In Rev[elation]18:13 the word 'slaves' is the rendering of a Greek word meaning 'bodies'. The Hebrew and Greek words for slave are usually rendered simply 'servant', 'bondman' or 'bondservant'.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/slave>

120. The man operating under the alias of 'Recorder Lydiard' whose name appears on the document under reference is a servant or slave who must

obey the orders of his master or face punishment under the rules of his society.

121. To rule on a case like this, he will have sworn the judicial oath and the oath of allegiance.
122. 'Recorder Lydiard' is therefore a legal fiction, not a peer or equal of a free man with self-evident and God-given rights under the Law of the Land, according to Magna Carta.
123. Since corporations have no rights under the Law and men and women do, 'Recorder Lydiard' had absolutely no lawful grounds to make any decision in favour of a corporation or person over a man.
124. The above facts allow us to conclude that 'Recorder Lydiard' must have been ordered by persons unknown not to find for the freemen of Runnymede over a corporation so his ruling was not freely arrived at; cannot be based on conscience or Law; and can have no authority in law.
125. His ruling therefore constitutes 'arbitrary judgement', which is contrary to reason and is against the Law.
126. For the 'Order' to carry the force of Law, the real man responsible for the legal fiction 'Recorder Lydiard' must swear under oath that its terms conform to the paramount and mandatory law.
127. Any man who adopts his person accepts that he is no longer free and is a servant or slave of his master, the monarch or the highest power in the society to which he has consented to belong.
128. In this case, the society you preside over is based on the monetary system and the power of the central banks which violate God's Law forbidding usury, the making of money simply from money (see pp84-88, Third and Final Testament).
129. Usury is odious in law.
130. A contract founded on a base and unlawful consideration, or against good morals, is null.
131. If ever the Law of God and man are at variance, the former are to be obeyed in derogation of the later.
132. That which is against Divine Law is repugnant to society and is void.
133. The 'Law of the Land' is God's Law:

The Law of God and the law of the land are all one, and both
favour and preserve the common good of the land
134. The man who operated under the alias of 'Recorder Lydiard' was therefore not an independent judge because he is paid by a society in whose interests it is that a free man should be a slave without right to hold the land he lives on.
135. 'Recorder Lydiard' is not impartial as he has benefited from your society's failure to enforce the Law against usury, meaning it is around

£1.5trillion in debt to the Bank of England, a corporation, and pays around £1billion a week in interest on this unlawful debt.

136. 'Recorder Lydiard' therefore fails to meet the above two tests of a judge under the Law: independence and impartiality.

137. The real man who operates under the alias of 'Recorder Lydiard' has conspired with you, the Queen; the Chief Constable of Surrey; and the officers of Surrey police to deliver a fraudulent threatening communication, 'the Order', designed to cow free men and women.

The 'Order' itself

138. In addition, the 'Order' and others like it have no authority or lawful basis for the reasons set out below, among others.

139. The 'Order' mentions that the 'Recorder' heard 'counsel' for the plaintiff and a 'submission' from the defendants. This clashes with the following Principles of Law:

Unequal things should not be joined.

Every consent implies a submission but not every submission implies consent.

A twisting of language is unworthy of a judge.

140. This instrument states 'it is ordered'. As it is unclear which real man is making the 'Order', the instrument in question can have no lawful validity and must not be enforced.

141. The 'Order' has no validity without signature. It stands as a contractual offer to the legal fiction of a person or mask under the rules of a society to which no man belongs, only 'persons'.

142. The 'Order' or request fails to mention it may only carry the force of Law with the consent of a man and woman.

143. Since it was entirely foreseeable that the unlawful enforcement of the 'Order' would cause harm, loss or injury under the Law to a man by depriving him of his home, this omission constitutes fraud causing harm, loss or injury under the Principle of 'Love your neighbour...':

Who then, in law, is my neighbour? [..]

The answer seems to be - persons who are so closely and directly affected by my act that I ought reasonably to have them in contemplation as being so affected when I am directing my mind to the acts or omissions that are called in question.

Lord Atkin, *Donoghue v Stevenson*, [1932] AC 562, leading judgment, 26 May 1932

144. This is supported by a Principle of Law (although in this case, there is no element of 'good and just'):

What otherwise is good and just, if it be sought by force and fraud, becomes bad and unjust,

Page 36, The Third and Final Testament. Part1

145. Any attempt to represent legislation or an 'Order' as enforceable law therefore constitutes fraud, perverting the course of justice and potentially, treason.
146. Even then any lawful judgment of a judge is open to appeal to the monarch or Highest Officer of Law in the society you belong to and finally the Sovereign under the paramount and mandatory Law.
147. 'Recorder Lydiard' is a title or artificial person also known as a legal fiction. A legal fiction has no authority to make a binding judgment which can be enforced under the Law.
148. Only a judgment freely arrived at and sworn under oath according to Law by a man who has freely elected to be a judge rather than a servant ; slave; or the legal fiction of 'Recorder' can carry the force of Law.
149. Only a man who subjects himself to the One True God, Jesus, and his Law of 'Love God' and 'Love your neighbour as you love yourself' can make a binding enforceable judgment.

Artificial person

150. 'Orchid Runnymede Limited' is an artificial entity without sentience or soul, it has never had and will never have a right to freely enjoy the land or hold it under the Law.
151. A piece of paper cannot hold anything nor can it suffer harm, loss or injury precisely because it is not sentient.
152. A man under the Law has full liability in law for his actions. An artificial person does not as it is limited by insurance.
153. Even If 'Orchid Runnymede' has title to land in your society, all title is legal fiction, which has no meaning to a real man who has a right to hold land with respect to the rights of others (see p89, The Third and Final Testament, Part 1).
154. This is supported by the following Principles of Law:
 - Legality is not reality
 - Fiction of law is wrongful if it works loss or injury to any one.
 - There is no fiction without law.
 - Fictions arise from the law, and not law from fictions
 - Pages 35 and 36, Third and Final Testament, Part 1
155. 'Orchid Runnymede Limited' is a corporate entity, whose persons are also unlawfully involved in usury.
156. You cannot serve God and Mammon, where Mammon means the 'monetary system', in which states have a central bank which violates God's Law forbidding usury, see p84-88, The Third and Final Testament, Part 1.
157. Any attempt to entice a free man into your society is an infringement of his right to be free of any master other than God, which has paramount

protection under the Law of 'Love God' and 'Love your neighbour as yourself'.

158. For the purposes of the Law, a man is the natural holder of the land he uses or stays on. Under the rules of your society, 'possessions' are not synonymous with 'property' or 'land'. The latter two can only be taken from a man by a process of Law, not legislation or by any legal fiction.
159. The foreseeable effects of your breaking the Law will be men and women - - mothers with children, among them -- forced from their homes onto the streets. In addition to causing each free man or woman loss through deprivation of her property, you will also be exposing young children to serious harm to their health and well being.
160. You would not leave your home on sight of an unsigned, unenforceable 'Order' which did not originate from a court of Law so why expect others to do so? 'Do as you would be done by',
161. A compassionate human being would have intuitively understood that his duty to protect men and women overrode any unsigned piece of paper.
162. By law, any freeman may exercise his right to answer, not surrender, only to a sworn affidavit, witnessing that he has caused harm, loss or injury to a human being.
163. This is supported by a Principle of Law: 'No one is believed in court except upon his oath'. It does not restrict this Principle to the witness who swears to his truth under oath..

Respondent's duties

164. If you do not have the compassion and wisdom to see that you break the Law when you allow officers of the Law who have sworn fealty to you to enforce a non-binding legal instrument, then you pose an enormous threat to the freedom guaranteed under Law. As such, you will by your own actions have proved you are unfit to hold the office of queen or monarch under the Law.
165. Given the serious threats to our society from paedophilia, false-flag and real terrorism; unjustified war and unprosecuted war criminals, it cannot be in the common good of man to pay funds to institutions, which conspire to wage war, falsely imprison and cover up the truth about major world events, like the attacks on the US of 11th September 2001.
166. Given the serious threats to our society from paedophilia, false-flag and real terrorism; unjustified war and unprosecuted war criminals, it cannot be in the common good for officers of the Law to spend - or cause to spend -- the contributions to the state made through taxation on the prosecution of any free man who has not caused harm, loss or injury.
167. Mistakes, neglect, or misconducts are not to be regarded as accidents.
168. No rule of law protects anyone who wilfully closes his ears to information, or refuses to make inquiry when circumstances of grave suspicion imperatively demand it.

169. It is a violation of the Law for you, the Queen, your agents, officers or employees; or any corporate agent, officer or employee, to interfere in the enjoyment of any freeman's property or the pursuit of his interests under the Law.

170. My sworn affidavit to you, dated 24th August 2010, page 2, states:

A legal fiction corporation cannot secure *in personam* jurisdiction over or against Affiant, a living man with a soul responsible to God, his Creator, without Affiant's voluntary election to submit.

Any Police Officer and/or Government/corporate officer, agent and/or employee who attempts to enforce statutes against Affiant would be violating the law and engaging in Enticement to Slavery.

It would be unlawful for any Police Officer, Government/corporate agent, official, employee or the like, to hold, incarcerate, detain, restrain and/or restrict the Affiant against the Affiant's will at any time whatsoever.

Any party that would order, represent or persuade the Affiant to falsely present the Affiant as a UNITED KINGDOM citizen, vessel or person directly or by deception, device, misnomer, mistaken identity, warrant or indictment, real or imagined, would be engaging in Enticement to Slavery.

It would be both a violation of law and a violation of the Affiant's God given unalienable rights if any government/corporative agent, officer or employee attempts to, or does in-fact, force, coerce, manipulate and/or deceive the Affiant into receiving any form of medical treatment at anytime whatsoever, including but not limited to vaccinations.

The Affiant is not a member of any society whatsoever and therefore the Affiant is not bound by any society's statutes, rules or codes

It would be unlawful for the Respondent and/or any of the Respondent's agents, officers or employees, and/or any Government/corporate agent, officer or employee, to remove the Affiant's property and/or interests, or restrict Affiant's use of Affiant's property and/or interests against Affiant's will and without Affiant's express consent.

Quoted at page 102, The Third and Final Testament, Part 1

171. There cannot therefore be any reasonable dispute that you, the Queen, did not know that the Law of God is the higher Law and that any man may refuse consent to your society and its legal fictions, among them, statute and person.

172. Since officers who have sworn fealty to you clearly violated the rights of real men and women, you have knowingly broken the Law.

173. This is supported by two Principles of Law:

He who does anything through another, is considered as doing it himself.

The master is liable for injury done by his servant.

174. And by the following passages of God's Bible:

If any man therefore sets aside the Law's demands, and teaches others to do the same, he will have the lowest place in the kingdom of Heaven, whereas anyone who keeps the Law and teaches others so will stand high in the kingdom of Heaven.

I tell you, unless you show yourselves far better men than the Pharisees and the doctors [teachers] of the law, you can never enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

Matthew 5:19-20

For if a man keeps the whole law apart from one single point, he is guilty of breaking all of it.

James 2:10-11

175. Any use of a notary public, Bank of England Promissory Notes or any other public facilities -- among them, the postcode -- when alternatives are generally unavailable, does not comprise:

- i. a submission to any political jurisdiction,
- ii. the creation of an adhesion contract expressly or tacitly with the UNITED KINGDOM or any other party real or imagined,
- iii. consent to appear before any body or tribunal, administrative or judicial, real or imagined.

176. Your failure to provide me with a verified rebuttal to this affidavit point - by-point no later than ten (10) days from the date of issuance, or request additional time to comply, will comprise you, the Queen's agreement with and confession of all facts herein, in perpetuity, the said confession being *res judicata* and *stare decisis*.

177. 'I, a man and god alive commonly known as David Shayler the Christ, on my own unlimited liability under the Law, certify that I have adopted the above text as holograph; read it and do know that the facts and law contained are true, correct and complete, not misleading, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.'

Signed

26th day of October, 2015, at Palmer's Green, London

By: David Shayler the Christ (Affiant) All rights reserved.
David Shayler the Christ, *in rerum natura*

Witness 1

Name IAN PUDDLICK

Address [Address Supplied]

Subscribed and sworn before me by David Shayler, known to me to be the real man signing this affidavit

Signed 


26 day of OCTOBER, 20 15 at PALMER GREEN

Witness 2

Name Leena Puddick

Address [Address Supplied]

Subscribed and sworn before me by David Shayler, known to me to be the real man signing this affidavit

Signed 

26 day of October, 20 15 at Palmer's Green