

The contract called the Treaty of Verona – the slavery foundation stone and the deception of magna carta Submitted by john. on Fri, 05/02/2010 _ 17:53

Before we look at magna carta (the script) let us go back two years previous to 1213 and the contract called the treaty of verona. King John, as most kings, tried to no avail to establish, as William the conqueror did, a dictatorship. This seems to be the model to follow and William set a precedent that all kings and queens would try to follow, or at least they would try to push the boundaries set out in the doctrine written by the church of Rome. The pope's main goal was to try and control all the lands of the world under the doctrine that he is the 'vicar of Christ', using the myth of Jesus Christ to achieve this. Placing him at the top of the chain and by using the myth to his and whom he serves' benefit, he would proclaim that he was the owner of all lands on behalf of Jesus, until such time as Jesus would return and he would supposedly hand it all back to him. Contained within this is every living breathing creature including us - basically in servitude to his wishes and all he commands? This was done through a legal system called canon law, the law of contracting that works through fiction, as it itself, is only fiction. So to set the stage we have the pope at the top of the chain supposedly owning all land and everything upon it and canon law as the script for the play, and the principle of the script to be: that the principles of religion contribute most powerfully to keep nations in the state of passive obedience, including their kings and queens. In being the 'vicar of Christ' the number one law to be used at first was the fear of god, and this is exactly what was used against king John to make him circum to the popes wishes.

When looking at King John, there are so many conflicting versions of history surrounding the events and life of John, almost to the point that most versions contradict themselves. It would seem that, yes, John and England were in some financial difficulties arising from the constant need to maintain lands in other countries and control of them, but more to the point that there was always someone wishing to take the throne of this country away from whoever held it at the time. The basis of the problem seems to be that John did not want to accept Stephan Langton, the Vatican's representative, as Archbishop, installed by pope innocent III to rule England under religious doctrine as Holy See. (canon law) Did John realise he was just to be a front man with everything being controlled from the shadows? John in effect was to become a slave to Stephan Langton and I am sure John realized this and of course no king of England could become a slave in his own land....what would become of his status? John thwarted the pope on this and got himself excommunicated, which to John being a very holy man in fear of God, was a very bad thing to happen - in fact, the only card the pope needed to play. John, as his brother Richard I had done, had invoked the law of mortmain, being brought in by Richard when he was crowned for the second time after being held captive for seven years by the czar of Germany. One of the agreements and part of the contract for his release was that Richard would install canon law upon being crowned, to maintain what William had started. John invoked mortmain so no one could pass land on to the church or anyone else without the king's permission. In some ways I see what John was trying to do, although historians have masked this fact deliberately – maybe a vain attempt to protect this island on behalf of whom he served: us. But it still remains that the law of mortmain was to be used as a very bad devise and still is today and would serve the pope well, but it seems John was forced into a predicament and used what he had at his disposal. It seems without mortmain the king would lose all the land he controlled. The Vatican did not like this as they would lose control of lands as many under the fear of god were giving their lands to the

church. The church had to devise a way to maintain the lands being always theirs and maintain control. John was the perfect candidate because of his religious nature and the excommunication devise worked perfectly to achieve this, with the added bonus that Stephen Langton would be in control and John would circum to this. The pope needed to cast in stone or at least on paper a contract with John that would be everlasting that would hand over everything including lands and chattels (us) to the supremacy of the pope and the church of Rome.

When John was excommunicated this affected this very religious man to such an extent it is said he went on bended knee and submitted to the popes supremacy to be absolved of excommunication. John handed over title to his kingdoms at the time which consisted of England and Ireland to the pope and all chattels as vassals, which means someone who is holding a fief (a piece of land held under the feudal system) who owes allegiance and service to a feudal lord. The pope was setting himself up as the ultimate lord on behalf of the corporation known as the church of Rome, the greatest conquest that netted the pope the place needed to take the rest of the world under an empire that he represented, an empire that was to become the biggest corporation in the world. John swore submission and loyalty to the pope under the delusion that if he didn't he would be excommunicated again, and to John this was worse than death of the body or anything else on this earth that could be done to him. The threat of eternal damnation was enough for John to circum to the wishes and desires of a man pretending to be a god on earth, a land lord John would worship as all of religious men, women and children have been deceived into doing. This is the ultimate deception, the ultimate lie relying on a myth, but was so strong in its devious nature that a man would surrender anything it requires to be surrendered – as when you join the 'order of St John of Jerusalem' better known by their nick name 'the knights templar'.

Albeit reluctantly John accepted Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury, knowing full well that the new archbishop was in control of the country and truly 'ruled', for John had offered a vassals bond (contract) of fealty (a loyalty someone owes to a lord or sovereign) and homage (a disposition or tendency to yield to the will of another) to the pope and the pope's servants, in other words to the CEO of the corporation and the CEO's directors. It is recorded in history that in July of 1213 John was absolved of excommunication at Winchester by the newly appointed 'ruler' Stephen Langton after becoming the new archbishop of Canterbury. On October 3rd 1213 John placed this island and every land across the world and the men, women and children of those lands in the hands of slavers and the biggest slave corporation in the world forever, by the ratification of the Treaty of Verona and by doing so he surrendered this island to the pope as vicar of christ who has claimed ownership of everyone and everything. Through the deception of religion and the lies it is based upon and perpetuates, from that moment in history we all became slaves to those lies and the construct it created, known as the commercial construct, in other words the world as we know it and all it has to offer.

The pope realized after a while, and only a short while, that in essence because the contract was between himself and John then the only people that could ever break the contract were descendants, heirs and successors doing the same in the same positions i.e. successive popes or successive kings and queens of England. Although he had manipulated John, he knew which is obvious, that John would not live forever, so steps would have to be taken to make sure every successive pope or king and queen of England would keep up their end of the contract. Now the

Barons (French title not English) were the popes and the corporation's next tool to be used to create a controlling aspect upon the king. By fueling the Barons by saying they were now the slaves and not the slavers as was created for them in William's times, the pope and corporation fueled a rebellion of the Barons against the king for signing the treaty (contract) and supposedly forced John to sign the magna carta at Runnymede in 1215. Immediately after magna carta was signed it is wrote in history that the pope innocent III declared it unlawful, which I feel is a complete smoke screen (evidence to follow) as the pope needed the Barons to control any successive kings and queens to make sure the contract stayed in place – for without it the See of Rome (corporation) would lose its strangle hold over the island and would not have allowed for the control and false ownership of the lands of the world the corporation has now, none of this would have happened without this treaty (contract) first being in place.

At this time the whole powerbase was held by John, even though in pretence John was just over seeing what was happening under the ruling hand of Stephen Langton. As many in the country were very loyal to John, in effect John could raise an army if he had had the balls to do so, to go against Langton, the pope and the corporation, if becoming strong enough again to undo what he had done if his false belief in an entity called god did not stand in the way. The Barons were very much needed to be on the corporation's side, so they were enticed and mustered through the greed of power and position, offering them status was all that was needed to maintain they would do the corporations dirty work. This was needed as anyone who ascended the throne after John could dissolve the contract, especially if they would not conform to the will of the corporation and the false laws of the fear of god and its oppression. What was needed was for the separation of power away from John and a legal document that would offer the Barons a unique set of laws for them alone and a commune of their own (city of London; within the Roman walls) a separate state to control everything from, in return for their willingness to keep John in check – on behalf of the archbishop which in turn was on behalf of the corporation. Because John was weakened from his endeavors with the pope, Stephen Langton and because of illness it was needed to strike while the iron was hot and a document within legal history was needed to be scripted to do such, not only the unique set of laws for the Barons, but also a document that would serve later to allow the corporation to extend its grip and maintain that the treaty (contract) would never be broken, by the introduction of a parliament and a fully fledged central point of administration of the legal systems you would call law that would ensure the devolution of the power base happened. Within this parliament (senate) the archbishops would have 26 seats to maintain absolute control on behalf of the corporation through a series of deceptive processes based upon representation to fool everyone – which still remains to this day

Magna Carta 1215....the most perfect of all legal documents....

Not two years later the most famous or should I say infamous document in English legal history was scripted and forced upon King John at Runnymede to sign on the 15th June 1215, but to this day I have not seen a signed copy of this document and I know of no one who has ever checked the translation to see if it is correct – what else could be hidden in these words we have not been told about. Magna carta 1215 is as it stands the most perfect of all legal documents and contains many of the processes still used to this day, but as it was then, none of these are for you to use they are explicitly for the socially dominant and are unique to them. This is why Jack Straw in a presentation in Washington in February 2008 stated “we need to modernise magna carta” and the

presentation he gave was called the modernisation of magna carta. Let's start by looking at its name magna carta – the great charter of liberties.

Charter: A written grant from the sovereign power of a country conferring certain rights and privileges on a person or a corporation, also: A document incorporating an institution and specifying its rights; includes the articles of incorporation and the certificate of incorporation

As you can see a charter is a grant that does not apply to men, women and children it applies to 'persons', as long as you are deemed as to have the 'privileges of a person'. Under canon law although man and person are synonymous in grammar, not all men were classed as persons as slaves were classed as 'things'. At this time in England most of us would have been serfs; in other words slaves and this would have been the majority of us, so to any lord we would have been things and things (chattels) have no rights. They have no personality they are personality: moveable property and Williams 'Domesday Book' was a list of all his personalty, as all censuses are. So when you combine this with liberties.

Liberties: The condition of being physically and legally free from confinement, servitude, forced labour, privileges, rights, civil liberties.

Something that is plainly obvious starts to emerge. As it says above legally free, but 'things' cannot be legally free as they have no legal personality i.e. 'status' they do not exist in the legal world, so in effect they have no legal rights. 'Things' are not physically or legally free and can be kept in confinement, servitude under forced labour, they have no privileges, or rights and no civil liberties. 'Things' do not enjoy social, political or economic rights and privileges, they are property of another under the whim of that other. Even in its name alone it spells out who it was wrote for and exactly why it was wrote. Liberty is not freedom, liberty is a grant of rights, but would only apply to the ones of status, those who believed they were better in some way, as we would know it now the upper class high society. This legal document set forth the class divide, although already well established this document maintained that this concept would carry on through the ages even to present day and even in the parliamentarians own words spoke by Jack Straw "it is very essential and is needed to be modernised so it can be maintained".

The concept of liberty forms the core of all democratic principles and societies, yet as a legal concept it defies clear definition, which to me is very obvious because it actually defines slavery and is the antithesis of moral or natural as slavery is. We must remember that legal is in form only (persons) a category of 'things' distinguished by some common characteristic or quality and within this comes the legal ability to enslave those of lesser quality. A master slave syndrome maintained by a immoral legal concept in the form of liberty under a false belief system based upon nothing more than human suffering and a delusional miscomprehension that anything and everything is ok, as long as it has the label 'legal' upon it such as war. What is most evident here is the fact that 'society' relies upon a democratic process to exist and this is where the true meaning of society rears its ugly head. The socially dominant members of any community a definition of the word society says it all and describes what a democratic process really allows for in allowing the socially dominant to live off the back bone of the rest of the community believing they have a divine rite to do so and no matter what is needed to maintain this deception it is ok as long as it has the label 'legal' applied to it. In essence liberty is no more than legal

slavery where men, women and children are bound by legal chains and not physical ones _ are bound to those who are deluded under a misguided comprehension deriving from the use of fictional artificial law emanating from the church and the laws of oppression. One of the concepts magna carta achieved was to make the laws of oppression legal. But this document was to lead to many other devices that were needed to contain the kings and queens of the future within legal doctrine to prevent them from ever being able to break the original contract between John and pope innocent III and was to be used to set up the legal mechanism that would prevent this occurring and create a constitutional figure head. If you are struggling with any of this then let's put it another way and bring it up to modern day. Before 1972 we were all known as 'subjects' the queens subjects, now of course we are known as 'citizens' more on this in a bit, but for now let's look at the word 'subjects'.

Subject: One who is under the rule of another or others, especially one who owes allegiance to a government or a ruler, the obligations of a vassal to a lord: a slave

So up until 1972 we were classed as slaves no different in description to the times magna carta was penned. Another deceptive word to disguise the true meaning of what we are actually classed as, by the socially dominant, the ruling classes and those of delusional status. Now we are classed as citizens, as of by definition being part of a republic, with the processes of a republic and a sovereign who is no more than a president, a figure head called a constitutional sovereign. When the new republic is fully establish (i.e. the European union), the figure head of the old republic will be removed to allow us to merge with the new republic and thus the only one who can break the original contract is removed forever, legally that is....please remember this is all based upon legal fiction, the use of artificial law (legal systems) and has no power whatsoever over you unless you want it to and you except the illusion. The republic is a political one based on the legal concept of liberty that is why you are now classed as a 'citizen'; a native or naturalized member of a state or other political community and oh boy you live in a political community controlled by legal parameters within a constitution, that is why everything is done under a constitutional basis derived from statute (legal) from the word status: The legal character or condition of a person or a thing. Governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed: The body of people (plural of person) who are citizens (a native or naturalized member of a state or other political community) of a particular government. But what they do not tell you is the fact that not all persons have to give consent, only 'particular persons' as slaves have no say now as they did not at any other time. You are 'ruled' whether you like it or not FULL STOP under this doctrine as a thing. They use an attachment to you called a legal personality via a piece of paper, a name, or as it was in the days of magna carta just a family name, to be able to legally label the thing (slave) as the thing cannot exist in the legal world unless it has a name, which became a certificate 153 years ago to say what it's called. The thing is then ruled, regularised, regulated and ordered to adhere to all democracies legal concepts (statutes) via the attached name, via policy=contracts under acts (statutes) and are fooled into believing they are electing representatives to do this on their behalf and they are fooled into believing they can withhold consent _ all we are really saying is 'NO' and that is the stumbling block, nothing to do with consent whatsoever. Without doubt we are fucking stupid!

This document set this doctrine in place as a legal concept and maintained that slavery would be legalised through this document that would be maintained till even now, with the concepts still

now driven by the same purpose for the same needs. But this was not only to effect just England this was to effect the world and everywhere the fleet set sail to, delivering the doctrines of common and canon law legal systems and of course the place it emanates from the church. That is why whenever you look at a country within the common wealth its foundation is within a common law legal system construct to set up the privileges for the socially dominant who would then introduce the canon law legal system to control the 'things' (us), because the civil legal system has no foundation without the common law legal system first being in place. Because without a common law legal system there are no socially dominant and without the socially dominant there is nothing classed as things (slaves) so there is no need for a system to control them, a canon law legal system called democracy.

Without delving too deeply into the document evidence starts to emerge that without doubt throws new light on to what historians maintain. One key element is that the pope sorry the pope was against the signing of magna carta and was quoted to say "...this document is unlawful and unjust as it is base and shameful..." and this has been given as the main reason King John was excommunicated, total fabrication. Without doubt this document was scripted in Rome and put together by legal minds of the time because John had already signed the treaty of Verona (contract) and this document was to ensure John or any successor to the throne could never break that treaty (contract) and if this was not the case then why was Stephen Langton present at the signing? And offering advice! Especially because he was a cardinal: one of a group of more than 100 prominent bishops in the sacred college who advise the pope and elect new popes. It just does not make any sense if you realise the facts and do not accept what historians say as being literal and more based on hearsay constructed to mask the truth deliberately.

"...on the advice of our venerable fathers, Stephen, archbishop of Canterbury, primate of all England and cardinal of the holy Roman church, Henry archbishop of Dublin, William of London, Peter of Winchester, Jocelyn of Bath and Glastonbury, Hugh of Lincoln, Walter of Worcester, William of Coventry and Benedict of Rochester, bishops, of master Pandulf, subdeacon and member of the household of the lord pope, of brother Aymeric, master of the order of Knights Templar in England...."

Not just Stephen but many other members of the pope's house hold plus the ruler of Ireland in the holy see's eyes. If the pope was so against this document, then why were all these witness to it and giving advice? Surely if this was the case they would have boycotted the whole thing, or prevented it from happening and not witnessed it. The Barons were being granted concessions in return for their obedience to the pope and to recognise that Stephen Langton was the official ruler even though this would be done from the shadows as it is now. Certain privileges and rights ordained upon them in the form of magna carta to maintain they would do what the pope wished through his representative Stephen Langton to ensure that the King would never have the ability to undo the contract. This is why this legal document is unique in every aspect to them and would serve to be the template to create another vessel for control of the king or queen and all the men women and children of England, namely parliament. This vessel again was to be employed around the world, although called by many different names, nonetheless exactly the same in construct and design for the same purpose: slavery through a deceptive legal process called democracy!