

Living Free in a Fem-Nazi World

The Book

Version 0.04
1st December 2011
Author: Peter-Andrew: Nolan(c)

Table of Contents

1. CHANGE CONTROL LOG	4
2. LAWFUL NOTICE TO THOSE WHO WOULD SLANDER ME	5
3. WHY SAY THAT THE WEST IS A “FEM-NAZI WORLD”	6
4. A FOR WORD AND WARNING.....	10
4.1. What About The Zombies?	11
4.2. Going Forward?	12
5. INTENDED AUDIENCE	13
6. PURPOSE	14
7. SUBJECTS COVERED IN THIS BOOK	15
8. HOW ARE MEN ENSLAVED?	16
8.1. The Woolly Mammoth Story	16
9. WHAT IS THE SOLUTION?	18
10. HOW DO I CLAIM MY RIGHTS?	20
11. THE DEFAULT JUDGEMENT	26
12. HOW DO I PERFORM A STRAWMAN RECAPTURE?	31
12.1. Why Perform A Strawman Recapture?	31
12.2. Components of a Strawman Recapture	31
12.2.1. Certificate of Sovereignty	32
12.2.2. Deed of Evidence	32
12.2.3. Common Law Copyright Notice	32
12.2.4. Hold Harmless Agreement	33
12.2.5. Private Agreement	33
12.2.6. Security Agreement	34
12.2.7. UCC 1 – Financing Statement	34
13. STRAWMAN RECAPTURE COMPLETED? WHAT IS NEXT?	35
14. A WORD ABOUT POLICY ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND KIDNAPPING.....	37
15. THE MANAGEMENT OF RELATIONSHIPS IN THE FUTURE.....	39
15.1. The Safe Working Environment	42

16.	AFFIDAVIT OF LAWFUL EQUALITY FOR A WOMAN.....	45
17.	AFFIDAVIT OF CHATTEL PROPERTY FOR A WOMAN TO A MAN.....	49
18.	AGREEMENT OF MARRIAGE BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN	52
19.	THE ARBITRATION PANEL	60
20.	RESCIND YOUR PRESUMED CONSENT TO THE 'MARRIAGE CONTRACT'	62
20.1.	What about current assets?	64
21.	A WORD ON PROSTITUTION	72
22.	A WORD ON LAWYERS AND BARRISTERS	74
23.	A WORD ON THE SEXISM AND GENDER POLITICS OF WOMEN	76
24.	A WORD ON THE RULE OF LAW.....	77
25.	WHAT DO WOMEN WANT?	79
25.1.	More Wisdom from Sue1	81
26.	WHAT DO WOMEN NOT WANT?	83
27.	APPENDIX A - ON WOMEN.BY ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER	84
28.	APPENDIX B – OH WHAT A BASTARD I AM	90
29.	APPENDIX C - DOCUMENTS ON WEBSITE.....	93
30.	APPENDIX D - ABOUT THE AUTHOR.....	95
31.	APPENDIX E – A FINAL WORD.....	101

1. CHANGE CONTROL LOG

#	Date	Name	Description
0.02	01/11/11	Peter-Andrew: Nolan(c)	Initial draft version for pre-publication review by selected people.
0.03	01/04/11	Peter-Andrew: Nolan(c)	Initial full copy version being released to the general population of men in the former British Empire.
0.04	1/12/11	Peter-Andrew: Nolan(c)	Minor updates. Documents linked were moved to the Crimes Against Fathers web site.

2. **LAWFUL NOTICE TO THOSE WHO WOULD SLANDER ME**

This is a Lawful Notice to women and their mangina lackeys who would make up lies and slander me.

My calling, Peter-Andrew: Nolan(c) and the strawman name PETER ANDREW NOLAN(c) is copyrighted world wide. So is my image and all aspects of my human self.

Any woman or mangina lackey who uses my name, my calling or my image without my written consent signed in red ink by my hand only is violating my copyright.

The cost of copyright violation **PER VIOLATION** is 1,000 troy ounces of 99.99% pure gold. So all of you women and magina lackeys might want to consider that before you write your lies about me. I will pursue copyright violations ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD so as to collect gold to be able to re-distribute to those I perceive as in need. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to take gold off women and their mangina lackeys and give it to men who are struggling to raise their boys because of the oppressive nature of the western 'legal' system today.

Any slander of me will be pursued **ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD**. So if you women tell lies about me and try and slander me to damage my business you will be pursued. I will take your property off you as a point of honour.

If any woman wishes to make a rebuttal for anything I have said they are welcome to do so directly to me at peter@peternolan.com on an Affidavit with a Notice of Intent and Proposed Remedy signed under penalty of perjury and full commercial liability.

Apart from that? I'm not interested in hearing what any women and their mangina lackeys have to say about this book.

This book is for men who wish to live in freedom. Not women or their mangina lackeys.

This book is intended to save many millions of lives.

Those who slander me are working against my efforts to re-introduce the rule of law into Ireland and Australia.

Those who slander me are working against my efforts to expose the criminals in the guvment and 'legal fraternity'.

I will not take kindly to that kind of slander.

Those who complain I am 'slandering' other people. Grow up. The people I am 'slandering' are criminals and scumbags. They deserve to be exposed for what they are. If they have a problem with what I am saying? They can create a common law court and see how they go with that.

3. **WHY SAY THAT THE WEST IS A “FEM-NAZI WORLD”**

I have decided to call this book “Living Free in a Fem-Nazi World”. A lot of people do not realise that Feminism is a set of hate policies expressed as a political view and that it is almost exactly in line with Nazism. Women certainly do not like being told that feminism and nazism are essentially the same thing.

Angry Harry pointed this out 7 years ago here:

<http://www.angryharry.com/esFeminismandNazism.htm>

Why do anti-feminists keep insisting that feminism and Nazism are very similar?

Well. The reason is this.

The Nazis were around well before the heavy-duty violence and the gas chambers. And for quite some time they operated in a manner that paralleled in many ways the more recent activities of feminists.

Furthermore, feminist and Nazi ideology have a lot in common.

Very occasionally I receive an email saying that it is outrageous to compare feminism with Nazism - because it somehow trivialises the terrible experiences of the Jews in the Germany of the 1930s.

But making the comparison does not do this at all.

It does the opposite.

It brings to the attention of people the kind of forces that gave rise to Nazism and, as far as men are concerned - particularly the white ones - it makes them understand a little better the horribleness of discrimination and demonisation.

Furthermore, most Jewish groups do not actually highlight the holocaust in order to gain everybody's sympathy. They do it so that people can ****LEARN!****

They do it so that people can see if something heinous is creeping up on us.

Anyway.

Here are 30 similarities between feminism and 'early' Nazism.

Feminism and Nazism have both ...

1. Discriminated against individuals on the basis of their genetic code.
2. Promoted the view that the targeted group was inferior genetically and behaviourally, e.g. see AH's [Men Bear a Striking Resemblance to Slugs](#).
3. Promoted propaganda that led to the targeted group being labeled as 'parasites', e.g. see AH's [Steven Jones - A Parasite?](#)
4. Promoted propaganda that led to the targeted group being constantly ridiculed e.g. see [Incredible Shrinking Y](#) by Maureen Dowd
5. Promoted propaganda that led to the targeted group being laughed at even when mutilated e.g. Bobbit jokes.
6. Demonised the target group by labeling them as perverts and sexual criminals, e.g. see [Put Up or Shut Up](#) by Wendy McElroy
7. Sought to break the target group away from their families e.g. see [The Federal Bureau of Marriage?](#) by Professor Stephen Baskerville.

-
8. Promoted the view that the targeted group was responsible for most of the major ills in society.
 9. Disseminated lies and disinformation about the targeted group in order to further promote their own ideology, e.g. see [Msinformation](#) by Professor Christina Hoff Sommers
 10. Disseminated lies and disinformation about historical matters, e.g. see AH's [Did Women Really Want To Go Out To Work?](#)
 11. Used intimidation, threats and coercion to prevent their opponents from speaking out e.g. see [AH's Feminists are nasty things.](#)
 12. Promoted the lie that the privileged group consisted of innocent 'victims' of the targeted group e.g. "women have been oppressed throughout history."
 13. Demanded special privileges in the workplace for members of the privileged group e.g. preferential job placements for women
 14. Discriminated against the targeted group in educational matters and in the workplace e.g. see AH's [Well Done the Girls?](#)
 15. Perverted the justice system so that members of the targeted group were easily discriminated against in the law e.g. in family courts.
 16. Arranged matters so that accusers from the privileged group could be shielded by anonymity in the courtroom e.g. in sex-assault cases.
 17. Arranged matters so that defendants from the targeted group had to 'prove' their innocence e.g. in sex-assault and domestic violence cases.
 18. Arranged matters so that members of the privileged group could capriciously define what, legally, was to be deemed 'a crime', e.g. where nowadays the 'feelings' of women rather than the behaviours of men are the determinants of what constitutes 'a crime' e.g. see [The Real Goal Of Feminism](#) by Antonia Feitz - 18 min
 19. Arranged matters so that members of the privileged group could capriciously define how the law was to view certain matters e.g. a fetus inside a woman can now be deemed by her - at her whim - to be a worthless piece of tissue or a prospective baby - with all the ramifications of this - regardless of how the father might feel about it all e.g. see AH's [Rant Against the Child Support Agency.](#) (Also sexual harassment etc.)
 20. Arranged matters so that the law punished members of the targeted group more severely than members of the privileged group for the very same crime e.g. in domestic violence and murder cases.
 21. Arranged matters so that members of the targeted group were made responsible for the choices and behaviours of members of the privileged group e.g. in paternity fraud cases where duped fathers still have to pay child support.
 22. Arranged matters so that members of the privileged group who harmed, or even murdered, members of the targeted group were shown undue leniency - and were often actually applauded for their actions, e.g. see [Killer given domestic violence award](#) and AH's [Loose Women.](#)
 23. Arranged matters so that the law punished members of the targeted group severely for even trivial offences - e.g. domestic violence, sexual harassment.
 24. Arranged matters so that members of the privileged group earned a right to the property of members of the targeted group for no other reason than that they were members of the privileged group e.g. alimony, child custody.
 25. Arranged matters so that certain speech or attitudes directed against the privileged group were criminalised e.g. biased 'hate speech' laws.
 26. Demanded subservience to the prevailing ideology and to the government.

-
27. Effectively controlled the mainstream media and the academic institutions and arranged for them to present a dishonest and dishonourable point of view in support of their ideology.
 28. Consistently highlighted and exaggerated the achievements and the suffering of the privileged group while downplaying the achievements and the suffering of the targeted group e.g. see [Human Rights are not for Men](#) by Melanie Phillips.
 29. Ran government-funded educational courses in universities (e.g. Women's Studies, Title IX) and in schools to promote the privileged group at the expense of the targeted group.
 30. Persisted in a long term campaign of hatred toward the targeted group, e.g. "Women need men like a fish needs a bicycle." "Men think about sex every 15 seconds." etc. Also see AH's [Permanent Menstrual Tension](#).

Bar the heavy violence and the gas chambers - which came towards the end of the Nazis hold on power - feminism and early Nazism are surely very similar indeed!

Hermann Goering ... *"The people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country."*

Feminists ... *"The people can always be brought to the bidding of the feminist leaders. All you have to do is tell women and children that they are being attacked (by men) and denounce those who protest as 'supporters of abuse' and for exposing women and children to danger. It works the same way in any country."*

Feminism. Nazism.

Nazism. Feminism.

The "best interests of the child" ...

"The state must declare the child to be the most precious treasure of the people. As long as the government is perceived as working for the benefit of the children, the people will happily endure almost any curtailment of liberty and almost any deprivation."

Adolph Hitler in Mein Kampf

Feminism. Nazism.

Nazism. Feminism.

Thanks be to Angry Harry for carrying on the fight for so long!

Gentlemen.

In the west today, a man who submits to 'govement' can be incarcerated without cause based on the lie of a woman. He can have his children stolen, his house stolen, all his past earnings stolen, all his future earnings stolen.

Indeed, a white, Christian, heterosexual, father in the west today is treated more brutally and is regularly deprived of more rights and property, namely his children, than was EVER the case for black slaves in the southern US states during the slavery period or was the case for Jews in Nazi Germany prior to the outbreak of hostilities in WW II.

It is **NO EXAGGERATION** to say that a white, Christian, heterosexual, fathers are the new 'Black Jews' only that they are treated MUCH WORSE than Blacks in slavery or Jews in Germany were treated until the outbreak of hostilities.

In BOTH cases a man could not have his children removed even by those oppressive regimes. You men who read this? You want to realise that you are the new 'Black Jew' and that you are more oppressed than these men were if you get married. Indeed, you can be more oppressed than these men were merely by a false allegation from a woman.

If you wish to be this oppressed? That's up to you. If you wish to do something about it? That is **ALSO** up to you. No other man has any obligation to hold your hand or free you. You have to free yourself.

You can look into **ANY NEWSPAPER** on pretty much **ANY** day of the week and read stories about men falsely incarcerated on the lies of women. Of men losing their children in divorce cases, losing lots of money in their divorce cases, of false sexual harassment charges or outrageous payouts for 'sexual harassment' which are many times the payouts for soldiers permanently disabled in the service of their country.

You Sir, in case you do not know it, live in a 'Fem-Nazi' world. Where women are the new 'brown shirts' who so enthusiastically call on the 'govement' to commit crimes against men such as steal their children, steal the proceeds of their lifes work, steal their future income, steal their liberty, and in some cases, tragically, steal the very life of a man.

If you do NOT know this is happening? Try this site www.the-spearhead.com.

This book is about freeing you from the fem-nazi, fem-fascist state you live in to live your life as you choose. This book will show you how to no longer be subject to the fem-nazi 'legislation' that claims you are a slave with no rights at all.

4. A FOR WORD AND WARNING

Gentlemen, this book has been evolving for some time and has gone through a number of 'virtual re-writes' in my mind as well as some on paper. What you are now reading is the version that was 'meant to be'. I wish to share with you a little about what it is you are about to read.

I have referred to this as 'my book' for over a year at the time I type this (October 2010). But for some reason I didn't write that much. I was collecting a lot of things and cutting and pasting a lot of things but I didn't really put them together. There was 'something missing'. Just a few weeks ago my copy of David Ickes latest book showed up and I eagerly read it. Even forgot to go to bed a couple of times while reading it. It turned out that there are quite a few parallels in our lives that I did not know about before reading his latest book.

As I pondered over his latest book and considered all that had happened to me over the last three years it finally became clear to me that this is not 'my book'. Someone or something wants me to write this book and I am merely the vehicle for the writing of the book. I can tell you, it was the weirdest feeling as I realised this. No. I don't know who this someone or something is. I don't know if they are friend or 'foe dressed as friend'. I do know that it is some being or power well in advance of me. I would therefore encourage you to read everything I write with a critical eye and not accept anything I say as 'truth'. I would encourage you to look into your hearts and look into your heads and determine what you perceive to be true, right, just and then act on that basis. I would encourage you to look out into the world and validate everything I say for yourself. If you have evidence that something I said was not correct? Please let me know. I would encourage you to take full responsibility for yourselves as sovereigns. It is quite a humbling experience to realise that you are 'just the messenger' but, as David notes, "It is what it is".

At the same time it also became clear to me that the events of my life over the last three years, many of which I didn't like such as the kidnapping and relocation to places unknown of my children, were events that had to happen in order for this book to be written.

Over the last few years I asked 'God' a few times: "Why me? Why did my family have to be destroyed by my wife? What is that all about?". Just the other week I got the answer. Because I **WAS** one of the very best fathers and husbands. Because I am an honest man of honour and integrity. Because my word is above reproach. Because of these I am the **perfect candidate** for having his family destroyed for no better reason than the greed of my ex-wife Jennifer. Because I am a man with backbone who will not allow injustice to stand. I am the perfect candidate.

Indeed, as I read David's book and noted how perfectly well he had been prepared to be the man he is and bring the message he brings I realised that I have been exceptionally well prepared to write this book I am currently typing. Indeed, I can't think of another man I know who would be a **BETTER** candidate to write this book. I will do my best and other men can take it or leave it.

David Icke comments "Infinite love does not always give us what we want". He's sure right about that one! People may question other things David Icke says, but on that one? He's spot on.

So? What is this book about? This book is about freeing men from the slavery of the Illuminati control grid. Of all the stuff I read out there? No-one has presented a 'solution'. I have been wondering about this for ages. Why is no-one presenting a solution? The closest is Michael Tsarion who, in one video of his I saw, noted words to the effect "We just need to walk away. That's all we need to do."

Michael spoke about how the Illuminati are far more intelligent than us, far more technologically advanced than us, and have been farming us for thousands of years. The idea we could somehow overthrow them by force or out-think them is ludicrous. He commented that the only real alternative is simply to refuse to be part of their system. Just 'walk away'.

And you know? He's right. If a man wants to be free? All he has to do is walk away. It's **THAT** simple.

So. That's what I did. I rescinded my consent to be governed and I declared myself sovereign and I 'walked away' from **THEIR** control grid as much as is possible in this 'modern world'.

And that is what this book is about. This book is about giving men the tools to 'walk away'. Just like I did. This book? Should you use it? Will free you from the tyranny of the control grid. I wish you well.

4.1. What About The Zombies?

I want to also add a word on this hysteria of 'we must wake everyone up'. In the alternative truth area there are endless numbers of people saying 'we must wake everyone up'. I happen to disagree. When I was young I learned a saying:

"Do not try and teach a pig to sing. It sounds terrible and annoys the pig."

When I walk around I see endless numbers of mindless walking zombies also known as 'people'. If you catch the tube around London like I have the last 2 years? You will see tens of thousands of these 'zombies' going to 'work'. Once you are awake and you see this it is really an amazing sight. They are all chasing 'promissory notes'.

For a long time I tried to 'wake the zombies up'. I would sit with people and show them the 'promise to pay' on the British pound notes and tell them about how this is a promissory note and their own rules say you don't have to pay anything to the guvment.

People would just glaze over and think I was a 'nutter'. So even when you present the most concrete and irrefutable of evidence the zombies are not going to 'wake up'. Fine. Let them sleep walk in their slavery. This book is for those few men who **WILL** take it and use it and liberate themselves. I think that number is about 1% of men. Then, after some time, other men will start to notice and say:

"Hey, he's doing pretty well, what's he got that I haven't?" And the answer will be 'knowledge'.

I was over on www.the-spearhead.com for about 8 months. This is a place that claims to be 'Piercing the Shield of Ignorance'. I must have put 2,000+ posts into that place. How many men actually figured out what I was saying was true? Three I think the number was. THAT is how asleep the zombies are. The zombies love their slavery and they will not thank you for pointing it out to them.

Michael Tsarion makes the analogy that when you shine a light into the face of a sleeping person sometimes they are not going to like that, even when it's for their own good. Plato said the same in "The Cave".

Men are now so dumbed down many of them are terrified at the idea that they might actually have to take responsibility for themselves and can not look to the 'monarch' or the 'guvment' to 'protect and provide'. Take a look around you and you will see this. Lots of men think that their 'guvment pension' is going to take care of them in their old age. Men think their guvment is there to help them. I have no idea how men can be this stupid. I'm not. I'm pretty smart but you don't have to be very smart to figure out your guvment is not your friend. After all, they kill more people than anything else. No less than Ronald Reagan said:

"The eleven most frightening words in the English language are I am from the government and I am here to help."

I knew my guvment was not my friend when I was 20 and they introduced higher taxes on University Education while claiming to be running a program for 'the clever country'. I immediately picked up the hypocrisy that you can't be claiming to be running a program for 'the clever country' while you are simultaneously reducing the ability of the best and brightest to be well educated.

I never voted 'left' again because it was clear they were a pack of liars. Indeed the Prime Minister at that time was Bob Hawke who was a Rhodes Scholar (Illuminati training school) and he was also a member of the Fabian Society (Illuminati political left wing). Bob Hawke was an Illuminati puppet and that's part of why his lies were so obvious.

John Howard was little less. It just turned out the right of politics are better liars than the left and they are all controlled by the Illuminati anyway. GST killed any idea Howard was 'honest John'. While I was in University I discovered that the quality of 'education' was so abysmal that it could not have possibly gotten this bad by accident. I skipped the vast majority of my 'lectures' because it was clear to me they were totally irrelevant and most were pitched at your average 10 year old. What a waste of time my 'degree' was. It was only later I realised that the 'degree' is a 'hurdle' to overcome to see if you are going to be a good sheeple.

So. No. I don't think there is any future in running around saying to men 'wake up, you are a slave, do you want to be free'? Because most will deny they are slaves despite the fact that they must work 40 hours a week, 48 weeks a year for 45 years. I mean really. If a man can deny he is a slave looking at those figures he can deny anything.

4.2. *Going Forward?*

There is no doubt in my mind that today most of the world is nothing but a totalitarian communist dictatorship with the thinnest of thin veneers of 'freedom' layered over the top. You have to admire the Illuminati. They have farmed us like sheep for thousands of years and we are so stupid we don't know it! That's pretty funny when you actually 'get it'. There is absolutely endless information on the web now as to how they have done this. Some names you can put into your google searches are:

- David Icke
- Alex Jones
- Henry Makow
- Michael Tsarion
- Eustice Mullins
- Aaron Russo
- G Edward Griffin
- Freeman
- Robert Menard
- John Harris

These are pretty much the "top bunch" of people who have produced books and videos as to what is really going on. You could not read all their works in a year if you studied them solid. But the evidence of the New World Order and your slavery is all around you. Once you understand how money works you know how their bogus system works. You should ask yourself the question:

"Why is it that in all my life no-one has ever told me how our money system really works?"

The answer would be. "Because it is the money system that is the primary mechanism of slavery and they don't want you to know how that works". Second behind the money system is the 'legal' system.

How do those of us who don't want to be slaves any more get out of this control grid? Well? It's actually pretty easy because the mechanism they are relying on is denial. Once you are out of denial it's really easy.

1. Learn where do your rights come from.
2. Learn how to claim your rights.
3. Learn how to exercise your rights.
4. Learn how to defend your rights.

You do these four things? You are as free as you are ever going to be.

Now, David Icke talks about the entrapment in the 5 sense reality and how we can interconnected to the 'All'. I am not there yet. If I get there? I'll write more about it. This book is about freeing you from the control grid put in place by the Illuminati. Which, in my opinion, is a really important thing for those who wish to be free.

Basically it all hangs on whether you want to be a slave or if you want to be a sovereign.

If you want to be a sovereign then be so.

All that there is to do is to choose to be sovereign and then be sovereign.

If you want to be a slave? Stop reading now.

If you want to be a sovereign and be free? Keep reading.

5. INTENDED AUDIENCE

The intended audience for “Living Free in a Fem-Nazi World – The Book” are:

- Men. ***Real Men***. The ones who have their balls between their legs and not in their wife’s purse. (If you have your balls in your wife’s purse, put this book down now. It will damage your brain.)
- Men who are hard working, honest men of honour and integrity and you are wanting to make something of yourself. (If you are a liar, if you do not know what honour is, if you have no integrity, put this book down now. It will damage your brain.)
- Men who want to be the best they can be. One time I had a sign on my desk. “To be average scares the hell out of me.” This book is not for guys who just want to ‘be one of the crowd’. You want to be a sheeple? Be a sheeple. There are plenty of them. If you want to be ‘average’? Put this book down now. It will damage your brain.
- Men who are considering being in relationship.
- Men who are considering getting married.
- Men who are married. (Hint. Your government marriage contract is a fraudulent contract. You can end it any time you like.)

Who this book is NOT for:

- This book is not for ‘dead beat’ men. If you are a ‘dead beat’ you can throw this away now. In all likelihood you are not a deadbeat because deadbeats do not pick up books like this.
- This book is not for man-hating, white knighting, mangina apologists.

These men disgust me. I have no respect for them. I sure as hell would not write a book for them. So if you are a man who automatically leaps to the defence of any woman who is ‘upset’? Go away. I don’t want you reading my best efforts. Go do something useful like throw yourself under a bus. Really. Just go away. I am so sick of the likes of you. I’ve heard all your rubbish. I said a lot of it myself up until three years ago myself. I am as disgusted at myself as I was as I am of you.

- This book is not intended for western ‘modern women’. If you are a ‘modern western woman’ and reading this book you might as well put it down now. You will only be ‘offended’ if it does not burn your brain to a cinder from the information presented.

And by the way. I don’t want to hear from any western women with respect to what is in this book. Go write your own books. I’ve heard enough from you all. It was mostly crap and not worth listening to. I gave women a good listening to and every chance.

You failed.

Note: Given this book is written in English the audience is limited to the English speaking world. Some of my German friends have been concerned at my comments which they take to include Germany. I am told that German Family Law is the fairest in the world. When I explain to my German friends the mass arrests happening in the English speaking world they are shocked. Many outright dis-believe me that what I say is true. So if you happen to be German and reading this? Germany is the ‘western’ country that is NOT implementing family law similar to the other western countries.

6. **PURPOSE**

The intended purposes of “Living Free in a Fem-Nazi World – The Book” are:

- To pass along one man’s knowledge and experience such that the ‘next guy’ might be able to use that knowledge and experience and avoid many of the same pitfalls I fell into from ignorance and placing my ‘trust’ in women.

My Rule#01 is this. **“Never trust a woman.”**

I mean **NOT EVER**. If a woman tells you the grass is green? Check for yourself. If a woman tells you the sky is blue? Check for yourself. The single biggest mistake I have made in my **ENTIRE LIFE** is to place trust in a woman. ANY woman but mostly my ex-wife, Jennifer Toal. If women do not like that being Rule#01? So what?

If they wanted to be trusted they should be honest. It’s real simple. When you are honest you are **TRUST-WORTHY**, note ‘worthy’. When you are a liar you are not **TRUST-WORTHY**. And women are the consummate liars. Indeed, I have come to the conclusion that they can not tell the difference between fact and fantasy. So it could almost be said they are not ‘lying’ so much as ‘incapable of being honest’ like men are incapable of producing babies. Indeed, I don’t hold women accountable for lying at all.

- To save **YOU** the reader, a great deal of ‘money’. If you are a man who has an interest in ‘money’ this book will save you more ‘money’ than anything else you could possibly read. You should be real interested in that.
- To give you, for free, everything you need to claim your freedom, your birth rights, and tell your fem-nazi totalitarian communist govment to get out of your life.

And yes, during the course of this book you will find out that all western govments are fem-nazi styled communist totalitarian govments that enslave you via the monetary system.

- To educate you in the ways of women such that you can notice the techniques of the trade that women use to dominate, control, lie, steal, and generally make a mess of a mans life. They are clearly identifiable.

Young men have a right to know these things. Have you young men every noticed that you are constantly told how ‘complicated’ women are and how ‘hard they are to understand’?

Well? I am near genius. I listened to women for 32 years, including my mum and aunts, to learn about women to be able to ‘better manage my relationships with women’. Guess what? They **ALL** lied. And because they **ALL** lied and told the **SAME** lies it sounded like the truth. More on that later.

Just remember a major portion of this book is about teaching you, young man, just how women go about dominating and controlling you and then messing up your life.

- To forewarn and forearm you with some small manner of defences against women.

7. SUBJECTS COVERED IN THIS BOOK

Closely linked to the 'Purposes' of this book are the Subjects covered by this book.

This is not an 'easy' book to read. If you want an 'easy' book to read try 'Thomas the Tank Engine' and be happy in your slavery. Really. Who said a book on freeing yourself from the Illuminati control grid should be 'easy to read'? I didn't. So. It's not going to be easy. It was not easy for me. It's going to be a hell of a lot easier for you since I have spent more than 3,000 hours learning this stuff and I will provide you pointers to lots of other books to read and videos to watch, as well.

So. Here are some of the subjects of this book.

- Women.
I am amazed how ignorant I was about women as a 44 year old. Really, really amazed. You see, I had thought women were 'reasonably honest' and I believed much of what they said. I had **NO IDEA** that they were **ALL** in on the 'marriage and children scam' and they **ALL** lie the **VAST MAJORITY OF THE TIME.**

One of the seminal events of my life was reading Shoepenhauers essay 'On Women'. At first I was **REALLY** angry no-one had ever showed me that essay before. Why was this essay not 'mandatory reading' for all young men? The reason was obvious. The young men have to be lied to in order to be stupid enough to buy 'marriage and children'. Shoepenhauers essay 'On Women' lays women and their lies bare. I have reproduced it in an appendix here and **YOU** are requested to take it on yourself to make sure you give a copy to **EVERY MAN YOU KNOW.**

Shoepenhauers essay 'On Women' should be the single most read piece of literature in the man-o-sphere.

- The Illuminati Control Grid
There are **MANY** books on this and I will point to them rather than reproduce too much of them here. I will include enough such that you can clearly see the control grid. It will then be up to you to go and read the references and find out as much as you want for yourself.
- How to get yourself **OUT** of **THEIR** control grid by performing a strawman recapture.
- You will also be told about your 'rights'. You will be taught the answers to the questions:
 - Where do my rights come from
(Hint: Not your fem-nazi totalitarian communist govments though they tell you they are the ones who 'give' you your rights. It is a lie.)
 - How do I claim my rights?
 - How do I exercise them?
 - How do I defend them?
(Hint: Because as sure as hell your fem-nazi totalitarian govments are **NOT** interesting in defending **YOUR** rights. They are interested in you being **THEIR** slave. Period.)
- Other things Illuminati and **THEIR** control grid and **THEIR** plans for you.
- How to divorce your wife, your state (Hint: You married your state too only they didn't tell you), refuse the jurisdiction of your satanic criminal 'courts' masquerading as a 'just-us' system, rescind your implied consent to pay income taxes, mortgages and other lines of credit, dis-own your children, travel the world free of 'pass-port' constraints (still in progress), and go about living your life as a free man on the planet your creator gave you to live on.

Yes. In common law countries, which is **ALL** the former British empire lands, you, my good man, can do all these things perfectly lawfully. And you are well advised to do them. It is up to you what you do. I am merely presenting information for your consideration. What you do with that information is up to you.

8. HOW ARE MEN ENSLAVED?

Something that most people never actually take the time to stop and think about is the answer to this question:

“How are men enslaved?”

I am amazed to see that almost **NO-ONE** has the balls to actually answer this question. You can read all the books you like by the ‘leading researchers’ and none of them will tell you just exactly how men are enslaved. I find it interesting in itself that this is totally omitted.

To make it very, very clear how men and women had to be ‘socialised’ by the Illuminati I developed a little anecdotal story. Of course we do not know if it is true or not. The Illuminati may have done things differently. But the effect is the same. In this story I merely credit the ‘elders’ as the Illuminati.

8.1. The Woolly Mammoth Story

20,000 years ago Og and Ogette lived in a little society that had found a nice big cave to live in and they were all very happy ‘cave people’. Each day the young men went out to make war with the ‘woolly mammoths’ to see if they could ‘bring home the bacon’. One fine morning Ogette kisses her man Og as he goes off to do battle with the woolly mammoth. She tells him how much she loves him and cares for him and how much she admires him for bringing home food for the children. Young Og is filled with pride and good feelings about his important role of feeding his ‘wife and children’. He is the ‘picture of a good husband, father and citizen’ in this little tribe.

The young men tromp off with a few of their number left to guard the women and children from the roaming sabre tooth tigers with nary but some pointed sticks for defence. These young men are expected to fight the sabre toothed tigers who might wander by, to their death if necessary. If they fail in this duty and do not die in the effort they know they will be killed by the men returning from the hunt. So basically they are taking on a mission ‘to the death’ to ‘protect the women and children’. Notice no women are required to ‘defend the women and children’ to their death. Not even old women who are past birthing age because, you know, despite the latest claims of ‘equality and feminism’ from some other nearby tribes the women in this tribe know that the men are stronger and that being ‘equal’ might see them as ‘dinner’ for a sabre toothed tiger!! Right?

Anyway, night falls and the young men return from the hunt. They have successfully killed and dissected a woolly mammoth and have brought home food for a month. There is great joy and celebration in the cave. The sacred fire is stoked to cook the meat. Ogette is all happy at the prospect of food for herself and her children and searches for her man Og to thank him but she can't find him. “Oh where is my beloved Og? Where is my beloved Og?”

She is soon told that Og, valiant and brave, had fallen victim to the woolly mammoths stomping foot during the kill. He has died to bring food to his wife and children. All the young men shout praises to the dead Og and his bravery and he is remembered in song. They cheer him and drink some of this funny stuff that they just learned how to make out of fruits that makes them feel good and sing his praises all night. (But Og is still dead. Don't miss that point.)

Ogette mourns the loss of her man....for a short while....basically until one of the other strong young men who does not have his own woman offers her some food and they start chatting. If she is to have food for herself and her children she has to align herself with a man. It's that simple. Welfare has not yet been invented. All the women know, and have known for 20,000 years, that a woman's affection must be immediately transferable. It's always been that way because it **HAS** to be that way.

The plain fact of the matter is that for the last 20,000 years men have died young in ‘war and work’ and it was necessary for the woman to be able to ‘transfer her affection’ to another man who would feed her and her children very easily. So much for how much ‘women love men’. They don't. It is a lie. They love the food and shelter that men provide. And when that is all taken care of they will have diamonds and 5 bedroom houses too. But a woman ‘loving a man’? There is no need for it so it does not happen. Anyone who has been in the divorce courts can see for himself how much women ‘love’ men and how much they ‘love’ what men provide. **BIG DIFFERENCE**. If you have evidence to refute the abuse of men in the divorce courts? Feel free to write your own book and publish it.

But what of the young men? Well? A strong young man does not need to kill a woolly mammoth to feed himself. He can go and catch a rabbit or two and do quite well. Why in hell would he risk his life to kill a woolly mammoth when he can feed himself quite easily with almost no effort on his part?

Well, the **OLD MEN** of the tribe know that in order for **THEM**, the women, **AND** the children to be fed the **YOUNG MEN** of the tribe have to do all the work of collecting food. So the **OLD MEN** of the tribe brainwash the **YOUNG MEN** of the tribe into the idea that **THEIR SPECIFIC WOMAN** is **SOMEHOW SPECIAL** and that the most honourable thing he can do is labour as best he can to feed **HIS** woman and children. Oh...and he has to pay 'taxes' of a little meat so the **OLD MEN** who are organising everything can be fed as well. Right?

So the **OLD MEN** invent 'love' and they brainwash the **YOUNG MEN** into 'love' and 'devotion' and 'dedication' and 'commitment' and 'honour' and 'integrity' all those nice words that we hear shoved down men's throats so often but which women know full well do not apply to **THEM**. After all, a woman can break her wedding vows and commit perjury with complete impunity, right? It is a woman's prerogative to change her mind, right?

And so the young Ogs are sent out to make war with the woolly mammoths with little more than pointed sticks because, if the old men, the women and the children are to be fed and the overall group is to survive or thrive it simply has to be done. If a few young Ogs die that's not a problem because it's always possible for one of the old men to take on the 'onerous duty' of impregnating the unmarried women for 'the good of the tribe' and to raise taxes to make sure the children are fed. Right?

The fact of the matter is that the young men are considered expendable by everyone except themselves. The only reason they do not suspect that they are considered expendable is because they are brainwashed.

Sounds like soldiers to me. Therefore, what is most essential for a woman is to find one of the young men who has been appropriately brainwashed and indoctrinated by the old men into believing that the best thing he can do is find 'love' with that 'special woman' who he will 'marry' and 'have children' and he will labour for the 'love of his life' for the rest of his life no matter that be short or long. Hhhmmm...that would describe ME perfectly in 1984 when my ex first hit on me! I was a very good selection for her! LOL!!

Young man. The truth is this. The 'old men' or the 'Illuminati' have known that the way to enslave men, to be willing to work hard and risk their lives, is by using the women to do so. It has always been that way. It does not always need to be that way. Now you are reading this book you can be one more young man who refuses to be enslaved by the Illuminati by way of a complicit woman.

And something very important for you to know young man? The women have been very well aware of this set up all along. I was really surprised to find that out. In my life, **ALL** the women told me the same lies so they sounded like the truth. Women tell the lie that women will love a good husband and father and would never treat such a man poorly and would never injure his children. Women are consistently painted out as 'goddess' while men are consistently painted as 'evil' and 'bad'.

This is the story of the enslavement of men. It has been this way since the 'serpent' persuaded Eve to take the apple and then **SHE** persuaded Adam to partake of the Apple, her already having done so. It turns out, and it was a surprise to me, that women are coldly calculating and manipulative and they are in full support of the Illuminati enslaving men. Lot's of women will 'hate' me for saying that. Fine. Please present your evidence it has ever been any other way.

This is why women vote left and vote for big guvment. Ann Coulter has even made the statement that women should not have the vote, and she would be happy to give up her vote if all women did, because when women get the vote what they do is plunder the finances of the 'guvment' to create welfare states. There was a play created by the Greeks called Assembly Women where the women snuck into the Assembly with fake beards on and introduced a communist state. It was presented as a comedy. So the communistic nature of women has been well known for at least 2,500 years. It is not 'news' to those who run the world.

Young man. The **MEN** at the top want you to be their slave by working 40 hours a week, 48 weeks a year, for 45 years or so. Then they 'tax' you to live off you like parasites. And the sad thing is that our women entirely agree with this idea. They are willing accomplices.

This book will show you how to hold women accountable and stop them from being the accomplices of the Illuminati.

9. WHAT IS THE SOLUTION?

Now. I have made it clear that Jennifer Toal committed the crimes of perjury, kidnapping, extortion and theft. I have also made it clear that the split of money was 5% vs 95% and that my overall take from 25 years of work after 'legal fees' was **MINUS EUR40,000**. This is all called 'legal' today. I have posted the source documents proving all this to my web site at <http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia> and I have also posted the you-tube video of my 'court-meeting' with David Dunkley.

It is obviously clear that the courts are totally bogus. It is just as clear by Kevin Rudds refusal to discipline his employees that the guvment is just a bogus.

So. What is the solution? Well? I'm glad you asked me that because I spent a bloody long time learning how to create one and then testing it. You are the beneficiary of this. You are welcome.

I said up front there was four things to be done.

1. Learn where do your rights come from.
2. Learn how to claim your rights.
3. Learn how to exercise your rights.
4. Learn how to defend your rights.

This is going to be so simple you are not going to believe it. But it's the truth.

1. **Learn where do rights come from.**

They come from **YOU**. **YOU** define what **YOUR** rights are going to be. Now. You may believe in God or some form of 'Creator' and you can declare your rights according to your beliefs from your creator. The only thing you need to keep in mind is that your rights end where another mans rights start.

Most men think their rights come from 'the state'. This is a big mistake. If you think your rights come from the state then you are a slave. The state is nothing but a bunch of **MEN** who are trying to enslave you and rob you and live off you as parasites. They do this by offering you 'help' and then sucking you dry to give you this 'help' once the 'help' has become 'obligatory'. Virtually every piece of the control grid was initially sold as 'helpful'. Money? Government? Religion? Medicine? Law? Police? Newspapers? TV? All sold as 'helpful' or 'beneficial' from the Illuminati which now rule the lives of billions.

2. **Learn how to claim your rights.**

You just state them. That's it. You **SAY** what your rights are and **BINGO** they are your rights. To communicate your claimed rights and to make sure that no-one else who presumes jurisdiction over you have a problem with your rights. The only thing you need to remember is that if you claim to be able to do something that involves someone else you are required to have their agreement. So **YOUR** 'rights' can only apply to **YOU**. You could say "I have the right to kill" but you might find that those you wish to kill might have something to say about that.

3. **Learn how to exercise your rights.**

You just use them. When you have claimed a right then you exercise it by using it. If you claim the freedom of speech you go out and you speak freely. If you claim right of travel then you go out and travel freely. When you are impeded you explain your rights and your claim and you ask the other person for a signed affidavit under penalty of perjury and full commercial liability for the law that they say gives them any right to infringe your rights.

Without said affidavit? They have no right to interfere with you. If they do then it is time to:

4. **Learn how to defend your rights.**

The primary mechanism to defending rights is for the accuser to complete an Affidavit and present it to the accused. You will see many examples of this linked in the appendices of this book. The mechanism I have used is to create an affidavit with a Proposed Remedy and a Notice of Intent that goes with it. I outline that I reserve the right to convene a de jour jury and a de jour court and try any dispute under common law.

Of course, the problem comes when the PTB simply run roughshod over you. My own personal opinion is that I am not at all adverse to defending my rights with force up to and including deadly force. I played plenty of football when I was a kid and I rather enjoyed the 'violence' of full contact sports. A little bit of violence towards people who infringe my rights? No problem. People who attempt to condemn me for that? Thanks for sharing. You can stop reading now.

Those people who are shrieking about 'non-violence' are the 'women and guvment'. And how many women have called the cops to use force against a man? **MILLIONS**. Those who are responsible for the **VAST** majority of violence against men by 'authorities' are the same people shrieking about how the people they are committing violence against should be 'non-violent'. All men should denounce anyone who has **EVER** used violence of themselves, any convenient mangina, or of the state who is now claiming non-violence, as hypocrites.

I have never had to use violence off the football field since I was a boy. However, I reserve the right to use violence, and I mean **ANY** level of violence against **ANY HUMAN** who might cause me injury, harm or loss. And those who deal with me know this.

I was in Bucharest a while ago and three men attempted to rob me of my laptop. Once I realised what they were doing I stepped back and told them I knew they were trying to rob me and if they did I would chase one of them down and I would beat him to death. And they could see I meant it.

Of course, the three of them could over-power me to take the laptop. But if I chased one of them it was obvious I could catch any individual one of them. So they, very sensibly, decided a 33% chance of being dead was not good odds for a laptop. If I had been 'non-violent' I would be out one laptop. Later, still in Bucharest I was attacked by 6 wild dogs. I 'barked' them out of the idea of attacking me without a single tool/weapon at my command. If I was not able to communicate to those dogs that they were not wise to attack me I might be dead. In Bucharest the odd tourist does get attacked by dogs and killed.

So yes. I am perfectly capable of violence and I have no problem being so if some person or animal is attempting to injure me.

I rebut the 'non-violence claims' of the 'tree huggers'. They say they wish non-violence yet they are using violence against tens of thousands of men daily.

It is not until men make it clear to women that a woman being violent to a man is no longer acceptable that men will be free of the enslavement visited on them by women.

My position now is that if an 'equal woman' hits me? I **WILL** hit her back. If any mangina then comes to 'defend' the aggressor? He will be hit as well.

It's about time the manginas also learned that their 'white-knighting' behaviour is also not acceptable to men.

10. HOW DO I CLAIM MY RIGHTS?

The most important document you will ever write out is your "Notice of Understanding and Intent and Claim of Right". You can read mine here:

<http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/190/threadid/1101/scope/posts/Default.aspx>

This is a document in which you write down the rights you claim for yourself. You are a sovereign and you get to decide what rights you have. The first thing that you must do is to make it clear to those you have failed to rebut as having the right to govern you up until now. When you were little, before you could think for yourself, your parents told you that you had to do what the guvment told you to do. Most likely. When you were around the age of 18 you were offered a 'guvment benefit' called 'income tax'. This is usually offered to you when you get your first job. They present their offer of income tax to you like this:

"In order to have this job you MUST apply for a social security number (of some sort including the Australian Tax File Number) and you MUST pay income tax."

Hmmm. What does 'must' mean there? You think they are speaking English because that sure sounds like English. Nope. They are speaking legalese. The language of the Law Society. Are you a member of the Law Society? Nope? Well then they are not speaking a language you can understand or comprehend. But they don't tell you that. They wait until you respond. If you interpret **MUST** as the English meaning 'compelled to' and you 'apply (beg)' for the 'benefit' of paying income taxes? Well that's **YOUR** choice. "Thank you" your guvment says "You just begged to be our slave." You see, in commerce, it is assumed that if you beg you know what you are begging for. So when you were about 18 you begged the guvment to be a slave for the benefit of being able to **PAY INCOME TAX**. Silly you.

I should add one word on negative assertion because its not 'normal' to speak like this. In 'negative assertion' you make the claim that you have seen no material facts or evidence of some item and that puts the onus on the **OTHER** side to present you with that evidence or material facts. If they do not do so then you have every lawful right to honestly believe that no such evidence or material facts exist.

So. The first part of your NOUCOR is to refute their claims and presumption of having any right to govern you. You can see this in my example where I state things like.

9. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that there is any statute law that evidences a man or person shall be convicted of an offence in respect of an act or omission in obedience to the laws for the time being made and enforced by persons in de facto possession of the sovereign power in and over the place where the act or omission occurs, without Principals consent, and believes that none exists

10. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that representation does not require mutual consent, and believes that none exists

11. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that neither representation nor governance can exist without mutual consent, and believes that none exists

12. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that Principal is not desirous to live life with love, compassion and truth, and believes that none exists

This places the burden of proof back onto the guvment to present material facts or evidence that shows that I, the human being, spirit of a man, have any obligation to be governed and can be subject to any statute law without my consent.

This is sent off to the Illuminati Shills commonly called Queen Elizabeth and her guvments. They are given a reasonable time frame to respond. If they do not respond then you send along your default judgement. Because they had an opportunity to counter claim and did not use it the default judgement puts in place a permanent estopple 'stop' and no lawful case can ever be brought against that human being for exercising any right that they have claimed on the NOUCOR.

The next important part of the NOUICOR is to establish your free man status. So you present the claims that there is no evidence you are not a free man, that there is no evidence that living in my community standards breaches the peace, that there is no evidence I am the NAME on THEIR 'Berth Certificate', that there is no evidence that acting as a friend to the corporations of 'COA' and 'NSW' is NOT ok, and lastly, to claim that if an action can be 'licensed' it must therefore also be lawful.

This is done as follows.

21. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that the free man on the land commonly called Peter-Andrew: Nolan© is not a Free Man and believes that none exists

22. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that acting peacefully within community standards breaches the peace, and believes that none exists

23. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that he does not reserve the right to NOT be recognised by the name on the Berth Certificate, and believes that none exists

24. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that acting peaceably within the community standards and as a friend of the 'STATE OF NEW SOUTH WALES and THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA' does breach the peace, and believes that none exists

25. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that any action for which one can apply for and receive a license is not a fundamentally lawful action, and believes that none exists

Some more key phases which will be explained one at a time are as follows:

This claim is to establish that I have seen no evidence that I am not an adult operating in full responsibility.

26. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that Principal is not a Free man standing in Gods Kingdom, who operates with full responsibility and not a child nor sees the need to ask permission to engage in lawful and peaceful activities, especially from those who claim limited liability, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that I have seen no evidence that by laws are just rules of corporations.

27. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that a by-law is not defined as a rule of a corporation, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that I have seen no evidence that corporations are legal fictions and that they require contracts to claim authority or control over 'parties'. It is not stated but an implied claim is that a party is also a fiction.

28. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that corporations are not legal fictions and do not require contracts in order to claim authority or control over other parties, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that I have seen no evidence that corporations alive, are human, or have any lawful authority over any man.

29. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that legal fictions have a soul or life and are capable or have lawful authority to exert any control over the free will man on the land, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that I have seen no evidence that any corporation can levy any taxes for me to have the enjoyment of my property.

30. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that Principal does not have a prior right to use his property without having to pay for the use or enjoyment of it, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that the Commonwealth of Australia is a corporation. How about that? It also establishes that I am not subject to any of the 'rules' also known as legislation, laws, statutes, of the "COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA". It is a corporation. Why should I let a corporation tell me what to do?

31. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA is not a corporation and registered in the UNITED STATES with registration number 0000805157 as recorded on the US Securities and Exchange Commission website and that it is no different to any other corporation such as K-Mart or General Motors; and I, a free man on the land, standing in Gods Kingdom am bound by any of their laws, policies or taxes, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that a summons is an invitation to attend and no obligation to honour it exists.

34. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that a summons is not merely an 'invitation to attend' and that those issued by any Australian corporation create any obligation or dishonour if ignored or refused for cause without dishonour, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that peace officers have an obligation to keep the peace and that they have an obligation to distinguish between statutes and laws.

35. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that peace officers do not have a duty to maintain the peace and to distinguish between statutes and law, and believes that peace officers have a duty to distinguish between statutes and law, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that peace officers who attempt to force statutes on me are breaking the law.

36. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that those peace officers who attempt to enforce statutes against a Free man standing in Gods Kingdom, are not, in fact, breaking the law, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that I have no obligation to interact with peace officers if they have not witnessed me breach the peace.

37. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that Principal does not have the power and lawful right to refuse intercourse or interaction with peace officers who have not observed Principal breach the peace, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that the bond of PETER ANDREW NOLAN is enough to insure me against any unforeseen circumstances.

38. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that I, the free man on the land commonly called Peter-Andrew: Nolan© does not have certified copies of the supersedes bonds/Birth Certificates issued to me by the Registrar of Births, Deaths, Marriages, New South Wales, Australia, and that said bond instrument would not be sufficient to satisfy any obligation or debt created by New South Wales State created entity PETER ANDREW NOLAN including sufficient insurance for the purpose of travel by automobile should there ever be an unintentional collision or other liability whatsoever, thus totally negating the necessity of State of New South Wales license plates, and believes that none exists

This claim is to establish that a permanent estoppel is sufficient to rebut any later claim against whatever it is that the permanent estoppel is claimed against as long as sensible and reasonable time is given to respond.

39. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material facts or evidence that shows that permanent estoppel by acquiescence does not bar any peace officer or prosecutor from bringing charges against a Freeman under any Act created if this claim is not responded to in the stated fashion and time, and believes that none exists

And this is the final claim to declare I say I will live peacefully and that no corporation has any right to force any statute onto me.

Therefore be it now known to any and all concerned and affected parties, that I, the free man on the land commonly called Peter-Andrew: Nolan© standing in Gods Kingdom do hereby say clearly specifically and unequivocally my intent to peacefully and lawfully live my life as I so choose and pursue whatever livelihood without being molested and journey in my private car(s), truck(s), or any other moving unit without any license and/or registration - free of all statutory obligations and restrictions while maintaining all rights at law to trade, exchange or barter .

This claim establishes the right to place a lien over the property of any human being who steals my property.

Should anyone attempt to confiscate or steal my property after being served this claim of right, will be held privately and personally liable and charged with theft. They will also be in agreement to me issuing a lien over their property and assets.

No man should forget this claim. The reason is obvious.

In addition I may wish to own a gun and reserve the right to do so for the purpose of hunting for sustenance, protection or recreation without any license or registration.

This is my claim that if anyone interferes with my lawful activities having been served notice of this claim and does not properly dispute this claim is breaking the law and will be dealt with in a properly convened court de jure.

Furthermore, I claim that anyone who interferes with my lawful activities after having been served notice of this claim and who fails to properly dispute or make lawful counterclaim is breaking the law, cannot claim good faith or colour of right and that such transgressions will be dealt with in a properly convened court de jure.

This is my claim that the courts are merely defacto and bound by the law and equity act of the COA and transact security interests. That is. They have no jurisdiction.

Furthermore, I claim that the courts in New South Wales are de-facto and bound by the Law and Equity Act and are in fact in the profitable business of conducting, witnessing and facilitating the transactions of security interests and I see no material evidence or facts to suggest otherwise and I don't believe it exists, and I further claim they require the consent of both parties prior to providing any such services.

This is my claim that all transactions of security interests require the consent of both parties and that I do not consent and that I rescind my consent for all such future transactions.

Furthermore, I claim all transactions of security interests require the consent of both parties and I do hereby deny consent to any transaction of a security interest issuing under any Act for as herein stated as a free man standing in Gods Kingdom I am not subject to any Act.

This is my claim of Freedom of Speech.

Furthermore, I claim my creator has gifted me with a mind and the ability to speak and hear and therefore He intends that I have the right of freedom of speech and freedom of thought and freedom of expression and freedom to hear other of His creations with no restriction and no limitations apart from Honouring He who created me.

This is my claim of Freedom of Travel.

Furthermore, I claim my creator has gifted me with two strong legs and a mind that can navigate and therefore He intends that I have the right of freedom of travel across that portion of His creation known as the Planet Earth with no restriction and no limitations apart from Honouring He who created me.

This is my claim of self defence up to and including deadly force against those who would injure me or those placed in my care by my creator.

Furthermore, I claim my creator has gifted me with consciousness, life, two strong arms and a mind that can use these arms with power and precision and therefore He intends that I have the right to defend from harm or aggression myself and those He places in my care with no restriction and no limitations apart from Honouring He who created me.

This is my claim that I can not be compelled to perform under any contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly. I need to add, in red ink to signify the living man. That is coming in an update of this claim.

Furthermore, I claim that I may not be compelled to perform under any contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, voluntarily and intentionally, without full disclosure and fixed terms and conditions atop my signature knowingly and consciously made by my hand.

This is my claim that I do not accept any liability for a compelled benefit or of any unrevealed contract or agreement.

Furthermore, I claim that I that I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed contract or commercial agreement which are my rights pursuant to common law.

This is my claim for my fee schedule. It is self explanatory I believe.

Furthermore, I claim my FEE SCHEDULE for any transgressions by peace officers, government principals or agents or justice system participants is ONE TROY OUNCE of 99.99% PURE GOLD PER HOUR or portion thereof if being questioned, interrogated or in any way detained, harassed or otherwise regulated and FIVE HUNDRED TROY OUNCES of 99.99% PURE GOLD PER HOUR or portion thereof if I am handcuffed, transported, incarcerated or subjected to any adjudication process without my express written and Notarised consent.

This is my claim for my fee schedule for copyright infringement. It is self explanatory I believe.

Furthermore, I claim my fee of ONE THOUSAND TROY OUNCES of 99.99% PURE GOLD for any and all unauthorized use of the fictitious corporate name PETER ANDREW NOLAN or my calling Peter-Andrew: Nolan© and all its derivatives each and every time it is used without my permission which can only be given in RED INK signed by MY HAND ONLY.

This is my claim for my fee schedule for copyright infringement. It is self explanatory I believe.

Furthermore, I claim that all combinations of the fictitious corporate name PETER ANDREW NOLAN or my calling Peter-Andrew: Nolan© and all its derivatives are subject to a Common Law Copyright agreement with the fee schedule as stated above and such Copyright is valid for use of the fictitious corporate name PETER ANDREW NOLAN or my calling Peter-Andrew: Nolan© and all its derivatives for that portion of the Kingdom of God commonly known as the Planet Earth.

This is my claim for That I can use a Notary Public to regain money owed by free schedule transgressions.

Furthermore, I claim the right to use a Notary Public to secure payment of the aforementioned FEE SCHEDULE against any transgressors who by their actions or omissions harm me or my interests, directly or by proxy in any way.

This is my claim that I have a right to convene a proper court de jure to address any criminal actions against me by guvment principals or agents.

Furthermore, I claim the right to convene a proper court de jure in order to address any potentially criminal actions of any peace officers, government principals or agents or justice system participants who, having been served notice of this claim, fail to dispute or discuss or make lawful counterclaim and then interfere by act or omission with the lawful exercise of properly claimed and established rights and freedoms.

This is my claim that I the law of agent and principal applies to my communications.

Furthermore, I claim the law of agent and principal applies and that service upon one is service upon both.

This is my claim that any disputes can be discussed in open forum and can be captured on video and or sound to use for any lawful purposes I see fit. This is how I video recorded my 'court meeting' and was able to place it onto you tube and to do that lawfully.

Furthermore, I claim the right to deal with any counterclaims or disputes publicly and in an open forum using discussion and negotiation and to capture as electronic video and sound said discussion and negotiation for whatever lawful purpose as I see fit.

Your NOUICOR is very likely the most important document you will ever write. You are well advised to spend some time on it. If you can get someone to review it then do so. But even if you do get someone to assist you it is **YOUR** claim of right. You can update it as you learn so it's not like it is set in concrete. But each update should be re-noticed to those who would claim jurisdiction over you. Maybe an update every few years makes sense.

And by the way? I always recommend men offer to pay other men to help them. Time is money so if you intend to ask the men in the free man area to take you through this process offer to pay them a reasonable amount for that help. Not all guys are like me. I can afford to spend 3,000 hours of my own time on something like this because I make plenty of money. More than enough to take care of myself. But I can only spend that time on being at the sharp edge of this process. I can't afford that time helping men on the routine paperwork that goes with this process. And once I have done all I can do I will go back to my real job.

Now. What is written here is **ALL YOU NEED** to claim your rights as a human being. If you wish to eject and get rid of your corporate strawman this is enough. You then be a sovereign man and you go out and you 'do your thing'. You defend yourself via the mechanisms you have claimed in your claim of right.

If you don't want to travel across national boundaries and don't want a bank account? This is enough. If you want to interact with **THEIR** public system? Then you might want to do a 'strawman recapture'.

Personally, my opinion is that Strawman recapture is the better way to go so as to be able to continue to effectively operate in **THEIR** public system. It is what I chose to do. However, it does take more time.

11. THE DEFAULT JUDGEMENT

Something that all men should be intimately aware of is the concept of a 'Default Judgement'. The best way to think of this is as follows. If you present an affidavit as a Lawful Notice to another human being and you state what is true for you and you give them an opportunity to object to your statement of truth or your claims of right they have the lawful obligation to respond to anything they object to. If they do not object they are accepting the Lawful Notice, affidavit, or claim of right.

You need to know there is a hierarchy in effect here as well.

1. The Lawful Notice is a lower level document than an affidavit.
A Lawful Notice is simply a document to notice someone of a situation and to ask for something in return as a 'proof of claim' for what you have noticed the human being about. A Lawful Notice is simply an 'upgraded letter' asking for a response.
2. An Affidavit is the highest level lawful document there is. When you are presented with an Affidavit you have a lawful obligation to rebut anything that you say is not true. If you do not rebut a point you accept the truth of that point. And you **NEVER** get the opportunity again to reject that point of truth.

The way I use them is then like this. When I just want to tell someone something or just ask for proof of claim then I sent them a Lawful Notice. I am not making this notice under penalty of perjury or full commercial liability so I can then afford to be more 'relaxed' in the presentation of what I am saying. I am not particularly liable for what I am saying other than 'slander' and since I don't slander people there is generally no liability created with a Lawful Notice.

Similarly, there is no compelling reason for a person to reply to a Lawful Notice unless they consider that something said in the lawful notice needs to be replied to. There is no need to rebut what is in a lawful notice unless it is asking for 'proof of claim'. If there is no proof of claim requested it's just a notice telling the other human being what it is you intend to do if the other human being does not reply.

The default judgement can do with either document. If your Lawful Notice asks for a proof of claim and the other human being does not provide you your proof of claim inside the period you specify, which must be considered reasonable by a jury if needs be, then you can issue a default judgment against your request for proof of claim for failure to provide proof of claim.

Should you present an Affidavit and/or a claim of right and points go un rebutted then you are entitled to issue a Default Judgement against your Affidavit. There is some confusion about 'Notaries Public' in this situation. Many people hold the opinion that these documents must be Notarised by a Notary Public to have lawful standing. I disagree with this opinion. A sovereign is his own highest authority and needs no other human being to 'counter sign' for his statements of truth. Similarly, should there be need for a jury to be convened a sovereign does not need someone else to speak for him or write for him or sign for him. The idea that a sovereign **NEEDS** someone else to do something to have access to anything is absurd and denies his sovereignty. The test I always use is this:

"Would anyone expect the Queen to do this to be able to make this claim?"

For example. If the queen were to fill out an Affidavit and three people countersigned to say that it was, indeed, the queen who applied the queens signature, would anyone believe she **ALSO** needs this to be 'notarised'? No. They wouldn't. And if it's good enough for the Queen it's good enough for me because I am on the same lawful level as the queen. She claims she is the 'sovereign' of England? I claim I am the sovereign of me. So I will use the same techniques as her. You can too if you like.

When preparing your Lawful Notices, Affidavits, Claim of Right and Default Judgments keep in mind at **ALL** times that what you are **REALLY DOING** is preparing evidence to be presented in a de jour court before a de jour jury of 12 honest men of honour and integrity. As long as you prepare your documents honestly and openly and you put them in plain English that any common man would be expected to understand you are going to do ok in the court. Don't be taken in by all the 'gobblygook' and 'complexity' that people talk about. The lawyers and judges try to confuse you to create a dependency on **THEIR** services by claiming 'justice' is complex. Justice is not complex. Don't forget that.

There are a lot of men with 'opinions' as to what is right and what is wrong on an Affidavit. I do not subscribe to these 'opinions' so much. A man writes out what he believes to be correct in good faith, and if there is ever a dispute he tells the jury what it was he meant at the time. The jury will judge him to be honest about that or not. The jury will NOT be applying a whole bunch of 'rules written by someone else' about what is 'right or wrong' and will not be told by a judge what it 'right or wrong'. They are to decide that for themselves.

So, back to the Default Judgement. Once you have given another human being a fair and reasonable time to respond to you. And you may also use a 'Notice of Opportunity to Cure' in a second notice or not. After this time you have a lawful right to issue a Default Judgement.

The Default Judgement merely mentions the previous efforts to obtain agreement, notes that no response or whatever response, has happened, and notes the Default Judgement.

Here is an example that has descriptions inside the text. As you can see, it is actually a very simple document but it is a very important document.

Label all the people you are sending the default judgement to.

To:

The woman holding the throne of David and acting as
Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II,
Queen of the United Kingdom
and the Commonwealth
Buckingham Palace
London SW1A 1AA, United Kingdom

Michael Jeffrey, acting as
The Honourable Major General Michael Jeffery
Australian Governor General of the Commonwealth of Australia
Government House
Dunrossil Drive
Yarralumia, Australian Capital Territory
Australia

Kevin Rudd, acting as The Honourable Kevin Rudd,
Prime Minister of Australia
Parliament House
Canberra, Australian Capital Territory
Australia

Robert McClelland, acting as The Honourable Robert McClelland
Attorney-General
Attorney-General's Department
Central Office
3-5 National Circuit
BARTON
Canberra, Australian Capital Territory 2600
Australia

And all heirs and successors to all the above.

Referencing:

Notice of Understanding and Intent And Claim of Right

I think it is a good idea to provide the receipt numbers. Some people are including self addressed postage paid envelopes enclosed so that the those who receive the notice simply put the self addressed envelope into the return post when the notice arrives. A scan/photocopy of the self addressed envelope and then the holding of that returned envelope is also excellent evidence that the notice was delivered. .

With British Mail Registered Mail Receipts as Follows:

The woman holding the throne of David and acting as
Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II,
Queen of the United Kingdom
and the Commonwealth
Buckingham Palace
London SW1A 1AA, United Kingdom
Receipt: ZV850251414GB

Michael Jeffrey, acting as
The Honourable Major General Michael Jeffery
Australian Governor General of the Commonwealth of Australia
Government House
Dunrossil Drive
Yarralumia, Australian Capital Territory
Australia
Receipt: RI774749458GB

Kevin Rudd, acting as The Honourable Kevin Rudd,
Prime Minister of Australia
Parliament House
Canberra, Australian Capital Territory
Australia
Receipt: RI774749461GB

Robert McClelland, acting as The Honourable Robert McClelland
Attorney-General
Attorney-General's Department
Central Office
3-5 National Circuit
BARTON
Canberra, Australian Capital Territory 2600
Australia
Receipt: RI774749492GB

**NOTARIAL NOTICE OF NON-RESPONSE
AND DEFAULT JUDGEMENT**

To date you have given no response to the Notice of Understanding and Intent and Claim of Right issued by registered mail as follows dated September 23rd 2009 written by the claimant addressed by the calling of Peter-Andrew: Nolan© a Free man, within the twenty day time period. (Printed copies are included for your information.)

I think it is a good idea to be repetitive.

The woman holding the throne of David and acting as
Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II,
Queen of the United Kingdom
and the Commonwealth
Buckingham Palace
London SW1A 1AA, United Kingdom
Receipt: ZV850251414GB

Michael Jeffrey, acting as
The Honourable Major General Michael Jeffery
Australian Governor General of the Commonwealth of Australia
Government House
Dunrossil Drive
Yarralumia, Australian Capital Territory
Australia
Receipt: RI774749458GB

Kevin Rudd, acting as The Honourable Kevin Rudd,
Prime Minister of Australia
Parliament House
Canberra, Australian Capital Territory
Australia
Receipt: RI774749461GB

Robert McClelland, acting as The Honourable Robert McClelland
Attorney-General
Attorney-General's Department
Central Office
3-5 National Circuit
BARTON
Canberra, Australian Capital Territory 2600
Australia
Receipt: RI774749492GB

This Notarial Notice is to advise you that your failure to respond has resulted in an automatic default judgment and permanent and irrevocable estoppel by acquiescence barring the bringing of charges under any statute or Act against Free man Peter-Andrew: Nolan©.

Autographed
Peter-Andrew: Nolan©
Principal and Claimant
All rights reserved

Done this.....Day of the Tenth Month of the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Nine Anno Domini, (22nd October AD2009) near London, England.

KNOW all men that I, _____ of London, England, at the request of Peter-Andrew: Nolan© , there being no notary public readily available, did on the Twenty Second Day of October 2009 Anno Domini, witness this NOTARIAL NOTICE OF NON-RESPONSE and DEFAULT JUDGEMENT and the above autograph of Peter-Andrew: Nolan© before

_____ and

_____.

Yours Faithfully,
By,

.....
(Autographed)
All rights reserved.

Witness 1

Date:

Witness 2

This document may be used in a Judicial Proceeding

I think it is a good idea to make it really clear that this may be used in a Judicial Proceeding to prove that every effort was made to give the human beings time to respond and to rebut claims made.

12. HOW DO I PERFORM A STRAWMAN RECAPTURE?

There are services to do this and I assume that these services will improve. If they improve over time then you would be well advised to spend your 'money' and use such a service. I am giving you what I did for you to work from. Period. I am not 'agony aunt' and I'm not going to spend a lot of time taking men through this. As I said above. If you want help? Ask someone who is proficient in this to help you and pay him for his time. I have spent enormous amounts of time on men who have shown very little interest in actually being useful.

12.1. Why Perform A Strawman Recapture?

I travel a lot. The robots at the 'Border Controls' are often dumber than rocks. Really. They are not doing that job because they are PHDs. They are nice guys and they are doing their best and I am by no means insulting them. But if you are going to be sitting at the border patrol for many years there has to be a reason for it. I also notice that in the UK they are using more and more women at border control and that can only spell trouble.

So, when you roll up to 'Border Control' and start explaining to them that you have a God given right to freedom of travel, or that you have conducted a lawful process of permanent estoppel with the leader of his 'country' such that he has no right to interfere? Well? Good luck with that. So passports are something useful to have. I have two. One from Australia and a World Passport. So far the 'World Passport' has not been accepted. I am working on that.

So, the main reason I wanted to keep my strawman is to maintain my passport. The other BIG reason is to maintain bank accounts. In case you haven't noticed? Try buying something on line without a credit card now. Not easy.

They are trying to make the control grid so pervasive that you simply can't function without it. However, they HAVE to provide remedy unless they are going to be caught promoting slavery. Their 'legalese gobblygook' is what they use to get people to believe they have to do stuff.

So it seems that maintaining the strawman and separating yourself from the strawman gives you the opportunity to operate in commerce in the 'normal' way that all the 'robots' are familiar with while creating a lawful and legal barrier between you and the strawman. This basically means you gain the benefit of using THEIR public system which is funded from your BOND against your 'Birth Certificate' while not being subject to THEIR corporate rules, legislation and statutes.

12.2. Components of a Strawman Recapture

There are a number of components to a claim of right. They are as follows:

1. Certificate of Sovereignty
2. Deed of Evidence
3. Common Law Copyright Notice
4. Hold Harmless Agreement
5. Private Agreement
6. Security Agreement
7. UCC 1 – Financing Statement

Each of these items will be discussed in detail in the following pages.

I want to acknowledge Arthur Cristian and his great site www.loveforlife.com.au. Arthur has been fighting these guys for a long, long time and has amassed an enormous amount of materials on his site. I could not have done this without referring to his materials. Thank you Arthur.

I got the skeletons for all these from here. <http://loveforlife.com.au/node/6169>

Instructions for completion from here: <http://loveforlife.com.au/node/6168>

Please refer to these instructions as they may be updated.

There are a number of components to a claim of right. They are as follows:

12.2.1. Certificate of Sovereignty

The Certificate of Sovereignty contains your Declaration of Sovereignty. This is a way of documenting and communicating to other people that you have declared that you are a Sovereign. Remember, you are Sovereign when you BE Sovereign. Sovereignty is a way of being, not a set of documents, and it is very important that you understand that. Filling out some paper work is not going to help you face down a policy enforcement officer or a magistrate. What is going to help you face down a policy enforcement officer or a magistrate is to remember that you are the Sovereign and they are your servant. And you do not allow them to act in any other way than as your servant. Treat them like you would treat your maid or your butler in your house.

The Certificate of Sovereignty also binds you to discharge truly and faithfully your common law duties to your fellow men. That means if you are signing this Certificate of Sovereignty then you are **OBLIGING** yourself to the common law. You are **OBLIGING** yourself to stand up for the common law and stand up for justice. That means you are **OBLIGING** yourself to serve on juries if you are asked.

12.2.2. Deed of Evidence

The Deed of Evidence is a tool to create the evidence of the Strawman. Basically it says that if the 'Berth Certificate' has been considered the Strawman in the past that this Deed of Evidence now declares that this piece of paper and extracts from it are the only legal evidence of that corporate strawman. If someone wants to talk to 'PETER ANDREW NOLAN(c)' I can give them a certified copy of this Deed. I believe I can also give them my 'Berth Certificate' as well. But I think giving them one of these is better.

12.2.3. Common Law Copyright Notice

Ok. Your name and your calling? Who owns it? You might say 'The guvment' or you might say 'well, no-one'. You would be wrong. **YOU** decide what you are going to be called and you can call yourself anything you want. So, lets say for convenience sake you will continue to use the name your parents gave you. Did you agree to a contract with your parents as to your name? No. You were a baby. You couldn't agree to **ANYTHING** back then.

So. Your Common Law Copyright Notice is a Notice to say that you are now taking copy right title of your name, your calling, any derivations of such, as well as all images of yourself and your DNA, your bodily parts etc. You claim you own everything about you and it is all **YOUR** copyright because **YOU** own you.

Also, importantly in these days of forced vaccinations. You are claiming you can not have anything put into your body as it is copyrighted as your body. This would also be covered in your claim of right where you have the right to self defence up to and including deadly force.

I also created a Notice of Methods of Communication which cites my Copyright Notice and Notices that people can communicate to me in writing under certain conditions. They can write to the Juristic Person or to the human being. To make it clear that they have communicated to who they think they have communicated to they have to address the two differently. I then respond from the point of view of who they have addressed.

Any breech of copyright once a human being has been noticed of the existence of the copyright, and since mine is in the public at my personal web site that means whoever wants to write to me has an obligation to find out if my name is copy righted. However, that's a little vexatious and so I always send my Notice of Methods of Communication and make sure that the other party has a chance to know my name is copy righted.

Now. I have not collected on a copyright infringement. But I sure hope to!! My ex brother in law, Michael Toal, has been a pain in the neck lately and he has been using my image without my consent and that is copyright infringement.

12.2.4. Hold Harmless Agreement

OK. The Hold Harmless Agreement is an Agreement whereby the debtor, PETER ANDREW NOLAN(c) and the creditor Peter-Andrew: Nolan(c) enter into an agreement whereby the debtor indemnifies and holds harmless the creditor for any claims that are made against the debtor.

This means that the human being can not be reached by any claim that is against the debtor, the strawman. This is quite cool because it means that when I use my Strawman Signature, which is what is on my passport and credit cards for example, then nothing I do there has any legal ramification for me. It is 'buyer beware' time and the 'buyer' must inform himself that he is taking the signature of a corporate fiction. This could be used maliciously but I wouldn't recommend that.

If a human being wants to contract with you in the private then you can use your human being autograph. I have noticed in some places the human beings signature is consistently referred to as an 'autograph'. I have not got to the bottom of that. But in any case. As long as you can make a mark that you recognise and is difficult enough to copy then that's a good signature/autograph for your human being. I recommend that you make your human being signature **SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT** to your strawman signature and make sure people know which legal or lawful party they are dealing with.

The Hold Harmless Agreement is the one to use to rebut the presumption that the Strawman that the police come looking for has got anything to do with you as the human being. It doesn't. And your Strawman signed an agreement to say so.

When the cops come. And they will. This Agreement is what you need to give them. Also? I think it's a really good idea to go down to your local police station and hand them over all this paperwork and tell them that you know about all this and that if the head of the local police station orders any of his boys around to kidnap you that you will hold the head of the station liable. That way you can make sure he tells **ALL** his boys to leave you alone.

You tell him you want to live in peace etc but tell him kidnapping is considered NOT ok.

12.2.5. Private Agreement

The Private Agreement alters the status of the Debtor to being a Transmitting Utility. It notes that the Creditor is the source of value for the Debtor such that the Debtor can engage in commerce. This 'transmitting utility' is important. It is creating the agreement that the Debtor can act AS the Creditor for all actions that the Debtor needs to undertake and that any 'remuneration' that comes back to the Debtor can be transmitted through to the Creditor.

On your UCC 1 Financing Statement you also need to note that the Debtor is now a Transmitting Utility. Don't forget that bit.

12.2.6. Security Agreement

The longest agreement of all is the Security Agreement. And this is the one you want to spend a bit of time on. I know it's hard to believe and understand in the beginning.

The Security Agreement delivers **ALL** property of the Debtor across to the Creditor. It then creates a large debt to the Creditor and names the Creditor as the Primary Creditor and Secured Party. The property is enumerated just to make sure that it's clear what is covered. Not every bank account needs to be named but just that Bank Accounts in the Debtors Name should be specified.

By creating the debt and naming the Creditor as the Primary Creditor and Secured Party the Creditor is then 'first in line' for payment. This means that if someone else comes along with a claim for 'money' from the debtor then they have to 'get in line'. Someone like, the govment for example.

Things are transferred across such as Passports, Tax File Numbers, Bank Accounts and the like. This then transfers all the property you **THOUGHT** was yours but was not across to you. The fact is that since you have been signing documents using the authorised signature against THEIR strawman all you have ever been doing is transferring money from one of THEIR accounts to another of THEIR accounts. Did you ever own anything? No. You didn't. This is how the state seizes property. You never owned it in the first place. They use a whole lot of legalese that you don't understand and tell you 'ignorance of the law is no excuse'. Then when you feel threatened and frightened you hire a liar/lawyer who pretends to be your friend but is anything BUT your friend and when you hire the liar/lawyer you waive all your rights and declare yourself a ward of the state and the pirates plunder you.

How about that?

So by having the Security Agreement transfer **THEIR** property across to **YOU** and for you to hold under a common law claim then **YOU** own that property and you hold it under the law of 'thou shalt not steal' which implies your property rights. And you can punished those who steal your property.

So. Spend some time on this Security Agreement. It's important.

12.2.7. UCC 1 – Financing Statement

Lastly? You must complete a UCC 1 Financing Statement. There are any number of web sites that will allow you to register a UCC 1 Financing Statement. As according to the instructions on Arthurs Site I went here:

<https://fortress.wa.gov/dol/ucc>

It took me a couple of goes because I kept doing the data entry incorrectly. This was one of the WORST web sites I had ever seen in all my years of working. I hope it is better by the time you use it.

My understanding is that the UCC 1 – Financing Statement is simply the registration of your contracts in a public place so that people may be reasonably expected to find it. You have the rights you have declared and you have the contracts that you have written but for people to have a reasonable chance to know that you have done this then the fact you have done it needs to be registered. I had thought it was another 'claim' thing. That if no-one rebutted your claim that it then stood. I now believe that is not correct and that it is truly just a place to publish the fact you have done this without needing to publish your whole set of contracts. In my case I have published my set of contracts and the UCC 1 – Financing Statement onto my personal web site now.

I spent some time with a non-de plum but I always knew I would have to 'come out' as I was going to try and put the judge and magistrates on trial and they have the right to confront their accuser. So before I made my name public these documents were made public in the name of 'John-Doe'.

Once you have registered your Financing Statement you can make claim that any person claiming against you had ample opportunity to inform themselves.

13. STRAWMAN RECAPTURE COMPLETED? WHAT IS NEXT?

Ok. Once you have set up your strawman recapture, you have completed your NOUICOR what is next?

Well? You will want to be exercising your rights. And there are some people dressed in nice blue clown costumes wearing the Masonic symbol of the checkerboard on their hats that are going to be wanting to try and tell you that you can't do that. These are the policy enforcement officers of whatever corporation that claims to run the land you are living on.

In my case I didn't bother going to see the local police officers because I don't really 'live' in one place. And this was all very new to me at the time. After consideration I believe it is a good idea to go and see the local station commander once you have completed this paperwork and explain to him that you are no longer the **JURISTIC PERSON** he assumes you to be.

I think it is important to explain to the local police commander that you really do want him to be a peace officer in your community but that you no longer wish him to be a 'policy enforcement officer' for the corporate policies being enforced on other people to also be forced onto you.

I think it is a good idea to explain to him that if he orders any of this policy enforcement officers to apply the corporate policies to you that you will hold the officer himself responsible for his actions as well as the station commander who issues the order responsible.

The next step is to go about exercising your claimed rights. Whatever it is that you claimed as your rights, go out and exercise them.

Sooner or later some of these policy enforcement officers will attempt to violate your rights. You need to understand who you are and how you are to interact with these policy enforcement officers.

You need to make sure that you have your fee schedule in place and then you need to make sure that the policy enforcement officer is well noticed and advised of your fee schedule.

This is my fee schedule. I'd suggest you do something similar:

Furthermore, I claim my FEE SCHEDULE for any transgressions by peace officers, government principals or agents or justice system participants is ONE TROY OUNCE of 99.99% PURE GOLD PER HOUR or portion thereof if being questioned, interrogated or in any way detained, harassed or otherwise regulated and FIVE HUNDRED TROY OUNCES of 99.99% PURE GOLD PER HOUR or portion thereof if I am handcuffed, transported, incarcerated or subjected to any adjudication process without my express written and Notarised consent.

Should the policy enforcement officer actually violate your rights then you will have to process remedy. It is important for a sovereign to always be aware that at **ALL** times it is **YOUR** responsibility to make sure you gather evidence to bring into a court such that you are able to provide evidence to gain a conviction should the other party commit perjury and deny the truth.

And make sure that when you bring Affidavits and accusations against someone you tell the truth. The rule of law is predicated on sovereigns telling the truth on Affidavits and perjury is a crime that will be punished.

Update: 2011-03-26. I have lawfully noticed all peace officers in Ireland and Australia with respect to certain elements of this book and what they may not lawfully do.

Australia

<http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums/tabid/82/forumid/97/threadid/159/scope/posts/Default.aspx>

Ireland

<http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/ireland/Forums/tabid/105/forumid/96/threadid/149/scope/posts/Default.aspx>

So, let's say that you do have your rights violated by one of these policy enforcement officers or the legal fraternity. What do you do then?

There is a well defined process that has worked for a thousand years or more.

1. You write out an affidavit of truth documenting what the situation was.
2. Include in this document the Notice of Intent.
 - i. The Notice of Intent is a document that is best included to tell the other part as a lawful notice what your intentions are. Usually this will include such things as reserving the right to form a common law court and empanelling a de jour jury to hear the matter.
3. Include in this document the Proposed Remedy.
 - ii. The Proposed Remedy also sometimes called 'Opportunity to Cure', is a document that describes your offer to the other party to admit to the accusation and then to make a remedy that is REASONABLE for the crime that was committed. It is VERY important that you offer that you offer the Proposed Remedy and that it would be perceived as REASONABLE by a jury of 12 men. This Proposed Remedy will be presented to the jury of 12 men to show them that you made a genuine effort to settle the matter outside of a court.

You then present this document to the Respondent. You give them time to respond etc. If they do not respond you create a default judgment. You might also give them an 'Opportunity to Cure'. However, I do not see the need for that. If the presentment goes to the other person properly then you have done all you can be expected to do.

Once the default judgement is created and also issued you can also do things like create a de jour jury or go through the sheriffs office. This is where we are up to. The ability to get a Remedy Instruction or some such device out of a de jour jury. When we get there we will see how that goes.

On my web site you can see many documents as I have described here in my own cases. They are presented for your educational purposes. You are welcome to read them to comprehend them and use them should you choose to do so.

Update: 2011-03-26. I have created the draft procedure manual for "The Peoples Court of Australia" and it will soon be released here:

<http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia>

We are proclaiming into existence "The Peoples Court of Australia" on 15th April 2011.

14. A WORD ABOUT POLICY ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND KIDNAPPING

There are some unscrupulous thugs calling themselves 'Policy Enforcement Officers'. This is shortened to 'Police' in many western countries. These men are scum. The worst kind of scum. Because they are employed to be 'Peace Officers' and to 'Protect and Serve' and instead they are allowing themselves to be the willing and complicit tools of oppression of their fellow men.

My disgust for these men knows no bounds. Even the 'honest' ones because they are not ringing the bell.

I have spoken to a small number of them and they pull their bullshit about how they are being 'helpful' but if you go into the role they are really playing then they will start their bullshit.

Here are my thoughts for men on how to deal with these scumbag men who are willing and complicit in enslaving you while lying to you can telling you they are 'protecting' you.

If you claim your right to defend your freedom then you are going to have to defend it when these scum try and kidnap you. My recommendation for men on how to deal with this situation is as follows:

1. Create a small group of some 5 or 6 men.
The reason the group is to be small is that this avoids infiltration by Illuminati Skills..
2. Each man is to swear an oath under pain of death to defend the life, liberty and property of the fellow members of the group. This oath is up to and including deadly force to defend each mans right to life, liberty and property.
3. Acquire deadly weapons and **DO NOT REGISTER THEM**. Let no-one know you have these weapons. Most especially **NOT** your guvment.
4. Learn how to use these deadly weapons.
5. One nominated man from the group go down to your local Policy Enforcement Office and lawfully notice the commanding officer that should he issue an order to falsely kidnap any free man, or should he issue an order to unlawfully remove property from a free man that **HE WILL PERSONALLY BE HELD RESPONSIBLE** for this crime.

Make sure you tell this man that **MANY MEN** are armed with deadly weapons and that they will have **NO HESITATION IN USING THEM** if the station commander allows **ANY** infringement of a free mans rights as claimed by that free man.

And you make sure you tell him that those who willing to carry out such unlawful orders will **ALSO BE SUBJECT** to summary justice dealt out by the militia of the Free Men. Tell him to make **DAMN SURE** that he passes that message around.

It might even be a good idea to video record the entire discussion and post it to You-Tube.

Now. What rights might you claim in dealing with these Policy Enforcement Officers? This is what I claim.

I claim that their policies only apply to **THEIR** trademark. If they would like to arrest **THEIR** trademark they can print a copy of my "Deed of Evidence" and put it into a cell for as long as they like. It's on my web site here:

<http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/190/threadid/1104/scope/posts/Default.aspx>

I also claim that if a Peace Officer wishes to arrest me then what he needs is a human being accusing me of a crime. That human being must be willing to create, or already have created, an Affidavit signed under penalty of perjury, full commercial liability, with proposed remedy and notice of intent, prior to the peace officer calling on me.

Should such an affidavit be presented the Peace Officer is obliged to accompany me to a magistrate who will state his oath of office before me and enter into the bond of his oath of office to hear the testimony of this other human being under oath as well as my rebuttal under oath. This is all to be performed on the record and under common law jurisdiction because I claim common law jurisdiction.

The Magistrate may not deprive me of my freedom unless the accusation is so serious that I would be a 'flight risk' and that there is substantive evidence that I was indeed guilty of such a crime. Since I do not plan on committing any such crimes there will be no such evidence. One persons testimony rebutted under oath is not evidence.

So. My question to any Peace Officer trying to do anything with me is as follows. I suggest you also choose some similar statement.

"Son, do you have an Affidavit with an attached Proposed Remedy and Notice of Intent signed under penalty of perjury and full commercial liability making an accusation of a crime against me?"

Or do you have a human being making oath to you that they will complete such a document?

If no? You are hereby lawfully noticed that any attempt to kidnap me by force is punishable by force up to and including deadly force at the time and place of my choosing.

Son. You kidnap me? You are putting your life at risk. Now. Go get your paperwork in order."

And, of course, if you need to live up to the promise of summary justice against one of these scumbag criminals calling themselves Policy Enforcement Officers? The way to do that is to ensure that one of the men you have taken oath with delivers on his oath while you are **FAR AWAY** and have an irrefutable alibi. You need to remember that in such a situation **NO CRIME IS COMMITTED**. The Policy Enforcement Officer was lawfully noticed that you claim the right to use deadly force at the time and place of your choosing should he kidnap you thus violating your right of freedom. You do not make the claim that it must be you do deliver on that Lawful Notice. And no other Peace Officer may 'investigate' the situation since no crime was committed.

Once a few Policy Enforcement Officers have had summary justice dealt out to them, and let no man forget that these scum have been killing plenty of men themselves so no sympathy can be afforded them, they might choose to stop being 'Policy Enforcement Officers' and start being Peace Officers again. **THEIR CHOICE**.

When I was a kid there was a kid in my football team who's Dad was a 'Peace Officer'. He was a really nice man and he was a pillar of the community. I am more than happy to pay men to be Peace Officers and they will have my gratitude and respect for being Peace Officers. It is a very important job.

However. I despise Policy Enforcement Officers like the pair who came into my house at my wife's invitation and assaulted me and kidnapped and incarcerated me based on a lie by my wife. Those men are scum. They are no better than the German Soldiers who put people into gas chambers or ovens saying "I am only following orders."

If our Peace Officers had been men of honour and integrity they would have refused to violate men's right to life, liberty and property. They are not men of honour and integrity. They are scum. They deserve to be labelled the scum they are. They can redeem themselves by choosing to be Peace Officers once more.

And Gentlemen? **ANY MAN** who can bring an Affidavit of an alleged crime committed by one of these scum known as Policy Enforcement Officers will also be give a path to justice from courts that are created in Ireland and Australia. It is the responsibility of each man to ensure he is acting lawfully at **ALL TIMES** even when acting as a 'Policy Enforcement Officer' of a private corporation just the same way as the burger flipper from McDonalds is required to act lawfully. Just because a man is given a blue clown costume and a gun does **NOT** put him **ABOVE** the law. Indeed, if anything, because he is given a deadly weapon he has **MORE RESPONSIBILITY** to make sure he is acting lawfully.

So. This is my advice to men about 'kidnapping' from scum calling themselves 'Policy Enforcement Officers'. Make sure you defend yourself from them by oath of a small group of men, make sure you have weapons that can be used to back up that oath, make sure you communicate this to the senior officers. Then go about your business. And deliver on your oath if you ever need to.

Have no concern or sympathy for these men who would enslave you. They made their bed. Let them sleep in it.

15. THE MANAGEMENT OF RELATIONSHIPS IN THE FUTURE

There are many people talking about relationships all around the western world. With the collapse of the marriage rate, the number of children born out of wedlock going on to being criminals, the drug problems, the divorce rates. There is not a thinking man in the western world who is not aware that there is something seriously wrong in the world today with respect to relationships between men and women. Try www.the-spearhead.com.

This has been by plan. It is part of reducing the number of people on the planet and it is well documented. The short story is this:

1. The Illuminati want to cull back the population back to 500M people. That's what they say. And the people that say that are some very powerful and influential people. They are not to be automatically dis-believed just because what they are saying is 'un-believable'. Just start with 'Georgia Guidestones'
2. In order to more effectively 'manage the people' the Illuminati started the two world wars. The problem was that these wars did not reduce the population quickly enough for the liking of the Illuminati. They are currently trying to get World War Three started. (see www.threeworldwars.com).
3. The next step was to decide to destroy the family. The destruction of the family would leave people more easily managed, more easily culled/killed if needs be. So immediately after WW II the assault on the family started in the west. At this time the first 'propaganda' about how women should be looking forward to the 'prince charming' wedding was started. For example the Walt Disney movie 'Cinderella'.
4. The next steps were things like the introduction of the Pill to 'liberate' women from the 'oppression' of child birth and being required to be very careful before marriage, best abstaining, so that accidental pregnancy does not take place. The introduction of 'feminism' included such things as 'free love' which was actually documented in the communist manifesto, the programming of 'the home is the comfortable concentration camp', the programming of women in the house were 'brain damaged and suffering from the disease with no name'. Those who bother to read it can see that the Communist Manifesto said that the nuclear family had to be abolished and children had to be raised by the state to ensure 'equality'.
5. In 1974 the UN promoted through the Council for Population Control in Bucharest the idea that all member states should ensure equal outcomes in the public work place for men and women. Following on from this meeting in 1974 the **ENTIRE WESTERN WORLD** re-wrote their family laws in the subsequent 12 years. In Australia the 'Family Law' was re-written in 1975. Many men will read this from Australia. At that time there were huge political and social issues. The labor government had come to power for the first time in 20+ years. Vietnam was ongoing and there were marches in the streets. And inflation rates were high. Yet. In this turbulent time what did Komrade Gough Whitlam and his band of cronies do?

They REWROTE THE FAMILY LAW (Legislation).

6. The Illuminati ordered the re-writing of the legislation of most western countries to introduce 'positive discrimination' for women. However, if there is 'positive discrimination' it begs the question, who is this discrimination against? Well? That would be men. By the early 80s we were starting to see 'the quota women' turning up in jobs all over the place. And men said "Ok, we will let you come in and see how you go." Alas, what then happened was that when women under performed in the work place it was not 'politically correct' to actually speak about women's poor work performance.

I recall this when I first started working in 1982. When the female trainees that were my peers would do university work and not the work that they were allocated to do no-one would talk about this and no-one would point out to the females that this was 'stealing'. When I asked about how this could be I was called 'sexist'!! Apparently if a man asks a woman to do her job that she is being paid for he is 'sexist'!! This call of 'sexist' has been going on in the workplace for **AT LEAST 28** years that I am **PERSONALLY** aware of. This experience has been repeated to me by men ALL **OVER THE WORLD**.

7. Following the re-write of the Family Law the divorce rate spiralled all around the western world. There was also the introduction of 'welfare' for these women who were no longer being supported by husbands. And not long later there came draconian 'laws' to 'make dead beat dads pay'. This has all gotten so out of hand that suicide by men in divorce is around 8-10x higher than the suicide rate of women.

If women are the ones who are so disadvantaged? Why it is the men killing themselves? Hhmmmm.

So? If you go out into the world and take a look around you will find that relationships between men and women are in disarray. You will see that men are walking away from long term relationships and marriage in their droves. And rightly so. I was one who was criminally abused for more than three years at the time of writing (Now March 2011). And when I sought justice not only did virtually **ALL** western women hurl abuse at me for wanting a path to justice a **LOT** of **MEN** did too. I am one of perhaps **100 MILLION** such men.

Whenever we allegedly 'complain' for wanting justice to be done we are abused. Gee. Thanks a lot. For me this has gone on for three years. I have worked my arse off for 2.5 years and spent a great deal of money and a great deal of time figuring out how to gain remedy. Not one woman has helped me. I have just this week, after more than 2.5 years, had the first woman say "I will help you as best I can". That was a really pathetic effort from our women folk. When I point this out they call me sexist some more. Gee. Women have not changed their shrieking calls in 28 years and what they do is every time you reveal their treachery they scream 'sexism' at you. It's about time western women made a different call.

This book is written for **MEN** and no women are invited to read it.

And this section answers the question for a man.

"I am being severely discriminated against and I am labelled a sexist if I 'complain' about this discrimination. Relationships with a woman are like walking on egg shells. What is a possible remedy?"

The next section of this document is about remedy. And remedy is so simple it is awesome.

The major problem today, apart from the Illuminati wanting to kill 90-95% of the worlds population, is that they are pursuing this agenda via the practice of offering the women the 'babies and money' from the men by force the state via the taxation system. Effectively, the Illuminati are offering men as 'state-tax-man-slaves' to the women and women are buying that deal in their tens of millions.

So? What is to be done to stop this system. Simple. Rescind your consent to be governed. As you have seen above. And **STOP 'PAYING' INCOME TAXES**. Their income taxes are payable by **THEIR** person....**NOT YOU**. Their income taxes are only payable on the **PROFIT** from **THEIR JURISTIC PERSON. NOT YOU**.

So. If you refuse to participate in **THEIR** system you can refuse to be bound by **THEIR** rules. Now, it's important to understand that by refusing consent to be governed does not mean that you can NOT still take advantage of **THEIR** system that was created for you by **YOUR DELEGATES FOR YOU**. You have every right to access the strawman by being the primary creditor and secured party of the strawman. When you want to sign something as the strawman then you sign the strawman name. When you sign something as the human being you sign your human being name.

Many men will be happy with that. Just ignore the system. But most men are actually required to interact with women in their public life and some men, like me, actually also wish to interact with women in our private lives.

The issue with dealing with women in our private lives is that women are not held to account for their actions. A woman can commit murder and reasonably expect to be given only a nominal punishment. A woman can commit perjury and no-one will do anything. This includes the western woman's 'right' to commit kidnapping, extortion and theft with total impunity and this is totally supported by the Family Law court and usually supported by the 'manginas' around the women.

So. The next step in the solution is to establish the lawful position of the women in your life. And **YOU** are **RESPONSIBLE** for establishing the lawful position of the women in your life. If a western woman in your life says "don't you trust me" you are best advised to give the answer "no". If she acts all hurt? Bad luck. If she did not stand up for men by denouncing women committing common law crimes during the last 30 years? Why not? And if she decided to trade her credibility for the privileges being accorded women by way of crimes? Well it was **SHE** who decided to waive **HER** credibility.

So? How do you determine what the lawful status of a woman is? Well, you have to ask her. And how do you ask her in such a way as to make it lawfully binding? You ask her to create an Affidavit and give you a certified copy or to place a certified copy of her Affidavit into the public domain.

Now. Women in your life are going to be **FURIOUS** about being asked to do this and they will come up with the normal 101 excuses. Just **IGNORE** them all. If she tries the one of "why don't men have to do this?" you can reply "because men have always known that they are equal before the law to other men".

So what tools are available? Surprisingly today? None. These had to be created .

The first Affidavit I have created is for a woman to claim lawful equality for the woman. These Affidavits are what I have called a **BONDED** Affidavit. It's like a **BONDED** oath. It is making a statement of what the woman believes to be true and what she will do in the future with respect to how she will deal with men. If someone can show a situation where the woman has violated her oaths of the Affidavit the plaintiff can present an Affidavit for the infraction under oath. If the Affidavit is not rebutted the bond is forfeit. If the Affidavit is rebutted it is a matter for the common law de jour court to progress. Could this be done better? Maybe. I would welcome other people to create sample documents that can be added to my website or placed into web sites for men to use.

When I say 'lawful equality' I mean 'lawful equality and waiving all privileges'. This is important for you to understand. Today women enjoy enormous privileges over men and they always have. If they wish lawful equality to men then men will rightly insist that all privileges are waived and that men have no obligations to offer privileges to women as men commonly do today.

For example? How many women change flat tires? Almost none. They always get the 'nearest man' to do that. Well? That's not equal. That's a privilege. A woman has no 'right' to have a man-slave change her tire.

The unique idea that I propose is that **YOU MEN** who see these manginas extend privileges to women who claim equality but demand privileges? You then **TELL** the **MEN** that you have no respect for them and you refuse to have anything to do with these **MEN** because they are also the agents of your betrayal.

If a man allows a woman to claim equality and then also offers that woman privileges?

HE IS NOT YOUR FRIEND. DO NOT DO BUSINESS WITH HIM.

I propose that men ask women to put forward an Affidavit to say whether they are claiming lawful equality between men and women or whether they are claiming what might be called the 'traditional' status of women which, since they have claimed they were oppressed as the 'chattel property of men' I am giving it exactly the same name as they gave it.

I propose that men give women they interact with a **CLEAR** choice as to the lawful status they wish to select.

Now? The interesting bit is this. **ALL** men have a right to refuse to interact with any human being that they do not know the lawful status of. So, if women are NOT willing to make a public statement as to their lawful status, ALL men have a right to tell that woman he will not interact with her in any way because he does not know her lawful status. And please do not forget her 'legal status' is irrelevant to this conversation. What is relevant is her **LAWFUL STATUS.**

This also means that any man who employs a woman? He has **EVERY RIGHT** to transform his company from a 'company' to an association (because a REGIS-tered company is owned by the GUVMENT and you do NOT own a company) and then ask all the women he employs to complete one of the two affidavits to establish her lawful position. If a woman refuses to establish her lawful position an employer has **EVERY RIGHT** to terminate employment opportunities with his company. She is an 'Occupational Health and Safety Risk'.

A good example of this is the whole issue of false sexual harassment. Very large numbers of women have made false sexual harassment claims in the workplace and have then claimed ludicrous amounts of 'money' to address 'hurt feelings'. Should a woman claim equality then she will agree to hear such cases in front of a de jour jury. Should the allegation be found to have knowingly lied in the accusation then she forfeits her bond to the man she is making the false allegation to. Simple. She lies under oath committing perjury? She pays. Big time.

In all these cases the woman is required to sign an Affidavit and be liable for punishment to perjury so as to establish her lawful status. Should she refuse to establish her lawful status, which is fine, men are well advised not to interact because of the uncertainty of relating to her lawful status and her actions.

15.1. The Safe Working Environment

There is also the issue of 'safe working environment'. In all western countries there is legislation in place that insists that employers offer a 'safe working environment'. Who has NOT heard of 'Occupational Health and Safety'?

Well? If a woman does NOT define her lawful status she is **NOT SAFE** to work with. She can make a false allegation and she will not be punished. That means **YOU**, the man, are being subjected to an un-safe working environment.

What can you do about this? You can create a Lawful Notice whereby you notice your employer that you insist that all those whom your employer wishes you to interact with in the course of HIS business have lawfully declared their lawful status. It is not necessary for men to do this since men know they are 'equal before the law' and subject to jury trial should they commit a crime. However, women claim they are not 'equal before the law' and women claim that they have a right to make false allegations to the vast detriment of the man with complete impunity.

Since this is the case men in the workplace are very well advised to create letters to insist that they will not work with any other human being who is not subject to the law just like they are.

An example text of such a letter is as follows. The idea is to claim common law jurisdiction by way of noticing the human being and the agent and placing the common law notice at the top of the letter.

You are simply lawfully noticing your employer that you believe you are being asked to work in an unsafe working environment as you could be falsely accused of any number of crimes by a female employee who would enjoy the benefit of not being subject to remedy for her crime of perjury.

You are proposing two solutions and offering your employer the opportunity to also make a proposal in return. You are letting your employer know that should you suffer any injury, harm or loss via a false accusation by one of his female employees that, since he is the employer asking your to suffer in this unsafe working environment, you will hold **HIM** accountable for any injury, harm or loss as you can not hold the woman accountable for the same.

It is then up to the employer to respond to this Lawful Notice. Should he not respond you issue a follow on letter to make sure that the employer is noticed of the expiry of the time period in which he can propose solutions and that he is now lawfully liable under the common law for any injury, harm or loss suffered by you in going about **HIS** business.

Make sure he understands that you **WILL** put him before a jury and demand compensation for **ANY** injury, harm or loss caused by false allegations of any of **HIS** female employees because such could have been easily foreseen. They happen every day so there is no 'excuse' that this is 'unusual' or 'unexpected' or 'unknown'.

Gentlemen. The way to deal with women is to make sure the **MEN** who offer them privileges know that it is no longer acceptable to men to be discriminated against by other men like this and to make sure those **MEN** who discriminate against you know that you **WILL** deprive them of their property should they continue to offer women privileges over and above 'equality before the law'.

ALL women's privileges are accorded by **MEN**. Women do almost **NOTHING** for themselves. So you are best advised to **ATTACK THE MEN** who are offering women privileges. Very, very simple.

<p>Lawful Notice to: To the human being calling himself a-b: c also acting as Mr. A. B. C. Name and address of employer</p>	<p>Lawful Notice From: Peter-Andrew: Nolan@ Human Being. All Rights Reserved. Waiving None. Without Prejudice. The address that you wish to receive correspondence to.</p>
--	---

Date: xx/xx/20xx	Subject: Lawful Notice with respect to Occupational Health and Safety
------------------	---

Notice to Principal and notice to Agent and notice to Agent is notice to Principal.

This lawful notice is issued under the common law jurisdiction of the land commonly called Australia.

To the human being calling himself a-b: c.

Greetings and Salutations. I offer this Lawful Notice to you to ensure we are in agreement as to the obligations of us both with respect to my being a man who is labouring for you in this company we call xyz.

After much time and study it has come to my attention that I am being placed at severe risk of injury, harm and loss by working for you in this company. I wish to continue our relationship and so I seek resolution of this issue to the satisfaction of us both.

As you well know, in our society, including our workplace, women can make false allegations of 'domestic violence', 'sexual harassment', 'rape', and pretty much anything else they would like to claim is 'inappropriate' or 'offensive' without enumerating what these might be. They can do this on the basis of lies with complete impunity. It is well known in our society that women can commit perjury in a court of law under oath and do so with complete impunity.

As a man and as an employee of your company you are asking me to work in interaction with women. However, as stated above, these woman can make a false allegation against me with impunity causing me serious injury, harm and loss and I will not be compensated for this crime against me. This is, therefore, an unsafe working environment. All us men know we are working in such hostile and dangerous environments and it is about time we did something about it.

I offer you two solutions to this problem for your consideration, both of which would be agreeable and acceptable to me:

1. Provide me the opportunity to work exclusively with men in the course of performing activities for your company.
2. Ensure that any woman you request me to work with has created a Bonded Affidavit such that she has lawfully declared her lawful status. I have no concern what her lawful status is declared to be. I only have concern that she will be held accountable for any crime she commits against me.

I am sure you agree that you have an obligation as an employer not to allow crimes to be committed with impunity in your company as part of providing a 'safe working environment'. You would surely agree you have an obligation to not allow us men to physically hit women or kick them or rape them with impunity. I am just as sure you will agree that women do not have a right to commit perjury and make false allegations against us men with complete impunity. All I am insisting on is that I know that those whom I work with can not commit crimes against me with impunity. A perfectly reasonable position.

In pursuit of ensuring that we can create agreement I am willing to allow you 28 days to determine which of these options you wish to implement so that we can all work in our newly safe working environment.

I am also open to counter proposals should you believe that you have an alternative solution that might be acceptable to me.

Should you wish to not respond to this proposal and you insist that I remain working in an un-safe working environment I hereby lawfully notice you that should I be subject to any such false allegations that I will hold you responsible as a human being and I will reserve the right to regain all damages from you.

I reserve the right to form a de jour jury in a de jour court and present my case against you for what will be your wilful negligence of my request to ensure that all those employees of yours I interact with be subject to the law of the land, the common law, just as I am.

It is not my intention to put you into a 'difficult position'. I am merely lawfully noticing you of my position with respect to currently working in an unsafe working environment. I know this may sound 'crazy' but you and I have both seen MANY men's careers destroyed by false allegations from women. Should you allow my career to be one of these then it is you I will hold accountable before a court of law for your wilful negligence.

Yours Sincerely
Peter-Andrew: Nolan©
Human Being. All rights reserved.
Without Prejudice.
Also acting as
Primary Creditor and Secured Party
For the Juristic Person
MR. PETER ANDREW NOLAN©

16. AFFIDAVIT OF LAWFUL EQUALITY FOR A WOMAN

This section contains the sample text for a woman to declare by way of Affidavit her lawful equality to a man. Please note this includes waiving the benefits and privileges commonly associated with being a woman. Women have claimed 'equality' for 40 years now but if you ask a woman to actually write down what she means by that you will soon see that the picture gets real 'fuzzy' really quickly.

Well? This document is intended to make sure that this 'fuzziness' is removed. This 'Bonded Affidavit' is intended to be updated and customised by the woman who fills it out to explain **EXACTLY** what she means by her claim of 'equality' to a man. Any man has the right to demand any woman produce a copy of this Affidavit at any time, or that it be kept online to be viewed by any man who wishes to know the lawful status of any woman at any point in time. If not produced the man has a right to refuse interaction with the woman. I claim this is required because western women have, en-mass, claimed 'equality' but demanded privilege. It's time that men did not interact with any woman who was not willing to make a clear statement as to her lawful status.

Lawful Notice To Whom it May Concern Let All Men and Women Know

Month, Day, Year

<Page Break>

Lawful Notice To Whom it May Concern
Let All Men and Women Know

FIAT JUSTITIA, RUAT COELUM Let Right Be Done, Though The Heavens Should Fall

*Notice to principal is notice to agent.
Notice to agent is notice to principal.*

I, commonly addressed by the calling of First-Second: Family®, hereinafter the "Principal", in my correct public capacity as beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction, being of majority in age, competent to testify, a self realized and free sentient woman, my yes be yes, my no be no, do state that the truths and facts herein are of first hand personal knowledge, true, correct, complete, not just true and correct, certain and not misleading, so help me God.

This Notice is addressed to all the men and women of Gods creation commonly known as Planet Earth.

AFFIDAVIT WITH RESPECT TO EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW

1. Principal is of legal age and competent to testify.
2. Principal is of legal age and competent to make oath.
3. Principal has first hand knowledge of the facts stated herein.
4. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material fact or evidence that shows that Principal does not have lawful right to make the oaths of this affidavit.

-
5. Principal makes oath that she claims lawful equality with the men of the land known as <name of the land>.
 6. Principal makes oath that should she stand accused of a crime, that being causing injury harm or loss to any other human being, by way of a sworn affidavit and accompanying evidence, that she submits to the authority of a lawfully constituted court with a lawfully constituted jury of 12 men sworn to judge her case justly and fairly on a lawfully equal basis to any other person presented to such a jury.
 7. Principal makes oath that she will stand under the decision of the jury on the basis that any such decision must be unanimous and that any remedy statement rendered by the de jour jury must be unanimous from the 12 men of the jury.
 8. Principal makes oath that she will stand under the lawful axioms:
“All men and women are equal before the law”
“All men and women are innocent until proven guilty”
“Burden of proof is with the plaintiff”
 9. Principal makes oath that she waives the “women’s privilege” that should she strike a man that he will not strike her back. Principal stands under the common male principal that to strike a man is to waive the protection of the law such that the struck man may deal out any punishment he sees fit.
 10. Principal makes oath that she waives the “women’s privilege” that should she be highly irritating and obnoxious to a man that the man will not strike her. Principal stands under the common male principal that to be highly irritating and obnoxious to a man is to waive the protection of the law such that the man being irritated may deal out any punishment he sees fit.
 11. Principal makes oath that she waives the “women’s privilege” of preferential treatment with respect to national service and service in the armed forces.
 12. Principal makes oath that she may be ‘called up’ and conscripted to serve in the armed forces in the defence of the nation as have men for many years.
 13. Principal makes oath that she waives the “women’s privilege” of preferential treatment with respect to housing, medical treatment and other government services.
 14. Principal makes oath that she will under no circumstances provide support in any way, shape or form to any woman who refuses to declare by affidavit her lawful position with respect to equality to men. Principal is not concerned that a woman might choose ‘equality’ or ‘chattel property of a man’. Principal is merely concerned that women clearly communicate said choice and Principal will not support any woman who does not make a declaration by Affidavit one way or the other.

-
15. Principal makes oath that she will under no circumstances provide support to any endeavour of any woman who claims “lawful equality” by similar Affidavit but then takes advantage of men’s habit of extending “women’s privileges” or participates in any activity where men are excluded or refused the opportunity to earn their living in competition with women based merely on their sex.

Principal states that this includes but is not limited to such items as:

- a. Women’s Tennis which Principal denounces as sexist and discriminatory.
- b. Women’s Golf which Principal denounces as sexist and discriminatory.
- c. Women’s Soccer which Principal denounces as sexist and discriminatory.
- d. The teaching professions which Principal denounces as sexist and discriminatory.
- e. The child care industry which Principal denounces as sexist and discriminatory.
- f. The practice of providing subsidies for ‘Women and other minorities’ which Principal denounces as insulting to women and sexist and discriminatory against men.

16. Principal makes oath that she will under no circumstances accept any government grant or any government support that she did not compete for on a lawfully equal basis with men.
17. Principal makes oath that she will under no circumstances request that a man perform a routine task, like changing a flat tyre on a car, like changing a light bulb, merely to exercise the “women’s privilege” of being able to get a man to perform a task that she can perfectly well perform herself. Principal makes oath that she will perform such routine tasks herself or pay the man for his exertion of his efforts for such routine tasks.
18. Principal makes oath that in all areas of her life, business or professional, private, or social she will at all times compete on a lawfully equal basis with men and waive and take no advantage of “women’s privileges” commonly afforded to women by men.

Principal states that this includes but is not limited to such things as:

- a. The “women’s privilege” of being paid for on ‘dates’ such as dinners, drinks, tickets to shows, travel, accommodation and similar.
- b. Being rated in business or professional performance higher than men based on sex rather than based on performance. Principal denounces the practice of more highly rating women based on sex as insulting to her and other women who wish to be treated as ‘equal before the law’ to men.

Principal makes oath that she bonds these oaths with the amount of XXXX Troy Ounces of 99.99% pure gold. This bond amount to be forfeit to any person who can provide evidence to a de jour jury of breaking these oaths such that the jury decision is that the oaths were broken.

This amount is the declaration of what the Principals word is ‘worth’.

Of course, if you have other ideas as to what should go in this affidavit please share on the forums.

Further Principal saith not,

As Good As AVAL

First-Second: Family© Principal. Only in the capacity as beneficiary of
the Original Jurisdiction.

Done this.....Day of the Ninth Month of the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Ten Anno
Domini, (23rd September AD2010) near Dublin, Ireland.

JURAT:

ss: Sworn and subscribed near the city of Dublin, on this day personally appeared before me First-
Second: Family© known to me to be the living breathing life-force free man described herein who
executed the foregoing instrument acknowledged to me that First-Second: Family© executed the same
as his free act and deed as true, correct complete and not misleading.

KNOW all men that I, _____ of Dublin, Ireland, at the request of First-Second:
Family©, there being no notary public readily available, did on the Twenty Third Day of September 2010
Anno Domini, witness the above autograph of First-Second: Family© before

_____ and

_____.

Yours Faithfully,
By,

(Autographed)
All rights reserved.

Witness 1

Date:

Witness 2

17. AFFIDAVIT OF CHATTEL PROPERTY FOR A WOMAN TO A MAN

This section contains the sample text for a woman to declare by way of Affidavit that she wishes to be the chattel property of a man. Typically this will be her father, husband or son. By declaring herself the property of a man the woman is declaring that she wishes the provision and protection of the man and other men and wishes to avail of the typical and traditional "women's privileges" extended by men to women.

Of course in this arrangement the man will perform the traditional roles of provider/protector for the woman. The reason there is no affidavit needed is that his word will be good enough to trust.

The idea is to make it very clear that the woman knows and understands that she is choosing to submit to the man and that she is seeking the provision and protection of the man in return. She is also making clear that the man is the 'head' of the family and that any children ensuing from the relationship with the man are the property of the man. In short. This is very much like the 'traditional' version of marriage.

Lawful Notice To Whom it May Concern Let All Men and Women Know

Month, Day, Year

<Page Break>

Lawful Notice To Whom it May Concern
Let All Men and Women Know

FIAT JUSTITIA, RUAT COELUM

Let Right Be Done, Though The Heavens Should Fall

Notice to principal is notice to agent.

Notice to agent is notice to principal.

I, commonly addressed by the calling of First-Second: Family©, hereinafter the "Principal", in my correct public capacity as beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction, being of majority in age, competent to testify, a self realized and free sentient woman, my yes be yes, my no be no, do state that the truths and facts herein are of first hand personal knowledge, true, correct, complete, not just true and correct, certain and not misleading, so help me God.

This Notice is addressed to all the men and women of Gods creation commonly known as Planet Earth.

AFFIDAVIT WITH RESPECT TO A WOMAN DECLARING HERSELF THE CHATTEL PROPERTY OF A MAN

1. Principal is of legal age and competent to testify.
2. Principal is of legal age and competent to make oath and waive rights.
3. Principal has first hand knowledge of the facts stated herein.

-
4. Principal has not seen or been presented with any material fact or evidence that shows that Principal does not have lawful right to make the oaths and waive the rights noted in this affidavit.
 5. Principal makes oath that she claims to be the lawful chattel property of the man commonly called first-second: last who was born on the land known as <name of the land>.
 6. Principal makes oath that she waives all rights and vests all her God given rights to the man commonly called first-second: last.
 7. Principal makes oath that in any dispute of opinion in any decision making process she will submit to the decision arrived at by the man commonly called first-second: last and put her faith and trust in him that he will act in her best interests.
 8. Principal makes oath that any children that may ensue from the union with the man commonly called first-second that she waives all parental and 'ownership' rights to the child to the man commonly called first-second: last. Principal makes oath that in any dispute of opinion in any decision making process with respect to raising any children that may ensure she will submit to the decision arrived at by the man commonly called first-second: last and put her faith and trust in him that he will act in the best interests of the children
 9. Principal makes claim to the right to avail of traditional chivalry offered by men to the wives of their fellow men.
 10. Principal makes claim she is desirous of the 'provision and protection' of the men of her land such that they will make their best efforts to protect her at all times.
 11. Principal makes claim that she believes women are, on average, significantly smaller and weaker than men and is desirous of claiming an obligation upon men to assist her when in need on the basis of her weaker and smaller physical build.

Principal makes oath that she bonds these oaths with the amount of XXXX Troy Ounces of 99.99% pure gold. This amount to be forfeit to any person who can provide evidence to a de jour jury of breaking these oaths such that the jury decision is that the oaths were broken.

This amount is the declaration of what the Principals word is 'worth'.

Further Principal saith not,

As Good As AVAL

First-Second: Family© Principal. Only in the capacity as beneficiary of
the Original Jurisdiction.

Done this.....Day of the Ninth Month of the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Ten Anno
Domini, (23rd September AD2010) near Dublin, Ireland.

JURAT:

ss: Sworn and subscribed near the city of Dublin, on this day personally appeared before me First-
Second: Family© known to me to be the living breathing life-force free man described herein who
executed the foregoing instrument acknowledged to me that First-Second: Family© executed the same
as his free act and deed as true, correct complete and not misleading.

KNOW all men that I, _____ of Dublin, Ireland, at the request of First-Second:
Family©, there being no notary public readily available, did on the Twenty Third Day of September 2010
Anno Domini, witness the above autograph of First-Second: Family© before

_____ and

_____.

Yours Faithfully,
By,

(Autographed)
All rights reserved.

Witness 1

Date:

Witness 2

18. AGREEMENT OF MARRIAGE BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN

All around the world the 'govement' offers it's 'good help' by offering a 'marriage contract'. However, that contract is not actually given to the people involved, especially the man. He is kept completely in the dark. Further, the 'govement' actually changes that contract over time. The 'marriage contract is fraudulent and one can rescind ones consent to it from the beginning because of the fraud.

This section contains the sample text for a man and a woman to write an Agreement that is a binding contract for the duration of the marriage. This is a template and it is intended that the man and the woman will update it to suit their own beliefs and opinions. There is sample text for a variety of options included into the contract.

The Agreement must be entered into freely without coercion and remains in force for the period of the Agreement. The parties may place an Agreement period or may use 'until death do us part' clause. It is up to them.

The point of the Agreement is that it is an Agreement between the man and the woman and NOT the guvment.

Now. The woman may have created an Affidavit for 'lawful equality to men' or 'chattel property to a man' and either Affidavit might be reflected in the marriage contract. No matter what form of Affidavit the woman has completed the template Marriage Agreement can be updated to reflect the claims the woman has made.

The purpose of the Marriage Agreement is for **YOU**, the man, to have clarity as to the Agreement you are entering into and to remove the women's 'privilege' of not being responsible for the Agreements she makes.

Of course, if you are already married you can rescind your existing Marriage License and re-write your marriage using the template Marriage Agreement as the basis for customisation.

I would strongly encourage **ALL MEN** to rescind their fraudulent marriage licenses and create a Marriage Agreement such that you have clarity and a lawful basis on which to built your marriage.

It does not matter if your wife refuses to rescind your fraudulent marriage license. You can do that unilaterally and I have provided the Affidavit for that.

Once you have gone through the process of rebutting your marriage license via affidavit and then issuing your default judgment you are no longer 'married' in the eyes of your 'govement'. Any man who does not get himself out of the hell known as the 'Marriage License' to the 'govement' when it is so easy to do now is an idiot who deserves everything coming his way from a vindictive soon to be ex-wife.

ALL MEN who read this are asked to get out there and tell **ALL MARRIED MEN** how to rescind their fraudulent 'Marriage License' and to 'divorce' the 'govement'.

If your wife complains about you rescinding your consent to be married and you really want to be married to her then she can complete a Marriage Agreement with you.

ALL MEN should be well aware that this means that those of you who are doing 'cheaper to keep her' can now get rid of any wife you don't like at a **FAR BETTER** price than has been possible in the past. Women have been responsible for 90%+ of divorces over the last 30-40 years when offered 'babies and money' by the 'govement'? Well? They have nothing to complain about if men seek a little 'equality' in that 90% number and divorce those women whom they have found to be unsatisfactory wives.

And my personal message to all those manginas like Barrack Obama who so continually talk about 'dead beat dads' and so continually run men down?

FUCK YOU MANGINA. YOU GET NO RESPECT FROM ME.

I would encourage **ALL MEN** to tell those manginas who so consistently talk about 'dead beat dads' exactly the same. Barrack Obama is one of the most disgusting pieces of shit walking this planet today given his incessant unjust vilification of men.

I do not respect **ANY MAN** who votes for uber-mangina Obama.

MARRIAGE AGREEMENT

ABC-20100101-MA

Non-negotiable – Private between the Parties

PARTIES

MAN

First-second: last(c)

WOMAN

First-second: last(c)

This Marriage Agreement is mutually agreed upon and entered into in this Nineteenth Day of the Tenth Month in the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Nine between the Man first-second: last(c) and the Woman first-second: last(c).

Words Defined; Glossary of Terms. As used in this Marriage Agreement, the following words and terms express the meanings set forth as follows, *non obstante*:

Appellation. In this Marriage Agreement the term “appellation” means: A general term that introduces and specifies a particular term which may be used in addressing, greeting, calling out for, and making appeals of a particular living, breathing, flesh-and-blood man or woman.

Derivative. In this Marriage Agreement the term “derivative” means coming from another; taken from something preceding; secondary; that which has not the origin in itself, but obtains existence from something foregoing and of a more primal and fundamental nature; anything derived from another.

Ens legis. In this Marriage Agreement the term “ens legis” means a creature of the law; an artificial being, as contrasted with a natural person, such as a corporation, considered as deriving its existence entirely from the law.

Marriage Agreement. In this Marriage Agreement the term “Marriage Agreement” means this Marriage Agreement ABC-20100101-MA, as this Marriage Agreement may be amended and modified in accordance with the agreement of the parties signing hereunder, together with all attachments, exhibits, documents, endorsements, and schedules re this Marriage Agreement attached hereto.

Arbitration Panel. In this Marriage Agreement the term “Arbitration Panel” means a panel of 12 living souls of 6 men and 6 women who have been in a state of marriage for 20 years or longer and have one child of 18 years of age or older. This Arbitration Panel is to hear disputes and to take into consideration the best interests of the children, the community, and the disputing couple to issue Remedy Instruction to resolve the dispute. The Arbitration Panel does NOT have the full powers of a properly convened court de jour and does not follow all the guidelines of a de jour court.

De Jour Court and De Jour Jury. In this Marriage Agreement the terms “De Jour Court” and “De Jour Jury” means a panel of 12 living souls of men empanelled under oath to hear a criminal case of injury, harm or loss by a plaintiff against a defendant. All decisions of the de jour jury must be unanimous. All Remedy Instructions issued by the de jour Jury must be unanimous. In this Marriage Agreement the de jour Jury can be invoked by either party when there is an unresolved complaint of criminal behaviour such as physical violence by one party against another. A de jour jury in a de jour court is the highest authority in the land and can issue Remedy Instructions that must be obeyed by any Government Instrument.

first-second: family. In this Marriage Agreement the term “first-second : family” means the sentient, living, breathing, flesh-and-blood man identified by the distinctive appellation “First-second: family©.”

first-second: family. In this Marriage Agreement the term “first-second : family” means the sentient, living, breathing, flesh-and-blood woman identified by the distinctive appellation “First-second: family©.”

Juristic person. In this Marriage Agreement the term “juristic person” means an abstract, legal entity *ens legis*, such as a corporation, created by construct of law and considered as possessing certain legal rights and duties of a human being; an imaginary entity, such as Debtor, i.e. FIRST SECOND FAMILY, which, on the basis of legal reasoning, is legally treated as a human being for the purpose of conducting commercial activity for the benefit of a biological, living being, such as Creditor.

Man or Living, breathing, flesh-and-blood man. In this Marriage Agreement the term “living, breathing, flesh-and-blood man” means the man, first-second: last©, a sentient, living being, as distinguished from an artificial construct, ens legis, i.e. a juristic person, created by construct of law.

Woman or Living, breathing, flesh-and-blood woman. In this Marriage Agreement the term “living, breathing, flesh-and-blood woman” means the woman, first-second: last©, a sentient, living being, as distinguished from an artificial construct, ens legis, i.e. a juristic person, created by construct of law.

Non obstante. In this Marriage Agreement the term “non obstante” means: Words anciently used in public and private instruments with the intent of precluding, in advance, any interpretation other than certain declared objects, purposes

Sentient, living being. In this Marriage Agreement the term “sentient, living being” means the man or woman, i.e. first-second: last© or first-second: last©, a living, breathing, flesh-and-blood man, as distinguished from an abstract legal construct such as an artificial entity, juristic person, corporation, partnership, association, and the like.

This Marriage Agreement ABC-20100101-MA is dated: the Nineteenth Day of the Tenth Month in the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Nine.

Terms of Performance for the Man

(In this section the man is required to document what his obligations and expectations for his performance are.)

1. The man will make his best efforts to provide food, shelter, clothing, warmth and comfort for the woman and any children born of the woman.
2. The man will make his best efforts to provide education for any children born of the woman such that the children have the best opportunity the man can possibly provide for the children.
3. Should the woman fall ill the man will make his best efforts to provide for her well-being.
4. The man undertakes that he has no unilateral right of action within the household. All actions required two 'yeses' and both parties have veto over any decision. The only exception is the disciplining of any children born of the woman that may be necessary. The man has unilateral decision making power over the disciplining of the children.

Terms of Performance for the Woman

1. The woman will make her best efforts to provide food, shelter, clothing, warmth and comfort for the man in the period before any children she may be lucky enough to bear.
2. Should the woman bear children she will make her best efforts to provide care and nurturing for the best outcome for the children.
3. Should the woman bear children she reserves the right to return to work and place the children into care. The care arrangement must be agreed by the man. The woman has no unilateral decision making rights towards the mans children. Both parties must be in agreement with all decisions relating to the welfare of the children.
4. Should the man fall ill the woman will make her best efforts to provide for his well-being.
5. The man and the woman may wish to negotiate the question of sex and intimacy in this section. For example the man is taking on the obligation to make his best efforts to provide food, shelter, clothing etc. The wise man who wishes to make sure his wife will give him the sex he needs will write what he wants in this section of the Agreement. If nothing is written, then he is pretty much accepting that no sex will happen.
6. The woman undertakes that she has no unilateral right of action within the household. All actions required two 'yeses' and both parties have veto over any decision. The only exception is the disciplining of any children born of the woman that may be necessary. The man has unilateral decision making power over the disciplining of the children.

Property Rights

1. On the birth of a child by the woman the man has the right to perform a paternity test to ensure that the baby is his biological baby.
2. All property rights are vested in the man and he can delegate signing rights to various instruments to the woman.
3. The man and the woman are vested with property rights and each retains their own property. A set of 'joint property' is to be created and this joint property will be accessible to both the man and the woman over their signatures independently. This may include such joint property as bank accounts, motor vehicles, household furniture and the like.
4. None of the property of the man or woman is to be transferred to any government department via 'registration'. This includes the house, motor vehicles, children or any other property that is commonly registered in the ignorance that registration is required.

Force Majeure

1. Neither party can be held responsible for contract violation due to incidents that are outside of their reasonable or possible control. This includes such things as Acts of God, victims of criminal actions, genuine illness and similar difficult circumstances that neither party can control.

Remedy Procedure

Should the two parties have a dispute which can not be resolved then the remedy procedure for Agreement continuance is as follows:

1. Each party prepare Affidavits and swap them with each other.
2. Each party prepare responding Affidavits until such time as all responses are exhausted.
3. The parties empanel an Arbitration Panel.
4. The parties present their affidavits to the Arbitration Panel.
5. The Arbitration Panel reads the affidavits and can ask questions of the Parties which are answered under oath.
6. Any incidence of Perjury results in the Marriage Agreement being immediately terminated and all property and children being placed with the injured party. The injured party then has all right to determine how to proceed.
7. The Arbitration Panel will retire to privately discuss the Remedy Instruction that they will issue.
8. The Arbitration Panel issues the Remedy Instruction and both parties are obliged to make best efforts to implement the Remedy Instruction.
9. Should either party refuse to perform their allotted Remedy Instruction all joint Property and any children are transferred to the Injured Party and the Agreement is terminated.
10. The Arbitration Panel may order a portion of the property owned by the refusing party to also be transferred to the Injured Party.

Under NO circumstances can the Arbitration Panel issue any order for future income of the man or woman to be transferred to the other party. Should the Agreement be terminated there can be no future obligations placed upon either party as there is no Agreement by which to place those obligations. If the woman wants the benefit of the children she can pay for them. If the man wants the benefit of the children he can pay for them. Period.

Penalty Clauses

The following penalty clauses apply to this contract:

1. Sexual intercourse with a third party without the expressed written notarised consent of the other party is strictly forbidden. Any such sexual intercourse proven will result in the termination of the Agreement. Children born of the woman will be transferred to the injured party. All joint property and all property of the injuring party will be transferred to the injured party. The Agreement will then terminate.
2. Sexual intercourse with a third party is agreed to under the terms of this Agreement.
3. Physical assault of one party by another party is subject to common law on the basis of causing injury harm or loss. The injured party can make claim and make request for remedy. Should the injuring party not perform the proposed remedy the injured party can bring the matter to a de jour court with a jury of 12 men and present the case. Both parties agree to be bound by the decision of the de jour jury.
4. Physical assault of one party to a child of the marriage is strictly forbidden. This does NOT include the normal disciplining of children that is required. The man will be the sole arbiter as to the use of force on a child for the purpose of disciplining the child.

Should the woman physically assault the child the man can complete an Affidavit and propose remedy. Should the woman not perform the Proposed Remedy then the man can bring the Affidavits and evidence to a de jour court and a de jour jury of 12 men can hear the case and issue a Remedy Instruction.

The woman undertakes to make best efforts to perform the Remedy Instruction. Should the woman refuse to make remedy the de jour jury will issue instruction to transfer the children to the man, all property to the man, and terminate the Agreement.

5. The man and woman may also write in other penalty clauses such as:
 - a. Should either party make demeaning or insulting remarks to any third party with obvious intent to cause emotional distress to the other party then a penalty of xxxxxxxx will be applied.
 - b. Should either party lie be word or lie by omission of word to the other party then a penalty of xxxxxxxx will be applied.

Under no circumstances may either party employ the services of any government agency nor the services of any 'Family Law Lawyer' to bring dispute to the Marriage Agreement.

Should a party sign any contract with any government re-presentative or family law lawyer then the all property and the children will be forfeit to the injured party immediately and the Agreement will terminate immediately.

This is put in here to put those scumbag family law lawyers and judges out of business.

They should be flipping burgers.

Contract Termination

Should the woman bear a child that is not the child of the man then:

1. This Agreement is automatically terminated.
2. The child becomes the lawful property of the man who is the biological father.
3. All property of the woman is forfeit to the man.
4. The man shall decide how he chooses to move forward and is not bound by any clauses in this contract.

This contract is set to run from the date of 2010-01-01 until the date of 2020-12-31.

At the end of this contact property will be split as follows:

1. All personal property of the man and woman will remain with the man and the woman.
2. All joint property will be split as nearly as 50/50 as is possible.
3. Any dispute will be taken to an Arbitration Panel.

With respect to children the following applies:

1. Should any minor children remain in the household they will be transferred to the man and he shall be solely responsible for their upbringing to the age of 18.
2. Should any minor children remain in the household they will go with the same sex parent and that parent shall be solely responsible for their upbringing.
3. Should any minor children remain in the household they will be transferred to the woman and she shall be solely responsible for their upbringing to the age of 18.

With respect to any monies earned after the agreement termination both parties are in agreement that no claim can be made on future incomes as the agreement is no longer in force and can not be used to make claims on future monies.

Man

Woman

Autograph

Autograph

Printed Calling

Printed Calling

Date

Date

KNOW all men that I, _____ of London, England, at the request of first-second: last and first-second: last did on the Nineteenth Day of October 2009 Anno Domini, witness the above autograph first-second: last and first-second: last before

_____ and

_____.

Yours Faithfully,
By,

(Autographed)
All rights reserved.

Witness 1

Date:

Witness 2

19. THE ARBITRATION PANEL

I have proposed an Arbitration Panel for the resolution of dispute or divorce between a man and a woman where they have created that marriage using the Marriage Agreement.

There are **MANY** reasons why I propose this. Not the least of which is that the 'Family Courts' are a satanic criminal enterprise used to enslave men. However, there are occasions when a divorce is something that would actually be beneficial to the parties involved. There are actually men who are terrible fathers and husbands, and there are actually women who are terrible wives and mothers. No man, or woman, should be forced to be shackled to one of these if there is clear evidence that severe violence and threat of severe injury exists. The normal 'rough and tumble' of relationships is not an excuse for a divorce, in my opinion. And this ludicrous "I don't like the one I picked" nonsense has to stop because it injures the children so badly.

In my opinion, the one who breaks the Marriage Agreement must be required to make Remedy according to the unanimous decision of the Arbitration Panel. There can be no 'consequence free breach of Agreement allowed. If there is? Then Agreement are worthless.

The proposal for the Arbitration Panel is as follows:

1. To contain 6 men and 6 women.
2. These men and women must have been married for 20+ years. Not necessarily to each other but if some 'married couples' were on the panel I would say this is a good thing.
3. Each person on the panel must have raised at least one child to the age of 18 years.
4. Decisions from the Arbitration Panel must be unanimous. This includes verdicts of innocence or guilt of breach of Agreement as well as Remedy Instructions for the people involved.
5. All Remedy Instructions are to be sex neutral. This means that Arbitration Panels must take into account the prior Remedy Instructions of other Arbitration Panels in issuing a Remedy Instruction. Such prior cases might be referenced by a person who is nominated as an 'expert advisor' to the Arbitration Panel.

By using prior decisions for Remedy Instructions on a sex neutral basis the tendency for women to be given 'pussy passes' will be removed because the same 'pass' will be required to be given to men in the same situation. The Arbitration Panel will not have the ability to discriminate against men as the satanic criminal Family Courts do today.

6. All evidence given to the Arbitration Panel is given into the Public under oath and can be reviewed by any person over the age of 18 at a later date.
7. Deliberations of the Arbitration Panel will be video and audio recorded so that any attempt to subvert the process of dispute settlement can be detected at a later date. Since serving on the Arbitration Panel is performed under oath any attempt to subvert it is the crime of perjury and the Panelist is subject to the common law punishment for Perjury should he/she be found guilty of this crime.
8. The only way that the Arbitration Panel can vary from this proposal is if both parties sign an Affidavit agreeing to the alterations from the 'standard' Arbitration Panel.
9. The person found to be 'in the wrong' pays for the costs of the Arbitration Panel.
10. Should the Arbitration Panel be invoked on an amicable agreement basis to issue Instructions for the termination of the Marriage Agreement then payment for the panellists is to be made from the joint assets of the man and woman prior to any disbursement of assets from the couple.
11. The recommended payment for the Panelists is one ounce of silver per hour of service. Should any panellist attempt to 'pad' the deliberations for personal benefit they can be accused of the crime of theft.

-
12. The recommended payment for the 'expert advisor' to the panel is two ounces of silver per hour. This is because he will have to read through many transcripts to determine the outcomes of OTHER cases and he will not be paid for this time of reading transcripts for OTHER cases. He must make his money up for this time by being paid at a higher rate when exercising his knowledge of other cases gained in his own time.

Should you have other suggestions for the Arbitration Panel please feel free to post them to the forums.

It is my belief that such an Arbitration Panel will be a far more effective instrument to end Marriages that are in severe trouble than the current satanic criminal family courts.

20. **RESCIND YOUR PRESUMED CONSENT TO THE 'MARRIAGE CONTRACT'**

One of the most important things in this document is the following affidavit that you can then follow up with a default judgement. If you are **ALREADY MARRIED** then you, sir, are **WELL ADVISED** to rescind the implied consent that you have agreed to the 'Marriage Contract' that people talk about.

In **ALL THE FORMER BRITISH EMPIRE LANDS** the 'marriage contract' is a fraudulent contract. There are four key elements of a contract for that contract to be lawful.

1. Full Disclosure – Meaning that both parties must be fully open in setting and agreeing upon the details and the terms of the contract. Both parties must be left with no doubt or confusion about the terms set out in the contract.
2. Consideration – Meaning 'that which is offered' in the agreement. The "Consideration" must be something that all parties to the contract agree is of enough value to involve their participation in the contract. .
3. Terms and Conditions – Meaning the structure and the requirements of the agreement and the obligations of each or all of the involved parties.
4. Signature – This is the most important part of the Contract and is the proof that the agreement took place. It also implies 'consensus ad idem' or a 'meeting of the minds'.

If the contract is not lawful then it can be rescinded. This comes from the fundamental position in common law of "to not use fraud in your contracts". The re-representatives of "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" make the presumption that when signing the "Certificate of Marriage" that you are entering into a three way binding contract with "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA". They are claiming the following:

1. That they are the superior party to a three party contract.
2. That they own **ALL PROCEEDS** of the marriage including **ALL PROPERTY, ALL CHILDREN** and any other assets that are brought to the marriage from prior efforts as well!!

So? Here is a question for you if you are a married man? Where you ever presented with a contract, namely a set of pieces of paper, that provided:

1. **FULL DISCLOSURE**
2. **MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL CONSIDERATION**
3. **TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

For your 'marriage'?

And did you ever discuss this contract with a re-representative of "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" such that you had a "meeting of the minds" and did this re-representative of "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" sign this contract in your presence such that it was clear to all parties as to the nature of this contract?

And if you, Sir, did NOT have this? You are the victim of a fraudulent contract and you can rescind that contract from the beginning. You can complete your Affidavit, Proposed Remedy and Notice of Intent should you wish to, and should the re-representatives of "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" not be able to show you the contracts signed under the conditions above you can create a default judgment and send it back off to Gillard and Krew saying that you are no longer legally married and **NEVER WERE LEGALLY MARRIED** because the presumed contract was **NEVER VALID** as the presumptions were based on a fraud.

Yes Sir. If you want? You can divorce "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" and your WIFE and she has no recourse to the 'FAMILY LAW' or to the FAMILY COURTS the minute you issue the default judgment.

Update: 2011-03-24. I have now served on Julia Gillard my Default Judgement for my rescinding my presumed consent to the marriage contract from the beginning. No rebuttal was forthcoming.

How do you go about 'divorcing' "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" and your wife?

Simple.

Take the following Affidavit and customise it to your own needs. Send it off to the 'usual list of suspects' depending on the country in which you live. In Australia that would be the Prime Minister, Governor General, Attorney General and the Queen, just to be nice to Lizzy to let her know one more of her slaves has 'run off the plantation'.

Then, given an appropriate time period like 2-3 weeks, if the re-representatives of "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" have not produced the correct paperwork, and they won't, you issue a default judgment to rescind any implied consent to be married.

This procedure works whether you perform a Strawman Recapture or not. This affidavit is performed at the common law level. You were tricked into believing you had a contract with "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" when you did not. And fraud can never be the basis for a lawful contract. When fraud is used to make presumption of a lawful contract that contract is NEVER in force. It is 'null and void' from the beginning (ab initio).

What does this mean? This means I have just put into the public the lawful mechanism for ANY MAN IN AUSTRALIA, or indeed the former British Colonies, to divorce their wives and NOT be subject to 'Family Law'! How about that? Any man who wishes to send me a donation via paypal would be most appreciated!!! The donation button is on the front page of my website!

Quite seriously. **ANY MAN** who does not **IMMEDIATELY** rescind his consent to be "married" to "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" and is subsequently taken to the cleaners by 'wifey'? I will no longer have any sympathy for such men. Really. I can't do **ANY MORE** than give them the paperwork to complete.

Now. Women are going to bitch and moan that I have done this. GOOD! They are going to say:

"Peter-Andrew: Nolan(c) is a scumbag because he promotes divorce?"

Western women are hypocrites. They have been promoting divorce for decades and they have been vicious and ruthless about it as well. They can say whatever they like about me. The women who have been good and loving wives to their husbands have nothing to fear. The husband can rescind his consent to be married to "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" unilaterally and he can sign up a 'Marriage Agreement' with the wife he is happy with.

The only women who have anything to fear from this paperwork are women who have been complete bitches to their husbands whom the husband would be very happy to be without. **THOSE** women **SHOULD** be worried. Any man who divorces one of **THOSE** women? **GOOD LUCK TO HIM!**

I worked for over 18 months to enrol women into the possibility of discussing the vast bias in the courts, the 'pussy pass for perjury' and the deaths of so many men. Western women **REFUSED TO DISCUSS THIS ISSUE.**

When I walked into the Australian Federal Magistrates Court on November 26th 2009 and proved my remedy? That was the last day that women could have offered a 'peace offering' to go forward. Women hated on me for 18 months while I created my remedy? Well? Now they only have themselves to blame that I am making that remedy available to ALL MEN in the former British empire. All common law lands.

This document will work in such places as:

Australia
Ireland
USA
Canada
New Zealand
INDIA (I LOVE THAT!!)
And all the other 'Commonwealth' countries.

20.1. What about current assets?

I would suggest that **ALL MEN** of any significant means get a bank account in a **THIRD PARTY JURISDICTION AS SOON AS YOU CAN**.

Just because you have contracts in place does **NOT** mean that the **PTB** will not try and steal from you. You are well advised to get your money out of **THEIR** system as soon as you can because **THEIR** system is on the downhill run. You can put your 'money' into a foreign jurisdiction or you can turn it into silver (I think gold has been cornered by the Illuminati) or some other form of persistent wealth.

I propose that I will run a service to get bank accounts created in Switzerland because I have dealings quite close to Switzerland. The going rate for foreigners opening up a bank account in Switzerland via an 'agency' is EUR700 or so for the 'agency'. This is quite a fair fee for the legwork involved. I could make a very good business of that. There is no law saying that you can not open a bank account in Switzerland or any other third party jurisdiction if you want to. Certainly the Swiss will be happy to have your 'money'.

I also know men in Australia who are working on creating a bank that they will run. When it is off the ground that will be another option. Once it is off the ground I will announce the details on my web site.

If you have a house and a mortgage? I would recommend you learn how to clear your mortgage so that you owe the bank no 'money'. Once you do that? Sell your house immediately and turn the asset into something that the Illuminati can not steal from you. The Illuminati has a plan to 'seize' all houses even if you have claimed it back through your strawman. This plan includes "guns, lots of guns".

If you have NOT somehow reclaimed your house back from your 'strawman' the government still owns it and you are a tenant in your own house. This is how they make you pay land taxes lawfully and legally.

Sir? If your wife gives you **ANY STATIC** about clearing out your mortgage and selling the house so that you can put **YOUR ASSETS** out of the reach of the **CRIMINALS** in the government? **ANY STATIC AT ALL?** You **KNOW** what that means. You don't need me to tell you.

Women bring 90%+ of **ALL** divorces (those numbers provided by women by the way) and the women have been making out like bandits in divorces for decades. The women know this. Hell, so do most men. So all those **INTELLIGENT MEN OUT THERE?** You are going to use this paperwork and then move on. You might stay 'married' or you might leave. But whatever it is you do? You will have **YOUR ASSETS** beyond the reach of **YOUR WIFE** and the **CRIMINALS** in the government.

And that is a **REAL** smart idea.

Just remember men. I was stripped of 95% of the assets I created over a 25 year period. Once you take into account 'legal fees' I was out about EUR40,000 for 25 years of work. Women **LAUGHED** at me. So I say no man should have **ANY SYMPATHY** for the women's loss of ability to screw you over via the courts. The women have done this **RUTHLESSLY** for decades now. Men have pleaded with the women **FOR DECADES** to stop doing this. And they refused to. Well? All I am doing is setting the playing field level.

I am not suggesting men rip women off. I am suggesting that women have **THEIR** ability to rip men off removed. Experience in the US has shown that if the woman does **NOT** massively financially benefit from divorce that the divorce rate drops like a stone.

Those US states where divorce laws were very biased and they were changed BACK to 50/50 custody is standard unless PROOF of wrong doing and no alimony because of the 50/50 custody? Those states saw divorce rates drop like a stone. Well? We are likely to see the same in the west. Once women are no longer able to screw a man over in the courts? I believe we are going to see women return to be a whole lot nicer people rather than the complete bitches so many western women have been these last 40 years. Try reading www.the-spearhead.com to read about how horrible women have been to men of late.

Gentlemen?

1. Divorce your state. Why would you want to be married to your government?
2. Get your money out of the country before your country gets your money out of you.
3. THEN decide if you still want to be married. Be a free man who is married, not a slave. Or leave. Up to you!

From the free man commonly called
Peter-Andrew: Nolan©,
Standing in God's Kingdom
In Care Of xxxxxxxxxxxx

To:

Lawful Notice To Respondent:

**The human being calling herself Julia Gillard also claiming to act as Prime Minister of the Company
commonly known as 'THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA'**

PO Box 6022

House of Re-Presentatives

Parliament House

Canberra ACT 2600

Phone: + 61-2-6277-7700

Fax: +61-2-6273-4100

1st November 2010

Lawful Notice To Respondent:

The human being calling herself Julia Gillard also claiming to act as Prime Minister of the Company commonly known as 'THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA'

PO Box 6022
House of Re-presentatives
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

1st November 2010

FIAT JUSTITIA, RUAT COELUM

Let Right Be Done, Though The Heavens Should Fall

Notice to principal is notice to agent.

Notice to agent is notice to principal.

I, commonly addressed by the calling of Peter-Andrew: Nolan©, hereinafter the "Principal", in my correct public capacity as beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction, being of majority in age, competent to testify, a self realized and free sentient man, my yes be yes, my no be no, do state that the truths and facts herein are of first hand personal knowledge, true, correct, complete, not just true and correct, certain and not misleading, so help me God.

This Notice is addressed to the the human being calling herself Julia Gillard also claiming to act as Prime Minister of the Company commonly known as 'THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA'.

**AFFIDAVIT WITH RESPECT TO
RESCINDING CONSENT TO A MARRIAGE LICENSE
AND IMPLIED CONTRACTS
BETWEEN
JENNIFER MARGUERITE ROBINSON
AND
PETER ANDREW NOLAN**

1. Principal is of legal age and competent to testify.
2. Principal has first hand knowledge of the facts stated herein.
3. Principal makes oath that on the date of 7th of October 1989 he and Jennifer Marguerite Robinson undertook the ceremony of 'Marriage' in St Pauls Church, Fernleigh Road, Turvey Park Wagga Wagga, New South Wales on a land commonly known as Australia.
4. Principal makes oath that he applied his signature to a document called "Certificate of Marriage" which is headed as "Commonwealth of Australia – Marriage Act – Registered Number 35078".
5. Principal makes oath that the "celebrant" that did countersign this "Certificate of Marriage" was a man that presented himself as a "Minister of the Anglican Church" by the name of John Cohen. A man known to myself and my bride for some time to be re-presenting himself as a "Minister of the Anglican Church".

-
6. Principal makes oath that the extract of the "Certificate of Marriage" shows that it was "registered at Sydney, NEW SOUTH WALES" on 20th of December 1989 and signed by a said "Principal Registrar" the name of whom is not discernable from the signature.
 7. Principal makes oath that he was not present at the signing of the "Certificate of Marriage" by said "Principal Registrar" on 20th December 1989 and at no time did said "Principal Registrar" contact Principal and discuss or disclose any claimed conditions of any implied contract associated with this "Certificate of Marriage".
 8. Principal makes oath that at the date of signing this "Certificate of Marriage" no evidence was presented to Principal as to what the "COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" actually was.
 9. Principal makes oath that only after extensive reading and research did he find in 2008 that the COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA is a sovereign entity registered on the UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION and is merely a privately held run for profit corporation and not, as represented, a Constitutional Monarchy run by a government working in the best interests of the people who inhabit the land mass commonly known as AUSTRALIA. Further. This corporation was only registered on the UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION in 1999 after the 'referendum' on Australia becoming a republic which was a fraudulent referendum to my knowledge.
 10. Principal makes oath that he has never, at any time, been presented with any evidence of the lawful and legal existence of an entity known as "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" at the time he signed the "Certificate of Marriage".
 11. Principal makes oath that to his certain knowledge the alleged terms and conditions of the "Marriage Act 1961" were varied since 7th of October 1989. This has been done by successive "Acts of Parliament" by which the "Marriage Act" and "Family Law Act" have been vastly altered in the period between 7th of October 1989 to 11th November 2007.
 12. Principal makes oath that he has seen no facts or material evidence to the effect that:
For a contract to be binding it does NOT require all of the following and sincerely believes none exists:
 - i. Full Disclosure – Meaning that both parties must be fully open in setting and agreeing upon the details and the terms of the contract. Both parties must be left with no doubt or confusion about the terms set out in the contract.
 - ii. Consideration – Meaning 'that which is offered' in the agreement. The "Consideration" must be something that all parties to the contract agree is of enough value to involve their participation in the contract. .
 - iii. Terms and Conditions – Meaning the structure and the requirements of the agreement and the obligations of each or all of the involved parties.
 - iv. Signature – This is the most important part of the Contract and is the proof that the agreement took place. It also implies 'consensus ad idem' or a 'meeting of the minds'.
 13. Principal makes oath that he has seen no facts or material evidence to the effect that:
Once a contract is executed by the signing of the involved parties that the contract can be altered without such documents as a contract amendment or contract variation that must also be in writing and must also meet the 4 conditions listed above for the contract amendment to be binding and sincerely believes none exists
 14. Principal makes oath that the 'Terms and Conditions' to the "Certificate of Marriage" that the entity calling itself "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" re-presented by the non-present party calling himself "Principal Registrar" at no time attached or presented the "Terms and Conditions" claimed to be the "Marriage Act of 1961" to the "Certificate of Marriage".

-
15. Principal makes oath that he never had full disclosure of the alleged “contract” as he was led to believe that the “Marriage Certificate” was a “formality” and did was not in any way, shape or form create a “contract” with the legal entity calling itself “THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA”.
 16. Principal makes oath that at no time did the man calling himself John Cohen and presenting himself as a “minister” of the Anglican Church say that he was also acting as an agent of the entity calling itself “THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA” and therefore Principal makes Oath that it was at no time disclosed that the there would be a presumption that signing the “Certificate of Marriage” would create any sort of binding contract with the entity calling itself “THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA”.
 17. Principal makes oath that at no time did any self declared re-presentative of the entity calling itself “THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA” make offer of consideration in exchange for signing an alleged contract.
 18. Principal makes oath that at no time did any self declared re-presentative of the entity calling itself “THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA” make presentation that the “Certificate of Marriage” was a three way binding contract with “THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA” being the superior party and claiming ownership and title of all property and offspring of the Principal and his bride Jennifer Marguerite Toal.

Therefore be it now known to any and all concerned and affected parties, that I, the free man on the land commonly called Peter-Andrew: Nolan© standing in Gods Kingdom do hereby say clearly, specifically and unequivocally that I rescind any presumed consent to enter into any contract with the entity known as “THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA” via the signature of the Trademark named PETER ANDREW NOLAN via the document commonly called a “Certificate of Marriage”.

Furthermore, I claim that all actions deriving from the claim of “THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA” that it had a lawful contract must be compensated under the Proposed Remedy or by a common law de jour jury or any such mechanism as can be found to be effective.

Further Principal saith not,

As Good As AVAL

Peter-Andrew: Nolan© Principal. Only in the capacity as beneficiary of
the Original Jurisdiction. Third party Intervener and aggrieved party.

Done this.....Day of the Eleventh Month of the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand and Ten Anno Domini, (4th
November AD2010) near London, England.

JURAT:

ss: Sworn and subscribed near the city of London, on this day personally appeared before me Peter-Andrew:
Nolan© known to me to be the living breathing life-force free man described herein who executed the foregoing
instrument acknowledged to me that Peter-Andrew: Nolan© executed the same as his free act and deed as true,
correct complete and not misleading.

KNOW all men that I, _____ of London, England, at the request of Peter-Andrew:
Nolan©, there being no notary public readily available, did on the Fourth Day of November 2010 Anno Domini,
witness the above autograph of Peter-Andrew: Nolan© before

_____ and

_____.

Yours Faithfully,
By,

(Autographed)

All rights reserved.

Witness 1

Date:

Witness 2

Proposed Remedy

The re-representatives of "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" have made quite a nuisance of themselves to the Principal these last three years.

The loss sustained by Principal has been in excess of \$A350,000. The Principal has had his house stolen and sold against his will, his children kidnapped against his will. He has been subject to extortion and theft. All these crimes were predicated and perpetrated by re-representatives of "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" based on the false claim that there was a binding contract created by the placing of the Principals Signature on the "Certificate of Marriage".

Therefore, Principal claims the following damages to be paid as fair and just compensation for the loss of property, 'money, children, and time taken to remedy this crime against him.

Loss of Property:	\$A290,000	
Loss of Money: Watts McCray:	\$A45,000	
Time and effort for Remedy:	\$A100,000	(1,000 hours at \$A100/hour)
General pain and suffering:	\$A100,000	
Loss of children:	\$A2	(\$A1 per child)
Total:	\$A535,002.	

This amount to be placed into the following account by 25th December 2010.

Name:	Peter Nolan
Address:	c/- xxxxxxxxxxxxxx Wagga Wagga NSW 2650
Bank:	St. George Bank
BSB:	xxxxxxxxxx
Account Number:	xxxxxxxxxx

Since Respondent is well aware that "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" can create this 'money' out of nothing with no effort or expense at all Respondent is encouraged to take 'the easy way out' of simply making a 'payment' of 'mythical money' and we can all live happily ever after.

Should the Respondent believe that there is any false point on the above affidavit or wish to contest Principals Claim then counter claim my be lodged with the Principal by the date of 30th November 2010.

Should no response be forthcoming it will be determined that Respondent has accepted the points of this Affidavit and a Default Judgement will be generated by the Principal and sent to the Respondent.

Notice of Intent

The re-representatives of the "THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA" have been singularly unwilling to respond to prior Lawful Notices. Just in case the Respondent continues this trend Principal wishes to make clear his Intent should this Remedy Payment not be made by 25th December 2010.

Principal retains the right to issue a default judgement on his own signature and authority as Beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction, to place liens against the property of Respondent or to form a court dejour and present matters of fact to the court de jour to make a judgement as to any and all violations of the property rights of Principal and any remedy for those violations.

Principal advises Respondent that non-response is considered dis-honour under law and that Principal reserves the right to generate default judgments by his own signature and authority as Beneficiary to the Original Jurisdiction, place liens against the Respondents property to be seized by the appropriate Sheriff, or convene a court dejour to persue remedy should Respondent choose to go into dis-honour.

Yours Sincerely
By

Peter-Andrew: Nolan©
Human Being

Signed

All Rights, Privileges and Powers Reserved Without
Prejudice

Date: _____

21. A WORD ON PROSTITUTION

One man who commented on what I was writing told me “I suggest you make a comment on prostitution in your book.”

I thought that was a good idea. So here it is. My opinion about prostitution. Men can make of it what they will.

Prostitution is only ‘illegal’. It is not unlawful. The legislation and statutes that apply to prostitution only apply to your strawman. They do not apply to you, the human being. If you and some woman wish to come to some agreement as to exchanging something that you both see is of value and that transaction is agreeable to you both then no-one else has any right to tell you what you can and can not do. You can lawfully notice your local Policy Enforcement Officers of this and tell them that should they try to enforce their legislation on you that you will seek justice in a properly convened court de jour.

Western women are liars and hypocrites and prostitution is one of their BIGGEST lies. Their expressed opinion of prostitution exposes their hypocrisy in spades.

Hundreds of millions of women claim “My body my choice” when it comes to killing their own babies. Um? What exactly is the mans choice in the murder of HIS baby? Oh, that’s right, men don’t have babies, men have liabilities, and don’t you men forget that. Women claim they can kill the baby of a man at any time it is in the womb. Go check it out if you do not believe me. The few women who do NOT claim this stand by and allow other women to do this. The 2 BILLION abortions that are estimated to have taken place since 1970 make it pretty clear what women think about “my body my choice”.

But, with all this ‘empowerment’ and ‘my body my choice’ what do women say about **OTHER** women who are willing to have sex for money? Oh? **THOSE** women are not entitled to ‘my body my choice’. **THOSE** women must be stopped from being ‘evil prostitutes’ while they have a right to be an ‘enlightened and celebrated baby killer’.

Really? And who, exactly is hurt by the act of prostitution? No one. There is no dead foetus in the garbage bin at the end of a ‘roll in the hay’ between a man and a woman like there is at the end of an abortion.

The whole issue of women denouncing prostitution is one area where their lies and hypocrisy are so ‘in your face’ that you simply can not make excuses for them and believe the rubbish they come up with. Either an adult is free to do as they please where they cause no injury, harm or loss to anyone else, or they are not.

Women and their mangina lackeys are the **ONLY** people who are so hypocritical they will argue the toss about this.

In ANY case what is marriage other than ‘prostitution’ that is ‘acceptable’? Not much else today. What was my wife other than a prostitute? My wife lied to me from the very first date. If she lied to me from the very first date what was she lying for? To get money. How did she get money? By pretending to ‘love’ me. What is that called? That is called prostitution. Men ask me if I have ‘ever used a prostitute’. My answer is simple. I say:

“Sure I have. I was with a prostitute for 23 years. I just didn’t know it. I consider prostitutes to be FAR ABOVE my ex on a moral scale since prostitutes don’t lie to men about what they are doing whereas my ex lied to everyone about what she was doing. Yet, still women will support a lying woman who was clearly a prostitute and denounce honest women who are prostitutes. Thank you for the opportunity to explain the hypocrisy of women one more time.”

My opinion is that if an adult man and an adult woman both agree to have sex and they are happy about the exchange of ‘value’ that takes place, be it ‘cash-money’ or ‘matri-money’, and no-one is harmed?

They can do whatever they please.

And all those women who claim they should be able to tell someone ELSE what they should and should not do? I recommend you just ignore them and go about your business. They are such clear hypocrites.

One of the good things that will come out of men learning how to deny the jurisdiction of the courts is that prostitution is likely to become far more widespread, far safer for all, and very likely far less expensive. The only reason that prostitution is so expensive, so dangerous, so linked to criminal activities is because it is a crime.

It is like the days of prohibition in the US. By making alcohol 'illegal' all that happened was that it was controlled by criminals and quite some crimes and violence followed. Alcohol became of poor quality. Many died from 'bad booze'. Criminal gangs fought for control of the alcohol trade. It was all rather like the 'drugs' trade today. Only the most poorly informed people are not aware that the 'drugs trade' is actually run by our govments.

In Germany? Where prostitution is legal? It is well regulated and there is little social 'stigma' attached to it. Sure. The women don't like it. And the married men denounce it so as to 'keep in good with the wife'. Or perhaps some of the married men really do disapprove. I can't tell the difference. But why should there be any social stigma or hatred of prostitutes? It is 'the worlds oldest profession'. It's not like people don't know that prostitution happens. It is only women who want to retain their 'power' by being the sole suppliers of sex, a monopoly, that object to prostitution. Women and their tame manginas.

Indeed? If women did not use sex as a weapon against men? If wives were more forthcoming with sex for their husbands? Prostitution would markedly decline. Everyone knows that the largest group of men who use the services of prostitutes are actually married men. Now? Why would this be? It would be because the wife uses sex as a weapon against the husband. And just to make it clear? Even when men are faithful in marriage, as I was, in the face of a wife using sex as a weapon? We are not appreciated or rewarded for our good behaviour. Indeed? I was hated on by western women just as much as the worst of cheating husbands. Gee. Thanks.

If women are going to treat the best of husbands just as badly as the worst of husbands? Would any man be surprised that the man will seek comfort in the arms of another woman? And even if the 'other woman' is not a 'formal prostitute' we all know that she is angling for his money if he has any.

Women STILL somehow miraculously 'fall in love' with men who have more money than them a staggering 90% of the time. Gee. What a co-incidence. The number of women who 'marry down' is still very small. So much for 'equality'.

And again to point out the hypocrisy of women.

Women like Helen Girly Brown and Andrea Dworkin were prostitutes. Yet they are revered as heroines of the feminist movement. Let's not forget that MANY of the 'leading feminists' who are 'respected' were prostitutes or sluts. Germaine Greer admits that she has sex with SEVEN different men in her THREE WEEK MARRIAGE. Yet she is lauded as an 'example of all a woman can be' and a 'hero to women'. Do you men think women would laud as a 'hero to men' a man who had sex with SEVEN WOMEN in a three week marriage? Do I need to remind you men about the reaction of women to Bill Clintons blow job?

Women laud and champion women who have been prostitutes and sluts and turn that into hatred of men.

Yet those same women hate on men who use the services of prostitutes and actually really like women.

Just more hypocrisy from our women folk.

It is **EVERYWHERE** you look.

So my opinion on prostitution stands as:

Two Sovereigns are free to do as they please so long as they agree.

No-one else has any right to tell two sovereigns what they can and can not agree to.

22. A WORD ON LAWYERS AND BARRISTERS

Having just written a word on prostitutes it seems only entirely fair to also write a word on lawyers and barristers as follows. Not that I intend to denigrate prostitutes by putting their page next to the lawyers and barristers page.

My disgust at the lawyers in the Family Law area knows no bounds. They are even bigger scumbags than the Policy Enforcement Officers. Your average Policy Enforcement Officer is a man of little education and much indoctrination doing his best on a relatively meagre salary. They are, in many cases, "doing the best they can with what the good lord gave them". In many cases they don't have a lot of options.

But lawyers and barristers? These men are well educated. They are paid vastly too well. They live lives of luxury as they gorge themselves on the carcasses of honest men of honour and integrity who wanted nothing more than to be the fathers to the children they had. My disgust for these men knows no bounds. None at all. I will not rest until every single family law lawyer is flipping burgers. **NOT EVER.**

I have taken vow to put **ALL FAMILY LAW LAWYERS AND BARRISTERS OUT OF BUSINESS.** These scum should never be allowed any position of any responsibility **EVER AGAIN.**

If you take my scumbag lawyer calling himself Justin Dowd as just one example? I presented this man with extensive evidence of the genocide being committed in Australia. He **CHARGED ME \$A3,000** to read these materials and when I asked him if he was willing to help me break the news of this crime he told me he was not interested and didn't know any other lawyers who were interested in exposing this genocide either. That's what these people are like. How big a scumbag can one man be?

When I pointed out the Justin that common law was superior to legislation and statutes he argued this was not the case. I have the email trail. And when I presented him with the Robert McClelland presentation saying that, indeed, common law was superior to legislation and the only mechanism for protecting individual property rights did Justin Dowd say "Gee, sorry Peter, I was wrong, let me tell **ALL MY LAWYERS MATES** about this important error we have made." Nope. Just silence from the scumbag Justin Dowd.

And don't even bother to get me started on the other criminal scumbag lawyer I had in Australia called Jacqueline Vincent. That woman was such a liar that when I met with her face to face on March 7th 2008 it was clear she was a lying bitch. I just didn't know what she was lying about. It turned out to be 'everything'. How this woman expects to raise her child when she is such a lying bitch and a criminal of the worst kind is beyond me. I pity her child. Poor kid has no chance at all with a bitch like that for a mother.

And try taking a look at Fiona Brassil of Daniel Springs in Dublin and Sarah Bevan of her own firm in Australia who were Jennifer's Lawyers. Look what **THOSE** bitches did!!

Everything from suborning perjury to lying blatantly to filling my exes head full of lies so as to attack her husband and take a path that would destroy her family and impoverish herself? With 'friends' like Fiona Brassil and Sarah Bevan who needs enemies?

You men should have no doubt in your mind. ALL the Family Law Lawyers know that Family Law is a complete scam to destroy the family such that they can gorge themselves on the carcasses of the families they destroy. ANY Family Law Lawyer who tries to tell you different is just lying to you. Period. You should just call them a liar to their face. Try reading the transcript of what Sarah Bevan said in the 'meeting' with David Dunkley. Here is the link again:

<http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/200/threadid/1108/scope/posts/Default.aspx>

She actually goes so far as to say that the court should have no concern about justice for me because, you know, I'm not willing to be a slave. Bitches like this belong on the street pushing all their worldly good before them in a shopping cart. Bitches like this are paid MONEY to spout this sort of man-hatred? And women wonder why I have no respect for them? They should try reading what Sarah Bevan said in the 'court' and notice that no women will denounce her for the lying bitch she is.

Women will say “she was just doing her job”. Well? So where the German soldiers shoving Jews, gypsies, gays, the infirm and elderly into gas chambers. It doesn't make it right.

“I was just following orders” and “I was just doing my job” were shown not to be a reasonable defence at the Nuremberg trials.

So to all you men out there? Let me make it very, very clear to you. With respect to common law contracts you have the right to go to a de jour court to settle any disputes. You have the right to use an Affidavit with an attached Proposed Remedy and Notice of Intent to settle your disputes.

Leave these blood sucking leeches of lawyers **OUT OF THE LOOP**. Put them out of business. Starve them to death. That's what they deserve.

And just like policy enforcement officers? For any man who can bring me an Affidavit with an attached Proposed Remedy and Notice of Intent to settle your disputes with lawyers who then refuse to settle the dispute? You will be welcome to the courts we create in Ireland and Australia to gain remedy from these criminals. Pretty much ALL the wealth they have gained they gained as the proceeds of crimes. It should be taken from them by any man who can prove that a crime was committed against him by these scumbags.

In my own education it only took me about three months to realise that there was an underlying law system beneath the Uniform Commercial Code of Legislation. I was reading about UCC and noticed it talked about how the UCC had to work in harmony with underlying law systems which begged the question, what underlying law systems?

In Australia and Ireland this is common law. Same for the US, Canada, India, New Zealand etc.

Now. If I can find this out in three months as a layman? What do you think the lawyers know about this? Do you think they can really go to law school for **SEVEN YEARS** and not know that the common law system is superior in Australia? No. Not possible. And this is evidenced by the fact that plenty of lawyers, like Justin Dowd, try very hard to tell me that legislation, being UCC, was superior to common law only to go totally quiet when it was demonstrated to them this was not the case. The 'give away' was that, once defeated in this argument, they DID NOT then go out into the public and announce their 'mistake'.

I've done the same thing to 3-4 lawyers or people with 'law degrees' in public places like The Spearhead or the Irish Free Man site.

Simply put. There is no credibility in the argument that lawyers do not know that they are scammers because when it is revealed to one he is a criminal scumbag scammer there is no 'remorse' and no effort to address the situation. Just look at Justin Dowd and Jacqueline Vincent. When they were exposed as criminal scumbags what did they do? They just blocked emails and then continue on with 'Business As Usual'. What scumbags these people are.

Men? I strongly advise you to talk to as many men as you can and denounce these scumbag lawyers and barristers for the scumbags they are. Tell men they can use common law courts with de jour juries in all former British colony countries.

Tell them they would be well advised to 'starve a lawyer today'. Because that's what lawyers and barristers deserve. They deserve to be starved of any money that comes from gorging themselves on the carcasses of families, especially the carcasses of fathers and husbands who were doing their best.

These scumbags do this **EVERY DAY OF THE WEEK**.

23. A WORD ON THE SEXISM AND GENDER POLITICS OF WOMEN

Everything that western women do to men relies on the western woman being able to lie to the man and the man believing the lies. It's that simple. If you simply do not trust what a woman says to you then you will be relatively safe. This is why women push so hard with the 'you have to trust me' crap they go on with and why they make out they are so 'hurt' when you tell them you don't trust them. Indeed the Illuminati is changing the meaning of 'misogyny' to 'mis-trust of women'. Something that all intelligent men will do now.

Let me tell you about women and 'trust' and their gender politics. When I separated Jennifer told a whole series of lies in the affidavits and this is perjury. Did **ANY** woman say this was not ok? Nope. **NOT ONE!**

WESTERN WOMEN ALMOST UNIVERSALLY CONDONE PEJURY.

You, as a man, should never, ever lose sight of the fact that women condone perjury across a wide range of false allegations. This is called lying. They know they condone this lying. This is why they have to scream abuse at any man who calls them liars. It's because it is true. If it was not true they would rebut the allegation, not scream abuse.

Now. When I was separating from her Jennifer abused my mother. I wrote a letter to the International Women's Club of Dublin. This was the most 'exclusive' club of women in Ireland. These women would call themselves the 'cream of women'. More like 'off yoghurt' if you ask my opinion. Of ALL these women was ONE of them honest? No. NOT ONE. **NONE** of them would condemn Jennifer's perjury.

2.5 years later on? I sent another open letter to this group of women. I had posted Jennifer's perjurous statements, evidence of her stealing, and evidence of her committing adultery. I made the point that her new employer has every right to know she is a thief and has stolen money from her own company previously. I also made the point that the 'new man' had a right to know that she was an adulteress who had viciously and ruthlessly attacked her husband even though she had promised to 'settle amicably' to her own children.

I asked for the contact details of these people so that they could be given the evidence of Jennifer's crimes so they are forewarned. This is a public service to innocent people inadvertently dealing with a criminal.

Here is the question. How many women do you think actually told me these details? Of course, the answer is none.

Your women, and I mean pretty much **ALL** your women, will protect a woman who is a criminal from being exposed let alone actually punish them. You, young man, have a right to be well aware that women will protect criminal women.

If you think your women are going to be honest with you? I have a bridge I want to sell you.

If you think women are not totally sexist against men? I have a bridge I want to sell you.

If you think women are not totally committed to Gender Politics? I have a bridge I want to sell you.

In 2.5 years not a single woman will even enter into the discussion as to whether women who commit crimes against men should be punished for that. **THEY WILL NOT EVEN TALK ABOUT IT.** So you, young man, should listen to what that tells you. Because what they tells you is that women wish to be privileged to the extent that they can commit crimes against you with complete impunity.

You, young man, should **NEVER** lose site of the fact that even 'the best of the good women' gladly and willingly cover up for women who are criminals.

24. A WORD ON THE RULE OF LAW

This is going to be a very controversial 'word on the rule of law'. But hey, I am not concerned about controversy.

Today men are so badly abused they do not have the protection of the law. If you are a man in the English speaking western world there is no rule of law for you today. There is only the satanic priests of the UCC courts wanting to steal from you and plenty of women who will help them do it for 'their cut'. I have, for three years, pursued 'the rule of law' and for justice to be done in my particular case. Suffice to say I am hated on by pretty much **ALL** western women and not a few men as well for having the temerity to wish to avail of the protection of the law. If a man attempts to gain justice for himself without taking 'the law into his own hands' he can be assured he will be hated on for doing so. Fine.

Something that you, young man, should be very aware of is this. When you are not the beneficiary of the 'protection of the rule of law' you also have no obligation to 'obey the law'. None at all. You should not forget that. The 'rule of law' works **BOTH WAYS** or **NO WAYS**. You are afforded the protection of the rule of law as part of the social contract of obeying the laws of the people of the land you are living on.

If the protection of the law is withdrawn from you then you should rightly feel no obligation to obey anything that someone might call 'the law'. I certainly do not.

And here is something else men might want to know for themselves. When a man is falsely accused or is going to be taken to the cleaners in the 'Family Court' it is not 'lose 50% of your stuff'.

As in my case David Dunkley sent 95% of the assets I worked for all those years to Jennifer. You men should know that:

5% is the new 50% if you happen to be a man.

Quite literally. They are going to do everything they can to make sure **YOUR LIFE IS OVER.**

If you do not believe that then you should talk to a few men who have come out the other side. Or you should take a look at the suicide statistics of men in divorce or false rape allegations. Go ask men about this on www.the-spearhead.com.

What does this all mean? Well? It means you have to ask yourself a question. In the absence of the rule of law how are you going to protect yourself from these lawless women and lawless 'legal system'? Because if you do not protect yourself I can assure you that no-one else is going to protect you for you.

But how can you 'protect yourself' from your wife when she attacks you using the satanic criminal courts and when no-one else will lend you assistance to be with your children? How can you stop **YOUR** life being over? Well? People will not like what I say next but that's **THEIR** problem.

The protagonist is removed from their position of abusive power. The soon to be ex-wife has 'a fatal accident'.

We are now seeing more and more men simply kill their soon to be ex-wife and very often we are seeing them also kill their children. Many times these men are then also killing themselves. If men are feeling so abused that they are willing to kill their wife and children and not JUST themselves then it's high time people listened up. I have consistently talked about one estimate of 4,000 men in Australia kill themselves each year from the abuse they receive from the Family Court and CSA. And you know what? No-one cares about them. They really don't.

Well? How long is it going to be before men figure this out. That if their soon to be ex-wife has a 'fatal accident' that they will get the kids, the house, HER life insurance policy, and his future income. Indeed. **HIS** life is no longer 'over'. Just **HERS** is over. If you don't believe me when I say this is happening and that incidents of this are going to become more frequent. Watch this video.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ptDBhpmR8Cc&feature=player_embedded

How long can it be before the more intelligent of men figure out that the best way for such an 'accident' to happen is via the old 'Stranger on a Train' mechanism. That is. The man finds another man that has the same problem that has NO CONNECTION to him and they 'trade problems'.

Because there is NO connection between the two men and NO connection between the two men and the women involved the probability of being found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt for any crime is ALMOST ZERO.

How long can it be before the more intelligent men, who really want the best for their children, who really want to be with their children, figure out that arranging a 'Stranger on a Train fatal accident' is FAR more likely to lead to a good life than to go into the satanic criminal courts?

My own opinion? It can't be long at all. There was a recent case in South Africa where a man killed his wife and stuffed her in the freezer. He then killed a later partner and they re-opened the case about the 'wife who ran off'. They found her in the freezer. The father was quoted in the article saying something like:

"If he did not want to be married to her why not just divorce her? Why did he have to kill her?"

Well. The answer would be that if he did HIS life would be destroyed and from HIS point of view committing murder looked like a MUCH BETTER OPTION.

I have been telling people for a while now that the murder rate of wives and children by distressed fathers has been seemingly rising. I have been telling people that if just 10% of the men who decide they are going to commit suicide would kill the judge/magistrate or the wife/children first we will have an epidemic of murder and dead people on our hands.

All intelligent men know that my proposal to get the satanic criminal scumbags of the Family Court **OUT OF THE FAMILY** and to 'starve a family law lawyer today' by using the Arbitration Panel instead of the Family Court is actually a very viable alternative to the Family Court.

My warning to all intelligent men, and women and children, is this. If these proposals are not taken up? If women continue to support perjury, kidnapping, extortion and theft as they do today? Then the most intelligent of the men they are attacking are going to start organising 'Stranger on a train fatal accidents' for their wives.

As far as I see it? This is inevitable. When a woman makes the mans BEST OPTION her own MURDER she had better start thinking about just how smart that move is.

I am not advocating murder. I am merely saying that when you make a mans best option murder? Some of those men WILL take that option without any hesitation at all.

If the wholesale slaughter of Family Law Judges/Magistrates/Lawyers and vindictive wives and the innocent children is what you men reading this sentence really want?

Just continue to do nothing as you are mostly doing now. And don't bitch to me when my prediction about the murder rate comes true.

But if you want more stable and secure marriages? If you want fewer dead wives and children? Then teach other men about the ideas in this book. Spread the word. Give men a path to justice via Arbitration Panels and de jour courts. Protect the rights of your fellow men when they are victims of crime. Because if you do not protect their rights when they are victims of crime? They might just take justice into their own hands, which they have every right to do. And since the only form of justice that will work for them is one where there are no witnesses to report what happened? That form of justice will require killing people.

So? Those men who read this and then do nothing? You will have the blood of these people who are subsequently murdered on your hands because you chose not to give men a path to justice when they had crimes committed against them.

I can see a day when things could become very, very bad if men do not implement the ideas in this book or similarly effective strategies.

25. **WHAT DO WOMEN WANT?**

A lot of men asked me to include more about women themselves in this book. So here is a little bit of my opinion on women now.

There was a funny Mel Gibson movie about this called "What Women Want". It just wasn't correct.

It is now 'politically incorrect' to talk about 'what women want' because it is only by not being talked about it that men can be entrapped into giving women what it is they want.

So read this sentence. It is the most important sentence in this book. One often overlooked by men.

Most women want babies.

That is it. They want babies. The physiological role of women in the human race is to produce the babies.

Whether you believe in Adam and Eve or evolution, you have to agree that a woman can have a baby and a man cannot. We are yet to see science advance so far as to allow a man to have a baby.

Women are created to 'make babies'. Politically incorrect. Absolutely true. I am reminded of a Russian woman I was dating. I asked her if she would ever consider not having babies. She stood before me and said;

"Peter, look at me. I am a woman. The purpose of my existence is to have babies."

Western women are rarely that honest.

We joke about the 'ticking biological clock' and 'nesting instinct'. It's funny because it is true.

As a man? If you want to be with a woman on a long term basis you are well advised to understand first and foremost 'women want babies'. You, as the man, are completely irrelevant with the exception of what else women want. Any man will do. Re-read the Woolly Mammoth story if you think this is not so.

You can see this is a fact when you look at the army of 'baby-mammas' that are being produced all around the world. They will go and get themselves pregnant from any thug in any bar and then demand the 'welfare state' pay for them and their babies. So this next statement is something that every man should know.

Most women want someone else to pay for THEIR babies so they can have the maximum amount of time with them.

And if you do not believe that statement I would invite you to go into men's groups and ask just how often it happens that the 'wifey' gets her two or three babies and then quits work never to return. It is a VERY frequent occurrence. There are MANY men out there totally enslaved to high mortgages and wives who promised to work and then refused to once the babies arrived. I was one of them.

So, if you combine the two together and you realise that women want 'babies and money' you will have the most accurate of all descriptions of what women want.

So, if you are a woman and you are reading this and you are offended? I warned you at the front to put the book down.

So, to simplify the message for you because you are a man and it works for you to have the message as simple as possible. It is this...

Most women want babies and money.

You, Sir, are completely un-necessary with the exception that if you provide the sperm for the babies you are likely to have to provide the money for the baby as well. You need to know, for your own benefit

The woman does not want you, she wants your sperm and your money. That's it.

Now, your woman cannot say that because if she did you would run away very quickly. She has to get your sperm and your money from you by saying something else.. Forewarned is forearmed.

If you do not believe me on this? Just google 'Paternity Fraud'. If women did not want this statement being made about them in general then they would have behaved a little better for the last 40 years.

One of the events that really woke me up to this was as follows. I was talking with one of my lady friends. We shall call her Sue1 here. Sue1 is just wonderful and at one time the question of being together or even possibly being married was discussed.

The situation was that she wanted more babies and I did not. It's a very normal issue. We spent nearly a year with each of us persuading the other to our point of view. One conversation we had is worth you knowing about young man.

Sue1: "When we are married, if I change my mind and decide I want a baby, we can have a miracle baby."

Peter: "Really? A miracle baby? What is that? I don't know what you mean by that."

Sue1: "That is where I go and get a baby from another man and I tell you that it is your baby and it's "a miracle"! "

Peter: "That's really interesting. But don't you think I might be a little upset about that?"

Sue1: "Peter. If you do not want to pay for any baby a woman has you must not marry her."

Peter: "Really? I've never heard that before. Do you think other women think like this?"

Sue1: "All us women think like this. But I am honest!!!"

I went on to check this statement out with other eastern European women. It turns out that ALL of them said pretty much the same thing. A woman will get a baby any way she pleases and try and pin it on a man to pay for it. Sometimes it is the husband but it is often not.

Another conversation I had with an eastern European woman went like this. She was a 'friend of a friend'.

Peter: I mentioned in passing that my wife became 'accidentally pregnant' when she was young.

Sue2: "You western men are so stupid. No woman gets 'accidentally pregnant'."

Peter: "Really? Can you tell me more about that?"

Sue2: "Sure. We are women. We know what makes us pregnant. We know when we can get pregnant. So if we want to get pregnant we know just exactly how to do it. And if we do NOT want to be pregnant we know just exactly how to do that too. No women get 'accidentally pregnant'. You western men are so dumb you will believe anything."

I had to admit I really laughed at her calling me so 'dumb'. Because in this respect I clearly was.

I also checked THIS comment out with a number of other women as well and yep, they told me pretty much the same thing. That in most cases the 'accidental pregnancy' was well and truly planned.

If you, young man, have any doubts as to the truth of some of these comments? I suggest you go to men's groups and ask the older men about these things. You have a right to know how badly you have been lied to. You have a right to have the opportunity to make sure you do not finish up in the same boat as me. Getting MINUS EUR40K after 26 years of working. THAT is how much women care about you. Not at all.

25.1. More Wisdom from Sue1

Just after I separated I happened to meet a Ukrainian woman. We will call her Sue1 in this book. Our first meeting in November 2007 was just 'one of those accidents' that happen that was very brief, friendly and fun. I was looking for 'Wife 2.0' whom I wanted to be of similar cultural background to me. Sue1 didn't qualify as I realised she was not 'western' almost immediately I saw her and we only chatted enough to know each others names and faces. Five minutes tops.

As things happen, there are 'accidents' in life that lead to something. I started a relationship with a 'western woman' soon after my separation and that ended during March 2008. That very weekend I happened to 'bump into' Sue1 again. Life is strange like that. We had this chat and we decided that we might like to get to know each other better. Well? We did for nearly 2.5 years on and off with some ups and downs normally associated with new relationships.

What impressed me most about Sue1 was her humility, honesty, integrity, care and concern, sympathy and support. There are more things but those are the highlights.

She happened to 'bump into me' the exact same week I started the process of dis-owning my former children. This was a process wherein I nearly killed myself many times. I was suicidal all that April in 2008. It was only the May Day party that I went to that year that I first started coming out of my 'suicidal stage'. I am very lucky it was only a month for me. Many men spend years feeling suicidal when their children are taken from them. A major reason I chose to dis-own my former children was that they were so dear to me and I loved them so much that if I were to perform my duty to protect them I would have had to have Jennifer killed.

Since I did not want her killed my former children had to be dis-owned as they were being badly abused by Jennifer. It was just their bad luck one entire sex totally and utterly supports and sanctions child abuse while also supporting removing the protector from the children. The responsibility of the abuse of my former children rests on the shoulders of Jennifer and ALL those women who refused to assist me in that situation and ALL those OTHER women who did not speak out about this kind of abuse going on over the last 40 years.

Sue1 has said so many things to me over the 2.5 years we were dating that they are worth recording for you young men. Things like the comment above about the 'miracle baby'. She didn't know what I was going through at that time (April 2008). She just knew something was terribly wrong and I wouldn't talk about it. She gave me affection and support during this time that no other woman did. I did have another woman friend, who was married, giving me words of encouragement that were also greatly appreciated. She is now one of my best friends in the world. I am very loyal to my friends. In direct contrast to how western wives are to husbands now. Sadly, only two women could be bothered to assist me at this most difficult of times.

I put in here some of the things that Sue1 and I said. You might learn from these. This is what a lovely woman is like.

At that May Day Party. When I was still suicidal. She knocked her bread roll off her plate but it did not fall to the floor. She grabbed the bread roll quickly and waived it at me and said words to the effect:

Sue1: "I am so happy that did not fall on the floor so I can still eat it. Did you know that in the Ukraine, when a bread roll falls to the ground and if we can pick it up and it is not spoiled that we say a small prayer to God thanking him for saving this bread roll for us? After all, many people don't have even bread to eat."

Can you imagine a western feminist woman saying a prayer and being thankful for a bread roll not being spoiled when it fell to the ground? Western feminist women are not thankful for anything. Everything is an 'entitlement'. Not something to be thankful for. This incident was the first time it occurred to me to actually have a future. It really caught my attention.

Peter: "Tell me, if we were to be married, what would make you happy in marriage?"

Sue1: "Peter, women do not know what makes them happy. A woman has to be told what she can have by her man and told to be happy about it. Then she will be happy."

Can you imagine a western feminist woman saying that? No. You can't. What she was telling me was that if we were to marry the way to make her happy was as a child. To tell her what she can have and tell her to be happy about it. The level of personal 'happiness' of western women is plummeting and this has been widely reported. This is why.

I loved this one. This was the second time she “snapped” at me as in “made an angry comment”. She was very tired and a little out of sorts on the day. She had misunderstood something I said to her and reacted what for her was “angrily”.

Peter: “I have told you once before. Speaking angrily to me like that is totally unacceptable. I won’t tolerate it. You have to apologise right now and never do that again.”

Sue1 (laughing hysterically by the way): “Peter. Do you think THAT is going to make me behave? No. It won’t. A man has to put his woman in her place. When she is angry to him like that? He needs to stomp on her and put her down so that she will not try doing that again for a long, long time. If he does not do that? She will fight him all day every day. She will make his life miserable until he learns to put her in her place. Do you not know this?”

Peter: “Sue1. I have told you. I grew up in a house with three boys. The only woman in the house was my mum. Tell me, how do you think I would have gone if I tried to ‘stomp on my mother’ and ‘put her in her place’?”

Sue1 (She looked at me with a deepening frown and concern, a very worried look) : “Hmmm....I can see that you and I are going to fight a lot when we are married.”

Sue1 is a VERY strong willed woman which is both good and bad. She could see from my lack of experience at ‘putting a woman in her place’ as she called it would cause a LOT of problems between us. It would be something I would have to learn how to do.

This was one of the major issues in my marriage as well. I had been taught that women were ‘adults’ and that they were ‘responsible for their actions’ and so insisted that my wife take responsibility for her actions. Alas, she could not, and it was, indeed, cruel to expect her to. But this is the brainwashing us men were subject to. In this book I propose two affidavits. One for the woman to claim equality before the law and other for her to waive her rights and claim to be ‘chattel property of a man’. I rather suspect that a LOT of men will ONLY offer the deal of ‘chattel property’ and I also rather suspect a LOT of women will take that deal.

There is NOTHING WRONG for a woman to made the ‘trade’ (if you want to call it that) of having the man be the head of the household with the obligation and responsibility for making sure his wife and children are provided for in return for her being obedient to his decisions. After all? The responsibility clearly lay with him. Why should he carry that responsibility should he not have the appropriate authority to act in all matters.

If women do not like this? They can have their ‘turkey baster’ kids and provide for themselves. After 40 years of feminism how many ‘happily married couples’ do we see where one is the ‘mother’ of turkey baster kids and the other is a woman who labours for 45-60 hours a week for 48-50 weeks of the year for 45 years to provide for her and her children? This is so rare I have not heard of a case yet. But it used to be **EVERY MAN**. If women are so ‘equal’ why are they not doing what men have done for thousand of years yet? Labour to pay for someone else and HER children?

If you try and tell a western woman they are like a child and not responsible for their actions they will hurl abuse at you. BUT.....THEN.....When they commit a crime and you try to gain justice by holding them responsible for their actions they make up all these reasons why the woman is not responsible for her actions and hurl abuse at you for that too!! I know. I’ve had so much abuse hurled at me for wanting Jennifer to be held accountable for her perjury, kidnapping, extortion and theft it’s just not funny. I just dismiss all abuse by women now as ‘background noise’.

The repeating pattern, of course, with western women, is that the simply hurl abuse at men to get whatever they want now. Any man who is not doing what ‘princess wants’ gets abuse hurled at him. Any thanks for a ‘job well done’? Nope. Forget that now with western women.

The idea that ‘you catch more flies with honey than vinegar’ is gone with western women. The truth has nothing to do with their endless diatribe of abuse thrown at men by western women. This is one reason I never listen to the abuse western women throw around any more. Eastern women like Sue1 know that you catch more flies with honey than with vinegar. So they talk nicely to me.

26. WHAT DO WOMEN NOT WANT?

I have to say it. Women **HATE** betas. They hate beta providers with a passion. They will marry them after they figure out that the alphas will not marry them. But they hate the man and hate themselves for 'settling'.

If you are a beta-provider and you have a woman telling you how wonderful you are? She is lying to you. It's as simple as that.

If you do not know this? Go to www.the-spearhead.com and ask the men there if women love or loath beta-providers.

You have read this and you have been warned.

Don't let that warning go to waste.

27. APPENDIX A - ON WOMEN. BY ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER

Every young man should do himself the favour of reading this: From here:

<http://www.theabsolute.net/misogyny/onwomen.html>

These few words of Jouy, *Sans les femmes le commencement de notre vie seroit privé de secours, le milieu de plaisirs et la fin de consolation*, more exactly express, in my opinion, the true praise of woman than Schiller's poem, *Würde der Frauen*, which is the fruit of much careful thought and impressive because of its antithesis and use of contrast. The same thing is more pathetically expressed by Byron in *Sardanapalus*, Act i, Sc. 2:—

“The very first
Of human life must spring from woman's breast,
Your first small words are taught you from her lips,
Your first tears quench'd by her, and your last sighs
Too often breathed out in a woman's hearing,
When men have shrunk from the ignoble care
Of watching the last hour of him who led them.”

Both passages show the right point of view for the appreciation of women.

One need only look at a woman's shape to discover that she is not intended for either too much mental or too much physical work. She pays the debt of life not by what she does but by what she suffers — by the pains of child-bearing, care for the child, and by subjection to man, to whom she should be a patient and cheerful companion. The greatest sorrows and joys or great exhibition of strength are not assigned to her; her life should flow more quietly, more gently, and less obtrusively than man's, without her being essentially happier or unhappier.

Women are directly adapted to act as the nurses and educators of our early childhood, for the simple reason that they themselves are childish, foolish, and short-sighted — in a word, are big children all their lives, something intermediate between the child and the man, who is a man in the strict sense of the word. Consider how a young girl will toy day after day with a child, dance with it and sing to it; and then consider what a man, with the very best intentions in the world, could do in her place.

With girls, Nature has had in view what is called in a dramatic sense a “striking effect,” for she endows them for a few years with a richness of beauty and a fullness of charm at the expense of the rest of their lives; so that they may during these years ensnare the fantasy of a man to such a degree as to make him rush into taking the honourable care of them, in some kind of form, for a lifetime — a step which would not seem sufficiently justified if he only considered the matter. Accordingly, Nature has furnished woman, as she has the rest of her creatures, with the weapons and implements necessary for the protection of her existence and for just the length of time that they will be of service to her; so that Nature has proceeded here with her usual economy. Just as the female ant after coition loses her wings, which then become superfluous, nay, dangerous for breeding purposes, so for the most part does a woman lose her beauty after giving birth to one or two children; and probably for the same reasons.

Then again we find that young girls in their hearts regard their domestic or other affairs as secondary things, if not as a mere jest. Love, conquests, and all that these include, such as dressing, dancing, and so on, they give their serious attention.

The nobler and more perfect a thing is, the later and slower is it in reaching maturity. Man reaches the maturity of his reasoning and mental faculties scarcely before he is eight-and-twenty; woman when she is eighteen; but hers is reason of very narrow limitations. This is why women remain children all their lives, for they always see only what is near at hand, cling to the present, take the appearance of a thing for reality, and prefer trifling matters to the most important. It is by virtue of man's reasoning powers that he does not live in the present only, like the brute, but observes and ponders over the past and future; and from this spring discretion, care, and that anxiety which we so frequently notice in people.

The advantages, as well as the disadvantages, that this entails, make woman, in consequence of her weaker reasoning powers, less of a partaker in them. Moreover, she is intellectually short-sighted, for although her intuitive understanding quickly perceives what is near to her, on the other hand her circle of vision is limited and does not embrace anything that is remote; hence everything that is absent or past, or in the future, affects women in a less degree than men. This is why they have greater inclination for extravagance, which sometimes borders on madness. Women in their hearts think that men are intended to earn money so that they may spend it, if possible during their husband's lifetime, but at any rate after his death.

As soon as he has given them his earnings on which to keep house they are strengthened in this belief. Although all this entails many disadvantages, yet it has this advantage—that a woman lives more in the present than a man, and that she enjoys it more keenly if it is at all bearable. This is the origin of that cheerfulness which is peculiar to woman and makes her fit to divert man, and in case of need, to console him when he is weighed down by cares. To consult women in matters of difficulty, as the Germans used to do in old times, is by no means a matter to be overlooked; for their way of grasping a thing is quite different from ours, chiefly because they like the shortest way to the point, and usually keep their attention fixed upon what lies nearest; while we, as a rule, see beyond it, for the simple reason that it lies under our nose; it then becomes necessary for us to be brought back to the thing in order to obtain a near and simple view. This is why women are more sober in their judgment than we, and why they see nothing more in things than is really there; while we, if our passions are roused, slightly exaggerate or add to our imagination.

It is because women's reasoning powers are weaker that they show more sympathy for the unfortunate than men, and consequently take a kinder interest in them. On the other hand, women are inferior to men in matters of justice, honesty, and conscientiousness. Again, because their reasoning faculty is weak, things clearly visible and real, and belonging to the present, exercise a power over them which is rarely counteracted by abstract thoughts, fixed maxims, or firm resolutions, in general, by regard for the past and future or by consideration for what is absent and remote. Accordingly they have the first and principal qualities of virtue, but they lack the secondary qualities which are often a necessary instrument in developing it. Women may be compared in this respect to an organism that has a liver but no gall-bladder.⁹ So that it will be found that the fundamental fault in the character of women is that they have no "*sense of justice*."

This arises from their deficiency in the power of reasoning already referred to, and reflection, but is also partly due to the fact that Nature has not destined them, as the weaker sex, to be dependent on strength but on cunning; this is why they are instinctively crafty, and have an ineradicable tendency to lie. For as lions are furnished with claws and teeth, elephants with tusks, boars with fangs, bulls with horns, and the cuttlefish with its dark, inky fluid, so Nature has provided woman for her protection and defence with the faculty of dissimulation, and all the power which Nature has given to man in the form of bodily strength and reason has been conferred on woman in this form.

Hence, dissimulation is innate in woman and almost as characteristic of the very stupid as of the clever. Accordingly, it is as natural for women to dissemble at every opportunity as it is for those animals to turn to their weapons when they are attacked; and they feel in doing so that in a certain measure they are only making use of their rights. Therefore a woman who is perfectly truthful and does not dissemble is perhaps an impossibility. This is why they see through dissimulation in others so easily; therefore it is not advisable to attempt it with them. From the fundamental defect that has been stated, and all that it involves, spring falseness, faithlessness, treachery, ungratefulness, and so on. In a court of justice women are more often found guilty of perjury than men. It is indeed to be generally questioned whether they should be allowed to take an oath at all. From time to time there are repeated cases everywhere of ladies, who want for nothing, secretly pocketing and taking away things from shop counters.

Nature has made it the calling of the young, strong, and handsome men to look after the propagation of the human race; so that the species may not degenerate. This is the firm will of Nature, and it finds its expression in the passions of women. This law surpasses all others in both age and power. Woe then to the man who sets up rights and interests in such a way as to make them stand in the way of it; for whatever he may do or say, they will, at the first significant onset, be unmercifully annihilated. For the secret, unformulated, nay, unconscious but innate moral of woman is: *We are justified in deceiving those who, because they care a little for us,—that is to say for the individual,—imagine they have obtained rights over the species. The constitution, and consequently the welfare of the species, have been put into our hands and entrusted to our care through the medium of the next generation which proceeds from us; let us fulfil our duties conscientiously.*

But women are by no means conscious of this leading principle *in abstracto*, they are only conscious of it *in concreto*, and have no other way of expressing it than in the manner in which they act when the opportunity arrives. So that their conscience does not trouble them so much as we imagine, for in the darkest depths of their hearts they are conscious that in violating their duty towards the individual they have all the better fulfilled it towards the species, whose claim upon them is infinitely greater. (A fuller explanation of this matter may be found in vol. ii., ch. 44, in my chief work, *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*.)

Because women in truth exist entirely for the propagation of the race, and their destiny ends here, they live more for the species than for the individual, and in their hearts take the affairs of the species more seriously than those of the individual. This gives to their whole being and character a certain frivolousness, and altogether a certain tendency which is fundamentally different from that of man; and this it is which develops that discord in married life which is so prevalent and almost the normal state.

It is natural for a feeling of mere indifference to exist between men, but between women it is actual enmity. This is due perhaps to the fact that *odium figulinum* in the case of men, is limited to their everyday affairs, but with women embraces the whole sex; since they have only one kind of business. Even when they meet in the street, they look at each other like Guelphs and Ghibellines. And it is quite evident when two women first make each other's acquaintance that they exhibit more constraint and dissimulation than two men placed in similar circumstances.

This is why an exchange of compliments between two women is much more ridiculous than between two men. Further, while a man will, as a rule, address others, even those inferior to himself, with a certain feeling of consideration and humanity, it is unbearable to see how proudly and disdainfully a lady of rank will, for the most part, behave towards one who is in a lower rank (not employed in her service) when she speaks to her. This may be because differences of rank are much more precarious with women than with us, and consequently more quickly change their line of conduct and elevate them, or because while a hundred things must be weighed in our case, there is only one to be weighed in theirs, namely, with which man they have found favour; and again, because of the one-sided nature of their vocation they stand in closer relationship to each other than men do; and so it is they try to render prominent the differences of rank.

It is only the man whose intellect is clouded by his sexual instinct that could give that stunted, narrow-shouldered, broad-hipped, and short-legged race the name of *the fair sex*; for the entire beauty of the sex is based on this instinct. One would be more justified in calling them the *unaesthetic sex* than the beautiful. Neither for music, nor for poetry, nor for fine art have they any real or true sense and susceptibility, and it is mere mockery on their part, in their desire to please, if they affect any such thing.

This makes them incapable of taking a purely objective interest in anything, and the reason for it is, I fancy, as follows.

A man strives to get *direct* mastery over things either by understanding them or by compulsion. But a woman is always and everywhere driven to *indirect* mastery, namely through a man; all her *direct* mastery being limited to him alone. Therefore it lies in woman's nature to look upon everything only as a means for winning man, and her interest in anything else is always a simulated one, a mere roundabout way to gain her ends, consisting of coquetry and pretence. Hence Rousseau said, *Les femmes, en général, n'aiment aucun art, ne se connoissent à aucun et n'ont aucun génie* (Lettre à d'Alembert, note xx.). Every one who can see through a sham must have found this to be the case. One need only watch the way they behave at a concert, the opera, or the play; the childish simplicity, for instance, with which they keep on chattering during the finest passages in the greatest masterpieces. If it is true that the Greeks forbade women to go to the play, they acted in a right way; for they would at any rate be able to hear something. In our day it would be more appropriate to substitute *taceat mulier in theatro* for *taceat mulier in ecclesia*; and this might perhaps be put up in big letters on the curtain.

Nothing different can be expected of women if it is borne in mind that the most eminent of the whole sex have never accomplished anything in the fine arts that is really great, genuine, and original, or given to the world any kind of work of permanent value. This is most striking in regard to painting, the technique of which is as much within their reach as within ours; this is why they pursue it so industriously. Still, they have not a single great painting to show, for the simple reason that they lack that objectivity of mind which is precisely what is so directly necessary in painting. They always stick to what is subjective.

For this reason, ordinary women have no susceptibility for painting at all: for *natura non facit saltum*. And Huarte, in his book which has been famous for three hundred years, *Examen de ingenios para las ciencias*, contends that women do not possess the higher capacities. Individual and partial exceptions do not alter the matter; women are and remain, taken altogether, the most thorough and incurable philistines; and because of the extremely absurd arrangement which allows them to share the position and title of their husbands they are a constant stimulus to his *ignoble* ambitions.

And further, it is because they are philistines that modern society, to which they give the tone and where they have sway, has become corrupted. As regards their position, one should be guided by Napoleon's maxim, *Les femmes n'ont pas de rang*; and regarding them in other things, Chamfort says very truly: *Elles sont faites pour commercer avec nos faiblesses avec notre folie, mais non avec notre raison. Il existe entre elles et les hommes des sympathies d'épiderme et très-peu de sympathies d'esprit d'âme et de caractère*. They are the *sexus sequior*, the second sex in every respect, therefore their weaknesses should be spared, but to treat women with extreme reverence is ridiculous, and lowers us in their own eyes. When nature divided the human race into two parts, she did not cut it exactly through the middle!

The difference between the positive and negative poles, according to polarity, is not merely qualitative but also quantitative. And it was in this light that the ancients and people of the East regarded woman; they recognised her true position better than we, with our old French ideas of gallantry and absurd veneration, that highest product of Christian—Teutonic stupidity. These ideas have only served to make them arrogant and imperious, to such an extent as to remind one at times of the holy apes in Benares, who, in the consciousness of their holiness and inviolability, think they can do anything and everything they please.

In the West, the woman, that is to say the "lady," finds herself in a *fausse position*; for woman, rightly named by the ancients *sexus sequior*, is by no means fit to be the object of our honour and veneration, or to hold her head higher than man and to have the same rights as he. The consequences of this *fausse position* are sufficiently clear. Accordingly, it would be a very desirable thing if this Number Two of the human race in Europe were assigned her natural position, and the lady-grievance got rid of, which is not only ridiculed by the whole of Asia, but would have been equally ridiculed by Greece and Rome. The result of this would be that the condition of our social, civil, and political affairs would be incalculably improved. The Salic law would be unnecessary; it would be a superfluous truism.

The European lady, strictly speaking, is a creature who should not exist at all; but there ought to be housekeepers, and young girls who hope to become such; and they should be brought up not to be arrogant, but to be domesticated and submissive. It is exactly because there are *ladies* in Europe that women of a lower standing, that is to say, the greater majority of the sex, are much more unhappy than they are in the East. Even Lord Byron says (*Letters and Papers*, by Thomas Moore, vol. ii. p. 399), *Thought of the state of women under the ancient Greeks—convenient enough. Present state, a remnant of the barbarism of the chivalric and feudal ages—artificial and unnatural. They ought to mind home—and be well fed and clothed—but not mixed in society. Well educated, too, in religion—but to read neither poetry nor politics—nothing but books of piety and cookery. Music—drawing—dancing—also a little gardening and ploughing now and then. I have seen them mending the roads in Epirus with good success. Why not, as well as hay-making and milking?*

In our part of the world, where monogamy is in force, to marry means to halve one's rights and to double one's duties. When the laws granted woman the same rights as man, they should also have given her a masculine power of reason. On the contrary, just as the privileges and honours which the laws decree to women surpass what Nature has meted out to them, so is there a proportional decrease in the number of women who really share these privileges; therefore the remainder are deprived of their natural rights in so far as the others have been given more than Nature accords.

For the unnatural position of privilege which the institution of monogamy, and the laws of marriage which accompany it, assign to the woman, whereby she is regarded throughout as a full equivalent of the man, which she is not by any means, cause intelligent and prudent men to reflect a great deal before they make so great a sacrifice and consent to so unfair an arrangement. Therefore, whilst among polygamous nations every woman finds maintenance, where monogamy exists the number of married women is limited, and a countless number of women who are without support remain over; those in the upper classes vegetate as useless old maids, those in the lower are reduced to very hard work of a distasteful nature, or become prostitutes, and lead a life which is as joyless as it is void of honour. But under such circumstances they become a necessity to the masculine sex; so that their position is openly recognised as a special means for protecting from seduction those other women favoured by fate either to have found husbands, or who hope to find them. In London alone there are 80,000 prostitutes. Then what are these women who have come too quickly to this most terrible end but human sacrifices on the altar of monogamy?

The women here referred to and who are placed in this wretched position are the inevitable counterbalance to the European lady, with her pretensions and arrogance. Hence polygamy is a real benefit to the female sex, taking it as a *whole*. And, on the other hand, there is no reason why a man whose wife suffers from chronic illness, or remains barren, or has gradually become too old for him, should not take a second. Many people become converts to Mormonism for the precise reasons that they condemn the unnatural institution of monogamy. The conferring of unnatural rights upon women has imposed unnatural duties upon them, the violation of which, however, makes them unhappy.

For example, many a man thinks marriage inadvisable as far as his social standing and monetary position are concerned, unless he contracts a brilliant match. He will then wish to win a woman of his own choice under different conditions, namely, under those which will render safe her future and that of her children. Be the conditions ever so just, reasonable, and adequate, and she consents by giving up those undue privileges which marriage, as the basis of civil society, alone can bestow, she must to a certain extent lose her honour and lead a life of loneliness; since human nature makes us dependent on the opinion of others in a way that is completely out of proportion to its value. While, if the woman does not consent, she runs the risk of being compelled to marry a man she dislikes, or of shrivelling up into an old maid; for the time allotted to her to find a home is very short.

In view of this side of the institution of monogamy, Thomasius's profoundly learned treatise, *de Concubinato*, is well worth reading, for it shows that, among all nations, and in all ages, down to the Lutheran Reformation, concubinage was allowed, nay, that it was an institution, in a certain measure even recognised by law and associated with no dishonour. And it held this position until the Lutheran Reformation, when it was recognised as another means for justifying the marriage of the clergy; whereupon the Catholic party did not dare to remain behindhand in the matter.

It is useless to argue about polygamy, it must be taken as a fact existing everywhere, the *mere regulation* of which is the problem to be solved. Where are there, then, any real monogamists? We all live, at any rate for a time, and the majority of us always, in polygamy. Consequently, as each man needs many women, nothing is more just than to let him, nay, make it incumbent upon him to provide for many women. By this means woman will be brought back to her proper and natural place as a subordinate being, and *the lady*, that monster of European civilisation and Christian–Teutonic stupidity, with her ridiculous claim to respect and veneration, will no longer exist; there will still be *women*, but no *unhappy women*, of whom Europe is at present full. The Mormons' standpoint is right.

In India no woman is ever independent, but each one stands under the control of her father or her husband, or brother or son, in accordance with the law of Manu.

It is certainly a revolting idea that widows should sacrifice themselves on their husband's dead body; but it is also revolting that the money which the husband has earned by working diligently for all his life, in the hope that he was working for his children, should be wasted on her paramours. *Medium tenere beati*. The first love of a mother, as that of animals and men, is purely *instinctive*, and consequently ceases when the child is no longer physically helpless. After that, the first love should be reinstated by a love based on habit and reason; but this often does not appear, especially where the mother has not loved the father. The love of a father for his children is of a different nature and more sincere; it is founded on a recognition of his own inner self in the child, and is therefore metaphysical in its origin.

In almost every nation, both of the new and old world, and even among the Hottentots, property is inherited by the male descendants alone; it is only in Europe that one has departed from this. That the property which men have with difficulty acquired by long-continued struggling and hard work should afterwards come into the hands of women, who, in their want of reason, either squander it within a short time or otherwise waste it, is an injustice as great as it is common, and it should be prevented by limiting the right of women to inherit. It seems to me that it would be a better arrangement if women, be they widows or daughters, only inherited the money for life secured by mortgage, but not the property itself or the capital, unless there lacked male descendants. It is men who make the money, and not women; therefore women are neither justified in having unconditional possession of it nor capable of administering it. Women should never have the free disposition of wealth, strictly so-called, which they may inherit, such as capital, houses, and estates. They need a guardian always; therefore they should not have the guardianship of their children under any circumstances whatever.

The vanity of women, even if it should not be greater than that of men, has this evil in it, that it is directed on material things—that is to say, on their personal beauty and then on tinsel, pomp, and show. This is why they are in their right element in society. This it is which makes them inclined to be *extravagant*, especially since they possess little reasoning power. Accordingly, an ancient writer says, [Greek: *Gunae to synolon esti dapanaeron physei*].¹⁰ Men's vanity, on the other hand, is often directed on non-material advantages, such as intellect, learning, courage, and the like.

Aristotle explains in the *Politics*¹¹ the great disadvantages which the Spartans brought upon themselves by granting too much to their women, by allowing them the right of inheritance and dowry, and a great amount of freedom; and how this contributed greatly to the fall of Sparta. May it not be that the influence of women in France, which has been increasing since Louis XIII.'s time, was to blame for that gradual corruption of the court and government which led to the first Revolution, of which all subsequent disturbances have been the result?

In any case, the false position of the female sex, so conspicuously exposed by the existence of the "lady," is a fundamental defect in our social condition, and this defect, proceeding from the very heart of it, must extend its harmful influence in every direction. That woman is by nature intended to obey is shown by the fact that every woman who is placed in the unnatural position of absolute independence at once attaches herself to some kind of man, by whom she is controlled and governed; this is because she requires a master. If she, is young, the man is a lover; if she is old, a priest.

28. APPENDIX B – OH WHAT A BASTARD I AM

Gentlemen. Women hurl abuse at me all the time. It's so standard now that it has just become 'noise' like the traffic going past. Not worth taking any notice of. But there is something that I would like to draw your attention to.

In May 2007 I asked Jennifer, as my then wife, who had told me she was 'indifferent' to being married to me in February 2007, to take a class that had helped her twice before. It was called 'The Landmark Forum'. I, as usual, paid for the flights, accommodation etc since I was the only one working.

I asked her to attend the Landmark Forum again with a view of generating a breakthrough in her relationship with me. She wrote the following letter to me. I have copied it exactly as written, spelling mistakes and all. My comments are below the full version of the letter.

You men should take a close look at this. I have **HUNDREDS** of 'love letters' from Jennifer professing her undying love. Sure. Undying until committing perjury in her court submissions, stealing money, kidnapping my children. **THAT** kind of 'undying love' I can do without thank you very much.

You men want to take real close notice that **NO OTHER WOMEN** condemn this sort of behaviour. **NONE OF THEM**. And once you figure **THAT** out then you will realise just how little women think of men now. You are nothing but slaves to be used. You would do well not to forget that.

Many women have said to me "I would like to see your exs side of the story". So I give them this and then I tell them that for 'bad' they can make up anything they like because Jennifer accused me of adultery, domestic violence, abandoning my children and being an all round bad father.

I tell women "make up your worst and assume she said it" but note that she is also a liar or epic proportions. After all. A woman who sends a note like this and then claims the man is a bad husband inside 6 months? What sort of credibility do such claims have? None at all.

So. Here it is for your reading pleasure. This is just two months before she was talking to a divorce lawyer and three months before stealing EUR18,000 from our company and 6 months before submitting allegations I was a 'bad father and husband' who has 'abandoned' his family.

Read this young man. You will learn something. You will learn that your wife professing 'undying love' for you lasts until she calls her lawyer. And if you don't learn that lesson from me? They you deserve to learn it from a greedy, vindictive, cruel and callous wife.

Oh how I must have been such a bastard. ;-)

Dearest Peter,

As you know I came to the forum to have a breakthrough in my relationship with you. As people have gotten up to speak I have seen aspects of my way of being reflected in their stories. As I listened the possibility has dawned on me that while I have complained of being bullied by you I have actually been the bully. I have been so stubborn as to make our marriage unworkable. I have resisted nearly everything you suggested, all to show you that you are not the boss of me. I guess after all these years and divorce on the table it should be pretty clear to both of us that that's the case.

The possibility I have invented for myself and my life is the possibility of head over heels love, passionate, compassionate, generous and unstoppable. I have also taken on the possibility of abundance. Years ago you asked me to create a relationship and invite you to be enrolled in it. Last night I finally did that. I don't blame you for being cynical about that invitation. A less persistent man would have divorced me years ago.

You are the Samson that holds up the roof of the world over me and our family. I have been Delilah pretending to love you while undermining your strength. I am so sorry for that. I realize that for us to have the relationship of my possibility I will have to give up making you wrong. I am committed to having this possibility in my life. I will have head-over-heels love with someone and you are my first choice.

I know you feel the relationship with our children is secondary and I have always made you wrong for that. I want our relationship to be complete freeing you to be a father to them. Will you be their father? No amount of mother love can compensate them for the loss of you. I am also standing in the possibility of our children attending the teen forum. I see how I have enrolled them in my stories about you to their detriment. I want them to have the loving relationship with you I know is possible.

Now I have created a possibility for my life do you think it is one I might enroll you in? I invite you to share a life with me more wonderful than we could ever have apart.

My offer to you is nothing less than myself, utterly, totally and completely,

With all my love Jenni

My comments about this letter are as follows:

As I listened the possibility has dawned on me that while I have complained of being bullied by you I have actually been the bully. I have been so stubborn as to make our marriage unworkable.

Yes. In our household, the 'bully' was Jennifer. Every step of the way. She bullied me, she bullied the children, she bullied her parents. She bullied everyone. In many cases oh so nicely so as the person might not notice it, but Jennifer has been nothing but a 'bully' all her married life. She complained of being 'bullied' at school. I now do not believe that story one little bit. Perhaps some of the other girls 'pushed back'. That would be more believable.

"A less persistent man would have divorced me years ago."

Yes. I loved Jennifer with all my heart and soul and I prayed she would regain her faith and be the wife she vowed to be on her wedding day. Even my Family Law Solicitor in Sydney (female) told me I was stupid not to divorce this woman years previously. Apparently loving your wife and begging her to be a decent human being and standing loyally by her despite her abuse to give her every chance to take up her religion again and be a decent human being is called "stupid" in our society by women. You men should NOT forget this.

"You are the Samson that holds up the roof of the world over me and our family. I have been Deliah pretending to love you while undermining your strength. I am so sorry for that."

Notice that Jennifer admits to undermining my strength. Basically, all that I tried to do and contribute to my family was undermined by Jennifer while she, in her own words "pretended to love me".

Jennifer is sorry. Really? When she betrayed me within a few months? You can make up your own mind if that is the action of a 'sorry' person.

"I know you feel the relationship with our children is secondary and I have always made you wrong for that. I want our relationship to be complete freeing you to be a father to them."

Yet inside 6 months she is alleging I am an unfit father who has abandoned them and is demanding sole custody and sole discretion of access to my former children. That sure sounds like 'freeing' to me.

I could not make this shit up.

"No amount of mother love can compensate them for the loss of you."

Yet inside 6 months she is denying me access to my former children in an effort to line her own pockets with money she has stolen from the family through blatantly lying to me. Ok. That sounds like good 'mothering' to me. **NOT!**

"My offer to you is nothing less than myself, utterly, totally and Completely"

Sounds like a great offer. But she neglects to mention that she retains the right to be dishonest and demands the ability to steal money from the family finances. Her offer was turned down on the basis that if she was offering herself she needed to get a job and help. Which she refused to do.

As you can see from this letter Jennifer's lies are laid bare. And yes, they really are that disgusting. However the more important lesson for **YOU** young man is that virtually **ALL OTHER WOMEN** take the view that this kind of attitude is **PERFECTLY OK.**

THAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT LESSON TO LEARN FROM THIS LETTER.

29. APPENDIX C - DOCUMENTS ON WEBSITE

One of the problems with writing a book like this is that there is so much information available that a normal human being could not read it all in a year. Really. I read so much information to learn about the control grid that it was really not funny. Most men do NOT have all the time needed to do such. As such, it is counter productive to put into this book too much information that will lead men astray from the items that are most important for them to read.

However, I also acknowledge that SOME MEN will want to read such information and that it is useful for them to have access to it quickly and easily from a single reference point like this. Further, many of the documents that I have used I have placed onto my web site and created links for so that they are easily accessible.

I have included sets of links here with descriptions and links so that those who are interested can click on these and go find some of the more interesting things on the web that they might like to read or watch.

Name	Description/Link
Video of 'Court Meeting'	<p>The most important item I have released is the video evidence of David Dunkley committing crimes. All men should take a look at this video.</p> <p>http://www.youtube.com/user/peternolan1109?feature=mhum</p> <p>The full download of the video is here, all be it in a low quality format.</p> <p>http://www.peternolan.com/LinkClick.aspx?link=CourtHearing01.wmv&tabid=538&mid=1229</p>
Transcript of the 'Court Meeting'	<p>As you watch the video it is recommended that you read the transcript of what is being said. The words on the video can be hard to hear and the real purpose of the video is to serve as evidence of the transcript. Keep an eye out for the statement that 'talk of inalienable rights is a nonsense'.</p> <p>http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/200/t/hreadid/1108/scope/posts/Default.aspx</p>
Court 'Order' of 2010-02-19.	<p>David Dunkley was foolish enough to then go on and issue a 'Court Order' and this is it. Take a close look and you will see how he deceptively sent 95% of the proceeds of my 25 years of labour to Jennifer.</p> <p>http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/200/t/hreadid/1109/scope/posts/Default.aspx</p>
Documents on Sovereignty	<p>This is the forum entry for the Documents on Sovereignty. These are the documents I used to perform my 'strawman recapture' process.</p> <p>You can download the scanned versions of each of these documents from here:</p> <p>http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/190/scope/threads/Default.aspx</p>
Documents related to Court Cases in Ireland	<p>It gets a bit complicated because I had court cases running in both Ireland and Australia. Some things pass over both sets of cases. I've done my best to organise these things but they can still be a little confusing. This link goes to the documents for my case in Ireland. It includes such things as Jennifers perjurous court documents and Judge Griffins orders to close my bank accounts without my consent and without good service of any documents on me.</p> <p>http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/201/scope/threads/Default.aspx</p>
Documents related to Court Cases in Australia	<p>And this is the list of documents I am releasing for the court case in Australia.</p> <p>http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/200/scope/threads/Default.aspx</p>
Documents exposing the criminals in the legal fraternity	<p>This set of documents exposes the criminals in the legal fraternity in Australia.</p>

in Australia	http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/202/cope/threads/Default.aspx
Open Letters	<p>I have created a number of 'open letters' and some of them are worth reading. You can find them here:</p> <p>http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/226/cope/threads/Default.aspx</p> <p>http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums/tabid/82/forumid/80/scope/threads/Default.aspx</p>
Other Forum Entries	<p>I was going to link many other things in this table but I believe it is just best to point the reader to the CAF forums and the links in the forums. I will, as diligently as possible, place links into the forums and maintain those links there. I have changed the forums to allow anonymous downloads so you can go to these forums and download any materials placed there as well as link to other peoples work.</p> <p>http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums.aspx http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2.aspx</p>
Crimes Against Fathers Website	<p>www.crimesagainstfathers.com</p> <p>This is a global site that will be used to prosecute those whom fathers accuse of a crime on an Affidavit under penalty of perjury and full commercial liability.</p> <p>We are creating portals for each country and perhaps state in the US under the parent site.</p> <p>It is also the major mechanism we will use to disseminate information about crimes against fathers.</p>

30. APPENDIX D - ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Every book like this has to have an 'about the author'. It is that little bit of text that establishes some level of credibility to answer questions such as:

- "Why should I listen to this guy?"
- "Does he know what he is talking about?"
- "Can I really learn anything from him?"

I will go through all this in this section. Those who know me know how I am. All the documents I talk about have gone to various so called 'world leaders' using my real calling. I am not hard to find if someone really wants to find me, and quite a few have.

In the early 90s I was 'somewhat famous' in my area of speciality. I didn't really like it. I would prefer to not be 'famous' or 'well known' outside of my specific business interests. I am just a guy who was intended to be one more piece of 'divorce court road kill' and they couldn't defeat me so they had to steal all my 'money' off me. Well? I'm going to take all the property of two magistrates and one judge. The three who committed crimes against me.

So, as we say in Australia: G'day. Some brief facts about me are:

- I was born in 1964 so at the time of writing this book I am 46.
- I was raised of loving caring parents who taught me the value of family.
- I was raised in a small country town in Australia called Wagga Wagga.
- I had a great childhood, no bad experiences, no skeletons in the closet.
- When I was little my Dad used to say to me "Son, when you grow up, if you are really lucky, you will marry a woman like your mother." I believed him. I just didn't get lucky.
- When I was 12 I discovered girls....and knew that I liked them.
- I was what I considered 'unsuccessful' with girls...for some reason I could not get the ones I liked to like me back when I was 12. I didn't realise most boys have the same problem at that age.
- When I was 14 I had my first girlfriend, for 6 weeks, and I was heartbroken when she told me she did not want to be my girlfriend any more. We remained great friends for 32 years before I dropped her as a friend. In my words I dropped her because I realised that she was not a friend, and never was, and that maintaining that 'friendship' was 'worthless' to me. Her reply was telling. It included:

"You are the only person who has wished me happy birthday all these last 32 years. Not even my mother has remembered in time every time." And "Have a good life."

A lot of young men I tell that to are shocked. "Have a good life"? After 32 years of steadfast 'friendship' during which time we had both cried on each others shoulders many times over as we lived our lives? Stories like that really shake up the young men.

- When I was 16 I had my second girlfriend. And that lasted 18 months and was a wonderful growing experience. I messed up that relationship by being too 'chickenshit' to deal with the issue that I planned to move away from my hometown to go to university. I apologised many years later and the wonderful woman was generous enough to forgive me my lack of courage and maturity. After all, I was just 17 and most 17 year old boys lack courage and maturity in their relationships with girls.
- When I was 20 I 're-met' the girl who was to become my wife. She was a family friend. Her little brother and I were best mates at school. She was actually the best friend of my first girlfriend and so I knew her from when I was 12. I had been in and out of their house from the time I was 12. Her name is Jennifer.

-
- Jennifer and I started out on 'the date that never was' on the evening of Wimbledon Ladies Final in 1984. So it was always easy for us to remember which day marked our anniversary of being together.
 - We were together for 5 years before getting married.
 - We were married for 18 years.
 - Jennifer had two children from her first marriage. I raised them as my own but always made sure they honoured their real father. An early decision was they were to use my first name.
 - We had two children of our own born in 1991 (Josephine) and 1993 (Joshua).
 - I completed my degree and was lucky enough to get a great job at IBM. I worked there for 8.5 years before starting my own company. I ran that for 2 years before being made an offer 'too good to refuse' to move back into the corporate world. By 2000 I had enough of the corporate world again and relocated to Ireland to contract in a team with an old mate of mine.
 - From February 2001 to the date of print I have worked based out of Ireland doing Consulting work in my area of specialisation. I am one of the top people in the world in the area of Business Intelligence. There will be plenty of western women try and destroy my business out of hatred for men like me. You know, honest men who are prepared to put their thoughts into print. Western women HATE men like me with a passion.

Any woman who makes knowingly false claims against me will be accused of slander and I will have a jury issue a Remedy Instruction. So ladies? You should not even be reading this, but if you slander me? I will find you and I will take your property off you.

- I have made good money for my age from the time I was 22. In later years I have done very well in terms of earning revenue because of my high level of skills.
- I was faithful to Jennifer throughout my 23 years though I had plenty of opportunity to have sex with any number of women. I travelled extensively for work and was made MANY offers. I was very surprised women do not value faithfulness. I now tell young men don't bother being faithful as it will not be rewarded. If women wanted faithful husbands they should have rewarded a man like me rather than to punish me for my wife's crimes.
- I never once lied to Jennifer in our 23 years together. (Not many men can say that.) I was even more surprised that honesty is not rewarded in a marriage. Indeed, dis-honesty by a woman is abundantly rewarded and supported by other women.
- I don't do drugs, I am not a drunk though I do like the odd drink. I rarely smoked cigarettes and never, every had so much as a cigarette in sight of my children.
- I used to be Christian until I realised it was part of the Illuminati control grid.
- I am very widely travelled. I have worked on 5 continents and in at least 20 countries for something like 200+ companies. Some of those companies you know the names of as they are household names in Europe and Australia. Some of my clients have been global household names. I really must count them all some time.
- When my grandmothers died I was the grandchild who was asked by my peers, my cousins, to perform the Eulogies at BOTH the grandmothers funerals. I was told that this honour had previously gone to the eldest grand child but it was decided to have a 'vote' on this in my generation and I was, apparently, asked to perform this honour. Those two speeches live in my memory as the greatest honours of my life.

I add that to let the read know. I am the sort of man my FEMALE cousins asked to eulogise their grandmother. I am held in high regard across my family, though some of the women are not happy with what I am now saying. Bad luck them. If they can find anything I say that is false they are welcome to rebut my facts, evidence and well based opinion based on those facts and evidence. I'm still waiting.

- In divorce I was treated terribly. Really terribly. My personal and company bank accounts were frozen even before any documents were served on me. This meant I was impoverished and needed to borrow money to defend myself from the perjury of false allegations being made against me by someone who swore for many years she 'loved' me who had also sworn to our children she would 'settle amicably'.
- My former children were kidnapped as in relocated to places unknown and I was refused even a phone number.
- The thing that pissed me off the most was this. My mother was falling into dementia and in February 08 I went to my home town to spend my last time with her in a lucid state. Jennifer, in attempting to extort money from me, refused to give my father a phone number for his wife of 49 years to call her beloved grandchildren on his word of honour this phone number would not be given to me.

I was forced to sit in front of my elderly and ill mother, while she knew full well she had only a month or two of lucidity left, and watch her cry as she begged me to get a phone number to talk to her grand daughter.

You men would be well advised to take note of what I just wrote. A woman was prepared to abuse an ill and elderly woman by withholding contact from her grand-daughter in order to extort money from the father and son.

I talked to Jennifer's father, Bill Toal, and demanded he take this issue to Jennifer's mother, Irene, and tell her in no uncertain terms that this was one of the most disgusting and repulsive acts of abuse I had ever seen in my life. I demanded a phone number or this act would be widely broadcast in our town. Jennifer's mother, also a grandmother many times over, refused to rebuke her daughter and I was left with no result.

I talked to many other women demanding they call Jennifer and demand that she stop the abuse of my mother. You men want to listen up ***REAL CLOSE***. Guess what? ***NOT ONE WOMAN ACTED***. Ok? Have you ***GOT THAT?*** Every woman I talked to said 'No'. She would not stand up to such bully tactics and such abuse from Jennifer. Guess what? You might be next..

I was the admin of Jennifer's largest social group and I obviously had the email list for that social group. This was the International Women's Club of Dublin. It was filled with women whose husbands came from 'somewhere else' to work in Dublin like I had done. These women were the richest and most privileged women you could meet.

So I wrote one of the most scathing letters I ever wrote and I told those women in no uncertain terms just how disgusted I was with each and every one of them that they would allow such abuse of an ill and elderly woman. One who was in the age group of many of the women in that social group. I told them I was thorough, thoroughly, thoroughly disgusted that they would allow such behaviour of one of their members and that if that is what women in this club were like they were beneath my contempt.

Eventually my father was given a number to call and my mother was able to talk to her grand children before slipping into incoherency. But that I had to roundly denounce more than 200 women as utterly disgusting and beneath my contempt to get it should tell you men reading this just how disgusting western women have become.

You men would be well advised to ask yourself: "How can more than two hundred women agree with abuse of an elderly and ill woman in order to extort money from a man who has done no wrong?" Go ahead. Ask yourself that question. See what you come up with. Talk about it with your mates. Ask them what they come up with too.

- As time went on and I learned that the courts were nothing but a satanic cult that are part of the nazi totalitarian communist government control grid I fired my lawyers and started acting on my own.
- In Ireland the so called 'outstanding interim support' was EUR150,000. I sent Judge Griffin a lawful Bill for his Order of EUR1.5M. I have never heard another peep about that so called 'interim support' and therefore I have proven that any man can deny an 'court order' of the family court by using conditional acceptance and issuing a bill for the fulfilment of the order.

-
- In Australia I walked into the satanic criminal 'just-us' system to deal with the scumbag self confessed criminal calling himself David Dunkley on 2009-11-26. The full transcript is here:

<http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/200/threadid/1108/scope/posts/Default.aspx>

I video recorded the 'meeting'. It is on my you-tube channel here:

<http://www.youtube.com/user/peternolan1109>

I proved, and collected the evidence, that the 'Australian Federal Magistrates Court' is nothing but a bunch of scumbag criminals masquerading as 'magistrates'. They are private employees of a private company called 'The Commonwealth of Australia' and they are scumbag criminals.

I have David Dunkley, on video and in a transcript saying 'talk of inalienable rights is a nonsense'. He means YOUR right to life, liberty and the enjoyment of your property. It does not get any clearer than that.

While sitting on the 'bench' David Dunkley refused to answer the question as to whether he was acting under oath TWICE. That tells you he was not. The video footage was sent to Kevin Rudd (Australian Prime Minister) and Robert McClelland (Australian Attorney General) and they were given 6 months to act against the scumbag self confessed criminal David Dunkley and they did nothing.

I sincerely believe this is treason as David Dunkley is acting as a senior officer of a foreign power, the British, and Rudd/McClelland did not deal with this treason therefore committing treason themselves. They were required to act according to the statues of 'The Commonwealth of Australia' as well as according to common law which is the prevailing law in the land known as Australia.

- So. I created and presented the evidence of the corruption of the courts to the Prime Minister and the Attorney General and they did nothing thereby committing a crime themselves. You men want to take REAL CLOSE notice of those facts.
- Further, the criminal scumbag calling himself David Dunkley took exception to me gathering this evidence and so contrived a deceptive 'order' to transfer 95% of the entire proceeds of my 25 years of labour to Jennifer. The scumbag tried to get my signature on a form giving me EUR12,000 of my own money. I told him to basically 'go f*** himself' and that he had all the paperwork for my claim to the entire amount and since he had offered no rebuttal in the time frame required that any attempt to send any of my property anywhere else would constitute common law theft for which he would be charged.

You can read this deceptive order here and my annotations on that order:

<http://www.crimesagainstfathers.com/australia/Forums2/tabid/369/forumid/200/threadid/1108/scope/posts/Default.aspx>

- The deceptive and unlawful order was acted on by another criminal scumbag called Justin Dowd who works at 'Watts McCray' in Sydney as a family law lawyer. At the time of writing I still need to deal with this criminal scumbag. But to tell you, dear reader, what sort of scumbag this man is? I presented him with evidence of the ongoing genocide in Australia and asked him if he would be patriot and help me expose the genocide.

HE CHARGED ME \$A3,000 TO READ MY EVIDENCE OF GENOCIDE and then said he would do nothing about it. THAT is the sort of scumbag Justin Dowd is. He will be charged with accessory to genocide when I get around to him.

- The final wash up was that 95% of the proceeds of my 25 years of labour was transferred to Jennifer. Now, you men? Listen **REAL CLOSE**. How many women do you think protested that 5% vs 95% was clearly unlawful and must be addressed? Yes. You guessed it. **NONE**.

Ask yourself the question: ***"What does it mean when NO WOMAN will protest a 5% vs 95% split of assets when all those who are close to the situation know full well the woman was bone idle and refused to make her best efforts for more than 10 years of an 18 year marriage?"***

Go ahead. Ask yourself that question and see what you come up with.

If you think women want 'Equality'? I have a bridge to sell you. Ok?

-
- Here is something else you men will want to know about. Jennifer committed the common law crimes, on the land common known as Ireland, of perjury, kidnapping, extortion and theft. I joined the Irish Free Man Group and I was interviewed by the host, Vince, and I presented my story. I did this in an effort to educate and expose the Illuminati control grid.

In the interview Vince noted I had 'upset' some of the women by my statements about 'western women'. He noted that there were many 'good women' who were subscribers to the site. One of the things I undertook to do was to challenge the women on the site to live up to their claims of wanting 'equality' and 'common law' to be practiced in Ireland.

The challenge to the women was simple. My ex had committed crimes. I asked for the women on the site to form a jury such that I could present my evidence to the jury and for the jury to deliberate and pronounce a punishment since my ex had accepted she had committed these crimes. I stated that the only thing I would claim is that whatever punishment was given my ex that no MAN could be more harshly punished for committing the same crimes.

Now? How many women do you think volunteered to serve on this jury? **THREE**. And one of them reported to me that when talking to other women about how this was 'only right and fair' the OTHER WOMEN attacked her as 'supporting Peter' where what they were really supporting was the rule of law.

You men here might want to ask yourself the question: "Why is it, that given 5.5 months, the women of the Irish Free Man Group (of which there were at least 200 at the time) flatly refused to form a jury to try a woman for crimes committed against a man?"

You would do well to think about that question for a while and see what you come up with. Ask yourself . "Does this sound like women want to be 'equal before the law' to you?" Well? Does it?

- Continuing on. I have found scumbag criminal calling herself Louise Henderson, also calling herself 'Australian Federal Magistrate Louise Henderson' operating her criminal activities out the of 'Federal Magistrates Court' in Parramatta Sydney guilty of common law theft. Ditto for scumbag criminal David Dunkley. I am working on forming juries to have the remedy issued.
- I will also be holding a court for scumbag criminal Judge Griffin of the satanic criminal 'just-us' system acting as a 'Family Court' in Dublin on the land known as Ireland.
- Lastly, but certainly not leastly, I will be running a court for my ex before 12 men who will pronounce a remedy that will set the standard for MEN AND WOMEN for the crimes of perjury, kidnapping, extortion and theft committed on the land known as Ireland. I care not what the remedy is. I only care that no man suffer harsher remedy than Jennifer. The men will be faced with the decision. Do we offer no remedy and therefore de-criminalise perjury, kidnapping, extortion and theft or do they issue a remedy such that these crimes are still considered crimes? It will be an interesting trial.

You men reading this book? You want to be really, really, really clear. In divorce you are very, very, very likely to be f***ed over like I was. In men's groups we are starting to see some men point out that if the ex has a 'fatal accident' then the man has a FAR better chance at a good life than if he tried to go into the satanic criminal 'just-us' system also calling itself 'The Family Court'. And you men would do well to remember this.

So, my summary is that I am a pretty 'normal' guy who has done his best for his family for a long, long time. I have plenty of experience of being married. I spent a lot of time 'working on' relationships.

So why am I writing this book?

Well, because, despite my doing all I could, my very best, when my wife and I got divorced she did things I would have thought were impossible to do. I was 'legally abused' at the same time as crimes were committed against my interests causing injury, harm and loss.

And that was very disappointing to me.

But what was **MORE** disappointing was the lack of a view of 'broader responsibility' by women to stop Jennifer from doing what she was doing.

I had married into a family and I assumed that should I ever have trouble with my wife I could always go to her parents and ask for help to have her behave reasonably. Much to his credit, her father was great and he did his best to help, as did our eldest son of 26. But that was only 'early on'. Both Bill Toal and Jarrod Robinson then committed crimes by engaging in Jennifer's crimes against me. Both will be accused of these crimes and have their property taken off them.

Jennifer was adamant that she was unwilling to listen to her father and adult son. Only 2 other women tried to persuade Jennifer that I had done nothing wrong, indeed I had done all I could, and that it was not reasonable to 'take him for all you can get' at the end.

So, this book is about this situation in which men find themselves and how to get out of it legally and lawfully.

Young man? No matter how great a husband you are. No matter what you do. When your wife leaves, as is almost inevitable nowadays, she is very likely going to 'take you for all you can get'. You cannot 'do enough' for her to be reasonable. The likelihood that she will be reasonable is so low as to be insignificant.

Shakespeare was right "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned." And this is true even if the woman initiated the divorce.

So this book is about arming you with advice:

1. Such that you do not land in my position, which I will describe in these pages.
2. On how to notice when you are being 'worked over' to get you to commit to getting married and having kids with the woman who says she loves you.
3. How to divorce your wife, state, rescind your consent to pay income taxes, alimony, child support, and to walk away free.
4. How to unplug from THEIR control grid.
5. How to claim your birthright of freedom, claim your rights, exercise them, and defend them.

That is enough of introductions and background. Let's get into the 'meat' of this book.

31. APPENDIX E – A FINAL WORD

Young man. You might be wondering to yourself.

- Why has Peter put so much of his personal life 'out there' to be read?
- Why has he been so willing to suffer the 'outrageous slings and arrows' of so many vindictive women telling lies about him, trying to ruin his business, trying to ruin his life?
- Why has he spent so much time and money on other people when he could so clearly just go back to writing and selling software and living a very comfortable life?
- What are his reasons for doing this?

Let me answer that by an email I received from a young man. This is a fine young lad of about 22 years of age. He's even a pretty good looking young lad. He's in the 'tall dark and handsome' category. Yes. He's sent me some pics so I could put a face to the name.

Here is what he said to me.

*Just want to take a moment to say thank you for all your dedication to this cause and to saving men's lives. Based on your actions I can tell you actually **have a heart** and are genuinely looking out for the well-being of young men such as myself. In particular I have found your information regarding women to be **VERY** enlightening, this same **crucial** and **vital** information about women for young men is so ruthlessly suppressed by the media.*

I can now clearly see who my friends are and who they are not. To give you an example, a few weeks back my aunt (mid-50's) came to visit me. While she was here she kept going on and on about "You're so tall my baby, we need to get you married" and "When you get out of school the girls are gonna love you, we need to find you a good girl who knows how to cook".

*Now, had I still been in the dark about women I would've thought what she said was a good idea and mostly benign, but now that I know the truth, I can **CLEARLY** see she does not have my best interests in mind, she is merely trying to get "babies" in the form of grandchildren so **SHE** can talk and brag about with her female friends.*

In another incident recently at work, an new woman (mid-30's) who just started was chatting up people during lunch and she asked me "You're pretty tall, are you married? You need a girlfriend".

*You were 100% right!!! They're **ALL** in on the marriage scam!!! It's **CRAZY** to see this stuff proven to be true in real life scenarios!*

*Keep doing what you're doing man, **DONT EVER STOP***

And you know what? I am never going to stop. Someone has to look out for these young lads being so badly lied to and it might as well be me. There are many other men also telling you young lads how badly lied to you are. You can find a bunch of them here www.the-spearhead.com. I recommend that site to every young man who would like to read about how badly men are abused and how much crime is committed against them with impunity. There are plenty of men sharing their stories there. I also recommend www.menarebetterthanwomen.com/forums because on this site men speak much more openly. And there are plenty of guys there who will tell young men just exactly how life is. There is also a vast array of cases recorded in the forums over the many years they have been running.

When I first came out of my period of being suicidal I made a vow to 'save one mans life'. I felt that if I could 'save one mans life' that I could then get on with my life feeling that I had 'done some good' for some young lad and that he would not be victimized like I was. Only trouble was I achieved this in a few weeks after joining 'Men are Better Than Women'. On telling my story there I was immediately met with MANY emails from young men thanking me for sharing my experiences. Many knew 'something was up' but they didn't know what. Once I told them the 'what' they 'got it'. I am pleased to say I counseled a number of young men there to end their engagements and refuse to marry their fiancée.

Every single one of them thanked me for that as I was able to put into perspective the behaviours they were seeing from their fiancées.

Young men have been the 'cannon fodder' for 'the tribe' since the time of the 'woolly mammoth'. This is why I included the 'Woolly Mammoth' story. Young men read that and it really resonates with them. They can see that from the time of the "Woolly Mammoth" until today men have been "expendable slaves" in war and work.

I recall telling the Woolly Mammoth story to 'Sue 3'. At the end she gave me this really 'fierce' look and said:

Sue 3: "You are so cynical"

Peter: "Yes. But in this case I also happen to be correct."

And at that her expression 'broke' and she look quite forlorn and sad. She knew she was the one who was looking for a brainwashed man who would be willing to sacrifice his life for her and that she would never, ever love him like he would her. In that instant, she really 'got' what it was to be a man who loved a woman and realized that she would never feel a similar way. I told her that I didn't really know if it was good for her in all cases to be spending time with me because the 'life lessons' I might share might be a little too much a little too soon for her.

I tell the young men, and young women, the Woolly Mammoth story to point out that to the young men that if you are expected to dedicate your **ENTIRE LIFE** to a woman you had better make sure you are getting something worthwhile in return. Today? There is nothing of value offered a man for this 'commitment'. He can have his very children stolen from him, along with his house and life's work, **JUST LIKE I DID**, and women will **LAUGH AT HIM**, just like they did me. When I tell the lads "5% is the new 50% they really get it".

And for the young women? I am warning them that if they do not offer something of real value then many, many more men are going to refuse the joke that is called 'commitment' now. There is no 'commitment' at all from a woman. Another conversation with Sue 3?

Sue 3: "But the problem for us women is that after 2-3 years with a man he can put us women out on the street with only our suitcases. He does not have to make a commitment. And then we have to start searching for a new man to be our husband all over again!"

Peter: "Oh? Really? And this would be somehow worse than it is for us men? We can have our children kidnapped, our houses stolen, our money stolen AND our future income stolen. We can be put in jail for talking to our own kids. We don't even get the suitcases with our cloths in it and set out on the street. You mean you might feel as hard done by as us MEN?"

To that comment she just hung her head. So I drilled it home.

Peter: "For 30 years in the west women have stolen everything of value from so many men, and all the other women stood by and laughed at us. If you want to know who to blame for how hard it is to find a husband now look no further than all those women who supported women like my wife. All those women who laughed at men like me. There are millions of men like me. And we are telling every young man we meet to refuse to marry and refuse to have children. If I were you? I'd be throwing stones at my ex and women like her. They are the cause of your problems."

To that comment she just hung her head some more. She really wants to find a husband and she can see how hard it is going to be with so many older men like me telling the younger men:

"Do not marry under ANY circumstances until we sort this mess out".

The only way women are going to have ANYTHING of value to offer is for them to sign one of the two Affidavits that I proposed. And to follow up on from those Affidavits? Women will have to insist that those women who claim 'lawful equality' will have to ensure that women who break their agreement and violate their oaths actually have the bond given to the man they violated the oath to.

Only then will women start to restore some of the credibility they have so gleefully thrown away.

So yes. I will keep going, telling young men 'how it really is' via books, podcasts, and videos.

The young men have a right to know.

This page is intentionally left blank