

VOW & OATH

(Redacted by TPF)

Key Concepts are foundational legal concepts that are vital to comprehend when considering using the Ecclesiastical Deed Poll. These Key Concepts are reflected within the body of Divine Canon Law *Astrum Iuris Divini Canonum*, particularly Positive Law. Please Read Positive Law further for other Key Concepts not mentioned.

Vow and Oath

At the heart of Anglo-Saxon law from the 4th Century is the concept that “*a man’s oath is his bond*” – in other words once a promise is given, it is expected to be kept. This of course is most often presented in terms of contracts (Maxim of Law: “*The law is contract*”). However, the foundation of law since these times and up to the present day is still based on oral testimony taking precedence over written documents (in memoriam).

What is an oath then? In accordance with Canon 1480 of Positive Law: “*an oath is a solemn appeal to the Divine Creator by invocation and the presence of at least two witnesses that a pronouncement is true or a promise binding*”.

What is the difference between an oath and a vow? In accordance with Canon 1488 of Positive Law: “*A Vow is a solemn engagement or undertaking made to the Divine Creator to perform some action, to make some gift or sacrifice in return for special favor*”.

The difference then between Anglo-Saxon law and Roman (Western) Law formed by the elite anti-Semitic parasites also known as the Venetian/Florentine Khazar Bankers/Slave traders is the dependence on vows and oaths being true in order that they can be monetized and bonded. In other words, the law of the Roman Cult and the Bar Associations/Society depends on the foundation of Anglo-Saxon law as demonstrated through Positive Law to function.

It is a symbiotic relationship between the “host”, the living man or woman functioning under ancient moral values and the parasitic court and banks then seizing that good will and energy to monetize it for their own

benefit. This is also why consent is so vital. Without consent, this energy cannot be stolen and monetized.

Necessity and being "under duress"

The antithesis of a vow or oath given under consent is any vow, oath, sign or seal given by necessity under duress. It is the most feared of realizations of the courts and banks as it renders their monetized promissory notes null and void, therefore their court acts are worthless and condone fraud.

What is necessity? In accordance with **Canon 1403** of Positive Law: *“Necessity is the unavoidable requirement of a Party to consent, act or perform in a manner that they would not otherwise do if not for the presence of some clear need, threat, coercion, danger or risk. Hence, any oath, vow, sign or seal given under Necessity has no legal validity or value”*.

To trick people into believing that the “law of necessity” does not exist and that the principle of “under duress” is no longer honored, many *courts, prosecutors, judges* and *attorneys* try to convince people that any compliance is consent. This incites one of two actions – either people agree and do not appeal, or they state that their actions was the result of coercion and or duress and or “necessity”, or **secondly** some people simply refuse to comply and their dishonor is thus used to condemn them.

Many *courts* actively seek those who have woken up to the fraud by members of their private *Bar guild* by punishing them for their non-compliance and demonstration(s) of ‘contempt of court’ in order to obviate the ‘fraud of the court’ and of the action itself. Even worse, many people giving information and advice to others continue to confuse them by telling them not to comply. This enables a ‘court’ to avoid rendering their own actions as null and void through the laws of *necessity* and use the delinquency of the defendant as a weapon against them.

Sadly, the dishonor of non-compliance by an individual surreptitiously supports the desire and strategy of members of the private bar guild and ‘court(s)’ - for men and women not to invoke their individual *natural rights* - professing that through *necessity* they complied, even though they may have done so “under constraint and under duress” [... *via coactus*...]

Consent

As outlined earlier, the *courts* of the global corporate/financial/legal system needs your consent (by *tacit* agreement or by declaring you *incompetent*) in order to underwrite their bonds and make money. **But what do we exactly mean by Consent? And where is the consent of the judges, clerks and prosecutors in relation to any kind of Ecclesiastical Deed we issue?**

In accordance with Canon 1408 of Positive Law: “*Consent is the agreement of one Party to a claim presented by another. In the absence of consent of all parties, Justice does not exist*”. Canon 1409 goes onto state “*No Injury can be complained by a consenting Party*” and Canon 1414 states “*The agreement of the parties makes the law of the contract*”.

So Consent to the Bar and the Crown (Bank) is vital, not only to underwriting the value of any bonds created through their courts, but it is integral to making their administrative process both legal and lawful as a valid agreement. **But how then does this work when we do not consent, or we refuse to comply?**

Well, when a man or woman stands their ground, respecting the law by stating for and on the record that they do not *consent* to any punitive sentences or orders, but would comply only under duress and necessity to any administrative procedure during the court procedure, then any bonds are rendered worthless and the court process to the bank is becomes waste of time.

However, when a man or woman is tricked by disinformation into not respecting the law and refuses to comply with some administrative process (excluding sentencing) by not appearing, then the court can use its *trustee* powers to declare the man or woman *delinquent* and therefore *incompetent*. When this occurs, the court may “*legally*” steal the *energy* of the man or woman as *consent* as though you had signed your name or stood in court and agreed. Thus, **the worst action any man or woman can take is to deliberately place themselves in dishonor** since it makes the court process straightforward and simple.

Yet there is an outstanding issue concerning *consent* and Ecclesiastical Deeds when considering how and when the *trustee(s)*, *administrators* or *executors* consented making the Ecclesiastical Deed valid?

The answer exists in the canons concerning competence and consent.

In accordance to Canon 1418: “*Natural birth of the flesh is proof of lawful conveyance from a ‘Divine Trust’ to a ‘True Trust’ as a result of willing consent by the ‘Divine Person’ to be born in accordance with these Canons. Therefore, the existence of the body of a living flesh ‘Homo Sapien’ is proof of their divine (ecclesiastical) consent to obey these Canons’*”.

Now let’s consider **Canon 1814**: “*As the Divine Person is also part of the Divine Creator, a Divine Person is always considered competent’*”.

Also consider **Canon 1816**: “*While the Divine Person is always considered competent, it is possible for the True Person represented by the flesh to be incompetent’* and

Canon 1817 being “*Only True Persons represented by the flesh of a living man or woman demonstrating knowledge and consent to these Canons and agreeing to obey statutes derived from the Canons may be regarded as competent’*”.

So what do these Canons tell us?

Well, it explains why an Ecclesiastical Deed is so important as it is a Deed which evokes the *tacit consent* given by the living *trustees, administrators* and *executors* proven by being born, whether the flesh agrees or not.

If the flesh of the *Trustee, Administrator* or *Executor* disagrees, then they have openly admitted they are incompetent and therefore incapable of administering *trust law*, nor any kind of *property* or *fiduciary* duties.

Basically, they have your ass nailed either which way regarding *consent* and validity of ‘Ecclesiastical Deeds’. However, one may advance a strong argument based entirely upon common sense that it is impossible for a ‘Divine Person’ at birth to be either cognizant of anything and or give *voluntary consent*. Further, the burden of proof always rests upon (s)he that makes the claim!