

JUSTINIAN-DECEPTION
DOUBLESPEAK

Queens Speech, 1953



A-QUEENS-DECEPTION-?

DID-THE-QUEEN-DOUBLESPEAK-?

Queens Speech 1953 Anomaly

Queens Speech: 1953 Anomaly:

I want you to take a close look at the Queen's speech 1953, at around the 2 minute mark, where she sets up a trusteeship and offers herself up as the first trustee and then admits that, as she said: "many of you have placed your trust in me" (Words to that effect) however, its the word "insincerity" that she uses just before she sets up this trust.

On the so called official Royal website, they state the words as: "in sincerity" making the spoken word sound the same as "insincerity" As you can see, if you say "in sincerity" and "insincerity" you can't really tell them apart when spoken, so I went into the Webster's dictionary to see how they use the word: "sincerity" and I found that when using such a word, they claim it to be used like this: **"In all sincerity"** and never used as: **"In sincerity"**. I assume that the word "all" for good reason, is used in order to not cause confusion between the opposite meanings of: "in sincerity" and "insincerity" and one would assume that the Queens speech writers would have been aware of such a grammatical fact.

In relation to the international: Crown Corporation...

I am trying to find the point of agreement to a false or counterfeit or wrong contract, sort of the primary point of where the deception started that gave the presumption that we agreed to act as trustee's (Corporate citizens) for such a crown corporation and right at the very beginning in 1953 when the Queen put the Catholic crown on her head, the St Edward's crown, being different to the one before, her spoken words, in relation to the Queens speech, 1953, contain this point of obscurity when some form of doublespeak may have been at play in order to give confusion about the Queens true intention in relation to setting up the crown corporation trust. Was it a form of Doublespeak?

"In sincerity" or "Insincerity" used in the Queens 1953 speech...

The word "insincerity" is the complete opposite to the word: "sincerity" meaning, did she, or her speech writers or directors, cover her ass when she claimed that she was the first trustee, and then using the tricks of the learned tricksters of the BAR, did she convert a bogus trust into deceiving people into trusting her by hiding herself as the first trustee behind a doublespeak, doing so "In sincerity" or was it "in sincerity" when uttering the statement: "I trust you as so many of you have trusted in me" ?? ...

The Fundamental Point of Fraud by Doublespeak:

Is this the point of fraud in the contracts of the Queen and her foreign CROWN corporation and all its subdivisions, is that why she served the Catholic crown in order to lie from the beginning as the Romans and Babylon's, with their babble text language, always did? ... If the very beginning of the Queens trusteeship was set up in confusion, could this mean that the corporate CROWN, that has sold the sovereignty of so many nations out to the NAZI, Roman Corpus Juris system, European Union, and the UNITED NATIONS, could this mean that such a Queen has sold out the sovereignty of so many nations, knowingly??? ...

Was she a plant or maybe compromised or threatened or a part of selling, or maybe even giving away, for nothing, the sovereignty of so many nations to a foreign military style NEW WORLD ORDER, by using a dirty doublespeak trick from the very foundation speech in 1953, in order to deceive the masses into accepting such a foreign international crown corporation as their master in a bogus trust-law setup where the subjects of a nation have been converted into trustee-debtor-citizens of a foreign crown corporate state of the UN (United Nations)?

Was this a criminal act of “conversion” through a deception hidden within the grammatical rules of English and Latin based on a form of doublespeak and trickery with words and grammar while heavily relying on the ignorance and illiteracy of the greater masses?

It took us a long time to discover the fraud in the language relating to the fact that the SIGN-LANGUAGE is no grammatical part of the English written text, but finding such an anomaly in the Queen's 1953 speech is even more disturbing.

Were the Queens Speech Writers Aware of what they were Doing?

With all the English grammatical ability possessed by the royal family, one would think that the speech writer would know how to use the word "sincerity" in the correct English grammatically accepted way such as: "**In all sincerity**", but no, they used "**in sincerity**" but was that really: "**insincerity**" because, if she used the word "insincerity" she was giving full disclosure that the CROWN trust was false and she was telling you that she did not mean what she was saying in order to cover her own ass when the shit hits the fan and people wake up to the foreign, French-German, banker scam of plundering the sovereign nations (Nationals) for the benefit of the "international's" and all of the CROWN corporation and its subdivisions that, in the end, don't serve the people, as what looks like is happening both in England and here in Australia.

If the foundation of the Queens crown corporation and all of its subdivisions were deemed faulty in any way, would this throw doubt on the lawful validity of such entities?

DRY-EXCHANGE: Legal Term: Blacks Law Dictionary 4th Edition:

WHAT-IS-A-DRY-EXCHANGE

Re: Language of Babylon:

DRY EXCHANGE. In English law. A term formerly in use, said to have been invented for the purpose of disguising and covering usury; something being pretended to pass on both sides, whereas, in truth, nothing passed but on one side, in which respect it was called “dry.” Cowell; Blount.

A **DRY EXCHANGE** is also known as an Unconscionable Contract, being a contract that no man in his right mind would ever agree to enter into unless deceived or tricked. If a trustee offers to act as your trustee in good faith and “**in all sincerity**”, but with the hidden intent of stealing your property or never returning it at the end of the trusteeship contract, than such an act done by such a trustee would be of the lowest moral standard and such an act would be a violation of trust.

UNCONSCIONABLE-CONTRACT

Meaning: Blacks Law Dictionary 4th Edition

UNCONSCIONABLE BARGAIN. An unconscionable bargain or contract is one which no man in his senses, not under delusion, would make, on the one hand, and which no fair and honest man would accept, on the other. Hume v. U. S., 10 S.Ct. 134, 132 U.S. 406, 33 L.Ed. 393; Edler v. Frazier, 174 Iowa 43, 156 N.W. 182, 187; Hall v. Wingate, 159 Ga. 630, 126 S.E. 796, 813; 2 Ves. 125; 4 Bouv. Inst. n. 3848.

UNCONSCIONABLE CONDUCT. Conduct that is monstrously harsh and shocking to the conscience. Domus Realty Corporation v. 3440 Realty Co., 179 Misc. 749, 40 N.Y.S.2d 69, 73.

Meaning: English Dictionary, (Google search)



unconscionable

/ʌnˈkɒŋj(ə)nəb(ə)l/

adjective

adjective: unconscionable

not right or reasonable.

"the unconscionable conduct of his son"

Similar: unethical amoral immoral unprincipled indefensible wrong

unscrupulous unfair underhand dishonourable dishonest corrupt

depraved shady

An Extract from the Queens Speech 1953:

*"The ceremonies you have seen today are ancient, and some of their origins are veiled in the mists of the past. But their spirit and their meaning shine through the ages never, perhaps, more brightly than now. I have **in sincerity** pledged myself to your service, as so many of you are pledged to mine. Throughout all my life and with all my heart I shall strive to be worthy of your trust."*


When the Queen used the term: "In sincerity", the word spoken sounded as: "Insincerity" so the reason why the Webster's Dictionary clarify the word "Sincerity" to be used as: "In all sincerity" was to make clear the true clear intention of the speaker or writer in order that the words: "In sincerity" was never confused with the word: "Insincerity" meaning the total opposite to the word: 'sincerity"... I don't want to make any claim that would destroy the City of London or the CROWN corporation, however, grammatically, there is a case for clarification in relation to what was said in the 1953 Queens speech.

A-MESMERIZING-WOMAN

A beautiful looking Queen that mesmerized the Nations into acting as trustee's of the CROWN corporation

There is no doubt that this Queen was a beautiful mesmerizing woman and even today, in her elder years, she holds an elegance and beauty of years past but could this mesmerizing beauty have been used to benefit the first trusteeship, the CROWN corporation and its directors, on a world scale but set itself up in such a way that minimised its liability as a trustee by converting the very people it deceptively pledged itself too as a trustee and converted its trustors into its own trustee's.

This could also be deemed as a bankers trick or an act of conversion but can only be done on the consent of those who agree to be converted.



The maxim: "Ignorance of the law is no excuse," may refer to the ignorance relating to the grammatical laws of the English language, being the only real law that mattered because the language of the contract is always the foundation stone and the only real authority that exists.

Can you read? if you assume you can read than any anomaly or grammatical doublespeak you may miss or fall into must fall on your own head because your ignorance can no longer, in legal terms, be any defence.

In relation to the Queens speech, 1953, the Queen may have spoken the truth, the speech is what it is, the interpretation could be deciphered either way but when confronted with the science of grammar in relation to the English language, it appears that the correct interpretation identifies a warning, a concern, almost an upside down flag flying for those that can see doublespeak. Has the Crown been taken over by a hidden force, some form of underground private entity that may have usurped itself into the public treasury, passing itself off as the public, but in fact, nothing more than corporate international waterborne pirate entities taking advantage of the ill-informed illiterate.

If the CROWN corporation has become the first trustee but had nothing to offer as security but the birthright and dominion of the ones that agreed to act as trustee's of the CROWN in the first place, than those that were converted from trustor to trustee, are the only ones that pledged their collateral, being their birthright and dominion of their own lands, to the CROWN as security, but then, for no sane reason, swap over roll and become the trustee of the Queens CROWN corporation... Is this crazy?

CONCLUSION

Are you the subject of the National?
or the Citizen of the International?

It appears as if we are seeing a massive change in the world as this planned new world order takes full effect. The plight of the independence of many nations are being eroded whereas the multinationals have seen the benefits of a global system where monopolies can now exist on a global scale.

Large cheap labour countries like China and the next upcoming third world countries with cheap labour, are destroying local industries and the independence of smaller nations causing massive losses in small business of nations, loss of local manufacturing, loss of farming and local food production and all going to large multinational monopoly organizations for short term gain's until the next big third world country surrenders to the lower bids of the cheap cutthroat world of global manufacturing control and all done at the detriment of the people of nations that have probably unwittingly become trustee-citizens of such corporate foreign administrative trustee's through this political doublespeak and hidden agenda's enforced by debased legal documents being passed off as grammatically correct.

This is profit driven international militarised corporations taking over the treasuries of the people of nations through doublespeak and grammatical deceptions enforced by the private well armed foreign state police force that have become the new form of terror against anyone that questions or exposes its crimes.

WHEN-THE-ENEMY-IS-TRUTH

We may have a problem

