

Julian Assange is being double-crossed by his lawyers:

To: Julian's father:

Dear John Shipton,

Re: Julian Assange is unlawfully imprisoned.

Your son, Julian, is being double-crossed by his own lawyers because they are ensuring that he does not get the chance of having a jury not only release him but give him the thanks he deserves for being a good man - I refer to Edmund Burke's famous quotation of "*All it takes for evil to triumph is that good men do nothing.*"

Julian, like the rest of us, is entitled to "the lawful judgment of his equals" because "*no free man shall be ... exiled ... or destroyed in any way...*" by any other method, if "*the law of the land*" is to be upheld. These words are taken from Magna Carta which was written to overcome tyranny and "*is now seen as a traditional mandate for trial by jury, justice for all and no arbitrary imprisonment*".

Below is an email I sent to Julian's lawyers at while back but never received a response. As you can see, the true administration of justice is simple and has been with us for a long time. Equally, those who wickedly don't want to be brought to justice have been the "*false brethren*" who, "*by stealth ... might bring us into bondage*", even longer.

It is to Helena Kennedy QC, a senior barrister in the Doughty Chambers in London. Geoffrey Robertson QC is the top lawyer in that firm and he is anti-trial by jury (as I found out many years ago). The Bill of Rights 1688 says that "*diverse evill Councillors Judges and Ministers employed by him did endeavour to subvert and extirpate the Protestant Religion and the Lawes and Liberties of this Kingdome*"this holds true, as much today as it always has done.

The email:

"Dear Ms Kennedy, QC,

Re: the unlawful imprisonment of Julian Assange.

The Confirmation of Charters 1297 says clearly "*and have it declared to the people that we have granted that they shall be observed in all points, and that our justices, sheriffs, mayors, and other officials which under us have to administer the laws of our land, shall allow the said charters in pleas before them and in judgments in all their points; that is to wit, the Great Charter as the common law and the Charter of the Forest according to the Assize of the Forest, for the relief of our people. 2. And we will that if any judgment be given from henceforth, contrary to the points of the charters aforesaid, by the justices or by any other our ministers that hold plea before them against the points of the charters, it shall be undone and holden for naught.*"

Surely, Julian Assange would never have given his consent to summary disposal, ie: HALSBURY'S LAWS OF AUSTRALIA says under (130-13460): "*Consent to summary jurisdiction The consent to be tried summarily must be clear and unequivocal and a failure to carry out the procedures for obtaining the consent will deprive the court of jurisdiction to determine the matters summarily.*" This would require his signing a Memorandum of Consent.

In the early days of British settlement in Australia, the first Attorney General, Sax Bannister, levelled an action against the local magistrates, ie: R v the Magistrates of Sydney 1824 (attached), and the Chief Justice Forbes left no doubt about a free man's right to trial by jury.

Has a Writ of Habeas Corpus ever been filed for Julian Assange to bring him before a Common Law court?"

I thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely,
John Wilson.

PS: my mobile phone number is +61 401 413 650.