

For those who are awake, you will be aware of the globalist agenda called the “Great Reset”, and for those who are just waking up, the open letter to President Trump on 25th October 2020 from Carlo Maria Vigano, the former Apostolic Nuncio to the United States of America lays out their plan out for all who wish to see <https://www.catholicbusinessjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/Archbishop-Vigano-Open-Letter-to-President-of-the-United-States.pdf>

“This great reset is destined to fail because those who planned it do not understand that there are still people ready to take to the streets to defend their rights, to protect their loved ones, to give a future to their children and grandchildren.”.... The enemy has Satan on its side, He who only knows how to hate. But on our side, we have the Lord Almighty, the God of armies arrayed for battle ,.....”

This is the crux of the matter, *“there are still people ready to take to the streets to defend their rights,”...* and choose freedom over tyranny. It’s irrelevant whether or not you believe Satan exists, the point is, they do, but with God on your side, you can help to defeat him, and I hope to show you how.

The following link is of particular concern to those of us in the UK. We ignore it at our peril.

<https://www.brighteon.com/48a27436-bc2b-4061-9dcd-7e76ab2acf5d>

The link below takes you to an excellent presentation given by John Bingley, on the Constitutional Settlement following the Glorious Revolution of 1688/9. Pay particular attention to the relevance of oaths. Oaths are the key.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FUv88R0YhKw>

In America, the people have President Trump as their rallying point. President Trump’s sworn duty is to defend and uphold the Constitution, appointing like minded Judges who will obey the rule of law and having one nation under God. Co-incidentally, these ideals were all laid in the foundations of the Revolutionary Settlement of 1688/9. In the corporate United Kingdom we have no leader. Boris Johnson does not appear to be working in our best interests so who do we turn to? We need something or someone to identify with as a rallying symbol to unite us.

In view of the Constitutional importance of Oaths made to God, particularly where there has been abuse, what better rallying call could there be than to assert the principles of our Constitutional settlement, the Glorious Revolution of 1688/9 which, through the terms of the Coronation Oath⁽¹⁾ undeniably contracted the Monarch to the Constitution and thus defeated the divine right of Kings. The glue that holds the fabric of the Constitution together are the Oaths of allegiance & Supremacy, the Coronation Oath and the prerequisite duty to abide by the rule of law.

(1) <https://mobile.twitter.com/mikeburke80/status/1315406661318828032/photo/1>

At Her Coronation, Her Majesty swore to God that she would to the utmost of Her power maintain the laws of God, to govern in accordance with the statutes, laws and customs and to cause law with justice in mercy to be executed in all Her judgments. This is an original express contract and is binding throughout Her Majesty’s reign. No one can relieve Her Majesty from this obligation.

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/lords/1868/feb/18/second-reading>

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD

said, that the noble Lord opposite had argued as if the only reason for imposing an oath upon entrance to office was with a view to punishment in the case of non-fulfilment of duty by the person taking the oath, and hence, if in any other way it could be rendered the interest of the officeholder to perform his duty, the oath became entirely superfluous, and, because superfluous, irreverent. His noble Friend entirely left out of sight one great motive with which oaths had been prescribed. These were not dictated by a mere calculation of how a particular duty could be obtained from a particular man about to be admitted to office. The real principle on which an oath was justified was, that there were in a Christian country certain great offices about which there was a worth and dignity making it desirable as well for the nation itself as for the man, that there should be a recognition of the fact that in the discharge of the duties of that office, he was acting under the highest conceivable obligations. The Coronation oath afforded a good illustration of his meaning. No one imagined that the oath taken by the Sovereign upon the Coronation was the security to which every person in the country was to look for the performance by the Sovereign of the functions so undertaken. Nevertheless, it would be a great abnegation of the Christian Church of the realm, if, in the solemn compact made by the Sovereign with the people over whom he 858 was to reign, there were left out of sight all reference to the supreme Lord, in whose sight the Christian Sovereign declared that he undertook and entered upon the duties attaching to the Throne.

England is a Christian country, a faith which is the foundation of our monarchy, our laws, our social happiness, and it is a requirement of the constitutional settlement of 1688/9 that all officers and ministers who serve Her Majesty *"in all times to come"*, swear an oath of allegiance to Her Majesty and to God. Delving back into history, you will find that constables were mentioned in the great Charter of Liberties, Magna Carta 1215. Constables too are fettered with an obligation to swear an Oath of loyalty to God that they will well and truly serve their Sovereign Lady in order to be appointed to the Office of Constable.

However, what happened is that in July 1858, an Act was passed entitled "An Act to provide for the relief of Her Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish religion." (Seems to also go under the name Jews Relief Act 1858. 21 & 22 Vict., c. 48.) The Act appears to have been passed on 23rd July 1858 although there is no record of it having received the Royal Assent in Hansard and is shown this the link as c49 but nothing for c48.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/21-22/49/section/IV/enacted>

On 26th July 1858, Baron Lionel Nathan De Rothschild, a member for the City of London wished to take his seat in the House of Commons but was unable to subscribe to the required oath. The Jew Relief Act passed a few days earlier, allowed for a different method of allowing Jews to take their seat in Parliament, even though they entertain a conscientious objection to take the oath *"on the true faith of a Christian."* The Act did not enable either House of Parliament to admit the Jews, but enabled either House by Resolution to do so, acting on their own responsibility to allow a Jew, a person who was *"morally unfit"*, to legislate in a Christian Legislature.

The following speech was taken from a debate a few days earlier and shows just why it is so important to have God in our lives so we are ruled by right, not wrong, and that can be done only by a wholly Christian legislature. We need to see where and why things went wrong in the past in order to correct them and put us back on the right course. Hansard journals records these critical events in time *"and by which the nation, so vitally affected by our proceedings, acquires an opportunity of knowing what were the premises from which its representatives deduced the inferences eventuating in the contents of our statute-book."*

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1858/jul/21/a/ejourned-debate>

HC Deb 21 July 1858 vol 151 cc1879-902 [1879](#)

MR. WARREN

I would say that, as members of a Christian Legislature, we are bound to assert the supremacy of Christianity in principle, in practice, in our public, and in our individual capacity; and that he is a traitor to Christianity, he is false to his own convictions, and lost to a sense of his duty, as a member of a Christian Legislature, who is, for an instant lukewarm or backward in expressing his opinions upon a matter of such unspeakable moment as that involved in the present discussion. If a flagrant dereliction of principle is involved in the Bill introduced, but, 1885 in a straightforward manner by the noble Lord the Member for London, the present Bill varies from his only by its greater departure from principle, and the unsatisfactory and discreditable grounds upon which it is based. The noble Lord the Member for London occupies a worthy place in the history of his country; and I tell him here to his face that I know he is really ashamed to have his name connected with the passing of such a Bill as this through the House of Commons. It is true that the noble Lord, who has been throughout his career the sincere, the dignified, the temperate, the conciliatory, the constitutional promoter of the great but, in my view, unhappy change now impending over us, may say that he accepts this wretched Bill as an installment—that he regards it as a step in the right direction, and in a guarded and stern spirit, not acknowledging it to have any good in itself, except so far as it gets in the thin end of the wedge, and will enable him to secure the final triumph of the principle for which he has so long contended. The next thing to be surrendered is that exponent of the union between Church and State, which is to be found in the maintenance of church rates. The enemies of the Established Church—all who contend for the unqualified and unconditional abolition of church rates—will find their hands strengthened, and the 1886 path before them cleared, by the enactment of the Bill now under consideration. We have no such privilege entrusted to us by the Constitution. We speak only by our votes, and by those discussions which precede and govern our votes; by those debates which instantly find their way to every quarter of the country—of the world indeed—and by which the nation, so vitally affected by our proceedings, acquires an opportunity of knowing what were the premises from which its representatives deduced the inferences eventuating in the contents of our statute-book. But, with the leave of the House, I will sum up these remarks, some of which I have made with no small pain and reluctance, by reading the grounds upon which I protest, to the last, against this, or any Bill admitting Jews into either House of Parliament. Several of those reasons, I am sure, must commend themselves to the judgment of even hon. Gentlemen opposite, who are so near the hour of triumph that they may well—as I am sure they will be forbearing and patient. I Protest, then, against the passing of this Bill, because—

1. In language used in 1888 "another place," a Jew, demanding admission, as such into the Legislature of this Christian country—and that for such purpose the profession of Christianity required from other members of the Legislature be dispensed with—is a man repudiating HIM, who is the central point of the whole Christian Revelation, and declaring HIM to be an impostor. The Jew must, therefore, in the whole tone of his thoughts, and in the whole series of his principles, be so at variance with the principles and tone of thought of a Christian community, that he cannot safely be trusted with the discretionary, power of making laws for that Christian community.

2. That it is reasonable and just that none but Christians should be Members of the Legislature of a Christian country, whose laws are, and have for ages been, professedly Christian.

3. That the Object specified in the summons to Parliament being to consult "for the state and defence of this kingdom, and the Church," it is a mockery to summon a Jew to take part in such deliberations.

4. That a Jew cannot, as such, join in the prayers with which both Houses of Parliament have from time immemorial commenced their daily deliberations, one of such prayers concluding with a supplication that "the result of all our counsels may be the uniting and knitting together of the hearts of all persons and estates within the realm, in true Christian love and charity one towards another, through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour." Such prayers a Jew must treat with derision, or recoil from them with horror.

5. That the greatness or smallness of the number of Jews who may be admitted into this hitherto Christian Legislature, is immaterial, the principle contended for by the opponents of the Bill being finally and completely surrendered by the admission of a single Jew, as such, and of right.

6. That the fundamental principle of the Bill is one which, when formally adopted and promulgated by the Legislature, will tend directly to lower the influence of Christianity upon public opinion, and promote indifference to Christianity and unbelief.

7. That the formal and deliberate surrender of the exclusively Christian character of the Legislature, is fearfully inauspicious at the moment of inaugurating a new system of Government for India; and is calculated to entail disastrous consequences on legislative and executive action when made known to the many millions of the Queen's subjects in 1889 India.

8. That the admission of Jews into the Legislature is opposed to public opinion and the wishes of the people, which ought to be distinctly ascertained by means of a general election before taking a step so seriously affecting the constitution of the Legislature.—And here I beg leave to pause for one instant, to point out that I have found the signatures to petitions presented during this Session against the Jewish claims to be 14,500 in number, and those in favour of them only between 300 and 400.

9. That the Bill now before the House empowers one of two co-ordinate branches of the Legislature to admit into its number those whom the other has solemnly declared to it that they are "in a state of moral unfitness to take part in the legislation of a

professedly Christian country;" and from such an anomalous and incongruous organization, no safe or advantageous legislation for the highest interests of the country can proceed.

10. That the Bill before the House is, in the above and other respects, without precedent in our legislation; opposed to the genius and spirit of the Constitution; offensive to the Jew; derogatory to the dignity of this House; provocative of disunion and collision between the two Houses; and violates equally the principles of both parties to this unhappy contest. Lastly. That the admission or rejection of the Jew as a member of the Legislature is either morally right or morally wrong; and, as such, cannot legitimately form the subject of concession or compromise.

So with the bill being steered through the House of Commons by Baron Lionel Nathan De Rothschild, referred to in a speech as a great constitutional authority, and the House of Lords, having solemnly declared that a Jew was "*morally unfit*" to sit and legislate in a Christian Legislature, the House of Commons did it anyway by resolution. This was the beginning of the separation of Church from State.

What does actuate those who oppose such admission is the full and decided conviction that a Christian assembly like this Legislature should be wholly Christian, if we expect what we pray for—the blessing of Almighty God on our exertions to properly direct the affairs of a free and Christian people. The hon. Member for Sheffield (Mr. Hadfield) who so much rejoices at the House of Lords having given their consent to the admission of Jews to this House by a simple Resolution, has not made one word of objection to the Reasons which came down from that House for having rejected that clause of the Bill which permitted the Jew to take his seat in this House—which Reasons declared, in emphatic terms, that the Jew was morally unfit to sit and legislate in a Christian Legislature. I beg to express my full concurrence in those Reasons, and therefore I cannot give my vote for admitting a person whom those Reasons declare to be totally unfit for admission into this House.

Ten years later the Promissory Oaths Act of 1868 was passed by Queen Victoria using the dispensing powers of the Monarch with the words "*WHEREAS it is 'expedient to amend the Law relating to Promissory Oaths,*" All Officers and ministers who sought employment under the Crown and by the Crown we mean the regal institution of the Crown and its dignity in governance, but felt that they were unable to take the Oath for personal or religious reasons (2) were allowed to circumvent the Constitutional requirements and could choose to attest or abjure rather than swear to God on the bible. That continues to the present time and includes all Judges. (Expedient means morally wrong, i.e. contrary to Her conscience, and therefore a breach of Oath.)

(2) <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1859/jun/06/resolution>

Sir, it is well known that I feel strongly that this House should be Christian by its constitution; that it is the representative of a nation Christian by a vast majority of the inhabitants of these islands; and that it is also in accordance with the constitution of this country as established or re-established at the Revolution of 1688 that the House should be Christian, all the leading functionaries of the State are Christian, and until very recently this House has been Christian..... I am sure that the House will not think it improper in me, entertaining these strong convictions, however unworthy I myself may be to take such a part, still to declare my opinion that the House by its whole constitution should remain what it has been for so many years—Christian; because if we admit those who reject Christianity, we have no longer the power in our corporate capacity of appealing to the great code of Christianity as forming our rule of right as distinguished from wrong.

Now we come to that peculiar chap called a police officer. In simple terms, before he becomes a police officer he has to swear an oath to God to that he will well and truly serve his Sovereign Lady before being appointed to the office of constable. He becomes a police officer when he joins a police force. This is relevant as you will see later.

Those who "*take to the streets to defend their rights*" are the ones who end up on the receiving end of the oppressive and treasonous forces being used against them in order to silence them and enforce obedience whilst they unroll their masterplan.

It is through the medium of “police officers” who are used as the unwitting? tools to implement and enforce the world-wide global lockdowns that attention is drawn. This information is particularly relevant to the countries and dominions that follow the Common Law system and includes South Africa, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, India and all of the dominions.(3)

(The petition referred to below is the Petition of Right 1628.)

(3) <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1914/apr/01/british-citizens-rights>

Mr. HARCOURT.

This Petition and Bill of Rights has been and is the basis of every grant of self-government to every one of our Dominions throughout the world, and is the essential basis of our administration of Crown Colonies and Protectorates under the British Parliament.

In the United Kingdom, Police officers have no lawful authority or power over us and are simply the enforcement arm of this foreign, alien jurisdiction and are “seemingly” totally oblivious of what they are actually doing. They have, in their ignorance of the law, cast aside their allegiance to Her Majesty by continuing to exercise the Common Law powers of a constable to enable them to arrest individuals, not for breaches of Her Majesty’s peace, but for breaches of these corporate regulations in order to transport them against their free will and consent to private corporate courts where they are then tried for offences unknown to the Common Law and the Laws of God, the lively oracles that Her Majesty swore to maintain at Her Majesty’s Coronation.

I see this as a fraudulent and treasonous method of enforcement under this foreign, alien corporate system of lawlessness because there appears to be no Writ of Habeas Corpus as of right as there are no courts exercising a Common Law jurisdiction in England from where such Writ can run. This unlawful, subversive, oppressive power subjugates us against our free will and consent and any form of lawful protest or dissent against it is harshly dealt with by a similar misuse of powers by what masquerades as Her Majesty’s judiciary.

The only power available to Judges employed by this foreign corporate institution that is conducting its private business and trading under the name “U.K. PLC” (1) and controlled by an entity called “THE CROWN” (a foreign corporate entity) is, like the constables, their fraudulent & treasonous misuse of Common Law juridical powers which are by necessity subordinate to the constitutional arrangements of 1688 and has usurped the REAL living Sovereign of England with a fictional Crown Corporation.

(1) http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1994/nov/24/address-in-reply-to-her-majestys-most-1#S5LV0559P0_19941124_HOL_132

Lord Nickson. We all know that the National Health Service, education, the environment, local government, defence, the Civil Service, the police, the judiciary and even politicians in the Houses of Parliament must all be paid for out of the earnings of UK plc, the wealth creating sector.

In any claim in any ordinary customary court, there must be a judge representing Her Majesty as her majesty cannot be non-suited, otherwise who will cause law with justice in mercy to be executed in all their judgments?(2) This is not the case in these alien courts.

(2) THE KING *against* ALMON. Hil. 5 Geo. III. 1765.

By our constitution, the King is the fountain of every species of justice, which is administered in this kingdom. 12 Co. 25. The King is "de jure" to distribute justice to all his subjects; and, because he cannot do it himself to all persons, he delegates his power to his Judges, who have the custody and guard of the King's oath, and sit in the seat of the King "concerning his justice."

Police officers are employees of their relevant corporate police force that operates under the umbrella corporation, UK PLC. The general public are not employees of UK PLC and therefore do not have to obey the corporate rules, usually expressed as regulations. However if you are caught by police officers contravening these regulations, a variety of tools are used to "enforce obedience," like issuing penalty notices, arrests, forced detention via their custody suites or forced appearances at Magistrates Courts.

This explains how it is possible. It seems that we are now in what is called Statutory Jurisdiction, which is not a genuine Admiralty jurisdiction. It is "colourable" Admiralty Jurisdiction that the judges are enforcing because we are using "colourable money." Colourable Admiralty is now known as Statutory Jurisdiction.

The criminal law jurisdiction, the one that the Police officers enforce, was created with the passing of the Justices of the Peace Act 1968 and finalized with the Magistrates Court Act 1980. The Justices of the Peace Act 1968 repealed as being obsolete the Act of Charles I, 1640 called:

An Act for [the Regulating the Privie Councell and for taking away the Court commonly called the Star Chamber.

<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47221>

This 1968 Act also replaced the Petition of Right 1627, which is covered in the explanatory document entitled "Halsbury's exercise of the prerogative."

In essence, what the Justices of the Peace Act 1968 did was to recreate the same illegal court system, run by the Privy Council, that the 1640 Act of Charles I had abolished. Part of the 1640 Act reads:

All Matters examinable in the Star Chamber may be examinable and redressed by the Common Law; Council Table has assumed a Power contrary to Law.; Court of Star Chamber and all its Powers dissolved.

The issuing of Commissions for erecting courts of a like nature were also declared illegal and pernicious by the Declaration and Bill of Rights 1688/9.

3. That the Commission for erecting the late Court of Commissioners for Ecclesiasticall Causes and all other Commissions and Courts of like nature are Illegall and Pemicious.(3)

So, what police officers do is exercise an unlawful use of the powers of arrest derived from the office of constable in order to obtain the powers needed to arrest you. They can call themselves constables, police constables or police officers but at no time are they actually operating in that specific Common Law jurisdiction from which their powers are obtained, that of the office of constable. In addition, a man cannot serve two masters (4) in two opposing and contradictory jurisdictions and should that dilemma ever arise, to whom does his primary allegiance lie?

(3) (Note. A similar Commission for Justices of the Peace was issued under the Great Seal with the Magistrates Court Act 1980.

In essence, it would appear that the courts are a military style tribunal and we are treated as "alien enemies," segregated from the Common Law, or as Lord Hewart of Bury would call it, "separating the people from their courts."

(4) <https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Matthew-6-24/>

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

In order to become a corporate police officer you first have to submit to the requirements of the office of constable by swearing an oath to God that you will "well and truly serve to our Sovereign Lady the Queen, in the office of constable....," where your duty is to uphold the rule of law, the Common Law, the Supreme Law of the Land.

The dilemma mentioned earlier is attributed to the fact that the religious element of the constables oath of office was bypassed by the simple expedient of replacing it with an attestation going back to the Police Act 1964. Therefore there have been no true constables for over 50 years! Even after the passing of the Promissory Oaths Act 1868,⁽⁵⁾ Constables were still required to take the oath of office.

(5) <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/lords/1868/feb/18/second-reading>

LORD LYVEDEN

The noble Lord was understood to ask what oath would be required of special constables. [The LORD CHANCELLOR: They would take the oath of office.] Then in this case the advice of all the Commissioners had been disregarded, as in this instance a declaration was proposed instead of any oath. He did not mean to oppose the Bill, but ⁸⁵⁷ had thought that he ought not to let it pass sub silentio.

This is the result, not even an option to swear a solemn oath to God.

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/zxcz3efxtp39wp/police%20attestation%20slide.pdf?dl=0>

If you attest, you are not swearing an oath; therefore you cannot be sworn in, a contradiction in terms. It says *"Before being sworn in as a Constable, and receiving their police powers..."* so, police officers powers come from where again?

Historically, I believe that the correct wording for the constable's oath was as follows:

"I swear, that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady the Queen, in the Office of Constable for the (here mention the constablewick), for the year next ensuing, or until I shall be thereof discharged by due course of law. I shall see the Queens peace kept, and keep all such watch and ward as are usually accustomed and ought to be kept; and I shall well and truly do and execute all other things belonging to the said office, according to the best of my skill and knowledge." So help me God.

Also, who is the Queen as referred to in the new attestation? Why is Her Majesty no longer our Sovereign Lady? By removing the words "Our Sovereign Lady" the authors of that "oath" have compiled a document which imagines the death of the Sovereign, which is punishable under the Treason Act 1351. It has also removed the Style and Honour of Her Majesty as a Sovereign Queen by Law established, which is an offence contrary to the 1848 Treason Felony Act.

The giveaway to this identity crisis is the displaying of a patch on the left breast area identifying the individual as “Constable xxx” at the top, the force name in the middle and the words “Police officer” at the bottom.

From the moment you are “captured,” (kidnapped), police officers no longer need to exercise the powers of a constable as you are now in their jurisdiction. But supposing a true constable (there are NONE) were to arrest for an offence at Common Law, what does he do with you? He cannot present you before anything but an ordinary, customary Common Law Court that operates under the rule of law, because that is the only jurisdiction that he upholds.

In order to keep up the pretence, Magistrates Courts can fraudulently exercise a Common Law jurisdiction as ancillary (6) to their Star Chamber proceedings to bind over to keep the peace or fine and/or imprison for contempt, again, a Common Law offence. You could call it a pretend jurisdiction used for a pretend power for a pretended arrest at Common Law, it’s an illusion.

(6) <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1968/69/section/1>

It is hereby declared that any court of record having a criminal jurisdiction has, as ancillary to that jurisdiction, the power to bind over to keep the peace,.....

<https://www.thefreedictionary.com/ancillary> Of secondary importance; subordinate:

So, you’re arrested, for a breach of the Coronavirus regulations, where exactly are you taken to? You’re taken to the custody suite at the police station, which is the holding place for the ones that they have captured. You are then processed and either released, bailed or kept in custody until you are taken to, where?..... the Magistrates Court, the revived Court of Star Chamber!! How did you get there again? Without this fraudulent, treasonable and unconstitutional exercise of constable powers, there is no way that police officers can coerce you into this foreign jurisdiction.

Further proof that only constables have any power can be evidenced in legislation, for example the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. If police officers had any powers, it would be unnecessary for Acts of Parliament to refer to constables at all, and why are arrest warrants addressed only to constables?

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/60/section/1>

Power of constable to stop and search persons, vehicles etc.

(1) *A constable may exercise any power conferred by this section—*

Or;

24 Arrest without warrant: constables

(1) *A constable may arrest without a warrant—*

In the Supplementary interpretation in the Coronavirus regulations it says “constable” includes any police officer.....” What our democratically elected members of Parliament cannot do by statute our

unelected Privy Council has done by regulations. They, not your duly elected lawmakers, have provided their own interpretation as to whom can be identified as a constable in order to exercise those all important powers to enforce compliance.

I repeat, you cannot wear two hats. You cannot have two masters, its either Common Law jurisdiction or statutory jurisdiction, and should a conflict arise, which takes precedent?

Evidence of these created courts and jurisdictions is given in an excerpt from the following judgment:

[2018] EWHC 2767 (Admin) Royal Courts of Justice Tuesday, 22 May 2018

6 The daimant has drawn attention to a number of pieces of legislation, all of which he submits have not been in any way repealed and which give rise to fundamental rights, in particular the right for free movement and not to impede persons travelling around this country and, secondly, in relation to due procedures which must be abided by if English constitutional law is to be properly reflected, leading to the conclusion that the court was not properly constituted to address the issues which were raised in the original prosecution. In relation to those submissions, the daimant in particular relies upon Magna Carta (1297), the Confirmation of the Charters (1297), the Justices of the Peace Act (1361), the Treason Act (1351) along with the Fifth Statute of Westminster of the same year, Liberty of Subject (1354), Confirmation of Charters and Statutes (1416) and Confirmation of Liberties (1423). Reference is also made to subsequent constitutional enactments, such as the Act of Settlement, which reconfirm the rights and liberties of subjects of England.

7 Those submissions are good so far as they go. The difficulty which they face is that alongside and under the rubric of those older statutes of the law of England there have, of course, been more modern pieces of legislation creating courts and offences against the background of that broader constitutional-law canvas. In particular, so far as the original conviction leading to the first case brought by the daimant is concerned, **Parliament has enacted the Magistrates' Courts Act 1980 along with the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, and provided there a specific jurisdiction in relation to offences such as those of the kind of which the daimant was convicted**, and afforded the magistrates' courts authority and provided them with particular procedures to enable allegations of those offences to be examined and scrutinised and for lawful decisions as to criminal liability for those offences to be investigated, and, in appropriate cases, found to have been proved.

8 There is thus no inconsistency, in my judgment, between the existence of the ancient constitutional statutes and charters on which the daimant places reliance and the more modern legislation dealing specifically with the creation of courts and jurisdictions within which those constitutional rights are to be exercised and examined.

Yes, you read that correctly, and for individuals citing Magna Carta & the Bill of Rights to protest against the enforced lockdowns, please note, your right to due process guaranteed by the Great Charter of Liberties is to be exercised and examined in a court that is operating exactly as the Court of Star Chamber did until 1640 when it was abolished. These judgments enforced upon the people in the name of law are a FRAUD. They have no authority and are without mercy. Justice without mercy is Godless and repugnant to the terms of the Coronation Oath. (Remedy for breach of that contract is give at the end of the essay.)

Once legislation is enacted, by Parliament, it then gives to certain ministers the power to make rules by order in council. For this purpose, that specified minister becomes a corporation sole when he appears before the Queen in Council.

Who are the unelected Privy Council you may ask, who make these regulations, and how many Privy Counsellors are there? What if you were told that there were nearly 700? Here are five of them doing what they know best, Teresa May, John Major, Tony Blair, David Cameron & Gordon Brown.

<https://twitter.com/jaglancy/status/1331508151426932736?s=09>

Don't forget Prince William, Camilla Parker Bowles, Jeremy Corbyn, Boris Johnson and surprise, surprise, George Soros's number 2 in the UK, Lord Molloch Brown.

What if you learned that Privy Council has arrogated powers unto themselves to repeal Acts of Parliament, modify the terms of the Coronation Oath without Statutory Authority and to give the Royal Assent (7) (as Lords Commissioners with the Statute of Westminster.) contrary to the Coronation Oath sworn by George V and then modify the Oath of the next Monarch to retrospectively validate and reflect the changed circumstances. The Oath that Her Majesty swore at Her Coronation was also altered by the Privy Council without statutory authorisation. Remember, since 1858 we have been ruled by wrong, not right.

(7) <https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1931/dec/11/royal-assent>

(See attached PDF entitled: Coronation Oath. Opinion of the Lord High Chancellor and Law Officers of the Crown 1936)

"In our opinion the Statute of Westminster does alter the constitutional position of this country in relation to the Dominions in such a way as to render the existing words of the Coronation Oath inapplicable."

Legislation MUST surely be commensurate with the terms of the Coronation Oath, otherwise perjury is maintained. What would be the point of requiring the Monarch to swear an Oath that can be breached with impunity?

The Queen-in-council is served by members of the Privy Council which connects with its equivalent in all other Commonwealth Countries. The Privy Council is 'LEGALLY' above Parliament because of its prerogative powers and its members are appointed for life. They appear to run this fraudulent & treasonous global business through a dormant regency commission that was revived after what appears to have been the expiry of a 100 year agreement under the Lord Justices Act 1837, to govern South Africa, New Zealand, Australia, Canada and all the dominions.

<https://privycouncil.independent.gov.uk/privy-council/privy-council-members/>

Next, see:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Privy_Council_of_the_United_Kingdom

"The Privy Council formally advises the sovereign on the exercise of the Royal Prerogative, and as a body corporate (as Queen-in-council) it issues executive instruments known as Orders in Council, which among other powers enact Acts of Parliament."

So it appears that the United Kingdom is run as a Trust, the Cabinet is the administrator and we are the beneficiaries AND trustees, with regulations made pursuant to statute, and by which our lives are governed, by a body corporate run by the unelected Privy Council and seemingly accountable to no-one and whose proceedings were abolished forever, not only since the Act of 1640 but also by article 1 of the 1688/9 Declaration and Bill of Rights as being "illegal and pernicious".

As there are at Common Law no constables who have sworn the requisite oath to maintain Her Majesty's peace, the roots of which can be traced back to the Laws of God and the Ten Commandments, their corporate employers believe that its corporate police officers must have a duty imposed on them by the Common Law to catch 'criminals'. Therefore it was imperative that they had such a coercive power which is why the office of constable was subverted, and used not only to subjugate us but also to raise business for UK PLC, the wealth creating sector of the Crown Corporation.

Police officers are also used to assist enforcement agents etc with the collection of these penalties and fines, and that opens up another can of worms. In 2015, (8) an Act was passed called Criminal Justice and Courts Act.

(8) <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/2/section/26>

That Act recognized that the powers and privileges of a constable could be used in a corrupt or improper manner and specifies under what circumstances that use would be improper.

(2) A police constable guilty of an offence under this section is liable, on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 14 years or a fine (or both).

Police officers are under the impression that the 2015 Act does not apply to them when assisting with enforcement of civil process. That is exactly when the Act applies to them. The process by which these fines /debts are collected are usually by an alleged order purportedly issued by a court, whereas in fact the debts are collected by distress. What exactly is distress?

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/commons/1879/may/09/resolution>

"A distress in its ancient form may, therefore, be deemed as— The taking without legal process of a personal chattel from the possession of the wrongdoer or defaulter into the hands of the party grieved, to be hold as a pledge for the redress, performance, or satisfaction required."

Halsbury's Laws of England/DISTRESS (VOLUME 13 (2007 REISSUE))

1. NATURE OF THE REMEDY OF DISTRESS/901.

Meaning of distress.

DISTRESS (VOLUME 13 (2007 REISSUE))

1. NATURE OF THE REMEDY OF DISTRESS

901. Meaning of distress.

The term 'distress' primarily connotes a summary remedy by which a person is entitled **without legal process** to take into his possession the personal chattels of another person, to be held as a pledge to compel the performance of a duty, or the satisfaction of a debt or demand¹. By almost universal sanction the term 'dis-tress' is now used to designate both the process of taking, and the chattels taken², though originally it applied only to the taking.

By statute, remedies referred to as distress³ have been introduced for the recovery of rates⁴ and taxes⁵ and for the enforcement of certain fines imposed by or orders of magistrates' courts⁶.

Distress is a remedy to which resort may be made without legal process! So exactly what legal instrument do these enforcement agents claim to have from the courts when the debt is being enforced as a landlord/tenant relationship, the old Feudal system of law, or more accurately, breach of contract.

The police are often sucked into assisting these enforcement agents when their presence is requested and that is one of the frauds that the 2015 Act sought to remedy and of which council liability orders are a prime example. Without the assistance of "police officers," these fraudulent & unconstitutional debts cannot be enforced.

An interesting speech taken from the journals of Hansard that explains how certain clauses (called Henry VIII powers) are used to make important changes in legislation and at the same time deprive the courts of the right to inquire into the authority or legality of them. This continues today.

GROWING POWER OF EXECUTIVEHC Deb 27 January 1937 vol 319 cc1026-36 [1026](#)

Mr. Dingle Foot

I should like to quote one passage which will convey to Members the view which His Majesty's Judges take of this sort of legislation. This passage occurred during the conduct, a year or two ago, of a case in which a Clause of that kind, though I do not say with those actual words, was under consideration, and the right hon. Gentleman who is now Minister for the Co-ordination of Defence was arguing on behalf of the Government. This is how the interchange, if I may so describe it, ran: The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: IS your argument, then, that any Order of the Minister, however far it may depart from the Act, has effect as though enacted in the Act, if it purports to be made under the Act? The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is so, my Lord. Of course, it does not sound very 1033 pretty in that form—(Laughter)—and I would prefer to say that the court may not inquire whether it is made under the Act. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: Do you say that if under the name of an improvement scheme under this Act the Minister sanctioned anything whatever it would have statutory effect? The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I think that is so. Mr. JUSTICE TALBOT: Suppose Parliament had intended to say what the Attorney-General says they have said, how could they have expressed it better than they have done? The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: They might have said 'After the passing of the Act the Minister may do what he likes.' Mr. JUSTICE SWIFT: That is what they have said. There is no comment which I could make to add to that. I only want to submit that when we give to a Government Department or to a Minister power to make Regulations and to deprive the courts of the right to inquire into the authority or the legality of those Regulations we are within measurable distance of government by decree, and government by decree, after all, is the hallmark of dictatorships everywhere.

The following speech sums the situation up in its entirety as to why Christianity is so important in our lives and is likely the most important speech ever made in any debate recorded in Hansard in over 200 years. We turned our back to God when we allowed a Jew into the legislature, not by Act of Parliament but by a simple resolution of the House of Commons acting on its own responsibility. Since then we have been ruled by wrong, not right. Now you can understand why our ancestors denied all but Christians to sit and vote in Parliament. The Glorious Revolution of 1688/9 was to preserve our rights freedoms for future generations, let it be a guiding light to us to steer us back to our Constitutional settlement of 1688/9.

OATH OF JEWISH MEMBERSRESOLUTIONHC Deb 06 June 1859 vol 154 cc14-20 [14](#)

MR. NEWDEGATE

Sir, it is well known that I feel strongly that this House should be Christian by its constitution; that it is the representative of a nation Christian by a vast majority of the inhabitants of these islands; and that it is also in accordance with the constitution of this country as established—or re-established—16 at the Revolution of 1688 that the House should be Christian, all the leading functionaries of the State are Christian, and until very recently this House has been Christian. I will not go into the large question which has been so often and so long debated in this House; I am sure that the House will not think it improper in me, entertaining these strong convictions, however unworthy I myself may be to take such a part, still to declare my opinion that the House by its

whole constitution should remain what it has been for so many years—Christian; because if we admit those who reject Christianity, we have no longer the power in our corporate capacity of appealing to the great code of Christianity as forming our rule of right as distinguished from wrong. I feel that I must not travel into many matters connected with this question, but I wish to impress upon hon. Members who come here for the first time that they have now to decide for themselves and for the House this question, which has been so long debated—that is whether this House shall remain based on the constitution as that constitution was established in 1688. Persons who entertain revolutionary opinions cavil at that establishment; and I feel deeply upon this question, because it involves that establishment to its very base. What was the policy of the Monarch who was then ejected from the throne? James II. issued a declaration that no peculiarity of religious belief, and no want of religious belief, should disqualify any man from employment under the Government. That was done at the instance of Jesuit advisers; and the reply to that declaration by the nation was the ejection of himself and of his family from the throne; although in that revolution the last vestiges of what was called "the Divine right" of the Monarch were swept away, the nation supplied its place by securing that the whole constitution of the Imperial Parliament should be in accordance with the character of the Sovereign; that thus the whole Imperial power should be Christian, fundamentally and in all its details.

Sir, when we reflect upon how this country has prospered since that period, some 180 years; how free from turmoil we have been, how safe has been our freedom among the shocks which have overturned the Governments and constitutions of other countries, I cannot divest my mind of the belief that it is not merely the inherent characteristics of the people that have 17 given that security; and if there is a God who governs the world, we must believe this in that particular organization of our institutions is entailed a blessing upon this country; and it shall not be for the want of my vote at all events, that that which I believe to be calculated to insure the continuance of this blessing be removed from the constitution of this country. I will not detain the House much longer, but I cannot help adverting to one fact. I beg the House to remember that at this moment the Liberal mind throughout Europe is stirred towards the principle of nationality. The desire is that the various nations of the world should be governed as nations by recognizing their natural limits and their peculiarities of descent as the limits of their respective Governments. But what are we asked to do here? I speak not of the individual with disrespect; but we are asked to seat a person here, in the British House of Commons, who declares himself to be an Austrian Baron. I know not whether Baron Lionel de Rothschild bears that title with the sanction of Her Majesty; but I must say that on examining the rolls of the last Parliament, towards its close, I was surprised to find that that hon. Gentleman had thought it becoming, that his name should appear on that roll with an Austrian title attached to it. There have been distinguished men in this House entitled to bear foreign titles—Sir Thomas Fremantle and others—but I never before knew a person appear in this House by a title derived from a foreign State. It may be an inadvertence; but it marks this fact, that one who is a Jew by race and religion does not regard with the same feelings the nation in which he lives as do those who are Christians, and who are identified with that nation both by birth and by religion. The truth is, that a Jew by his religion is bound to consider himself as neither an Austrian, nor a Frenchman, nor an English man, nor a Neapolitan, nor a German; and in all these nations you will find members of the Rothschild family. He is of a nation of which the present state of existence is a signal miracle, and I cannot help feeling that the hon. Member when he enters an Austrian title upon the rolls of this House, verifies the saying, that a true Jew can be really of no nation, but of that nation which is a standing miracle of the justice of the Almighty in its present scattered condition. I will not further detain the House. I cannot assent to 18 the Motion which has been proposed by the noble Lord the Member for London. My conduct on this question has been actuated by a sense of duty, and as long as I have a seat here I shall vote against this infraction of its Christian character. As long as I have a seat in this House I will ask those also who entertain the same convictions to vote with me. And I cannot think that our protest deserves to be termed intolerant, bigoted, or uncharitable; for what we ask is simply this, that the moral rule adopted for the conduct of this House in its corporate capacity shall be the rule of Protestant Christianity; if you condemn us as intolerant, bigoted, or presumptuous, you condemn the religion to which we adhere, and which we would see prevail as furnishing the code of morality for our guidance as an English Legislature. I warn you that this Act which you are now called upon to sanction is deeply and widely unpopular. You may meet with cheers from the inconsiderate, but I tell you that the feeling which lies deep in the breasts of the people of England is one of regret that, in what they consider a wanton exercise of liberality, this House should be tempted to discard that great code of morality which is their guide in the government of their families and in all the relations of life, and should depart from that recognition of the Almighty which is common to all Christians, and without which to us He is an "Unknown God."

The following judgment was given not long after the revolution of 1688. We not only have the right but we also have an indispensable obligation to resist. It would seem that the original contract (Coronation Oath) between the crown and the people is now broke, as the executive "*endeavours the subversion and total destruction of the government.*"

Impeachment of Sacheverell (1710)

Your lordships on this occasion will again consider the ancient legal constitution of the government of this kingdom; from which it will evidently appear to your lordships that the subjects of this realm had not only a power and right in themselves to make that resistance, but lay under an indispensable obligation to do it. The nature of our constitution

is that of a limited monarchy, wherein the supreme power is communicated and divided between queen, lords, and commons, though the executive power and administration be wholly in the crown. **The terms of such a constitution express an original contract between the crown and the people....** The consequences of such a frame of government are obvious.... If the executive part endeavours the subversion and total destruction of the government, the original contract is thereby broke, and the right of allegiance ceases. That part of the government thus fundamentally injured hath a right to save or recover that constitution in which it had an original interest.....

A year later, following Baron Lionel Nathan De Rothschild's admission to sit and vote in Parliament in 1858, Cardinal Manning wrote this in "*The Tablet*" in August, 1859:

If ever there was a land in which work is to be done, and perhaps much to suffer, it is here. I shall not say too much if I say that we have to subjugate and subdue, to conquer and rule, an Imperial race; we have to do with a will which reigns throughout the world, as the will of old Rome reigned once; we have to bend or break that will which nations and kingdoms have found invincible and inflexible. [...] Were heresy [i.e., Protestantism!] conquered in England, it would be conquered throughout the world. All its lines meet here, and therefore in England the Church of God [!] must be gathered in its strength.

We have a choice, we can look to God for salvation and return to path of Christianity, shown in our values, our way of life, in our institutions and in our legislatures around the world. Those who cannot swear "*on the true faith of a Christian*", must never again be allowed to take a seat in any legislature anywhere; because now you know what happened after just one got in, not by the front door, but carried out in a manner that was unprecedented in the annals of Parliamentary history and ultimately by the abuse of Parliamentary privilege.

A simple resolution (a policy decision) of the House of Commons extended their privileges, limited by the Declaration of Rights and the Bill of Rights 1688/9 to allow a Jew to sit and vote in Parliament and at a stroke, overturned the 1688 revolutionary settlement. This extended Parliamentary privilege created a virus that went on to infect all other Christian legislatures that have followed the Westminster system of government since 1858 by incorporating this extended privilege into their own Parliamentary Privileges and thus effectively destroying their own Christian legislature from within.

Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap **Galatians 6:7**