Joe Biden used his executive powers by Proclamation to issue an Executive Order that mandates the jab. What are Executive Orders? They are Orders made by the President alone, without concurrence of Congress, your duly elected lawmakers.

Executive Power to issue Proclamations by the President of the USA is the same as an exercise of the prerogative power to issue Proclamations by Order in Council by the Monarch in England who is constitutionally and contractually bound by the terms of both the Coronation Oath and the Bill of Rights 1688/9. An order in Council is made by the King "*by and with the advice of his Privy Council alone*". However, such Proclamations are only binding so far as they are founded upon and enforce the laws of the realm. They cannot alter the Common Law or create a new offence. They cannot be subversive of the rights and liberties of the subject and cannot be used in an innovatory way. If this were not so, the executive could dispense with Parliament and Judiciary and become an unlimited tyranny.

Ironically, that is precisely what the Executive have done, except that they have entered into a partnership with the judiciary in order to have their system of administrative law enforced. Administrative Courts were created not by Act of Parliament, but simply by the issuing a Practice Statement that changed the name to Administrative Courts. Any guesses as to who makes the rules that regulate the proceedings in these Courts? Further clues will be provided in this essay.

A proclamation is legislation by decree. 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 measureable distance of government by decree, and government by decree, after all, is the hallmark of dictatorships everywhere.

"Prerogative is created for the benefit of the people and cannot be exercised to their prejudice"
(Nichols v. Nichols 1576)

American Presidents too are under the same restraints. One every occasion that President Trump exercised these Executive powers is was for the benefit of the American people, which he was bound to do by the terms of both the 1776 Constitution and his sworn oath of office. Furthermore, the swearing of an oath, a morally binding act, means that failure to fulfill the oath is perjury. There is an interesting distinction between the crime of perjury and other crimes: crimes in law require malice aforethought. Could it therefore be thought that no perjury has been committed where an oath, subsequently broken, was made in good faith, and only later on did the forswearer decide to give false evidence? From this it is clear that the nature of an oath is to create an ongoing obligation, one that a person of honour could not resile from, and that an oath made on one day binds the swearer forever afterwards, creating the continuing possibility of perjury if the oath is broken, regardless of the fact that no false intention was held at the very time the oath was taken.

Back in the days of Alfred the Great, the difference between Englishmen and the Vikings was seen in the fact that the Vikings broke their oaths: such people were not to be trusted. Consequently, oath-breaking, in other words, perjury, has always been contrary to Common Law, although the first Act of Parliament dealing with perjury appears to be the 1540 Maintenance and Embracery Act. De Bracton indicated that perjury was against the Common Law as understood in his day: *"The punishment of those convicted in the aforesaid assises will be this: first of all, let them be arrested and cast into prison, and let all their lands and chattels be seized into the king's hand until they are redeemed at the king's will, so that nothing remains to them except their vacant tenements. They incur perpetual infamy and lose the lex terrae, so that they will never afterwards be admitted to an oath, for they will not henceforth be oathworthy, nor be received as witnesses, because it is presumed that he who is once convicted of perjury will perjure himself again."*

A society populated by people you cannot trust to keep their word is not a society at all, and where society retreats, bureaucratic power rushes in to fill the void.

Extract from the case of proclamations1610 :

"In the same term it was resolved by the two Chief Justices, Chief Baron, and Baron Altham, upon conference betwixt the Lords of the Privy Council and them, that the King by his proclamation cannot create any offence which was not an offence before, for then he may alter the law of the land by his proclamation in a high point; for if he may create an offence where none is, upon that ensues fine and imprisonment; also the law of England is divided into three parts, common law, statute law, and custom; but the King's proclamation is none of them: also malum aut est malum in se, aut prohibitum, that which is against common law is malum in se, malum prohibitum is such an offence as is prohibited by Act of Parliament, and not by proclamation.

Also it was resolved, that the King hath no prerogative, but that which the law of the land allows him."

In Chapter seven of Blackstones "Commentaries of the laws of England" entitled OF THE KING'S PREROGATIVE he had this to say: *"And ſir Henry Finch, under Charles the firſt, after the lapſe of two centuries more, though he lays down the law of prerogative in very ſtrong and emphatical terms, yet qualifies it with a general reſtriction, in regard to the liberties of the people. "The king hath a prerogative in all things, that are not injurious to the ſubject; for in them all it muſt be remembered, that the king's prerogative ſtretcheth not to the doing of any wrong"*

Former Presidents like Bush, Obama, Clinton and Biden have got away with unconstitutional use of Executive powers because little is known by the great majority of Americans of the restrictions placed on them. What restrictions apply to the prerogative powers of a Monarch to issue Proclamations also apply to Presidential Proclamations for the reasons given above.

In England, all members of the Executive also happen to be Privy Counsellors. Regulations made by the Privy Council give themselves the power to do acts which only Parliament can do, and then by licence, they give a power to dispense with that which their own order was meant to effect. A classic example is the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. It's the regulations that prohibit cannabis, but then allows exemptions under licence. Think of all the regulations that control our everyday life, parking, regulations, traffic enforcement regulations, building regulations, council tax enforcement regulations, flight regulations, Coronavirus regulations, the list is endless, and yet they are not made by our democratically elected lawmakers.

All regulations are made by the Executive in Council, that is, the Privy Council (around 700 of them) in their corporate capacity through the "Crown Corporation" and run out of their offices in London where the Pilgrim Society are also based. This treasonous, fraudulent & corrupt private, foreign corporation run the corporations of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India and all other self governing dominions and colonies that operate under the Westminster system of government including Jamaica, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Papua Ne w Guinea, St Christopher and Nevis, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Tuvalu, Barbados, Grenada, Solomon Islands, St Lucia and The Bahamas, India, South Africa etc, around 70 or more in total.

The Privy Council in London connect to their counterpart Privy Counsellors and Counsellors of State, in other countries, all of whom were cast adrift from the protection of the Laws of England with their Corporate Constitutions drawn up by Orders in Council and through membership of the United Nations, they have established internationally those principals of Colonial government that had always been carried out in practice between living Monarchs and their subjects in their Colonial Empire, only now in a fictional, Corporate capacity. The United Nations is the continuation of the scheme for a World government that started with the Covenant of League of Nations in 1919.

In order to conquer us, subversives have been hard at work, learning just how our "flexible" Constitution really was in order to develop schemes, procedures and tactics to undermine and ultimately destroy it.

Our thanks go to some of the most prominent families who carried out this constitutional research and helped make this happen, the Rothchilds,* the Salisbury, the Cecils, the Cranbournes and don't forget the many Lord Chancellors from at least 1966 who sold us out and without whose valuable assistance this would not have been possible.

* (Immediately after the Napoleonic wars, the Illuminati assumed that all the nations of Europe were so destitute and so weary of wars that they would willingly accept any solution. Through the Congress of Vienna, the Rothschilds had hoped to create a sort of early league of nations, their first attempt at one-world government.)

Also, a big shout out to the Lord Chancellor Lord Gardner, who in July 1966 issued a Practice Statement, the penultimate paragraph which reads:

Practice Statement [1966] 3 All ER 77

Judgment - Judicial decision as authority - Stare decisis - House of Lords - Freedom of House of Lords to depart from their previous decisions where right to do so - Doctrine of precedent nevertheless an indispensable foundation of decisions of law.

"In this connection they will bear in mind the danger of disturbing retrospectively the basis on which contracts, settlements of property and fiscal arrangements have been entered into and also the especial need for certainty as to the criminal law."

Why contracts, fiscal arrangements and property and the especial need for certainty as to the criminal law? That's because they don't want this practice overturned by another group of Judges who might go the other way in the future, because that may well then expose them to their criminal actions. I believe we have what is known as the collective responsibility of Judges, so, one rotten apple and they all go.

I thought things didn't quite add up a few years ago so I contacted the new Supreme Court to see if they would kindly answer a few constitutional questions that I had for them. This is the email:

10th November 2011.

enquiries@supremecourt.gsi.gov.uk

Dear Sir,

I have been engaged in research on constitutional law for many years now and in particular, our Common Law. This research is still ongoing.

When I called the Supreme Court recently to see if you would be able to answer a few questions that I have formulated, I was kindly advised to email them to you and you would pass them on to someone who should provide the answers that I was seeking.

One conclusion that I have come to is that there are now no Common Law Courts operating in England.

1. Could you please confirm if this is correct?

I have looked on your website and noticed that you are shown as a 'Superior' Court of Record.

2. What is the significance and meaning of the word 'Superior' with respect to a Court of Record?

(a) Could you please tell me what the relevance is to being a 'Superior' Court of Record, when I can find no evidence of any other Courts of Record in existence in England?

(b) Do you have inferior Courts of Record and if so, what are they and what is their role?

(c) What is a Court of Record?

3. Does the Supreme Court act as an ordinary, customary Court in the land known as England?

Following the Revolution of 1688, limitation was placed upon the Monarch by changes to the Coronation Oath and by the Declaration and Bill of Rights. This was an undoubted limitation upon the source of all governing power. Sir William Blackstone dedicated a short chapter of his commentaries to the 'Duties of the King' which he regarded as certain. One such duty or limitation was that the Declaration and Bill of Rights were to be followed and observed as the mode of government.

This revolutionary settlement declared all but Common Law Courts illegal and this constitutional principle was confirmed by Lord Denning during the debates on the European Communities Amendment Bill HL Deb 08 October 1986 vol 480 cc246-95 246 at 250:

"There is our judicial system deriving from the Crown as the source and fountain of justice. No court can be set up in England, no court can exist in England, except by the authority of the Queen and Parliament. That has been so ever since the Bill of Rights."

4. As the Courts are Her Majesty's Courts, and administrative law forms no part of our laws or custom which Her Majesty solemnly promised to uphold in Her Majesty's sworn Oath; on whose authority are Her Majesty's Judges relying on to use Her Majesty's Courts as the venue in which to conduct their business with the Executive and Her Majesty's subjects?

Halisbury's Laws of England /Administrative Law (Volume 1(1) (2001 reissue))/1 confirms that administrative courts are an arrangement between the Executive and the Judiciary.

R v Lancashire County Council, ex p Huddleston [1986] 2 All ER 941 at 945, 136 NLJ Rep 562, CA, per Sir John Donaldson MR [Master of the Rolls] *('Notwithstanding that the courts have for centuries exercised a limited supervisory jurisdiction by means of the prerogative writs, the wider remedy of judicial review and the evolution of what is, in effect, a specialist administrative or public law court is a post-war development. This development has created a new relationship between the courts and those who derive their authority from the public law, one of partnership based on a common aim, namely the maintenance of the highest standards of public administration').*

5. The Supreme Court claim to be bound by the 1966 House of Lords Practice Statement. Was the issuing of this Statement a coup and an overt act of treason by the judiciary in that it overthrows the established laws and customs of the realm, the very laws which they had sworn to Her Majesty to uphold through their Oaths of Office?

The following extract is from the judgment in R v Almon (1765) Wilm 243; 97 ER 935

"By our constitution, the King is the fountain of every species of justice, which is administered in this kingdom. 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 the Judges, who have the custody and guard the Kings Oath, and sit in the seat of the King concerning his justice."

6. Is the 1966 Practice Statement still being observed?

7. Does the fact that Her Majesty The Queen *per se* has never given Her Majesty's Royal Assent and that Parliament obtains the appearance of Royal Assent by the use of Royal Commissioners who are not bound by Her Majesty's Oath mean that all 'Acts of Parliament' during Her Majesty's reign are void at Common Law?

8. What is the relevance to the 1666 Cestu Qui Vie Act and the Cestu Qui Vie Act passed by Queen Anne in 1707 to the current practice of 'Law' in the Lower Courts?

9. The House of Commons was incorporated in 1908 and hence it is operating a legal fiction, trading in fictional unit of account. What is the relevance of this legal fiction regarding suits about "money"?

10. "Money bills" pass through the House of Commons and evade examination by the House of Lords. Could you let me know what is *legal tender* for such bills today?

According to Halisbury's Laws of England:

"In Great Britain there are no fundamental constitutional guarantees or prohibitions, and important rules of British constitutional law and practice are inconsistent with well-known versions of the doctrine…… In some Commonwealth countries it is unconstitutional for the Executive or the legislature to encroach on the domain impliedly reserved to the judiciary,[1] or for judicial functions to be vested in bodies other than courts, or for judicial officers to be appointed by the Executive."

(1) See especially *Liyanage v R* [1967] 1 AC 259, [1966] 1 All ER 650.

The following extract is from the above judgment.

Lord Pierse: *"Therefore the legislative power of Ceylon is still limited by the inability (which it inherits from the Crown) to pass laws which offend against fundamental principles. This vague and uncertain phrase might arguably be called in aid against some of the statutes passed by any Sovereign power…..Blackstone in his Commentaries said: 'Therefore a particular act of the legislature to confiscate the goods of Titius , or to attaint him of high treason, does not enter into the idea of a municipal law: for the operation of this act is spent upon Titius only and has no relation to the community in general: it is rather a sentence than a law.'…..If such Acts as these were valid the judicial power could be wholly absorbed by the legislature and taken out of the hands of the judges. It is appreciated that the legislature had no such general intention. It was beset by a grave situation and it took grave measures to deal with it, thinking, one must presume, that it had power to do so and was acting rightly. But that consideration is irrelevant, and gives no validity to acts which infringe the Constitution. What is done once, if it be allowed, may be done again and in a lesser crisis and less serious circumstances. And thus judicial power may be eroded. Such an*

erosion is contrary to the clear intention of the Constitution. In their Lordships' view the Acts were ultra vires and invalid."

12. How can there be no fundamental guarantees of the separation of powers in Great Britain if Ceylon is limited by an inability, which it ***inherits*** from the Crown, to pass laws which offend against fundamental principles?

What is the difference between Great Britain and the United Kingdom for the people of England?

13. Is the unlawful use of Her Majesty's Courts by the partnership between the executive and the judiciary fraudulent misrepresentation and treason, as it subverts and overthrows the established laws and usages of the Kingdom?

(The case of R v Thistlewood (1820) established that "To destroy the constitution of the country is an act of treason.")

Yours sincerely,

xxxxxxxxx

They never did reply. I wonder why?

This is the deep state, the un-removable, unelected pack of treasonable subversives that have been controlling and running the whole shit-show behind the scenes. Why do I say un-removable? A letter was sent to the Privy Council Office in London in the late 1980's over the Single European Act 1972 and the Amendment Act of 1986. The letter named over a dozen Privy Counsellors, pointing out that under those Acts, there was no provision for the retention of the Monarchy, their policies were incompatible with their oath, they had betrayed the trust the Queen had placed in them and that they should be expelled from the Privy Council. The reply received from the Privy Council Office was "astonishing." It suggested that if a member of a subversive organisation succeeded in attaining to a responsible position, that individual was no longer subversive by virtue of his position.

Thus: "Dear Sir. In reply to your letter of 22nd July (1986) the matters to which you refer are ..... matters on which Her Majesty is advised by Her Ministers. No question of conflict of loyally..... can therefore arise."

It is of interest to note that the Single European Act of 1972 (effectively a Bill of Rights for the Executive) and the European Communities (Amendment) Act of 1986 were actually drafted by Lord Cockfield and Malcolm Rifkind, both Privy Counsellors. This is subversion and treason from within.

Governance has now turned into a criminal enterprise with policy being put above the rule of Law. As the Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart indicated in 1929 in his controversial book "The New Despotism", he accurately predicted the administrative lawlessness now blighting not just England but the World. Administrative law, or what can be termed civil international law, is forced upon us by the use of the prerogative emergency powers, also known as Henry VIII clauses, which suspends the operation of constitutional principles..

This means that although we are in a Common Law jurisdiction, an alien form of law incompatible with our Common Law is being imposed on us to oust the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts. The Judges sitting in such hearings are acting in a quasi judicial or administrative capacity and are not under Oath as they should be in a Common Law jurisdiction. They are not Courts in the true sense of the word either, they are tribunals of facts.

In the 1934 case of Re Ashby, had this to say about such tribunals:

"The distinguishing mark of an administrative tribunal is that it possesses a complete, absolute and unfettered discretion and, having no fixed standard to follow, it is guided by its own ideas of policy and expediency. Hence, acting within its proper province and observing any procedural formalities prescribed, it cannot err in substantive matters because there is no standard for it to follow and hence no standard to judge or correct it by."

Reference to the Declaration and Bill of Rights1688 are helpful in this regard. They enumerate the grievances and then the remedy.

The grievance.

By issueing and causeing to be executed a Commission under the Great Seale for Erecting a Court called The Court of Commissioners for Ecclesiasticall Causes.

The remedy.

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 Pernicious.

The effect of the Declaration and Bill of Rights 1688, together with the Coronation Oath was an absolute prohibition on all but Common Law Courts. Since then, no Court can exist in this country without the assent of the Monarch and Parliament. The only Courts which have such authority are our ordinary, customary Courts. That we have all been subjugated to International or administrative law, has taken some ingenuity by the parliamentary draftsmen who have framed legislation.

The method by which administrative law (ecclesiastical law) was foisted on us to create a system of corporate governance separate from our Common Law traditions and the victory gained with the revolutionary settlement of 1688/9 stems back to a novel idea used to pass the National Assembly of the Church of England (Powers) Act 1919. The method used was to have an ecclesiastical committee of 25 Privy Counsellors to advise Her Majesty to pass laws but with no minister responsible for it and Parliament being unable to debate or amend it. They can only accept or reject it. This method was by the laying documents on a table for 40 days, still the current practice. It is a way of giving Royal Assent without any recourse to Parliament.

All legislation of this nature are not Acts of Parliament, merely to have "effect" as an Acts of Parliament. This is why the words *"Acts of Parliament agreed on"* were removed from the Coronation Oath before being sworn by Her Majesty at Her Majesty's Coronation in 1953. The Privy Council removed words from an Act of Parliament acting on their own authority and without the sanction of Parliament by claiming precedent, having made alterations to the Coronation Oath on at least two previous occasions, one in 1937 following the Statute of Westminster 1931, the passing of which was contrary to the Coronation Oath sworn by George V. Legislation MUST follow the Oath and not the other way round otherwise what would be the point of requiring the Monarch to swear an Oath that can be breached with impunity? It has to be commensurate with the terms of the Coronation Oath, otherwise perjury is maintained

The significance of this was that with the removal of those words from the Coronation Oath, Privy Counsellors could now advise Her Majesty to pass legislation that had not been sanctioned or debated in Parliament as they were not *"Acts of Parliament agreed on".*

It is a principle of the English law that the will of the Legislature being the supreme lawmaking authority, is the supreme law of the land.* The claim to unlimited legislative powers, usually referred to as the doctrine of the Supremacy of Parliament, (actually a doctrine of the courts) to legislate on any matter, is base on the principle that our duly elected lawmakers in Parliament would not delegate its lawmaking powers legislate and to create crimes to outside bodies not responsible to Parliament, but that is what they have done with the United Nations, the Privy Council and the Pharmaceutical industry** Because the Common Law controls the legislative powers of Parliament, Parliament can no longer claim to be "Supreme in all matters", so the doctrine of implied repeal is out the window as is the Human Rights Act, the Single European Act and all the foreign crap that was incorporated into English law.

'As a matter of law the courts of England recognize Parliament as being omnipotent in all save the power to destroy its own omnipotence.' (*Manuel v Att Gen* [1983] Ch 77 (Sir Robert Megarry VC). The omnipotence mentioned in this quote equals the whole Constitution. There is no enabling Constitutional authority bestowed on Parliament to destroy or diminish the very Constitution which is the source and foundation of its authority.

*https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/written-answers/2004/mar/31/parliament-legislative-powers

Lord Lester of Herne Hill
asked Her Majesty's Government:
Whether, in preparing legislative proposals to introduce into Parliament, they operate on the basis that the legislative powers of Parliament are, as a matter of British constitutional law, unlimited powers.

The Attorney-General (Lord Goldsmith)
The Government consider that it is a fundamental principle of British constitutional law that the competence of Parliament to legislate on any matter is unlimited.

Lord Lester of Herne Hill asked Her Majesty's Government:
What is their understanding of the legal sources from which the legislative powers of Parliament are derived; and what are those sources.

Lord Goldsmith
The source of the legislative powers is the common law.

**WEIGHTS AND MEASURES REGULATIONS WAYS AND MEANS *HC Deb 20 April 1964 vol 693 cc1017-54* 1017

Mr. Eric Fletcher (Islington, East) *"All I need add on the merits is that the Minister has been given certain powers, but he has not been given the power to sub-delegate his legislative function. It is contrary to all our traditions to attempt to confer upon a private body, however eminent, however respectable, the power to legislate and the power to impose additions to our criminal law, and that is what is being done. In Regulation 3 the Minister says that in so far as the British Pharmacopoeia and the British Pharmaceutical Codex revise current editions by adding various other drugs, with monographs attached to them, then individual members of the public become liable to penalties.*
I have no doubt that these are very reputable bodies which will act with the greatest circumspection and discretion, but they are not allowed to legislate or create a crime. That is the duty of Parliament. They are responsible to nobody, however properly they may wish to act."

Dr. Horace King (Southampton, Itchen)
"I believe that the hon. Member for Farnham is right: the issue we are debating tonight is whether we are prepared to hand over to anyone outside Parliament power to make laws which have never been approved by Parliament."

Magna Carta 1215 together with the Petition of Rights 1628 and Bill of Rights 1688/9 had been the basis of every grant of self-government to every one of the Dominions that the Crown governs throughout the world, and was the essential basis of the administration of Crown Colonies and Protectorates under the British Parliament.

Since 1689 there can be no doubt that the settlement terms upon the Crown apply in all its governance throughout all its territories. There appears no power to bypass this limitation of constitutional authority to any subsequent governance deriving its legitimacy there from.

How do the provisions defeat arbitrary power?

Firstly reading the Bill of Rights will reveal the following passage

*"….whom it hath pleased Almighty God to make the glorious instrument of delivering this Kingdom from popery and **arbitrary power**."*

Thus it is clearly declared in written text of the settlement documents as a principle objective of the settlement. To remove all ***arbitrary power***.

How might the provisions manifest this objective and defend the Subjects against all intrusive impositions hence forth? It is effected by the process of the separation of powers. Arbitrary power requires the unification of two ingredients the power to declare an objective unilaterally, and the power to enforce it. Those two ingredients are now combined in the hands of the Executive who have created a system of administrative law enforced by their partnership with the Judiciary. The problem is however, how does the Executive get you into their jurisdiction and their administrative courts in the first place? Here comes your fictional, all capital, corporate name and a ready-made enforcement arm, police officers. (See previous essay for that can of worms!)

Judiciary, Legislature and the Executive *HL Deb 05 June 1996 vol 572 cc1254-313*

Lord Mishcon *"If we are speaking about the separation of powers and the independence of the judiciary, is it right that it is ultimately a Prime Minister who decides who are to be our chief judges? It is a matter which ought to be considered not because of difficulty at this moment but because of the difficulty that future generations may have to face."*

Remember, the Prime Minister is also a Privy Counsellor and can appoint political judges but, as we have now learned, this system of administrative lawlessness now operating in the Courts is prohibited by article 3 of the Bill of Rights 1688 as being "*pernicious and illegall.*"

As General Flynn in the USA pointed out in a recent interview in referring to the USA, he said that acts of the Executive lack any democratic input. This is confirmed in the following judgment, given in the Highest Court in the land, the House of Lords, & the extract from a debate in the same House confirms that the Judiciary know that what is going on is wrong and that it's undemocratic & unconstitutional.

R (On The Application of Bancoult) V Secretary of State For Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs

HOUSE OF LORDS SESSION 2007-08 [2008] UKHL 61

"….But the fact that such Orders in Council in certain important respects resemble Acts of Parliament does not mean that they share all their characteristics. The principle of the sovereignty of Parliament, as it has been developed by the courts over the past 350 years, is founded upon the unique authority Parliament derives from its representative character. An exercise of the prerogative lacks this quality; although it may be legislative in character, it is still an exercise of power by the executive alone."

Hunting Bill (Hansard, 15 November 2004)

Lord Donaldson of Lymington.....In this context, judges have only two tasks. First, they must uphold and enforce all laws which have a constitutional and legal foundation; in other words, laws which have a democratic foundation. Secondly, they must protect the public from being harrassed by laws which, notwithstanding the bona fides of those promulgating them, have no constitutional and legal foundation; in other words, laws which are undemocratic and perhaps dictatorial in character."

Without this fundamental, representative element, we can now see that acts of the Executive do not follow due process as guaranteed by the Common Law and the famous Charter of Liberties, Magna Carta of 1215 and are therefore void ab initio. Interestingly, the due process clause in Chapter 29 of 1297 version of Magna Carta that is on the statute book has not been repealed.

Similarly, the Observance of due Process of Law Act of 1368, Chapter III, still remains on the statute book. *"None shall be put to answer without due Process of Law…. And if any Thing from henceforth be done to the contrary, it shall be void in the Law, and holden for Error"*

Due process is therefore recognized by both the Common and Statute Law.

Its also interesting to note that the John F Kennedy memorial is sited in Runnymede, England, where the great Charter of Liberties, the Magna Carta was sealed by King John in June 1215. What a co-incidence! The due process clause guaranteed by Magna Carta may well prove to be invaluable to all of us.

Fortunately, following the English Revolution of 1688, our ancestors foresaw what might happen in the future and left us with a remedy. The following judgment was given not long after the English Revolution of 1688. We not only have the right but we also have an indispensable obligation to resist. 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.....

This is supported in Chapter seven of Blackstones Commentaries of the laws of England entitled OF THE KING'S PREROGATIVE ….. *"we may now be allowed to lay down the law of redress against public oppression. If therefore any future prince should endeavor to subvert the constitution by breaking the original contract between king and people, should violate the fundamental laws, and should withdraw himself out of the kingdom; we are now authorized to declare that this conjunction of circumstance would amount to an abdication, and the throne would be thereby vacant. But it is not for us to say, that any one, or two, of these ingredients would amount to such a situation; for other circumstances which a fertile imagination may furnish, since both law and history are silent, it becomes us to*

be silent too; leaving to future generations, whenever necessity and the safety of the whole shall require it, the exertion of those inherent (though latent) powers of society, which no climate, no time, no constitution, no contract, can ever destroy or diminish."

The duty of vindicating the law, when thus abandoned by the Government, is cast, by the principles of the English constitution, on private citizens; if private citizens declined it, there would be no check on the illegal conduct of officers of the Crown.

When did this all start? In England we had reformers get into power in Parliament in the early 1830's and by the 1840's they were talking about socialist ideology creeping in. By the late 1850's we still hadn't learned and in July 1858, the House of Commons extended their Privileges, limited by both the Common Law and the revolutionary settlement of 1688 to a Jew, a man who could not swear "*on the true faith of a Christian*", and let Baron Lionel Nathan DeRothschild sit and vote in what had previously been a wholly Christian legislature. He was the original virus and it went on to infect all the self governing legislatures by incorporating this extended privilege into their own Constitutions. We kicked God and Christianity out of England in 1858 and since then we have done the same to all our colonies and self governing territories and have been ruled by wrong, not right in our Corporate capacity.

How important this is can be seen in when a year later, following Baron Lionel Nathan De Rothschilds 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.

Make no mistake, we are at war. Good v evil. Any weapon used to gain such objectives, whether it is psychological warfare, deceit or other tactics, may be regarded as a weapon of war. A television company disseminating supporting propaganda may be worth several army divisions to an enemy. Back in the late eighties when research was being done using the edition of Archbold that was available then, paragraph 3017 said: "Words spoken or written and published may constitute an overt act if relating to a treasonable act or design."

And the same authority, paragraph 3018: "Conspiracy: Where a conspiracy is laid as an overt act, the acts of any of the conspirators in furtherance of the common design may be given in evidence against all."

Objectives in waging war are:-

(a) To deprive the nation of food or other essentials.
(b) Seizure of the territories of the nation.
(c) Seizure of national assets, for use by foreign rulers.
(d) The establishment of alien laws, imposed by an alien ruler.
(e) The destruction of the national Parliament.
(f) The dethronement of the Monarch and the eradication of the national Monarchy.

No prizes for guessing who the military report to!