

There is Nothing Lawful about Common Law

Please download MP3 Audio Broadcast of this Blog > [here](#) (42 min 16 Mb)

Hello, this is Frank O'Collins and many thanks to all of you who take the time to listen to this audio and read this blog for Thursday 5th June 2014 entitled "There is Nothing Lawful about Common Law". By this topic I mean:

1. The Commonwealth Laws "or Common Law" being the Statutes passed by Westminster since Henry 3rd in 1224 right up to the present day have never honored the Golden Rule of Law that "all are equal under true law and none are above it"; and
2. The very fact that there are dozens and dozens of different definitions for Common Law, with none of them matching; The very fact that some claim it is the collected precedents of the courts, while others refer to the body of statutes of their own country; while others again speak of Common Law in terms of only the maxims embedded in both as if it is somehow equivalent to Natural Law means there is no clarity even to what Common Law is meaning it can't possibly be Law, because any law that is unclear cannot possibly be true law; and
3. As we will be discussing yet again tonight, when you actually get to read the statutes at large of Westminster claimed from the time of Henry 3rd right through to the present day, then it is blatant and obvious that there is no real justice through these statutes, nor fair process, nor any genuine attempt to follow the principles of civilized behaviour as defined by the Carolingians more than a thousand years ago, or by Emperor Constantine more than seventeen hundred years ago. In fact, the laws of Westminster make the most brutal laws of pagan Rome seem noble and we will speak and look at some of these tonight.

The reason I chose to do this final blog on the topic of Common Law and why there is nothing lawful about it at all, is because of some of the confused responses I received from some of you, in reply to the blog and audio from last week entitled "***The Secrets and Truth about Common Law Revealed***" read this blog entitled "There is Nothing Lawful about Common Law".

The first reason for this blog is that whenever I do a blog and audio, I try to build upon what we have already discussed. The blog and audio from last week was no

different and so I hoped that people would get around to reading or listening to one of the earlier blogs and audios about the nature of law, what is law, so there is no confusion when legal scholars and others start writing up definitions claiming Common Law is equivalent to Natural Law. If you did have the chance to listen to some of the previous audios and read the previous blogs then you would know with some certainty how preposterous that idea of Common Law being equal or similar to Natural Law. But if you are in any doubt, then hopefully tonight will make it abundantly clear.

The blog last week was about flushing out the fact that within the Statutes of Westminster there are acts of parliament starting from the 13th century listing rights, remedies and wrong – often hundreds of years before other acts come into existence, trying to throw us off the land, or out of our homes, or turn us into “things”, or bind us under oppressive contracts. So what I was arguing is that if the Common Law is to mean anything, then at least it must respect the foundation from which it claims its legitimacy.

Secondly, as Common Law or the Commonwealth Laws of England through Westminster deal with statutes, any sensible discussion needs to address the nature of what are Statutes. That is another reason I was hoping that anyone coming to listen to last week and this week, will take the time to read and listen to earlier blogs such as the one on Thursday May 22 entitled “***Proof that the Bankers and their Agents have completed destroyed any illusion of Rule of Law in Western Societies***”. If I kept going back to write and say the same things covered in these earlier blogs and audios then it would make moving forward very difficult. So again, I hope you can find the time to listen to at least the most recent blogs so the items we discuss tonight make sense.

Thirdly, if something I say is not clear; or if something I write appears in error; or if you feel there is any discrepancy, then I welcome the suggested correction, the request for clarity. We are all learning and so I welcome even criticism. All I ask, is that you take the time to hear what I am saying, read what is written and keep an open mind. That’s all.

If there is no remedy then there is no law

As I wrote and said last week, I am not trying to endorse the Statutes of Westminster- I am only putting out a reminder to all of us that there are many dozens of alleged ancient statutes supposedly providing remedy to any sort of corrupt officials, greedy bankers and malicious court officials. The ***Magna Carta***, The ***Statute of Merton of 1235***, The ***Statute of Westminster of 1275*** and of ***Gloucester of 1278*** and of Westminster again in ***1285*** and the

Statute of the Defense of Rights of 1292 and the **Statute of Westminster of 1357** and the **Bill of Rights of 1689** are all examples within the body of thousands of Statutes of Commonwealth Law or Common Law which describe certain rights, wrongs against injuring rights and remedies of such rights are injured. As we discussed last week, if there is no remedy against some deprivation of rights then such an instrument cannot be law – as where there is no remedy there is no law.

These statutes I mentioned as well as many more, claim to provide some form of remedy in the face of tyranny and corruption. For example, an act of 1889 (**52&53Vict. c.69**) under Queen Victoria provides clear remedy against any form of official corruption dealing with public officials and in particular with local government. An act by Henry 8th in 1529 (**21Hen.8 c.15**) also provides relief against false recoveries for example.

The problem is that these kind of statutes are hidden all over the place and difficult to find. That is why I am not simply giving a list of all statutes to you or to others but linking them up through the Canons of law on One-Heaven.Org so whenever we discuss a concept in law that has some history within Common Law, then when we outline that history I will be making sure there are direct links to specific statutes to show you. So far, I have linked a few hundred different sections within the Canons and there if many hundreds of links to go.

It is also useful to know the origin of certain law and procedures like when one goes to court. Last week, I referred to a particular definition of Common Law that defined the period from 1848 onwards as effectively the end of Common Law with the abolition of certain procedures and standards within Common Law courts as well as the introduction of a new form of justice called “summary justice” in the name of efficiency which in effect considers you guilty before being proven innocent – or the reverse of what the law should be.

So Acts like **c.43** of 1848 (**11&12Vict. c.43**) on the new proceedings of Summary Justice, or follow up acts of 1857 (**20&21Vict. c.43**) and 1879 (**42&43Vict. c.49**), 1881 (**44&45Vict. c.24**) and 1884 (**47&48Vict c.43**) are important to comprehend, particularly if someone was contemplating defending yourself. I am not saying you should or should not such action. What I am saying is that knowledge and competence of the origin of their procedures, such as the Common Law Court Procedural Changes in 1854 (**17&18Vict. c.125**) and 1857 (**23&24Vict. c.126**) and 1860 (**23&24Vict. c.126**) are critical if you are to be competent in any manner do contemplate a self defense. By reading the statutes, you get to see how the procedures or proceedings within courts evolved over time.

Different forms of “Common Law”

I also explained last week that where certain communities have embraced some of the body of statutes of Westminster as Common Law we have the condition where some of these statutes of potential rights and remedies remain active, because subsequent repeals may not apply. That was the point I was trying to make in explaining for example the situation of some of the 13 colonies of the United States that chose to adopt some of the laws of Great Britain prior to 1776 that were not repugnant to the Declaration of Independence.

Similarly, when Australia was declared a country in 1900 – keeping in mind I have used the word country and not sovereign and independent land or body politic – that the Common Law was recognized firstly as those laws back before 1828 and the Australian Courts Act. It is different again for Canada for example and its recognition of Common Law before its constitution was enacted in 1867.

As far as this being a little confusing when different countries claim to follow Common Law yet have different interpretations of just what the Common law is, the **Statute of Westminster of 1931** should have put a rest to all those points of confusion. This Act of 1931 made it crystal clear that no country, dominion, territory or people are bound by any Statute of England, or Great Britain or the United Kingdom from that date forward, unless the legislative body of such a country, or dominion or territory also pass a similar act. In other words, just because it is promulgated by Westminster, unless it is also passed by the House of Representatives also known as the Congress in the United States or the House of Commons of Canada or the House of Representatives in Australia, then the law does not apply.

So I hope this makes the questions concerning different dates and times as to the Common law clearer.

Repugnant and Insane Acts of Common Law

OK, let's go back to the theme of this blog and the issue that “There is Nothing Lawful about Common Law”. So far, we have been talking about some of the older acts which outline rights, wrongs and remedies. But what about the raft of acts of Westminster that fly in the face of these rights and remedies? What about the raft of acts that declare you are not only dead at law, but to be counted as dead? Or that people without money or title are to be treated literally as useless cattle, to be rounded up as slaves? Surely, if these kinds of laws still find themselves active today, then any argument the Common law is lawful is a complete lie.

So let's start then with the occult acts obsessed in converting the world from the living to the undead – or the origin of the obsession of the ruling elite in zombies.

If you have come to read some of the material on Ucadia websites then you have come across the term **Cestui Que Vie** meaning a type of trust created, usually in secret for the alleged benefit of another. There are many other names for such trusts, namely term of life or years, or per autre vie, or fides commissary trust, or foreign citus trust to name a few. There has also been a lot of rubbish spread around about Cestui Que Vie Trusts as well, with some blogs trying to belittle the discussion as some kind of grand conspiracy or delusion. So let's lay this to rest then.

The origin of Cestui Que Vie Trusts is almost certainly around 1535 during the reign of Henry VIII. We know this because these type of trusts are essential to the holding of rights of others and therefore the act of seizing the smaller estates of everyone, hidden as small spiritual estates in 1535 could not have conceptually worked, without the existence of CQV trusts. Unfortunately, we no longer have any record of the original acts creating CQV as they are long since been lost, or destroyed and replaced by new forged statutes. What we have instead, is a range of acts that give us some insight into their operation, namely

Now, some of the arguments in creating a CQV trust are that someone is lost, abandoned, presumed dead, or an infant, or lunatic, an idiot or some other argument of unsound mind. This is why the connection between CQV trusts and the claim that their existence supports the argument that under the wholly corrupt and insane world of Common Law, the politicians of Westminster declared everyone dead.

It is to this argument that young lawyers and internet trolls have a field day. They cite all kinds of counter arguments why this is simply false. Well, is it? Let's have a look at the *prima facie* evidence – the undeniable facts and proof.

The general statutes cite the 6th Act of Charles the 2nd in the 18th year of his reign or 1666 as the Cestui Que Vie Act. Some books, deliberately move this act to 1667 to avoid the obvious occult reference (**19Car.2 c.6**). In fact, the act is all about the concept of Proof of Life and while we do not have the original act, it was almost certainly responsible also for what was known as the Bills of Mortality or the Bills of the Dead that began after and not before (contrary to yet more confusion), this particular act.

The same deliberate confusion exists with the 18th statute issued in the 6th year of the reign of Queen Anne (**6Ann. c.18**) also concerning proof of life, but listed

in official records as a Cestui Que View Act. So, what does Proof of Life have to do with Cestui Que Vie Acts and Bills of Mortality or Bills of the Dead? A great deal actually.

The concept is quite brilliant and very simple and unfortunately virtually everyone, including the those agents working for the system fail to get it – under these two acts that are still part of “Common Law”, if you cannot and do not prove yourself Living, using the prescribed rituals and bullshit procedures of the nihilists inhabiting the sewers of Westminster, then you are not only dead at law, but literally dead. Not physically dead, but within the realm of the undead or Mundi. It is that simple.

Let me say it again so no one can possibly misunderstand what I just said. The Act of 1666 and the act of 1707 on proof of life and claimed as Cestui Que View mean that if you do not follow their insane and unjustified occult rituals and paperwork to prove you are alive and one of them, then you and everyone you know are dead in their system. How utterly corrupt and profane and sacrilegious against any notion of Rule of Law.

Still think Common Law has anything in common with Natural Law?

Let's move to another example. You may have heard of the Poor Laws of England, then Great Britain which are held up as the first working examples of welfare to stop the poor from starvation. Actually nothing could be further from the truth.

The poor were starving because like today, the rich and greedy and stupid with guns were stealing the means of survival of the poor and squeezing them till the died.

In fact, the occult leaders of the private Bar Guilds created two entirely different statutes on the books concerning the Poor Laws beginning with Queen Elizabeth 1st in 1601. One that is for public consumption ([43El. c.2](#)) and is all high and mighty in charity and Christian ideals and another private version ([43El. c.3](#)) which exposes the system for what it is – organized slavery.

Still not convinced about the evils of the Poor Law System of Common Law?

Fast forward to 1670 and the 22nd year of the reign of Charles 2nd and the formalization of poor workhouses ([22Car.2 c.18](#)). These were not refuges but hell holes. A prison would have had better conditions than workhouses. No, these were enterprises in collusion with Christian ministers, the government and private enterprise to exploit the poor for their own ends. Sound familiar to today?

Have a look then at the workhouse test act of 1722 under George 1st (**9Geo.1 c.7**) or later under his grandson George 3rd in 1775 (**15Geo.3 c.21**). Suddenly all this rose colored platitudes on the beautiful Common Law is exposed for what it is, as by this time people who had their lands seized and their property taken had the choice to either starve to death, or try and survive in a workhouse for a few years. Mothers were separated from their children. Husbands from their wives. In fact children were a valuable commodity.

Still think Common Law is something positive? Have a look at the Enclosure Act of 1773 (**13Geo.3 c.81**). Literally hundreds of thousands of people lost their homes, their possessions, their inheritance and were rounded up like cattle to be sold as slaves into private enterprise and the hell holes of workhouses.

Oh and children. Have a look at the act of the same year in 1773 that effectively endorses the sale of children as a commodity (**13Geo.3 c.82**) and (**17Geo.3 c.36**) endorsed by the church. Disgusting, deprived, wicked and wholly barbaric, without an inch of true law, or justice.

Which brings me to Common law viewing all those who will not bow down to Illuminati and ruling Elite Commercial Network as “things” and less than human or cattle. When you look at the statutes you can find plenty of acts speaking about Negro slaves

These acts are part of the history of the British Empire exploiting and raping and pillaging Africa until acts abolished the slavery of negroes in the 19th Century.

But what about white slavery? It seems there is no obvious mention of white slaves in the statutes even though we know that slavery was rife and that Ireland and Scotland and Wales suffered terribly at the hands of the mad English merchants.

It turns out you won't find any explicit act describing the poor of England, or Wales or Scotland or Ireland or any other colony as slaves, because they are called something else.

They are described as "*Horns Unwrought*" when they are docile and compliant, like most people are today – utter cowards, stupid and compliant, or "*Distempered Horned Cattle*" when they are no longer being cowardly and actually are trying to stop the madness of the souless and mindless ruling elite.

Well, we have an act of 1464 (**4Ed.4 c.8**) by Edwards 1st describing that the trade of a certain group of people of a certain exclusive religion known horners were banned from plying their tradewithin a certain distance of London in the taking of Horns Unwrought.

King James 1st in 1609 ([7J. c.14](#)) banned the business of the Mystery Company and the Horners of the House of Convertors and their perculiar and false religion from the business of white slavery of Horns Unwrought.

However Charles the 2nd in 1672 ([25Car.2 c.4](#)) opened the white slave trade partially back up on the selling of white poor people as "horned cattle", providing there are suffering distemper, or rebellion against the absolute control of the mad and corrupt ruling elite.

By the way, George IVth in 1825 through act c.105 repealed the ban on the exclusive business of white slaves or "Horns Unwrought" and the certain mysterious group also known as the Mystery Company and the House of the Convertors originally of Venice and Pisa and of a perculiar religion that claimed exclusive right of ownership of slaves for hundreds of years. This act put this particular group of a particular false and totally made up religion back into the slave trade of white slaves in 1825. The period right when we have the end to black slavery.

It wasn't just slavery of the poor people but the fact that if they ever did rise up like the Scots during the 18th Century, then none of these wonderful laws on the rights of men applied and under an act of 1737 ([10Geo.2 c.35](#)) and ([27Geo.2 c.15](#)) they could be summarily executed without trial or jury.

Dozens of acts in the 18th century refer to rebellious Horned Cattle with Distemper. I assure you, we are not speaking about mad cow disease but people fighting against injustice and trying to survive. Such as [1746](#), [1747](#), [1748](#), [1749](#), [1750](#), [1751](#), [1752](#), [1753](#), [1754](#), [1755](#), [1756](#), [1757](#), [1758](#) and [1774](#).

And even the suppression of people held in prisons and workhouses trying to survive ([23Geo.3 c.23](#)).

In my research of my family, I found that one of my great great grandmothers actually died in a work house in Ireland after her husband died and there was no means to support her children. From the time she was admitted, she lasted only five years in that hell hole, which is around the average life expectancy as a war of the Crown of the United Kingdom and its workhouses in Ireland in the 1860's.

The Invisible Constitution

There is nothing grand about the Common Law. There is nothing noble about the laws of England or Great Britain or the United Kingdom. There is nothing

enlightened or just or lawful about it. So the sooner people get over the delusion and actually read the statutes as I have, then the quicker we can have people working on how we get out of the mess of a corporate pirate world out of control.

As far as the United Kingdom being a democracy and having a Constitution: Public Law must be public, published and viewable. Otherwise it cannot be Public Law! Similarly, a Private Law or Special Law by its nature can be private. Again this is an obvious statement. Yet the point being whether a law be Public or Private, what it can never be is unclear, or missing, or unreasonable or impossible. If a Law is unclear, or missing pieces, or unreasonable or impossible then as Blackstone in his Commentaries on English Law in the 18th Century described, it ceases to be law.

The Common Law is not a constitution. The United Kingdom does not have a constitution. Nor does any of it resemble law of a true democracy of any sort in history.

So to all of you who continue to stand up, to read, to learn and become competent- Thank you! To those of you who care to **help** and support - Thank you! Until we speak next week, please be safe, be well. Thank you and good night. Cheers Frank