

From:

Address:

To:

Date:

Notice of Obligation according to English Constitutional Law

Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal. Notice to principal is Notice to Agent

Please read the following '**notice**' thoroughly and carefully. It is a **notice**, a **lawful document** and **evidence**. It informs you. It means what it says.
The information herein is of the **utmost importance** and requires your **immediate and urgent attention**.

Please be aware that failure to act **immediately** upon the evidence contained within this **lawful notice** in accordance with English Constitutional law, contravenes the lawful duty of any public servant within or without the realm of the English Isles and Commonwealth and, is an **offence** under various current constitutionally arranged treason legislation of the realm, the 1571 Treason Act for example (see exhibit D).

It is an offence at common law for any man or woman who knows that treason is being planned or committed not to report the same as soon as he/she can to a justice of the peace (misprision of treason); it is also an **offence** at Common law for any police constable, of whatever rank, to not investigate the clear evidence of crime(s) (**High Treason**) contained within this document, especially since Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 was lawfully invoked according to the correct protocols of

English constitutional law on the 23rd March 2001, invoked because of the treason committed within the treaty of Nice (see exhibit B and C). To even deny Article 61's invocation would be an act of sedition at common law and contravene the 1571 Treason act (see exhibit D).

Be warned - Ignorance is **no defence** in law. If current serving police constables will not defend the sovereignty of the people of the realm, whilst continuing to serve treasonous usurping forces, then it leaves no option but for the people to police and defend the realm themselves, as demanded by said Article 61, which provides each and every one of us leave to do so "in any other way they can". For without National Sovereignty we become a nation of slaves to a usurping force i.e, the United Nations (see exhibit B).

The traitor Prime Minister Harold Wilson, back in the 1950's stopped universities from teaching constitutional law (common law) as part of this treasonous plot. Since that time no police constable, nor members of the judiciary, or those who practice law have been taught the correct laws of the realm, they have instead been taught that rules created by a treasonous parliament are law and, that legalese is the language of law. They are also told that parliament is sovereign and that parliament can create whatever laws it likes without any accountability to the people or the law of the land, which is clearly and evidently **not the case** within a system of service under constitutional law. Ask yourself, how can an institution (parliament) which was created as a service to the people be sovereign over them....obviously it cannot!

Under constitutional law, the sovereign people of the realm including the commonwealth, are governed by the laws and principles that they are happy to be governed by. **All** public servants are in service to the people by sworn Oath of Office to a constitutional monarch, whom in turn is also in service to the people by sworn Oath (Coronation Oath). These facts are not difficult to discern, as these facts are clearly evidenced within the public domain and easily accessible with just a little investigation.

The principles of law are simple because they should be natural to us all....to cause no harm, no loss, and to remain peaceful, whilst also honouring any agreements made with others is all that is demanded by law, we are free to do anything that does not contravene these Four basic principles. Any integral man or woman would naturally be happy to be governed by these common-sense principles.

The English Constitution was evidently usurped by those seeking to overthrow the sovereignty of the people of this realm as far back as 1686 after James II was allowed to take the throne despite being Catholic. This contravened the 1559 Act of Supremacy created by Elizabeth I, whom reasserted the Christian protestant religion within the realm after her sister Mary I died, and made it so that any future monarch must be of the protestant religion in order to preserve the faith and the common laws and customs of the people. This was necessary after the Roman Catholic church had yet again sought to overthrow the English monarchy via Mary I (bloody Mary) whom was a papist sympathiser and a treasonous monarch. 1554 - Four months after Mary's accession, Parliament meets to re-establish Catholicism in England - The persecution of Protestants begins, the heresy laws are revived and England is reconciled to Papal authority (= High Treason).

Since 1686 all Acts of parliament created have **not** been granted royal assent by a constitutionally arranged monarch, therefore they cannot be laws at all, they are no more than rules of a treasonous administration. The 1688 Coronation Oath Act (the first time said Oath was created as an Act of Parliament) clearly promises that the monarch will abide by the statutes in parliament instead of the laws and customs of the people. This Act serves as evidence of treason committed by the English parliament at the time. The 1688/9 Bill of Rights also usurped the obligations of a constitutional monarch, whom is obliged to independently grant or withhold royal assent to government Bills in accordance with the laws and customs of the people.

Since we the people are lawfully compelled to compel you to act according to the truth (evidenced facts) without fear nor favour and, that you have a sworn Oath of Office and duty of care to respond to this Notice, and to investigate the allegations of treason contained herein. We also recognize the difficult position that certain individuals find themselves in when the truth is realized, especially those of you serving within the office of constable.

We seek to open up dialogue with good people within the police who are at least prepared to observe the evidenced facts if nothing more. We will not be compelling you to take action against the administration until it is safe to do so if you do correspond with us. When the time is right, we plan to supply support and protection to all those who are prepared to defend the truth and the realm, whether they be employed as public servants or not. We are prepared to correspond privately and to keep identities secret whilst we work on creating an end to this criminally insane regime. If you truly care about the future freedoms and health of

the people of this realm, and that of yourself and loved ones, and you are unhappy with the direction in which the country is heading, then join us quietly.

We the people are the largest force within the realm and we are growing in number by the day. We seek a common sense, peaceful remedy by asking for your help in returning the judiciary to the rule of law, and reasserting courts of law so that justice can be seen to be done. There may come a time where you will have a choice to make, either to defend the criminally established administration or to protect and serve the people, we urge you to make the correct choice.

Moving on to more recent treasonous events:
On 12 June 1941, imposter representatives of the English Isles, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, along with other nations met in London and signed the Declaration of St. James' Palace. This was the first of six conferences that led up to the founding of the United Nations and the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations were the driving force behind the creation of the European Union and are today seeking to become the world authority, which is why all sovereignty is being covertly and overtly destroyed globally.

The evidence contained within the book created by the UN after the Earth Summit took place in 1992 " Earth Summit Agenda 21" reveals the true intention of the United Nations agenda. All English councils today have a 'sustainable development' mandate.

Moreover:
A long-range deception strategy to create a single Federal European state with the erosion of each nation's sovereignty, currency and the powers to determine its own laws and affairs, was finalised by the Geo-political centre of the third Reich in Berlin 1942. This was done with the effect that should the Nazis lose the war, militarily, they should continue their plans for a European dictatorship economically, through corporatism (aka fascism), and political subversion. Their future shape of Europe is detailed in the seminars entitled 'Europaische wirtschaftsgemeinschaft' (public document worldcat. OCLC number 31002821). Translated into English as 'European Economic Community'. The chapter headings of this Nazi document were replicated almost verbatim in the 1992 Maastricht Treaty.

Since the end of the Second world war diverse treasonous persons, groups and movements with this ideology, have conspired to build on this agenda which has become known as the European Union.

The involvement of the English Isles in this agenda began in 1948 with the formation of the European movement. This was a state funded Anglo-French profederal European lobbying body posing as a non-governmental grass-roots pressure group.

The first move toward a federal Europe did not involve England directly, it was the signing of the treaty of Rome in 1957 by Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

Meticulous research has uncovered a wealth of official, archived documents from the period 1970-72 which shows the blatant deceit perpetrated by the (so called) 'ruling elite' at the time. These documents have been released after the thirty-year rule, which unlawfully hid them from the public. The Evidence file FCO 30/1048 has been within the public domain since 2002 and is easily accessible online. We strongly advise that you employ due diligence and investigate the evidence within said file.

The English common law applies to all sovereign living breathing men and women and dictates that we are all born free to do whatever we choose for ourselves, provided we do not cause harm or loss to another's life, liberty or property, or their rights to life, liberty or property.

England, within the United Kingdom of Great Britain is a common law jurisdiction and provides the people with National Sovereignty. The English parliament has no lawful authority ever to breach, surrender land or transfer, even temporarily, the sovereignty of the people except when conquered in open warfare.

No man/woman (neither monarch, nor prime minister, nor any prelate, politician, judge or public servant) is above the common laws and customs of the English constitution.

The 1559 Act of Supremacy is a constitutionally arranged Act and stands unrepealed to this day. The Act includes the clause: “No foreign prince, person,

prelate state or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm".

Treason at common law is the offence of attempting to overthrow the lawful governance of a state to which the offender owes allegiance; or of betraying the state into the hands of a foreign power (EU/UN) which is high treason, and still punishable by death (see exhibit D).

Sedition at common law is the offence of overt conduct such as speech and organisation that is deemed by lawful authority as tending toward insurrection against the constitutionally established order. Sedition includes the subversion of a constitution and incitement of discontent (or resistance) to lawful authority.

Evidence pertaining to sedition and High Treason committed by English Prime Ministers since 1973.

The evidence presented in the Foreign and Commonwealth document 'FCO 30/1048 files, shows that the Heath Government of the 1970's was well aware that an essential loss of national sovereignty would occur within thirty years with the passing of the European Communities Bill, and knew it would, in all likelihood, be rejected if brought to the people, which of course it was not. This in itself was an act of Sedition at common law by the Heath administration.

The passage of the European Communities Act on the 1st January 1973 established the principle that European law would always prevail over English Common law in the event of a clash, thereby overthrowing the supremacy of the English constitution, and was a criminal act of High Treason at common law by the Heath administration.

The signing of the single European Act in 1986 reducing Britain's independent decision-making powers further by extending majority voting in certain areas of policy making, was a criminal act of Treason at common law by the Thatcher administration.

The signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, based on the original EEC Berlin document 1942, surrendering sovereign powers of the Queen in parliament to an unelected body in Europe, was an act of Treason at common law by the Major administration.

The signing of the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997 increased the European Unions powers for action at community level. This included further European integration in legislative, police, judicial, customs and security matters and strengthened Europol, was an act of Treason at common law by the Blair administration.

With the full knowledge of this Treason and to escape future prosecution, the Blair government attempted to repeal the Treason legislation in section 36 of the 'Crime and Disorder Act 1998', also abolishing the death penalty for High Treason. This included the repealing of the Treasonable and Seditious Practices Act 1795. However, the crime of treason at common law still stands as common law has primacy and Tony Blair had no lawful authority to do so. Although this action by Tony Blair provides evidence of his criminal intent, the said 1795 Act was not created by way of a constitutionally arranged monarch, and is therefore not a lawful Act of parliament, subsequently it is used within this Notice under duress of circumstances.

The signing of the Nice Treaty in 2001 and the E.U. Constitution in 2004 were further acts of High Treason at common law by the Blair administration.

In an attempt to further protect themselves against criminal prosecution, the Blair government removed the word 'sovereignty' from the oath of office of constables in the police reform Act 2002 (section 83), and also modified the legislation to enable non British nationals to become police officers (section 82). These are acts of both Sedition and Treason at common law by the Blair administration.

The signing of the Lisbon Treaty in 2008 surrendered further control of policy making, including that relating to immigration and borders, was an act of Treason at common law by the Brown administration.

By surrendering further powers to the E.U. for direct taxation on the English people, and for allowing the EU to end the British rebate via further proposed treaties is evidence to prove that this was an act of Treason at Common Law by the Cameron administration.

By misleading the English people into voting to remain within or without of the treasonously established European Union, under the guise of 'Brexit', which granted authority to article 50 of the Lisbon treaty, whilst also allowing British armed forces to be under the control of the European Union (PESCO), and whilst

threatening to bring EU law (corpus juris) into English law, were blatant acts of High Treason at common law by the May Administration.

For allowing United Nations troops onto the streets of England whilst continuing to usurp and deny the English constitution, whilst creating “laws” (rules) which lock-down the people under false pretences i.e, covid 19 and, seeking to create rules to test and inject the sovereign people against their will whilst furthering the goals of the UN's Agenda 21 – 2030, are despicable acts of high treason at common law by the Johnson administration.

The treasury department of the European Community has never allowed an independent audit by professional accountants of their books. One year of non-publication is a criminal offence. In fact, its financial accounts have been disapproved by the E.U's own court of auditors. This crime has already been reported to the UK Serious Fraud Office by former MP Ashley Mote. They are in possession of the evidence and have confirmed to him that the remittance of English taxpayer's funds into the hands of this criminal enterprise is, of course, a criminal offence.

Today English constitutional law demands that we **all** stand in lawful dissent in support of the baron’s petition, which was correctly served upon the office of sovereign on the 7th of February 2001, and which was subsequently invoked as said on the 23rd March 2001. It is our lawful duty to continue to distress those who refuse to stand under the terms and conditions laid down under Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 (the security clause). It's invocation, which was reported in the Daily Telegraph by Caroline Davis on the 24th March 2001 under the title “Peers Petition Queen on Europe”, can only be denied by seditious means. The invocation of Article 61 still stands to this day as the lawful position of the English Isles and commonwealth. All of the evidence referred to herein is a matter of public record.

Furthermore, the fact that Magna Carta 1215 has **not** been repealed nor annulled, despite what the imposters within Westminster may say, is further evidenced by the following quotes.

Alistair MacDonald QC said in 2015 that:

“It is a terrible irony that, as we celebrate Magna Carta, it is being undermined by an executive which pays lip service to its principles. If the legacy of Magna Carta is to last another 800 years, it requires everyone with a sense of history and an

understanding of the critical importance of the rule of law to our society to stand up and fight for it. The liberties conferred by this great document were hard won. We owe it to posterity to ensure that they are not lost in our time."

Churchill, A History of the English Speaking Peoples (1956):
“Here is a law which is above the King and Parliament, and which even He and They must not and may not legally break. And in the event they or anyone else were to try to abrogate it, such attempt at abrogation shall have no force nor effect and can be safely ignored with no legal ill effect. In addition, in the event of successful attempts at abrogation of such liberties, customs, or rights, the King has commanded and do hereby compel any and all subjects to swear oath to join the barons to assail the properties and persons and families of those [. . . .] who had successfully completed such abrogation, including but not limited to that of the individual Members of Parliament who had voted in favour of any such successful attempts at abrogation. This reaffirmation of a supreme law and its expression in a general charter is the great work of Magna Carta; and this alone justifies the respect in which men have held it.”

We now **affirm** that all of the information herein is correct and true to the best of our collective knowledge and first-hand experience and, that we the people have 'Lawful Excuse' and the lawful authority to make and enforce (if necessary) such demands on all public servants to act in accordance with our 1000 year old common laws and customs.

As of yet treason is an unproven claim because no court of law exists within the realm to hear the matter. Whilst the police continue to ignore the truth in law (evidenced facts), and continue to aid and abet high treason instead of serving and protecting the people as they should be, we the people are increasingly duty bound by law and conscience to put an end to this travesty "in any other way they can".

We would of course prefer to use reason, logic and the truth to defend the realm in a peaceful and lawful manner by bringing the guilty parties to justice within properly convened courts of law however, without the aid of those entrusted to enforce the law of the land, the end result may not be as peaceful as can be envisaged. All police officers today are acting outside of the law in outlawry and

therefore have no protection under the law as a result, a perilous position indeed. History has shown that when the English people eventually stand up for their rights and freedoms, they are omnipotent. We shall show no mercy to those traitors within the realm who wilfully aid and abet the demise of our way of life if a peaceful remedy remains impossible to attain.

With regard to this 'Notice of Obligation according to English Constitutional Law' now being served, We the People of the Commonwealth & former Commonwealth countries provide your office with a reasonable time frame of at least fourteen (14) days for the necessary investigation into the evidence and allegations of high treason provided therein to take place.

Without Malice, vexation, frivolity or ill will, and on penalty of perjury.

Signed: We the People of the Commonwealth & former Commonwealth countries.

Exhibit C:

Daily Telegraph report on the invocation of Article 61 'Peers Petition Queen on Europe'. By Caroline Davies
12:00 AM GMT 24 Mar 2001

"**Four** peers invoked ancient rights under the Magna Carta yesterday to petition the Queen to block closer integration with Europe.

The Duke of Rutland, Viscount Masserene and Ferrard, Lord Hamilton of Dalzell and Lord Ashbourne were imbued with the spirit of the ancient Charter, thrust on King John in 1215. In accordance with the Charter's Clause 61, the famous enforcement clause, the four presented a vellum parchment at Buckingham Palace, declaring that the ancient rights and freedoms of the British people had to be defended.

The clause, one of the most important in the Charter, which was pressed on King John at Runnymede, allows subjects of the realm to present a quorum of 25 barons with a petition, which four of their number then have to take to the Monarch, who must accept it. It was last used in 1688 at the start of the Glorious Revolution.

The four peers, who were all thrown out of Parliament in November 1999, proved they had that quorum by presenting Sir Robin Janvrin, the Queen's private secretary, with the petition signed by 28 hereditaries and letters of support from another 60. In addition, they claim the support of thousands of members of the public.

They say that several articles in the Treaty of Nice agreed by Tony Blair in December will destroy fundamental British liberties. The Queen has 40 days to respond. Under the Magna Carta's provisions, if the Sovereign does not observe the Charter the people may rise up and wage war on her, seizing castles, lands and possessions until they have redress."

Exhibit A: Article 61 Magna Carta 1215.
61. "Since, moreover, for God and the amendment of our kingdom and for the better allaying of the quarrel that has arisen between us and our barons, we have granted all these concessions, desirous that they should enjoy them in complete and firm endurance forever, we give and grant to them the underwritten security, namely, that the barons choose five and twenty barons of the kingdom, whomsoever they will, who shall be bound with all their might, to observe and hold, and cause to be observed, the peace and liberties we have granted and confirmed to them by this our present Charter, so that if we, or our justiciar, or our bailiffs or any one of our officers, shall in anything be at fault towards anyone, or shall have broken any one of the articles of this peace or of this security, and the offense be notified to four barons of the foresaid five and twenty, the said four barons shall repair to us (or our justiciar, if we are out of the realm) and, laying the transgression before us, petition to have that transgression redressed without delay. And if we shall not have corrected the transgression (or, in the event of our being out of the realm, if our justiciar shall not have corrected it) within forty days, reckoning from the time it has been intimated to us (or to our justiciar, if we should be out of the realm), the four barons aforesaid shall refer that matter to the rest of the five and twenty barons, **and those five and twenty barons shall, together with the community of the whole realm, distrain and distress us in all possible ways, namely, by seizing our castles, lands, possessions, and in any other way**

they can, until redress has been obtained as they deem fit, saving harmless our own person, and the persons of our queen and children; and when redress has been obtained, they shall resume their old relations towards us. And let whoever in the country desires it, swear to obey the orders of the said five and twenty barons for the execution of all the aforesaid matters, and along with them, to molest us to the utmost of his power; and we publicly and freely grant leave to everyone who wishes to swear, and we shall never forbid anyone to swear. **All those, moveover, in the land who of themselves and of their own accord are unwilling to swear to the twenty five to help them in constraining and molesting us, we shall by our command compel the same to swear to the effect foresaid.** And if any one of the five and twenty barons shall have died or departed from the land, or be incapacitated in any other manner which would prevent the foresaid provisions being carried out, those of the said twenty five barons who are left shall choose another in his place according to their own judgment, and he shall be sworn in the same way as the others. Further, in all matters, the execution of which is entrusted, to these twenty five barons, if perchance these twenty five are present and disagree about anything, or if some of them, after being summoned, are unwilling or unable to be present, that which the majority of those present ordain or command shall be held as fixed and established, exactly as if the whole twenty five had concurred in this; and the said twenty five shall swear that they will faithfully observe all that is aforesaid, and cause it to be observed with all their might. And we shall procure nothing from anyone, directly or indirectly, whereby any part of these concessions and liberties might be revoked or diminished; and if any such things has been procured, let it be void and null, and we shall never use it personally or by another."

Exhibit B: The Barons petition.

The Petition.

A Petition to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II presented under clause 61 of Magna Carta 1215 on the 7th February 2001. To Defend British Rights and Freedoms.

"Ma'am,

as our humble duty, we draw to Your Majesty's attention:

1. the loss of our national independence and the erosion of our ancient rights, freedoms and customs since the United Kingdom became a member of the European Economic Community (now the European Union) in 1973;

2. the terms of the Treaty of Nice, 2000, which, if ratified, will cause significant new losses of national independence, and further imperil the rights and freedoms of the British people, by surrendering powers to the European Union:
a) to enter into international treaties binding on the United Kingdom, without the consent of your Government;
b) to ban political parties, deny free association and restrict the free expression of political opinion;
c) which can be used to introduce an alien system of criminal justice, abolish the ancient British rights of habeas corpus and trial by jury, and allow onto British soil men-at-arms from other countries with powers of enforcement;
d) to create a military force which will place British service personnel under the command of the European Union without reference to British interests, and contrary to:
i) the oath of personal loyalty to the Crown sworn by British forces, ii) the Queen's Commission, and
iii) the United Kingdom's obligations to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation;
e) which remove the United Kingdom's right to veto decisions not in British interests;

3. the creation by the European Union of a Charter of Fundamental Rights, which purports to give it the power to abolish such "rights" at will;

4. the unlawful use of the Royal Prerogative to
a) suspend or offend against statutes in ways which are prejudicial and detrimental to your sovereignty, contrary to the Coronation Oath Act, 1688;
b) subvert the rights and liberties of your loyal subjects, contrary to the ruling in Nichols v Nichols, 1576;

5. Your Majesty's power to withhold the Royal Assent, and the precedent set by Queen Anne under a similar threat to the security of the Realm in 1707;

Wherefore it is our humble duty **to petition** Your Majesty to withhold the Royal Assent from any Parliamentary Bill which attempts to ratify the Treaty of Nice unless and until the people of the United Kingdom have given clear and

specific approval; to uphold and preserve the rights, freedoms and customs of your loyal subjects as set out in Magna Carta and the Declaration of Rights, which you, our Sovereign, swore before the nation to uphold and preserve in your Coronation Oath of June1953, We have the honour to be Your Majesty's loyal and obedient subjects."

(signed)

Notes:
The House of Lords Records Office confirmed in writing as recently as last September that Magna Carta, signed by King John in June 1215, stands to this day. Home Secretary Jack Straw said as much on 1 October 2000, when the Human Rights Act came into force. Halsbury's Laws of England says: "Magna Carta is as binding upon the Crown today as it was the day it was sealed at Runnymede."

The Treaty of Nice signed by the British Government in December 2000 includes:

Article 24 –transforms the EU into an independent state with powers to enter into treaties with other states which would then be binding on all member states, subject to agreement determined by Qualified Majority Voting.

Article 23 allows the EU to appoint its own representatives in other countries, effectively with ambassadorial status.

Article 191 –assumes for the EU the right to "lay down regulations governing political parties at European level [ie: in the EU]" and withdraw or prevent the funding of political parties which do not "contribute to forming a European awareness." This is a clear restriction of free speech and free political association. It also introduces two particularly abhorrent propositions – taxation without representation and the use of sanctions to suppress public opinion.

Articles 29 and 31 –establish common policing and judicial cooperation (Eurojust).

Article 67 –allows matters of justice and home affairs to be agreed by QMV. These articles open the door to the imposition of Corpus Juris on the UK (article 31 specifically calls for cross-border policing and prosecution, and the removal of conflicts of jurisdiction), and the deployment of armed Europol law enforcement officers on the streets of Britain. These matters were originally dealt with under

article 280, which mysteriously disappeared from the draft of the Nice Treaty at the very last minute, in part at least following heavy pressure from British eurorealists.

Article 17 –establishes a common foreign and defence policy for the EU, with its own military force. The House of Commons was told on 11 December 2000, that: "The entire chain of command must remain under the political control and strategic direction of the EU. NATO will be kept informed." Her Majesty The Queen is Commander in Chief of all her armed forces and Colonel in Chief of 46 of Her Regiments of the British army, every other regiment owing its loyalty directly via another member of The Royal Family as its Colonel in Chief to Her Majesty.

The loss of the UK veto applies to 39 new areas of EU "competence", including indirect taxation, the environment, immigration, trade, employment, industrial policy, and regional funding. The EU also has plans for QMV to be expended to other areas not agreed at Nice, and without further treaty negotiations.

Charter of Fundamental Rights – signed at Biarritz, autumn 2000.
Article 52 purports to give the EU the power to abolish them at will, effectively making them meaningless. The whole proposition that the state has the right to grant and abolish fundamental human rights [ie: those we inherit at birth and hold in trust for future generations] is not only absurd but also contrary to Magna Carta, 1215, the Declaration of Rights 1688, and the Bill of Rights 1689." **[N.B. The Declaration and Bill of Rights were not granted royal assent by a constitutionally arranged monarch and are therefore unconstitutional, the barons committee failed to recognise that fact]**

"Clause 61 of Magna Carta was last invoked when the Bishop of Salisbury (Gilbert Burnet) acted on behalf of the barons and bishops of England to invite William of Orange and Mary to come to London in 1688, after King James II had failed to re-establish Roman Catholicism in England, and lost the confidence of the people. His act of abdication was to throw the Great Seal into the Thames and flee the country.

The ruling in Nichols v Nichols 1576 included the words: "Prerogative is created for the benefit of the people and cannot be exercised to their prejudice." (The Royal Prerogative is the power delegated by the sovereign to ministers to sign treaties on behalf of the nation).

In 1707, Queen Anne withheld the Royal Assent from the Scottish Militia Bill when it became apparent that James Francis Stuart (pretender Prince of Wales, and the Queen's half-brother) was planning with Louis XIV of France to invade Scotland from Calais in an attempt to establish a Jacobite sovereign. Were such an invasion to be successful, the Queen feared a Scottish militia might be turned against the monarchy. Thus, parliament's will was denied in the interests of the sovereignty of the nation and the security of the realm.

Addressing both Houses of Parliament on 20 July 1988, at an historic meeting of both houses to mark the 300th anniversary of the Declaration of Rights, Her Majesty said that it was "still part of statute law…on which the whole foundation and edifice of our parliamentary democracy rests."

The Declaration of Rights spelt out the details:

"…the said Lords…and Commons, being the two Houses of Parliament, should continue to sit and…make effectual provision for the settlement of the …laws and liberties of this kingdom, so that the same for the future might not be in danger again of being subverted. …the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed…and all officers and ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majesties and their successors according to the same, in all time to come."

Both Magna Carta and the Declaration of Rights are contracts between the sovereign and the people. Because they are not statute law they cannot be repealed. Both proclaimed what were taken to be self-evident freedoms which exist by right. Equally, both were based on a concept of permanence.

List Of Signatories Peers signing the petition:

Lord Ashbourne, The Duke of Rutland, Viscount Massereene & Ferrard (as Lord Oriel) Lord Hamilton of Dalzell signed and presented the petition at Buckingham Palace.

The petition was also signed by:

Lord Sudeley, Viscount Cowdray, Viscount Norwich, Lord Napier & Ettrick, Earl of Romney, Earl Kitchener, Lord Napier of Magdala, Lord Ailsa, Lord Sandys, Earl Cathcart, Lord Oaksey, Lord Milne, Lord Newall, Lord Barber of

Tewkesbury, Lord Dormer, Viscount Exmouth, Lord Wise, Earl of Devon, Earl of Cromer, Earl of Shannon (as Lord Carleton), Lord Sandford, Marquis of Aberdeen (as Earl Aberdeen), Lord Strathcarron, Lord Craigmyle. The Countess of Dysart also signed, but the Dysart title is Scottish and pre-dates the Union of 1707.
Letter To The Queens Private Secretary
Sir Robin Janvrin, KCVO, CB
Principal Private Secretary to Her Majesty The Queen
Buckingham Palace
London
23 March 2001

"You were kind enough to invite a letter of amplification to accompany our petition to Her Majesty. Thank you.

The Treaty of Nice raises issues of major constitutional importance. It directly threatens our rights and freedoms, and undermines oaths of loyalty to the Crown. Such fundamental matters cannot be considered merely the stuff of day-to-day politics. They directly concern the Crown, the constitution and every British subject, including generations yet unborn.

We find ourselves living in exceptional times, which call for exceptional measures. Hence our petition to Her Majesty, which exercises rights unused for over 300 years – clause 61 of Magna Carta, which were reinforced by article 5 of the Bill of Rights.

As you know, the wording of clause 61 says: …and, laying the transgression before us, petition to have that transgression redressed without delay…And we shall procure nothing from anyone, directly or indirectly, whereby any part of these concessions and liberties might be revoked or diminished; and if any such things has been procured, let it be void and null.

We have petitioned Her Majesty to withhold the Royal Assent from any Bill seeking to ratify the Treaty of Nice because there is clear evidence (which we shall address in a moment) that it is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United Kingdom. It conflicts with Magna Carta, with the Declaration and Bill of Rights and, above all, with Her Majesty's Coronation Oath and the Oaths of Office of Her Majesty's ministers. Every one of these protections stand to this day, **which is why they are now being invoked by our petition.**

Ultimately, our supreme protection is Her Majesty's obligations under the Coronation Oath. The Queen has solemnly promised to govern the peoples of the United Kingdom according to the Statutes in Parliament agreed on and according to their laws and customs. Her Majesty also swore to preserve all rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to any of them.

From the spiritual point of view, it is unimaginable that Her Majesty would seek, in effect, a divorce from her duty. From a secular point of view, the Coronation Oath is a signed contract.

Recent statements by ministers, and by the previous prime minister, confirm that they would not advise any measure which might tend to breach the Coronation Oath nor betray Her Majesty's promise to her loyal subjects. Her Majesty accepts the advice of her ministers. Conversely, it is their duty to advise in accordance with the Coronation Oath. They cannot lawfully advise a breach. Nor can they gain or remain in power without swearing allegiance to the Crown. Yet the Treaty of Nice represents precisely such a breach, and it has now been signed by the foreign secretary using the Royal Prerogative.

Blackstones Commentaries (volume 1, page 239) says of the Royal Prerogative: The splendour, rights, and powers of the Crown were attached to it for the benefit of the people. They form part of, and are, generally speaking, as ancient as the law itself . De prerogativa regis is merely declaratory of the common law…

The duties arising from the relation of sovereign and subject are reciprocal. Protection, that is, the security and governance of his dominions according to law, is the duty of the sovereign; and allegiance and subjection, with reference to the same criterion, the constitution and laws of the country, form, in return, the duty of the governed We have already observed that the prerogatives are vested in him for the benefit of his subjects, and that his Majesty is under, and not above, the laws.

For such words to have meaning, the act of signing the Treaty of Nice by the foreign secretary demonstrates that ministers have de facto renounced their oaths of allegiance. Indeed, faced in due course with a Bill seeking ratification of the Treaty of Nice, the only options appear to be for Her Majesty to dissolve Parliament, or for the government to resign and fight an election on the issue. The ex-government would then be faced with seeking elective power to introduce new oaths of loyalty under a new constitution as part of their new manifesto. This

would distil the issues as perhaps nothing else might, since it would allow the people of the United Kingdom to decide whether or not they wished the constitution to be breached in this way, their rights and freedoms to be curtailed, and the position, powers and responsibilities of their sovereign to be diminished.

Of course, for the many thousands of subjects who have supported our petition, no such option exists. As the Act of Supremacy and the Bill of Rights put it: all usurped and foreign power and authority may forever be clearly extinguished, and never used or obeyed in this realm. no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate shall at anytime after the last day of this session of Parliament, use, enjoy or exercise any manner of power, jurisdiction, superiority, authority, pre-eminence or privilege within this realm, but that henceforth the same shall be clearly abolished out of this realm, forever.

So it is clear that no-one – neither sovereign, nor parliament, nor government, nor people – may tamper with, dismantle, destroy or surrender our constitution. We are all tenants of it, and trustees. We inherited these rights, and we have a supreme responsibility to pass them in good order to future generations. They are not ours to discard or diminish.

Which is why oaths of allegiance place an essential limitation on parliament's power, and the Queen's Coronation Oath is crucial. The Coronation Oath is a moral obligation, a religious obligation, a sworn obligation, a contractual obligation, a statutory obligation, a common law obligation, a customary obligation, an obligation on all who swear allegiance, it is the duty of government, and it is sworn for the nation, the commonwealth and all dominions.

The Coronation Oath is the peak of a pyramid, and all subordinate oaths are bound by its limitations. The armed services swear allegiance to the sovereign, not to the government of the day. This helps clarify the principle that allegiance is necessary, and not optional – an essential part of the checks and balances of our constitution. Without these oaths, and their lawful enforcement, we have little to protect us from government by tyranny.

We return now to our reasons for stating that the Treaty of Nice is unconstitutional. Our petition highlights several such clauses. We draw particular attention to article 191, which seeks to restrict the political freedom of Her Majesty's subjects.

The EU seeks to assume the right to lay down regulations governing political parties at European level [ie: in the EU] and withdraw or prevent the funding of political parties which do not contribute to forming a European awareness. This is a clear restriction of free speech and free political association. It also introduces two particularly abhorrent propositions – taxation without representation and the use of state sanctions to suppress public opinion.

Our political freedom is absolute. The Bill of Rights says so. It cannot be limited in any way. Her Majesty is rightfully inscribed on our coins of the realm as Fid. Def. and Lib. Def. – Libertatis Defensor, Defender of the Freedom of the People.

It has been suggested to us that a referendum or plebiscite might be an acceptable response to the question of ratification of the Treaty of Nice, but we do not hold that view. A referendum or plebiscite which purported to make lawful the infringement of our common law rights would itself be unlawful.

We come back to the oath of allegiance. Magna Carta says: "We will appoint as justices, constables, sheriffs, or other officials, only men that know the law of the realm and are minded to keep it well"…. How can such officers of the Crown organize such a referendum or plebiscite? These procedures would also infringe articles 1, 2 and 4 of the Bill of Rights:

1. That the pretended power of Suspending of Lawes or the Execution of Lawes by Regall Authority without Consent of Parlyament is illegall. (This must include the Coronation Oath Act.)

2. That the pretended Power of Dispensing with Lawes or the Execution of Lawes by Regal Authoritie as it hath beene assumed and exercised of late is illegall.

4. That levying Money for or to the Use of the Crowne by pretence of Prerogative without Grant of Parlyament for longer time or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted is Illegall. (This is further protection of our common law rights.)

In the event that the Treaty of Nice is considered for Royal Assent we respectfully request that Her Majesty grant us an opportunity to examine the opinion of those who seek to alter our constitution by contrary advice. Accordingly, under those same terms of Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights quoted earlier, we the undersigned, and others– have formed a Barons Constitutional Committee to be

available for consultation and to monitor the present situation as it develops ..until redress has been obtained.

We are and remain Her Majesty's most loyal and obedient subjects."

Ashbourne Rutland Massereene & Ferrard Hamilton of Dalzell

The Reply:

"I am commanded by The Queen to reply to your letter of 23rd March and the accompanying petition to Her Majesty about the Treaty of Nice.

The Queen continues to give this issue her closest attention. She is well aware of the strength of feeling which European Treaties, such as the Treaty of Nice, cause. As a constitutional sovereign, Her Majesty is advised by her Government who support this Treaty. As I am sure you know, the Treaty of Nice cannot enter force until it has been ratified by all Member States and in the United Kingdom this entails the necessary legislation being passed by Parliament."

Exhibit D:
(Please be aware that the 1571 Treason Act is current constitutional law, which was created by a constitutionally arranged monarch and has **not** been repealed by the same).

Elizabeth I - 1571 Treason Act:

"An act whereby certain offences be made treason. . . . Be it enacted, declared, and established. . . . that, if any person or persons whatsoever, at any time after the last day of June next coming during the natural life of our most gracious sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth. . . , shall, within the realm or without, compass, imagine, invent, devise, or intend the death or destruction, or any bodily harm tending to death, destruction, maim, or wounding of the royal person of the same our sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth; or to deprive or depose her of or from the style, honour, or kingly name of the imperial crown of this realm or of any other realm or dominion to her majesty belonging, or to levy war against her majesty within this realm or without, or to move or to stir any foreigners or strangers with force to invade this realm or the realm of Ireland or any other her majesty's dominions

being under her majesty's obeisance, and such compasses, imaginations, inventions, devices, or intentions, or any of them shall maliciously, advisedly, and expressly utter or declare by any printing, writing, ciphering, speech, words, or sayings; or if any person or persons whatsoever, after the said last day of June, shall maliciously, advisedly, and directly publish, declare, hold opinion, affirm or say by any speech, express words, or sayings that our said sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth, during her life is not or ought not to be queen of this realm of England and also of the realms of France and Ireland, or that any other person or persons ought of right to be king or queen of the said realms. . . , during her majesty's life, or shall by writing, printing, preaching, speech, express words, or sayings maliciously, advisedly, and directly publish, set forth, and affirm that...our said sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth, is an heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel, or an usurper of the crown of the said realms or any of them; that then all and every such said offence or offences shall be taken, deemed, and declared, by the authority of this act and parliament, to be high treason; and that as well the principal offender or offenders therein as all and every the abettors, counsellors, and procurers to the same offence or offences, and all and every aiders and comforters of the same offender or offenders...shall suffer pains of death and also forfeit unto the queen's majesty, her heirs, and successors, all and singular lands, tenements, and hereditaments, goods, and chattels, as in cases of high treason by the laws and statutes of this realm at this day of right ought to be forfeited and lost. . . . And be it further enacted that, if any person shall in any wise hold and affirm or maintain that the common lawes of this realm not altered by parliament ought not to direct the right of the crown of England; or that our said sovereign lady. . . , with and by the authority of the parliament of England, is not able to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to limit and bind the crown of this realm and the descent, limitation, inheritance, and government thereof ; or that this present statute, or any part thereof, or any other statute to be made by the authority of the parliament of England with the royal assent of our said sovereign lady. . . . for limiting of the crown, or any statute for recognizing the right of the said crown and realm to be justly and lawfully in the most royal person of our said sovereign lady. . . . is not, are not, or shall not or ought not to be forever of good and sufficient force and validity to bind, limit, restrain, and govern all persons...whatsoever; every such person, so holding, affirming, or maintaining during the life of the queen's majesty, shall be judged a high traitor, and suffer and forfeit as in cases of high treason is accustomed."