



The Council of Representatives
We The People UK
C/O Boxndice Ltd
Innovation Forum
Frederick Road
Salford
M6 6FP

Chief Constable:

Constabulary:

Collar Number:

Street name

(TOWN)

(COUNTY)

(POST CODE)

30th November 2020

This “NOTICE OF DEFAULT & OPPORTUNITY TO CURE” is for the attention of the named recipient only, their successor or the organisation Principal, you are required in your role as a public servant, to ensure the named recipient or your organisations Principal, receives this without delay. As a courtesy the recipient has been identified as having decision making authority along with vicarious liability for their organisation, they have also made a solemn Oath of public office, which may be used to hold them to account under Law should any eventualities arise with their response that deviates from addressing the issues raised within this lawful document, whether through Malfeasance, Misfeasance or Nonfeasance.

As a further courtesy we will draw your attention on the behalf of the named recipient of the **Maxim in law: Ignorance of the law is no excuse**. Whilst opening someone else’s mail is allowed in certain circumstances, should any dispute arise over the recipient disputing receipt of this Notice the material facts are clearly indisputable. Your own conduct may also be viewed as criminal, as although you may have responsibility for opening the recipients correspondence on a day to day basis in your job role, therefore establishing “reasonable excuse”, the wrong decision may be seen as “intending to act to the recipient’s detriment” and lead to prosecutions against those responsible.

NOTICE OF DEFAULT & OPPORTUNITY TO CURE

Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal, Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent

Dear

INSERT NAME

This is a lawful notice. Please read it carefully. It informs you. **It means what it says.** We do not stand under the Law Society's 'legalese' and there are no hidden meanings or interpretations beyond the simple English statements herein.

BE WARNED – The Maxim in law is very clear: **Ignorance of the law is no excuse.** Whilst the defence of '**Superior Orders**' often known as the '**Nuremburg Defence**', or '**just following orders**' was clearly discredited in the Attorney General of Israel vs Adolf Eichmann in 1961, leading to his conviction and subsequent execution on the 1st June 1962.

A reply to this notice is REQUIRED and is to be made stating the respondent's clearly legible full name and on his or her full commercial liability and penalty of perjury. Your response is required within FIVE (5) days from the date you were hand served this notice; failure to respond in substance will provide your tacit consent to all the FACTS contained within this Notice and or any previous Notice served; and that you are unable to provide lawful proof-of-claim to the contrary.

DO NOT IGNORE IT.

You are hereby again put on Notice of our standing and the lawful facts. If you fail to respond to the aforesaid Notices in 'substance' or within the reasonable time frame provided herein, without first legally rebutting the points of law claimed herein or within previous Notice(s) served, and abide by your duties as a Police Constable sworn by solemn oath under English constitutional law, it will be considered as an admission of your 'Dereliction of Duty'.

We The People state that:

- 1) Your Solemn Oath of Office (EXHIBIT A) as a Police Constable clearly shows your loyalty and Allegiance is to the Queen, confirming your lawful & moral duty to perform with Fairness, Integrity, Diligence & Impartiality and prevent all offences against people and property, acts of Treason and Fraud are just such offences.
- 2) You have a clear Oath sworn moral and lawful duty to investigate & prosecute where necessary the allegations of crime in case studies 1-7 within the 'NOTICE OF OBLIGATION ACCORDING TO ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL LAW'

- 3) The realm has not had a constitutionally arranged Monarch since 1686
- 4) The Treason Act 1571 (EXHIBIT B) is current constitutional law, which was created by a constitutionally arranged monarch and has NOT been repealed by the same.
- 5) For a Parliamentary Bill to become an Act of Parliament it must be granted Royal Assent by a constitutionally arranged Monarch
- 6) Constitutional Law stipulates Royal Assent may only lawfully be Granted or Withheld by the serving constitutionally arranged Monarch in accordance with their lawfully binding coronation Oath
- 7) Royal Assent can only be provided by a constitutionally arranged Monarch with Lawful Standing
- 8) The Security Clause of Magna Carta 1215 colloquially known as Article 61 was invoked on the 23rd March 2001 (Article C) & to this day has not been revoked
- 9) The invocation of the Security Clause of Magna Carta 1215 colloquially known as Article 61 deposed Queen Elizabeth II in law, making Royal Assent unobtainable even by an unconstitutionally arranged Monarch
- 10) The realm is a common law jurisdiction as clearly contracted by the unconstitutionally arranged Monarch Queen Elizabeth II to the people in her Coronation Oath.
- 11) While invoked the Security Clause Magna Carta 1215 empowers the Sovereign people of the realm to Police the realm in accordance with the law of the land.
- 12) While invoked the Security Clause Magna Carta 1215 empowers the Sovereign people of the realm to hold Court De Jure in accordance with the law of the land.
- 13) As part of the community of the realm (EXHIBIT D) we have lawful excuse to distrain and distress the crown in all possible ways. It is our common law jurisdiction claim that subsequent to due process and conviction by Court De Jure, the people of said court shall determine penalty regarding crimes of High Treason, Misprision of High Treason & Sedition, with regard to both statute laws of the admiralty tradition (such as the 1571 Treason Act) and the true, common law of the land, including all relevant historic cases, in determining sentence. Clemency shall be at the discretion of the court alone, not any monarch or other official.

This being the third Notice to be served the Council of Representatives for 'We the People' use this 'Notice of Default and Opportunity to Cure' as a reminder of the two preceding Notices, 'NOTICE OF OBLIGATION ACCORDING TO ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL LAW', and a 'NOTICE TO COMPEL PERFORMANCE', which were either ignored or mislaid, or were not answered correctly, or acted upon according to the claims and assertions stated within them in 'SUBSTANCE'.

Electronic copies of these two proceeding Notices are available on we-the-people.co.uk

Allowing for a reasonable time frame for you to respond to this 'Notice of Default and Opportunity to Cure', we hereby offer you this further chance to rebut or confirm our understanding of the common law as referred to in our previous Notice(s) so that you may remain in honour, and thus by doing so enabling an opportunity to remedy this matter by law, amicably so as to prevent further crimes, save any future breach of the peace or torts being committed.

We The People hereby attest and affirm that all of the above is the truth and as to our lawful understanding.

Without malice, vexation, frivolity or ill will, and on our full commercial liability and penalty of perjury and, with no admission of liability whatsoever and with all our individual, natural, indefeasible and unalienable Common law rights reserved.

We The People

Sworn and subscribed on the date:

Signed:

EXHIBIT A

I, ... of ... do solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm that I will well and truly serve the Queen in the office of constable, with fairness, integrity, diligence and impartiality, upholding fundamental human rights and according equal respect to all people; and that I will, to the best of my power, cause the peace to be kept and preserved and prevent all offences against people and property; and that while I continue to hold the said office I will to the best of my skill and knowledge discharge all the duties thereof faithfully according to law.

EXHIBIT B

Elizabeth I - 1571 Treason Act:

"An act whereby certaine 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."

EXHIBIT C

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 June 1953, 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 euro-realists.

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 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.

Blackstone's 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.”

The nine principles by Sir Robert Peel [1]

1. The basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent crime and disorder.
2. The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police actions.
3. Police must secure the willing co-operation of the public in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the respect of the public.
4. The degree of co-operation of the public that can be secured diminishes proportionately to the necessity of the use of physical force.
5. Police seek and preserve public favour not by catering to public opinion but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to the law.
6. Police use physical force to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient.
7. Police, at all times, should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence
8. Police should always direct their action strictly towards their functions and never appear to usurp the powers of the judiciary.
9. The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it.

These principles listed above may have been Sir Robert Peel's principles. However, the Metropolitan Police's founding principles and, *de facto* the founding principles of all other modern (post 1829) UK police forces, was summarised by Sir Richard Mayne (the first commissioner) in 1829 in the following terms:

The nine principles by Sir Richard Mayne

1. To prevent crime and disorder, as an alternative to their repression by military force and severity of legal punishment.
2. To recognise always that the power of the police to fulfil their functions and duties is dependent on public approval of their existence, actions and behaviour and on their ability to secure and maintain public respect.
3. To recognise always that to secure and maintain the respect and approval of the public means also the securing of the willing co-operation of the public in the task of securing observance of laws.
4. To recognise always that the extent to which the co-operation of the public can be secured diminishes proportionately the necessity of the use of physical force and compulsion for achieving police objectives.

5. To seek and preserve public favour, not by pandering to public opinion; but by constantly demonstrating absolutely impartial service to law, in complete independence of policy, and without regard to the justice or injustice of the substance of individual laws, by ready offering of individual service and friendship to all members of the public without regard to their wealth or social standing, by ready exercise of courtesy and friendly good humour; and by ready offering of individual sacrifice in protecting and preserving life.
6. To use physical force only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient to obtain public co-operation to an extent necessary to secure observance of law or to restore order, and to use only the minimum degree of physical force which is necessary on any particular occasion for achieving a police objective.
7. To maintain at all times a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and that the public are the police, the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence.
8. To recognise always the need for strict adherence to police-executive functions, and to refrain from even seeming to usurp the powers of the judiciary of avenging individuals or the State, and of authoritatively judging guilt and punishing the guilty.
9. To recognise always that the test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, and not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with them.

In a broad sense these principles were continued to be taught until the time of Sir Robert Mark when he introduced his little “blue book” in the 1970’s:

Exhibit D:

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, moreover, 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."

Unused Information

The principles of Sir Robert Mark

"The primary object of an efficient police is the prevention of crime: the next that of detection and punishment of offenders if crime is committed. To these ends all the efforts of police must be directed. The protection of life and property, the preservation of public tranquillity, and the absence of crime, will alone prove whether those efforts have been successful and whether the objects for which the police were appointed have been attained."

Mark does go on though to make the point that the above is done with the consent of the public and is not done by way of imposing on the public.

Since Sir Robert Mark every commissioner has had his own set of "principles", for instance Sir Peter Imbert had "The Plus Program" and so on.

Notwithstanding the generality of my last comment, poster versions of Sir Richard Mayne's principles could still be seen within the Met Police Training school as late as the early 1990's (for historical purposes).