



To: Chief Constable,

Police HQ: UK Chief Constable Headquarters

From: Council of Representatives for We-The-People.co.uk

Address: We The People: C/O Boxndice Ltd. The Innovation Forum, Frederick Road, Salford University Business Park, Salford, M6 6FP.

Date 14/12/20

Affidavit of Truth

Preamble

"This Affidavit of Truth 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.

Please do us the courtesy of reading this "Affidavit of Truth" in its entirety. We are Sovereign constitutional subjects of the Realm of England & children of the Almighty, who are very, very concerned with what is happening to our country and that the Police Services are no longer serving the British people under the rule of law. This is a very dangerous situation in-deed."

Affidavit of Truth

Please read the following thoroughly and carefully. It is an Affidavit, a **LAWFUL INSTRUMENT** 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 – 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.. 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 developed and passed on from previous generations and widely accepted as the law of the land. **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 **EXHIBIT E**). [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 Oaths of public office whether Member of the House of Commons or the House of Lords (**EXHIBIT F**), Judges (**EXHIBIT G**), Magistrates (**EXHIBIT H**), Police Constables (**EXHIBIT I**) & those of the Armed Forces (**EXHIBIT J**) are made to the serving Monarch. Whilst the serving Monarchs own coronation Oath (**EXHIBIT E**) is made to the people. The Oath of Allegiance has its origins in Magna Carta sealed on 15th June 1215.

The Promissory Oaths Act 1868 requires the holders of a number of public offices, including secretaries of state, ministers and judicial offices, to take an oath of allegiance, oath of office or judicial oath. Any office holder who is required to take an oath that refuses to take it or to take a solemn affirmation in its place, then they are disqualified from holding the office or must vacate the office if they have already entered it.

The Monarch's Coronation Oath and the public Oaths of public office clearly evidence the truth that is the people of the realm who are truly sovereign, with the people only divesting responsibility to the Monarch, for the purposes of exercising that sovereignty, in return for the rights, freedoms and protections guaranteed by the constitution that the Monarch is sworn to uphold, as per the common law.

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.**

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.

The English Constitution was 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 owing allegiance to the Pope as a Catholic. This contravened the 1559 Act of Supremacy created by Elizabeth I, who 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) who was a papist sympathiser. In 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 are simply **unratified 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, who is obliged to independently grant or withhold royal assent to government Bills in accordance with the laws and customs of the people.***

*Consequent to the above, all unratified statute laws since 1686 should be rejected should they fail to serve the interests of the people at common law. Operational laws that have not been ratified, may nevertheless be considered to be in force (i) **only** so long as they do not conflict with common law **and** (ii) on grounds that they serve the people's best interests **and/or** (iii) that they call officials to account in their offices. In these respects, The Promissory Oaths Act 1868 may be considered valid and in force on all three counts, in the spirit of any humane constitutional protections against tyranny.*

Since we the people are lawfully obliged 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 Affidavit, 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.

For it is the police who are called upon to uphold law and order and apprehend those guilty of criminality.

Yet this altogether alien landscape in 2020 makes it impossible for the police to carry out duties to the best of their ability – due to a conflict of interest between gainful employment and upholding truth and the spirit of the law. Such is untenable, as it sets police against the interests of the people, since police are being effectively strong-armed to become henchmen of the state.

It is not sustainable that a few corporations and government both enforce policies that purport to deny human rights and seek to coerce the common man by creating and applying overreaching ‘rules’ restricting the same man’s ability to lawfully and freely go about his daily business.

And so, we appeal to you as fellow living, sovereign beings, rather than as faceless agents, concerned merely with upholding a system not fit for purpose, or that is even remotely humane. We are calling everybody (including large corporations) back to their core humanity. The current system in the west is imploding. We believe that good and honourable police men and women see and experience this too. The good and honourable people of these lands seek solidarity with you.

We see now the long term consequences for the whole planet of the conflict of interest between democratic governance and private interests having been allowed to go unchecked. The problem we face in common is that the current legalese complexity reflects an obfuscation of simplicity (of basic common law) – an obfuscation which in reality supports the private interests (primarily economic) of those with legislative power.

In essence, we consider that a complex, contemporary society is still optimally governable by simple principles. These MUST be at the heart of any system, in order to prevent the unwieldy structures (which current legalese systems exploit via ‘professionals’ trained and skilled in obfuscations) providing a haven for parasites, who seek to extract personal resources illicitly from the commons (which all citizens contribute to and participate within – including our whole police force, once they remove their uniforms at the end of their working day, the Police participating within our shared humanity, and dependence upon the functional commons). Our common interest stands in direct contrast to those interests being served without restraint, of predatory mega-corporations, oligarchs and governments across the world, which are systematically decimating the small business lifeblood of the average self-employed individual, or the employees (including police who are not corrupt servants of the agenda) who supply their vital human labour to make society work for all.

We, the people awakened to our own sovereignty, are the largest force within the realm and 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 United Nations 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 pro-federal 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 on line. 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 un-repealed 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 that 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 Union's 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 without an express mandate from the people. 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 (renamed "Attestation") of constables in the police reform Act 2002 (schedule 4 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 for example Covid19 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 barons petition, which was duly 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.”

It is also noteworthy that this clause was invoked at the start of the Glorious revolution in 1688 as evidenced in the barons petition (Exhibit B) to depose what is clearly evidenced as a FALSE MONARCH James II, who owed his allegiance as a Papist to the Pope in clear contravention of the act of Supremacy 1559. Clause 61 of Magna Carta 1215 was 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 (EXHIBIT B), after King James II had failed to re-establish Roman Catholicism in England, and lost the confidence of the people.

A response to the petition would NOT have been provided if the security clause (Article 61) and Magna Carta 1215 itself had already been repealed according to law. Furthermore we did not celebrate the 700th Year of Magna Carta in 1997, we celebrated 800 years of its creation on the 15th June 2015. Coins were also minted in its commemoration.

The lawful invocation of the “security clause” within Magna Carta 1215 on the 23rd March 2001 is clearly evidenced by the Barons petition & the response from Her Majesty (EXHIBIT B), which to this day has not been remedied with the Crown continuing to Trespass and commit Treason against the sovereign people of the realm, **the Sovereign people of this Realm, that you are sworn through your Oath of Allegiance & the coronation Oath of the Queen.**

The final process of any Bill becoming an Act of Parliament is the Monarch granting royal assent, so should the Bill be to the detriment of the public interest, such as unconstitutional or self-serving to Parliament, the Monarch has the right, has the moral and lawful duty, to refuse Royal assent.

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.

A clear example of the subversion of our constitution was the Parliament Act 1911 subsequent to the Finance Bill 1909. The House of Lords had rejected the Bill as they believed it placed to heavy tax burden upon the subject, they believed they had no right to amend a money Bill after the seditious ruling in 1667 when the House of Commons told the Upper house they could not start or amend a money Bill, that roll was the commons. There is nothing in our constitution to support this argument.

In the False belief they had no right to amend the 1909 Bill so they instead exercised their constitutional right to reject the Bill as they viewed the tax burden being proposed for the people by the Asquith administration was excessively high. Asquith went to the Lords and told them he was putting forward a Bill that became the Parliament Act 1911, corrupted a clear check and balance within the realms democracy, the Bill would limit the authority of the House of Lords to reject further bills.

The Fabian/Liberal Prime Minister Asquith told the Lords if they did not pass this Bill he planned to put 500 new peers into the Lords, who would vote for the closure of the Lords. It was on these grounds the Lords gave their consent to this Bill, purely under duress.

The Bill which was proposed to become the 1910 Parliament Act, was presented to the reigning Monarch King Edward VII by the Asquith administration, which the King sent back to Parliament commenting ‘to give my assent to this Bill would cause a constitutional crisis’.

The purpose of the checks and balances within our uncodified constitution are to **prevent a Parliamentary Dictatorship**, which the reigning King realised and fully understood. He fulfilled his lawful duty under his own Coronation Oath as the final constraint on by his refusal to grant Royal Assent to a Bill the Lords had commented on ‘to tax the common man in such way is like taking the food from their mouths’ However Edward VII died that year and was succeeded by King George V who was himself educated by the Fabian Lord Lore.

Asquith once again presented the Bill to the new King, who perhaps was under Fabian influenced counsel or did not understand, either our Constitution or his duty that his coronation Oath committed him too. The original Bill King Edward VII declined was now granted Royal assent by King George V becoming the 1911 Parliament Act, which not only limited the veto of the House of Lords but the FALSE belief that Royal Assent could be lawfully (In line with our uncodified constitution) automatically granted.

It is evidential in fact, that **all Statutes granted royal assent since the 1911 Parliament Act** was illegally enacted and, whilst the constitutional boundaries had been breached by said Act, have no standing under British/English law at this time thus, **cannot by law be used** in any legal way, especially by police in defence of those whom have blatantly usurped the constitution, and by claiming the people's sovereignty "Parliamentary sovereignty".

It is our lawful understanding only a constitutionally arranged Monarch with lawful standing can grant Royal assent, therefore clearly the invocation of said Article on the 23rd day of March 2001 clearly deposed the Queen (in law) making lawful Royal assent unobtainable, and by default, all Acts of Parliament since this date not only **null & void** but **clearly fraudulent**.

We are honourable, law abiding subjects of the Realm who stand assertively under the truth in law in order to protect the common laws and customs of the land, and to also defend our unalienable rights as sovereign men & women of the Realm.

Whereas we have taken this standpoint in law in order to defend the realm and our unalienable Sovereign Rights, which the Common laws and customs of the land protect, and which the English and Commonwealth constitution demands that **we all must do at this time**, I also have a duty by law to "compel" all others who have not yet transferred their allegiance from the Crown to the Common Law Constitution, via the Committee of the Barons, and I must do all that I can to ensure that others do also.

Therefore I DEMAND that you, the named recipient defend the English Crown and Church of England as ordered **by Royal Command**. (EXHIBIT A) (Appendix 1)

Continuing to current acts of High Treason and Fraud by the current regime at Westminster, a clear example of the treacherous nature of their **unlawful Parliamentary dictatorship**, is the act of High Treason within section 38 of the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill, that is unlawfully and fraudulently claimed to have been granted Royal Assent & is therefore fraudulently presented as "**European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020**", and I exhibit as (EXHIBIT L).

The Johnson Administration have passed a Bill through both houses in Parliament that proclaims Parliament is Sovereign despite the clear constraints placed upon Parliament by the Oaths of Allegiance every Member is bound by under the constitution, securing their own loyalty to the Monarch, as required by the Promissory Oaths Act 1868, a Solemn Oath lawfully binding Allegiance to the people via the Queens own Oath, in the same manner that you yourself are bound under via your Oath of office as a Police Constable.

Parliament has always been constrained by the parameters of our constitutional law, which are clearly indicated by the Coronation Oath, & the Oaths of public office. You yourself, just as every Police Constable throughout the Realm including those under your vicarious liability, are bound by a solemn Oath of Allegiance to the Queen or now as compelled by Royal Command, to take the Oath of Allegiance to the committee of Barons (Appendix 1) who are the only lawful authority within the realm at this time, discharging yourself of all other Oath's of Allegiance.

It is clear that in accordance with the Constitutional Parliamentary protocols, in accordance with the law of the realm. That this Bill was read in both Houses of Parliament, and due to the perceived significance of this legislation, as the 'legal instrument' to enable 'Brexit' and the clear 'Duty of Care' each and every Member of Parliament of both Houses have under Oath, compels upon them a clear moral & lawful obligation to be fully aware of each and every part of said Bill.

There is clear evidenced proof that the Commons record a vote of 330 to 231 while the House of Lords amended Clause 38 in accordance with Baroness Hayter's amendment with a vote of 239 to 235, while another amendment attracted a vote of 300 to 220, it is therefore clearly evidenced that at least 561 out of a possible 650 members of the House of Commons, and a further 520 members out of a possible 670 plus members of the House of Lords had full knowledge of the contents of the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill.

The Constitutional Constraints & Parameters are clearly evidenced within the Oaths of Public Office taken by each and every member, clearly pledging Oaths of Allegiance to the Monarch, yet 330 Members of the House of Commons & 239 Members of the House of Lords openly broke their Oath of Office, by committing HIGH TREASON by voting in favour of PARLIAMENTARY SOVERIEGNTY in contravention of the Promissory Oaths Act 1868, & in doing so **must by law vacate the Office they have entered into.**

At least a further 231 members of the House of Commons giving a number of at least 561 Commons MPs & 281 members of the House of Lords giving a number of at least 520 Lords, who had knowledge of the HIGH TREASON within this Bill and therefore stand clearly accused of the clear and evidenced act of MISPRISION OF HIGH TREASON in contravention of the Promissory Oaths Act 1868, & in doing so **must by law vacate the Office they have entered into.**

The remaining 89 members of the House of Commons and a number exceeding 230 members within the House of Lords, who are yet to be investigated as to their knowledge of the Treason within the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill, are accused of the clearly evidenced Misconduct in public office at common law through their clear dereliction of duty under Oath if not the very real likelihood of full knowledge of the Treason within the EU (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill, and therefore the MISPRISION OF HIGH TREASON.

The problem that we people face in these extremely corrupt and dangerous times, is that there are NO AUTHORISED courts of law where the English and Commonwealth Constitution is being observed, therefore it is impossible to remedy thefts, frauds, war crimes, genocide or **High Treason** etc. being committed by any peaceful means, which said crimes many English and Commonwealth constitutional subjects are being subjected to, and or being **forced** to aid and abet by unwitting agents of the Crown. That is about to change however as more people are becoming more aware of the truth now. The legal system will NOT be able to protect its agents in future.

Statement of Truth

This being the fourth (4) document, We the people and our undersigned Agents have served to you including a 'NOTICE OF OBLIGATION ACCORDING TO ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL LAW', a 'NOTICE TO COMPEL PERFORMANCE' & a 'NOTICE OF DEFAULT & OPPORTUNITY TO CURE' we must now draw your attention to the perilous position you are placing the Realm into by your continued and evidenced, Misconduct in public office through nonfeasance, & given the current evidenced allegations of HIGH TREASON within Westminster you must yourself be considered for charges of High Treason, Misprision of High Treason and Sedition at common law which if you were to be convicted before Court De Jure carry a mandatory Death Penalty, should you fail to act, or respond to this 'Affidavit of Truth' within the generous 7 day time scale allowed.

Failure to respond to this 'Affidavit of Truth' within the timescale in substance with proof of counter claim will be taken to be your Tacit agreement to the facts below.

1. Your Solemn Oath of Office (EXHIBIT I) 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. The realm has not had a constitutionally arranged Monarch since 1686

3. The Treason Act 1571 (EXHIBIT D) is current constitutional law, which was created by a constitutionally arranged monarch and has NOT been repealed by the same.
4. For a Parliamentary Bill to become an Act of Parliament it must be granted Royal Assent
5. Constitutional Law stipulates Royal Assent may only lawfully be Granted or Withheld by the serving Monarch in accordance with their lawfully binding coronation Oath
6. Royal Assent can only be provided by a Monarch with Lawful Standing
7. The Security Clause of Magna Carta 1215 colloquially known as Article 61 was invoked on the 23rd March 2001 & to this day has not been revoked
8. 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
9. The Promissory Oaths act 1868 sets clear Parameters & Constraints to protect the uncodified Constitution of the Realm through Oaths of Allegiance to the serving Monarch including all members of Parliament whether Lords Spiritual and Temporal along with those in the Commons.
10. **Parliament declaring it self-sovereign is an act of High Treason**, as clearly indicated by The Coronation Oath at 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. Parliament can never be Sovereign over either the Monarch or her people.
 - A) Every member of Parliament including Lords Spiritual and Temporal, Commons and Ministers alike, who had sight or knowledge of this Bill must face justice in accordance with the Common Law for the Misprision of High Treason
 - B) Every member of Parliament including Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons alike, who voted for this Bill must face justice in accordance with the Common Law for High Treason
11. The realm is a common law jurisdiction as clearly contracted by Queen Elizabeth to the people in her Coronation Oath.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. It is our lawful understanding that conviction by Court De Jure in accordance with the law of the land for the crimes of High Treason, Misprision of High Treason & Sedition carry a mandatory death penalty that may only be commuted by Royal Mercy
15. While the Security Clause Magna Carta 1215 is invoked it is our lawful understanding Royal Mercy would not be obtainable lawfully
16. As an Oath sworn Police Constable you have a clear duty under Oath, to investigate all allegations of Crime without fear nor favor, if you either fail to lawfully rebut the allegations of HIGH TREASON by proof of counter claim, you have a clear and immediate duty to investigate the evidenced HIGH TREASON & MISPRISION OF HIGH TREASON in points 10 A and B. Failure to either Rebut our understanding of the law by proof of counter claim & fail to act in the timescale may be used as evidence against you, at any future Judicial process such as Misconduct in public office, Misprision of high treason and sedition

17. Due to the significant importance of the European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Bill, it would appear a clearly evidenced gross dereliction of duty of every member of the Houses of Parliament had not read carefully the text of this proposed legislation which the remaining 89 Members of the House of Commons & in excess of 230 Members of the House of Lords whose knowledge in this Treasonous legislation is yet to be investigated, & if innocent after investigation charges of Misconduct in public office against these Members of Parliament are therefore clearly evidenced and must be answered.

We the people demand your response within 7 days to rebut our understanding of the law, or for you to contact our council of representatives to reassure that you will be fulfilling your duty under Oath and protecting us, as victims of crime from further Trespass, while investigating our evidenced allegations & prosecuting when and where appropriate without fear or favour.

I hereby attest and affirm that all of the above is the truth and as to my Lawful understanding.

We the undersigned hereby demand that all Police Constabulary's MUST assist the people to achieve a properly convened court de jure trial so that the TRUTH can be heard according to the law.

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

Sworn and subscribed on the date: 14/12/20

Signed We The People:

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, 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.”

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 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.”

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 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 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 E

In the Coronation ceremony of 2 June 1953, one of the highlights was when The Queen made her Coronation Oath (taken from the Order of Service for the Coronation).

The Queen having returned to her Chair, (her Majesty having already on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1952, in the presence of the two Houses of Parliament, made and signed the Declaration prescribed by Act of Parliament), the Archbishop standing before her shall administer the Coronation Oath, first asking the Queen,

Madam, is your Majesty willing to take the Oath?

And the Queen answering,

I am willing.

The Archbishop shall minister these questions; and The Queen, having a book in her hands, shall answer each question severally as follows:

Archbishop. Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the Peoples of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Pakistan, and Ceylon, and of your Possessions and the other Territories to any of them belonging or pertaining, according to their respective laws and customs?

Queen. I solemnly promise so to do.

Archbishop. Will you to your power cause Law and Justice, in Mercy, to be executed in all your judgements?

Queen. I will.

Archbishop. Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the Laws of God and the true profession of the Gospel? Will you to the utmost of your power maintain in the United Kingdom the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law? Will you maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship,

discipline, and government thereof, as by law established in England? And will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of England, and to the Churches there committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges, as by law do or shall appertain to them or any of them?

Queen. All this I promise to do.

Then the Queen arising out of her Chair, supported as before, the Sword of State being carried before her, shall go to the Altar, and make her solemn Oath in the sight of all the people to observe the premisses: laying her right hand upon the Holy Gospel in the great Bible (which was before carried in the procession and is now brought from the Altar by the Arch-bishop, and tendered to her as she kneels upon the steps), and saying these words:

The things which I have here before promised, I will perform and keep. So help me God.

Then the Queen shall kiss the Book and sign the Oath.

The Queen having thus taken her Oath shall return again to her Chair, and the Bible shall be delivered to the Dean of Westminster.

EXHIBIT F

Members of the House of Commons and the House of Lords take an oath of allegiance to the Crown. This is called swearing in. If they object to swearing the oath, they can make a solemn affirmation. They do this before taking their seats in Parliament. This can happen after a general election, by-election or after the death of the monarch.

The wording of the oath comes from the Promissory Oaths Act 1868. The form and manner of giving the oath are set out in the Oaths Act 1978.

MPs take the oath by holding the sacred text in their uplifted hand and saying the words of the oath:

I (name of Member) swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God.
The Act also permits the oath to be taken in the Scottish manner. With uplifted hand but not holding the sacred text. Members may also take the oath by kissing the book and using the words:

I (name of Member) do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God.
Texts of the oath and affirmation are available in Braille.

The oath/affirmation must first be made and taken in English. Members can follow this with an oath or affirmation in Welsh, Scottish Gaelic or Cornish.

EXHIBIT G

When judges are sworn in they take two oaths/affirmations. The first is the oath of allegiance and the second the judicial oath; these are collectively referred to as the judicial oath.

Oath of allegiance

“I, _____ , do swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors, according to law.”

Judicial oath

“I, _____ , do swear by Almighty God that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second in the office of _____ , and I will do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of this realm, without fear or favour, affection or ill will.”

Affirmation – Allegiance

“I, _____ , do solemnly sincerely and truly declare and affirm that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second Her Heirs and Successors according to Law.”

Affirmation – Judicial

“I, _____ , do solemnly sincerely and truly declare and affirm that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second in the office of _____ , and I will do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of this Realm without fear or favour, affection or ill will.”

EXHIBIT H

Magistrates' first Oath of Allegiance:

I... swear that I will well and truly serve our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth the Second, in the office of Justice of the Peace and I will do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of the Realm without fear or favour, affection or ill will.

Magistrates' second Judicial Oath:

I... do swear that I will well and faithfully serve in the office of... and that I will do right to all manner of people without fear or favour, affection or ill-will according to the laws and usages of this realm.^[21]

EXHIBIT I

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 J

I... swear by Almighty God (do solemnly, and truly declare and affirm) that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty **Queen Elizabeth II**, Her Heirs and Successors, and that I will, as in duty bound, honestly and faithfully defend Her Majesty, Her Heirs and Successors, in Person, Crown and Dignity against all enemies, and will observe and obey all orders of Her Majesty, Her Heirs and Successors, and of the Generals and officers set over me

EXHIBIT K

European Union (Withdrawal Agreement) Act 2020

Parliamentary sovereignty

38 Parliamentary sovereignty

(1) It is recognised that the Parliament of the United Kingdom is sovereign.

(2) In particular, its sovereignty subsists notwithstanding—

- A. directly applicable or directly effective EU law continuing to be recognised and available in domestic law by virtue of section 1A or 1B of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (savings of existing law for the implementation period),
- B. section 7A of that Act (other directly applicable or directly effective aspects of the withdrawal agreement),
- C. section 7B of that Act (deemed direct applicability or direct effect in relation to the EEA EFTA separation agreement and the Swiss citizens' rights agreement), and
- D. section 7C of that Act (interpretation of law relating to the withdrawal agreement (other than the implementation period), the EEA EFTA separation agreement and the Swiss citizens' rights agreement).

(3) Accordingly, nothing in this Act derogates from the sovereignty of the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Appendix 1

OATH PROCESS

- 1) You will need a Bible and 3 witnesses & a blank copy of this page.
- 2) Holding the Bible in your right hand and in the presence of your witnesses, you swear the Oath of Allegiance.
- 3) In the presence of your 3 witnesses you sign the document, with your witnesses completing their respective details.
- 4) Store the document in a safe place.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

I, _____ In full knowledge of treason being committed in Parliament, by delivering the Sovereign Peoples of this Common law land into the hands of foreign powers, in understanding of some wrongs done by the present holder of the office of Sovereign, from whom I now transfer my allegiance, do so willingly, and wholeheartedly enter into lawful dissent as the law demands by royal command, and I solemnly swear upon my Oath to obey the direction of the lords of the barons' committee whom invoked Article 61 of the 1215 Magna Carta on the 23rd March 2001, in accordance with the royal command to do so, as long as said barons act strictly according to constitutional law at all times without deviation, and until such times as redress of these present wrongs has been achieved.

Sworn and subscribed on the _____

Signed.

Witnessed by:

Signature	Print
(1)	
(2)	
(3)	

Appendix 2

- 1.) A long range deception to overthrow the sovereignty of the British Isles, by controlling its currency and the powers to determine its own laws and affairs, was finalized 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.

- 2.) Since the end of the 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.
- 3.) The involvement of the United Kingdom in this agenda began in 1948 with the formation of the European movement. This was a state funded Anglo-French pro-federal European lobbying body posing as a non-governmental grass-roots pressure group. The documentation evidencing these events are present on the discs FCO 30/1048.
- 4.) The said movement is still publicly active today lobbying for total European integration and a European constitution. Also Common Purpose are an active pro EU lobby group masquerading as a charity with its grubby hands within our local services and institutions.
- 5.) The first move toward a federal Europe did not involve Britain directly, it was the signing of the treaty of Rome in 1957 by Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.
- 6.) Meticulous research has uncovered a wealth of official, archived documents from the period 1970-72 which shows the deceit perpetrated by the (so called) "ruling elite" at the time, and these documents have since been released after the illegal thirty year rule hid them under national security legislation - entitled 'FCO 30-10/48 '. A compilation of nearly 300 documents copied from the original documents which are still archived within the public records office today.
- 7.) The 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. Not to Breach the peace nor to dishonour agreements and or contracts entered into.
- 8.) England, within the 'United Kingdom of Great Britain' (both the latter two titles are now corporations) is a common law jurisdiction and the English parliament has no lawful authority ever to breach, surrender land or transfer, even temporarily, sovereignty except when conquered in war.
- 9.) No man (neither monarch, nor prime minister, nor any prelate, politician, judge or public servant) is above the common laws of England and the Commonwealth, which forms the English Constitution (Magna Carta 1215, and original Coronation Oath. The last constitutionally correct coronation Oath was taken by the traitor James II in 1685).
- 10.) Treason in statute law was redefined by the unrepealed Treason Act 1795 for the principal forms to include; a) compassing the death or serious injury of the sovereign or his/her spouse or eldest son; b) levying war against the sovereign in his/her realm, which includes, any insurrection against the authority of the sovereign or of the government that goes beyond riot or violent disorder; c) giving aid or comfort to the sovereign's enemies in war time.
- 11.) Treason at common law is the offence of attempting to overthrow a constitutionally bound Government of a state to which the offender owes allegiance; or of betraying the state into the hands of a foreign power.
- 12.) Sedition at common law means overt conduct such as writing, speech and organization that is deemed by the legal authority as tending toward insurrection against the established order. Sedition includes the subversion of a constitution and incitement of discontent (or resistance) to lawful authority.

- 13.) The evidence presented in the FCO 30/1048 ' files shows that the Heath Government of 1972 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 is an act of Sedition at common law.**
- 14.) The passage of the European Communities Act in 1972, establishing the principle that European law would always prevail over English and Commonwealth law in the event of a clash, thereby overthrowing the supremacy of the English parliament, **was a criminal Act of Treason at common law by the Heath administration.**
- 15.) The signing of the single European Act in 1986 reducing Britain's independent decision making powers further by extending qualified majority voting in certain areas of policy making, **was a criminal Act of Treason at common law by the Thatcher administration.**
- 16.) The signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, based on the original EEC Berlin document 1942, surrendering sovereign powers of the usurped Queen in parliament to an unelected body in Europe, **was an Act of Treason at common law by the Major administration.**
- 17.) 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.**
- 18.) With the full knowledge of this Treason and to escape prosecution, the Blair Government illegally repealed the 1795 Treason legislation in section 36 of the 'Crime and Disorder Act 1998' in an attempt to abolish the death penalty for high treason, however, the crime of Treason at common law still stands within other Acts (1351 - 1848 as well as 1795) as common law has primacy. **This was a further Act of treason by the Blair Administration.**
- 19.) The signing of the Nice Treaty in 2001 and the E.U. Constitution in 2004 **were further Acts of Treason at common law by the Blair administration.**
- 20.) 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 English and British nationals to become officers (section 82). **These are acts of both Sedition and Treason at common law by the Blair administration.**
- 21.) The signing of the Lisbon Treaty in 2008 surrendered further control of policy including that relating to immigration and borders, **was an Act of Treason at common law by the Brown administration.**
- 22.) The recent Prime Minister David Cameron, by denying the English peoples right to a referendum on the European Union, which was misdirection anyway since it is illegal to vote to remain or leave a treasonous institution, and by surrendering further powers to the EU for direct taxation on the English/British people, and by allowing the EU to end the rebate via further proposed treaties, **is evidence to prove that this is an Act of Treason at Common Law by the Cameron administration.**
- 23.) Theresa May (late imposter) prime minister for providing a draft Brexit bill on the 14th November 2018, which under article 171 provided the EU judiciary authority over our own common law judiciary and constitution and, for attempting to provide the EU control of our armed forces (PESCO) 'Permanent Structured Cooperation' and, whilst using the treasonous Brexit trap, which is a trap because it is treason to provide Article 50 of the Lisbon treaty with authority to take us out of the EU, especially whilst the evidence proves that we were never legally in the EU. The above stated facts **were Acts of High Treason at common law committed by the May Administration.**
- 24.) 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 EU'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.

Appendix 3

Full name of place do solemnly and sincerely promise that I will serve all the people of police force area in the office of police and crime commissioner without fear or favour.

I will act with integrity and diligence in my role and, to the best of my ability, will execute the duties of my office to ensure that the police are able to cut crime and protect the public.

I will give a voice to the public, especially victims of crime and work with other services to ensure the safety of the community and effective criminal justice.

I will take all steps within my power to ensure transparency of my decisions, so that I may be properly held to account by the public.

I will not seek to influence or prevent any lawful and reasonable investigation or arrest, nor encourage any police action save that which is lawful and justified within the bounds of this office.