

NOTICE OF OBLIGATION ACCORDING TO ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

NOTICE - Preamble

"This Notice 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 "NOTICE OF OBLIGATION ACCORDING TO ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL LAW" 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 indeed."

FAO: Chief Constables By Region - Address

Email: PDF Copies emailed to Confirmed Named: Chief Constables

Under Oath of Office:

Avon and Somerset	Headquarters PO Box 37 Valley Road Portishead Bristol BS20 8QJ
Bedfordshire Police	Headquarters Woburn Road Kempston, Bedford MK439AX
British Transport Police	HQ 25 Camden Road London NW1 9LN
Cambridgeshire Constabulary	Headquarters Hinchingsbrooke Park Huntingdon PE296NP
Cheshire Constabulary	Headquarters Clemonds Hey Oakmere Road Winsford Cheshire CW72UA
City of London Police	Headquarters PO Box 36451 182 Bishopsgate London EC2M4WN
Civil Nuclear Constabulary	Head Executive Office and Legal Services, F6 Culham Sci Centre, Abingdon, OX14 3DB
Cleveland Police	HQ P.O. Box 70 Ladgate Lane Middlesbrough TS8 9EH

Cumbria Constabulary	Headquarters Carleton Hall Penrith Cumbria CA10 2AU
Derbyshire Constabulary	Butterley Hall Ripley Derbyshire DE5 3RS
Devon and Cornwall	Middlemoor HQ Exeter EX2 7HQ
Dorset Police	Headquarters Winfrith Dorchester DT2 8DZ
Durham Constabulary	HQ Aykley Heads Durham DH1 5TT
Dyfed-Powys Police	Headquarters Po Box 99 Llangunnor Carmarthen SA31 2PF
Essex Police	PO Box 2 HQ Springfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 6DA
Gloucestershire Constabulary	Holland House Lansdown Rd Cheltenham GL51 6QH
Greater Manchester Police	Headquarters, Northampton Rd, Manchester. M40 0RE
Gwent Police	Headquarters Croesyceiliog, Cwmbran NP44 2XJ
Hampshire Constabulary	West Hill Winchester Hampshire SO22 5DB
Hertfordshire Constabulary	Headquarters Stanborough Road Welwyn Garden City Hertfordshire AL8 6XF
Humberside Police	Headquarters, Priory Road Police Station, Priory Road, Kingston Upon Hull, HU5 5SF
Kent Police	Headquarters Sutton Road Maidstone ME15 9BZ
Lancashire Constabulary	Headquarters Hutton Preston PR4 5SB
Leicestershire Constabulary	Headquarters St John's Enderby Leicester LE19 2BX
Lincolnshire Police	PO Box 999 Lincoln LN5 7PH
Merseyside Police	Malvern House, 13 Green Lane, Tuebrook, Liverpool L13 7DT
Metropolitan Police Service	New Scotland Yard, Victoria Embankment, Westminster, London, SW1A 2JL
Ministry of Defence Police	MDPHQ Wethersfield CM7 4AZ Operations & Communications Centre, Jubilee House, Falconers Chase, Wymondham, Norfolk, NR18 0WW
Norfolk Constabulary	
North Wales Police	Headquarters Glan-y-Don Colwyn Bay Conwy LL29 8AW
North Yorkshire Police	Alverton Court, Crosby Rd, Northallerton DL6 1BF
Northamptonshire Police	Wootton Hall Park, Northampton NN4 0JQ
Northumbria Police	Headquarters Ponteland Newcastle Upon Tyne NE20 0BL
Nottinghamshire Police	Sherwood Lodge, Arnold, Nottinghamshire, NG5 8PP
South Wales Police	Headquarters Cowbridge Road Bridgend CF38 3SU
South Yorkshire Police	321 The Common, Ecclesfield, Sheffield S35 9WL
Staffordshire Police	Weston Rd, Stafford ST18 0YY
Suffolk Constabulary	Headquarters Portal Avenue Martlesham Heath Ipswich IP5 3QS
Surrey Police	Mount Browne Sandy Lane Guildford Surrey GU3 1HG
Sussex Police	Sussex Police Headquarters, Church Ln, Lewes BN7 2DZ
Thames Valley Police	Headquarters Kidlington Oxon OX5 2NX
Warwickshire Police	Leek Wootton, Warwick CV35 7QA
West Mercia Police	Hindlip, Worcester WR3 8SP
West Midlands Police	New St, Hill Top, West Bromwich B70 0HN
West Yorkshire Police	6 Laburnum Rd, Wakefield WF1 3QP
Wiltshire Police	London Rd, Devizes SN10 2DN

NOTICE OF OBLIGATION ACCORDING TO ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Date: 16/10/20.

To: United Kingdom, Police Chief Constables, Police Constables - under Oath of Office.

Part 1 of 2: THE NOTICE.

Please read the following 'Notice' thoroughly and carefully. It is a NOTICE, a LAWFUL DOCUMENT and EVIDENCE. It informs you. It means what it says. The information herein is of the **UTMOST IMPORTANCE** and requires your **IMMEDIATE and URGENT ATTENTION**.

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

It is an offence at common law for any man or woman who knows that treason is being planned or committed not to report the same as soon as he/she can to a justice of the peace (misprision of treason); it is also an OFFENCE at Common law for any police constable, of whatever rank, to not investigate the clear evidence of crime(s) (HIGH TREASON) contained within this document, especially since Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 was lawfully invoked according to the correct protocols of English constitutional law on the 23rd March 2001, invoked because of the treason committed within the treaty of Nice (see exhibit B and C). To even deny Article 61's invocation would be an act of sedition at common law and contravene the 1571 Treason act (see exhibit D).

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

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

Under constitutional law, the sovereign people of the realm including the commonwealth, are governed by the laws and principles 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). [These facts are not difficult to discern, as these facts are clearly evidenced within the public domain and easily accessible with just a little investigation.]

The principles of law are simple because they should be natural to us all....to cause no harm, no loss, and to remain peaceful, whilst also honouring any agreements made with others is all that is demanded by law, we are free to do anything that does not contravene these four basic principles.

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

Since we the people are lawfully-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 Notice, and to investigate the allegations of treason contained herein. We also recognize the difficult position that certain individuals find themselves in when the truth is realized, especially those of you serving within the office of constable.

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 'Europäische 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 (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.”

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

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

We would of course prefer to use reason, logic and the truth to defend the realm in a peaceful and lawful manner by bringing the guilty parties to justice within properly convened courts of law. All police officers today are acting outside of the law in outlawry and therefore have no protection under the law as a result, a perilous position indeed.

And so, appealing to you as reasonable sovereign beings one to another, we implore you to consider this grave situation confronting us all, as being in our shared interest to address. In this regard, we enclose herein, a number of case studies of serious breaches (currently unaddressed as active criminal enterprises), under the current system, which evidence the unsustainable parasitism outlined above. The technical details you may require a specialist to look over are available in the appendices, along with fully elaborated case studies.

There IS remedy available. But this will require the shift into the jurisdiction of our common law terrain. Police jobs would simultaneously become much easier. Clearly, the current system is driven by fraud and morally corrupt, this is supported by evidence, statements, letters and emails within our supporting content from Police Commissioners, MPs and Business owners alike.

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

Signed: WE THE PEOPLE. www.we-the-people.co.uk/

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 expanded to other areas not agreed at Nice, and without further treaty negotiations.

Charter of Fundamental Rights – signed at Biarritz, autumn 2000.

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

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

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

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

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

The Declaration of Rights spelt out the details:

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

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

permanence.

List Of Signatories Peers signing the petition:

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

The petition was also signed by:

Lord Sudeley, Viscount Cowdray, Viscount Norwich, Lord Napier & Ettrick, Earl of Romney, Earl Kitchener, Lord Napier of Magdala, Lord Ailsa, Lord Sandys, Earl Cathcart, Lord Oaksey, Lord Milne, Lord Newall, Lord Barber of Tewkesbury, Lord Dormer, Viscount Exmouth, Lord Wise, Earl of Devon, Earl of Cromer, Earl of Shannon (as Lord Carleton), Lord Sandford, Marquis of Aberdeen (as Earl Aberdeen), Lord Strathcarron, Lord Craigmyle. The Countess of Dysart also signed, but the Dysart title is Scottish and pre-dates the Union of 1707.

Letter To The Queens Private Secretary
Sir Robin Janvrin, KCVO, CB
Principal Private Secretary to Her Majesty The Queen
Buckingham Palace
London
23 March 2001

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

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

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

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

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

Ultimately, our supreme protection is Her Majesty's obligations under the Coronation Oath. The Queen has solemnly promised to govern the peoples of the United Kingdom according to the Statutes in Parliament agreed on and according to their laws and customs. Her Majesty also swore to preserve all rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to any of them. From the spiritual point of view, it is unimaginable that Her Majesty would seek, in effect, a divorce from her duty. From a secular point of view, the Coronation Oath is a signed contract.

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

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."

Page Left Blank – Current Case Studies

Part 2 of 2 : CASE STUDIES & APPENDICES.

A selection of case studies that give an indication of how the UK economy, its businesses and Its people have now been brought to their knees unchecked by those who have taken an Oath of Office to serve this country on behalf of its people.

Where duplication of the information in Part 1 is identified this underlines the importance and severity of the crimes and impact upon the United Kingdom and its people. These cases are still ongoing.

The Medical Fraud and Malpractice emanating from The Corona Virus Act 2020 will be addressed by professionals of The World Doctors Alliance.

<http://worlddoctorsalliance.com/>

This will be done through Common Law Court sessions, in the format of Nuremburg hearings. Those identified of having committed Criminal Acts will receive justice from Common Law Courts - We The People.

Case Study one (1) Circa 1972

FCO 30/1048. Unlawful Entry into the Common Market, EU.

This Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) 30/1048 classified government document dated April 1971 remained secret until it was released under the 30 year rule.

It proves Heath's government knew the 1972 EEC Treaty would lead to the loss of sovereignty, and was therefore treason.

They had a stunningly accurate picture of the EU, which never was the European Economic Community (EEC), expecting Britain to be abolished after the turn of the century.

The authors, all civil servants or ministers, are very pro EU, their intent is clearly to conceal the loss of sovereignty. They understood perfectly Britain would be abolished.

In public, Heath's government lied in that the treaty would not affect our sovereignty.

This included Douglas Hurd, an active senior Conservative, who was both a liar and a traitor, a point put to him at the Conservative Conference in Blackpool.

He assured his connections in the legal profession would ensure he was never convicted.

Here are just a few of the damning sentences from FCO 30/1048.

Parliament controlled

11. Membership of the Communities will involve us in extensive limitations upon our freedom of action. For the first time Parliament is binding its successors.

Increasing loss of sovereignty

The loss of external sovereignty will however increase as the Community develops, according to the intention of the preamble to the Treaty of Rome "to establish the foundations of an even closer union among the European peoples".

Small threats to sovereignty, like Burgess, Blunt and Maclean's selling secrets to the Russians, attract 30 year jail sentences. The penalty for actually loosing even small parts of it until 1998 was "to hang by the neck until dead."

King Charles 1st was executed for treason that was, by comparison, relatively minor.

Lord Haw Haw - "Germany Calling" - William Joyce, was hanged for treason on 3rd January

1946. Joyce's efforts on behalf of Germany were small by comparison with Edward Heath's.

A video interview of Harry Beckhough ex British Intelligence, GCHQ before his death confirms Edward Heath's participation in the initiation of, transfer of power and sovereignty to an unelected Brussels operation funded by ex-Nazi spoils from the pillage and rape of Europe by German forces. Heath was fundamentally a German Spy. <https://bit.ly/30OzqQy>

This is further recorded by European witnesses in the publication Nazi Roots of The Brussels EU. <https://bit.ly/2HB5wsc>

Our law subservient

12. (ii) The power of the European Court to consider the extent to which a UK statute is compatible with Community Law will indirectly involve an innovation for us, as the European Court's decisions will be binding on our courts which might then have to rule on the validity or applicability of the United Kingdom statute. The writ of a foreign power is not allowed under the British Constitution, which Heath was breaking.

Predicting monetary and military union

18..but it will be in the British interest after accession to encourage the development of the Community toward an effectively harmonised economic, fiscal and monetary system and a fairly closely coordinated and consistent foreign and defence policy. If it came to do so then essential aspects of sovereignty both internal and external would indeed increasingly be transferred to the Community itself.

No withdrawal, sovereignty diminished

22. Even with the most dramatic development of the Community the major member states can hardly lose the "last resort" ability to withdraw in much less than three decades. The Community's development could produce before then a period in which the political practicability of withdrawal was doubtful. If the point should ever be reached at which inability to renounce the Treaty (and with it the degeneration of the national institutions which could opt for such a policy) was clear, then sovereignty, external, parliamentary and practical would indeed be diminished.

Disinformation

After entry there would be a major responsibility on HMG and on all political parties not to exacerbate public concern by attributing unpopular measures or unfavourable economic developments to the remote and unmanageable workings of the Community.

Transfer of the Executive

24 (ii) The transfer of major executive responsibilities to the bureaucratic Commission in Brussels will exacerbate popular feeling of alienation from government.

Erosion of sovereignty

24 (v) ...The more the Community is developed ... the more Parliamentary sovereignty will be eroded. ...The right... to withdraw will remain for a very considerable time. ...The sovereignty of the State will surely remain unchallenged for this century at least.

The EU Bureaucracy will rule

25. The impact of entry upon sovereignty is closely related to the blurring of distinctions between domestic Political and foreign affairs, to the greater political responsibility of the bureaucracy of the Community and the lack of effective democratic control.

The writers understanding of the future of the EU was bang on. They wanted the bureaucracy to take over from the democracy. The loss of sovereignty was desirable for them, legally traitors working deep inside our government.

With thanks to David Barnby. who obtained the original documents. David Noakes compiled and added additional intelligence for this document. Reference Materials:

https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApCwWYmI_p2Dhug4fANodZ2InB-S7w?e=1w5Yfn

When considering the late Master of the Rolls, Lord Chief Justice & Senior Law Lord, Baron Bingham of Cornhill's explanation of the rule of law earlier in this document, that the law must be accessible, intelligible, clear & predictable, with rights & liabilities resolved by the application of Law not discretion, with the laws of the land applied equally to all, along with Ministers and public officers exercising their powers conferred on them fairly and without exceeding their limits.

Is it fair and reasonable given the undoubted will of the Sovereign people of the United Kingdom & its constituent Nations **for the clearly evidenced Treason to be hidden for 30 years?** A clear abuse of Sovereignty, and a clear example of Misconduct in public office at common law.

If it is fair and proper for a veteran of the British Army such as Dennis Hutchings to face an attempted murder investigation, for an incident in County Tyrone in 1974 following no less than **Two previous investigations that had exonerated his name already.** Yet the Heath administration who attempted to sell our country out with the beastliness of forethought has yet to answer these most grievous and Capital offences that they attempted to cover with the clear misuse of classification of public documents.

We are reporting this crime to yourself and you are therefore required in accordance with Honour, the Rule of Law & your Oath sworn duty as a Police Constable under Common Law and under present legislation schedule 4, sect 83 the Police reform Act 2002 to investigate these allegations and bring those incriminated before a Court De Jure, in a prompt and timely manner.

Case Study two (2) Circa 1999 & 2001-Present

Lawful invocation on 23rd March 2001 of Article 61 Magna Carta 1215 & Nice Treaty

The Treaty of Nice was a direct result of the Heath administrations treasonous conduct within Case Study one (1) in this document.

The issues with the treaty of Nice are clearly highlighted within EXHIBIT A: The Barons Petition, attached to this document. EXHIBIT B is the translated text of Article 61 Magna Carta 1215.

This lawful invocation of Article 61 on the 23rd March 2001 has deposed (in law) Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and rendered every act and statute of Parliament Null & Void, along with every organ of Government within the English Isles & the Commonwealth of Nations.

Every action your Constabulary undertakes outside of the Common Law of the Land, is unlawful just as every act of Parliament since the date of invocation is that of a Government acting ultra vires.

1) A long range deception to overthrow the sovereignty of the English 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 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 documentation evidencing these events are present on the discs FCO 10 30/48 public document worldcat. OCLC number 31002821) which can be viewed online.

4) The said movement is still publicly active today lobbying for total European integration and a European constitution.

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 blatant deceit perpetrated by the (so called) 'ruling elite' at the time. These documents have been released after the thirty year rule, which unlawfully hid them from the public. The Evidence file FCO 30/1048 has been within the public domain since 2002 and is easily accessible online. We strongly advise that you employ due diligence and investigate the evidence within said file.
- 7) 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.
- 8) 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.
- 9) 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.
- 10) 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".
- 11) 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).
- 12) 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.
- 13) The evidence presented in the Foreign and Commonwealth document 'FCO 30/1048 files, shows that the Heath Government of the 1970's was well aware that an essential loss of national sovereignty would occur within thirty years with the passing of the European Communities Bill, and knew it would, in all likelihood, be rejected if brought to the people, which of course it was not. This in itself was an act of Sedition at common law by the Heath administration.
- 14) 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.
- 15) 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.
- 16) 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.
- 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 future prosecution, the Blair government attempted to repeal the Treason legislation in section 36 of the 'Crime and Disorder Act 1998', also abolishing the death penalty for High Treason. This included the repealing of the Treasonable and Seditious Practices Act 1795. However, the crime of treason at common law still stands as common law has primacy and Tony Blair had no lawful authority to do so. Although this action by Tony Blair provides evidence of his criminal intent, the said 1795 Act was not created by way of a constitutionally arranged monarch, and is therefore not a lawful Act of parliament, subsequently it is used within this Notice under duress of circumstances.

19) 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.

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 British nationals to become police 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 making, including that relating to immigration and borders, was an act of Treason at common law by the Brown administration.

22) 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.

23) 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.

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

25) 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.

Case Study three (3) Circa 2003 – Present

Insolvent Deutsche Bank Fraudsters – A litigation hypertext from shyreman.com

This covers the suppression of the precious metals market for 17 years with a view to defraud UK Banking clients. Mark Anthony Taylor was one of those clients who took a number of those banks to the Mercantile Courts in Birmingham. Case B40BM021. The Banks included Deutsche Bank, HSBC, UBS, RBS, Barclays, Citi Group and JP Morgan. Simon Brown QC effectively closed his case stating that Marks position was vexatious.

Deutsche Bank at a later date admitted the suppression of metals prices to a US Court to extract funds from clients and then cover up their activities. This in turn identified the rest of the defending Banks having committed the same fraud as they continue to do to this date.

This case brings into question the actions of several Political leaders and High Level Judiciary in the cover up of metals market fraud and money laundering impacting the Global Financial markets. British and Foreign investors.

The case covers money laundering, fraud and perjury and is recorded in some detail across the website <http://www.shyreman.com/>.

Marks intelligence gathering also links the appointment of Jes Staley as Barclays CEO by Jeffrey Epstein and the part he played in the metals rigging value suppression. Deutsche Bank incriminated Barclays as part of the New York disclosures. Jes Staley wrote to Mark to threaten him with a restraining order and hefty costs.

The outline of the core case is recorded in Gold Rigging and Bent Judges. A Video Analysis by Mark recorded in December 2016: <https://bit.ly/3iGawZB>: UBS Confess to Gold Rigging in New York January 2017: <https://bit.ly/36JYYCk> and Deutsche Bank, ISIS and the EU Jigsaw : Jan 2017: <https://bit.ly/34z7Xna>

This video evidence contains pictures of documents that are within the <http://www.shyreman.com/> website: <http://www.shyreman.com/archive.php>

Freedom of Information request F17-296

A freedom of investigation request to Parliament identifies that Parliament were NOT truthful covering up the fact that under questions from the Daily Mail, The Treasury Select Committee never interviewed Jes Staley as should have been part of his appointment procedure.

This is also recorded on What Do They Know.

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/id_like_a_transcript_or_recordin

This confirms further cover ups within the realms of Westminster. Lack of investigation impacts all markets and currency values and pension schemes not just in the UK but Globally.

Case Study four (4) Circa 2006 - Present

Mortgage Securities Fraud- Securitisation Process Fraud.

My name is Bruce Robert Lamb and I'm a Business Analyst and Project Manager and have from 2006 to date brought together a significant amount of data and contacts along with others to identify that all in the UK Government and wider Parliament is NOT as conveyed in the media and totally out of kilter?

I think many know this at heart. On the 16th October 2018 I met with All Party Political Group (APPG) for Banking in Portcullis House, Westminster also my MP Mike Kane, Sale East & Wythenshawe after having brought together a substantial amount of data and connecting intelligence to show the UK economy was being taken down by sources within The Treasury and HMRC.

This meeting was arranged by Kevin Hollinrake MP for Thirsk & Malton an MP linked with APPG Banking. All supporting data was passed to them.

The theft and fraud I identified had been covered up by design through the FSA then FCA, Police, Economic Crime Groups, Serious Fraud Office and Corporate Accountancy practices supporting the cover up and the HM Treasury/ Government narrative of nothing to see here.

My specific fraud was the identification of a £200 Million bank securities fraud through off plan property, price against delivered product manipulation and property misdescription.

5000 properties roughly £40k overvalued each. This was found through further investigation eventually to be with a view to destabilising the entire UK economy at a later date.

Property valuations in areas were dropping to a fraudulent value created through securities/ contract documents being counterfeit within the banking process. This was by design.

It had the desired effect of placing properties in negative equity UK wide when further investigation with Mortgage Securitisation Claims identified approximately 50% of UK new builds were in the same position late 1990's to early 2000's onwards.

Much of the personal data was recorded in Cyclops 1146/12 an investigation closed by GMP and the Serious Fraud Office stating the case was under £1 Million therefore out of scope of investigation.

Through work with Legal Quest on Mortgage Securitisation Claims (MSC) further details on the impact can be found within their website <https://yourmsc.co.uk/>

This further linked MSC element when the process is clearly understood creates a theft from the UK public purse of an estimated £1.8 Trillion based on non-payment of Banks funds to HMRC of Stamp Duty Land Tax (SDLT @ 4%). Thus denying public funds and UK PLC of working capital.

On 16.10.18 Portcullis House, Westminster, Mike Kane was instructed by Heather Buchanan (Exec Director APPG Banking) to ask questions of John Glen The Treasury Minister in the House of Commons, this was after Theresa May in the Commons had already responded to a question set that the regulator (FCA) had enough checks and balances in place to make sure fraud was investigated correctly. The Questions were levelled by Kevin Hollinrake MP. The further questions were to be brought together by myself and conveyed to Mike Kane MP. <https://twitter.com/kevinhollinrake/status/1050041387058630658>

Theresa Mays response had been a lie as the FSA/ FCA is a protective gate and a revolving door mechanism to The City, witnessed recently with Andrew Bailey ex FCA Gatekeeper moving to The Bank of England Governor position. A Private Bank with Public responsibilities.

On 30.11.18 I met by arrangement Mike Kane MP in his office Wythenshawe to discuss the outline question set for him to ask in The House of Commons of John Glen, Treasury Minister He asked for a recap but I was barely two minutes into this when he stood up and accused me of being a conspiracy theorist and anti-semitic.

Wythenshawe & Sale East MP

MIKE KANE


Mike was elected as the Member of Parliament for Wythenshawe and Sale East in a by-election on 14th February 2014. In September 2015 Mike was appointed Shadow Minister for International Development. In October 2016 Mike was appointed Shadow Minister for Schools, and more recently in April 2020 Mike was appointed Shadow Minister for Aviation and Maritime.



Learn more about Mike

See Mike's latest news

The Banking Process – White Collar Fraud – Follow The Money.



1. Securities Fraud through Property Mis-Description and Systemic Over Valuation. Taking the UK economy down. NOT investigated by Police or Regulators by design.

Covered up at Government/ MP Level. Bank Process in Blue.

The objective of the question set would identify that the UK was being taken down from within economically and covered up within Government Departments under the control of John Glen and his predecessors. The cover up was running deep all the way into Government departments.

The questions were never asked by Mike Kane and now the UK has been taken down economically, through a false pandemic narrative wrecking the UK economy, placing the NHS Ten years behind in operation scheduling confirming my tabled analysis to Kevin Hollinrake and Heather Buchanan. This has been an inside job on taking down the UK economy on the pretence of a pandemic that never took place.

Refer to World Doctors Alliance Statement: 30.09.20.

This can be provided for review should you not have an available copy.

<http://worlddoctorsalliance.com/>

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/high-consequence-infectious-diseases-hcid>

WDA Notices:

https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApCwWYmI_p2DhvZMoHZ_PN4tC00a5w?e=da0htu

https://peerlessreads.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/CvFNF_GovtKiller.mp4



PR **Coronavirus Covid-19**
Fact Not Fear

Based on the Imperial College Covid-19 Response Team's work, later published on the 16th March, the UK Prime Minister went on television and he and the UK Chief Medical Officer announced that 80% of the UK could become infected and 1% (cited in the media as 530,000 Britons) could die.

2. Dylan Harvey Property Prices were changing values twice on the same day. Sold, then sold again. Over valuations 30-42% in the case studies recorded.



The Dylan Harvey Investment – The Mark Up

111 Apartment, Quebec Building Bury Street, Salford, Greater Manchester, M3 7DA	£126,950 Flat Leasehold Not New Build	10-Apr-2006 <i>Max (M3 TDA)</i>
111 Apartment, Quebec Building Bury Street, Salford, Greater Manchester, M3 7DA	£96,747 Flat Leasehold New Build	10-Apr-2006 <i>Max (M3 TDA)</i>
112 Apartment, Quebec Building Bury Street, Salford, Greater Manchester, M3 7DA	£126,950 Flat Leasehold Not New Build	24-Apr-2006 <i>Max (M3 TDA)</i>
112 Apartment, Quebec Building Bury Street, Salford, Greater Manchester, M3 7DA	£96,747 Flat Leasehold New Build	27-Apr-2006 <i>Max (M3 TDA)</i>
113 Apartment, Quebec Building Bury Street, Salford, Greater Manchester, M3 7DA	£96,747 Flat Leasehold New Build	10-Apr-2006 <i>Max (M3 TDA)</i>
113 Apartment, Quebec Building Bury Street, Salford, Greater Manchester, M3 7DA	£126,950 Flat Leasehold Not New Build	10-Apr-2006 <i>Max (M3 TDA)</i>
114 Apartment, ...	£96,747	



Apartment	£ Price 1	£ Price 2	£ Increase	% Markup
111 Quebec	96,747	126,950	30,203	31.2%
112 Quebec	96,747	126,950	30,203	31.2%
113 Quebec	96,747	126,950	40,203	41.5%

3. Property Mis-Description and Overvaluation. Knight Frank Survey.

12.0 Valuation

- 12.1 Having regard to the various reports and based upon our recent inspections we are of the opinion that the Market Value of the unencumbered long leasehold interest of the properties assuming a new build premium as at the date of representations supplied is represented by the following figures:

Address	Retrospective Value	Date of Valuation	Original Value provided
Apartment 201, 33 Simpson Street, Manchester, M4 4BZ	£146,000	September 2006	Off Plan Price £169,950 Estimated Market Value £188,950
11 Ashbrook Court (22 Birch View), Rochdale	£110,000	October 2006	Off plan price £126,950 Estimated Market Value £149,950

https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApCwWYml_p2Dhu9u25RJ2v-ZH5vnBQ?e=LQfDNr



The Dylan Harvey Investment – Gap Analysis

12.0 Valuation

12.1 Having regard to the various reports and based upon our search capabilities we are of the opinion that the Market Value of the conventional long leasehold interest of the property (assuming a long lease premium is in the form of a representative capital or representative life annuity figure)

Address	Representative Value	Size of Property	Original Value provided
Apartment 401, 52 Kingsway Street, Manchester M2 4JZ	£126,000	60sqm	£145,000 (Price £126,000 + Estimated Market Value £19,000)
11 Barkness Court, 1st Floor, Huddersfield	£110,000	100sqm, 2nd	£120,000 (Price £110,000 + Estimated Market Value £10,000)

12.0 Declaration

12.1 I declare that I am not acting as an agent in the transaction and have complied with the duty of care. I should state that all details and conditions provided by the relevant estate agent are correct to the best of my knowledge.



Property misdescription against delivered product lead to vast pockets of negative equity UK wide, disrupting the economy and pension schemes not only in the North West but across the UK where this practice was allowed to take place by white collar criminals. Dimensions, Car Park Spaces missing, Property Finishes, 2nd Bathrooms replaced with wardrobes are typical of the delivered product on GAP Analysis.

Fwd: Fw: CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD - THE BRITISH MODEL

2 messages

TheAbstraction <mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com>
To: Bruce Lamb <bruce.lamb@boxndice.com>

Wed, Nov 14, 2018 at 6:16 PM

Just got this interesting email...

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **len lawrence** <bae146@hotmail.co.uk>
Date: Wed, 14 Nov 2018 at 16:08
Subject: Fw: CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD - THE BRITISH MODEL
To: TheAbstraction <mark.anthony.taylor@gmail.com>

From: Jean : robertsonj@parliament.uk; william@williamwragg.org.uk; william.wragg.mp@parliament.uk; barronj@parliament.uk; steve.baker.mp@parliament.uk; brennank@parliament.uk; vicky.ford.mp@parliament.uk; jo.stevens.mp; paul.masterton.mp; chris.elmore.mp; kevin.hollinrake.mp; bob.stewart.mp; jim.shannon.mp; stephen.kerr.mp; mahmoodk@parliament.uk; andrew.jones.mp@parliament.uk; kirsty.blackman.mp@parliament.uk; jonathan.reynolds.mp; john.glen.mp
Subject: CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD - THE BRITISH MODEL

Dear Sirs

"As a nation, we pride ourselves on the rule of law. Above the Old Bailey stands the gilded statue of Lady Justice. She carries the sword of justice in one hand and the scales of justice in the other. She wears a blindfold to symbolise that justice is blind and does not distinguish between the powerful and the weak. Yet for those who have been the victims of the systematic fraud practised by UK banks and financial institutions, such sentiment is nonsense. The statue representing their experience of justice would be heavily rusted rather than gilded. It would wear a blindfold to avoid having to see the activities of the financial institutions whose wrongdoing has ruined individuals and families, and its arms would be firmly tied behind its back to symbolise the lack of activity by both the police and the regulators." ".....we have seen clear evidence of tampering with documents, false witness statements and the leveraging of a position of power and clout to drive many thousands of good businesses into insolvency."

William Wragg, MP

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=bfbebb5a&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1617134257826399060&siml=msg-f%3A1617134257826399060&siml=msg-a%3A7894561676227187859


1/6

11/15/2018

Boxndice Limited Mail - Fwd: Fw: CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD - THE BRITISH MODEL

https://www.theyworkforyou.com/whall/?id=2018-10-09b_32_2&s=document+fraud#g34.0

Many MPs and Lords are aware this is taking place without investigation but an external force through controlled Politicians are enabling Banks and Secret Societies be they Masonic or Common Purpose aligned, either knowingly or unknowingly to take down the UK economy and commit fraud for personal gain or they are leveraged by financial, photographic or have paedophile network alliances. Treason is being committed.



https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApCwWYmI_p2Dhu9u25RJ2v-ZH5vnBQ?e=d5eFfo

<https://www.tangentpropertieservices.com/legal-quest-challenge>

Analysis completed specifically for the Lloyds Fraud(s) investigations to date have been undertaken by the Action 4 Justice team. The Framework documents linked "The Wetiko Investigation and Matrix" from intelligence gathered show the clear links between Common Purpose, Westminster's MP's PM's over decades and the Banking sector. The Mind Map (Page 14) presented covers 20% roughly of the intelligence held by their own Business Analysts and Investigators. Others Banks intelligence available on request. This white collar fraud network extends into most UK Councils, Police Forces, Westminster and The City. Documents linked via hyperlinks in PDF format: Wetiko Matrix: <https://bit.ly/3nHFHfH> Dr Konstantine Mettenheim: <https://bit.ly/2GPusfJ>

Case Study five (5) Circa 2000 – Present

Example of Sovereignty Erosion. UN Direct Intervention with UK Local Councils & Telecommunications Operators



The involvement of local government direct UK wide implementing United Nations sustainable development goals is directly linked to the fraudulent leverage placed on local councils and compromised parties early 2000's onward with LOBO loans.

These loans were operated under a bait and switch tactic which has seen up to 70% of local council funding going directly into interest payments.

Banking institutions leveraged the situation through fraudulent contracts going in with low interest rates and then switching the rate through a tactical approach written into the Lender Option Borrower Option contracts. This we can confirm when studying other financial malpractice matters.

Banks don't lend money they manage securities, further detail by County Council would be in their contracts but a general explanation is provided by Ian Fraser on his website.

<http://www.ianfraser.org/how-city-banks-and-brokers-stitched-up-localauthorities-with-lobo-loans/>



<http://lada.debtresistance.uk/what-is-a-lobo/>

It would appear that the European Union and United Nations have directly brokered or contracted with Local Councils and Authorities across the UK, participating in the Act of Treason.

Effectively waging war through technology based installations 5G and LED Street lighting the length and breadth of the United Kingdom.

“Blue light” of LED streetlights linked to breast and prostate cancer

The “blue light” emitted by street lights including LEDs, and commercial outdoor lighting such as advertising, is linked to a significant increase in the risk of breast and prostate cancer, innovative new research has concluded.



https://www.exeter.ac.uk/news/featurednews/title_655460_en.html

Further investigation by an independent team of which parties are directly involved is required and a RACI exercise completed for each UK Council where the false narrative has been extended to the UK public across all media types. RACI – Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed. 5G LED Street Lighting Slide Deck – Mark Steele linked. <https://bit.ly/3cZfCiI>


Huawei Whistle Blower Confirmation 5G is a Weapons System and Can Be placed in “Attack Mode”. Why would a telecommunications system need a Beam Forming “Attack Mode” attribute?


Analysis on Output Power – Evidence. <https://bit.ly/3dbsVfR>

IEEE Confirmation of Kill Grid Functionality Built into strategic positioning of Masts, Antennae & Confirmation that a population would need to be injected with a “Resonance Enhancer”.

https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApCwWYmI_p2DhvZRuwz6iVKDfe5S0Q?e=rofHqB

5G Huawei Whistle blower. 8/10/20: Huawei 5G - Attack Targets – Functionality





Case Study six (6) Circa 2000 – Present

Len Lawrence Ex Royal Navy Pilot, Ex BAE Pilot. Toxic Fumes in BAE cabins. Judicial Cover Ups and Property Theft.

Len's story and case may be reaching its final stages as ex forces staff who now work for the Met Police did not like to see injustice done to someone who had served his country. They provided hidden intelligence to support his earlier claims. This case study demonstrates the levels of cover up that can impact many and the lengths some will take to try and silence those who have been harmed through corporate failings or admissions of guilt. Watching Len's video interview with Caroline Stephen's details events and the expose' of Judge Simon Oliver involvement in taking bribes to sway decisions within the legal system.

The series of events around Simon Oliver been recorded on the website

<https://judgesbehavingbadlyblog.wordpress.com/>

<https://bit.ly/3mkUaHU>

https://1drv.ms/u/s!ApCwWYmI_p2DhvEu8HS61Yq5eyfrhg?e=GhQoBQ

Through a series of events leading to a cabin breach by organic petroleum derivatives which impacted Lens central nervous system and that of other pilot's historically a series of events and industry/ corporate denials lead to loss of his marriage, property, assets and his welfare. Linked information and the slides below briefly tell the tale of the suffering this man has had to endure to begin to get his life back. Justice needs to be done.

*The abuse of court of protection protocols is especially grievous, wherein exclusionary mental health legislation is used in order to side line and even silence those with views that would seek actively to expose corruption, in order to achieve vital, systemic redress. We note similar changes now under the Coronavirus legislation, intended to make it so that only one psychiatrist is required, instead of two, in order to confirm mental capacity – making it easier still (removing checks and balances inbuilt) which would militate against abuses of power and creation/manipulation of regulations to prejudice the rights of those seeking remedy, by stripping them of all their rights to a voice and justice. This is abominable and is yet more evidence of a

truly inhumane system, using power to protect special interests from any culpability for their conduct, destroying lives of ordinary men and women, to secure the status of 'above the law' (which no mortal, not even the monarch, can truly be).

For having the positive audacity to research who was behind attempting to persuade him NOT to investigate the crime against him. Some unknown party decided to make him homeless yet again.

To what lengths are those who run the Justice system prepared to go to cover up white collar criminals?



Case Study seven (7) Circa 2012 – Present

Private Motor Insurance Fraud. (Estimated £3 Billion/PA.)

Identified by mark of the Clann wyschna. As previously disclosed in letters to your Constabulary 006 001 & to your Police Fire & Crime Commissionaire 006 002.

The Government have facilitated the creation of an Extortion Racket for the benefit of the General Insurer operating within the Private Motor Insurance Market through sect 143 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 & the removal of the territorial Constabularies in England & Wales Fraud Function and its centralization within the privately funded City of London Police Constabulary.

The Fraud openly breaches around 10 of the 11 Financial Conduct Authority's (FCA) Key Principles for Business something the FCA themselves accept as 'a serious issue' FCA complaint 206366951.

The Fraud is facilitated through a referral question unfairly incentivising an inferior product, to remove the Insurers lawfully contracted obligation to indemnify the consumer in the event of a non-fault road traffic collision, that removes the insurance principal of subrogation and therefore requirement for loss mitigation, to aggrandise the Insurer through the creation of an illegitimate revenue stream at both there consumers expense & seeing massive unlawful increases in premiums.

A clear understanding of the fraud is outlined in both the Competition & Marketing Authority Private Motor Insurance Investigation Final Report, & the Association of British Insurers General Terms Agreement Technical Committee Protocols, which when examined with the minutes from various meetings, clearly suggests that senior ministers inc the Attorney General & members of the FSA predecessor to the FCA may have conspired &/or connived with the General Insurers.

There is suggestion of Bribery & Corruption within the City of London Police who are privately funded from within the City of London, and whose own Insurance Fraud Enforcement Department receive funding from the General Insurers Trade Organisation the Association of British Insurers.

The FCA are currently investigating the allegation unsupervised despite this total failure of regulation leaving them clearly liable for the indictable Misconduct in public office at Common Law along with potentially Conspiracy to commit fraud at Common Law.

To add insult to the considerable loss suffered already, the FCA are claiming they cannot share the results of their investigation due to legislation.

Due to the blocks and buffers by the “Official Public Authorities” I had strong suspicions there would be many, many more such schemes in place, which led me to meeting the investigator of the 4th Case Study.

Remedy

We are required by Royal Command to compel you once again to stand under common law with the Committee of Barons who lawfully invoked Article 61 of MC1215 on the 23rd March 2001.

You are required to uphold the law of the land and therefore launch investigations and prosecute as evidence dictates the list of seven case studies within this document.

Allowing for a reasonable time frame for you to respond to this “**Notice of Obligation According To English Constitutional Law**” I hereby offer you this further chance to rebut or confirm my understanding of the common law as referred to in my 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 save any future breach of the peace or torts being committed.

We 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 personal commercial liability and penalty of perjury and, with no admission of liability whatsoever and with all our natural, indefeasible and unalienable Common law rights intact.

For & on behalf of the people of the United Kingdom & Northern Ireland

Sworn and subscribed on the date: www.we-the-people.co.uk/

Appendix 1

'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.'

Appendix 2

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.

Appendix 3

Types of Fundamental Human Rights

1. The right to life
2. The right to dignity of persons
3. Right to freedom of speech
4. Right to freedom of association
5. The right to fair hearing
6. The right to freedom of movement
7. The right from freedom of discrimination
8. The right to personal liberty
9. The right to vote and be voted for during an election
10. The right to private family life
11. Right to ownership of properties

Appendix 4

The current wording of the Parliamentary Oath is prescribed by section 1 of the Oaths Act 1978. The usual wording of the oath is thus:

I 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 wording of the solemn affirmation, as set out in the Oaths Act 1978, is:

I do solemnly, sincerely, and truly declare and affirm, That I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors, according to law.²

Appendix 5

<https://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/originsofparliament/birthofparliament/overview/magnacarta/magnacartaclauses/>

Appendix 6

<https://magnacartaplus.org/magnacarta/>

Appendix 7

Article 61 – Magna Carta – Lawful Rebellion

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

My Lord, Lord Craigmyle.

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)	