To: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (doing business as \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)

From: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Served by recorded delivery.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**NOTICE OF LAWFUL OBJECTION & DECLARATION OF STANDING IN LAW**

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

 Dear\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_,

I am writing to you with the presumption that you are the senior agent of the alleged authority in which you are employed or appointed. If there is a more senior position than yours within the department or office, then you are instructed to pass this official NOTICE OF LAWFUL OBLIGATION upward for the attention of the Principal Crown agent who holds an Oath of Office.

I am writing to you to put you on Notice of my standing in law, with the intent to prevent any future breach of the peace, harassment, coercion, demands with menaces, trespass, criminal damage, or any other unlawful intrusion into my affairs, including phone calls and emails, without just and lawful cause to do so, nor without lawful/legal authority.

Whereas I,\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **solemnly declare an Oath of allegiance to the Committee of the Barons who invoked Article 61 of the 1215 Magna Carta on the 23rd of March 2001**(see exhibit A & B) and, that I am as a result of this standing with the lawful excuse to "distress" the Crown, and cannot by Royal Proclamation, aid and abet it in any way whatsoever, including\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ whom may/are making, or may in future make demands on me to comply with unlawful legislation, I with this attempt to pre-empt any such criminal behaviour **by Declaration of my lawful standing herein.**

Please be aware that the 1215 Magna Carta has not been repealed, and that if it had been abolished as the quislings within parliament state, then the (criminally) usurped and deposed (by law) "Queen Elizabeth II" would not have responded to the Baron's petition which was served on her via Sir Robin Janvrin (Queens' Private Secretary) at noon on the 7th of February 2001 (see exhibit A).

Furthermore, if the 1215 Magna Carta had been indeed repealed as the conspirators in Parliament would have us believe, then we would not have celebrated Magna Carta's 800th anniversary on the 15th of June in 2015; coins were minted in its commemoration in 2015. A response to the said petition did occur, leaving the Barons' Committee with no choice under English and Commonwealth law but to invoke Article 61 – the famous' Security Clause' (see exhibit B).

**The Reply:**

I am commanded by The Queen to reply to your letter of the 23rd of March and the accompanying petition to Her Majesty about the Treaty of Nice" – (Sir Robin Janvrin, Private Secretary to Her Majesty The Queen);

**"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."**

Moreover, we did not celebrate the 1297 statute version of the Magna Carta in 1997. Hence, a little common sense is required to disprove the propaganda espoused by the successive, Treasonous administration(s), the alleged "representatives" of the people.

Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 came into effect on the 23rd of March 2001 because of the High Treason committed by Prime Minister Anthony Charles Lynton Blair, who signed the Treasonous E.U. Treaty of 'Nice' on the 26th of January 2001. I have supplied herein a transcript of the petition of the barons, which includes within its address the evidence on the treasonous aspects of the Treaty of Nice (See exhibit B).

Moreover, It is not the people's fault that the Barons' Committee were forced by law to invoke the security clause of Magna Carta 1215 in 2001. I understand that we **MUST ALL**, by **ROYAL COMMAND**, abide by Constitutional law (clause 61 of Magna Carta 1215).

I am an honourable, law-abiding subject of the country who stands assertively under the truth in law to protect the common laws and customs of the land and defend my unalienable rights as a sovereign man/woman of the Realm.

Furthermore, Treason evidence is also supplied herein, which proves undeniably that Edward Heath and his co-conspirators did, with malice aforethought, commit Sedition and High Treason at Common Law when he signed the European Economic Communities Bill in 1972. The Heath Administration hid this blatant treachery under the Official Secrets Act for 30 years, remaining within the National Archives within the Public Records Office until being released into the public domain in 2002.

A link to a PDF Evidence file and the transcript of a Letter to Edward Heath from Lord Kilmuir is evidence of Heath's Treason (see Exhibits D & E - respectively).

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

Therefore, I DEMAND that you, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, defend the English Crown and Church of England as ordered **by Royal Command.**

The problem that we people face in these extremely corrupt and dangerous times is that there are NO AUTHORISED courts of law observing the English and Commonwealth Constitution; therefore, it is impossible to remedy thefts, frauds, war crimes, genocide or **High Treason** committed by any peaceful means, which said crimes many English and Commonwealth constitutional subjects are subject to, and or being **forced**to aid and abet by unwitting agents of the Crown. However, that will change as more people become aware of the truth. Therefore, the (il)legal system will **not** be able to protect its agents in future.

Whereas the "Courts" (Private Corporate Businesses) are all run by criminally established private corporate enterprises these days, whereby none of them observes the Rule of Law or Due Process of Law within their corrupt tribunal hearings, there is nowhere for the ordinary people to receive remedy against said crimes other than relying on the public to stand by the truth in the law. Therefore, as a public servant, you have a duty of care to stand under your Oath to the Common Law and abide by the Royal/Constitutional Command to dissent and distress the Crown at this time, **not the people.**

The facts are all completely evidential. Successive quisling governments are destroying England and the Commonwealth's ancient common law system. If this were not the case, then Article 61 of Magna Carta 1215 would not have been invoked following the correct protocols of English and Commonwealth Constitutional law, obviously (see Exhibit C – Article 61 text). Therefore, to deny the English and Commonwealth Constitution publicly is also the criminal offence of **Sedition at Common law**.

Whereas English Constitutional law within universities was taken out of the syllabus in the 1960s when Harold Wilson, PM, criminally prevented the practice, public servants today can be forgiven (up to a point) for not understanding the law. Still, nobody**can convincingly say that they were unaware of the facts once formally notified of them. Ignorance is no defence in law.**

As a result of the general ignorance by the People on these URGENT matters of High Treason, which have been reported to the police by many of the people already, I am informing you of my standing so that you are well aware of the facts in case any agents under your direction may attempt to enforce illegal policies or to attempt to coerce me to aid and abet those who may seek to do so in future. Any Crown agent from your department/institution trying to do so from this day forth, I may treat the same as any common criminal and hold you personally liable for their actions or omissions. We all have the right and duty to self-defence and to defend ourselves from coercion to aid and abet crime.

If you ignore this Official and URGENT Notice, or do not respond to the specific points addressed herein, and or do not honourably rebut my understandings of the law in substance if you deem them wrong in any way. Within Fourteen (14) days from your receipt of this 'Notice Of Lawful Objection & Declaration Of Standing in Law', then it shall be taken to mean by all interested parties, now and at ANY future time, whilst the security clause of Magna Carta remains in effect, that **you have no legal/lawful objection to my standing**and, that you will prevent within your power any agents from harassing myself or attending the above address to coerce me to aid and abet crime. ANY debt enforcement agent(s) or any other interested Third-party agents, allegedly authorised by the Crown under your direction, shall be reported to the Police, including but not limited to any harassment, demanding monies with menaces, breach of the peace, criminal damage, thefts and or coercion to commit a crime.

**Should you reply, it will be on your full commercial liability and penalty of perjury** and, by your Oath of Office, with a duty of care to the public and the law. I also require a legibly printed name and a wet signature with any correspondence sent to me by you or your Office/department.

Before any reply to this Notice, please be aware that Sedition is still a crime in England as it remains unrepealed by **constitutional authority** and remains as law to this day.

Maxim:" Ignorance of the law does not excuse misconduct in anyone, least of all a sworn Officer of the Law."

Sincerely, and without vexation, frivolity, or ill will, or in any way intended to deceive whatsoever, and with all my Common law unalienable Rights reserved. The Above is my Lawful understanding and sworn to on penalty of perjury and my full commercial liability.

Signed:

 Witnessed by: Date:

 1.

 2.

 3.

**ENCLOSED EVIDENCE:**

**Exhibit A:** Daily Telegraph report on the invocation of Article 61 "Peers Petition Queen on Europe"

**Exhibit B:** The Barons petition 2001

**Exhibit C:** Article 61, the whole translated text;

**Exhibit D:** Lord Kilmuir's letter to Edward Heath PM;

**Exhibit E:** Link to - FCO 30/1048 - Edward Heath treason Evidence PDF file.

**Exhibit F:** Oath of Allegiance

**Exhibit A:** **Daily Telegraph report on the invocation of Article 61;**

"Peers Petition Queen on Europe". By Caroline Davies -12:00am GMT 24 March 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 upon 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 B:** **The Baron's petition 2001;**

A Petition to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II presented under clause 61 of Magna Carta 1215. 7 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:
3. 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 removes 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:**

As recently as last September, the House of Lords Records Office confirmed in writing that the Magna Carta, sealed by King John in June 1215, still stands. 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 the following:

Article 24 –transforms the E.U. 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 E.U. to appoint its representatives in other countries, effectively with ambassadorial status.

Article 191 –assumes for the E.U. the right to "lay down regulations governing political parties at European level [i.e., in the E.U.]" 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 using 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 upon by Q.M.V. These articles open the door to the imposition of Corpus Juris on the U.K. (article 31 specifically calls for cross-border policing and prosecution and the removal of conflicts of jurisdiction) and deployment of armed Europol law enforcement officers on the streets of Britain. These matters were initially 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 E.U., with its own military force. The House of Commons was told on 11 December 2000: "The entire chain of command must remain under the political control and strategic direction of the E.U. 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 U.K. veto applies to 39 new areas of E.U. "competence", including indirect taxation, the environment, immigration, trade, employment, industrial policy, and regional funding. The E.U. also has plans for Q.M.V. to be expanded to other areas not agreed upon at Nice and without further treaty negotiations.

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

Article 52 -purports to give the E.U. 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 [i.e., 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.

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 successful, the Queen feared a Scottish militia might be turned against the monarchy. Thus, the parliament's will was denied in the interests of the nation's sovereignty and the realm's security.

Addressing both Houses of Parliament on 20 July 1988, at a 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."

The 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), and 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, K.C.V.O., C.B. 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 unborn generations. We find ourselves living in exceptional times, which call for extraordinary measures. Hence our petition to Her Majesty, which exercises rights unused for over 300 years – clause 61 of Magna Carta, 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 have 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. Furthermore, it conflicts with the Magna Carta, 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 stands to this day, which is why they are now being invoked by our petition.**

Ultimately, our supreme protection is Her Majesty's obligation 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. But 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 foreign secretary's signing of the Treaty of Nice 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. But, 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 any time 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 sovereign, parliament, government, or people may tamper with, dismantle, destroy, or surrender our constitution. We are all tenants of it and trustees. We inherited these rights and 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 are an essential limitation on parliament's power, and the 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, and an obligation on all who swear allegiance; it is the duty of government. It is sworn for the nation, the commonwealth, and all dominions.

**The Coronation Oath is the peak of a pyramid, and its limitations bind all subordinate oaths.** 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 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 E.U. seeks to assume the right to lay down regulations governing political parties at the European level [i.e., in the E.U.] 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 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 organise 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 23 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 supports this Treaty. However, 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." – (Sir Robin Janvrin, Private Secretary to Her Majesty The Queen);**

**Exhibit C: Article 61, the entire translated text;**

"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 aforesaid.**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 aforesaid provisions being carried out, those of the said twenty-five barons who are left shall choose another in his place according to their own judgement, 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 D:** **Lord Kilmuir's letter to Edward Heath (PM);**

 ['The Heath Government was prepared to commit acts of sedition and treason in taking the U.K. into the E.E.C. Unfortunately, we do not have a copy of Heath's original letter to Lord Kilmuir, and therefore Heath's questions are unknown. However, it will take little imagination to guess what they were: ".]

 "My Dear Ted,

You wrote to me on 30 November about the constitutional implications of our becoming a party to the Treaty of Rome. I have now had an opportunity of considering what you say in your letter and have studied the memoranda you sent me.

I agree with you that there are important constitutional issues involved. I have no doubt that if we do sign the Treaty, we shall suffer some loss of sovereignty, but before attempting to define or evaluate the loss, I wish to make one general observation.

At the end of the day, the issue of whether or not to join the European Economic Community must be decided on broad political grounds, and if it appears from what follows in this letter that I find the constitutional objections serious, that does not mean that I consider them conclusive. I do, however, think it important that we should appreciate clearly from the outset exactly what, from the constitutional point of view, is involved if we sign the treaty, and it is with that consideration in mind that I have addressed myself to the questions you have raised. **He is clear that if we do sign the agreement with the E.E.C., we will suffer some loss of Sovereignty**.

This is clearly an act of Treason because our Constitution allows no surrender of any part of our Constitution to a foreign power beyond the control of the Queen in parliament. This is evidenced by the convention, which says: (Parliament may do many things, but what it may not do is surrender any of its rights to govern unless we have been defeated in war). And the ruling given to King Edward 3rd in 1366 in which he was told that King John's action in surrendering England to the Pope and ruling England as a Vassal King to Rome was illegal because England did not belong to John; he only held it in trust for those who followed on. The Money the Pope was demanding as tribute was not to be paid. Because England's Kings were not vassal Kings to the Pope, and the money was not owed.

Adherence to the Treaty of Rome would, in my opinion, affect our sovereignty in three ways: - Parliament would be required to surrender some of its functions to the organs of the community; The Crown would be called on to transfer part of its treaty-making power to those organs of the community; The Constitution confers treaty-making powers only on the Sovereign, and the Sovereign cannot transfer those powers to a foreign power or even our own parliament because they are not the incumbent Sovereigns to give away as they only hold those powers in trust for those who follow on.

Our courts of law would sacrifice some degree of independence by becoming subordinate in certain respects to the European Court of Justice. It is a Praemunire to allow any case to be taken to a foreign court, not under the control of the Sovereign. The European Court of Justice or the European Court of Human Rights are foreign courts not under the control of our Sovereign. Praemunire is a crime akin to Treason.

The position of Parliament. It is clear that the memorandum prepared by your Legal Advisers that the Council could eventually (after the system of qualified majority voting had come into force) make regulations which would be binding on us even against our wishes and which would in fact become for us part of the law of the land.

There are two ways in which this requirement of the Treaty could, in practice, be implemented: - It is a Praemunire to allow any laws or regulations not made by the Sovereign in parliament to take effect as law in England. This is illegal under the Acts of Treason 1351, the Act of Praemunire 1392, The Act of Supremacy 1559, and the Declaration and Bill of Rights 1688/9.

Parliament could legislate ad hoc on each occasion that the Council make regulations requiring action by us. The difficulty would be that, since Parliament can bind neither itself nor its successors, we could only comply with our obligations under the Treaty if Parliament abandoned its right of passing independent judgement on the legislative proposals put before it. A parallel is the constitutional convention whereby Parliament passes British North American Bills without question at the request of the Parliament of Canada; in this respect, Parliament here has substance, if not in form, abdicated its sovereign position. It would have protanto to do the same for the Community. However, no such power exists for parliament to do this. **This would be an Act of Treason under the 1351 Treason Act**, A Praemunire under the 1392 Act of Praemunire, an Act of Treason under the 1559 Act of Supremacy, and the 1688/9 Declaration and Bill of Rights.

It would, in theory, be possible for parliament to enact at the outset legislation which would give the automatic force of law to any existing or future regulations made by the appropriate organs of the Community. For Parliament to do this would go far beyond the most extensive delegation of powers, even in wartime, we have ever experienced. I do not think there is any likelihood of this being acceptable to the House of Commons. Whichever course were adopted, Parliament would retain in theory, the liberty to repeal the relevant Act or Acts, but I would agree with you that we must act on the assumption that entry into the Community would be irrevocable; we should therefore accept a position where Parliament had no more power to repeal its own enactments than it has in practice to abrogate the statute of Westminster.

In short, Parliament would have to transfer to the Council, or other appropriate organs of the Community, its substantive powers of legislating over the whole of a very important field. There is no constitutionally acceptable method of doing this because it would be tantamount to a total abrogation of their duty to govern us according to our laws and customs.

**And it would be an Act of Treason under the 1351 Treason Act**, A Praemunire under the 1392 Act of Praemunire, and Treason under the 1559 Act of Supremacy, and the Declaration and Bill of Rights 1688/9 Treaty-making Powers. The proposition that every treaty entered into by the United Kingdom does to some extent fetter our freedom of action is plainly true. Some treaties, such as GATT and O.E.E.C., severely restrict our liberty to make agreements with third parties. I should not regard it as detrimental to our sovereign that, by signing the Treaty of Rome, we undertook not to make tariff or trade agreements without the Council's approval. But to transfer to the council or the Commission the power to make such treaties on our behalf, even against our will, is an entirely different proposition. There seems to me to be a clear distinction between the exercise of sovereignty involved in the conscious acceptance by us of obligations under treaty-making powers and the total or partial surrender of sovereignty involved in our cession of these powers to some other body.

To confer a sovereign state's treaty-making powers on an international organisation is the first step on the road, which leads by way of confederation to the fully federal state. I do not suggest that what is involved would carry us far in this direction. Still, it would be a most significant step and one for which our case has no precedent. Moreover, a further surrender of the sovereignty of parliamentary supremacy would necessarily be involved: as you know, although the treaty-making power is vested in the Crown. Parliamentary sanction is required for any treaty which consists of a change in the law or the imposition of taxation, to take two examples, and we cannot ratify such a treaty unless Parliament consents. But suppose binding treaties are to be entered into on our behalf. In that case, Parliament must surrender this function and either resign itself to becoming a rubber stamp or give the Community, in effect, the power to amend our domestic laws.

**This is a surrender of our Sovereignty, a clear Act of Treason under the 1351 Treason Act and a Praemunire** under the 1392 Act of Praemunire; it is Treason under the 1559 Act of Supremacy and the 1688/9 Declaration and Bill of Rights.

**Independence of the Courts:**

There is no precedent for our final appellate tribunal being required to refer questions of law (even in a limited field) to another court and, as I assume to be the implication of 'refer'- to accept that court's decision. You will remember that when a similar proposal was considered in connection with the Council of Europe, we strongly objected to it. I do not doubt that the legal profession in this country would share my dislike for such a proposal which must inevitably detract from the independence and authority of our courts. Of those three objections, the first two are by far the more important.

I must emphasise that, in my view, the surrenders of sovereignly involved are serious ones. I think that as a matter of practical politics, it will not be easy to persuade Parliament or the public to accept them. It would be a great mistake to underestimate the force of objections to them. But these objections should be brought into the open now because, if we attempt to gloss over them at this stage, those opposed to our joining the Community will undoubtedly seize them with more damaging effects later on.

Having said this, I would again emphasise that although those constitutional considerations must be given their full weight when we balance the arguments on either side, I do not for one moment wish to convey the impression that they must necessarily tip the scale. In the long run, we shall have to decide whether economic factors require us to make some sacrifices of sovereignty: my concern is to ensure that we see precisely what we are being called on to sacrifice and how serious our loss would be. It is a Praemunire to subject Her Majesty's Courts of law to the domination of a foreign court outside of Her Majesty's control."

**Exhibit E:**Link to FCO 30/1048 Edward Heath Treason Evidence PDF file;

<http://www.nommeraadio.ee/meedia/pdf/RRS/Brittide%20petmine.pdf>

**Exhibit F: Oath of Allegiance**