

It is with respect, that I reply to Andrew Roberts article of 1st February 2020.

This article goes some way to shedding light on the history of the laws of England (there is no such thing as British Law) yet fails to detail the most obvious.

In fact, it mentions exams in the future, yet fails to mention why the curriculum syllabus and bar exams from 1970 onwards exclude Civic and Constitutional Law – rather an important point I would suggest.

The reason, I contend, is an intention by the “elites” and enemies of this Country (England), Marxists and Socialists in all forms, their enemy is our written Constitution. The enemy always attack what they fear the most!

There is nothing more powerful than the English Constitution - but only if it is enforced.

There are many Constitutional and Ancient Laws and Customs that are forever and unalterable! In fact, there is a case, where the Judgement states that:-

**[1953] ScotCS CSIH\_2, 1953 SC 396, 1953 SLT 255**

*“Further, the Treaty and the associated legislation, by which the Parliament of Great Britain was brought into being as the successor of the separate Parliaments of Scotland and England, contain some clauses which expressly reserve to the Parliament of Great Britain powers of subsequent modification, and other clauses which either contain no such power or emphatically exclude subsequent alteration by declarations that the provision shall be fundamental and unalterable in all time coming, or declarations of a like effect. I have never been able to understand how it is possible to reconcile with elementary canons of construction the adoption by the English constitutional theorists of the same attitude to these markedly different types of provisions.*

*The Lord Advocate conceded this point by admitting that the Parliament of Great Britain "could not" repeal or alter such "fundamental and essential" conditions. He was doubtless influenced in making this concession by the modified views expressed by Dicey in his later work entitled Thoughts on the Scottish Union, from which I take this passage (pp. 252–253):—*

*"The statesmen of 1707, though giving full sovereign power to the Parliament of Great Britain, clearly believed in the possibility of creating an absolutely sovereign Legislature which should yet be bound by unalterable laws." “*

and

“I have not found in the Union legislation any provision that the Parliament of Great Britain should be "*absolutely sovereign*" in the sense that that Parliament should be free to alter the Treaty at will.”

By reading this Judgement and Blackstone’s Commentary of the Laws of England one should now bring in one or two of these “Constitutional written Laws bound by Solemn Oath and Convention”

The Bill of Rights of 1688/9 (Public Law) clearly states;

1. The Bill of Rights 1688 “*Adjudged*”
2. The Bill of Rights 1688 “*for all time to come*”
3. The Bill of Rights 1688 “*Forever*” three times.
4. The Bill of Rights 1688 “*shall stand remaine and be the Law of this Realme forever*”

And by no means least:-

Supremacy: The Bill of Rights 1688 “*And I doe declare That noe Forreigne Prince Person Prelate, State or Potentate hath or ought to have [any Jurisdiction Power Superiority Preeminence] or Authoritie Ecclesiasticall or Spirituall within this Realme Soe helpe me God.*

Moving to The Bill of Rights 1688/9 authority (private law), the most powerful authority, the Convention of the people 1688 and its outcome.

The Declaration of Rights 1688 read to and signed by both William and Mary.

This convention is as important to England as the Magna Carta of 1215 and restates “*our rights*”. It is the detail and record of this convention that truly holds the keys to liberty and freedom of the people. Including the Right to Bear Arms in self-defence. A right which was subsequently passed to and included in our American Brothers and Sisters Constitution.

The Coronation Oath Act of 1688 sworn by Her Majesty the Queen on June 2nd 1953, and the substance of that Oath, being declared still valid on July 20th 1988 by Her Majesty to both Houses of Parliament (a Declaration).

Restated and confirmed by Betty Boothroyd (speaker of the House of Commons) in Parliament as advice to the Courts in 1993.

The Crown and Parliament Act 1688, The Act of Settlement 1701 and of course the Acts of Union 1706/7 did not diminish these ancient laws and customs in fact, it enshrined it for all time to come.

So then we come to Dicey, what did he say with reference to our Constitution

“All the conventions of the constitution, said Dicey, were *‘intended to secure the ultimate supremacy of the electorate as the true political sovereign of the State’* .

Constitutional maxims are ‘subordinate and subservient to the fundamental principle of popular sovereignty’. (p253)

Now to the issue of Treaties and how very illegal (unlawful, unconstitutional) and extremely dishonest they were (are), to the point of perjuring ones oath “and” Treason.

Regions: Regions are a construct of the plan to divide England, not so much Little Englanders as England is too big. I quite like England as Counties, Districts and Parishes.

Treaty of Rome 1957

1992/3 Maastricht Treaty - no referendum

1997 Amsterdam Treaty - no referendum

2001 Nice Treaty - no referendum

2007 Lisbon Treaty - no referendum

Treaty of Rome 1957 (which we were lied to about) see below:-

Initially known as the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (or EEC Treaty in short), its name has been retrospectively amended on several occasions since 1957.

The Maastricht Treaty of 1992 removed the word “**economic**” from the Treaty of Rome’s official title and, in 2009, the Lisbon Treaty renamed it the “**Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union**” .

As you can see there was a deliberate sleight of hand (fraud).

The regions are seriously dangerous to England, solely intended to destroy and erase England from the map and “common law”.

There are nine regions of England according to the EU mandate and plan.

However; Scotland will remain a single region (one reason it now has a single police constabulary, instead of seven). Its National Identity remains intact.

The same for Wales and NI. (Although the eventual intention of the EU is to create a single republic of Ireland).

Now, do you understand that Nations and Regions of the United Kingdom are in effect code for the breakup and division of England?

I agree, with Winston, but do not be fooled by Boris Johnson or any political system which believes it is sovereign.

*“Nothing can save England if she will not save herself,”* Winston Churchill told his countrymen on St George’s Day 1933. *“If we lose faith in ourselves, in our capacity to guide and govern, if we lose our will to live, then indeed our story is told.”*

Now shall we have the first English National Referendum on English Independence?

I believe we should!