From: Your name

Street Address

Town/Suburb State Postcode

To: Recipients name doing business as;

Job Title Business/gov dept

Street Address

Town/City

State Postcode

Date served: Mailing date

*Sent by recorded post.*

Dear Recipients name,

I am writing to bring a pressing matter to your immediate and utmost attention regarding the implications of your enforcement of precrime legislation while posing as a public servant in Commonwealth jurisdictions since the coronation ceremony of King Charles III.

The thrust of this letter is summarised in the following three points.

1. Man-made institutions cannot delegate or grant rights that individual members, who collectively form that institution, do not possess individually. In other words, if an individual or group lacks a specific right, they cannot bestow that right upon another individual or group. Therefore, the authority of Parliament is constrained by the inherent rights of each individual and any attempt to surpass these boundaries is by definition a crime against humanity.
2. Acting against one's conscience cannot be morally justified, as there is no inherent obligation to do so. When an agent of government claims moral authority to violate inviolable rights, it promotes the acceptance of immoral orders as virtuous. True authority cannot be attributed to those who assume power over others, yet authority as defined by contemporary governing systems necessitates unquestioning obedience to dominate by force. In reality, the existence of genuine authority rests upon the ability to make decisions in alignment with objective morality, and to exceed these limits, immediately delegitimises one’s claim to authority.
3. No document or ritual has the power to alter objective morality and transform evil into something good. When legislation aligns with objective morality, it becomes redundant as morality itself already dictates the right course of actions. On the other hand, if legislation contradicts objective morality, it is deemed criminal and each individual has a moral responsibility to reject it, as morality supersedes any man-made laws or rituals. Hence, legislated Acts of Parliament do not possess the power to create an obligation to obey and therefore has no inherent authority.

On Saturday May 6, 2023, King Charles III signed a binding document acknowledging the people of Britain and the Commonwealth as the supreme authority over their public servants. Although some may consider the oath contained within the document to be of symbolic significance, a recent report by the House of Commons from May 2023 states that the oath is the only part of the ceremony that is required by law. This oath is binding and serves as a one-sided contract with the people of the realms that fall under its jurisdiction. Being a Commonwealth country, Australia falls under this jurisdiction.

While the people are not bound by the constitution, the King and his government, if chosen by him or the people, are duty bound by it. It is a promise made by the most senior public servant, the King, to preserve the people's way of life, ensuring that their inalienable rights are not trampled by anyone and that nobody may be deprived of their liberty without a Trial by a Jury of their peers.

The system of governance, known as constitutional monarchy, as expressed in the enduring Magna Carta of 1215, remains binding on our system of governance today, just as it was centuries ago. In this system, the title of King or Queen is given to the highest public servant.

Regardless of their title, a legitimate monarch holds the highest office in the Commonwealth. This office is created with the purpose of assisting the people in governing themselves, ensuring the independence of the jury to judge on all matters of justice. The jury, representing the country, makes decisions based on the consciences of individual jurors. Through this process, the people create and uphold their own laws.

Below is an extract from Lysander Spooner’s 1852 essay on "Trial by Jury". It eloquently highlights the pivotal role this institution plays in drawing a clear line between despotism and freedom.

“The authority to judge what are the powers of government and what are the liberties of the people must necessarily be vested in one or the other of the parties themselves, the government, or the people, because there is no third-party to whom it can be entrusted. If the authority be invested in the government, the government is absolute, and the people have no liberties except such as the government sees fit to indulge them with. If on the other hand that authority be vested in the people, then the people have all liberties as against the government except such as substantially the whole people through the jury choose to disclaim and the government can exercise no power except such as substantially the whole people through the jury consent that it may exercise.”

It is important to understand that Trial by Jury is not the same as jury trial, the difference is explained further below.

The jury trials conducted for criminal cases in the current system represent a diluted and distorted version of authentic Trial by Jury. Under this system, jurors are directed by the judge to disregard the justice of the 'legislation' and focus solely on determining the guilt of the accused, which essentially amounts to following orders. It is important to note that such 'order following' was outlawed after the Second World War.

This quote from Sir Winston Churchill, excerpted from a telegram sent from Cairo to the UK Home Secretary on November 21st, 1943, aptly captures the extent of criminality in which you have entangled yourself. The quote highlights the involvement of the executive, referring to the police and prisons, in this criminal context.

“The power of the ‘executive’ to cast a man into prison without formulating any charge known to the law, and particularly to deny him the judgment of his peers, is in the highest degree odious and is the foundation of all totalitarian government, whether Nazi or Communist.”

The democratic rule of law, as reflected in our English Common Law Constitution, upholds the principle that the power to punish resides outside the control of government, the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary. Instead, it places this power in the hands of ordinary people who serve as jurors, ensuring a system that is fair and balanced. This approach prevents the determination of appropriate penalties from being dictated by legislative bodies or other branches of government that are susceptible to being influenced to engage in criminal behaviour. This susceptibility is evident in cases where parliament legislates itself above the law, employing audacious measures such as granting immunity from private prosecution.

Examination of the oath of office taken by all public servants, whether in the military, constabulary, judiciary, civil service or as a member of parliament, reveals a consistent theme: pledging allegiance to the highest-ranking public servant. The role of the monarch is to assume the paramount responsibility of managing the daily provision of services to meet the needs of the people within the kingdom. This complex role necessitates the delegation of various responsibilities, leading to the creation of individual offices and the corresponding oaths for each office.

Recipients name, have you and your fellow employees, including the department secretary of Name of the Department, sworn or affirmed an oath of public office? Research indicates, it is a criminal offence to assume the position of a Commonwealth Public Official without signing an oath of office before a representative of the most senior public servant of the Commonwealth.

In order to cultivate a peaceful and harmonious coexistence within the kingdom, it is essential that everyone regardless of title is acknowledged as equal under the law. This principle of equality under the law was reaffirmed in 1215 through the sealing of Magna Carta, a response to King John's numerous atrocities that were no longer tolerable to the people. Magna Carta 1215 stands as the constitution for the entire English Commonwealth, and it distinguishes itself by recognising the people as sovereign, elevating them to their rightful position of superiority over the administrative system of service they established.

The legislation you claim as your grant of authority comes from a parliament that criminalised itself by declaring its own sovereignty and legislating itself above the law, thereby delegitimising its own authority.

The deliberate deception represented by a document claiming to be a constitution, which supposedly grants sovereignty to parliament, serves a malevolent purpose. Its aim is to subvert the inherent capacity of the people to govern themselves - an action that can be considered nothing short of treasonous, as it directly undermines the people as the supreme authority over their governing administration.

One way to identify such deception is by examining who holds the power to administer punishment. In the case of the 1901 Commonwealth of Australia ‘Constitution,’ parliament granted itself the authority to establish and govern the judiciary while enjoying parliamentary immunity from private prosecution.

The attempt to justify legislators granting themselves immunity from the law, thereby absolving themselves from liability for usurping the people's inherent right to self-governance, is not a statement of fact but rather an admission of complicity and guilt. Would you not agree?

The primary responsibility of the most senior public servant, the monarch, is to deny royal assent to legislation that imposes on the people's individual rights. This is an essential aspect of their sworn duty to protect individual rights.

Similar to the monarch, the primary role of every Governor General throughout the Commonwealth is to safeguard individual rights by denying royal assent to legislation that infringes upon them. However, this crucial responsibility has been neglected for decades due to the appointment of Governor Generals by political parties. These appointments, which constitute the highest crime of treason, serve as a glaring admission of criminal intent. By accepting these appointments, each Governor General willingly becomes complicit in the grave act of treason. Moreover, their allowance of immoral legislation to pass serves to elevate their crimes to the level of high treason, amplifying the severity and impact of their actions.

Our (English Commonwealth) Constitution preserves and protects a voluntaryist way of life as it serves as the agreed set of boundary conditions necessary for people to live as individuals interacting with others on a voluntary basis, whilst ensuring that no man or woman’s individual rights are transgressed, particularly by employees of the governing administration.

The political party system, along with the accompanying voting process known as Adult Suffrage, was deliberately created to deceive and dilute the more direct Rule of Law. The Rule of Law preserves the inherent ability of the people to shape the character of their society directly through the jury. In our proper system, there is no requirement for politics or the imposition of policies to dictate moral behaviour to the people. It is not the role of an administrative system of service to involve itself in the minutiae of our daily lives.

Law is supposed to be defined in the negative (the apophatic) - you can do anything you like except... (doing harm to others). This leaves an empty vast space of possibility and freedom for the people and law is dealt with through intent and not outcome.

The following passages offer a comprehensive explanation of why blindly following legislation lacks virtue. Merely complying without engaging one's moral faculties always leads to catastrophic outcomes. While the people believe you are a legitimate public servant, that is the standard to which you are accountable. A public servant's duty is to maintain societal stability by impartially distributing services to the people. Without impartiality, chaos and ruin become inevitable.

In your specific circumstance, Recipients name, describe the specific criminal actions the recipient has undertaken in conjunction with other agencies/gov depts/fake courts that were conspired with in order to violate your rights a parent and your child’s rights to live free from state molestation and forced separation. Your actions serve as undeniable evidence of premeditated intent to violate [my/the peoples] indefeasible rights for self-determination and my ability to independently make decisions regarding the welfare of my child/children. Such actions blatantly disregard the non-aggression principle enshrined in the law that governs all public servants.

[You have the choice to include further detail about the level of misery and suffering you have endured as a result of the recipients’ actions.]

The alarming statistics surrounding [Choose from fatherless or motherless] homes reveal a disturbing rise in teenage suicides, homeless runaways, high school dropouts, drug addictions, and youth incarceration. By obediently following orders that unquestionably accept hearsay as irrefutable truth, you actively contribute to the excruciating torment and anguish endured by innocent children - an alarming precursor to criminal behaviour. History, exemplified by the Nuremberg trials, unequivocally demonstrates that the weight of moral culpability rests upon those who carry out immoral orders.

This unconscionable situation has arisen due to your wilful enforcement of precrime legislation, a concept that grants authority to punish individuals for crimes they have not committed. This legislation treats mere opinions as indisputable truths, completely disregarding the need for evidence or thorough investigation. Precrime, bestows upon the accuser immunity from criminal prosecution for making false statements, elevating them above the law and allowing them to act with impunity.

Such legislation undermines the very essence of justice by denying inherent individual rights and freedoms, creating a climate of anguish and torment where innocent people are unjustly targeted and punished. It tears apart the familial bonds that form the fabric of a cohesive and harmonious society. In this dystopian reality, individuals live in constant fear, stripped of their rights and subjected to unwarranted persecution. The consequences are devastating, eroding trust, and perpetuating an environment of injustice and oppression.

Recipients name, would you be willing to stand in a court of law, under penalty of perjury, and affirm your acceptance of punishment based on an unsubstantiated complaint that lacks evidence or investigation? Would you go on the record to state that it is fair and just for the accuser to be granted immunity from prosecution for making false statements?

These orders you advocate for brazenly grant enforceable directives involving violence, forced re-education and labour, dispossession, defamation of character, and confinement. Shockingly, without any evidence of a crime being committed, these orders have subjected [me/innocent people] to repeated detention, dispossessed [me/them] of property, restricted [my/their] freedom of travel and association, and continue to pose an ongoing threat that [has forcibly separated me from my children/forcibly separates parents from their children]. This unjust situation has caused immeasurable distress, alarm, and chronic suffering.

The blind acceptance of parliamentary dictation of societal norms and the arbitrary imposition of punishments for rule violations stem solely from the people's ignorance. The people remain completely unaware of the correct democratic mechanisms that empower individuals and ensure that public servants cannot trample upon their rights. As a result, without knowledge about these mechanisms, the people are left entirely defenceless against legislative tyranny. They lack the means to safeguard their inalienable rights and prevent oppressive legislation from being imposed upon them, further compromising their freedoms with each passing day.

There is a well-known maxim in law that emphasises personal accountability for one's actions and omissions. I strongly advise you to become familiar with this principle, as your actions have caused significant harm to both me and my children, impacting our mental, emotional, and physical well-being. Additionally, I feel compelled to address the continuous defamation of character through the use of ad hominem attacks, such as labelling [me/people] [a/as] ['sovereign citizen/’sovereign citizens’].' I strongly encourage you to conduct thorough research, as you may come to discover that this term is an oxymoron leaving you susceptible to the tort of defamation of character.

It is incumbent on you as a civil servant to produce substantial evidence that you are administering the correct governing system under the democratic rule of law politicians refer to as a 'liberal western democracy'. Without evidence you give implicit endorsement of the deliberate deceit propagated by the political class that spreads misinformation to foster apathy and encourages ignorance among the population, leading the people to blindly accept that parliament has the right to grant itself immunity from private prosecution.

An omission is a failure to acknowledge the overwhelming evidence indicating that the [Name of the department child protection falls under in your state] operates as a for-profit corporation. This omission serves as evidence that you are complicit in the concealment of and participation in deceptive practices, which deny the protection of individual rights. Such actions constitute a crime against humanity.

In order to understand the gravity of the statement above the correct governing system that belies a liberal western democracy is articulated below.

In a correctly functioning democracy, legislation does not possess the power to punish. Instead, the authority to determine punishments rests with the people, exercised through the independent judgment of the jury, which safeguards an impartial justice system and assesses the justice of the legislation.

The purpose of legislation is to create a procedural process for delivering quality services to the people and at a minimum those procedures must stay in alignment with the people’s collective conscience in order to serve its intended purpose of meeting the people’s day-to-day needs in alignment with their shared values.

Participating in state-sanctioned abduction without evaluating the moral quality of the legislation that commands the violation of inherent rights is a crime under the law that controls government, which nations of the Commonwealth are bound to uphold. This crime does not lose its gravity, even if the majority choose to condone it through their apathetic silence.

Choosing blind obedience to immoral legislation is a conscious abandonment of one's moral compass - a damning indictment of a personal character defect. This is how guilt is established in a just court, where an impartial jury, guided by their unwavering conscience, stands as the ultimate arbiter. Such obedience suffocates the very essence of humanity, leaving justice to decay and all that is precious and sacred to languish in its decaying grip."

It is important to note that Trial by Jury is still upheld to this day. This is specifically stated in Article 29 of the 1297 statute version, which is prominently displayed in Parliament House Canberra. Article 29 reads in part “No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or disseised of his freehold, liberties or free customs, or be outlawed or exiled or in any other wise destroyed; nor will We pass upon him nor condemn him, but by lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.” Article 29 is a consolidation of Articles 39 and 40\*\* of Magna Carta 1215. The presence of this statute version in parliament serves as tangible evidence that Trial by Jury is the established method of administering legitimate law in this country.

Article 39\* of our world-respected permanent 1215 Great Charter Constitution Magna Carta\* strips the state, the government, and judicial officers of all power to set sentences and prescribe punishments, transferring this responsibility to the jury. This is the single most significant protective aspect of Trial by Jury defined and prescribed by the virtually immutable 1215 Magna Carta Constitution that binds all national administrations of service within the Commonwealth.

It is of utmost importance to recognise that any case heard in a court without a jury, which holds the independence to assess all aspects of the case, amounts to a summary trial. Such trials violate the law that forbids the government to execute any of its legislation by punishing violators in any case whatsoever, without first getting the consent of the people through a jury. Any public servant, be they a member of parliament, bureaucrat, department employee, judicial officer or state prosecutor, party to such violations constitutes a blatant act of malfeasance in public office, abuse of office and commissioning of a miscarriage of justice forbidden by the law that binds government and must be held responsible for their actions.

Every letter that provides you evidence of the correct system of governance you are bound to defend, that you ignore, serves as compounding evidence of a pathology that chooses the immorality of yielding unaccountable power to cause harm to innocent families.

It is the duty of a legitimate public servant to address all correspondence from the public regarding breaches of their authority in a substantive manner. Failure to do so constitutes yet more evidence of misconduct in public office.

Refusal or failure to provide evidence of your authority as a public servant serves as damming evidence of criminal.

A crime against humanity is by definition a widespread or systematic attack against an unarmed noncombatant population, such as acts of murder, extermination, enslavement, extortion, or persecution, committed as part of a state or organisational policy. This includes actions committed both during times of armed conflict and in non-conflict situations. Any man or woman that commits severe human rights abuses against the people they are sworn to protect is liable for crimes against humanity, which is a form of war crime.

Life is inherently uncertain, and each day you carry on disregarding the moral principles, the likelihood increases that you will encounter a situation where you will be required to justify consciously accepting a salary to enforce legislation that justifies trespassing on indefeasible individual rights and treats unsubstantiated opinions as unchallenged facts, thereby contributing to the perpetuation of an immoral system.

In a court of law, guilt is established not by whether harm was done, but whether the harm caused resulted from premeditated malicious intent. Your outright refusal to show transparency and refute the fact put before you of the crimes commented by a collective of people claiming to be government authority stands as irrefutable evidence that establishes motive of your premeditated intention to cause harm to the very people whose trust has been won under false pretenses.

As a matter of law, it is my duty to inform you that by receiving this letter, you now have ‘Knowledge of Circumstance’ surrounding the principles and values of our democratic system, which as a civil servant you are obligated to uphold. Failing to fulfil your sworn duty renders any claims of plausible deniability invalid, making you personally liable for any violations of the law that you commit. It is essential to remember that, as a civil servant, breaking the law constitutes a severe breach of trust and carries significant consequences."

Those involved in crimes against humanity bear an enduring personal responsibility, as these grave offences are not subject to any statute of limitations. Furthermore, in the event that justice eludes any public servant implicated in the abuse of their office, any ill-gotten assets obtained through these criminal acts shall be rightfully considered proceeds of crime, subject to forfeiture from their heirs and successors. Consequently, such assets, including personal wealth and possessions such as homes, vehicles, and boats, may be seized and distributed to the victims of these heinous acts.

I wish to emphasise a crucial fact: at the end of the Second World War, blindly following orders was internationally recognised as a war crime, and it continues to hold that status to this day. Countless public servants were held personally accountable for abandoning their moral judgment in favour of implementing immoral policies and procedures dictated by legislation.

Today, a growing number of individuals are experiencing private suffering due to the actions of so-called 'public servants' who simply follow orders. This profound injustice has not gone unnoticed, as an increasing number of people awaken to the truth and seek lawful justice. Media reports highlight the surge of self-representing individuals attending court hearings, a clear sign of the unstoppable wave of people unearthing the truth. It is only a matter of time before the resounding chorus of informed voices prevails, overpowering the very system that you contribute to through your actions.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. I urge you strongly to conduct independent investigations to fully grasp the profound significance of the moral principles that the oath of public office compels you to unwaveringly uphold, without exceptions. It is crucial to comprehend the far-reaching repercussions that arise when a representative acts in defiance of the promises made by the highest-ranking public servant to the people.

As I have supplied you with an articulated and referenced explanation, it is your responsibility to refute each false statement point for point in substance in a dated written reply by post within no more than ten (10) days of receipt of this letter, accompanied by your legibly written full name and wet ink signature on your full commercial liability and penalty of perjury.

If you are unable to refute the points of law contained herein in your reply, the law requires you to articulate the specific action you intend to undertake to restore the integrity of those whose fundamental rights you have violated, in accordance with the principles of democratic rule of law you are obliged to uphold and protect.

Sincerely,

Your name

\* DEMOCRACY DEFINED: The Manifesto - Kenn d'Oudney

\*\* THE CONSTITUTION TREATISE by Kenn d'Oudney - A Treatise on Law, Constitutions and Democracy in Twelve Points

Kenn d’Oudney’s material is sourced from the historical, legal, constitutional opuses by Gibbon, Palgrave, Millar, Gilbert, Hale, Crabbe, Hallam, Spooner, Coke, Blackstone, Mackintosh, de Thoyras, Stephens, Hume, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Wilson (Justice James), Macaulay et al.