From: Your name

Street Address

Town/Suburb State Postcode

To: Recipients name doing business as;

Job Title of 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. It pertains to the moral principles embedded in the oath of a police constable, the solemn commitment you take on the day of graduation from the academy. This oath binds you to the definitive set of standards that delineate the thin blue line separating lawful conduct from criminal behaviour.

The intention of this letter is to act as a gesture of goodwill, for you to take decisive action to stand in honour of your oath of office as it is only a matter of time before the overwhelming tide of informed voices prevails, overpowering the very system you contribute to through your actions.

Adherence to the oath of office without deviation is the cornerstone that empowers constables to embody the concept of 'policing by consent'. It is through unwavering commitment to this oath that true authority is bestowed. However, let it be known that anyone who claims to ‘police by consent’ yet lacks knowledge of their solemn oath can only resort to policing by force, a flagrant act of terrorism. The oath is not a mere formality; it is the foundation upon which the principles of justice, fairness, and trust are upheld, ensuring the safety and harmony of our society. Deviation from this oath undermines the very essence of 'policing by consent,' leaving only tyranny in its wake.

Responsibility for understanding the gravity of the oath of office you swore, which granted you the trust of the people and the authority to carry lethal weapons, ultimately falls on you. In order to effectively enforce the law, it is crucial to understand that blindly following any orders, whether from senior police or parliament, is strictly prohibited, especially when they conflict with universal morality. If you choose to investigate further, you may discover that the constable oath grants you independent authority to carry out your duties. This is why it is necessary for you to have private indemnity insurance and be fully aware of what it means to enforce the law as defined by your oath of office.

The law you are obligated to uphold requires you to bring all lawbreakers to justice, even more so if they are within your own ranks. Failure to do so would make you complicit in the deliberate concealment of crime, commonly known as misprision of treason.

The following passages provide a comprehensive explanation as to why there is no virtue in blindly following orders. Compliance without engaging one's moral faculties invariably leads to catastrophe. As a sworn constable, your duty is to maintain the stability of society through impartiality and the defence of objective morality, as the absence of these critical principles only results in chaos and ruin.

The moral authority granted to police constables under the correct system of equitable service to the people is reflected in the impartiality of the constable's oath of office which affirms your intention to serve 'without favour or affection, malice or ill-will'. Furthermore, your oath is a solemn promise to 'well and truly serve' the highest-ranking public servant of the Commonwealth denoted by the term ‘sovereign'.

The Office of Sovereign is entrusted with the role of the most senior public servant, carrying the paramount responsibility of overseeing the daily provision of services to meet the needs of the people within the Commonwealth. Their primary duty is to aid the people in self-governance by facilitating a natural justice tribunal. This tribunal provides impartial arbitration on matters of law, ensuring that all individuals are presumed innocent until proven guilty, as assessed by the consciences of jurors. When you swear allegiance to the sovereign, you solemnly pledge to uphold this same commitment.

The constable oath specifies that police constables are not serving legislators, but rather the whole community of which they are a part. By pledging allegiance to the sovereign, police constables are committing to a just and fair society, governed by the rule of law.

As the role of a constable is just one among many public service duties delegated by the most senior public servant, it is essential that the oath of office affirms allegiance to the individual entrusted with the highest responsibility. The person assuming the highest office in the commonwealth must pledge to uphold the laws and customs of the people in order to maintain their trust. This serves as verifiable proof that the law can only be judged and determined by the people themselves, rather than by those in roles of service. It is important to note that legislation created by the legislative branch of public servants does not possess the authority to create laws, but rather establishes rules for providing services to the people.

Furthermore, the symbolic meaning behind police swearing loyalty to the sovereign reflects the idea that the state and its institutions are a representation of the moral character of people, with the sovereign as the embodiment of the state. By swearing loyalty to the sovereign, police constables pledge to serve and protect the people and uphold the values of objective morality. This act represents the police constables’ commitment to defending the democratic institutions of the state and preserving the rule of law, which is essential for maintaining order and promoting the welfare of the community you have sworn to serve.

Upon closer examination, swearing allegiance to the sovereign does not indicate personal loyalty to a specific monarch or political party. Rather, it represents a solemn commitment to safeguarding the fundamental principles of the justice system, which the most senior public servant of the Commonwealth is bound to protect through their coronation oath. These principles include fairness, impartiality, and unwavering respect for the rule of law, forming the bedrock of the justice system.

On 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. This document includes an oath, required by law, which signifies a one-sided contract between the people and the jurisdictions it covers. During the oath ceremony witnessed by millions, Charles pledged to govern according to the 'laws and customs' of the realms and territories and to uphold the 'Laws of God'. These principles, rooted in the Bible, prohibit man-made legislation that violates individual rights and the sole judgment of one individual by another. As a result, the legitimacy of Magistrates' Courts is called into question, as they operate under legislation that infringes upon individual rights and allows one person to judge another.

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.

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 unnecessary 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. Therefore, legislation does not possess the power to create an obligation to obey and therefore has no inherent authority.

The democratic rule of law is administered through the people’s supreme law council known as Trial by Jury; the only source of authority that has the power to define the values of democratic state institutions because it reflects several fundamental principles of democracy.

First, Trial by Jury upholds the principle of the rule of law, which is essential for maintaining justice and fairness in society. It ensures that all people regardless of title or stature are equal before the law and that justice is administered impartially. It is important to understand that Trial by Jury is not the same as jury trial, the difference is explained further below.

Second, Trial by Jury reflects the principle of individual sovereignty, which holds that the power of the government derives from the people. By serving on a jury the people have direct control in shaping the laws and values of the state.

Third, Trial by Jury promotes transparency and accountability in the justice system. It provides an opportunity for people to scrutinise the actions of the government and ensure that justice is served according to the rule of law.

The preservation of Trial by Jury, as defined and established by the enduring 1215 Magna Carta Constitution and Common Law, is considered the most crucial protective aspect. It serves as the exclusive source of authority for all public servants within the English Commonwealth realm, even to this day.

While Magna Carta 1215 remains our lawful constitution, governing our government, 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.

Now to give specific detail to the correct system of justice that your oath of office is bound to uphold.

The principles of democratic rule of law are deeply ingrained in our English common law constitution, ensuring that the power to punish lies beyond the reach of government, executive, legislature, and judiciary. The protection our constitution provides against legislative tyranny becomes evident through its exclusive allocation of the responsibility to set sentences and prescribe punishments to the jury.

In order for a police constable to fulfil their duties in accordance with the law, it is essential to have a steadfast understanding of the critical role that Trial by Jury plays in upholding democratic principles. Trial by Jury stands as a vital component of the justice system, ensuring that those entrusted with decision-making power are held accountable to the law, safeguarding the people from the imposition of immoral legislation. It is the sole mechanism known to mankind that enables fair and impartial administration of justice, free from any biases or prejudices.

Trial by Jury is a cornerstone of the justice system in any democratic society. In this system, a jury of equals is chosen to hear evidence and decide on the guilt or innocence of a defendant. One of the key features of this system is the independence of the jury. The jury has the power to judge not only the accused, but also the justice of the legislation that brought them to trial. In cases where the legislation is deemed unjust, the jury has the power to annul it.

The jury of equals as stipulated under the law judges all aspects of the case including the admissibility of evidence, motive, the facts of the case, and the sentence. This system reflects the principles that justice must be administered by the people, for the people, judging from the impartiality of conscience, and that no individual is above the law.

The jury trials conducted for criminal cases in the current system represent a diluted and distorted version of authentic common law Trial by Jury. Under the current system, jurors are directed by the judge to disregard the justice of 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 universally recognised as the root of all evil at the Second World War as evidenced during the Nuremberg trials.

In a properly functioning democracy, a court that operates without a jury of equals is committing a miscarriage of justice. Additionally, all prosecutions can only be initiated by the aggrieved party. When police constables act as a third-party without first-hand knowledge of the crime, they infringe upon the sovereign right of the aggrieved to prosecute, which is not only contrary to the oath you take but also constitutes the most serious criminal offence and an act of outlawry.

Trial by Jury 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 of the people. In this way, the people always hold their liberties in their own hands, and never surrender them, even for a moment, into the hands of criminal government.

I have supplied a link to a collection of quotes on the importance of Trial by Jury from prominent law experts and historical figures for you to fulfil your duty under the law you’ve sworn to uphold:

<https://www.commonlawconstitution.org/resources/useful-quotations-in-support-of-the-constitution-and-trial-by-jury>

One such quote is from Sir Winston Churchill. Excerpt of telegram from Cairo to UK Home Secretary November 21st, 1943. For ease of understanding the term ‘executive’ means police and prisons.

“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.”

At this juncture, it is crucial to differentiate between law and legislation in order to articulate the duties that bestow officers enforcing the law. Law is derived from a fundamental moral principle known as The Golden Rule: ‘Do unto others as you would have them do unto you’.

As a police constable, you are sworn to uphold impartiality, and the verdicts of a jury of equals are the means by which this impartiality is established. Therefore, any summary action you are granted the authority to carry out can only come from the verdicts of a court of conscience. There is no other. To carry out the dictates of courts bereft of Trial by Jury is the act of ‘order following’.

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 any attempt to exceed these limits, immediately delegitimises one’s claim to authority.

It is every member of society’s collective responsibility to ensure that the justice system operates with integrity and impartiality. This means that anyone cooperating with courts absent of Trial by Jury is party to the premeditated participation in, and promotion of, a pretence instead of a real Trial by Jury, which is High Treason; and is, for each participating individual, the personal commission of a premeditated criminal act.

Your sworn duty as constable is to ensure that justice is upheld. This grants you higher standing than politicians, judges, magistrates, barristers, and solicitors because constables have the grant of authority to enter any court to ensure everyone within that court is acting within the law of the land and arrest any magistrate, judge, barrister etc acting beyond what the law of the land allows. Failure to do so is a criminal offence of the highest order.

As previously stated, the constable oath binds you to ensure that Trial by Jury is functioning correctly as part of your commitment to upholding the values and principles of a democratic society. By working to ensure that justice is administered fairly and equitably, the police constable’s role is to defend the authentic rule of law, protect the rights and freedoms of all people, and uphold the moral principles articulated in the oath of police constable.

If you have personally suffered injustices from the enforcement of apprehended violence or intervention orders either insert a paragraph here describing the violating actions, you were forced to endure or incorporate your story in the following paragraphs.

It is widely known that you and/or your fellow constables routinely enforce violence orders in civil matters, where there is no crime victim, using it as permission to abandon your moral faculties and justify the brazen use of force to engage in actions like breaking and entering, abduction, and detaining individuals without any evidence of a crime being committed.

These unconscionable orders have subjected [myself/numerous innocent people] to repeated detention, deprivation of property, and restrictions to their indefeasible rights to travel and freedom of association. They continue to pose an ongoing threat that forcibly separates primarily fathers from their children. This unjust situation causes immeasurable distress, alarm, and chronic suffering [to/for] [my] vulnerable children and their paternal/maternal protectors.

Consequently, the psychological and emotional distress inflicted upon [myself/parents], and [my/child/ren] is immeasurable, with far-reaching consequences. The trauma induced by you and/or your fellow constables, from forcibly separating children from their biological protectors, along with separating them from extended family members with whom they share a profound bond, is something that cannot be undone.

Your enforcement of immoral orders stands as a significant contributor to the prevalence of fatherless/motherless homes. Statistics reveal that the absence of fathers leads to 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 emerged due to your wilful enforcement of family violence legislation, a concept known as precrime, that grants authority to punish individuals for crimes they have not committed. Precrime treats mere opinion as indisputable truth, completely disregarding the requirement 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?

Even if your answer is yes to the questions above, the law you are sworn to uphold is such that intentionally using force or violence against individuals where there is no verifiable evidence of harmful or aggressive behaviour, violates the principles of impartiality and individual rights, which constitutes a crime against humanity.

Holding a lethal weapon and inflicting arbitrary punishment on innocent people is the very definition of terrorism. Police constables who neglect their obligation to uphold their sworn oath as public servants are in open defiance of their sworn duty to safeguard individual rights therefore participating in acts of domestic terrorism, which is considered a crime against humanity.

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. So, if police constables engage in acts of terror or commit severe human rights abuses against the people they are sworn to protect, it can be considered a crime against humanity, which is a form of war crime.

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

In a court of law, guilt is not established solely based on whether harm was done, but rather on whether the harm caused resulted from premeditated malicious intent. The fact that every police constable, when challenged, consistently refuse to confirm their commitment to their oath of office, despite publicly pledging to act impartially without malice or ill will, serves as undeniable evidence of a motive of premeditated intention to cause harm to the very people whose trust has been obtained under false pretenses, while perverting the course of justice.

The truth is indomitable, unyielding in its pursuit. It is ingrained in human nature that the more the media and government employees attempt to suppress those who unearth the truth and seek lawful justice, the stronger the determination to stand up for what is right. The recent surge in media stories highlighting the rising number of individuals who represent themselves in court branded as 'sovereign citizens', (a defamatory ad hominem attack commonly used by the media and agents of government) provides undeniable evidence of an unstoppable movement. More and more people are awakening to the disturbing ‘irregularities’ within the (il)legal system that purports to uphold justice.

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, and the duty of a police constable to uphold them. Failing to fulfil your sworn duty renders any claims of plausible deniability invalid, making you personally accountable for any violations of the law that you commit. As a police constable, it is essential to remember that breaking the law you swore to protect and defend, constitutes a most egregious crime.

The oath of office you have taken represents your solemn commitment and bond to the community whom you have sworn to serve. It signifies that both the people and constables are bound by the same moral principles. For instance, as an ordinary member of the community, you lack the moral authority to detain, arrest, or employ force based on immoral orders or legislation, especially in cases where no victim is involved. This fundamental principle holds true for any sworn officer of the crown as well. Acting in opposition to these principles constitutes a betrayal of the trust bestowed upon you by the people and exposes you to personal liability for abuse of office, misprision of treason, duplicity and personating a constable, at a minimum, carrying severe consequences in your private and unlimited capacity.

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.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. I strongly advise you to conduct your own independent investigations to clearly understand the gravity of the moral principles your oath of office binds you to uphold at all times.

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