

The opinions expressed in this book are solely those of the author and are intended to provoke thought and debate. This work is for entertainment and intellectual discussion purposes only. It is not intended to incite hatred, violence, or unlawful behaviour, nor to provide instruction on any illegal activity. Readers are reminded that freedom of expression is balanced against legal protections under UK law, including prohibitions on incitement to hatred and grossly offensive communications. The author and publisher disclaim all liability for any misuse or misinterpretation of this material.

Revelation 7:10

And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other has not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space.

The Written Constitution of England, Scotland ,Wales and Northern Ireland

&

The People's Constitution of England

&

The Popular Constitution of England.

Article 1.

Independence and Sovereignty. Head of State. People Sovereignty & State Sovereignty.

Britain is made of England , Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland it is a Sovereign and Independent Country. Each country united under Britain as a Treaty is a Treaty between Independent and Sovereign Nations.

England is a Sovereign and Independent Country, with Saint George's flag, Constitution, Currency, Set of Laws whose citizens are Native citizens by right , inheritance , origin and kin. Some other citizens of other countries can be citizens but only by means of adoption and integration and this is merely discretionary based on the merits of individual and native people's interest and decision.

Any form of double citizenship is prohibited in England.

No English citizen can't give up his English citizenship .

No English citizen can be stripped of his Citizenship.

If an English citizen can be found guilty of treacherous acts should be judged as stripping its citizenship the citizen cannot be found guilty.

A true Independent country is delivering justice to all its citizens.

No one who commits crimes against England and English people won't escape English Justice. England will pursue Justice against everyone in the world who commits crimes against English people.

2. The People are the Main Signatory and Beneficiary of this Constitution. The People are Sovereign internally and externally. People are Sovereign over any Political Elected and Designated Power. People are Sovereign against any Foreign Interest. People must be Free in their own country.

3. This is a Christian country. The English language is the main official language as well as other Native British Languages as Celtic Gaelic, Scottish- Gaelic, Welsh, Manx , Cornish and all the others pertaining to Native culture and History of Britain.

The Official Language of England is the English language spoken and written.

4. The flag of the country is sacred and protected by the Common Law. The law of the flag. This flag is the Union Jack Flag and the flags of St. George St, Andrew Cross, Red Dragon Flag , Kernel flag and Isle of Man flag amongst other county, regional or historic national symbols and values.

Any attempt of desecration of those values it's an attempt of intimidation, an act of war that would be deemed as a criminal act punishable by Law.

The Flag, State Insignia's, Shields are the property of Armed British Forces that are representing the State, the National Sovereignty and our Sacred Values and History. No one can sell those. The only authorised seller is the British Armed Forces and all the funds resulted must be in support of all Army Veterans.

5. All rightful Citizens of Britain: England, Scotland, Wales , Northern Ireland , must speak English in order to be recognised as lawful and eligible citizens. They might speak Welsh, Celtic Gaelic, Scottish Gaelic ,Cornish, Manx as part of our traditional and historic heritage of our countries of Britain.

6. No one who doesn't speak any of the official languages of Britain should be allowed to vote, work or stand in any public function in Britain. If holds citizenship and does not speak any Official Language of Britain should not be granted citizenship and any previously granted citizenships to any individuals must be annulled.

7. People and the Country are Sovereign and Country Laws are Sovereign and no other conventions can uphold the Sovereignty of country laws and its own People. This Constitution is a guarantee of Primordial Rights above all others for every Native British, as English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish and of every other Native individual by heritage, history ,language and culture as the true heirs of their country pertaining to their country.

8. People are sovereign . It's People and Mere the People. People have the right to freely express their political decisions and they have the right to Free Elections. As well the Right of People's Revolution is Guaranteed by this Constitution.

9. People can exercise their Right to Public Opinion, their Right to Protest and Gathering. The Right to Revolution is Guaranteed by this Constitution. It is the Right to Change any Political Form of Power in order for the Freedom and Fundamental Liberties of Citizens to be

Protected, or any urgent matter of National Security including Economic and Social matters.

10. People have the Right to Choose not only between different options of the same system but between different Structures of Political Decision too. This must be done in the most suitable way and Democratically agreed by National Referendum with a higher majority and electoral threshold more than of the Elected Government in Power.

11. The Will of Citizens is the Free Popular Will who legitimise this Constitution. The Constitution is the Law that every Elected Government, Central and Local as well any Public Authorities, Civil Service and designated Head of State must abide by and cannot modify nor change it. No Elected Government can prohibit this Constitution.

12. Everyone is Equal under the Law and there's no exemption not even after Death. Justice is Absolute and must always be served. This is the main Duty of this Constitution to uphold everyone to respect the Law and abide by the same rules and Principles. No crime nor any human rights violations, fraud, or theft are prescribed.

13. No Courts, National or International treaties or any other decisions of any Elected Government or Local Government or Civil Service nor anyone else cannot make any Anti-Constitutional policies, decisions or verdicts. The main condition of Unconstitutionality is by depriving the Native British or Irish or any other Natives of their Primordial Rights , right to have priority above any other , right to Prosperity , Security , Freedom of their Language, Opinion , Religion and Culture. Freedom of their Kind , heritage and ownership upon their land and resources.

14. This Constitution does not exclude any other else but it does prioritise the Natives in virtue of their merit number and heritage and

it does guarantee to any other Subjects the same rights in accordance to their merits , fidelity and contribution.

15. The Head of State is sworn , vested and hired to defend the Right of Natives, The rights of all Subjects and Citizens Fairly and Objective. The head of State Purpose is to foresee any Elected Government Central or Local , to use the Vetoing Right of People as this is its main obligation and Duty.

16. The Head of State stands between the People and Elected Government as the Guarantee that no elected Government will conspire against People Freedoms and Liberties .

17. The Head of State must protect its People all of the signatories and non-signatories of the Contract with the Nation against any threat internal and external and even against the system that represents him.

18. The Head of State as its Majesty , must bear the Promise of Justice for all its People and Subjects.

19. The Head of State is the Head of People. The Institutional Monarchy is a People institution and main power in the State.

20. The country is Sovereign and Governed by a Sovereign People and a Head of State designated by the People with Mandate to Represent them and Protect them by any external or internal threat.

21. The State is Sovereign and no one will dictate any terms other than the terms of its People. People are Sovereign and the State is also Sovereign.

22. The Elected Government must respond to People and the Law. People must obey the Law first but they have the right to question the Government or any designated power. The Government must obey the Citizens will and cannot tamper or question it.

Article 2

Fundamental Citizens Rights.

1. Right to have a Constitution that's written and adopted freely by means of free will and national referendum Right to Native Citizens by Birth, Heritage, Culture, Kin , History and Language to live in accordance with their own Liberties and the Right to have the main Right and Priority above all the others or any other interests.

2. Right to Native citizens to exercise any discretion and any decision of letting anyone else in which must be in accordance with the needs , discretion and interest of Native Citizens first.

3. Native's People rights are the First Rights , these are the Country Rights and of their Children Rights and all shall come first to anyone or anything else. British Native people are forming a distinct Civilisation as the collective form of material and spiritual culture able to perpetuate and maintain the human life of their own.

Article 3

National territory

Britain's national territory is everywhere where English and Native People live. We're a Nation of People First . Our borders might expand and we will welcome into our nation every one who's a British Native, pertaining to our history any person of good character that serves our interests and has the British people at heart.

Our Sea Territory it's our National Waters recognised internationally.

All assets and goods are the property of British People.

Our Aerial national space is inviolable.

Britain's Extraterrestrial National Space is made of the totality of Man made objects sent into the Extraterrestrial Space and are the Property of British tax payers.

National territory is inviolable ,this includes the historical landmark of Britain but all the other Crown territories and. Dependencies. All borders are inviolable.

Any attempt of desecration against the territorial integrity of Britain and its dependencies is a declaration of war. Any individual, state or organisation who undergoes any actions against Britain territorial integrity including borders it is regarded as an enemy of the state and martial laws might be applicable.

Article 4

Repatriation

Right of Repatriation is Primarily the Right of Every Son and Daughter of this Motherland , Britain, Eire, Scotland to return to the Motherland if he or she wishes to do so. It is prohibited to deport any Native English Person who can prove paternal and maternal descendance by Name , Kind , Heritage and Language. Any other foreign immigration would be essentially prohibited by Law and accepted only in exceptional cases and only with the recommendation of the Constitutional Army of People.

Article 5.

Fundamental right of people's propriety. Free speech and fundamental citizen rights.

1. Freedom of speech , ideas , thoughts , beliefs, opinions is Free in Absolute as this is the main Propriety of Man that even God cannot take it from him.

2. Fundamental right to Representation of Native Citizens it's the Fundament of this State and this Constitution . This is the main Object of this Constitution .

This is immutable and non-negotiable. Any attempt to deny, cancel , alter, modify or divert this Right and its Object from its initial meaning and purpose it's a Declaration of War and will be treated as such;

Every organisation, political or ideological who organises, attempts or exercises any policies, ideas meant to dispose of the English, British Native Population of their fundamental rights are proscribed by Law and considered enemies of this country and treated as terrorist organisations. The Freedom of anyone cannot be greater than the same Freedom of anyone else. The Majority is deciding this Right.

3. Property is the Right of anyone that can have what's rightfully theirs. The state cannot own any private property of others without fair trade .

4. Tax is the property of the taxpayer . The Tax Payer credits the State with Tax money in exchange for Public Services like Security , Health, Education, Roads, Social care , culture , entertainment, public spaces and so on. This is a Contact between the TaxPayer and the State. The tax is the TaxPayer property recognised by this Constitution that must be recognised as such by any common Law from now on.

5. The Citizen as rightful owner of his Tax Money and the Citizen can change , modify , or cancel this Contract anytime and have the right to procure other alternative means more suited to him and its needs as well as its family.

6. Social contribution mandatory for every citizen. However, it's not mandatory that the State impose this as a mandate as the State must be also held accountable for bad expenditure , waste of Public Money as Citizens need services to be able to live in Society and the State must be held accountable for not delivering those or in any other ways below the minimum required standards. To procure these services the Citizens must hire the State or any other form of enterprise that's able to provide those services for him and his family.

7. Liberty of Citizens is Absolute . Freedom of speech is the main Liberty of all Citizens, as it is their right to choose the best form, formula and format of political decision within the State including a different structure of political decision as long it best satisfies the citizens needs and priorities.

Article 6

Lawful state and citizen rights and obligations. Human rights, Rule of Law and Political rights of citizens.

1. The freedom of the Government movement should always be proportional to freedom of citizen movement. Authority of Government is equivalent with Citizens Liberties.

2. The true legitimacy of a Government is given by the popular enthusiasm of the masses.

3. Anyone who is respecting and abiding the Law receives the

Guarantee that his Human Rights will be fully Respected , in any declaration of those and all known versions of it. The Law is an exercise of Democracy where the law grants the rights individually and collectively based on a structure of merits. Respecting the law by each individual guarantees the human rights of every individual. By default it should be at the discretion of the State to decide about the human rights of a hideous criminal no matter if he's domestic or foreign.

4. The Partitocracy is declared as Unlawful by this Constitution. Every tax payer has the rights to Political Representation. Trade Unions are made of citizens and tax payers and other citizens organised groups that can form a group of pressure in society can run for seats into the Elected Parliament and can form The Elected Government as well. This will make any parties to take votes from the opposition of Trade Unions , Business associations , Professional Guilds or any other Citizens associations and vice versa in order for each party to be able to gain its majority of their policies and proposals . This move would mean that standards bars would be raised in Politics as it will be necessary for individuals to be more skilled and qualified to be able to impose their points and policies in Parliament and also to be able to understand the decisions that are made around them or have been involved into. This measure and Representative Reform and Proposed Constitutional Article is meant to protect the Democracy and Will of People and avoid any internal “ Coup d`Estat “ where a party might gain an initial majority but might end governing in the discontent of citizens , changing their electoral promise and in reality, they will end governing in minority. We need to ensure that our political power and representation is balanced to ensure the necessary equilibrium for a strong and healthy democracy where the will of the people is carried out after the Election Day too.

Article 7

Head of State role . Constitutional Court Role and Attributions.

1. The Head of State is the defender of this Constitution . Its main Duty is to Exercise the “ Right to Veto “ of People against any elected Government Central or local.

2. The right to Veto it is Exercised through the Constitutional Court. This is a Court summoned at the request of the Head of State on behalf of Peoples grievance . There must be over 1 million signatories for the Head of State to be able to summon the Constitutional Court . This would be in accordance with law requirements over the number of individuals affected and the impact of matter upon citizens and society.

3. The Constitutional Court will issue a subpoena to any members of the Government that makes the object of the citizen grievance . The Court will hear the parties and a verdict will be given in front of the Judge and a Jury. Once the Decision has been made, if the Government is found guilty they must stop the action that determined the grievance, repair the prejudice , or might be convicted if they broke any common law during their term or as a result of the popular grievances.

4. Then the Head of State receives the mandate from the Constitutional Army of People to Execute the Sentence.

5. The Constitutional Court is the Higher Instance of the Supreme Court summoned by the Head of State at the request of People and People Grievances against any of their Elected Government.

Article 8

The Social Contract and Constitutional Principles.

The Constitution and its Articles are mandatory for everyone. The Constitution is the fundamental law of the country and holds supreme authority. Every law passed by Parliament, every action of the government (whether local or central), as well as the conduct of the civil service, regulators, governmental agencies, and society in general, must comply with these principles.

As these Principles are made in virtue of power and will of the People of the Tax Payers and their recognised propriety by this Constitution. The Spirit of this Constitution proclaims “ Their Country is the main form of Propriety of all Native Citizens “.

Article 9.

Electoral Fraud Act and Higher Treason Act.

1. Every Elected Government must honour their Electoral Promises. This now will be reinforced by this Constitution by the Contract with the Nation.

2. Every Electoral promise holds the value of a Contract and it stands as Valid in any Court of Law and is the Object of the Constitutional Court for any breach or violations of this Law.

3. Once a Parliament, Local Council or local Government and Mayors all forms of elected Government are being mandatory subjected to the current Employment Law. Once they are invested in their mandate they will need to sign the Contract with Nation which is the contract of their Employment with the Nation , citizens, tax payers

and contributors. Mandatory conditions of employment are stated as a standard and as minimum must reflect mandatory conditions as : attendance , performance, conduct loyalty for the national cause and national interest and fitness for work . Mandatory general health and mental health checks must be carried prior to any formal offer of employment conducted by the Royal College of Medicine.

Background checks are compulsory to establish if the individuals filling those positions are trustworthy , have a proven track of fidelity and loyalty aligned with the cause and National Values. Checks might be extended and upon criminal records, financial and the list is not exhaustive. As well must accept every 4 months a mandatory financial review carried out by the Civil Service. They need to sign and agree to share with the Civil Service all the information required. Failure to comply might trigger suspension of their current mandate in any elected position.

4. The Constitutional Army of People is British People Will to Act Freely in order to defend their Interests , Country , Communities from all Enemies External and Internal , as well as the innate Citizen Right to hold accountable any authority , any elected representative for every action and for every penny spent. This is the Mandate proposed and reinforced by His Majesty as this is His Majesty's promise to Deliver Justice for its People.

Article 10

Proclamation The Economic Independence of England & Britain.

1. Our Nation cannot be truly Independent if it is not Economically Independent. This country will no longer be Subordinated to any Foreign Power nor any foreign capital. People of Britain shall never ever be slaves. Our Nation is a Nation of proud People , owners, conquerors, explorers, engineers, scientists, physicians, mathematicians , and people of ideas and action .

2. No Native British workers, English, Scottish, Irish , Welsh and others Natives workers cannot be sacked by anyone to be replaced with any foreign workforce. This will be a grave violation of British, English, Scottish, Irish , Welsh and other Natives Worker Rights. All companies found guilty of these belligerents and malicious practices of profiteering and pilgrimaging the Country and moreover, found guilty of conspiring against Vital Native Workers Rights shall all be banished from the country and all their assets can be found to be confiscated and this would include and all of those who hired illegal and undocumented illegal aliens and others alike. Thus , if the value of the prejudice caused is higher than the assets confiscated and recovered, Britain shall follow and prosecute all those everywhere in the world and have no rest until they'll be brought to Justice in front of the People as this is the Promise of its Majesty to deliver Justice and Prosperity for His People.

3. All existing capital of any enterprises and businesses that operate within the National territory and Dependencies shall be held in a minimal proportion of 50% into the hands of British and Native Peoples. Same as for every natural resource of the country Oil, Coal , Minerals , Fishery , Waters, Forestry and all the rest of Natural Resources.

4. We shall never surrender and be a Nation of Employees on our land and to work for others who sell to everyone our prestige of “ Made in Britain “ or Made in England , Scotland , Ireland , Wales.

5. Britain must produce its own energy and The Energy is a Vital Monopoly that must be in hands of People in a proportion of minimum 50%. Britain must be Energy Independent. The State and People must invest in new sources of energy such as Hydro- Energy, Nuclear and Upgrade the Grid to achieve a better integration of other sources such as wind , solar and other. The oil and coal must be used and owned by the Nation. All foreign Interests around our Oil, Gas and Coal must be Expropriated and an Expropriation Act will be

issued to anyone at His Majesty Pleasure .

6. The People and the State must have Economic initiative and Entrepreneurial Initiative. We need a State able to produce its own Economic means to sustain its apparatus versus a Consumer State that is spending and overspending anyone else's money. Hence the State must have exclusive monopolies on non-essential and auxiliary industries as Gambling, Road Car Insurance , Packaging , Recycling , Foreign Currency Exchange.

7. The Country must be able to produce its own food and not being dependent on foreign food. The Land cannot be bought by any foreign entity . The agricultural land cannot be expropriated and all agricultural land that has been illegally occupied by any other activities other than Agriculture must be expropriated by an Expropriation Act at His Majesty Pleasure.

8. Water Act and Water is a Human Right that this Constitution recognised as in Virtue to the Right to Life , Water cannot be estranged to any other entity other than the British people. An Expropriation Act will be issued at His Majesty Pleasure.

9. Fair-Trade is another Promise of His Majesty to restore Justice and trust and fairness in markets and trade. Monopoly Practices and trust Operations are condemned and deemed illegal by this Constitution. This would be considered as an act of aggression against Economic Independence of our Country and will be punishable with An Expropriation Act where all assets will be confiscated and banished from our markets.

10. The Expropriation Act it is His Majesty Executive Order to carry all necessary efforts in recovering our National Wealth that has been taken by Political means of corruption, robbery at a mega industrial scale and because of due magnitude that made to seem so legit business when in reality they resold us back our resources that we

have borrowed to them , they`ve used our satellites that we paid to put them out there in Space only to have inflated prices to telecommunications , we have borrough our railways to have the most expensive tickets in Europe and the world in Public transport and the list will be so long to enumerate all the examples.

The Head of State has the mandate and the power to expropriation of all businesses and organisations which endeavours hold enemy actions against the English and British Native Population, country's interests, national economic interests and national security and economic independence.

11. The Promise of His Majesty in this article” I’m here in front of my People to defend my People's Poverty and its little because the Poverty of my People is non-Negociable and Shall I raise the Sword of Christ against all those who stole from my people and punish them as never ever would raise again “.

12. No compensation should be given to any expropriated business because any expropriation should be carried out after a Lawful Process where the level of damages to our Economy, Society and Environment should cover the value of the prejudice and if lesser the responsible ones should be prosecuted internally and externally if the case.

Article 11

Welfare rights and Welfare Reform

1. Welfare and Compassion has defined our Nation as The Most Compassionate and Merciful with its People . People can fall into poverty and we need that net as otherwise it will cost more in combating the crime rather than our Welfare bill . However, when

the Welfare Bill became way more expensive for the Tax Payers it's upon Tax Payers discretion to agree that benefits should be payable to some categories of citizens.

2. Welfare is the State Investment in someone's potential that we invest in someone to get back into work and pay it back and contribute in return. This keeps our Economy and this is the Life cycle of Welfare as The Executive Institution of Church and The hand of God's Mercy on Earth . This must be kept within the Law and responsibility of all of us.

3. Welfare must be granted as an Act of Trust and here the responsibility falls within the State. The Department of Work and Pension must represent the interest of tax payers and must draw the conditions and commitments for all Welfare claimants in accordance with Tax payers conditions and interests only.

4. Welfare must be granted only to those that demonstrate Employability . The main basic conditions of Employability are , English Language proficiency , demonstrable skills needed for the work market , Legal status in the country. Therefore, all unemployable individuals on current Welfare must have this benefit stopped. Whether they pertain to a certain Religion, Community , HMRC must issue compulsory tax orders to cover all their expenses. These orders are named Red Stamps duties and are issued to every community center , community religious establishments and others and it is mandatory for those communities to support the costs for their own people living here .

5. Native People have guaranteed the Priority on Employment offers, benefits and any other social aid such as housing , emergency shelters, bank foods amongst others. It is unlawful for any Native British individual to be reused for social help before others. It is unlawful for any native British person to be homeless in their own country.

6. By His Majesty Order it has been Ordered to all Public institutions from every Council Building , City hall in every City and town and village from every Governmental and Public Building , including The building of Parliament and Buckingham Palace that at the night time when dark is settled at first hour of night that all doors must be opened and let in all British Native Homeless to stay the night to not suffer of cold, rain on the streets in their own country as all those buildings including the Palace of Parliament and Buckingham Palace as in every stone of those buildings a fraction of those it rightfully belongs to all them and must be given back this way and only when they need it. Motherland is calling his cubs as they cannot be let starving, in cold and rain in their own land built by their ancestors by blood , sword and honor you cannot let their children rot in the streets in shame and misery.

7. Claiming Welfare wrongly without no apparent genuine reason shall be considered theft and a prison sentence must be given and this sentence can be redeemed by free work done in Agriculture, Warehouse, Recycling, Streets and public spaces cleaning until the value of prejudice plus the interest and damage fees would be integrally covered.

Article 12

Family and Children Rights Bill

1. This Constitution is defending and protecting the union between a Man and Woman only as the only Marriage recognised and protected by this Constitution. This is the union between a Native Man and a Woman that will be prioritised and mostly protected as national priority and Constitutional Right of British people`s future.

2. Children Safeguarding it is the Duty of the entire Nation . Failure

to report and act promptly upon Children safeguarding concerns in Schools, Nurseries, Churches, Sport clubs , Community Centres and everywhere our children live they must live happy and free of any abuse or harm. Failure to Act promptly by Social Services, Schools and responsible social careers constitutes criminal negligence and might carry a lengthy prison sentence.

3. No children must face eviction and it is prohibited for any Judge to issue an Eviction Order without any confirmed arrangements that the Child and its Family can move straight into a new house or shelter . If the Children are foreign must be sent to their embassies if possible or any other community centres .

4. No children can be born in Prison . All beings are born free and no one can infringe this Right, not even God.

5. Reinstating the Death Penalty for every Children Killer , Rapist , Abuser , Proxenet, Groomer, Pornograph and Phaedoplile .

6. When Irodus gave the order that all Children of Israel be killed God cried of the Abomination that took place on the depth of the Earth . As God and the Sword of Christ in our hands must protect every child. As punishment and curse to be given to all those who do not act or are accomplices to any Abomination against our children and the Punishment to be unbearable to their soul and cursed to be and wondering for eternity in shame.

7. It prohibits any form of homosexual practices and is deemed as a criminal act to modify the body of a child or young person into a different sex or sexual orientation. Under common Law those who initiate these acts against children must receive the maximum punishment in accordance with the Law.

8. It is prohibited any form of homosexual propaganda in schools and any attempt to conspire against the natural order and health of our

children and this should be punishable in accordance with the Common Law as a Sexual Offence involving children and Grooming.

Article 13

The Rule of law and the Spirit of Law

No one can subvert , divert the law and interpret it in a pervert manner. Perverting the course of Justice is an attempt against the Law. Submitting the Law is an aggravated form of High Treason .

The Constitutional Army of People will summon not only the government but also The Judicial, Police , Civil Service, NHS and all those who have committed Injustice against British people . This is the promise of justice of his Majesty for its People .

Article 14

National Security Act and Civil Security Act

1. The threats against our country are not coming only from invading armies of other countries but as dangerous and lethal as any enemy invader`s army are from the Organised Crime, Terrorism, Islam, Mass Migration and Woke Extremist Policies.

2. The Head of State (King or Queen) must instate the State of Emergency , The State of War and call for a Mandatory Military Draft when the nation is attacked by terrorists or Invaded by Mass Migration. In the state of emergency the Protocol of War must be applied .

3. When the Nation is under attack by Terrorists the Nation is entering directly into the State of War. The Geneva Convention might apply for

the prisoners who surrendered and gave up their weapons . However if a terrorist wears a bomb attached to its body , or is armed, then the armed forces have the obligation by law and mandate to open fire and to secure the Civil Population.

4. Mass Migration is considered an Hostility and the State of emergency and State of War must be activated . The scope of Military operation would be the mass curfew and deportation. If hostile the State of War is Justifiable to defend the Civilian Population of harm. All illegal immigrants must be deported by military means when all other solutions including diplomatic means have been exhausted.

5. Food hygiene and safety must be reinforced and policed correctly as this is the next level threat to National Security . Potential danger of Pandemic with catastrophic effects dangling in air upon Britain . New Powers and Police forces must be deployed by Its Majesty order and Command.

To be established a National Authority for Food Safety Standards with deployed reinforcement agents to inspect, patrol and impose the law of National Safety Standard Food in every establishment where food and alimentary products are served or dispatched.

6. Environment Act , is reflecting now a matter of National Security , big polluters are organising criminal sabotages against our environment poisoning our waters, occupying our land illegally, destroying our forests , poisoning our lands and our air, spreading disease all these must be treated as forms of genocide and against British people.

Occupying our dwellings , houses, cities is called displacement of native British population. This is genocide against British people and a state of emergency must be instaured.

Article 15

People's shareholder model in the Economy .

People have the right to be issued with the fair and true value of their work as reflection of the economic value brought into the Economy .

A new quantification of work value is needed and established by this Constitution. A person receives a salary and pays tax. A company hires workers and pays tax. The cost of tax is to cover the costs of Public Services and costs of running the Government apparatus . Every company who hires Native British workers and its workforce is primordially native must realise an Act of shares and stocks cession at the equal of value of tax owned by this company whether is a National , Foreign or mixt company .

Thus would be transferred in Shares into the National Economy and the funds will be transferred directly by the workers upon a direct agreement with Public Services providers as Health, Education and Public Service providers. This would be meant to eliminate any fatal Government decisions in the future ensuring that no public money will be diverted , spent outside the main purpose , out of scope expenditure . This would avoid loss of public money and will minimise human error and Government bad intervention into the Economy . On the other hand the business would be more productive securing a stable and dedicated workforce. No taxation for business , no taxation for Agriculture and National food producers. A centralised financial Economy will become decentralised reducing Government involvement into financial affairs as People can realise a Economy of trade between services between different needs and without the need to spend monetary resources that can be reinvested and generate further health and prosperity.

The State would cease to be the main Perceptor of tax money. Tax

it's negotiable by the tax payers in accordance with the State offer and verified upon further consideration of tax payers. The government cannot negotiate any contract with a private entity using public money.

Article 16

National Education Strategy

Education is the State Obligation to instruct its youth and prepare them for Life. It is the main condition of achieving the future of our Nation. Education must be useful , purposeful, free of political and ideological interference and free of any religious division . The state must guarantee to all Native children priority and care and this must be mandatory for all the institutions involved in educating our children. Failure to comply might result in prosecution.

It has been decreed that “ It is mandatory for every employer to accept this as compulsory Social Obligation . Every employer must hire a certain number of young British graduates starting from the school benches as paid apprenticeships by the employer and then must guarantee a probationary period of 3 months to every young graduate. In exchange the employer would have reductions of PAYE , NI and corporation tax established by the quantum of benefits expenditure if the employer offers , trains and maintains young graduates in employment . This Tax Credit would last up until the young graduate reaches the age of 24 years of age and moves to the full living wage payable to every worker in Britain”.

At the proposal of His Majesty , a new Academy is required , this is “The National Academy of Applied Sciences” (IT , AI, Mind Philosophy, Cognitive sciences and Robotics) . This would be an environment where we can harness the potential for our future and

future development . Vital knowledge is required at the commencement of this century and a new era would lay the bricks of a new Civilisation . Our future as species on Earth but as on into Space is the new frontier and new adventure of Humanity that it's about to begin.

At the proposal of its Majesty the best English or British children over the age of ten years with the best results in school in every county will receive a full Bursary up until the age of their Master and PHD degree with financial support for the children to be able to study and to become the future leaders of this country.

Article 17

Decision to go to War .External War and Decision

England is an Independent country and it is declared as Neutral in any External conflict that does not concern any National, Overseas and Dependencies territories or Native Population or any direct vital interests.

Now, if a decision would be required , In time of Peace the Head of State,the King or the Queen is not the head of the Army and the leadership of the Army is transferred under Parliament Control and the Constitutional Army of People shares the control with the King's veto . The only decision that can be technically taken to go or not to an external War in times of peace is by means of a national referendum.

Our pledge is in favour of Peace and Diplomacy , into the mutual cooperation between us and all nations of the World.

In cases of War and National Emergency the Head of State it's the

Supreme Leader of All Armed Forces.

Article 18.

The Role of State in Society is preponderantly Executive. The People are the main Legislative Power in Society.

Article 19

Justice is Independent and Absolute Free. The Justice is The Institution of People Insubordinated to any Elected Structure of Power. The Law is mandatory for all the Members of Society including the Head of State , any Elected Government, any Citizens and Visitors.

Article 20.

The Constitutionality

It is mandatory for all laws including Justice decisions or any other laws and regulation promulgated by the Elected Executive power Central or Local to be Constitutional. No Laws can be respected if they are not Constitutional. It is forbidden for any Elected Government to promote , exercise Anti-Constitutional Laws while they're in their Elected Mandate.

Article 21.

The Flag of our Country is Sacred to all of us. The Union Jack, The Saint George Flag , Saint Andrew Flag , Dragon Flag, Kernel Flag , Ireland and any other flag pertaining to the Native History and Tradition of this country . Any desecration of these symbols is considered an Act of War and Martial Law should apply .

Article 22

State & Order – Delivering Justice, Policing, Prosecution, and the Law and Order

The State and Individual are equal under the Law.

The freedom of movement of the Government is equal and at least proportional with the freedom of movement of the Citizens.

This defends Freedom of Speech, Christian Religion and Democracy. British Native Population are still majoritarian hence any decision prioritising them it's Democratic and Constitutional.

Policing and Justice cannot be Unconstitutional.

Any arrest based on freedom of Speech it's Unconstitutional.

An Act of Opinion is Free and Protected by this Constitution.

The Courts must prove the Constitutionality of their Actions not by the content of the incriminating ideology but by measure of the degree of damage caused.

Police should only police criminal matters. It's now illegal in England, Scotland and Wales including Northern Ireland for Police to take part in any commercial dispute not without any sentence given by the Courts.

The judgement must be upheld if the opinion hasn't caused any follow-up action and no harm has been caused.

Article 23

Public self-defence act. Civic policing Act.

The current laws must be changed. This Constitutional Right and this Constitution is in favour of legitimising by Constitution and Law the following Citizens Rights:

1. To self defence of them and others including the right to intervene and help saving innocent lives.

2. The Right and Mandated Duty of Citizens to Constitute in Citizen Patrol Forces. 3. Right to carry weapons for all Citizens registered in the Constitutional Army of People under the Mandate of Patriotic Duty of Defending the Country, the Cities, the Streets and our borders.

4. Right to possess weapons only within the house or property perimeter with the condition that all weapons must be electronically tagged and have been registered for the Patriotic Duty under the Constitutional Army of People Command and under Its Majesty Rule in accordance with this Constitution.

5. The Constitutional Army of People will Act in the Mandate of Military draft and they will exercise their Patriotic Duty via a rotation system where all British Citizens mostly Man between 18 and 55 years old must exercise this Patriotic Service. Other men over 55 with Military Experience can help as Volunteers as well every woman between the age of 18 and 55 can participate voluntarily if not in patrolling or prevention duties but as drivers or other auxiliary positions.

6. The Employer must accept any detachment when everyone is drafted including for volunteers. The Employer will receive State Grants and Tax Credits and other facilities.

7. Patriotic duty cannot replace the Employer duties and the draft system must ensure fairness and periodicity (i.e. monthly 1 or 2 days of service via rotation).

8. Citizens Patrols will receive mandatory training up to 6 months as induction in groups and their role would be to Patrol and Detain, Stop and Search, Patrolling the Streets during School Programme, Parks, Public Venues, Public Transports and the Border.

9. They will have the order to respond in front of any attempt of aggression, will receive military training and they will have the right to open fire if their life is at risk.

10. The Units will be coordinated by experienced current and ex. Service Man and their purpose is to ensure security of our streets and compensate and help the Police.

11. They can only detain suspects but they must be handled by the Police.

12. Citizens Patrols have the right to break in any property if child grooming is suspected, human trafficking, terrorism, drug production or presence of illegal settlers.

13. They cannot intervene in any Political Protests and it's forbidden for the Citizens Patrol to be involved in any type of political manifestations.

14. All the interactions must be filmed and documented including use of physical or armed force.

Article 24.

British Workers Rights

- 1. It is prohibited and unlawful for any British Worker to be sacked and replaced by any cheaper foreign worker for the same job position.*
- 2. British Workers have the Right to be Shareholders in any Foreign mix capital companies in Britain.*
- 3. British Workers must be employed first by anyone. If the British Workers refuse the Job might then be offered to anyone else.*
- 4. A Foreign company must hire British workers first. Every company must have a minimum of 50% of their work force as British native citizens. A company cannot operate in Britain if their staff are under 50% of workforce Native British workers.*
- 5. British Workers have the right to organise in Labour Unions and they have Rights to Parliament seats. The Labour Unions must represent them politically and help to build the policy of Britain. The same rights are for Business and investors associations.*
- 6. Every British worker must have a salary that can feed and upkeep himself. It is prohibited by this Law any form of Laboural Exploitation of any Native British Worker.*
- 7. It is Prohibited that any British worker to work without an Employment Contract, to be paid cash in hand, zero hours contract or the Employer would restrict any Unionisation of British Workers.*
- 8. Every British worker should pertain to a Union. The Employers who impede this or whose policies are trying to divert this Constitutional Right might risk multiple fines or Nationalisation or which one is bigger.*

9. It is illegal for any British worker to work on a minimum wage more than 2 years after employment. A British worker must be paid the best market salary price.

10. It is illegal for any British worker to be paid less than other British workers on grounds of sex, age or any grounds. All workers doing the same type of job should be paid the same and any overtime or bonus is mandatory to be paid.

Article 25.

Women's rights .

1. Every woman in Britain has the Guaranteed Right given by this Constitution to be recognised, protected and its Mandatory for Society to recognise her Specific and Fundamental needs.

2. Every woman has the right to be safe at home, at work and in public. The thresholds in punishment for any type of violence against women must be considered and raised when involves physical and sexual violence. No punishment for only starring or addressing a woman in public should be pursued by the Police because this will waste Police time and resources. No father, husband or partner who's defending her partner or daughter's honour, integrity should be punished for any potential aggression against any perpetrator and should be included in the Right to Public Self Defence.

3. Police must prioritise any calls from women for domestic violence, sexual violence. Failure to consider or record these cases properly must be upheld as a grave offence against the ones in that Public Service and Duty.

4. Every pregnancy as a result of sexual violence must be terminated

by the Law.

5. Every pregnancy between the closest relatives must be terminated by the Law.

6. Every woman that has children's responsibilities should work only 6 hours but be paid for 8 hours . It is the Employer and Society Duty to help women and families raise their children. The Employer can't discriminate against women with children and the Employer should have certain tax relief applied. However, it's mandatory for every employer to respect the fundamental rights of Women to Child Care.

Article 26

Right to fair retribution. After working age rights.

1. Every person who worked his entire life and contributed has the right to fair and deserved compensation.

2. No pension should be taxed. No other income should be taxed after retirement age.

3. People who haven't contributed should not have any pension as it would be unfair and would take the money from the People who worked and paid into the System.

4. All Elderly have Free Transportation guaranteed by the State.

5. The Pensioners can't be Subjected to Debt Orders after Pension Age. It's the responsibility of those who are lending only.

6. Pensioners must have utilities bills subventioned by the State. Pensioners must not pay any bills or be reduced at the quantum and

their income threshold.

7. It is illegal for any pensioners to be a financial guarantor.

8. If there's no Recognition and Respect for the Elderly in Society there's no incentive for anyone to work and respect the Law.

9. Respect for Elderly it is mandatory in society.

Article 27

Native legal rights & adopted citizens. Foreigner rights.

All the Native and Integrated Citizens must have priority to all Public Services. Native citizens must be treated as priority in all aspects of this Society.

A non-native citizen might have the same rights as a Native Citizen but different priorities. Foreigner & Legal binding Definition.

1. People that are not born in a certain country, not belonging culturally , linguistically, ethnically who do not support, contribute to their country of residence and adoption who hold enemy and incompatible views of native population , whose activities stand against native people interests and aspirations. People that cannot speak or comprehend the language of that country , spoken and written and cannot contribute at all or they contribute insufficient or too little they should not be entitled to: Citizenship, welfare benefits, public services .Their presence on the national territory must be subjected to mandatory immigration control.

2. All people in this Country must respect the Law. Police and Emergency Services would be granted to everyone.

3. Medical care , education and Public Services are free of cost for all Native and Integrated Citizens.

4. A foreign person must pay for access to medical services, housing and education. A child born from foreign parents does not receive any assistance from the State.

5. If a foreign person is a victim of a crime perpetrated by another foreign national the foreign person must seek embassy assistance.

6. Policing bilateral agreements must be made by the Government and establishing common jurisdictions. If a foreign national is committing a crime against another foreign national the British police must arrest that person but he must be remanded in the custody of the Embassy of the country of provenience to be arrested by that country police and deported at the cost of that foreign state.

That person should be convicted and imprisoned in his own country of residence at the expense of that State. Our Diplomacy should work diligently to establish as many as possible Policing International Agreements.

7. Emergency life treatment care and Police assistance is equally prioritised for everyone.

Article 28

Separation of Powers into the State

1.1. The Parliament is Autonomous on its Decisions.

1.2. The Parliament is Subjected by the Will of its Citizens not only during the Elections but during the entirety of their mandate.

1.3 The Institutional Monarchy is the main Popular Institution of the Country. It carries and expresses the citizens demand, right of veto, scrutiny over any type of Elected Government or Public and Civil Authority.

1.4 The Institutional Monarchy does not interfere with the Elected Government nor the Designated Monarch or Head of State would not represent the country externally. This is the task of the Elected Government and Prime Minister.

1.5. The Institutional Monarchy is the defender of the Country, Constitution, Christian Faith and British way of life, culture and values.

1.6. The Head of State can freely have any social or political initiative or criticism but exercised only under the boundaries of the Constitutional Army of People. 1.7. The Head of State would address British people only. The Elected Government should not meet the Head of State and no interference should be present on neither Institution as those Institutions must be preserved as Independent to avoid corruption, immixture, non-ethical influence blackmail and any other attempts to tamper with the impartiality and correctitude of political decisions.

1.8. The Civil Service would remain under the Crown under the scrutiny of the Constitutional Army of People and Parliament.

1.9. The Head of State is the Head of the Civil Service with the same accountability as the Elected Government in front of its People.

2.0. Justice is Independent and Sovereign. The Magistrates and any other are accountable for the Constitutionality of their decisions.

2.1. The State can be Sued the same as any other Individuals. Law is absolute.

2.2. Police must be accountable to Parliament and People.

2.3. Any Sworn Authority must swear from now on only upon the British flag and flag of the Country that “ I swear to serve my People, my Country, to Respect the Constitution and to put my life and effort for the life and prosperity of British people. I swear to defend my country even with the price of my life . I admit that this is true to the best of my knowledge and I made myself the only responsible upon my actions during this mandate.

This is the statement I agree, I sustain and I sign.

2.4. Everyone in Public Service must sign this Contract with the Nation including the Head of State and everyone else. This is mandatory and no one must be sworn without signing this document.

2.5. The contract with the Nation are the Electors terms agreed by the Voters. Power to be Recognised, Invested and Mandated on behalf of the Electors. Electors are The Citizens tax payers with the right to vote. They have the main quality of Censors of any form of Government as the Employers of any elected or designated power into the State.

2.5. The Contract with the Nation holds Legal Powers and it is a valid document for every Court of Law in Britain and Northern Ireland.

Article 29

The Four Pillars of our Democracy

The First Pillar

The Institutional Monarchy is the vested power of Citizens to uphold the Constitution and ensure that any elected government and Public authority, civil service and local does what they must do and respects the terms of their promises.

Is also vetting upon the Independence of the nation internally and externally protecting the citizens from any abuse or foreign intervention or interests contrary with the peace and prosperity of British people.

The Constitutional Army of People is the main ad-hoc institution of all citizens demands. The Head of State has limitations. Any prohibition of any form of cult of personality, nepotism , line of Succession, undeserved or ungranted privileges.

The venues and all buildings pertaining to Monarchy are Declared by Law as Historic Patrimony and are under the Property of the British Army.

Second Pillar

The Parliament and the Elected Government is the main Executive Power in State is also Legislative upon initiative as the role of the Elected Government is to ensure and maintain functioning of our society as a whole.

The Parliament has limits as there's no Parliamentary privileges when an individual is committing a crime or is being arrested.

Third Pillar

Free Economic initiative, business and property. Our economy as our vital form of subsistence is mainly private.

The Private Initiative is Free and the State's role is to defend the fairness of trade, protect our economy and markets. Supporting our local and national business interests first. There's limits established by the law and the national economic interest. Some private initiatives might be restricted mostly upon national resources or specific types of activities that must be under the State's control for reasons of National Security and Economic Independence of Britain.

Forth Pillar

Freedom of Speech and Freedom of Press is the main condition for a society to be truly free and trusty.

Public Authorities must take action when deeds of corruption and abuse are investigated and presented by the Press (written and mass media).

No Public Authority can stop the Press and it is considered a felony any impedance of the access to Public Truth.

The Public Truth is the vital information about any activities meant to endanger the national, national wellbeing , law and integrity from any part of any public authority, business or any other individuals.

There's also limits such as the good rule of Public Interest and not based on personal opinions, denigration or people's past or people's private life or any other businesses as long weren't at that time any criminal offences or any other deeds of criminal nature. Those actions might influence electoral elections or create political blackmail that might endanger the national security of Britain.

Article 30

Identity and Citizens Rights to Identity & Privacy.

The State has the Obligation by Law to recognise all its Citizens.

The State is the unique issuer of all Identity documents required by Law. The State must keep just 3 elements of someone identity :

Full name , date of birth and National Insurance number.

These are unique identifiers required.

A person 's domicile, place of birth, parents name should not be required. No elected Government ,Central or local should have access to citizens data other than the law or public interests require.

Citizens data is considered a National Security matter. British Armed Forces & Ministry of Defence & Interior are the only official keepers of any citizens records.

Those must be handled by other Authorities excepting Police which would be subordinated to the Ministry of Defence & Interior.

This Constitution prohibits the access, handling ,administrating or any other involvement in any business or tasks around citizens databases of private or public information by any foreign , private company or by any private domestic company.

All Foreign Enterprise cannot collect, keep or handle any Private & Confidential data of any British citizens except the ones directly employed.

No foreign service provider would keep any data of British citizens, handle direct debits or any other private information.

They must adapt their trade via direct payments at source or any alternative measures. Only British national companies can keep private citizens' data as they have been subjected to respect the Law of National Secrecy and Data & Information Protection. "All data about British citizens, civil population, officials, state authorities, military, political , statal administration, vital technology, brands, innovation, vital scientific know-how, national, Business confidentiality, natural resources, telecommunication, vital infrastructure , public health, and any other data of National Interest might be subjected to this Law. No Foreign Entity , Person, Organisation or State cannot have access to this data. Any facilitators or people in charge or any other individuals found guilty of this offence must be prosecuted.

Article 31

Right to organise and decide Free Electoral Elections

1. The Government nor the Parliament or any other Local Government or Council cannot decide, tamper , prohibit or even delay the Free Will of Citizens to be put in power via their legitimate democratic means expressed by free elections.

2. The term for any type of Elections whether are General or Local are established merely by Citizens in virtue of their needs.

3. No fixed term would encourage good governments to keep delivering for their electorate of citizens as when a Motion of Censorship or Grievances are held by citizens the Constitutional Court must examine the grievance and make a verdict in maximum 24 hours. Then automatically, the respective Government is dissolved by

the decision of the Constitutional Court.

4. For General Elections the Grievance must reach 50% of the Electorate recorded in the previous election.

5. The data would be held Independently by a designated Electoral Committee.

6. Members of the Electoral Committee would be elected on the same basis as the Court of Jury.

7. No public money would be allocated to any political party, independent candidate or any aspiring group engaged in the electoral competition.

This principle should stand as fair in the reality of our economy and society “ no one should be paid beforehand only after he completed the job “. This is the genuine demand that anyone can have. As well the political classes make no exception as they are employees of the people.

8. An Elected Prime Minister must announce his resignation giving 6 months notice. After 6 months General Elections will be automatically held.

Once someone announces his resignation then the person must sign a Resignation Letter legally bound and recorded by the Constitutional Court.

9. Once the Official Letter of Resignation has been recorded at the Constitutional Court board then the Constitutional Court will order in a maximum of 24 hours the start of the Electoral Campaign and the formation of Electoral Committee.

10. If that person is unable to carry out his duties for the remaining 6

months due to health including death or legal issues as arrested until the electoral campaign then, the Head of State (King or Queen) and Civil Service and British Armed forces will ensure the Governance of the country during the Electoral Process & Debate.

11. Once a new Government has been elected they will take the office immediately after the result has been announced and the new Prime Minister must be sworn in 24 hours after the election result.

12. This Article will discourage bad governance and any attempt to defy the will of people. No bad governance should remain longer than necessary and it is the voters duty to identify this and tackle it as soon as possible and use the instruments of this Constitution and Democracy when needed. Stopping a bad Governance on time will reduce the effort for future generations to recover and to reduce the loss produced by incompetent and disloyal governments.

Article 32

General Elections and Local Councils Autonomy.

Councils have local autonomy and the will of the local residents cannot be tampered with nor by any central authority, political entity or any other entity.

The same principles of Public Grievance would be applicable in any of the circumstances that will force a new election.

If a mayor has been destituted due to Public Grievance or criminal conviction elections must be held and a new Mayor must be elected in 30 days to ensure that local urgent matters are continued to be dealt by a local elected authority.

For 30 days any affected Council will continue his normal activity on the essential departments where no meeting or decision can be taken because those decisions would be null. All decisions are valid whilst someone's in a mandate given by the electors.

Article 33

Forced resignation , no impunity clause. Criminal prosecution of any Elected Politician.

No one in Public Office is immune against criminal prosecution.

Law is Absolute. A King or a Worker, a Prime Minister, a CEO or a cleaner they'll face the same hand of the Law.

However, a Politician or even the Head of State isn't immune to being prosecuted, judged and convicted . This Article is a brief guidance about what would be the best protocol to be followed in order to avoid disruption where the country might be plunged in chaos and political instability.

If the Head of State ends up being arrested the country will be governed by the Elected Government only . Because of the stricter separations of Powers in State the lack of a Monarch even temporarily wouldn't affect the Constitution, nor will it dissolve the Constitutional Army of People.

By Spirit this Constitution is the Right of the British people who are a Sovereign People on its own Land and it is the people's right and duty to defend their Constitution and stand up against any form of internal or external oppression or any other violation of citizens' Primordial Rights.

The Constitutional Court cannot be dismissed as it is Independent and the Elected Government cannot tamper nor intervene with the

Constitution and the Justice. The Constitutional Army of People must continue to defend their country and their rights; they can swear in and install another Head of State anytime.

An Elected Prime Minister will be removed from its function right from the moment of its conviction not arrest.

Can be remanded on bond and placed on trial as soon as possible .

Once found guilty of a crime and convicted the office will be taken for 6 months by the Civil Service and Head of State until a new elected Government is placed in power. If the Head of State and Prime Minister end up being convicted of a crime then the next available protocol of emergency in case of “ major political crisis” is Anticipated General Elections which by Law must instaurate an Elected Government in 30 days. During these 30 days by Constitution a State of Emergency will be Declared where British Armed Forces will hold temporary power to ensure that order will be preserved during this period while a new elected government will be elected and installed via free elections.

Article 34

Democratic Right to Free Elections within British Armed Forces. Democratic Right at Free Elections within Public Services , Police, NHS and other Public Services.

No Political Intervention is admissible within British Armed Forces.

No Political unelected Generals should be in command , nor exercise any influence upon British armed forces.

No Political arbitrary appointment should be acceptable in any sector

of public life starting with Army, Police, Justice, Defence, Intelligence and any other Public Authority and Services. All Public Officials must be elected by their own members within their own Sector of Public Activity.

This measure will encourage career progression within any domains of the Public Sector . Moreover, this measure will encourage Professional Excellency against Political and ideological opportunism and clientelism.

In Absolute and Effect the Principle of Separation of Powers within the State must act as well within British Armed forces as well must be overall recognised and universally expanded, accepted and applied within Police, National Health System , Civil Service and other public organisations .

Always the democratic criterion must be imposed against arbitrary political nomination where the main attribute of leadership must be the professional quality democratically.

Article 35

Animal rights . Animal cruelty rights.

No human being is subjected to pain and cruelty and all times his dignity is respected. We all are living beings. Any wild animal in this country has the same equal rights to life and dignity as any British citizen.

Hence, it is a crime killing any wild animal.

Only domesticated animals can be sacrificed if their meat is consumable. A wild animal can be domesticated even if it is imported.

All domestic animals must be sacrificed without suffering , violence

or stress induced. This is called cruelty and it is a criminal offence to be induced into any living innocent creature.

Article 36.

Head of State Special Constitutional Powers. Protecting the Separation of Powers in State.

Our Democracy is founded by the right to free elections, expression of free will of citizens and a fair electoral process.

The Principle of Separation of Powers in State must be regarded in its absolute sense and overall must be applicable to all aspects of society, political system, elections, governance and many more.

The Head of State and Institutional Monarchy and Constitutional Army of People must protect this right of citizens. The Fundamental of our Democracy.

When donors are funding more than one party this practice is a breach of this principle because it is manipulating the free will of citizens by committing electoral deception. People must make informed decisions so when a donor is donating for both parties at the same time this is a clear violation of the right to choose and manipulation of the electoral decision of the citizens.

Parties found guilty of Treason should face legal consequences same for the donors. This should be regarded as “ Higher Treason” punishable under the “ Higher Treason Act” and “ Electoral Fraud Act”. If a Party wins the General or Local Elections those elections would be declared null if the Constitutional Court has pronounced this sentence.

As well another practice called “ the tactical vote” should be regarded as a breach of this principle of separations of powers in

state.

Separations of powers should be regarded in absolute terms as one of the fundamentals of our democracy.

When parties are trying to forge pre-electoral alliances to get into power or prevent another party from getting into power, in reality none of those parties taken individually are not meeting the minimum quota of votes required to win an election.

Nonetheless “ voting tactically “ is a breach of democratic vote of others. The principle of an Electoral Battle is that the Party who wins with a majority of votes over 50% of total voters is the party who will govern because this is the expression of voters will. When different parties are uniting themselves just to get by, until they reach power. Many times we have seen how the country plummets into political crisis and instability once the preelectoral alliances start having disagreements between them and proven many times that such a model is unable to govern any country.

Constitutional mandatory rules must be established to strengthen and protect our Democracy:

- 1. It is prohibited for any donors to fund more than one party.*
- 2. All parties' donations must be made public and recorded by the Electoral Commission. 3. All Parties must allow access to their finances if required by Law.*
- 4. The Constitutional Army of People has this mandate to ask for the information from any political parties.*
- 5. In case of a forced situation the Head of State will ask someone else to form an emergency Government.*

6. All Parties found guilty of electoral fraud by accepting electoral bribery in this case would be banned for a minimum term of 25 years from participating in any Public Elections.

7. Individuals found guilty might face imprisonment and permanent ban in taking part in politics, government, civil service or any other businesses around politics including counselling, government contracts, third party services, outsource and the list is not exhaustive.

8. On local elections the same ban will be applicable and the elections will be held again without the parties that have been excluded.

9. No pre-electoral alliances are admissible whether to get in power or prevent another party from getting in power.

10. The vote is free and also must be a serious citizen commitment. No interests and conventions or any political behind the scene games , closed doors interests can interfere with the right to free elections of the citizens. The right to have an informed decision before the vote it's a fundamental right of citizens guaranteed and protected by this Constitution.

11. An emergency government is the result of political-class mediocrity. This constitutional reform would ensure that political parties and other pressure groups including independents – raise the bar for quality standards, thereby offering citizens a viable model of governance.

Article 37

Electoral Code of Conduct

For having Free Elections a code of conduct must be instituted. The Electoral Elections by its nature is a vital moment in the life of the nation and a crucial matter for its future. Any interference might be subject of National Security matters and hence the necessity of an Electoral Code of Conduct mandatory to preserve our democracy and national security.

Section 1:

Purpose and Guiding Principles

- 1. The purpose of this Article is to protect the integrity, fairness, and trustworthiness of all elections held under this Constitution, thereby preserving public confidence in the democratic process.*
- 2. Elections shall be free from foreign interference, including financial contributions, disinformation campaigns, cyber operations, or any other influence by foreign states, entities, or agents.*
- 3. The fundamental principle shall be that electors cast their vote for policies, platforms, and ideas rather than for or against the personal character or historical conduct of individual candidates ("one vote for the idea, not the individual"). Practices that unduly focus on personal attacks, especially those unrelated to a candidate's current suitability for office, undermine democratic discourse and shall be restricted accordingly.*

Section 2:

Restrictions on Disclosure of Historical Allegations

- 1. It shall be unlawful for any person, organisation, or media outlet to publish, disseminate, or otherwise make public any allegation, claim, or information concerning a candidate's alleged misconduct, personal history, or behaviour prior to the date of the election, unless:*
- 2. The allegation relates to a serious criminal offence that remains prosecutable under the law;*
- 3. It directly and materially affects the candidate's current fitness for public office; and*
- 4. It has first been reported to and substantiated by the appropriate authorities (Section 3).*
- 5. Disclosures falling within subsection (1) that are made without prior reporting and substantiation shall constitute an offence under this Code, regardless of whether the allegation is true or false. Such actions risk being used as a weaponised smear to influence the election outcome and harm democratic participation.*
- 6. This restriction aims to prevent the revival of matters from decades past (for example, schoolboy conduct from nearly 50 years ago) that serve primarily to damage a candidate rather than inform voters about relevant qualifications.*
- 7. Exceptions may apply only where there is an immediate and credible risk to public safety or national security, subject to urgent judicial approval.*

Section 3:

Mandatory Reporting of Concerns to Authorities

- 1. Any person or entity who believes they possess credible evidence of a candidate's misconduct, criminal activity, or breach of law that may affect the electoral process must first report such concerns confidentially to the police, the Electoral Commission, or another appropriate independent authority.*
- 2. Public disclosure (including to the press, social media, or via any other means) shall be prohibited until:*
- 3. The relevant authority has investigated and confirmed the matter warrants public attention; or*
- 4. The authority has declined to act, and a court has granted permission for disclosure.*
- 5. Breaches of this requirement shall be punishable by substantial civil penalties, potential disqualification from standing for or holding public office, and/or criminal sanctions where intent to interfere with the election is proven.*

Section 4:

Transparency in Campaign Finance and Donor Restrictions

- 1. Full transparency shall be required for all campaign funding. Candidates, political parties, and associated campaigners must publicly disclose:*
- 2. The identity and nationality of every donor;*

3. The amount and date of each contribution; and

4. Any affiliations, interests, or connections that could indicate coordinated influence.

5. To prevent undue influence and the appearance of impropriety:

6. No individual or entity shall donate to multiple candidates or parties in the same election cycle in circumstances suggesting coordination or an attempt to hedge outcomes.

7. Strict limits on donation amounts shall be set by statute, with lower thresholds for foreign-linked contributions.

8. Donations above a prescribed nominal value that are anonymous or routed through intermediaries shall be prohibited.

9. An independent Electoral Commission shall maintain a real-time public register of donations during election periods. Failures in disclosure or attempts to circumvent these rules shall result in campaign suspension, forfeiture of funds, fines, and potential candidate disqualification.

Section 5:

Enforcement and Oversight

An independent “Electoral Integrity Commission” shall be established to monitor compliance, investigate breaches, and recommend sanctions or legislative changes. Members shall be appointed through a cross-party, non-partisan process ensuring impartiality. Sanctions for violations may include:

1. Financial penalties;

2. Disqualification of candidates or parties from the current or future elections;

3. Referral for criminal prosecution, particularly in cases involving foreign interference or deliberate electoral sabotage.

4. This Article shall apply to all national, devolved, and local elections. Amendments require a supermajority in Parliament or approval via referendum.

5. Media outlets, mass-media and press must have prohibitions in place to prevent misinformation and any interference attempts by reducing the risk of foreign interference in national elections.

6. Breaches of this conduct might result in fines and criminal prosecution.

Section 6:

Commencement

This Article shall come into force upon ratification and be supported by detailed implementing legislation of adoption. It reaffirms the commitment to a robust democracy where ideas and policies prevail over personalised attacks, and where the electoral process serves the public interest above all else. This draft strengthens the protections against exactly the kind of historical "digging up" while balancing free speech with electoral fairness. It stands for a safer way of making politics without foreign media controlling our democracy and the destiny of our nation.

This is a Constitutional Article and it's mandatory to be respected by the entire political class and mass media.

Article 38

Whistleblower Rights

Any whistleblower from the public sector, private sector, government— including the institutional monarchy – is protected by law against any legal action, employment consequences, dismissal or any other repercussion.

All protected matters should concern national security, public and internal security, expenditure of public money, violations of human rights, corruption and abuse. Any disclosure must respect the privacy and dignity of all people involved. The whistleblower must present evidence or verifiable information in order to gain legal protection. It is illegal and a criminal act to use these powers in order to gain any financial benefits, social media attention, or to settle personal disputes or vendettas. The matters reported must concern the exact issues for which the law grants protection.

Article 39

Mandatory Time Deadlines

Section 1

Every government derives its authority from the People and exists solely to execute the will of the People in accordance with the mandate granted to it through democratic processes.

Section 2

Any official response from a public institution—including but not

limited to government departments, Parliament, the Civil Service, local authorities, and other bodies exercising public functions—must be provided within 30 calendar days of receipt of a valid request or inquiry, unless a longer period is expressly permitted by law or justified in writing with reasons provided to the requester.

Section 3

Any political or administrative decision by government, Parliament, departments, the Civil Service, or local government that directly affects public rights, interests, or expectations must be communicated to affected parties or published within 30 calendar days of the decision being made.

Section 4

The right to priority in the handling of public matters shall prevail in society and politics. Public institutions must, by default, act promptly to meet the reasonable expectations of the public and taxpayers.

Section 5

This Article is intended to safeguard the public interest, protect taxpayers, and compel all levels of government to deliver timely and effective service to citizens. Failure to comply may give rise to remedies as determined by law or by an independent oversight body like the Constitutional Court . Failure to comply and deliver promptitude might trigger “the Public Right to Veto” against that Government or Public Institution.

This would imply that people can take that decision if the Parliament is deemed incompetent.

Article 40

Housing Reform & Housing Rights.

Right to housing for British Native People is guaranteed by this Constitutional Law.

It is unlawful to make any Native British Citizen homeless.

Should be made unlawful for any Local Councils to deprive British Native Citizens from having housing priority.

It is a criminal offense to evict Native British Children.

A Landlord must report first any eviction attempt to the Local Council.

The Local Council has 30 days to find alternative temporary shelter using Council public venues and facilities applying the emergency & calamity protocols.

Squatting and Squatter Rights are illegal in England, Scotland, Wales , Northern Ireland and any other territories where this Constitution will be adopted. If a property is unclaimed after 50 years the State can confiscate it as a clause invoked for non-payment of propriety & council tax.

Unclaimed or abandoned properties can be used by the Local Councils as temporary shelters for adult British natives only.

The immobile or the property should be returned to their owners once it has been claimed or sold. The owners will be exempt from paying any tax while a Compulsory Renting Order has been issued with a Duty Stamp from his Majesty.

Housing Monopoly is illegal in England, Scotland, Wales , Northern Ireland and any other territories where this Constitution will be adopted.

An Expropriation Order must be issued by His Majesty and compulsory confiscation orders executed in maximum 24 hours. If those conditions are satisfying the Law of Monopoly and improper use and upkeep of a commercial property.

Any property used for financial gains where an income has been generated or received is subjected to commercial propriety regime.

Commercial propriety must adhere to this mandatory handbook.

The propriety must meet all standards Health and Safety regulations. Not posing a danger to health & safety.

No monopolistic practices. All the social housing bought to be rented must be expropriated and confiscated.

Any private company that uses monopolistic acquisition to inflate the market price artificially should be expropriated and the property confiscated as collateral for the fines cumuli and for breaching monopoly laws and market conditions .

Social housing can be bought for housing only and cannot be rented. Can be used as a self-employed business address if the business owner lives there. The property will be exempted from commercial tax.

Any lease is illegal. A property must be only sold or rented. When a property is bought the entire rights and subsequent land rights must be bought with the property.

The state must prioritise the construction of homes. Therefore by Order of His Majesty a State Public Mortgage fund must be established.

This project must be for the British Native populace with very few exceptions admissible on family ties principle , mixed families and children.

British people with children must be prioritised , veterans and young married couples.

British people must have priority in housing and this must be guaranteed by Law.

No foreign individual or organisation cannot buy to rent property in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland and everywhere this Constitution has been adopted.

By His Majesty's order no Native British man ,woman or child must be homeless in its own ancestral land.

This land belongs to whom they built it , defended and inherited by generations.

This Constitution will make it unlawful and illegal for any Native British citizen to be homeless in its own ancestral land.

Special Article :

Right of Rectification, Modification or Annulment of this Constitution.

Any other Authors can add new Articles proposed by National Referendum. For an Article to become Constitutional the voters threshold must be over 50% from the entire Electorate. Any Article can be Amended or Cancelled but the threshold must be bigger than 75% of Electorate. A decisive Majority must be established for the vote not to be overturned otherwise chaos and dispute might endanger the Social Peace and put the Society in danger of unrest and Civil War.

This Constitution will remain valid for all its signatories and cannot be Abolished by any Elected Government , nor in times of War up until the last signatory of this Constitution will renounce it. This is our Spirit of Freedom , as we will never give up our Country and our Rights we will never surrender our Freedoms to anyone. This is the Will of all British People that not even God can take it from us.

This is the promise of His Majesty to its people, the right of People to live safely . Right to People Security is a Constitutional Commandment for the State and Society. To anyone coming to threat

the People of Britain shalt thou say to thy “ As you see that everything what moves and breathe in this Country , everyone and everything that watches , under a bush under a tree, behind a wall on top of a hill under the water , into the sky it is my friend and for you it is the enemy.

This Constitution will remain valid and in power until its last signatory. This is the Will of British People who’ll never surrender nor give up their country, Christian faith and British way of life.

Universal Principles of Popular Constitution

The true form of Leadership is People Initiative and People’s Will in Society.

The Power with which you engage your Demands it's the true force of Democracy.

Head of State it's a Principle " Standing between People and Elected (Employed) Government. This current model of "Government " showed why new mandates need to be created and invested in a new Institution . This should be the "role " of a new Monarch (not representative, decorative) but Institutional.

This is the State we're in and thus my quarrel is with this model of State where political power is unleashed against the citizen without any control or no citizen defence against it.

The vision and proposal of the " Manifesto " which is the State that “ I'm the State”, as the Citizen and tax payer I invest into the State with My; Authority, Powers and Mandate.

I'm the Tax Payer, the Employer and the State is the Employee.

The King or Head of State is employed, vested by the Citizens power to Represent me, in virtue of my interests.

The state is employing Justice and the Police.

The State is the issuer of the Law.

The State was employed to issue the Law.

Once the Citizens and State agrees that the Law is good it has been accepted.

Politics is the exercise of power to draw an Agreement.

Once Citizens voted an Agreement this has been Established as such.

The State deploys the Justice and its Executive powers Police and Law Enforcement.

Citizens have agreed to abide by the Law.

The state promised to keep the Law.

There's one more need to ensure this equilibrium.

Head of State as function is my direct mandate that I employ someone to represent me and my interests and he will respond to me as Citizen and Tax payer who holds the power and the decision. The State has the proposal as to why it was hired including the Head of State or the King , while he's got the proposal, I'm the Citizen and I'm having the last word and my decision.

These are the Principles of a New World of a New Jerusalem , a fairer world with fairer politics where my tax monies are not used in wars to kill someone else children from hundred or thousands of miles away, and are not used to enrich anyone, are not used to bring invasion on my shores , are not used to replace our workers with cheaper foreigners , or to feed the rapists of my children in prisons or keep them in state benefits.

It is my tax and my money and my Power, my say, of Me as the Citizen .

As a citizen, I hire and entrust the Head of State with the authority to oversee the elected government. I call upon the Head of State, whether a Monarch or Head of State, it is the Constitutional Representative.

I give the power and authority to exercise on my behalf this power to hold the power of vetoing and hold the government accountable, correct its errors, remedy its damages, and ensure it fulfills its promises to the people. This mandate, rooted in my constitutional rights, obligates the Head of State and their institution to act on behalf of citizens. Through a constitutionally established and politically organised collective demand, I assert my right to compel the Head of State to exercise veto power over the elected government, ensuring it serves the will of the people.

BOOK OF CONSTITUTION

The following part of this book are the explanations and guidance upon every article of the Popular Constitution. We've skipped article 3 and 4 as they are self explanatory in the way that have been formulated. Is the Universal Postulate Principle a vital link between its people and its territory. Are indivisible.

The Magna Carta has been the truly genuine Revolution in mankind history. It hasn't replaced the power with a different power. It has changed the rules of power over the people in itself. This is the continuous exercise of true emancipation, changing the rules of power, imposing new rules to any future and existing government. No need to replace any existing government. It's more about changing the rules of the entire game where no one could find it so easy as before to have power upon our freedoms.

Article 1

Sovereign, Sovereignty & National Independence

The Sovereign is neither a person nor an abstract concept. It is the authority vested in the Institution of Sovereignty to preserve the freedom of citizens, defend their rights, and uphold the liberty of the land. The

Institution of Sovereignty represents the true leadership of the nation.

This authority, rooted in the free will of citizens, exists to safeguard the fundamental rights of individuals and the liberties that have shaped this nation throughout its history, for both present and future generations.

The Sovereign's role, in leadership and duty, is to serve the nation. This must always prioritise the interests of the people, the independence of national institutions, and the freedom of the land.

The Sovereign must remain independent, politically impartial, and neutral in all societal matters. Its role within the Institution of Sovereignty is that of a guardian. The Institution of Sovereignty is politically and socially impartial, acting as an active referee and objective arbiter, seeking justice and resolution for all parties in society.

Sovereignty is the highest societal institution, observing, guiding, and governing in the national interest above all, operating within the rule of law and with respect for individual liberties and national interests.

Sovereignty as a principle of the main Institution of State stands between the people-voters, taxpayers, and citizens and any elected government, institution, or private entity.

It is the sole institution tasked with guaranteeing the individual freedoms and rights of citizens, even against the system it represents.

Should the political class or elected government conspire against the liberties of citizens or attempt to subjugate the freedom of the land, the Institution of Sovereignty must act as the defender of the people—the sole legitimate authority derived from the power of the people, given by the people, for the people.

The Sovereign shall convene the Constitutional Army of the People, the signatories of this Constitution, to act as a balancing force in matters of politics, society, economy, and public affairs. This body serves as a mediator, observer, and arbiter to ensure the optimal functioning of society, guaranteeing social justice, equity, and respect for the rights and liberties of all individuals.

These powers are a mandate entrusted by the people, granted with trust and faith in the Institution of Sovereignty.

The Sovereign, as the leader of this mandate, and the Institution of

Sovereignty, as its guarantor, uphold these constitutional rights and liberties for all signatories of this Act.

To illustrate this principle, consider the role of sovereignty as the embodiment of the power and will of citizens who place their trust in an elected government. For example, if a government were to enact policies that erode fundamental freedoms, such as restricting free speech or undermining judicial independence, the Institution of Sovereignty would intervene to protect citizens' rights, potentially by convening the Constitutional Army of the People to mediate or challenge such actions, ensuring the government remains accountable to the will of the people.

The Head of State would then receive new Constitutional Powers and a new Role within the State. The new role for the Head of State must be in accordance with the reality of our times. We need a more active role of Head of State beyond the ceremonial role. The Head of State must be sworn as protector of Independence and Sovereignty of the Constitution, British way of life, historic heritage and patrimony and Christian faith of all denominations , the Unity of Anglosphere and Commonwealth.

We need an Institution, neutral as a bridge of power and balance between the citizens and the elected power.

This is the Constitutional Ideal of the new Head of State of Britain .

Manifesto for True Independence of Britain **Upholding the Right to Free Elections and the Right to Revolution.**

Today we stand at a crossroads in the history of our nation of Britain . We are a people bound by a shared heritage, a common resolve, and an unyielding commitment to the principles of freedom, justice, and sovereignty. Yet, we must confront a stark truth: no nation can claim true independence if it is ruled unlawfully. A government that governs without legitimacy, without the consent of its people, or in defiance of our sacred national interests, is no government at all—it is a betrayal of the very soul of our nation. Today, we will present to you a vision, a

manifesto, a clarion call for reform that will restore power to the people, safeguard our sovereignty, and enshrine two fundamental rights: the Right to Free Elections and the Right to Revolution.

The foundation of a lawful government rests upon unassailable pillars: the unwavering defense of national interest and independence, the prioritisation of the native people's welfare, the steadfast adherence to the rule of law, and the protection of freedom and democracy, with freedom of speech as its cornerstone. These are not mere ideals; they are the bedrock of a just society. Any government that strays from these principles, that dares to act against the will and welfare of its people, must be deemed unlawful. It forfeits its legitimacy and betrays the trust bestowed upon it by the ballot box.

Any Government or Form of Human Political Leadership known in history it has its legitimacy rooted in a sole principle "

The legitimacy of every form of Governance it's bestowed by the popular enthusiasm of masses". There's no other substitute for political legitimacy.

Our current electoral system, though rooted in the noble tradition of democracy, is flawed—dangerously so. It grants a government a mandate, in our case five years, to rule as it sees fit, yet it offers no robust safeguards to protect our nation from a government that turns rogue. There is no ironclad constitutional mechanism to shield us from corruption, from the siphoning of public funds, from abuse of power, or from those who would subvert our laws for personal gain or foreign interests. This is not just a failure of governance; it is a failure of imagination, a failure to trust the people who are the true sovereigns of this land.

Consider this: our electoral laws, as they stand, are lenient, outdated, and, in some respects, rigged against the true national interest and security of the . They allow a government, once elected, to act with impunity for the duration of its term, even if it betrays the very principles it swore to uphold. This cannot stand. A nation is only truly independent

when neither external threats nor internal treachery can undermine its sovereignty, its security, or its prosperity. National security is not solely about defending our borders from foreign foes; it is equally about guarding against internal political actors who, whether through malice or negligence, act against the interests of our people.⁸⁷⁸⁸⁸⁷

Imagine groups of self-serving interests ascending to power, cloaked in the guise of legitimacy, yet acting in bad faith. They might manipulate our laws to enrich themselves, their families, or their cronies, awarding lucrative contracts to party donors or engaging in schemes of corruption that siphon wealth from the public purse. Worse still, they might collude with foreign powers or circles of influence, betraying them for personal gain. These are not mere missteps; these are acts of high treason against the state and its people. Such actions demand the harshest consequences, and we propose the creation of a New Enhanced National Security Act to hold accountable those who dare to undermine our nation's integrity. No one—neither minister nor magnate—should be above the law.

Yet, under our current system, the people are expected to endure such a government for five long years, bound by the chains of an electoral mandate that no longer reflects their will. This is an outrage. The rule of law, a principle universally revered in every just society, demands that a crime be prosecuted swiftly to prevent further harm. If an individual commits a heinous act, we do not wait five years to bring them to justice, as if they were untouchable until some arbitrary term expires. Why, then, should a government that violates the rights of its citizens, jeopardizes national security, or plunders our economy be granted such immunity? To allow a corrupt or treacherous government to cling to power is akin to allowing a predator to roam free, endangering the very society it was meant to serve.

This is why we must enshrine in our constitution a sacred and inalienable right: the Right to Revolution. This is not a call to chaos, but a call to empowerment. It is the right of the people, through collective

action, through petitions and signatures, to rise as one and declare, “Enough!” When compelling evidence emerges that a government acts against the national interest, violates basic citizen rights, or undermines our sovereignty, the people must have the power to overturn the initial electoral result and remove that government from office. This is not merely a right; it is a duty—a duty to protect the soul of our nation, to preserve our freedom, and to ensure that the will of the people remains supreme.

The Right to Free Elections, which we cherish, must be paired with this Right to Revolution. Just as every citizen has the power to cast a vote, so too must they have the power to retract it when the government they elected proves unworthy. Think of it as a vote-back guarantee, a constitutional promise that if those in power betray the trust placed in them, the people, assembled as a Constitutional Army of People, can demand accountability. This is not about undermining democracy; it is about perfecting it. It is about ensuring that the voice of the people is not silenced after election day, but resonates through every moment of governance.

The stands at a pivotal moment. A sole Government managed in one year to make this proposal a mere necessity. We can no longer tolerate a system that leaves us vulnerable to those who would exploit our trust. We can't afford to lose more national territory, to get assimilated in less than 50 years from now even less. We must forge a new constitutional path, one that upholds the sanctity of our elections while empowering us to act when those elections are betrayed. Let us build a nation where no government can hide behind a mandate to harm its people. Let us create a place where the rule of law is absolute, where national interest is paramount, and where the people's will is the ultimate authority.

Together, we will enshrine the Right to Free Elections and the Right to Revolution in our Constitution. Together, we will ensure that our nation remains truly independent, unbowed by external threats or internal

treachery. Together, we will reclaim our sovereignty and secure a future where it stands as a beacon of justice, freedom, and democracy for generations to come.

As once, with its fleet rules the waves now this small island will be the little stone that everyone's going to break their teeth on. Globalised Imperialism would cease any of his arguments here. We cannot have a diversity where we're not included, we cannot have free borders when we will have no country left, we cannot have a global economy when we won't have anything to own or sell. We cannot let become a Globalist Colony where our culture will vanish, our language will be spoken incorrectly perhaps by millions and millions of people but the original culture will disappear.

We cannot let ourselves assimilate and Islamised in a world where White British and White European wouldn't exist anymore.

This is what we stand for as the Constitutional Army of People of Britain and Europe, for the Rights of All Native Tribes of Europe, of all Ancient Cultures of Europe and for us as the true inheritors of our lands. Lands of Britain , Ireland, and Europe.

Right of Free Elections and Right to Revolution.

A country cannot be truly Independent if it is unlawfully ruled.

A ruling Government must rule lawfully.

In this Constitution lawfulness of a Government it's established by main 4 criterias :

1. National Interest and Independence
2. Native people Interest first
3. Rule of Law, Freedom and Democracy
4. Freedom of Speech.

A Government who doesn't act within those Principles it's generally deemed as unlawful.

The Constitutional Army of People must then form an ad-hoc assembly and gather signatures that based on their number can overthrow the initial vote if any Government might be deemed unlawful.

We have presented the Principles of Sovereignty and The Head of State role as keeper of the Constitution amongst others. Foremost the Head of State will be the Head of the New Constitutional Court.

In virtue of this article " Right of people to make Revolution" would be institutionalised and protected as a fundamental law of this country guaranteed by this Constitution.

The era of street protests would be over. Not because someone will prohibit those or impede them as the " Right to Protest" it's one of the main pillars of " Freedom of Speech". These are free in Absolute and no law or power could infringe those fundamental human liberties. The change would consist of an obvious improvement. The Right to Protest will be formally guaranteed by the Right to Vote and Right to Revolution.

It's given as a fundamental Constitutional right where the Head of State will be the Higher Executive Constitutional Power meant to keep and guarantee all Constitutional freedoms and rights to all the British citizens and contributors.

Once a Petition is pushed through the Constitutional Court, the Constitutional Court will be summoned . The timeframe would depend on the sheer number of individual signatures that if they might overturn the vote the Court must respond to this Petition in maximum 24 hours.

The Constitutional Court will give a Preliminary Hearing of both parties where the Chief of the Government, the Prime Minister, The House Speaker and Leaders of Political Parties in Parliament will meet in the Court with the designated leaders of the Constitutional Army of People.

The Constitutional Court will seek a mediation solution and a deadline for the current Government to comply. On the contrary, the Courts will withdraw the support of the Government and will establish the main Public Court Hearing.

If a mediation can or cannot be reached is when a Government it's

summoned in Court. The Constitutional Court holds powers to suspend anyone from a political or public function, holds power to arrest and prosecute anyone that can be charged with Higher Treason, Corruption or any other abuse and sent in front of any Magistrates Court to be judged.

If a mediation is not possible at all the Reclaimant is not obliged to accept that but as part of the Respondent plea they must ask it.

The Court must be held for a maximum 7 days after preliminary hearing.

This process might be lengthy but a decision must be made in a maximum of 90 days. In this period the Civil Service will be in temporary power without any ceremony and only for the purpose to transfer the power to the new elected government. If the destituted Government belonged to a certain party as part of conviction that party would be prescribed until further notice, review or appeal which only the Constitutional Court might decide upon it

The Civil Service would form a provisional Government for a maximum of 90 days. During that time the only mission is to maintain the order in the country until the democratic transfer of power has been achieved.

The Provisional Government would have mostly administrative tasks to keep the Government and Ministries run smoothly. During this 90 period the Parliament would be dissolved by the Head of State. The Provisional Government cannot make any decisions regarding politics, economy cannot influence or pass any legislation or policies and cannot deal with any external affairs.

The Provisional Government of Civil Service and Head of State will confirm the new elected Government.

This way a country would avoid the prolonged extensive damage upon economy, security and social security that an unlawful Government might produce in 5 years.

The Right to Revolution would reduce the damage that an unlawful Government can make in 5 years. It will strengthen more responsibility, control & compliance amongst the parties due to this deterrent of the Law on itself.

The era of street protests must be finished and guaranteed by a New Constitution and guaranteed by means of the Constitutional Court. This Article and need for a formal written Constitution it's necessary to prevent any attempts of subversive actions of any Government. For example, recently a Government managed to give up an Independent territory of the country, motivating it to lose these territories in the International Court of Law. Well if someone would have sent a couple of submarines there what the verdict of International Courts would have been?

A Constitution is needed as the fundamental law of the country to protect the Native People against any future plots of any Government partisan of foreign interests and interference where a succession of past Governments made their own law within the law for their own interest against the wide interest of the British people.

Article 2:

Fundamental Citizen Rights and Liberties

Constitutional Army of the People

This article begins with the statement: "We, the People of the ". The necessity of this follows:

The primary political reform needed in the is a Written Constitution as the fundamental law of the country, with the sole purpose of educating the public about their rights. For those born in the , a clear understanding of their fundamental citizen rights makes it harder for them to be oppressed. The more educated the people are, the more difficult it is to persuade or manipulate them. Few people in Britain are aware of the contents of specific Acts of Parliament. A concise formal and publicly Written Codified Constitution, limited to the fundamental core values of the Nation would be essential. As an example, this article outlines:

Fundamental Citizen Rights

This article establishes that native citizens by heritage are the most protected under this Constitution. It guarantees priority for native citizens in employment, healthcare, education, housing, and social benefits. While this Constitution does not exclude the rights of others based on their merits, it prioritises and safeguards the rights of the majority—those native to the land by history and heritage.

Civilisation is defined as the collective form of culture, both material and spiritual, intended to sustain and perpetuate human life. The rights of every individual are aligned with the rights of the land and its people. This Constitution ensures that future generations will benefit at least as much as the present generation. The land of the , comprising England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, belongs solely to the descendants of its people.

This Constitution holds no authority unless enshrined as a political and constitutional law. It grants every native citizen priority access to essential means of life, without excluding others based on their contributions. For instance, an individual not born in Britain but who has worked here for 15–20 years, paid taxes, abided by the law, and fulfilled their obligations to the country is eligible for the same rights as other taxpayers and contributors. However, this Constitution prioritises native citizens, particularly in employment, healthcare, education, housing, benefits, and other social and economic provisions.

As an example, consider a young British homeless man—a common and tragic occurrence in this country. When asked about his situation and whether he was receiving benefits, he explained that he was denied assistance at his local Jobcentre because he lacked an address and identification. He was advised that he could use the Jobcentre’s address and, as a British citizen born in the , could request discretionary support to obtain identification documents, which are a primary barrier to employment, housing, and social benefits. This case, and many like it,

demonstrates why prioritising and protecting native citizens under this Constitutional Right is vital.

A Written Constitution is essential to guarantee citizens' rights, enabling them to protect themselves against institutional, political, or ideological attacks and to counter any violations of their fundamental rights. Individuals born overseas may have rights to claim benefits in their country of origin as well as in Britain. However, a native citizen, with generational ties solely to the , is at a clear disadvantage, as their claims are limited to this country. Non-native individuals who have contributed to the British system may also make claims, but these should not prejudice the rights of native citizens.

This Constitution shall protect and define native citizens as the priority, majority, and rightful inheritors of the nation's rights. Any argument that non-natives, due to bigger need or contribution, should take precedence over native citizens shall be deemed unlawful and a violation of fundamental citizen rights. Such actions must be punishable by law. Any act against the rightful heirs of Britain —those with inherited rights and belonging to this country—must not result in deprivation, discrimination, or destitution that could lead to impoverishment or harm. Such actions would be treated as violations of sovereignty, independence, and national security.

It shall be illegal to deprive any native British citizen of priority in employment, housing, education, healthcare, social benefits, or security, whether by an individual, organisation, or public or private entity. Any such actions must be punishable by law.

For example, a company dismissed native workers via a video call to hire foreign workers at half the hourly wage, below even the minimum wage. Such practices, where native staff are replaced with cheaper foreign labour solely to save money or maximise profits, shall be deemed illegal. Dismissals must follow legal procedures based on performance, discipline, behaviour, or incapacity. A native British worker must not be dismissed solely to be replaced by a cheaper foreign worker. If a British worker is replaced by a more qualified overseas worker, the latter must be paid in accordance with their qualifications, not at the same rate as a

lower-skilled British worker.

It shall also be unlawful for any public institution to prioritise non-natives over natives in housing, benefits, healthcare, childcare, or similar services. For example, native families often wait years for council housing, only to be pushed back in the queue as newcomers are prioritised. Under this Constitution, such practices would be illegal. Our Constitution shall establish a principle of fairness that guarantees equitable access to social benefits, employment, and opportunities for all citizens, reflecting the collective responsibility of every individual to contribute to the nation's unity and prosperity. This principle acknowledges the contributions of all citizens whether born in Britain or naturalised—and upholds their equal rights under the law, fostering a cohesive society that respects individual needs and the public interest.

All citizens of the, irrespective of their background, are united by their commitment to the nation's welfare and shared future. Fairness is achieved through transparent, objective criteria that address genuine need, ensuring no citizen is unfairly disadvantaged in accessing essential resources.

Equal Access Based between Need and Contribution:

All citizens, whether native-born or naturalised, shall have equal access to social benefits, including housing, healthcare, education, welfare, and employment opportunities. Allocation of these resources shall be determined by objective criteria, such as economic hardship, health requirements, family circumstances, or risk of homelessness, applied consistently to all applicants. For instance, in social housing, priority bands shall reflect verified need, ensuring no citizen—native or otherwise—is unjustly disadvantaged. However, the main criteria should be applied in favour of the majoritarian element of the country because it's the most numerous and most in need and rights. This algorithm is based on the democratic mechanism of society in itself.

As long as there's a native Anglo-Saxon majority there should be a democracy in their favour that always must prioritise them.

We're deducting the following principle applied here.

Transparency and Accountability:

The allocation of public resources shall be governed by clear, publicly accessible criteria, with an appeals process to address disputes. This ensures every citizen, regardless of status, can understand and challenge decisions affecting their access to benefits, fostering trust in the fairness of the system. However, the principle of Social Justice must prevail. Since a majority would decide for a minority the decisions taken would be the same for everyone.

This is how a Democracy works. The same rights to social benefits would apply to everyone based on their contributions but never excluding or putting on the back of the queue the native majoritarian population.

Next applicable principle would be the Recognition of Legal Obligations by the State: These are the obligations owned by the State to its citizens. All the promises made by the State must be honoured . For instance, employment, healthcare, education, housing, benefits, pensions ,social care, security, justice, human rights and civil liberties , national security and independence are just a few.

The shall not honour its international commitments, such as those under the 1951 Refugee Convention, to provide priority support to vulnerable groups, such as refugees facing acute hardship before its own citizens. This should be discretionary only and never put before honouring the main and only legal obligations which are those who are the taxpayers, native citizens of the amongst all citizens contributors to Britain economy and state.

Signing an International Treaty like the one in 1951 or the European Convention of Human Rights these are just treaties between the and

other countries and International Organisations. However, those cannot be legal as long as they might clash with the Sovereign's laws of the country. In other countries, for example Bavaria and Switzerland there are specific laws that stipulate that indigenous population would always have priority in employment. This hasn't been sufficiently enforced or made it clear.

However, this shall not result in arbitrary disadvantage to other citizens. Models as separate dwellings should be allocated and not taken from the public housing resources which would endanger the social situation of native and adopted citizens contributors in the economy.

The number of refugees including the other foreigners must be capped at a maximum 2% of native population and asylum should be granted only from recognised countries and conflicts as well credible documented human rights issues like North Korea, Ugyur population in China, war but only on temporary basis, women's issues in Iran, Afghanistan and so on and to women only found in genuine fear of persecution and harm. South Africans white farmers are in a genuinely situation that demand asylum, as well persecuted Christians from countries like Lebanon, Israel (Palestine), Syria who are vetted and don't possess a risk to Britain national security and they understand and accept the conditions of asylum that them and their children are not entitled to British citizenship they must contribute while they staying in Britain and they need to return anytime back into their countries if situation changed.

However, Britain cannot receive more refugees and we're in a position where we cannot help ourselves because years and years of deprivation of native Anglo-Saxon population had created a generational issue of generational poverty in Britain. This will take a Britain deal of generational effort putting us in front of a grim and worrying perspective of how many generations of sacrifice must come until the country and society will come back to a sense of normality that where perhaps in the 80's and 90's where the Booming years brought a prosperous and dynamic two decades not only in but in Europe and the world also.

Because the asylum system has been abused by the newcomers and their Liberal accomplices and they didn't get back into their countries

when the conflicts from these countries ended. This had created an impossible situation where it became overcrowded in 3 decades unable to help anyone else, mostly those actually in genuine need of protection because someone abused the system and broke the very core principle of the system that was “ Human Solidarity “. Base of this core principle was we accept them as they accept to leave when it's possible for others to be able to come and keep this open to everybody. Now, it has come to an end because it has become overcrowded. This is sadly the situation, , once a champion of human rights and solidarity, entered into a situation where the only solidarity now must be with British people only. This is not optional, this is not negotiable. If the 2% cap from total Native population of foreigners is exceeding this figure the right to anyone at asylum including legal immigration must be stopped.

“ The Poverty and the needs of my Kind are non-negotiable “

‘We can only defend our Land, our kind and our little we have. “

This is the only thing left for , a war with no choice, left for generations to come alone now against everybody.

What I want to say:

“We will be what we were and more than that “

This is the change that needs to shift current and future generations of this country as survival is not optional.

In fact, the decision of granting asylum to anyone should be discretionary. The State should manifest discretion and in fact by Law the main condition in granting asylum to an individual is by accepting the main condition of asylum “ to accept removal whenever the situation from the country of origin and initial circumstances change “.

This must be applicable including to born children in Britain of the asylum claimants.

The initial purpose of granting political asylum to anyone starting from the initial UN Convention in 1952 didn't include any citizenship rights of asylum seekers and no formal obligation of any state to modify their internal constitutions nor altering their citizenship rules. The right to asylum isn't a right in itself and is not constituting a valid legal ground for citizenship. In fact the decision of granting asylum it's discretionary and temporarily legally based. Granting citizenship to asylum seekers was not the intention nor the purpose of the initial Convention of Human Rights. Let's not confuse the facts. Everyone has the right to be recognised as a citizen by any country. Now, when all the signatory states of the initial convention of human rights and at the first constituency of the United Nations all Nations agreed to recognise the right to anyone to be citizens and what was initially agreed upon the right to asylum was that in eventually of conflicts, wars, dictatorship, individuals from those affected countries can have refuge in other countries but only for the time of this conflict. The purpose of granting asylum was to give the people affected by war and persecution a safety net but the condition was to accept to be removed once the conflict ended or situation changed. There was no obligation for the initial states signatories of the convention to mandate the granting of citizenship on grounds of asylum.

This was with the purpose that the convention of human rights to be able to help as much as any people needed help because some issues in other countries might be temporary when new issues in some other parts might occur.

This Convention has been broken once the human rights lawyers stumbled on the existent laws and manipulated the content of the convention.

Imagine a hospital that has 1000 beds for 1000 people and 1000 that are sick they just move into the hospital and make it their own home or hotel. Exactly this was the purpose of the initial convention of human rights to ensure that there's a potential place for everyone because

someone should be supposed to leave that other one in a similar need to be able to benefit in the same way as others before.

Asylum should never stand as a path to citizenship nor gives a right to lawful residence and propriety into this country or any other rights similar to citizens of origin and adoption. By default the decision of granting asylum to anyone withholds the same powers as any entry visa, its conditional, discretionary meaning can be revoked anytime and carries the same legal status applicable to next generations.

As an asylum seeker is someone legally deemed as “*coming by force*” therefore not invited, not needed, not required or even legal. Whether someone has been accepted as having legally a claim to asylum in Britain by the “so called legal route” as applying via Britain embassy abroad directly from the country of provenience to the respective asylum seeker, this decision is merely for granting protection due to an imminent threat against someone's life due to reasons of Race, Nationality, Political ideas, Religion, Gender & Sexual orientation. Nonetheless, the right to asylum it's just the right of entry in the country and only for purpose of protection but without any obligation of State to grant any other rights as long it has been initially agreed that the condition of entry in the country would be equally conditional with the promise of voluntarily return in the country of origin soon as the initial reported circumstances would change. Our question is how many asylum seekers returned to their countries after the wars of Iraq, Syria, Libya, Afghanistan, Somalia and former Yugoslavia ended? Citizens from safe Eastern European countries that claimed protection before should be subjected to removal as well. In fact, legally an asylum decision it's not the same as a legal right to reside in a country because it's subject to compulsory leave if the original reported situation changes. Therefore, those or their children should not be viewed as citizens only based on birth right. Why should the Law state such a thing if they've been born in the ? The most recent Government guidance it's clear if none of the parents are not British citizens the children are inheriting the same status

If the parents breached the initial agreement of the asylum conditions they have broken the law upon not returning into their countries of origin

immediately after the initial circumstances changed. In fact this is their main breach of their legal conditions of entry. The State would have a base to revoke any citizenship granted to asylum seekers for main breach of their conditions of asylum. The law can be retrospectively applied based on the principle “ a felony remains a felony as long as that happened regardless of the status of the law, meaning if a regulation has been adopted it was because of the exact same issues that were meant to be tackled. If someone's found guilty of a felony committed before that has been deemed as unlawful that doesn't justify why someone needs to commit a felony and doesn't reduce or eliminate the evidence of that felony even that might happen before the law has been ratified as long the entirety of their previous actions are against the State and its lawful order.

Where urgent needs are comparable, allocations shall be balanced to ensure fairness across all groups, including the majority population. Those who are trespassing illegally in our borders and are breaching our immigration system should be punished because they are committing a felony before any other invoked rights. The felony would cancel the rights when it has been proven in Court of Law that a felony has been committed. Trespassing illegally on our borders is and must remain a felony only in certain exceptions deemed by the Law.

Promoting Social Cohesion:

The principle of fairness encourages all citizens to contribute to the nation's unity and prosperity through civic participation and mutual respect.

Policies shall support integration and shared responsibility, ensuring the diverse contributions of all citizens—whether through longstanding ties or new commitments—strengthen the social fabric of the . Would be deemed as “Unconstitutional” any attempt whether is a single individual or group to promote ideas and interests that are against social unity and cohesion, that excludes Native British citizens or promote foreign

cultures to replace the existing ones.

Evidence-Based Measures for Equity:

Where evidence demonstrates that specific groups, including the majority population, face systemic barriers in accessing resources (i.e., housing shortages in certain communities), targeted measures may be implemented to address these disparities. Such measures shall be temporary, proportionate, and based on verifiable data to ensure they do not disadvantage other citizens.

This principle is not about creating hierarchies, but about ensuring the rule of law functions to meet the needs of all citizens fairly. By prioritising objective need over status, he upholds a democratic system that prevents discontent and promotes trust in public institutions. No citizen shall be denied their rights to social benefits, employment, or opportunities, nor shall any citizen be unfairly relegated to the back of the queue due to arbitrary factors. Instead, allocations shall reflect the necessity of addressing genuine hardship, ensuring the majority population, as the largest demographic, benefits equitably alongside all others in proportion to their needs.

This is the consensus our society requires—a commitment to fairness that respects the equal dignity of every citizen whilst addressing the practical realities of resource allocation. By grounding our laws in transparency, evidence, and shared responsibility, we ensure the remains a just and prosperous nation for all. This Constitution prioritises democratically the interests of a majority of a country. In our country, Britain , the majority of the population it's a mix of native historic populations and ethnicities specific to the historic reality of this country. Celtic populations on pre-Roman era, adding an integrated element of Roman & Dacian & Other populations after the Roman invasion then a second wave of assimilation with Anglo-Saxon populations and Scandinavian elements “ Vikings “ have formed what we're calling today the Modern English, when Scottish, Welsh, Irish as well are direct

descendants of Celtic populations same as in Isle of Man and Cornwall. This is our Native structure by history and heritage which it's called the ethnic majority of this country.

Why cannot this be politically defended? Let's break the main arguments who consider this unlawful; it's divisive. Well it's actually divisive already between the members of the same native ethnicity who are against each other due to this policy.

The second argument is not inclusive. The native members of any country including ours cannot be included anywhere else. Because they've already here they've formed a country, society, a culture typical and adapted to their ethnicity.

The third argument invoked is racism. This cannot be true when the same members of an ethnic group look the same, speak the same language and live in a society created by them to serve their needs and their purposes according to their needs and ethnic character.

It's the duty of care of any foreign to integrate in this society. This should be made mandatory. It's the duty of care by Law and for the Law to serve purposely the Interest, Benefits and Priorities of the Native population first.

This is a Universal Principle of every country and nation on Earth. The very same reason why we're having Nations and States until nowadays. Social cohesion or Inclusion and diversity cannot be done and shall never be done at the cost and expense of the highest demographic population which is the most in need and in most poverty of all.

Article 5.

Fundamental right of people's propriety. Free speech and fundamental citizen rights.

This article deems it as proprietary to all individual possessions owned rightfully by the individual as the Law of property entitles. As it's rightfully yours, what's acquired legally and it's used properly without affecting any other equal right.

Examples. If someone's right to not be offended is deemed unconstitutional, it disproportionately goes against the right to free speech of others.

Free speech is free in absolute terms. Moreover, it is the fundamental intellectual property of every citizen as their own thoughts, ideas, expressions, creations, intellectual achievements, innovation, discovery and so on.

Political opinions are an expression of Free Speech. As with any original ideas and patents, free speech is the main intellectual property of citizens worldwide protected by the same "copyright" laws that grants the citizens the right of ownership upon their own intellectual property.

Copyright laws cannot be infringed; these are widely internationally valid and they have the same level of protection even outside national jurisdictions.

Political views are deemed as free speech and these should be protected by copyright laws.

To prevent the political power to be subverted by means of demagoguery when a corrupt ruling class might punish the opposition and declare illegal their views and convict them as political prisoners for them to promote their very same ideas but subverted towards different purposes and shifted towards different circles of interest.

This is the mechanism of how dictatorship is built by stealing and

prohibiting the ideas of political opposition to be used with the purpose of mass electoral manipulation to be able to conserve a certain ruling class that defends the interest of any minorities against the working class majority of a country.

Henceforth, no one can be punished for his political ideas because these are manifestations of free speech and legally protected by the copyright law.

Worldwide copyright laws are recognised.

In this Constitution, it is given a clarification in this aspect . We will clarify the difference between free speech and felony speech. For example, if someone believes their rights to privacy are violated and blocks a public pathway to invoke their rights, their rights cannot surpass the rights of others to free movement.

If someone's offended by a flag, or anything else you want to display within the premises of your property his right cannot be equal if by such display no common law it's broken as the right of anyone to its own expression, and individually it's equally respected by this Constitution.

A felony of speech it is around any criminal matters as transmission of information to facilitate criminal activities, to corrode the spirit of laws, manipulate human rights provisions, public morality, apology of criminal behaviour including in culture by praising crimes and criminals, idolatry of criminal behaviour, advocating for fraudulent and immoral behaviour like bypassing state security, know-how in committing of criminal or terrorist acts , perpetrating immoral and harmful behaviour and the list is not exhaustive. This will be the subject of further provisions" State Security and Information Act".

We try to establish a principle of social agreement as a pivotal argument of this Constitution. Socially and politically, any society it's a functional society when an agreement it's reached. Based on that agreement, this Constitution, it is in power.

The same rules apply to cession and rights to cession of all values, including financial values.

This law doesn't just make the tax an obligation. The Tax, it's deemed to be still the property of the taxpayer even after its cession to any form of government delegated freely by the people. The tax is in cession from the taxpayer's hands to the Government in the virtue of an agreement that makes a valid contract.

Example in this Constitution - A local Council elected mayor, it promises to build a certain number of roads in a period established between the electors, voters and the delegated authority. Here we have a contract that needs to be fulfilled by an agreement between parties and then, any form of government becomes a delegated authority to comply with certain demands from the electors that have the quality of taxpayers. The non-fulfilment of these demands attracts the nullity of any contract, the right of taxpayers to stop and even claim their property as cession in court of law.

In this subarticle, we will describe the relation between the legal component of tax and his deeds as individual property and the subsequent relation between individual property over the tax and public property. In conclusion, free speech is the main intellectual property of any citizens protected by universal copyright laws

Tax is deemed the legal property of citizens and the obligation of the State to respect this.

Any Courts should grant the status of tax paid as citizen property and confer the right of property upon the tax we pay deemed as " public money".

Article 6

Lawful state and citizen rights and obligations

The freedom of the Government movement should always be proportional to freedom of citizen movement.

All parties that constitute the state, including the Elected Government, civil society, citizens, and other civil associations that can form a pressure group in society, create a state based on an agreement. When an organisation becomes a group of pressure that automatically gives political power in society. Therefore, this Constitution guarantees the right of political representation to all citizen movements that represent a cause and a valid demand under the Law. Their entitlement is given under respecting their obligations, which include respecting the law and contributing. When they acquire the quality of taxpayers, they are eligible to be Contributors

Every contributor is those citizens who are the taxpayers, the native population of the s of Britain , that are free people without any debts with the Law. Therefore, these citizens are free to demand political power.

For instance, if the Party system cannot fulfil its obligations, the trade unions should have the same rights to represent themselves politically or any other citizen movement that is protesting a cause in virtue of any demands they have.

The legitimacy of a government is given by popular enthusiasm. Therefore, it should be guaranteed by this Constitution that the Freedom of choosing between any form and structure of political decision must be in the right of citizens and no one should obstruct this right.

Freedom of free speech, political ideas should be free in the absolute

term of law if there's no other breach of any common law.

The right of people to Revolution is based on the same absolute freedom of free speech, free association and freedom of political ideas, religion or any other ideas as long the means in expressing those ideas are merely by means of free speech and freedom of association.

As no one can force, constrain and coerce someone against its free will, there's no action that would justify the prohibition of any ideas based on Free Speech.

This Constitution is the Guarantee of Free Speech, Freedom of Association, Freedom of Political ideas as long there's no breach of any common law. What should be infringed are the actions that might constitute a breach of the law.

If someone is protesting and during the protest disorder has been produced, people got hurt, unlive, people being threatened or material destruction of public and private property resulted what it is punishable are the deeds and the subsequent actions for every breach of the law applying the correct contraventions for every deed that was in a result a breach of law.

For example, if some protesters smash a window of a public or private building during a protest, the action that would be incriminated would be disorder and destruction. If someone were killed on the back of the ideas expressed by someone individually or organised would constitute a felony of murder.

The ideas in itself are to discuss issues that concern the individuals or individuals can express freely. Hate speech cannot be considered a felony if there's no other action. A felony action based on a speech felony must be connected between and proved beyond the reasonable doubt that precise felony of speech produced a material or criminal felony. The action itself should be merely treated as action, and punishable should be only the damage incurred.

Threatening someone individually, or collectively it's not an idea, it's an action aimed at someone directly.

However, if there's no physical component of your speech should be deemed as free regardless if this may or might not offend someone.

The same value applies to everyone who can express their speech freely.

If during a protest for example people would get hurt or might hurt someone, private or public property might be destroyed; those actions should be punishable as criminal actions.

The guidance should stand in favour of the truth. If someone uses political ideas, religious or any ideas as motivation of committing crimes the person's motivation is primarily to commit crimes hence the ideas or reasons invoked are irrelevant.

Let's put this example, let's say that in the name of cause A must harm all the individuals B . The action that must be punishable is the attempt of someone to hurt someone. The cause of A ideas and speech should not be regarded as the cause for the contravention nor to be a cause for punishment.

People can express freely their ideas without harming anyone, should be protected against any harm and should be guaranteed safe space and right to association as long as they do not harm anyone, and they don't plan to harm anyone. If someone is forced to harm anyone in the name of an idea it's a breach of Freedom of Speech because no one can be forced to adhere to any ideology without expressing his free will.

When someone is using ideology with the purpose of committing crimes, what's punishable is the crime and the aggravated circumstance would be the breaching of Free Speech Laws. It is punishable by this Law and in the name of this Constitution any breach of Free Speech. Using ideas as motives in committing crimes whether instigation to bodily harming the person, murder, destruction of property, rape, enslavement, theft of goods, propriety, money and assets, fraud, scam, obtaining undeserved benefits and the list isn't exhaustive all these constituting breaches of Free Speech.

If during a protest some people would get hurt in the name of an idea or because they've stood against an idea or for any other reasons the felony which is punishable here is the damage caused and how it should be interpreted.

Subject A kills subject B in the name of cause C. The felony is murder

with aggravated consequences of use of deception and breaches of Free Speech.

Using free speech as motivation to commit crimes, it's a crime in itself. However, if the ideas expressed on that protest are ideas expressed publicly and despite the fact that people might get hurt during that process or any other felony would be produced this would not make the object of any offence because this Constitution is the guarantee that Free Speech would be guaranteed and defended by this Constitution.

Native rights should be granted and clarified by any Court of Law as are based on heritage, history, generational contribution and majority.

This Constitution is based on meritocracy and democracy. A majority will always decide. The rights are given by the law based on the merits and legitimacy of the Law.

The Law is an exercise of Democracy where the law grants the rights individually and collectively based on a structure of merits. Respecting the law by each individual guarantees the human rights of every individual. By default it should be at the discretion of the State to decide about the human rights of a hideous criminal no matter if he's domestic or foreign.

Article 7

The Role of Head of State, Constitution and Constitutional Army of People.

Main Context:

This article is the guidance to clarify the most needed and stringent reform in our society.

The Absolute Autonomy of Parliament was initially designed in 1689 to protect the people and people's rights against any violation of their rights from the part of the Absolutist Monarchy at that time.

Nowaday, we use a 336 year's Law within the current context and challenges of our society. Nowadays, we're assisting this phenomenon of alienation of political class common in all denominated Parliamentary Democracies, including ours.

It's common, and it has become the norm that decisions of Parliament to be taken in disfavour of people interests so called" unpopular" decisions have been taken by our Parliament despite breaching National Security, violating basic citizens human rights, undermining of National Economy and Agriculture, destruction of our environment, poisoning of our waters, illegal occupation of land, destruction of our forestry and above all the real perspective of losing Suzerainty within the national territory.

This has been succeeded relatively short-term by a current Government by contradicting the initial electoral promises which in every common system of laws should be deemed as fraud and all this has happened, and it continues to happen without accountability for the Parliament and no regulation of this phenomenon.

The Constitutional Army of People in its Manifesto pledge stipulates the necessity of Parliament and Political class accountability, by creating a mechanism to be able to sustain the respect for citizens rights, for legal enforcement of electoral promises for extended accountability and protection of the National Sovereignty, Interests and System of Laws.

Recently, we have assisted a veritable coup of state started in 2024 where one Parliament managed to violate almost all current laws that protected vital and basic human rights of citizens of the . Moreover, they managed to breach international law denying basic nationality rights of a Sovereign Nation within British Overseas Territories, endangering National Sovereignty and violating their basic rights of those citizens which are their inalienable right of citizenship and their inalienable right to live in an Independent country.

One Parliament managed to violate basic human rights of freedom of expression, freedom of speech and undermining national independence and so on.

One Parliament who supposed to be a national Parliament in job of its

citizens managed to violate the entire basic citizens rights, showing open racism and discrimination of native Anglo-Saxon and European Caucasian population by practices that shall be regarded by the International law as apartheid, genocide, forced assimilation, denial of basic rights as housing, employment, education, healthcare and above all prohibition of freedom of expression and association.

To culminate with this series of other common broadly human rights violations as Laboural discrimination of Anglo-Saxon natives of this land and other Caucasian population of this country, discrimination in applying the criminal common law differently with exemptions granted to a particular racial, ethnic, religious group.

This can be classified as apartheid and ethnic cleansing practices seen during maybe the Ottoman occupation of Europe, formal Yugoslavia, South African Apartheid, Rwanda genocide and many others.

In general terms by definition The Parliament Autonomy has been subverted and replaced by Parliament and Government unaccountability by a huge hiatus between citizens interest, free will, expectations and respect of initial elected promises where in exchange the Parliament proved that anyone can be able to realise a “Coups of State” within the state by ascending in power by means of electoral fraud, deception of the public, breaching of social contract and violation of basic human and citizen rights of citizens of the of Britain .

This article is meant to reinforce the Social Contract and promote the Electoral Fairness law, in which we will describe the felony of Electoral Fraud and why this should be punishable under the High Treason Act.

The need for Reform of our laws is to bring extra lairs to strengthen the national security of the country and to lay the ground of a new politics in favour of national interest above all.

Britain is the first country that is now at risk of losing national territory within its own national territory. There's a real danger that in the immediate future an Islamic Republic will be proclaimed within the territories where the Anglo-Saxon population is now a minority . If over half of million people managed to smuggle illegally into the country due to lack of any border security, there's the same likelihood of these groups

to get weapons and organise themselves militarily.

Our current Head of State as an Institution is unable to reinforce anything upon Parliament, despite the Parliament forming the Government that's being called His Majesty's Government.

When citizens rights are being violated by the Parliament itself, there's no real means for protecting the nation against. The citizens need to wait 5 years to be able to change a Party, but not a System.

The lack of any balancing mechanisms of Power between Elected Government, Parliament and Citizens wouldn't prevent that if a party would be changed with another party the situation would be any different because if there's no balancing mechanism of power there's no mandate that people can prevent that the parties could conspire between them to maintain a certain state of tyranny on benefit of few against of the many.

Principle of Head of State role.

The Liberty of expression is in absolute form, including the freedom of choosing between any form and structure of political decision into the State.

A political system as any other system can be merely replaced in favour of another system that has an enhanced capability of solving the problems of its citizens. This is our pledge for a Unified Constitution for the country .

The Head of State, among their duties as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, must swear to defend the country against any external enemies and threats, as well as to uphold the law. In a broader sense, the role of the Head of State is to defend the law of the country, the rights of all people, the Constitution, and the British way of life. The people of Britain should adopt this Constitution by a Referendum. This is just a mere Manifesto in its form of proposal, however the main imperative consists in the creation of this new mandate for the Head of State.

The Head of State must represent the interests, values and beliefs of its citizens not as subjects but as free citizens, taxpayers, contributable, supporters of the economy and society.

When states of emergency occur including violations of citizens rights by the elected governments, central and locals then by means of social pressure and discontent the Constitutional Army should be convoked and bring to the knowledge of Institutional Head of State the collective nature of any queries, matters, issues of broad interest and national emergency.

The Head of State must in effect be the Head and Patron of the Constitutional Court where any unconstitutional matter shall be dealt according to the necessity and national emergency.

The citizens must by default have the Constitutional right to political vetoing granted by this Constitution.

This would be reinforced by the Social Contract Act and any violation punishable by the Constitutional Court under the High Treason Law and Electoral Fraud Act.

The role of Head of State would be as an impartial judge, and the Institution of Sovereignty that represents must be the guarantee of the access to justice of any citizen of the entire Realm.

Article 8

The Social Contract.

Every citizen who's a lawful citizen of the by Heritage, Birth and Adoption in his quality of taxpayer and contributable they must have the following political rights in absolute as undivided, immutable and guaranteed by this Constitution.

Right to vote, is equal with right to stand for vote and should as well as equal with the right of vetoing the vote if elected government it's found in non-compliance with initial electoral promises, breaches citizens rights, acting in bad faith against the national interests, including corruption, in service of a foreign power or group of interests, poor performance, errors and fraud that leads to damage, unlawful and

immoral behaviour, crime, abuse of power, misuse of public money, embezzlement or any other criminal or damaging action that may lead to citizen unrest and potentially generate mass unrest and social disruption.

Right of citizen political and labourer protest, it is guaranteed as Fundamental Liberty and Citizen's rights by this Constitution. The state and Head of State must guarantee the right of protesting citizens to be heard.

Hence, the Convocation of the Constitutional Army of People of Britain and forwarding a Petition to the Head of State it is the Obligation by Law for the Institutional Head of State to grant an initial hearing to the Constitutional Court where a decision should be made if the grievance is held or upheld.

In case that the grievance is held then the responsible parties should be cited in Court in 30 days from the date that the decision has been upheld.

Then, both parties would appear in Court. If the Constitutional Court will find the responsible party guilty of breaching the law and in clear violation of citizens rights then the Constitutional Court would declare an Act of Illegitimacy. Therefore, an Act of Illegitimacy can be applied to any political decision, whether it is central or local government or policies of public institutions including law enforcement and tribunals.

Let's take a recent past example. Let's see how this would work in practice.

Recently the Government took a strange decision to tax Britain farmers on their land and farm inheritance up to 25% of the property of Inherited value creating a hostile situation amongst farmers and as well putting at risk the national agriculture.

The Government maintained its stance motivating that there's a need for higher tax to cover the budget deficit.

However, here's a list of several violations of common law, human rights and danger to National Security.

Right to property it's a fundamental legal right. This cannot be abolished under any circumstance if there's no valid avenue as sale, confiscation for grounds of court rulings as debts recovery, collateral for

compensation (criminality, tax evasion, various claims including damage etc.)

Right to property is equal with the right of passing ownership and the right to inheritance is guaranteed by Law in the existence of a lawful will.

Tax on inheritance is illegal if the amount makes the possession of the inherited property inaccessible. If the State taxing the inheritance above the value of the property it's breaching a fundamental right of someone to receive inheritance.

The tax on inheritance is by all means a policy that should be unlawful as no law can contradict the same law. If the law states that you have the right to inheritance this is in absolute a right granted by the inheritance law.

The same law states that you have to pay upfront up to 25% of the property value then the State must prove the ownership of that 25% of the inherited property to prove the legitimacy of this. law.

In current definitions of the law a property can be transferred, exchanged only by means of a sale or donations. Exceptions are just the Court repossession orders for criminal, civil , tax evasion matters. Abandonment and war.

However the law treats this matter from its standard position of general case. Therefore if the state cannot prove that he owns 25% of inherited property then the state has no legal basis in perceiving this tax.

How should this work in a Constitutional Court?

Every group of pressure whether political party, trade union, professional guild, civic association should equally have the same political rights in representing themselves legally and politically meaning they can run for seats in Parliament as the same provisions for independent candidates would be applicable if they obtain the necessary ballot to enter Parliament.

In our case let's suppose that the farmers have their own organised professional guild and they have a seat in Parliament.

In this case the guild and their representatives would forward a case Petition to the Head of State Office sustained by a number of signatories.

The Law must establish a threshold like a minimum of 1 hundred thousand of signatories up to 1 million. Those would be accepted as ordinary petitions with a term of 30 days to be held and upheld in the Constitutional Court.

If a petition passes a 5 million threshold it became an extraordinary one and it's mandatory for the Head of State to convoke a National Emergency Panel made of Civil, Academic, Juridical and other professionals community advisors in which a decision must be given in maximum 48 hours from the acknowledged that a Petition for Constitutional Court has been received.

In this case the Constitutional Court can exercise the power to override and cancel the inheritance tax law for example with an order of reimbursement of potential losses that can make a later civil claim or can be part of the initial settlement if the Government has been found guilty of violation of inheritance tax. This is an example however the principle is; The People have the right to protest against any injustice against the people and their interests.

The Head of State has the legal obligation sworn by Constitution, mandated by the Constitution and the People to listen to the People and facilitate the access to Justice and Resolution when this is not possible by the existent mandates of the elected government or the law.

For example when there's need for more regulation in a domain where a problem that affects a wider number of people cannot be effectively resolved by the elected government and current apparatus of laws.

The Constitutional Court is the defence mechanism of the laws where the People can fight any attempts of sublimation of the laws whether it is a public or private entity.

Electoral Fraud Act and Higher Treason Act.

The Political class is accountable to the electors first not to institutions.

The vote is the expression of trust given by the voters to someone to represent them and work in their interest.

Fundamentally the vote needs to have the same power and Britainer than an employment contract because it is in reality an Employment Contract with special clauses.

An electoral act must contain the " electoral promises " , an electoral plan and terms of completion as well as means and available resources for this.

This Contract is legally binding with the Constitution. It is forbidden for any elected member of members of government whether central or local to be served , linked or pledged in favour of any interest of a foreign power.

They can be accused of higher treason and espionage. This will carry a life sentence in prison. The elected members of Government whether central and local must adhere to a Code of Conduct.

They must keep their electoral initial promises as they're bound by contract to fulfill their duties and conclude the projects they've asked the vote for.

In case that they're unable to do so this would be taken under the scrutiny of the Conditional Army of People. If it is the case that they lack resources, support or need more time they need to justify the cause of delays, address barriers and overall justify their activity. They have the obligation to respond to the Enquiries that come from the Constitutional Army of People. This is a mandatory thing to do.

When it has been proven acting with bad faith, mistake and incompetence, the Constitutional Army of People can file a Motion with the Constitutional Court.

For grave violations, the Head of State has the powers to dissolve the Government and call for new general elections.

Currently, the Monarch has these powers, but it is not clear if those are mandatory or discretionary at the latitude of the Monarch.

Designation of a Prime Minister is made by the party winner within the party if a Prime Minister resigns is destitute but not reelected.

This is what we call partitocracy . The exclusive Power of the Parties into the State. We should limit these powers in accordance with the same powers of citizens as per principle

The freedom of movement of the Government must always be equal with the freedom of movement of citizens in terms of political powers and rights.

The elected government is the hired government. The same provisions of employment contract must apply for them as everyone.

The necessity of an electoral contract is vital for the new political and social fabric of our type of society.

Who can take part in the Constitutional Army of People of Britain , England, Scotland,Wales and Northern Ireland.

Constitutional Army of People it's a concept of duty of every British citizen whether it is a native or adopted one to defend his country, his civil and political rights to protect the wellbeing of himself and his family and to contribute to the good of society.

The Constitutional Army of People comes as an organised response of all citizens when the country faces problems and situations of crisis whether due to foreign threats, internal threats, political crisis, natural disasters and so forth. It is the obligation for all citizens to take part in defending their own country and defend their rights.

Moreover it is the duty of every British citizen to stand against what's not right and not allow any form of abuse and violation of his basic rights or others.

This is the reason why the People must be in power by means of People.

The Constitutional Army of People it's not designed to be in charge as we already have the existing means. We have a Monarch , the

Parliament, House of Lords and House of Commons but what's lacking is a strong and fundamental citizen movement that should lead on this Principle.

The Politically elected class is the one that we vote for generally and locally and we hire them to do what we need and they are there for us as employees. They have their obligations equally as every citizen and in front of people they should respond the same as their employer to the people whenever they're asked. The Head of State must have obligations and duties as well. The current "Constitution" Act of Parliament limits the Monarch to interfere politically.

However, when it's asked to do so it's where we need to question if the current state of the Institution that's equivalent with the institution of Sovereignty it's fit for the purpose and needs of our society nowadays.

The Head of State must receive and exercise powers specifics of his type of duty and role in society.

This must be made mandatory under the power of the Constitutional Army of People of Britain .

This is the power of people demanding their rights, their freedoms and the resolution of their problems and conflicts.

The Constitutional Army of People can freely legitimize by means of a Written Constitution a single fundamental body and can freely adhere to by signatures of everyone that freely wants to take part.

The Constitutional Army of People of Britain it's made only by its citizens.

No one can vote no more in any type of elections held in the national territory without being a citizen and without knowing the English language.

Conclusion.

In the last elections in 2024 only 27 millions of people approximately voted against the very same number who didn't.

A Government was overall elected by virtually a quarter of the entire population of the .

Constitutional Army of People comes as the alternative to no alternative system. Gathering the same number of signatures from the people who didn't vote would mean that the Constitutional Army of People would be in power.

The purpose of the Constitutional Army of People is not to be in power over the people, meaning to promise that they'll do a better job than the Government X or Y .

The real purpose of the Constitutional Army of People is to be in power over its own elected Government including the Head of State to ensure that they will do what they've promised to do and to make sure that they'll do what people need them to do.

Article 10

The Law of the Economic Independence of Britain

A country cannot be truly independent without having actual control over its borders, territory, the integrity of its state institutions, and, most importantly, its own land, resources, and economic objectives. These are the primary sources that genuinely sustain the independence of every nation on earth. As every nation produces its own goods, technologies, ideas, and products, our nation produces what is known as "Made in Britain," our national brand and trademark. This concept embodies the very principle of the state itself.

"A state that cannot maintain its order is insufficient for itself." A state

unable to maintain its order often lacks the necessary means and resources for its citizens. In such cases, the state is out of scope. Therefore, a state cannot exist if it does not have sufficient control over its resources and economy to ensure the well-being of its citizens.

The national economy comprises all resources of a nation, including land for agriculture, waters for fishery and trade, mineral and marine resources, and subterranean resources within the national territory. Combined with all economic means of producing goods and income, at least 50% of these must be owned and benefit the state and its citizens. It is recommended that the more economic independence a state possesses, the stronger it is internally and the less vulnerable it is externally.

Our country, Britain , must consist of owners, farmers, and a working class as free people, not a mass of employees and subordinates to foreign powers. Our national economy must be at least 50% in the hands of the British people.

Law of National Patrimony and State Monopoly

By default, the state must have an exclusive monopoly over strategic economic objectives and resources to maintain the well-being of its citizens and protect national security, which includes economic national security as defined by this Constitution in all matters pertaining to national security concerns. Our natural resources are an exclusive state monopoly, to be exploited solely for the benefit of the nation, with resulting revenue directed toward public spending in vital sectors such as defence, border security, health, education, and welfare.

The definition of a state monopoly is the full control of the state over its vital resources, such as land, water, forestry, minerals, and marine resources, along with a minimum stake of 50% in vital economic sectors, including public services, utilities, transport, telecommunications, health, education, insurance, and the gambling industry. Below, we will explain

the strategic importance of a state monopoly and why it is the best means to guarantee the economic independence of the country.

A state monopoly is necessary for a nation to maintain essential control over indispensable resources, strategic economic domains, industries, or services if these resources are vital for citizens or if citizens depend on them as a primary source of income. There is no fixed rule for establishing a state monopoly, as priorities vary based on national interest. However, in an economy, the state must control what are known as vital strategic interests.

For example, if it produces steel needed for all economic domains, including defence, railways, and vital industrial infrastructure, the state must introduce a monopoly over metals and recycling. This would prevent private entities from controlling a vital resource and deter bad actors from acting against the economy's and public's vital interests. For instance, we face the theft of metals, such as copper electrical wires, often sold by criminals, which affects our railway systems and endangers public safety. Because metals have commercial value and continuous demand, they are attractive to organized criminals, often foreign, who see a quick cash-grabbing opportunity. When the state establishes a monopoly over a specific economic domain, it aims to conserve vital economic interests and ensure public and national security. In this case, if only the state holds the monopoly on recycling materials, the economic value of recycled metal would be nil, rendering criminal activity unprofitable and unjustifiable. As a result, certain criminal activities and risks to public safety could be mitigated. This example illustrates the necessity of a state monopoly.

For example, in our country, we have privatised vital public services and infrastructure, such as water services, the energy grid, gas transporter infrastructure, railways, oil reserves, and the steel industry, among others.

Our question in our manifesto is: What should the state do when a foreign entity acts in bad faith, causing damage to vital economic infrastructure, economic losses, market irregularities, and manipulation of markets that affect Britain economy, public services, increase public expenditures, cause economic damage, and hinder the overall development of the country? These situations result in a country losing its economic independence. Therefore, we propose a set of laws and policies to tackle this phenomenon and strengthen the economic independence of our country, the of Britain .

Public Interest Nationalisation Act

The public economy, infrastructure, and resources of Britain are the property of taxpayers and lawful citizens of Britain , under the administration of the government. These cannot be privatized to 100%. It is illegal for a non-Britain entity to sell, remove, or duplicate abroad a Britain product defined as a Britain national brand or "Made in Britain" national trademark.

As a precedent, we cite the example of a Chinese company that bought the main British steel company in Scunthorpe or the US hedge funds that acquired public water companies in Britain. Based on the analysis of these cases, we will formulate the grounds for establishing laws of state monopoly to prevent bad actors from destroying and profiteering off vital public infrastructure and services, where the national economy has been damaged and citizens deprived of essential public services.

The State is the only issuer of a State Monopoly. The law will grant to the State the limits, extensions and the purpose of its powers.

The State can issue a State Monopoly when it is in the Public Interest to do so or when matters of National Security and vital strategic interests impose these measures. By default it is prohibited for any private companies or any other private or foreign entities to instaure a monopoly on our internal economic markets.

This is a felony and breaching of the Law of Fair Competition on the Market and Undermining of State Authority and Interests.

Courts should impose fines to cover the prejudice calculated at the length of the felony and the length of the time needed to restore the damage.

As well a compensation index up to 75% would be added to the initial claim for loss of profit and opportunities.

No company shall practice monopolistic practices like nowadays with the contracts on different services where someone is binded to a lengthy contract without having the freedom of choice.

Examples are various from your service provider, telecommunication, broadband, utilities which companies are forcing a customer to accept up to a 3 year's contract without any possibility of real change and without any express mandatory obligation for that company to provide good quality services. These practices are monopolies and should be prohibited by this Constitution.

This Constitution guarantees and defends the freedom of economic competition on the market.

It is discriminatory and prohibits any unethical practices as Credit Scores punitive measures and refusing an employment to someone based on his credit score should be deemed unlawful and discriminatory.

The customers should have the first choice in products and services . This is the main fundamental right of the economy that needs to be respected and reinforced if needed.

National Economic Security Act. Antitrust and Free Markets Protection

We stand at a critical juncture in our economic history. Britain , a beacon of innovation and enterprise, faces a grave threat to its economic independence and the very fabric of its competitive spirit. For too long, the laws designed to safeguard fair competition and protect our markets

have been neglected, leaving the Competition and Markets Authority with insufficient authority to act decisively. This must change, and it must change now.

The absence of robust antitrust enforcement has allowed unfair competition to flourish, stifling the dynamism that once defined our natural economy. We have witnessed the erosion of countless market positions due to unchecked practices that favour a select few at the expense of many. Mergers and corporate acquisitions, while often cloaked in the guise of progress, have constricted the Britain market, granting an unfair advantage to our economic competitors abroad. This is not merely a matter of commerce; it is a question of national security, a direct challenge to our sovereignty and economic independence.

The laws of trust and fair competition, once the bedrock of our economic system, have been systematically undermined. Monopolies have taken root across diverse sectors, suffocating competition and subverting the national economy. From telecommunications to energy, from railways to retail, a handful of dominant players have controlled markets for the past two decades, leaving consumers and small businesses at their mercy. This cannot continue.

Consider, for a moment, the plight of the ordinary citizen. In the rental market, a small number of overseas landlords and property owners, holding vast portfolios of hundreds of properties, dictate prices and terms.

They impose unethical and, in some cases, illegal criteria in demanding guarantors, credit scores, or lengthy contract commitments. Let's take for example the recent ways in targeted exclusion of Native British Population from the Housing Market like no DSS allowed it's now getting replaced by a mandatory guarantor with a property and increased credit checks scrutiny. It's getting harder and more difficult for a working class family to get access to housing in their own country of

origin. Practices like creating systemically discrimination would always impact only a certain type of people and those would be more targeted by this system. Why native British people be unfairly affected by these criterias. Let's take for instance a Native British working class individual and a newcomer of the same age. Asking a Native born British individual to have the same credit score with a newcomer that resided here in the last 5 or 10 years compared with someone that resided here all his life since birth. If both have the same age, let's say 30 year's, the most disfavoured by this criteria would be the Native British Individual because he lived more into the country and had the probability to accumulate more debts than a foreigner that is only 5 or 10 years for example. This is an example of Monopolistic and discriminatory trust practice.

This Constitution it's in defence of British people and British people first of those natives of this land by heritage and ancestry and sometimes of integrated foreign born British citizens but only based on a strong connection with a Native British Individual, as marriage, children that can inherit automatically the British Citizenship by one of their parents being British.

However, if foreign monopoly dictates upon vital strategic social infrastructure like “ Housing “ then the question is how much this would affect our country ?

Fundamentally who's controlling the housing market it's controlling your population. Every human being needs decent and affordable housing conditions. A strong nation comes on the back of a nation of proprietaries.

When someone is controlling your housing market it's stagnating your national economy. A working force that's not prosperous where a good chunk of British working class families are going in foreign pockets this is one of biggest sources of economic stagnation.

Housing must be Exclusive Strategic State Monopoly . Social housing cannot be sold for profit. In fact if social housing has been sold in the past and transformed into rented property this now should be made illegal and properties need to be compulsory purchased by the State or if

they're in poor conditions the fines must exceed the value of these properties.

The State must be the unique guarantor for a rented property.

These practices artificially inflate prices, locking out hardworking families and individuals from affordable housing. The same pattern repeats across industries: telecommunications providers impose punitive contract termination fees; airlines, railways, and public transport operators fix prices to the detriment of consumers; and energy companies exploit their dominance to keep costs high. This is not a free market—it is a rigged one.

Inflating the rental prices artificially the mortgage rates would follow as a consequence of the markets as higher demand trigger higher prices but these occur because of

The time has come to act with resolve. The current antitrust laws, though well-intentioned, are inadequate for the challenges we face. They must be elevated to a constitutional article, enshrined as a fundamental pillar of our legal framework. We must send an unequivocal message that monopolistic practices will not be tolerated, whether they originate from multinational corporations or local landlords. The law must apply universally, from the smallest business to the largest conglomerate.

To restore fairness, we propose bold measures. Higher taxes on excessive revenues, stringent fines, and price controls tied to profit margins must be imposed on those who create trusts or engage in anti-competitive behaviour. Properties illegally acquired from local councils, originally intended for social housing, should be confiscated and returned to their rightful purpose—serving the public, not private profit. The state must also assert its rights over critical infrastructure, from satellite and aerial spaces to railways, energy, and commerce. Internet and mobile providers, profiting from our shared resources, must be taxed accordingly. Landfills, too, must be regulated, with fines for industrial non-recycling disposal to ensure environmental accountability alongside economic justice.

This is a call to action for the preservation of our economic sovereignty, for the protection of our small businesses, and for the empowerment of every citizen who seeks a fair chance in a free market. Let us rebuild a place where competition thrives, where innovation is rewarded, and where no one—neither corporate giant nor overseas investor—can hold our economy hostage. The path forward is clear: strengthen our laws, empower our institutions, and reclaim our markets for the people. Together, we can forge a future that honours our heritage of fairness and secures our prosperity for generations to come.

In the past, so called unethical corporationist practices were unpunished because of lack of regulation and little or no accountability.

The 21st century brought new technologies and advances, it also brought more criminal sophistication, where criminality ascended up to corporationist levels whose practices as deceiving trade, unfair competition, exploitation of labour & modern slavery are realities and challenges that we face nowadays as society.

New antitrust and monopoly powers will aim to strengthen a fairer, equitable free economy in defence of our free capitalist market, free initiative and fair trade.

The State of Antitrust Laws and the CMA in Britain

Historical Context of Britain Antitrust Laws,

Antitrust and competition law in Britain have deep historical roots, dating back to measures like King Edward the Confessor's prohibitions on forestalling in the 11th century, which prevented merchants from buying goods before they reached the market to inflate prices. Modern Britain competition law is primarily governed by the "Competition Act 1998" and the "Enterprise Act 2002", which replaced earlier frameworks like the Office of Fair Trading (OFT) with the establishment of the CMA in 2014 under the 'Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013'.

These laws aim to prohibit anti-competitive agreements, abuse of dominant positions, and mergers that substantially lessen competition. However, the CMA's enforcement powers and the broader antitrust framework have been criticized for lacking sufficient authority to address modern market challenges, particularly in digital markets, housing, and critical infrastructure sectors like energy and telecommunications, etc.

Britain's economy stands at a critical juncture, where insufficient antitrust enforcement has allowed monopolistic practices to proliferate across key sectors, eroding competition, inflating prices, and undermining consumer welfare. Dominant players in telecommunications, energy, railways, and housing have consolidated substantial market power, often at the expense of ordinary citizens. In the rental market, for instance, a small number of overseas landlords control large swathes of properties, imposing stringent requirements such as guarantors and high credit scores that artificially drive up rents and exclude many from affordable housing. Similarly, broadband and telecom providers lock consumers into lengthy contracts with punitive early exit fees, creating arrangements that prioritise corporate profits over service quality or affordability. These issues extend beyond individual sectors: online e-commerce platforms have decimated domestic retail, while supermarkets have posted exorbitant revenues amid cost-of-living pressures, energy crises, and geopolitical disruptions. Artificial price hikes in response to fluctuating oil and gas costs, coupled with inadequate scrutiny, exemplify a broader pattern of exploitative behaviour that demands robust legal safeguards.

The Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), Britain's primary enforcer of competition law, has seen its powers expanded through the Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Act 2024 (often referred to in discussions as effective from 2025), which introduced measures to tackle "killer acquisitions" of nascent competitors and established a Strategic Market Status regime for dominant digital firms. This

legislation also grants the CMA direct enforcement capabilities, including fines of up to 10% of global turnover for consumer law breaches. Despite these advancements, the CMA's authority remains constrained compared to counterparts in the European Union or the United States. In the EU, Articles 101 and 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union enable stricter penalties and more proactive regulation, particularly in digital markets. Across the Atlantic, the Sherman Act of 1890 and Clayton Act of 1914 have historically provided formidable tools against monopolisation, though enforcement has varied. Historical mergers in Britain have already concentrated markets, granting unfair advantages to global entities and weakening domestic firms. Procedural and jurisdictional limitations hinder the CMA's ability to impose decisive sanctions or conduct thorough investigations, leaving unethical practices—such as price-fixing, exclusionary contracts, and restrictive terms—largely under-addressed.

The ramifications extend far beyond economic fairness to encompass national security and sovereignty. Monopolies in critical infrastructure, including energy, telecommunications, and satellite systems, diminish Britain's independence and expose the nation to foreign influence. Private control over social housing and unregulated profits from shared resources like satellite airspace highlight glaring oversight gaps. The CMA's interventions have delivered tangible benefits, with estimates indicating that its competition work has saved consumers billions annually in recent years, underscoring the high stakes involved. Yet, without more fundamental reform, these vulnerabilities will persist, risking further erosion of Britain's competitive edge and economic resilience.

To confront these systemic challenges, Britain should elevate antitrust principles to a constitutional level, enshrining the protection of competition as a core tenet of its legal framework. The existing regime, rooted in the Competition Act 1998 and Enterprise Act 2002, struggles to address the complexities of contemporary markets dominated by

entrenched players and foreign interests. A constitutional article would empower the CMA with supreme investigative and enforcement authority, including the capacity to impose substantial fines—potentially up to 50% of global turnover in egregious cases—confiscate assets acquired through anti-competitive means, and mandate price controls where dominance prevails. It would explicitly prohibit practices that restrict competition, from price-fixing and market sharing to exclusionary contracts and discriminatory criteria in housing. Moreover, the state would assert sovereignty over critical resources, regulating and taxing profits from satellite airspace, energy networks, railways, and landfills to promote economic independence and environmental accountability.

Such an article would ensure universal application of antitrust rules, levelling the playing field for small businesses and multinational corporations alike. Judicial oversight through bodies like the Competition Appeal Tribunal, combined with enhanced liaison with prosecution services and police powers to treat macro-systemic fraud as a national security threat, would guarantee fairness and accountability. Implementation could involve parliamentary legislation requiring broad consensus, restructuring enforcement through a dedicated National Economic Policing Agency merging relevant bodies, nationwide public consultation, sector-specific guidelines, and international cooperation with the EU and US to combat cross-border issues like tax evasion and market fraud.

Critics might contend that constitutional entrenchment risks over-regulation and stifles innovation. However, evidence from robust regimes elsewhere demonstrates that strong enforcement drives productivity, reduces prices, and encourages genuine competition by preventing dominant firms from excluding entrants. The CMA's own assessments affirm that interventions foster business formation, higher wages, and sustained consumer gains. Far from hindering legitimate enterprise, a constitutional safeguard would target exploitative conduct

while preserving dynamic markets.

In conclusion, Britain must act boldly to restore competition as a cornerstone of its economy. By embedding antitrust protections at a constitutional level, the government can strengthen the CMA, prohibit unethical practices, protect consumers from exploitation, and safeguard national security against monopolistic and foreign dominance. This reform would lower prices, expand choice, spur innovation, and ensure economic sovereignty, reaffirming Britain's commitment to fair, resilient, and truly competitive markets for the benefit of all its people.

Britain faces a mounting environmental crisis from the relentless proliferation of plastic waste, particularly polyethylene terephthalate (PET), which dominates packaging for bottles, containers, and myriad everyday products. This material, prized for its durability and versatility, has become a scourge upon the nation's landscapes, soils, and waters. Microplastics derived from degraded PET and other plastics infiltrate ecosystems, contaminating freshwater sources, agricultural land, and even the food chain, with profound implications for biodiversity, human health, and long-term soil fertility. The patchwork of diverse plastic formulations, compounded by fragmented private recycling efforts, has rendered effective recovery impossible, allowing vast quantities of waste to persist in landfills or escape into the environment. Current recycling rates for plastic packaging in the United Kingdom hover disappointingly low, with figures around 44 to 55 per cent in recent years, far short of the ambitious targets needed to stem this tide. Foreign imports of subsidised plastics further undermine domestic efforts, exposing British industry to unfair competition while perpetuating reliance on virgin materials.

The proposed Polyethylene Terephthalate Standardisation and State Recycling Act represents a decisive and transformative response to these challenges. Mandating a single, standardised PET type—defined by a uniform molecular structure and free from recycling-impeding additives—this legislation would eliminate the incompatibility that plagues existing systems.

All plastic packaging manufactured, imported, or sold in Britain would conform to this DEFRA-certified standard, ensuring seamless integration into recycling streams. Non-compliance would incur severe penalties, including fines up to £5 million or 17 per cent of annual turnover, enforced rigorously by the Environment Agency.

Such standardisation draws on the intrinsic advantages of PET: its high melting point of around 245°C and density of 1.38 to 1.43 g/cm³ make it particularly amenable to advanced chemical recycling processes.

Such as hydrolysis, which breaks the polymer into reusable monomers, and enzymatic depolymerisation can extend the life of recycled material making it economically viable and this also will help the environment by reducing plastic contamination of soil and waters.

Central to the Act is the establishment of the National PET Recycling Authority (NPRA), a state monopoly operating under DEFRA oversight. The NPRA would assume responsibility for nationwide collection, sorting, and processing of PET waste, deploying cutting-edge hydrolysis and enzymatic techniques to create a true closed-loop system. Private entities would be barred from independent PET processing without approval, preventing market fragmentation and ensuring uniform high standards. This unified approach contrasts sharply with the European Union's Single-Use Plastics Directive, which mandates 25 per cent recycled content in PET beverage bottles by 2025—a target hampered by inconsistent enforcement and auditing—offering instead a resolute, nationally controlled model that prioritises domestic circularity.

Funding mechanisms within the Act would drive the transition towards sustainability. A PET Recycling Levy of £300 per tonne on virgin PET production would incentivise the use of recycled material, while the existing Plastic Packaging Tax—currently around £224 per tonne for packaging with less than 30 per cent recycled content—would continue, with heightened penalties for non-compliance. Revenues would finance NPRA operations, research into innovative recycling technologies, and subsidies to assist businesses in adapting production lines. A two-year

transition period, supported by grants, would mitigate disruption, allowing industry to retool without undue hardship.

The environmental and economic imperatives underpinning this proposal are compelling. The NPRA would target 90 per cent PET recycling within a decade, dramatically reducing landfill burdens, curbing carbon emissions, and reclaiming valuable resources for domestic use. By prioritising British production of recycled PET, the Act would shield manufacturers from subsidised foreign competition, as highlighted in reviews by the Trade Remedies Authority, and foster thousands of sustainable jobs in collection, processing, and innovation. This is not merely waste management; it is a strategic assertion of economic sovereignty, diminishing dependence on imported plastics and transforming a global crisis into a national opportunity for self-sufficiency.

Critics may argue that a state monopoly risks stifling private-sector innovation or imposing excessive burdens on business. Yet the evidence suggests otherwise: modest measures like the current Plastic Packaging Tax have failed to shift markets decisively due to their limited ambition and scope. A more robust, enforced framework—backed by substantial levies, strict prohibitions on non-compliant plastics, and public stewardship—would compel genuine adaptation while channelling investment into sustainable technologies. The Act's provisions for asset confiscation and criminal penalties for persistent offenders underscore a commitment to accountability, ensuring that polluters bear the cost rather than society at large.

In essence, the Polyethylene Terephthalate Standardisation and State Recycling Act embodies a bold pledge to reclaim Britain's environmental integrity and economic resilience. By forging a unified PET standard and entrusting its recycling to a dedicated national authority, the nation can halt the irreversible contamination of soil and waters, build a thriving circular economy, and set a global benchmark for sustainability. This is

leadership rooted in science, necessity, and national interest—a determination to ensure that future generations inherit cleaner ecosystems, a stronger economy, and true independence from the plastic plague that has too long afflicted our shores. The moment demands decisive action; through this Act, Britain can rise to meet it.

Economic Independence of Britain

National Food Security Act & Agriculture and Farming Act.

Constitutional Article

Introduction:

Currently our "living" implies unsupportable levels of economic pressure, price hikes and a death spiral of inflation that seems uncontrollable. Every day the working people of this country are confronted with uncontrollable inflation, higher prices for food, lesser quality amongst many other issues.

Times of famine and poverty depicted during the Victorian era or WW2, are recurring again, in an era where progress should benefit the many not the few, where our technological level would allow us to harvest more food and produce enough to ensure the subsistence of an entire country including ours, Britain.

Internal farming and food production has been affected by inheritance tax as result of illegal activity of an "Occupation Government". This tendency is common elsewhere too but it's manifesting more sharply and aggressively here in where the agricultural land is relatively scarce and

moreover has been sacrificed in favour of zero net energy where cultivable fields have been transformed in so called “ solar farms “ where agricultural vital land is occupied to produce electricity in exchange for our Food Security.

Beside this measures been utterly ineffective , undoubtedly madness at an industrial scale , should be deemed illegal as destruction of vital agricultural land and inducing famine amongst native population of a country should be seen as an act of war and genocide against British people.

This is not the only problem of today agriculture in , except heavy regulations and chaotic regimes of hard taxation of our domestic farmers, the main issue consists in the monopolistic blockage of third party food distribution chains who are fixing the prices illegally in disfavour of native farmers , offering pennies per tones of grain for instance where they selling at way higher and extortionate prices to the public making obscene profits by damaging the internal market inducing poverty amongst our national producers and subjecting the public to extortionate prices for food for everyone daily subsistence. The words " Poverty, Famine, Child famine in this country should have been long forgotten somewhere in some pages of an historic manual. Unfortunately we are living the same historical patterns and we are experiencing issues that our ancestors and predecessors have resolved for us a while ago .

This is the Constitutional Army of People Manifesto for Agriculture .

Main points:

The State is truly responsible for ensuring the means and facilities to access food and water for its Citizens.

Fundamental right of People to Life. This is the main Economic Commandment in which any Prosperous Nation has been founded on Earth.

The State's role is to defend the Right of Property over the Land of its Citizens for its Citizens and their benefit only.

Laws issued by the State must be only and only to preserve and reinforce this Right.

Agriculture it's the main source of survival for the nation.

It's unlawful that the State or any other authority would tax directly the farmer and his activity.

Farming must be Declared as Vital Strategic Activity for the Nation.

It's illegal for any Agricultural land to be dispossessed from its vital purpose to ensure the alimentary security of the Nation.

State has the obligation to establish a National Agricultural Circuit with the sole purpose to assess if the Nation alimentary needs are met.

No Agricultural land should be dispossessed from its purpose.

If an agricultural land it's sold it's recognised as propriety of the current owner that freely can transfer his property towards a different owner.

The only injunction would be in changing the purpose of the land.

Agricultural land should be used only for agriculture.

Any direct Tax on Agriculture issued by the State it's now declared as Unlawful.

The State must support the local Agriculture and any guidance should be meant to preserve the local farmer, to ensure correct market rules meant to give him a fair access to market without prejudice.

Water should be declared State Patrimony and its administration must be equitable and responsible to ensure it is accessible and plentiful for all citizens' needs, especially in Agriculture and Consumption.

Any tax on National Farmers must be abolished, including capital tax, income tax, capital tax and so on. This measure is to ensure that the farmers would sell their products to the public at the lowest price possible and advantageous for the farmer and the buyer which is the public.

The state must create and regulate a free Agricultural market where the producer should sell directly to the Public without any third party and no middle man .

Zero tax policy would apply to all British food producers as animal and poultry farmers and fishermen.

The currently does not have the capacity to ensure his alimentary food self-sufficiency.

Historically the country has been self-sufficient and reliable on trade, industry, animal farming combined with specific cultures adapted to the climate and environment of . Potatoes, carrot, cabbage, onion, leeks have grown in abundance in fruit trees and some greens. Some Medieval plants like stinging nettles have been abandoned by Modern Gastronomy. Historically, it has always been known to be self-reliant on internal food production and self-sufficiency.

The current situation of Agriculture is that the country relies on imported food, controlled prices by foreign corporations with current complicity to remove more Land from the Agricultural Circuit of the country to make room for more dwellings, housing which in time would become slums.

Who's dictating your food supply it's dictating the terms of your surrender as a country. This is another lesson of history. Each Invader Army from Roman Empire, to Genghis Khan, Arabs, Ottomans and others used this as the main tactic called to cut the enemy lines meaning to block their flux of supplies including basic vital supplies such as water and food.

In continuation we used the existing data and the most recent data on Britain food self-sufficiency comes from 2023 and 2024 reports, primarily from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and related analyses:

Overall Self-Sufficiency (2023):

Britain is approximately 62% self-sufficient in food by economic value, consistent with the past decade. For indigenous foods (those that

can be commercially grown in Britain), self-sufficiency is around these figures;

-By Volume (2024 Projection):

Analysis from the Energy and Climate Intelligence Unit (ECIU) estimates a decline in self-sufficiency across all farming sectors by 8% by volume, from an average of 86% (2018-2022) to 78% in 2024, due to adverse weather impacting crops (according to the report).

Fresh Vegetables: Self-sufficiency is at a record low of 53% in 2023, down from higher levels in previous years.

Fresh Fruit: Self-sufficiency remains low at 16-18%, with heavy reliance on imports for tropical and other fruits.

Potatoes: Self-sufficiency is around 71%, a 16% decline over the last 20 years.

Oilseed Rape: Projected to fall to a historic low of 40% in 2024, down from 75% (2018-2022).

Meat, Dairy, and Eggs: Britain produces roughly equivalent volumes to consumption, with near 100% self-sufficiency in poultry, eggs, and milk, though some imports occur due to consumer preferences for specific types of products however, new spikes in energy prices and disloyal competition might

Historical Context: Self-sufficiency has declined from a high of 78% in 1984, to the current 62% for all food production.

No data was available for years 2024 and 2025 in the moment when this article was written.

These figures reflect challenges like extreme weather (i.e., the wet

winter of 2023-2024), labour shortages, and reliance on global supply chains for items not suited to Britain's climate.

The data underscores that while Britain is strong in certain sectors like grains and livestock, it remains dependent on imports for nearly half its food consumption, particularly for fruits and vegetables.

These figures show a decline in food security in Britain , these data are from 2023 and now , these effects are sharper. Issues with imported food, hyper taxation of farmers oblige them to leave their crops on the fields as they cannot even sell it to no one as the market is associated by the monopolistic hyper chains who are invading our market with cheaper products produced overseas from Third World countries as South America, Africa, and rest of the world. The retaliation of EU and Brexit blockade have contributed to this situation and inheritance tax on top has made it impossible for British farmers and fishermen. No need to mention the decline of the British industry of beef , pork and poultry affected by hiking costs of electricity, induced inflation , EU blockade , lack of personnel and many other issues.

Nation Forward Project for National Agriculture.

This Act is the decision and necessity to create a free Agricultural National Market with the purpose of eliminating the blockade of third party hypermarket chains and middlemen in agriculture and food production and to ensure fair prices for the British national producers and British Public. Currently the British producers are being offered prices way below their limit of subsistence and with heavy and hyper taxation from the current government. This leaves room for exploitation and obscene speculative profit margins from the supermarket chains , where they keep artificially inflated prices to the consumer only to buy as low as possible from local farmers if not more likely from overseas farmers at prices of pure human exploitation for the to keep selling high to the British public.

There`s a solution and always the best solution is in the hands of the people . We are proposing today the creation of a Free Market for the National Food Producers . This project will be called Nation Forward Enterprise .

This enterprise will act as a substitute for all current hypermarkets who sell at extraordinary and hyper inflated prices to all British consumers.

Nation Forward Organisational Structure:

Nation Forward will be a mixed enterprise with 50% of shares in direct control of the State , as the tax payers associations, civil society , Constitutional Army of People and farmers and food producers if they want to invest . The elected Government will administer just 1% and the Institution of Head of State 0.5% .

The rest of 48.5% would be sold as shares on the free market if capital where the main offer will be made to all British residents and citizens in order to attract the financing and capital necessary for this project. Nation Forward will be listed on the stock markets exchange .

The beneficiaries would be the British public equally as British farmers and food producers where they could bring their production directly into the markets and local city halls that will be built in every British city , with modern conditions of sale, dispatch, refrigeration , food presentation access for public, parking and local transport routes in a whole modern version of our traditional medieval city markets that sustained our economy and life for millennia ensuring prosperity and abundance for the people.

British farmers would need to organise themselves into a National Guild that can have political rights and at least one reserved Independent seat in Parliament. From the standpoint of view , any direct taxation would be eliminated . The farmers would produce more , sell their products cheaper enough to be widely accessible to the public. In this case a genuine economic growth would be visible, where a current basket for sustaining a family of 3 to 4 people might reach somewhere around £300-£400 for minimum basic essential basket . Now if this reform would bring the same basket around £150 this would be our main goal.

This reform and project is vitally linked with the other project of Energetic Independence of where further energetic grants can be issued for the producers to keep the prices even lower and within the required margins of their profits as well . The main barriers for local farmers is the absence of direct access to the public, as opening a store today in it

requires an astronomic rent, plus electricity bills, then hyper taxation from HMRC , PAYE , VAT , making this endeavour quite unfeasible form the majority just a dream or the impossibility in itself.

Once the local farmers , and fishermen would have direct access to a direct and organised market where they can trade freely , safely in tune with standard food safety and hygiene this would make the price of groceries more cheaper and accessible to the public.

As well, direct contracts with schools, hospitals, and the army for food supplies locally produced would be another important advantage for British Agriculture.

The main investment would be around the facilities of New built markets with conditions of storage , refrigeration , chillers and shelves to allow the trade to be optimal. As well investments in packing stations , bottling , smoking , grilling , boiling, pasteurising and labelling . This activity will be supervised by a Central Labeling and Quality Control Government Agency that will test the meats , fish , and poultry against detection of parasites and trichinella and many others , the use of additives and preservatives only approved by law and the Food Safety Commission where test would be relevant and approved . This must be free of cost as much as possible but if the added costs would be higher then it would be necessary that farmers and producers would need to pay for a yearly certificate and label in order to cover at least the salaries costs of the staff from the Governmental Agency for Food Safety & Standards.

Nation Forward will be an importer and exporter as well upon demand . The importation policy must be fair and beneficial for the

external partner , always seeking to pay above the local market price to attract the best offer and selling reasonably to ensure a solid and constant profit which is the best business attitude, something that is perishable stock must be sold as soon as it's been put out on the market ensuring that the initial demand has been met .

Labelling and packing would and must be 100% recyclable to reduce packaging costs and reduce the pressure on Councils which makes the product more expensive because the packaging cannot be recycled and adjacent costs would incur from Councils due to increasing demand for spaces and recycling facilities that are quite scarce in .

This is the Constitutional Army goal for the National Agriculture for a more sustainable agriculture, fairer trading and elimination of middle man from the market. This would give more to the local farmer and more for their money to the consumer.

The Economic Independence of Britain

Water Act.

Constitutional Article

Water is a Human Right . Must be free to everyone to drink , Must be preserved by everyone and owned by no one other than the people who the land belongs to.

Can be sold and bought only for business and not to be wasted . Wasting the Nation's water or destroying it intentionally by pollution , devastation of environment or diversion of rivers and sources of water must be declared as a crime against the people and punished as genocide

or attempt to destroy people's health, agriculture and affect their life and their generations.

In Britain , since our Public Water Services have been privatised in a country which water was a synonym with the name of Britain well renowned by its rainy weather it's is almost impossible to conceive that we have a crisis of drinking water and during the summers of 2023, 2024 and 2025 restrictions must be put in place because we are beginning to lack and be depicted with this vital resource for life when we had this in such an abundance in the past .

This is the result of Mass Invasion successive Governments of National treason and occupation have brought us in this situation of extreme poverty , making us from such a rich country into an oriental deserted country where children there are selling water on the street due to scarcity , this is the future promised for Britain by Inclusion and Diversity ? To live in a deserted country with no land, no food and no water ?

Nationalisation is compulsory . Fines must be dedicated fines that would exceed the value of their investment and also damages must be paid in compensation for pollution and destruction of our sources of clear water .

This would be another effort that the generation to come will need to foot the bills on the account of incompetence of those who we left in charge to destroy our country and to semble famine and drought in our rich lands.

Legal definition and Constitutional definition of Water Act .

Water belongs to the Nation. It is a Strategic vital Objective. Must be

guarded under armed forces that will patrol and ensure that no enemy agents will poison the water, polluting or destroying it.

Water would be administered only by the State. Will be sold to commercial agents under a business license only , to distilleries , winery , soft drinks and so on under a commercial price.

By Law water is free for everyone to drink in Public Spaces . Water should be cleared by any added substances as fluorides and any other additives like chlorines , nitrates and many others. It will be monitored against bacteria and diseases regularly .

Poisoning , pollution and any irresponsible act that will damage our water supplies would be considered as a criminal act punishable up to life in prison for all those responsible and if it is a business all assets will be confiscated . Preserving the water sources now must be a mandatory responsibility for all citizens , businesses and State institutions.

Selling drinking water is now illegal in every form bottled, canned or served in public spaces.

Britain faces mounting water stress, particularly in the southeast, where population pressures, climate variability, and ageing infrastructure threaten long-term supply security. The Environment Agency has projected that without decisive intervention, England could confront a shortfall exceeding 4,800 million litres per day by 2050, with regions such as London, Kent, and East Anglia already experiencing acute constraints. Domestic consumption averages around 140 litres per person daily, of which toilet flushing alone accounts for roughly 30 per cent in many households, while gardening, laundry, and other non-ingestion uses add further substantial demand. Industrial and agricultural sectors compound the strain, often drawing on high-quality freshwater for

processes that require far lower purity.

A dual-pipe distribution system offers a pragmatic response by segregating potable and non-potable supplies. One network would deliver rigorously treated drinking water exclusively for consumption, cooking, and personal hygiene such as bathing. A parallel network would convey treated seawater, recycled wastewater, or harvested rainwater for toilet flushing, laundry, outdoor cleaning, garden irrigation, industrial cooling, vehicle washing, and similar applications. This separation reserves scarce freshwater for essential human needs while substituting abundant or recoverable sources for the remainder, which frequently comprises 30 to 50 per cent of total domestic and a significant share of non-domestic demand.

The advantages are compelling. By diverting non-potable uses to alternative sources, the system substantially lowers pressure on aquifers, rivers, and reservoirs, allowing natural recharge and ecosystem recovery. Treatment costs decline markedly for non-potable water, as reverse osmosis for desalination or advanced filtration for wastewater recycling need only achieve safety for external contact rather than ingestion standards. Resilience improves against drought cycles, while agriculture and industry gain reliable, cost-effective supplies compliant with environmental norms. Coastal geography favours seawater intake near major estuaries such as the Thames, Mersey, or Tyne, minimising conveyance distances.

Implementation would prioritise phased development to manage expense and disruption. New housing estates, industrial parks, and public

buildings must incorporate dual plumbing from the outset, with colour-coded pipelines—typically blue for potable and purple or black for non-potable—to eliminate cross-connection risks. Retrofitting older urban areas, though capital-intensive, becomes feasible in dense zones like London, Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool, where economies of scale apply. Existing wastewater or stormwater infrastructure could be repurposed where it is structurally sound, supplemented by dedicated pumping stations to sustain pressure in non-potable lines.

Treatment facilities form the backbone. Desalination plants using reverse osmosis would target non-potable output, requiring less energy than potable-grade production and generating brine manageable through regulated discharge or beneficial reuse. Wastewater recycling would upgrade municipal plants with membrane filtration, ultraviolet disinfection, and other processes already piloted in the United Kingdom, leveraging current assets to contain costs. Both approaches demand careful brine and concentrate management to protect marine environments.

End-use adaptations vary by sector. In homes, separate toilets, washing-machine, and external taps would connect to non-potable lines, with smart metering focused on potable consumption to incentivise conservation. Industrial sites would install dedicated feeds for cooling towers, cleaning, and processing, while agricultural areas in East Anglia could draw from pipelines or canals for drip irrigation, augmented by urban rainwater harvesting transferred to drought-prone fields. Safety hinges on stringent standards: updated Water Supply Regulations would define non-potable quality thresholds, mandate backflow prevention

devices, and require routine inspections and testing. Public campaigns would explain the system, dispel misconceptions, and highlight benefits, addressing unfounded concerns about hygiene or disease risk through evidence-based education.

Funding would blend public and private sources. Sovereign bonds and shares in a commercial arm of state-owned or regulated water entities could attract domestic investment, supplemented by DEFRA grants and utility contributions. Lower tariffs for non-potable water would encourage uptake, while incentives—grants for retrofitting, tax relief for dual-pipe adoption—would accelerate domestic and business participation. National research institutes and university programmes should receive targeted support to advance low-energy desalination, efficient recycling, and durable piping materials such as composite or modern PVC variants resistant to biofouling.

Pilot schemes in water-stressed localities—new developments in Kent or southeast London, public buildings, or industrial clusters—would test viability, refine costs, and demonstrate savings. Success here paves the way for broader rollout, mandating dual systems in future construction and offering subventions to manufacturers of compliant equipment.

Parallel to technological adaptation, a complementary strategy would impose a century-long moratorium on new residential, industrial, commercial, or religious development in designated green zones, allowing ecosystems to regenerate and aquifers to replenish. Compulsory demolition of unauthorised structures or slums encroaching on protected areas such as the Lake District would follow, with those sites placed

under armed forces or specialised ranger protection to prevent illegal felling or degradation. A strict prohibition on tree removal from public land would apply: only naturally dead or storm-damaged specimens could be felled, while healthy trees obstructing necessary public works must be carefully uprooted and replanted elsewhere, prioritising water-scarce regions. Violations—cutting a healthy tree without authorisation—would incur severe penalties, with fines reaching £100,000 or more for businesses and up to £50,000 for individuals, treated as criminal damage to vital natural capital.

These combined measures—dual-pipe infrastructure and enforced ecological restoration—promise substantial water savings: potentially 30 to 50 per cent reduction in potable domestic demand and 20 to 40 per cent in industrial and agricultural withdrawals. Long-term benefits include lower treatment and maintenance expenditures, reduced consumer bills through decreased reliance on expensive potable supplies, and enhanced climate resilience. By confronting prejudices that equate non-potable use with deprivation or risk, often rooted in exaggerated cleanliness concerns, society can embrace practical resource stewardship. Progress demands recognising that tap water and bottled water often share identical origins, yet one incurs unnecessary plastic waste and cost. Rational management today secures abundance tomorrow, balancing human needs with the natural systems that sustain them.

Economic Independence of Britain

The Energy Independence Law of Britain

Constitutional Article

Introduction

The matter of energy it's vital for the national economy and the control upon this sector it's vitally strategic.

Who is controlling the energy sector it's controlling the economy of an entire country. Hence why it's so vital that the State must own the majority of stake in all energy companies including producers and providers as well the infrastructure of gas and electricity the national energy grid and national gas infrastructure must be controlled by the State also.

Many supporters in favour of privatisation of the energy sector have failed to foresee future crises in the entire chain of economy and supply due to international conflicts.

When oil and gas prices are hiking the entire economy it's under pressure and the private companies are adding to a higher cost of inflation hiking energy prices up to unbearable levels sometimes most affected is domestic consumption.

The State needs to have a Strategic Monopoly in Energy to be able to control its own economy. Producing cheaper domestic energy means the reduction of inflation and the best healthy recipe for sustainable and constant economic growth.

Energy is the backbone of any modern economy, and its control is a matter of strategic national importance.

The reliance on privatised energy markets has exposed vulnerabilities, particularly during international crises that drive up oil and gas prices, placing immense pressure on the economy.

This report proposes a comprehensive framework for establishing energy independence through state-led initiatives, including the nationalisation of key energy sectors, investment in sustainable infrastructure, and the creation of a National Energy System (NES)

modelled on the principles of the National Health Service (NHS). The objective is to ensure affordable, reliable, and sustainable energy to support economic stability and growth while addressing environmental concerns.

The Case for State Control of the Energy Sector and its primordial importance for the economy.

National Energy System (NES)

Achieving energy independence for Britain demands a comprehensive and resolute strategy that prioritises diversification of the energy mix, nationalisation of the sector, and the establishment of a robust National Energy System (NES) modelled on the National Health Service principles. This approach seeks to liberate the nation from the vulnerabilities of global energy markets, reduce costs for consumers, and foster sustainable economic growth. By synthesising key elements such as hydropower—with a heightened emphasis on tidal hydro energy—micro nuclear power, waste-to-energy technologies, and judicious integration of existing renewables, alongside a firm state monopoly on fossil fuels, Britain can transition towards self-sufficiency. The strategy emphasises funding through innovative taxation and public investment rather than burdening household energy bills, while addressing environmental concerns, including minimal impacts on

agriculture and irrigation from dam construction, and enhancing infrastructure resilience. In essence, this framework transforms energy from a commodified resource into a cornerstone of national security and prosperity, with careful consideration of cost efficiencies through alternatives like biogas for heating and prioritised public transport to minimise overall expenditure. Central to this vision is the diversification of energy sources, with a particular focus on hydropower as a reliable and enduring renewable option, shifting emphasis towards tidal hydro energy to capitalise on Britain's extensive coastline. Tidal hydro energy, harnessing the predictable power of sea currents and tidal ranges through barrages, lagoons, and submerged turbines, stands out for its consistency, unaffected by weather variability and offering a stable supply that complements the intermittency of wind and solar. Britain's geography, featuring one of the world's highest tidal ranges in areas like the Severn Estuary (up to 14 metres), positions it ideally for large-scale projects such as the Severn Barrage, alongside sites in the Solway Firth, Mersey Estuary, and Swansea Bay. To maximise this potential and reduce reliance on land-based infrastructure, the plan proposes a mix weighted towards 60 per cent tidal systems and 40 per cent traditional dams, projected to deliver approximately one-third of Britain's annual electricity demand of 320 terawatt-hours at an estimated investment of around £49 to £57 billion. Engineering innovations for tidal projects, including modular caisson construction, dynamic flow modelling for optimal turbine placement, and submerged designs like the Orbital O2, would minimise visual and ecological disruptions while enhancing output by 5 to 10 per cent. These initiatives not only secure energy supply but also combat coastal erosion by creating artificial land barriers, protective reefs, and stable perimeters around installations, thereby bolstering shoreline defence and long-term productivity. While traditional dams form a smaller portion of the hydropower mix at 40 per cent, their implementation is designed to avoid adverse effects on agriculture and irrigation. Prioritising run-of-river schemes in highland regions such as the Scottish Highlands, Grampians, and Snowdonia in Wales—areas with steep topography and minimal arable land—ensures that projects

require little to no large reservoirs, thus preventing flooding of fertile valleys or disruption to existing farmland. These schemes operate by diverting a portion of river flow through turbines without significant water storage, maintaining natural downstream flows essential for irrigation and ecosystems. Moreover, dams can enhance agricultural resilience by providing controlled water releases during dry periods, supporting irrigation in surrounding areas without competing for land use. Environmental safeguards, including fish passages, sediment management systems compliant with Water Framework Directive standards, and prefabricated modules to expedite construction, further mitigate impacts, reducing build times by 20 per cent and costs by 10 per cent. With pumped storage integration utilising existing reservoirs like Dinorwig, this approach contributes around 35 terawatt-hours annually from 10,000 megawatts across 20 to 30 sites, all selected for high energy yield and low agricultural interference. Over a phased 15-year rollout, the combination of tidal dominance and careful dam siting ensures hydropower's reliability without compromising Britain's vital farming sector or irrigation needs. Complementing hydropower are micro nuclear plants, particularly small modular reactors, which provide scalable, low-carbon base-load power with high efficiency. These reactors, designed for enhanced safety and compactness, would contribute another third of electricity needs, requiring about 16,667 megawatts of capacity at a cost of £63 to £69 billion. Deployment would focus on existing nuclear sites like Sellafield and Sizewell to leverage infrastructure and expertise, with partnerships involving domestic firms such as Rolls-Royce accelerating technology adoption. Security measures form a critical layer, incorporating fortified perimeters, cybersecurity protocols aligned with international standards, and robust waste management to build public confidence. By phasing construction over 15 years and investing in workforce training through dedicated academies, this element mitigates risks associated with traditional large-scale nuclear facilities, ensuring operational longevity and minimal disruption. Waste-to-energy technologies further diversify the mix, transforming municipal and industrial waste into electricity via biogas production and

pyrolysis, thereby addressing waste management challenges while generating power. Scaled to cover the remaining third of electricity demand, this would entail £122 to £134 billion in investment for facilities strategically located near urban centres. Such systems reduce landfill dependency and greenhouse emissions, with potential expansion to include biogas from human and agricultural waste, as demonstrated in efficient models from other nations. This integration not only bolsters energy resilience but also supports industrial sectors requiring steady supply, aligning with broader sustainability goals, and offers synergies with heating solutions to contain costs. While wind and solar energy play a supplementary role, their limitations necessitate careful management rather than expansive new deployments. Britain's existing surplus of wind turbines and solar panels, often inefficiently integrated into the grid, should be optimised through relocation and stricter controls. Solar panels, for instance, would be removed from agricultural fields to prevent land degradation and repositioned on concrete rooftops or as fencing materials, where higher temperatures boost efficiency. Wind energy suits remote rural areas, but large-scale reliance proves uneconomical due to high infrastructure costs and vulnerability to extreme weather. Emphasising recycling of composite materials in these technologies mitigates environmental hazards, ensuring their contribution enhances rather than undermines the overall system. Underpinning this diversified portfolio is the nationalisation of the energy sector and the creation of the NES as a state-controlled entity. This system would consolidate production, distribution, and infrastructure under central oversight, eliminating market distortions where private companies inflate green energy prices to match fossil fuels. By removing intermediary levies, energy costs could plummet by 70 to 90 per cent, making it affordable and competitive. Fossil fuels, including oil, gas, and coal, would fall under an exclusive state monopoly, with expropriation of foreign exploitations redirecting revenues towards independence efforts. This approach counters criticisms of green energy's high costs, attributing them instead to privatised profiteering, and enforces a carbon tax dedicated solely to

NES investments, avoiding diversion to unrelated priorities. The original estimation for full energy independence, encompassing electricity, heat, and transport, reached £1.5 to £1.6 trillion, but refinements incorporating alternatives reduce this. Electricity alone, at 320 terawatt-hours, costs £345 to £379 billion. To optimise, the strategy incorporates biogas production for heating—channelled from human and agricultural waste through integrated systems, as proven in large-scale models elsewhere—requiring an additional £50 billion in infrastructure but avoiding full electrification's demand surge. This halves the heat-related electricity shift to 300 terawatt-hours, capping total demand at 720 terawatt-hours and scaling generation costs to approximately £790 to £870 billion. For transport, prioritising public investment in electrified trains, trams, and trolleybuses over widespread vehicle electrification redirects the 200 terawatt-hours, with £100 billion allocated for network expansion, further containing demand. Industry relies on targeted fossil fuel use with efficiency upgrades, adding £50 billion without substantial electricity increases. These adjustments reduce non-electricity costs to £220 billion, yielding a revised total for full independence of £1.1 to £1.2 trillion, demonstrating how strategic alternatives pull expenditures down while maintaining viability. Funding this refined transition relies on taxation and public investment mechanisms designed for equity and temporality. State bonds would raise substantial capital at low interest, repayable through energy revenues, while public shares offered to citizens—ensuring a 52 per cent state and citizen ownership—foster democratic participation akin to individual savings accounts. Additional revenues from progressive wealth taxes, corporate contributions, and state monopolies on recycling, gambling, and currency exchange provide buffers, with clauses mandating their abolition once objectives are met. This strategy spreads costs over 20 to 30 years, avoiding consumer surcharges and incorporating tax reliefs for businesses in exchange for investments. Implementation demands a phased, pilot-driven approach to test scalability and profitability, beginning with modular units of tidal hydropower, nuclear, and waste-to-energy before full expansion. Grid upgrades, costing £100 to £110 billion, would incorporate advanced

conductors and storage to resolve current connectivity failures, such as those plaguing scattered wind and solar farms. Policy frameworks, including streamlined regulations and public engagement campaigns, would mitigate opposition, while international collaborations enhance technological efficiency. Long-term profitability shines through, with projected revenues from energy sales at £20 per megawatt-hour yielding surpluses that, combined with savings from avoided imports and reduced inflation, deliver a net present value of £600 to £900 billion. Broader benefits, including job creation, GDP growth, and environmental gains, amplify this viability. In conclusion, Britain's path to energy independence hinges on a synthesised strategy that harnesses tidal hydropower's unparalleled reliability, nuclear's efficiency, waste-to-energy's practicality, and renewables' potential within a nationalised framework. By establishing the NES, incorporating cost-saving alternatives like biogas and public transport, and funding through targeted, temporary measures, the nation can escape geopolitical dependencies, revitalise its economy, and secure a sustainable future at a reduced total of £1.1 to £1.2 trillion spread around 20 years. This not only shields against global volatility but also positions energy as a public good, driving prosperity for generations to come.

The following text presents a compelling vision for economic reform in Britain, advocating the creation of state monopolies in sectors that generate substantial floating capital—gambling, car insurance, currency exchange, and cryptocurrency—alongside an extension to recycling of metals, glass, plastic, and wood. This approach seeks to curb speculative practices, redirect profits to public infrastructure such as the proposed National Energy System (NES), and foster genuine self-sufficiency for the state.

Other State Monopolies: Car Insurance, Gambling, Currency Exchange, and Cryptocurrency

Abstract

Certain economic activities, though non-essential, produce considerable floating capital that endangers Britain's economic stability. Floating capital refers to funds engaged in speculative financial manoeuvres aimed at securing unearned profits through disloyal competition, thereby distorting capital markets and eroding overall confidence. This mirrors the conduct of many financial institutions, wherein managers, shareholders, and executives deploy client monies for personal gain, retaining the bulk of returns via obscure contracts and policies. Consumers, frequently outmatched by intricate legal language, inadvertently assent to arrangements that facilitate fund dilapidation—an exploitative practice meriting recognition as a criminal economic offence. Compulsory car insurance, imposed by the British government upon all road users, illustrates the problem vividly. The private insurance sector has prospered under this obligation, accumulating vast premiums that are invested and traded, frequently to consumers' disadvantage. Claim processes remain notoriously protracted, with delays and denials commonplace, creating fertile ground for fraud. Since the state enforces this mandate, it is reasonable to enquire why it refrains from capturing the resultant profits. A parasitic industry has instead arisen, harnessing floating capital to unsettle Britain's financial markets through unchecked speculation.

The gambling sector has likewise expanded without restraint, converting high streets in cities across Britain into clusters of betting shops, casinos, and pawnshops. This spread not only warps local economies but also diminishes the welfare of the working class, entrenching addiction and financial distress. Vigorous state intervention is imperative to regulate the industry and channel its proceeds towards public benefit, thereby alleviating the attendant social and economic damage.

Cryptocurrency exchanges, largely beyond effective oversight, introduce additional perils. A national exchange, underwritten by the Bank of England, could provide a secure, regulated platform, yielding

revenue from fees and prudent investments whilst guaranteeing transparency and safety. Private platforms, vulnerable to volatility and misconduct, ought to be proscribed to avert disruption. Currency exchanges, encompassing retail and institutional operations, require state dominion to thwart money laundering and the exodus of illicit funds. Nationalisation would retain profits within the domestic economy, bolstering vital infrastructure including the National Energy System (NES).

The British government should therefore institute state monopolies across gambling, car insurance, cryptocurrency exchanges, and currency exchanges. Such nationalisation would eradicate speculative excesses, redirect earnings to public investment, and fortify financial markets. A state-operated car insurance scheme, for example, could expedite claims, lower premiums, and funnel surpluses into the NES, sidestepping private-sector inefficiencies. A national gambling authority might oversee betting, finance addiction support, and direct revenues towards broader development. A Bank of England-guaranteed cryptocurrency exchange would cultivate international confidence, drawing investment and fees, whilst state-controlled currency exchanges would staunch illicit outflows.

This strategy supports the overarching objective of financing critical infrastructure via taxation and state-derived profits, eschewing consumer surcharges. By abolishing floating capital and restraining disloyal competition, Britain can safeguard its economy, uplift working-class welfare, and ensure that gains from mandatory or socially consequential sectors accrue to the common good. When paired with a state monopoly on recycling, these measures would revitalise high streets, diminish economic fraud, and lay a robust foundation for endeavours like the NES, securing enduring prosperity.

A national cryptocurrency exchange, constructed by the British Government and backed by the Bank of England, could emerge as a globally trusted platform. Funds would enjoy sovereign guarantees, enabling Britain to reap not only transaction fees but also investment returns, founded upon established regulation, security, and clarity.

Currency exchange must remain exclusively under state control to prevent money laundering and the extraction of laundered funds from Britain.

Potential Revenue from State Monopolies

To gauge the budgetary contribution from state monopolies in gambling, car insurance, currency exchange, and cryptocurrency, estimates draw upon recent industry data, positing that the state would absorb most private profits after deducting operational expenses, with adjustments for efficiencies and market realities. Figures are expressed in British Pounds (£), oriented towards recent and near-term values.

The gambling industry remains a major contributor, with gross gambling yield (GGY) reaching £16.8 billion for the financial year April 2024 to March 2025, reflecting a 7.3% rise driven principally by online growth. Under monopoly, the state could retain net proceeds after costs (broadly 40–50% of GGY for operations, plus provisions for social programmes), potentially yielding £8–10 billion annually or more with reinvestment in harm reduction and diversified offerings.

The car insurance market, covering millions of vehicles, generates substantial premiums; average figures have declined recently (around £550–£750 depending on quarter and source, with total market income estimates in the £20–27 billion range). Private margins have been pressured by claims inflation, but state efficiencies—centralised processing and elimination of marketing overheads—could deliver £4–6 billion net annually after claims and administration.

Currency exchange encompasses retail and institutional flows; whilst London's FX dominance is immense (daily turnover in trillions), retail profits are more modest. A state monopoly, perhaps integrated with public networks, might capture £1.5–3.5 billion net, curbing laundering and retaining value domestically.

Cryptocurrency ownership has moderated (around 8% of adults in recent surveys), with UK market revenue modest (hundreds of millions). A state platform could generate £200–500 million annually in fees, enhanced by regulatory trust, though volatility remains a challenge.

Combined, these sectors could contribute £14–20 billion yearly, funding significant portions of the NES (for instance, 25–35% of a £56 billion hydropower element) and offsetting long-term infrastructure ambitions.

Extending to a Recycling Monopoly

Britain's recycling and waste sector offers further potential. Metals recycling dominates, with market revenue around £40–42 billion recently, projecting steady growth. Private margins of 10–20% suggest state efficiencies (centralised sorting, reduced exports) could yield £16–21 billion net annually after costs and contingencies.

Glass recycling, high-volume but lower-value, contributes modestly (£0.3–0.4 billion net). Plastic, amid export and infrastructure hurdles, offers £1.3–2 billion. Wood, smaller in scale, adds £0.2–0.3 billion. Total from recycling might reach £18–23 billion per year, redirectable to the NES and easing council tax pressures by treating disposal as a public resource rather than taxpayer burden.

Combined Revenue and Broader Implications

Incorporating recycling (£18–23 billion), gambling (£8–10 billion), car insurance (£4–6 billion), cryptocurrency (£0.2–0.5 billion), and ancillary measures (such as enhanced Plastic Packaging Tax), annual revenues could attain £32–41 billion. This would substantially finance the NES, reduce tax burdens, cover deficits, and prevent inflated public

acquisitions that enrich narrow interests. Recycling places disposal within the public domain, ensuring taxpayer-funded services align with resource exploitation under state stewardship, thereby balancing costs and benefits. Compulsory car insurance, rendering Britain among the costliest places for vehicle ownership, could similarly alleviate fiscal strains under monopoly. Cryptocurrency, still nascent yet poised for growth from its trillion-dollar global base, might draw worldwide trust via a secure state exchange—essential given limitations on prohibiting foreign platforms and risks to citizens in insolvency scenarios.

This constitutes the philosophy of a New State: prosperous, revenue-generating, and independent. True economic sovereignty demands a state that produces wealth rather than merely redistributing it. Subjugated states impose heavy taxes to service debts; a robust Enterprise State minimises direct taxation through indirect levies and self-generated income, investing productively whilst sustaining services.

The Expropriation Act, the welfare reforms, and these monopolies together herald a Britain capable of honouring its people's sacrifices, reclaiming its assets, and building a future unencumbered by foreign dependence or internal betrayal.

This is our philosophy of a New State, a prosperous one, a State capable of producing its own revenue instead of spending exclusively the revenue of others. This is the true meaning of Economic Independence, a strong state that doesn't owe, isn't subjugated to any foreign interest or power able to produce its own revenue and be self-sufficient able to support its citizens.

A subjugated State imposes higher taxes to cover the costs and mostly the debts. A State that will lower taxes might be a State that doesn't provide too many public services and might lack revenue and authority hence cannot be independent either as it is too weak internally or subordinated to foreign interests.

The ideal formula of State it's the type of Enterprise State able to

invest and produce revenue and to tax its citizens mostly indirectly with a minimum amount of direct taxation.

The Expropriation Act

This Act concerns the national security of Britain, and its primary purpose and definition lie in safeguarding the national interest and the lives of the British, English, Scottish, Irish, Welsh, and all others of this land and country. In the past, a series of irresponsible and corrupt governments, betraying national interests and people's priorities, have surrendered the economy due to their lack of competence, subordination to foreign powers, or actions against the interests of the many, particularly the poor native majority, in a country now more divided than ever.

We have surrendered our railways, only to be overcharged for their use. These railways were built by every John, Peter, Charles, Mary, Elizabeth, and others who laboured with their bare hands during Queen Victoria's reign, toiling with sweat, blood, hunger, and eating bread mixed with dirt. They died early and young from diseases and misery to construct our railways, factories, and other marvellous achievements of the Industrial Revolution. While others benefited from these accomplishments, the British, English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, and others of this land—the workers—did not reap the rewards of their work and sacrifices. Many paid with their lives, yet neither they nor their descendants benefited, as those who came to power surrendered these assets for nothing. Since then, the public has been forced to pay obscene prices for railway transportation, energy, public transport, metro, and water. Now, we ask ourselves when travelling by train from London to Newcastle: did we buy a ticket or the entire train carriage? The same question arises when we see our energy and water bills and transportation costs compared to those in other countries in Europe and the world.

The sole legal basis of the Expropriation Act is that these entities have profited excessively and drained our pockets for years with the

complicity of successive governments. They have bought our industries, resources, assets, patents, inventions, and trademarks, removing us from the market and scrapping our industries at the scrap metal yard, leaving our workers in abject poverty, destitute, and without a future.

What they did was theft on an industrial scale, and we still wonder how they got away with it. The scale was so immense that it appeared to be legitimate business, facilitated by the complicity of past and present governments in this national theft spanning generations. They have robbed this country for over 100 years, and the plundering continues. We must put an end to this historic, organised robbery on an industrial scale. They have sold and resold our industries and assets behind our backs. For example, if Paul gave his truck to Peter to use, and Peter agreed to pay a concession fee of £100, then Peter sold the truck to John for a concession fee of £200, Paul still receives his £100. When John sells the concession to Adam for £400, and Adam sells it to Robert for £600, Paul still receives only his £100, even though the truck remains his. Because Paul signed a shady deal, he can do nothing, and they continue selling his truck among themselves at increasingly higher prices for Britainer profit. This depicts how the privatisation of our public services and state companies operates.

The Expropriation Act must be enacted by an independent judiciary with investigative powers to reopen and examine all privatisation files, evaluate the true prejudice and lost revenue, and issue a compulsory confiscation order for all assets identified. It must pursue and prosecute those responsible worldwide, seeking to recover as much as possible from the damages caused by trust and monopolistic practices and policies, as well as the economic blockade imposed on Britain since the 1960s.

The Expropriation Act will be executed at His Majesty's pleasure, as His Majesty promises to deliver justice for his people.

Main Manifesto in support of New Project of Reform of Welfare, Unemployment and benefits system in Britain .

Historically, our Civilisation made the step to become a modern society with the help of organised public health systems and organised social security systems of welfare and benefits. Previously , this role belonged to the Church as in virtue of Christian morale the Church also understood that Charity is the element of containing the social equilibrium for a society to exist. Imagine that people sometimes experience difficulties in life, and they find themselves in situations with no apparent solution. This is where Charity comes hand in hand with human solidarity, proving the strong bond of every society. After the Judicial system and Police, the Welfare state is the second pillar of maintaining the equilibrium and security within the society.

Imagine that people would have to recur in committing crimes to fulfil their necessities when there's no immediate solution as employment or any other form of aid.

The feeling that there's a social net that won't let the individual fall into an abject level of poverty is giving that mass feeling of mass contention where if these fines mechanisms would lack from a Civilised society we would live in a different world where people would occur to mass looting, infinite cycles of social unrest in a world that Society would be dominated by chaos, disorder, the masses would begin to commit crimes, and they'll organise in committing crimes because this would be a non-alternative state for somewhere Law and Social Cohesion would be difficult to apply. Work and Employment is not always available and sometimes people must wait for a better opportunity whether moving from a deprived economic area, enhancing or learning new skills. However, there are situations that are not typically in control of individuals. Sometimes people are too sick to be able to look for themselves and here's where charity became compulsory in society. A new phenomenon began occurring within European nations, where destitution and collective deprivation makes certain categories of individuals displaced and unadaptable. Take the example of mass

migration where entire regions became replaced where individuals lack opportunity, education, skills to be able to maintain themselves in a job, where poverty and lack of education became a generational issue.

This is the social cancer that is threatening our social cohesion. While entire segments of native population became dependent on Welfare due to

That's why we need to understand the importance and the mission of our organised benefits system and its social mission, which is to keep the social equilibrium and balance in our society.

Currently, our benefits' system is wasting precious public money in feeding the unadapted ones and unable to work in this country while we do not help enough the most affected segments of our society, children's, elderly, sick and disabled including those who they're being born with disabilities. We don't do enough to reintegrate the ex Service Men's and Military Veterans and tackle the native population situation of homelessness and deprivation. We don't have only individual deprivation in this country, but we have an historic regional deprivation, with the North most disfavoured than the South.

Our benefits' system is lacking the ability of helping as well as the ones in genuine need in helping the children of this country who live in child poverty in a country that on paper is ranked in the top 20 biggest world economies.

Instead, precious resources have been inadequately spent and a paradox and chaos have been created.

Our National benefit system must be used in the job of our nation for Britain and achieving a status quo of social harmony and equity in our society.

The State has no obligation in granting benefits to anyone nor asylum or any form of protection if such measures would invalidate and violate the National Security, and Public Safety.

People who cannot speak the language of this country in essence are deemed unemployable. They can't work in all economic segments of our national economy; they might sometimes work but within the

surroundings of their communities. Therefore, if the benefit of the overall nation is reduced merely to a portion pertaining only to a certain group of people or communities we have to reserve our right in vetoing any entitlement to benefits from people who don't satisfy the minimum social and national integration criteria.

The Law must be rectified as such Law must in effect prove the purpose and the necessity of the entitlement of public money merely in these conditions. Such merely as the wider public interest, along with the National interest and above all the National security interest.

Proposed Article,

Constitutional Reform of Britain Welfare and Benefits System

Green Paper,

The Welfare system is the benefit given exclusively by the State, solely at the discretion of the State with the purpose in helping its citizens when no other reasonable means are available to them.

A disfavoured citizen is a person in a state of vulnerability, with no immediate recourse such as unemployment due to destitution by no fault of his own, illness, juridical situation or long term sickness and disability. It can also be a young graduate from any form of education who doesn't have enough working experience and needs further support to be accommodated into the Working marketplace.

Those who are eligible to apply for this benefit must be only the Lawful residents between the age of 16 and 60 that are able to work and are not in employment or education and are eligible for Universal credit unemployment benefits only. Other categories would be eligible for different benefits. These categories might be;

People too sick to work or disabled, people between 60-65 where the same provisions of this benefit cannot be fully applied for them, single

mothers with more than 2 children, Army Veterans, and the list is not exhaustive. These categories are prioritised under a different enhanced benefit and form of social protection called "Welfare Provisions". See article 2 of this Green Paper.

Other categories such as, Asylum seekers, temporary legal immigrants, convicted criminals (sex offenders, terrorists, etc.) on licence for certain crimes they've been convicted are excluded from this category. For some of this list, other benefits may apply to them.

The state has no legal duty to provide benefits for any foreign people that are not lawful residents in the country, in fact only Native People should mainly access the benefit system and other citizens in accordance with their contribution and if they've worked before in Britain and are citizens .

Universal credit should be ceased for all BRP cardholders, pre-settled status and settled status. However, this can be challenged only by the previous employer in cases of redundancy and only after the employer pays a bond to ensure that the workers are settled legally in Britain.

An employer brings workers from overseas, but he's unable to provide them with sufficient employment. This should be made illegal under the new employment law.

Breaching of Immigration Limits.

It is unlawful and considered human exploitation that the displacement of foreign population to be brought in Britain with the purpose of financial gains by means of deception and unrealistic promises by breaching the initial contract that work in Britain for a foreign national must be guaranteed by Law upon his employment.

As a result, the state accumulates a burden that might endanger the present social and equilibrium. It affects the overseas person and is producing economic damage and loss of opportunity in his homeland. Moreover, it affects the national balance of resources, public services where the state must limit these resources for all its citizens to be able to cope with these types of situations.

This can be avoidable if the Law would be reinforced in order to protect the National Interest and personal health and safety of any overseas individual that aspires to work in Britain.

If someone is found guilty by the offence of breaching of Immigration limits is liable up to 25 years in prison or up to 1 million pounds fine whichever is Britainer.

This felony would encompass elements of mass deception considered as a form of human exploitation, would endanger the citizen's safety by bringing people from overseas that are not properly vetted and without any proper form of economic sustainable activities. This also would increase the burden upon State resources and vital services.

The financial penalties are justifiable by the costs associated with costs of public services such as health, education, benefits and other public costs associated with.

The individuals found guilty by this offence in case that are not Britain nationals should have the entire property dispossessed and all their bank accounts closed and deported and the sentence suspended. A life interdiction to enter Britain would be enforced with immediate effect.

If the felon would come back to Britain the previous sentence should be reinstated plus 5 to 10 years for illegal entry in Britain, violation of trust and breaching of licence. If they would successfully recover the entire amount of financial prejudice and if they would have made a successful recovery of funds including from the offender country of origin the offender might then be removed from the with a suspended sentence. Upon return a 12 years felony would be added on top of initial felony for breaching border security and trespassing Britain borders.

In case that an employer who brought foreign nationals to work must lay down their work force temporarily due to unforeseen circumstances like issues with weather if they're working in Agriculture, natural disasters, explosions, accidents and the list is not exhaustive must deposit a bond of £15000 per person while the situation is remediated and with guarantees from the employer that the person would resume work, and it

is necessary that the person might be in need of state assistance while he's on redundancy.

When the employee would resume work and the employer would declare this with the immigration, the bond should be refunded to the employer in 48 hours after the first RTI received by HMRC. The foreign workers can claim state benefits if they're working in vital sectors of the economy and for cases of redundancy where they lost their employment by no fault of their own but only if the employer guarantees that the worker will resume its work in the same workplace. A work visa should be tied by one employer and if the work stops then the right to reside in the country must cease.

Sometimes DWP can issue referrals to local communities, religious or ethnic associations, for refugees and asylum seekers. HMRC can impose higher taxes to those who are from the same country and ethnicity with the existing citizens and residents of the same countries. The new Taxation rules must be imposed to protect the local force and prioritise the local workers. New tax working policy frame to support DWP in cutting welfare bills for Public spending and redirecting the funds towards prioritising the support for local work force and the disabled ones to the elderly and most vulnerable people to support the National efforts in tackling child poverty in Britain.

If a number of Asylum Seekers are of the same religion and ethnicity with ties to existing local communities, religious establishments such as church, mosques, community centres or other establishments including schools then a Duty stamp tax would be issued by HMRC to those institutions primarily. This would be a global yearly tax bill issued to those establishments.

The establishments can cover the costs of Duty Stamp Tax by collecting donations from the community members to cover the costs of the duty tax.

The costs of duty tax would be made by the benefits bill, immigration bills, health, housing, public services, education for every individual of the same religion, ethnicity, nationality of the establishment that has been

issued a Duty Stamp Tax.

Example if in a local area are a number of these establishments , HMRC would calculate the entire yearly costs associated with the immigrants within the local area of those who belong to the same community as local worship places Church, Mosques, Temples, Religious and Community Associations, Community schools and the list isn't exhaustive. Every of these establishments would receive a Letter from HMRC with a duty stamp. The deadline of the payable lump sum is 6 to 9 months from the date that letter has been issued. If the sum isn't paid in full by the deadline penalties up to %100 might be applicable. If the sum hasn't been paid then the HMRC can file with the Courts an order of repossession of propriety and if the property cannot be valorised on the market, then HMRC must apply for a Demolition Order in Court to be able to sell the terrain. The associated demolition costs might be incurred upon the offender, but sometimes may be transferred to the Council tax bill of those who belong to the same community. HMRC and DWP must have permission granted by the Courts to access any Census data when the financial recovery and tax purpose affairs are in place.

The prejudice recovered must be redirected towards DWP to continue to prioritise programs as upskilling the Young Native British and prepare them for work or aid to single natives mothers in Food Stamps and other Welfare provisions.

The DWP can issue referrals to certain communities to redirect the associated costs of immigrants towards their local ethnic or religious communities. The communities must send the receipts and expenses to HMRC and to complete a Tax form associated with the Red Tax Duty tax relief form. The tax relief form must be shown as evidence that a community contributed towards any costs involving immigrants, whether they are legal immigrants as a result of working visas or asylum seekers legally or illegally. These measures are meant to take the pressure off public services and involve all responsible parties in safeguarding the public purse.

We advocate for a dynamic National Welfare system where Local

DWP Job Centres will become Job Senders.

Imagine your work coach is calling you only to attend one appointment. How is this possible? Because your work coach found you a suitable job and you need to present yourself the next day. We cannot use the benefits like a social ATM for foreign and domestic people . Immigrants legal or illegal which are coming in Britain are so attracted like an “El Dorado” of Welfare Paradise where claimants are receiving in benefits more than £4000 net where even their work coaches within DWP are receiving about half in salary.

We cannot continue to keep this system which morally and financially will bankrupt the country.

Work should be mandatory. New roles within DWP must get people in employment , work coaches must play the role of recruiters too , must facilitate meaningful qualifications and upskilling and connecting with local businesses to have people employed.

Must be mandatory for any benefit claimant to accept any job from now on otherwise their benefits must be stopped. Britain must be firm that any low skills job can be made by local people. This is the secret in tackling immigration when there’s not going to be any need bringing anyone else from outside to fill those roles.

Addenda :

Tax relief forms. Red Duty Stamp, Green Paper

All the costs associated with new immigrants whether legal or illegal must be supported by the local community from where these immigrants might belong to.

The presence of a pre-established community is one of the reasons that most illegal immigrants chose to come legally or illegally in Britain by crossing the channel on small boats, on the back of the lorries or by different legal routes such as work and family visas that sometimes are

misused and abused. Some of them that are coming legally end up breaching their legal stay and ending up in the asylum system. All these factors are contributing to the phenomenon of social clogging.

The reasons behind their decision to immigrate to Britain are complex and multifaceted, however one of the main contributory factors is the presence of a local ethnic community that draws more new incomers here. Whether the newcomers are being brought by their local communities themselves by facilitating visas, employment or family reasons such as matrimony or family reunification, these are not the only contributing factors. The mirage of a better life fuelled by the remittances sent abroad, illegal practices of bypassing the asylum laws, illegal immigration, human trafficking have contributed to the artificial increase of Britain population and getting to critical unsustainable levels.

Britain infrastructure is not built for a huge population, the territory of the is relatively small. In comparison, it is 5000 square kilometres bigger than Romania which has a population of 20 millions or Belarus that has only a population of 9 millions.

The strain on public services, resources, access to housing, and health education is considerably bigger in Britain with a population of 70 million inhabitants for a territory that's ideal only for a maximum of 50 million inhabitants.

The introduction of Red Stamp duty tax is meant to protect the local native population from falling into irrecoverable levels of abject poverty. It is a measure to confer more responsibility to the communities in regards with immigration and their support towards immigrating new people. In fact, the costs of current benefits such as Universal Credit, HMRC child benefits, Home Office costs would sum over 20 billion pounds per year that could be saved with 7 billions pounds only in Universal Credit cost for asylum seekers.

It is also the communities' responsibility to ensure that the newcomers would have a fair chance to succeed in Britain, as public welfare isn't the right system for them. The local communities could spend more from their resources on providing housing, food and education to newcomers, reducing their dependency on the State's Welfare systems mostly being

overloaded, insufficient and unfit for their needs.

The Red Duty Stamp Tax would be applied globally per annum to all religious, cultural, local communities where migration is prevalent.

For example, in one year alone, 40000 illegal immigrants have crossed the channel into small boats and the majority of them belong to a unique religion even if their nationalities were different. Now, if they have been referred in the first place to their local pre-established communities as their churches or temples or mosques they would have the chance to harvest invaluable skill to be able to adapt here, and their life could have been significantly improved compared with the current conditions and resources allocated to them by the Home Office.

In the middle of their local communities could have felt the warmth of their communities who would have welcomed them, greeting their presence and contributing to reducing the local animosity. They would have benefited by tailored support to their needs and this support has come in the shape of proper cultural appropriation which is a fundamental liaison to bond communities together.

Therefore, the taxation would be issued to every of those local churches, mosques, temples, at the yearly quantum of how much public money is spent on these new immigrants.

The same provisions would equally apply for skilled migrant workers that ended up in the asylum system or those who immigrated by family, community members and so on.

As mentioned before it's the duty of the local community to raise the full amount of stamp tax, and they'll have 6 months to collect it from the members of religious congregations, churches, mosques, temples, local shops and businesses and members of that community in general.

This measure is important to ensure the wellbeing of newcomers, to feel more integrated in our society by raising the responsibility of their local communities. The benefits would be in the long term because the newcomers could benefit more from the experience and skills of their pre-established communities.

For example, if 1000 Hindus or Muslims or Buddhists or Christians would immigrate to Britain because of war in their home countries then

upon their arrival here would need immediate support. In this case, the most indicated and adequate solution would be the help of their local pre-established communities.

Imagine if a persisted, let's refer that individual to his local Church, Temples, Mosques, Community Centre, Schools and so on in order to get proper support tailored to his understanding and needs.

The individual would be then referred to a local community centre and the referral would be made to his local Mosques, Temples or Church. The referral would be posted by DWP to that institution, and we will hand a barcode to the asylum seeker to the Local institution.

At the beginning of every financial year every local multicultural community would be issued a HMRC, Red Duty Stamp Tax to every of these communities.

The purpose of DWP referrals would be to reduce the amount of burden on DWP but as well is meant to reduce the amount of the Red Duty Stamp Tax.

The mechanisms work this way:

A family of asylum seekers it's referred to their local Mosque for example. The local Mosque has been issued with a Red Duty Stamp Tax by HMRC.

The family would receive a paper with a barcode that can be scanned from a mobile application. Once it is scanned it creates a file and an automated email is generated to the email address linked in the application.

Now the local community can take photos of the tenancy agreement and receipts of the monthly rent paid as well as receipts from supermarkets, shops, including transport and other expenses.

Then these would be deducted from the amount of the Red Stamp Duty tax owned by that local diverse establishment.

If the Mosque, Temple or Church paid their Tax Duty Stamp in less than 6 months and their expenses are more than the amount of tax, the sum that's over the initial threshold would be reimbursed.

State benefits redefinition

The citizens in receipt of State benefits are receiving this benefit only with the purpose of investment of the State in helping that person to recover from a situation of hardship due to no fault of his own and due to occurrence beyond any reasonable means of control. The purpose of this benefit is that the State is making an investment in someone's potential, in helping the person, in order to become a fully sustainable and economically viable citizen of this country.

This proviso and all subsequent provisions are subjected to a Contract.

The person obligations are:

To be fit for work. To be willing to accept any work & commitments.
To provide evidence to support his entitlement and provide evidence of his bank statements and take part in regular reviews of his claim every 3 months after his first 3 months from the start of his claim
To be prepared, qualified for work or to attend and complete successfully all mandatory work training and other courses of work preparation and qualification, all provided at the expense of the State.

The person must know the English language if lives in England or English or Welsh languages if he lives in Wales or English or Scottish Gaelic language if he lives in Scotland or English or Irish Gaelic language if lives in Northern Ireland, in a sufficient level of understanding given instructions and also must prove that's able to communicate effectively in a minimal accepted standard of communication in any of these languages.

The State can withdraw this offer without any warning, and it withholds any right of appeal if the following violations of this Law and agreements have been committed.

The Contract would become automatically null if it's proven that;

The claimant is an asylum seeker or has been found that he entered illegally. The prohibition might be discretionarily extended if the claimant is provenient from a family that entered illegally in Britain.

The claimant has an undeclared capital of £15000 and over.

The claimant itself, it's a Landlord.

The claimant it's a Company director, and he's having company funds or liquid assets under any Company name.

The claimant has been found working and concealed or failed to declare this.

The claimant has engaged in illegal activities and has been arrested for more than 30 days.

The claimant failed to declare other income or other activities as self-employed.

Claimant has been found to participate in political activities' marches, protests etc. except union protests if he's a formal employee.

Claimants have been found that have expressed anti-British views, hateful and initiatory activities against the State and the Country.

Claimant has engaged itself on anti-social behaviour, vandalism, hooliganism , drugs consumption, violence against DWP staff, unacceptable behaviour, harassment or sexual harassment.

All unacceptable behaviour would be punished, and the claim must be closed without any right of appeal.

The department might reserve the right to terminate this contract if

claimants use their money to gamble, not paying their rent, destroying a private property and being demanded for this by the landlord, council or housing association or letting agent.

The claimant failed to report that is travelling abroad without any good reason, or he lived abroad for intermittent successive periods (social tourism is when someone cashed in State benefits, and he's returning after a period and just before the deadlines of appointments, commitments, etc.)

Claimants have been found to receive other benefits from another country.

Claimant it is prohibited to send any unemployment funds abroad that are granted by the State for living expenses in Britain , Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. This should constitute grave violations of claimant commitments. This claim should be closed without the right of appeal, and further sanctions should be applicable for the full recovery of funds that have been sent out of Britain without authorisation.

It is prohibited that any funds given by the national benefit system to be spent abroad, whether sending remittances to relatives or spending it abroad this is prohibited.

The social money is not the claimants' property but the taxpayers property. The social money is granted as a living expenses loan that must be spent within the national territory of the country of issuance. This must be within Britain only.

The purpose of granting social benefits it's to help someone temporarily until the person is re-enabling their economic and productive life.

However, the social money must only be spent in Britain internally to help the economy.

Humanitarian exceptions might apply only in case of life-threatening treatment abroad (including dental treatment) for the claimants and his children only. The funds must be approved by the DWP before departure, and it's needed that the claimants must present evidence of the treatment, surgery etc. with legalised translation of the medical letters by authorised interpreters at claimants cost. The transcripts must have an apostille, whether it can be procured from a public notary or Britain embassy

abroad. Based on these documents, DWP can authorise the payment of benefits for the entire duration of the treatment and recovery.

In case that the claimant has been found that he's been financially supported by his family in Britain or abroad and when the income received from the family or other parties it's equal with the income received from the State and in this case the contract will cease its existence. The claimant must repay this money back up to the entire amount that has been granted in benefits or up to 50% if the value of economic support is up to 50% of the amount of benefits that has been granted to the claimant.

The claimant or its relatives belong to a terrorist organisation or any other Britain's enemy entity as Enemy States, Organisations etc. This would be subjected to review and prompted under National Security Act and Guidance. No one from a Britain enemy's country, terrorist groups should receive any form of public money support. If this prejudice cannot be recovered from them must be further investigated and recovered from those responsible for this mistake.

Those responsible whether lawyers, civil servants, government authority knew about, or acted in bad faith must be prosecuted under National Security Act for Espionage and Enemy Actions against the state.

Claimant it's a relative of a Convicted terrorist in Britain who has committed acts against Britain territory, interests and Sovereignty.

The claimant has been found to have fought against Britain military in past conflicts where Britain military troops and personnel were deployed.

This list is not exhaustive and may apply to children and relatives sometimes.

As well, the claimant has been found living abroad in the past in a state that became Britain's enemy, or it's under International sanctions and might pose a threat to Britain security.

Claimants have been convicted abroad for sexual offences and returned to Britain.

The claimant failed to declare that he's living with a spouse who's earning a full-time wage.

The claimant does not live at the property and has been found that he's subletting the property.

A claimant is claiming child benefits who are not his, or they don't live with the claimant, whether in Britain or abroad.

The claimant has declared a false identity or uses a false name.

The claimant used false names in the past.

The claimant had previously committed immigration offences.

The claimant is married to a close relative. Claimant disputable marriage (only if a non Britain partner is on the claim) and the marriage it is deemed or reasonably suspected as not be a genuine marriage whether is forced, polygamous or for economic purposes only, shame marriage or any other exploitative form concealed under the marriage act it's punishable, and the State is obligated to withdraw any form of benefits payment immediately without notice. The state must withhold any right of appeal on every instance.

The DWP can close a claim discretionarily if it's proven that claimant sent remittances abroad in the past while claiming benefits. It's prohibited under the new law that any money granted as benefits be sent or spent abroad. Many will argue that while people are claiming benefits they are saving for their holidays. This is morally wrong for the tax payers while tax payers are going to work to pay taxes and contributing the ones receiving support must adhere to the main conditions of receiving any form of state benefits which are the taxpayers terms and conditions afterwards.

Someone's receiving social benefits with the purpose of enhancing

their skills, acquiring extra training and qualifications, looking for employment and dedicating their time around looking for new employment and taking care of his family.

Should be prohibited any form of travelling abroad for any benefits claimants except documented trips as bereavement and medical emergencies.

DWP needs to establish a limit of reclaims. Many cases of fraud have been signaled when claimants took advances out and closed their current claims without paying back the advances just to reopen new claims and ask for new advances which are in reality loans and they've closed those claims again to claim again maybe to a different job sender.

Benefit fraud must be classed as theft of public money and those caught must be prosecuted. DWP and Police must have common powers to identify and arrest all those who are committing benefits fraud.

The system would collapse under the pressure of over expenditure on benefits. It's like granting insecure loans as a bank. You'll soon be bankrupt. The principle of prudence must be at the forefront of any decision of the State in granting benefits to someone.

As well the Department can withhold to stop this support if more than one relative lives in the same household or altogether the same family members are claiming benefits simultaneously, even they're living at different addresses sometimes as an example extended families where the number of individuals would exceed the normal threshold for an eligible family under the Family eligibility criteria (see the attached addenda).

As well the Department might reserve to exercise his right to nullify at his discretion if the claimants have been deemed to be found in engaging in appalling behaviour in Public and Online, animal cruelty, sexual abuse of an animal, exhibitionist appalling behaviour in public and online that attracts public anger and discontent and so on.

Serial shoplifters that have been found and not always convicted would be barred from accessing any benefits.

The same rules would apply for everyone who concealed that life, or it's supported by an economically viable partner or close relative.

This applies to Religious organisations, enclosed communities with mutual support available and so on. The list is not exhaustive, either.

We may issue interdictions for someone to apply for benefits again if they have been found to have committed any of these violations or multiple violations at once from all these provisions mentioned so far.

The interdiction might apply between minimum one year, and indefinite until further notice or permanent time period in some cases. These interdictions and the time frame are decided solely at State discretion in accordance with State interests, priorities and other internal regulations.

A claimant can be banned indefinitely in reclaiming Universal Credit if his claim has been previously closed due to capital above the admissible limit of £16000 , fraud concerns or repeat failure to comply with mandatory work search commitments due to inherent issues like drug & alcohol , gambling addiction . In some cases the claims might be reviewed and guided towards adequate support , towards Welfare Provisions.

Moreover, the interdictions would be permanent if anyone within Britain has committed benefit fraud in the last 15 years if they have unpaid debts as unrecovered overpayments due to error fraud and mistake.

The DWP must have powers to pursue debt up to 25 years and retroactively apply.

In case that our DWP officers have spotted any other irregularities of interest for Police, Immigration and other competent authorities including other countries Police and Law Enforcement it is the obligation of this department in reporting and liaising with all other competent agencies and social services.

Domestic violence, woman and child sexual abuse, human trafficking and modern slavery are omnipresent dangers that threading our society and National Security.

The Department of Work and Pensions have the obligation established

by law to liaise and report all these occurrences to any other responsible agency and has the obligation to provide information when required to do so.

The Department won't uphold any of these decisions of automatic termination of this contract, and the termination decision would be applied immediately by default.

The Department might reserve the right to follow and prosecute everyone who prejudiced the Department, and if someone has been overpaid due to claimant or system error must return this money. We will prosecute everyone who has committed any of these felonies, even in the past when the previous rules haven't applied nor reinforced upon these provisions.

Department for Work and Pensions proposal for new powers to follow, prosecute fraud from existing cases and past cases when their Laws haven't been sufficiently enforced or solid regulations and control have completely lacked.

The time frame that fraud investigations can be reopened is not a set amount of time. The department must continue to investigate and prosecute with the purpose of recovering the damage at any time. Proposal for New Powers granted by the Parliament to DWP in order to issue Income restraining orders and withheld wages.

New DWP Executive Officers would have powers to ask for information of interest to any financial institution and businesses, and they have powers to issue a Wages Restraining order against the defended in conditions that the Department is in possession of conclusive and beyond any doubt evidence that proves that the defended have received undeserved State benefits, being overpaid or not entitled to. This can be taken under the pre-legal action in which the DWP executive officers would have the powers to follow, locate and retain the defendant in conjunction with Local Police at defendant Domicile, Work Place, Community, Public Spaces etc.

These powers can be extended to any abroad jurisdictions if the

defendants left the country. However, not before putting in place an extradition order or any other international agreement.

DWP can transfer the Welfare debt into HMRC debt that can increase the amount of tax that a defendant's paying towards Tax, PAYE or NI. Within a Wage & Income restriction order, the claimant would have to pay up to 15% more on his Tax bill towards offsetting the DWP debt. Refusal to do so and consequently resulting in violation of this agreement, as making itself jobless might result in prosecution, unpaid work or any punitive measures proportional to the gravity of the felony in case.

The department would be encouraged to seek and prioritise money recovery by means of Income, Salary, Bank funds, tradable assets as shares, cryptocurrency, gold, propriety, and other assets that can be sold.

Claimants might want to take Legal action against the Department, but this would be their responsibility at their expense and diligence.

The Department would recognise any Decision from a Britain Court, and it will act in restitution in accordance with the Court's verdict.

If they would successfully recover the entire amount of financial prejudice and if they would have made a successful recovery of funds including from the offender country of origin the offender might be then released to be deported if he's in Britain. However, they must pursue legal action against the claimant in Claimant's country of origin for theft of Public Money which needs to be regarded from now on as a serious offense with a higher social impact upon Britain society.

The claimant understands that by accepting these commitments, he's entering into a Contract with DWP. The same provisions would now apply for any claimant as engaging in any public political activities it's forbidden and might constitute a Violation of Mandatory Commitments whilst the claimant voluntarily agrees to comply and respect the rules under this contract. The Violation of these rules previously stipulated here, would cease the existence of this contract and it will attract his nullity.

This contract has a legal power and the claimant legal duty is bound to respect this contract. The claimant has the right to complain about any type of unacceptable behaviour from part of DWP staff or mistakes that produced payment delays. The claimant has the right to file for compensation damage if the delays have affected the claimants' life, i.e. have been disconnected from gas and electricity and needs to pay reconnection fees, he lost his food on refrigerator due to electricity outage the claimants have the right to file for a Petition of Restitution and Compensation.

Claimants have the right to appeal if they made a mistake or if DWP failed to provide essential training in finding new employment, assisted support to facilitate employment, access to DWP resources such as access to Internet, information about job offers and other essential updates.

Claimants have the right to be heard if they fail to attend mandatory appointments in case of illness, family issues, bereavement, child and relatives illness and pet illness. Claimants are required to provide supporting evidence in 30 days from the appeal.

The claimant must provide as evidence the following medical evidence of the appointments including dental and veterinary appointments as well as children and relatives in case that needed to bring those to these appointments.

New Framework for DWP -Department of Control, Compliance and Investigation (CCI).

Former Universal Credit Review.

This department will be merged within HMRC into creating a new Division across the DWP and HMRC.

The main critique against former Universal Credit Review team within the DWP consists in two main aspects:

Cost-effective, efficiency and the level of intrusion, stress, targeting of vulnerable people and loss of efficiency.

As with any inspection, these main features must be provided. The

inspection must be unheralded. Because if we're targeting those who might potentially have committed benefit or tax fraud it wouldn't be advisable to prevent them or tipping out the discretion and sophistication of our operations.

Loss of methods efficiency. Once a Britainer number of people are interviewed using the same investigative methods, the results fade more and more. In a word, it became walloped.

As an example, we're asking our claimants how many more bank accounts they have. If they're answering "No" and we're unable to detect any transfers between accounts, we're unable to pursue any further review on this case. As a consequence of word spreading we noticed that more and more claimants provide similar answers, this is because more and more people might relate to other people including social media in what our review consists of and so on.

In these cases, we cannot take any further action despite any other founded suspicions because our current methods become walloped and ineffective.

A simple method to bypass our review methods is the simplest one, someone who has a bank account in which they receive benefits must use only that account for all benefits he receives, to pay the rent and bills with that account to spend on utilities and Council tax and few shopping transactions. If someone's having any other assets, savings, undeclared income, buying cryptocurrency or shares, illegal activities and so on, all is needed is to always use separate accounts and never transfer anything from that account or accounts into the account where Universal Credit gets paid. We can only follow the money trail and question about. However, it's so elementary for anyone to bypass our current methods. The question is?

It's this expenditure from the Department for Work and Pensions justified and necessary when the methods of supposedly detecting fraud and error on the system are lacking the most elementary aspect of any investigation?

Meaning any investigation must be inopportune, the evidence must be gathered prior to any other action in order to have a compelling amount

of evidence that would justify the suspicion and any further action of the department which would make this activity efficient and cost-effective.

On the other hand, the level of stress intrusion and presumably humiliating behaviour, it's obvious. Not everyone keeps things like remembering old bank account details like even 1 year behind. Due to the inability of someone to produce this evidence mandatory for the review we're risking to stop payments and close claims to the most vulnerable segment from our society including single parents on benefits caring for disabled children.

The DWP must be as a positive factor in social well being meant to tackle inequality, social injustice, poverty, Laboural abuse, fraud, mistake & error and other threats against National Security as exploiting our benefits' system by criminal gangs, immigration frauds, use of public money to divert taxpayers' monies towards organised crime, terrorist organisations, drug cartels, human trafficking and other criminals' threats internal and external as well.

Strengthening this framework would ensure a better grip against fraud, error and ineffective overspending of public money.

Why is a multi department division across DWP, HMRC and FCA compulsory?

Currently, DWP is undergoing mandatory reviews of all Universal Credit claims on a regular basis and with more spending than initially predicted.

As a result of weaker policies, the Department of Work and Pensions reported a staggering around 6 billion pounds lost due to fraud and error. According to Department for Work and Pensions statements, it's blamed that this happened during COVID pandemic where the claims had been wrongly granted without proper identity verification.

In 2024 the Department for Work and Pensions said that they've managed to salvage over 100 billion pounds and the aimed target is over 1 billion pounds in 2025.

However, it is questionable that the main methods in reviewing Universal Credit claims would be as effective as they're now and adding more expenditure as outsourcing contracts with private entities would add more to current issues than bring feasible solutions.

New DWP proposal for powers granted by Britain Parliament. Project of Law (Proposal)

Every Financial Institution which operates in Britain whether centralised or decentralised must adhere to the following FCA rule and must respect the Law.

This Law is proposing;

Mandatory releasing of information to the authorities mandated to ask for this information.

DWP should receive these powers to ask for any financial interest of interest.

Current proposals forwarded by the State Secretary referring only to the compulsory obligations of financial institutions to divulge this information to DWP about claimants that might have over £6000.

Here's the weakest point of this strategy. Firstly, the Banks are private institutions they cannot divulge personal information as this would create a precedent in breaching the Data Protection Act.

Second as we've mentioned before is someone's having account 1 on Bank A in which the claimant receives his benefits. Bank A might never know if this person has any other money or income if he never made any other transactions using bank A other than receiving benefits, paying bills and normal spending.

In case that the claimant might have another account, i.e. account number 2 with bank B, the person would never receive benefits or anything in account number 2 held with bank B.

Bank B also would never know if that claimant receives any benefits therefore Bank B would never report anything to DWP either same as Bank A, and the list is not exhaustive.

A crypto asset service would never know if claimants are in receipts of benefits. For example, Crypto Exchanges might ask details if customers are working, are self-employed or in benefits. However, the crypto exchange would not ask any information they might do if something

would be suspicious. However, from experience these financial companies are managing millions of transactions on a daily basis and the possibility of slippage is Britainer than any other institutions. Same with Stock brokers, trading apps, Internet E-banking and so on.

The proposed approach, it's a more direct one and more conducive.

New FCA rules are mandatory for all banks, financial institutions, hedges funds, cryptocurrency exchanges, brokers, trading apps etc. which must allow Access to any FCA request for information as extension of official FOI with mandate from the Court.

This means the creation of a centralised database for all British financial institutions. Now, when we're undergoing reviews we will ask for information from the correspondent financial institution where we pay benefits to any claimant.

We can access the HMRC benefits database. However, we need a third financial database for all financial institutions, services in Britain which would be the FCA centralised database.

Accessing these three databases, the DWP investigation officers could forward release of information orders to all financial companies in Britain based on this law and powers given to DWP and HMRC.

Project of law (proposal). CCI department DWP & HMRC. Merging two Departments within DWP Universal Credit Review and Civil Service CDFD. Creation of Commission of Control Compliance and Investigation (CCI).

DWP and HMRC could ask for any type of financial information same as to police and any other Government or Law Enforcement authorities from Britain if such request is made by a public authorised body as DWP & HMRC, CCI Department.

Any Requests from the CCI Department must be responded to in 72 hours from the date of the request.

CCI can only ask for any financial information contained only by that financial institution.

This can be only:

Monthly statements and financial transaction history for the accounts that someone might hold.

CCI would never ask for any credit information or services offered by the financial institution.

CCI would never ask for any other information about children joint accounts, other people account,

CCI would ask for this information in a formal standard request made with that institution.

This movement meant a merger between Universal Credit Review service and CFCD into a new unified division would strengthen DWP and HMRC intelligence in combating benefit fraud and tax evasion.

Increased challenges have shifted our social culture and fabric of our society, proliferation of cash in hand economy and claiming of state benefits without the State having a firm grip on these.

This move would reduce DWP costs and will make the process of Welfare control more effective. The mission of this new enhanced department within the Civil Service would be to keep the system alive and avoid losses due to fraud , error & mistake as well foreign intervention, criminal organised fraud activities conducted by the enemy circles of the .

The benefits of this new department in conjunction with other at least 4 departments of Civil service Universal Credit Review, CFCD, CFEMS, HMRC

responsible for controlling the businesses if they pay and respect the minimum wage along with few other control and compliance departments in HMRC would be beneficial in stopping any attempt to cheat the system and exploit the benefits' system would cease.

We would have access to all financial information of someone claiming benefits, or he claimed in the past and there's evidence that might have abused, cheated the benefits' system. Moreover, economic criminality is one of the major threats to Economic and Social Independence.

Address to Parliament on the Urgent Establishment of the Compliance Control and Investigation Department

Madam Speaker, Right Honourable and Honourable Members,

The stands imperilled at a crossroads, its economic vitality and social fabric besieged by an insidious adversary: economic criminality. This malignant force, woven into the very sinews of our society, siphons billions of pounds from our Public Purse, undermines the trust of our citizens, and threatens the very pillars of our national security. From tax evasion to benefit fraud, from money laundering to the exploitation of our immigration systems, the challenges we face are not mere inconveniences but a profound assault on the prosperity and sovereignty of our nation. Today, I stand before this House to propose an urgent and transformative solution: the establishment of the Compliance Control and Investigation Department, or CCI, a unified bastion of resolve to restore the economic integrity of the .

Consider the breadth of this crisis. In our high streets, businesses that appear legitimate—be it a fast-food outlet in Manchester, a barber shop in Birmingham, or a seemingly innocuous carpet showroom in Leeds—too often serve as fronts for money laundering, concealing illicit profits behind a veneer of commerce. Sophisticated fraudsters, operating with chilling precision, orchestrate international scams targeting our citizens. In recent years, elderly residents in Cornwall have fallen prey to cold-calling frauds, where perpetrators, using Britain-based mobile and landline numbers, pose as trusted institutions to plunder life savings. These schemes, often coordinated from abroad but facilitated within our borders, expose the vulnerability of our systems.

Meanwhile, the rise in drug trafficking, fuelled by unchecked cash flows, has devastated communities in Glasgow and beyond, with criminal networks exploiting lax oversight to peddle misery.

Tax evasion and avoidance further exacerbate this crisis. Multinational corporations and wealthy individuals exploit loopholes to divert billions

from HM Revenue and Customs, funds that could bolster our National Health Service or secure the pensions of our elderly. In one stark example, a recent investigation uncovered a London-based firm funnelling profits through offshore accounts, depriving the Exchequer of millions while our schools and hospitals languished underfunded. Benefit fraud compounds this injustice, with fraudulent claims diverting welfare from those who need it most—disabled citizens in Cardiff, single parents in Newcastle, or pensioners in Norfolk who rely on the State for dignity in their twilight years. Uncontrolled immigration, both legal and illegal, has also been exploited by criminal networks. In Dover, authorities have uncovered fraudulent visa schemes enabling human trafficking, while in London, rogue operators have abused the welfare system, claiming benefits under false identities.

These are not isolated incidents but symptoms of a systemic malaise, where multinational criminal enterprises exploit the vulnerabilities of our fragmented State apparatus.

The root of this crisis lies in our inability to act with unity and resolve. Our current framework, splintered across the Department for Work and Pensions, HM Revenue and Customs, the Home Office, and assorted fraud investigation units, is hamstrung by inefficiency. Departments operate in silos, their efforts disjointed, their intelligence unshared. For instance, when the Department for Work and Pensions identifies irregularities in benefit claims, these cases are referred to separate fraud units, only to languish in bureaucratic limbo.

Our police forces, underfunded and undertrained, are ill-equipped to counter the sophistication of modern criminality. In Manchester, officers have reported being outmanoeuvred by tech-savvy fraudsters using encrypted networks to evade detection. Our legislation, too, lags behind the ingenuity of those who exploit it, leaving the State powerless to stem the tide of economic crime. If this crisis deepens, the rising costs of fraud and criminality will place intolerable strain on our public services, risking the collapse of the National Health Service and the state pension system—bedrocks of our social contract.

To confront this existential threat, we propose the creation of the

Compliance Control and Investigation Department, a formidable and unified body that consolidates the expertise and resources of our existing agencies into a single, resolute force.

The CCI will serve as the vanguard of our economic defence, centralising coordination to ensure seamless communication across government. It will harness cutting-edge data analytics and intelligence-sharing protocols to detect and dismantle criminal networks with precision. Picture a team in Bristol, using advanced algorithms to trace illicit funds from a local business to an offshore account, or investigators in Liverpool uncovering a human trafficking ring disguised as a legitimate employment agency. At the heart of the CCI will be a cadre of highly trained Civil Sheriffs, officers vested with robust powers to investigate, seize assets, and effect arrests in concert with local police forces. Their mandate will be comprehensive, encompassing benefit fraud, tax evasion, money laundering, immigration fraud, drug trafficking, human trafficking, and modern slavery. These Civil Sheriffs will not merely react to crime but proactively disrupt it, ensuring that this is no longer a haven for those who seek to exploit it.

The establishment of the CCI demands bold and immediate legislative action from this House. Parliament must confer upon the CCI statutory authority to investigate and prosecute offenders, with rigorous oversight to safeguard accountability and public trust. We must allocate substantial funding to train Civil Sheriffs and invest in technological infrastructure, ensuring they are equipped to counter the sophistication of modern criminality. Mandatory collaboration protocols must be enshrined in law, compelling the Department for Work and Pensions, HM Revenue and Customs, the Home Office, and law enforcement agencies to work as a cohesive unit.

Consider the potential: a coordinated operation where HMRC identifies tax irregularities in a Southampton-based firm, shares intelligence with the CCI, and enables Civil Sheriffs to seize assets and arrest perpetrators within days, not months. Stronger penalties for tax evasion, benefit fraud, and immigration-related offences must be introduced to deter would-be criminals, sending a clear message that

they will not tolerate exploitation. Furthermore, we must fund public awareness campaigns to empower our citizens—educating pensioners in Devon about telephone scams, or small business owners in Sheffield about fraudulent investment schemes—ensuring they are not unwitting victims of this scourge.

The rewards of this endeavour are manifold. The CCI will stem the haemorrhaging of billions of pounds lost annually to economic crime, recovering funds to fortify our public services. It will enhance the efficiency of public expenditure by eliminating the wasteful duplication of efforts across departments. It will protect our most vulnerable citizens, ensuring that welfare reaches those in genuine need—be it a disabled veteran in Kent or a struggling family in Yorkshire. By dismantling organized crime networks, both domestic and international, the CCI will bolster our national security, denying safe harbour to those who traffic in drugs, humans, or misery. Above all, it will restore the confidence of our people in the State's ability to uphold justice, protect their livelihoods, and secure their future.

Madam Speaker, Right Honourable and Honourable Members, cannot remain a soft target for international criminal syndicates. Organised criminality has evolved into a multinational industry, one that threatens the very foundations of our society. The Compliance Control and Investigation Department is not merely a policy proposal but a clarion call to action—a resolute commitment to safeguarding the economic independence and national resilience of our Britain nation. I beseech this House to act with urgency and unanimity, to enact the legislation necessary to establish the CCI, to empower our Civil Sheriffs, and to protect our citizens from the ravages of economic criminality. Let us rise to this challenge, as we have risen to challenges in the past, and secure a prosperous and just future for Britain .

Our experience within the Civil Service showed that tax evasion or failure of paying minimum wage are hand in hand with tax evasion by means of cash in hand economy and jobs and benefits claims. The links between organised criminality, benefits fraud and immigration fraud are obvious. The scheme for cash in hand economy and disguised outlets

used for money laundering not only from drugs but to disguise the money that is poured into Britain from enemy funded states and terrorist organisations to subvert and weaken our society. The number of mosques, temples and other religious establishments grew exponentially with the numbers of migrants legal or illegal and the number of unregulated outlets cash in hand economy have boomed in recent years in Britain.

As a result we have an increased bill on benefits like Universal Credit and PIP and other types of benefits, increased spending by the Home Office and increased taxes and inflation every year. The main motor is the opportunity and weaknesses of our laws to prevent this. Economic criminality, Enemy states funding from circles of Qatar, Iran, Saudi Arabia to fuel the Islamic Extremism in Britain found a fertile ground in Britain where tax evasion is easy to be made, where there's no control about cash in hand economy no control over all financial institutions not really because we have an increased number of benefits claims from people that arrived illegally in small boats where the pensionary and elderly are threatened by homelessness and lose their housing benefits because they might be asked to move somewhere else cheaper where there's no houses available due to the increased numbers of our population.

Moreover at the level of Local Councils there's increased pressure on social housing, benefits and raises in taxation of working people. We have assisted at cases like the ones in Nottingham, Birmingham and many other local councils going bust. This is unacceptable for the tax payers to support the costs of local corruption, inefficiency and should be deemed unlawful that the tax payers would support these costs.

Bringing order in our society we won't limit any essential freedoms but we will cut more and more opportunistic leeways or profiting unlawfully. The proposal of increased control would strengthen our liberties and freedoms by conserving our resources that need to be spent for the good of this country within this country.

I commend this matter to the House.

**Main obligations of the Department for Work and Pensions.
New Project Proposal of Britain Welfare for British people's wellbeing .**

Prioritising the ,

Universal Credit Welfare provision

This benefit is granted to the most vulnerable segment of society. The DWP understands the importance of Welfare in our society. The main duty is to serve, defend and help the British natives first which should be embedded as a Mandatory Constitutional obligation that everyone should adhere to.

“Poverty of my People and my Kind is non -negotiable. This is what I will defend and all you will defend in the name of my people and in the name of Britain “.

Under this Constitution the State is obliged to respect this fundamental Universal Human Right number one priority;

Every human being has the right to live.

Some members of our society and children are the most vulnerable ones.

Children that are at risk of poverty, the Welfare should grant an extra benefit called “ Food Stamps” where the parents on low income whether unemployed or low wages work and in receipt of State Benefits like Universal Credit are eligible to this benefit.

The rationale behind this measure is to avoid and tackle child neglect where horrific cases that shocked our society .

Address on the Tragic Loss of Children to Parental Neglect and Violence in the , 2020–2025

This is the message from the Constitutional Army of People of Britain, of England, Scotland , Wales and Northern Ireland to the Parliament and to all whom this may correspond.

Madam Speaker, Right Honourable and Honourable Members,

It is with a heavy heart that I rise to address this House on a matter of profound sorrow and urgent concern: the tragic deaths of children in the past five years, lost to horrific parental neglect and violence. These heart-wrenching cases, etched into the collective conscience of our nation, lay bare the devastating consequences of abuse within the home and expose critical shortcomings in our systems of protection. Each child's name—Arthur, Star, Alfie, Finley, and others—stands as a solemn reminder of our duty to safeguard the most vulnerable among us. Today, I recount these tragedies not to dwell in grief but to honour their memory by illuminating the failures that allowed such atrocities to occur, as evidenced by public discourse, including voices on X, and to spur this House to action.

In 2020, the nation was shaken by the death of Arthur Labinjo-Hughes, a six-year-old boy from Solihull, whose life was stolen by the very individuals entrusted with his care. Arthur endured unimaginable cruelty at the hands of his father, Thomas Hughes, and stepmother, Emma Tustin. Starved to the point of emaciation, beaten relentlessly, and forced to stand for hours in isolation, Arthur's frail voice, captured in recordings crying "no one loves me," haunts us still. Despite concerns raised by relatives about his deteriorating condition, social services failed to intervene with the urgency required. In June 2020, Arthur succumbed to a fatal head injury, his small body bearing the scars of prolonged abuse. Tustin was convicted of murder, and Hughes of manslaughter, in 2021. The public outcry on X was palpable, with countless users expressing anguish and fury, one post lamenting, "How could we let Arthur down so terribly?" This case exposed a grievous lapse in oversight, where warning signs were ignored, leaving a child defenceless.

That same year, in Keighley, West Yorkshire, the life of 16-month-old Star Hobson was extinguished by a campaign of brutality. Star's mother's partner, Savannah Brockhill, inflicted catastrophic injuries,

including fractured bones and internal damage, while her mother, Frankie Smith, stood by, complicit through neglect. Family members and friends raised multiple alarms with social services, reporting bruises and signs of distress, yet no decisive action was taken to remove Star from her tormentors. In September 2020, Star died from her injuries, and in 2021, Brockhill was convicted of murder, with Smith found guilty of causing or allowing her death. The tragedy reverberated across X, where users decried the “systemic failures” that left Star unprotected, one post poignantly asking, “How many more children must die before we act?” Star’s death underscored the dire need for robust intervention mechanisms to heed the cries of those who cannot speak for themselves.

In 2023, the nation mourned Alfie Phillips, an 18-month-old from Kent, whose life was cut short by a night of unimaginable violence. Alfie’s mother, Sian Hedges, and her partner, Jack Benham, subjected him to a barrage of abuse fuelled by drug and alcohol misuse. The toddler suffered over 70 visible injuries, including broken ribs, arms, and legs, and died in November 2020 from the cumulative trauma. Despite prior involvement with social services, Alfie was left in the care of his abusers, a decision that proved fatal. Hedges and Benham were convicted of murder in 2023, their trial revealing a chilling disregard for Alfie’s wellbeing. On X, the public expressed horror, with posts highlighting the “unacceptable” failure of authorities to protect Alfie, one user noting, “Another child betrayed by a system meant to save him.” This case illuminated the devastating consequences of inadequate monitoring and intervention.

Equally harrowing was the death of Finley Boden, a 10-month-old from Chesterfield, Derbyshire, in 2020. Finley was returned to the care of his parents, Shannon Marsden and Stephen Boden, just weeks before his murder, despite documented concerns about their drug misuse and history of domestic violence. Within 39 days, Finley endured 130 separate injuries, including burns, fractures, and severe bruising, inflicted with merciless cruelty. He died on Christmas Day 2020, his suffering hidden behind closed doors. In 2023, Marsden and Boden were convicted of murder, with a subsequent serious case review revealing

multiple missed opportunities to protect Finley. The outpouring of grief on X was profound, with users sharing messages like, “Finley’s death is a stain on our conscience—how could we fail him so utterly?” This tragedy highlighted the catastrophic risks of premature reunification decisions and insufficient oversight.

In 2022, the death of two-year-old Kyrell Wilson in Bradford added to this grim litany. Kyrell was killed by his mother, Emma Wilson, who subjected him to repeated physical assaults, resulting in severe internal injuries. Nursery staff had raised concerns about Kyrell’s wellbeing, noting unexplained bruises and changes in behaviour, yet social services failed to act decisively. Wilson was convicted of murder in 2022, with the court describing her actions as a “gross betrayal” of her son’s trust. On X, the public voiced frustration, with one post stating, “Kyrell’s death could have been prevented if someone had listened.” This case further exposed the gaps in communication and coordination that allow vulnerable children to slip through the cracks.

These tragedies—Arthur, Star, Alfie, Finley, Kyrell—represent but a fraction of the losses we have suffered. Each child’s death is a wound upon our nation, a stark reminder of the failures in our safeguarding systems. The voices on X, echoing the grief and anger of our communities, demand accountability and reform.

These cases reveal a pattern of missed opportunities, inadequate responses, and fragmented systems that fail to protect the most vulnerable. Madam Speaker, this House cannot stand idly by while such horrors persist. We must honour these children by strengthening our child protection frameworks, ensuring robust intervention, and holding those responsible to account. Let us act with urgency to prevent further loss and to affirm our unwavering commitment to the safety of every child in this .

Welfare provisions would apply this benefit to British parents only on benefits and in precarious conditions of life under this new benefit named food stamps. This would be a prepaid debit card that would be accepted only in supermarkets and only for food essentials. Cannot be

withdrawn in cash.

This measure would compel the parents to spend this prepaid money to have food in the house to avoid spending money on other things and leave the children without food. This is a common situation in Britain where the State needs to take action.

The eligibility to Universal Credit will be determined by the monitoring of expenses on this prepaid card as DWP as the issuer would have access to this data. Failure to provide food or use the card would trigger a thorough investigation from Social Services.

These tragedies as many others are the core of child poverty in Britain. Lack of parental resources, education, lack of monolithic family, mental health and addictions are factors of risk for a segment of the children population of this country.

The way that this benefit could be financed would be mainly from tax reduction protocols between food chains, supermarkets chains and British producers. We should be able to apply tax reduction in exchange for transfer in products for a certain amount of tax if this would be viable or establish the percent of tax reduction against the necessary costs for this new added benefit.

Careful selection of the eligible families prioritising British young parents, young parents with low resources, number of children and lack of relatives or parents support.

Direct contracts with British farmers and tax reduction for them, subvention for the products and scrapping inheritance tax and transfer this on a quote product tax. Many farmers had to put to sleep their animals, throw the milk in the sewage channel or leave the crops on the field because the supermarkets were not paying Britain farmers the price they were asking, preferring to import cheaper from abroad leaving Britain farmers no choice sometimes to abandon their production.

On top of that a heavy irrational inheritance tax has been plunked upon them. Sometimes even the supermarkets are throwing food away because not all was sold and it has expired. In exchange these quantities could be written off and supermarkets would have to sell it in exchange for Governmental Food Stamps.

We can increase bin taxes and landfill taxes for the supermarkets that are throwing food making this practice illegal in Britain .

However, financing this benefit would be possible without increasing too much the public burden.

The critics of this provision would criticise that an increase in State Benefits as an added £500-£600 on Food Stamps along with the current amount payable in Universal Credit will encourage people to stay on benefits more now.

Well I want to tell those who might want to criticise how the Universal Credit is actually working.

Universal Credit has certain elements, Standard Rate for a person or a couple (at couple rate) with no housing costs. Then the Housing element, limited capability for work and Children element. All this is paid in cash via bank transfer. Under this new arrangement Children Element on every Universal Credit claim will be moved onto “Food Stamps” .

The current rate would be increased to cover the inflation rate. This measure would ensure that this money within the child element in Universal Credit it's spent on food essentials and not something else. The same could be applicable by merging HMRC child benefits, DLA into “ Food Stamps” where credits for other essentials can be introduced by the DWP. This would give the possibility for DWP to better monitor this money and to ensure that money has been actually spent on the children of this country by their parents and legal guardians where British native children must have priority.

On the other hand segmentation of the social benefits into the prepaid cards and social cheques sent to landlords would tackle the bad spending habits that in the end would affect the most vulnerable that have no fault of their own.

This is the new Commitment of the State and the call for true Reform proposed by the Constitutional Army of People .

By case the Welfare provisions could be extended to people who are too vulnerable and incapable to work or care for themselves. The exceptions would be established on a case by case basis by DWP.

However the current system of Universal Credit became too costly and subjected to error. Last example DWP lost in 2020 during COVID 19 around over 6 billions of pounds due to fraud, error and mistake which they haven't fully recovered since.

Universal Credit must be split into Universal Credit on Standard employability provisions and Welfare where different controls and provisions are more necessary and imperative to be applied.

I commend this matter to the House.

Article 12

Constitutional Project Family and Children Rights bill

Family is defined by the union between a man and a woman which is freely, consensual and unanimously accepted as recognised and protected against any interference or restriction other than the ones applied by this Law.

This union is the manifold of our society and the family. It is recognised as being the union between a man and a woman in the purpose of harmonious coexistence, child procreation, raising and educating our future generations.

The monogamous heterosexual family composed by a biological man and woman is the fundament and pillar of our society, the monogamous family, where the man and woman are not related by blood, are not forcingly into this union and are both free to exercise their union and commitments.

The family is protected against any form of violence, coercion or any other pressure as well from external and internal factors.

The family is protected against domestic violence and this law prohibits any form of domestic violence against any member of the

family and children.

The state has the authority to immediately intervene in cases of domestic violence and with preponderance in case of violence and abuse against children whether is physical, emotional, sexual or other nature. The state must intervene with emergencies and prioritise children welfare.

This Law is the Constitutional right that guarantees:

The liberty of family, protection of children against any form of violence and abuse. Prioritising Welfare and Children Provisions, immediate help and prohibits the following. It is against any children to be subjected to domestic abuse and violence.

Police and authorities must intervene immediately and children safeguarding it's mandatory from the following responsible institutions with a mandatory duty of care by Law.

Schools, GP, Social services, Religious associations, community centres etc.

Failure to report children safeguarding issues can lead to prosecution.

It is against the Law that any children would become homeless as there's no fault of their own. No children should experience homelessness and eviction. None of British native children must experience homelessness . If the children in cause are citizens of another country the social services must deliver them safely into the premises of their embassies.

Any eviction should be made when it has been reported by the Landlord to the Welfare department of Local Council and adjacent authorities.

The Welfare must undergo preparations firstly prioritising children welfare.

No Courts should grant any decisions before any proper Welfare proceedings. Once the Welfare proceedings have been submitted any other decisions given by the Courts it is legal. It is illegal in Britain , Wales , Scotland and Northern Ireland for any children no matter their

nationalities to be made homeless. The courts must order to withhold any decisions and any actions without the confirmation from the Social Services that alternative housing arrangements have been put in place and children can move there safely; this must happen before any sentence is pronounced.

In Court any Judge must ask the Landlord and the Court Peers respectively the Social Services & Local Council workers invited by the Court that needs to show evidence of the alternative living arrangements and if the new habitation is fit to move in.

Once the Court has been satisfied with all requisites of the Law and Constitutional Rights then an eviction sentence can be issued by the Court.

When the children in question are foreigners and are not a protected category the Court must order the Embassy of that country that a Welfare case has been passed onto the Immigration Judge Custody.

The sentence must be given in 24 hours. Then the police will safely escort and place these families and children into the premises of their national embassies. The Courts can issue a temporary restriction order for the families to leave the premises of their embassies. The matter would then be dealt with by the other State responsible for its citizens including abroad.

This order is to prevent children of other nationalities from being exposed to homelessness increasing the risk of abuse, trafficking, sexual exploitation and the list is not exhaustive.

In scenarios so common these days children are experiencing not only homelessness as a cause of evictions , the increasing number of young people affected by bad parenting, dysfunctional families, single motherhood phenomenon where the step parents reject the previous children and the list is not exhaustive here.

One of the causes that contributes to child poverty is 's children being

subjected to eviction and homelessness . Children living in temporary accommodations because the parents cannot afford rent despite being in work is the hardest unsolvable social issue of today.

The majority of children's poverty is made up of a staggering majority of native British children. Whether it is poverty, lack of opportunities, lack of suitable housing, it is our main unsolvable issue. Thousands of children are attending school for the free lunch given as the primary source of food for thousands if not more children of this country. Children from native British deprived families living in poverty.

Main cause of children's poverty because this affects children's wellbeing, mental health and affects their education and development. Other causes, more widespread, are socio-economic marginalisation and bad parenting.

This Constitution guarantees the right of children to be safe, free of abuse and poverty.

This bill guarantees the children's rights to be safe, living a nourishing life to ensure their full development and growth for our next generations to come.

In this Constitution it is stipulated as the guarantee that the State is legally responsible for safeguarding the children of this country.

Children of this country must be protected by this Constitution against any kind of abuse, violence, discrimination, poverty, marginalisation and against everyone and even against the State and its Institutions.

These are the extraordinary measures that need to be imposed, and it's compulsory to transform these measures into Constitutional rights.

Children cannot be born in prison, as everyone is born free.

Children cannot be evicted, and no Judge should grant any eviction if there's no confirmation from the Local Authorities that emergency accommodation has been found where children can move directly there. This would avoid situations when children have been evicted with their families but for fault of their own, as most commonly expected unpaid

rent the Local Councils have found the leeway to reject that they have an owned duty of care.

In some cases due to the housing crisis many evicted British families have been put on the back of the queue and not considered priority or simply were no houses available which it's quite common in concentrated urban areas of the country.

In this case, Welfare provisions are compulsory to be applied. Under this Constitution, every local authority must respect these Constitutional rights.

The State will act as Guarantor for rent where every landlord, renter of property will have to register as Socially Responsible Landlord. They'll have to pay an annual licence of 50% from their first monthly rent annually.

The Welfare will pay the rent check and send the deposit rent to the landlord.

Welfare will grant this provision upon careful assessment to these categories.

Native British single parents in poverty with more than 2 children or 1 disabled child or more children.

Native British families with more than 2 children, or 1 disabled or more children

Welfare Provisions might apply equally to all those who are citizens and satisfy the criteria of category 1 and 2.

The second most widespread cause of British children's poverty is bad parenting. In this scenario, main factors such as socio-economic deprivation, addiction issues of one of the parents, even both, and the moral decline of the nuclear traditional family are main contributors that accelerate child poverty in Britain.

Usually, the State would have less or no control upon personal and marital issues of the parents and bad life choices. Unavoidably a central

theme of this society that became “taboo” it's the step fathering of a child and most of the dramatic cases registered in Britain were as result of these internal relationship conflicts .

The State has the duty to closely monitor new changes in children's circumstances . Changes to matrimony law when new children come in addition to new parents by monitoring closely these new families.

The State needs to have a mandatory role in risk assessment and monitoring the children's Welfare. Horrendous cases shattered our country in the past years when Welfare concerns have been reported to social Services but no action has been taken until it was too late. This includes the most traumatic episode of child abuse in this country, the “grooming gangs scandal”.

It is by means of this Constitution a felony for every representative of Authority that is proven guilty of not taking action upon Children Safeguarding concerns , which action could have prevented the harm or death of a child, and must be punishable by law up to 15 years of imprisonment.

It is a common feature that most of these horrific cases would have been preventable because early signs of those children abuse have been spotted by others like school , careers, family members but the Social Services didn't act promptly , they have done a poorly job in assessing the risk or any other reasons that lead to these tragedies to occur. In most cases there was clear evidence , like signs of physical injuries and other related testimonies, but Social Services didn't act and these tragedies occurred.

Hence , the necessity for the State to reinforce Children protection and Welfare and the safeguarding responsibility for children pertaining to everyone , The State by its institutions, Schools, Police , Social Services, parents and other relatives and the list is not exhaustive.

The sanction against “ Criminal negligence of Children safeguarding duties, failure to report children safeguarding issues “ for everyone in service and sword to defend this Constitution , are legally bound to respect this Constitution and to Act in the interests of British people.

This Bill of Children's Rights will make every case of negligence and

misconduct failure that has been proven as deliberately as a failure to attend and report Welfare concerns that lead to a direct harm or killing of a child by the responsible authorities , once proven guilty this might be punishable up to 15 years in prison.

This Act hopefully will heal the tragedies that produced such unbearable losses of children's lives and will ensure that these types of avoidable tragedies will never occur in our country. As well , this will strengthen the Safeguarding procedures in cases of sexual abuse of children by foster parents or step parents as Welfare and Social Services would have to monitor more closely the children's in educational environments and monitoring as well the changes of circumstances in cases of changes of partners among the parents , organise more Welfare mandatory visits in these cases to have closer look and monitor of children's familial situation in . Imagine how many cases are still unreported still of young girls abused by step parents or occasional partners and so on . What if a closer monitoring and more visits from Social Services would make these cases more preventable , to be discovered in the early signs . Recently a new shocking reality began to occur in , children suicides where the causes can be very deeply rooted in hidden abused within their families.

As a society and Nation we have a main duty of care for our children. The role Of Nation is Mothering and fathering all children to ensure that our future generations will grow safe and free of trauma and abuse. This is an intimate element that holds a society and prevents a nation from progressing, as poverty is generational as well as the generational trauma that might hold a nation in place .

Welfare Provisions it is the Duty of State to safeguard the most vulnerable segment of our society, our children are our future. The State must reinforce the mandatory safeguarding by the State Responsible Authorities .

Should be made an Offense in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland for every act of negligence in safeguarding duty of Child

Protection Services and Social Services.

Should be made illegal that Welfare Provisions be denied or put back in the queue by any local authority.

Proposal for New Policy

Children Safeguarding and Justice Act Reinstating the Capital Punishment for Foreign & Domestic Children Murderers, Abusers, Rapists, Paedophiles, Traffickers & Child Pornographers.

Our Society was shattered by unimaginable, unfathomable tragedies that were perfectly preventable where innocent lives of British children have been tragically terminated or tragically shattered.

Foreign criminals have committed the most abominable crimes against us. Our innocent children have been killed. In parks, walking with mum and dad and having their throat sliced by a foreign alienated criminal. Little girls like angels being tragically murdered in the dance classroom, our young girls being shamed, raped and murdered, our little boys and girls killed with so much hate.

If you're capable to kill someone's children what does that tell you is that your hate against our people is incommensurable, without margins that you're hate us to the point that you want our species to become extinct in the next generation or so because what else would justify the killing and raping of innocent children in Britain?

What harm have we done to you? What harm or offence have people of Britain caused to those whom they've received in their land, freely, they've gave their houses for you to sleep while they're slept outside, they gave you from their food from their little while they've starved our ate from Food Banks, they've gave you all the liberties even to have your flag up for you to feel free and appreciated. You could practice your religion freely, you could raise your children while on benefits and we

woke up every morning for you to be home with your children while our children were unsafe on the streets.

What have they given us in exchange?

Our children murdered, raped, exploited and what we have gave to them as society? No justice, just generational trauma and poverty in their own land and more poverty continued into the next cycle of generations.

As parents we don't even blink when our children are in danger. We don't hesitate for a moment to not put our life first . Moreover, I would gladly exchange our life anytime for the life of our children.

We cannot deport these criminals by just letting them here to serve partial sentences and then let them free somewhere else. We have the same duty of care owed to our children as well owed to other children abroad. We cannot let them commit more hideous crimes and it would be so unfair to keep paying for their life in prison where such an individual would be undoubtedly beyond any form of redemption.

The sentence can be just the maximum possible sentence ever carried by human justice which is the Death Penalty.

There's no moral to justify any other alternative.

As well their families must be deported stripped of any rights because they have done nothing or little to prevent such tragedies.

Death penalty should be a lesson in a hope that would scare others, because the punishment is not vengeance but is moral and lesson to be shown to everyone how pain and sufferance feels for few minutes because the pain and sufferance of our children would be for a lifetime, carrying not only the trauma in itself but the generational trauma and poverty that was no justice for them and no light seen at the end of the tunnel.

This is my Pledge for a New Politics of a new country for our children.

Same as how Mother Lion is calling her cubs, the Nation must protect its children against every harm. It's more than our duty is our survival to protect and nourish our future generations .

This is our Pledge today from the Constitutional Army of People to be subjected to National Referendum by gathering signatures in a Petition until this would become the Law.

The Law meant to Protect us and our Children from Harm that would prevent all those who wagged hate and murder against our Children that never ever should they raise again.

The Sword of Christ should be sworn as Protection and the Flag carried out for everyone to know. Now, they know.

To declare this as "The Law " of the Country as His Majesty's Promise to Deliver Justice for its own People.

Britain , would follow and prosecute anyone that carried hideous crimes against British people no matter the Jurisdiction or Territory.

Any State who is openly protecting and hosting those criminals it's an Enemy State at the address of .

Whether British or Foreign any child abuser or any terrorist or hideous offender from the list of "Unpardonable Offences" would be followed everywhere in the world and no action would stop until the Justice and His Majesty Promise to deliver Justice for British people was carried out.

There's no preferential treatment if a British hideous offender has been released from a Foreign Prison, will carry out the maximum sentence anywhere in the world if the Author was British harming innocent children and women everywhere in the world he would be followed, prosecuted and executed everywhere in the world.

If it has been proven that the family was aware of his crimes and supported them financially or in any other way they might face the same punishment if he exploited these crimes for benefits or morally repugnant financial gain they might face the same punishment. Life in prison with compulsory work would be the minimum sentence that can

be dictated to all those hideous, incomprehensible and morally repugnant criminals.

There's no pardon and no redemption because there's no solution to restore these individuals. If someone steals something, it might serve as a sentence to repair the damage.

Certain violent criminals cannot be recovered for society but it's just on a case by case basis.

However, we haven't managed to recover a child rapist, murderous paedophile, terrorist, and so on. We are unable to find the remedy because there's no other principle of compensation or cure that can heal this because we simply haven't found it yet. What we pretend that we have found it's still putting the people at risk. Even locking out the most hideous criminal in theory could still escape. Some twisted minds are enjoying and living into the same moment during their sentence in prison. This is immoral as certain wounds never heal and society must forget and gain the feeling that a proper form of Justice has been served as proportional for the nature of their crimes.

Therefore to mitigate that risk of harm, Death Penalty it's the only option and injunction against someone who committed a hideous crime from the list of "Unpardonable crimes".

List of main "Unpardonable Crimes" (can be subjected to editing, addenda and corrections anytime, the list is not exhaustive).

1. Terrorism, Serial Child Offender Killer & Rapist all, Serial child killer, Serial children abuser rapists, facilitators (Pornographers, Pimps, Proxenets).
2. Serial paedophiles caught abroad or internally, Serial rapist & criminals, Child killers in cold blood, Mother and Children killers, Pregnant mothers killers including impregnating children that might die from childbirth.
3. Organised children abuse and mutilation, whether is LGBTQ or

Ethnic religious or any form of child abuse whether individual or institutional.

LGBTQ would be declared as a Terrorist Organisation who have proliferated mass children abuse and mutilation any action targeting children must stop. Any LGBTQ propaganda to children under 18 would be declared unlawful and might be declared as a form of (noncism) and perverting of children's minds.

Would be prescribed by Law. All the Authors would be Declared as Enemy of our Nation. Would be put under International prosecution and bounties would be offered whether the enemy was captured " Death or Alive".

4. Parents, carers adults found guilty of prolonged abuse & torture of a child whether the action lead to death of the child or irreparable damages for that child.

5. We will prosecute internationally all child killers, who have committed any form of children genocide worldwide.

People demanding Justice is compulsory and non-negotiable and the Promise of Justice for all People should be the main Promise of Its Majesty vested by “ Strength of People and Grace of God “ by people and mere the people of Britain and for people of Britain and their further offsprings.

Article 13

The Rule of law and the Spirit of Law

This is a another message from the Constitutional Army of People of Britain, of England, Scotland ,Wales and Northern Ireland addressed to the Parliament and to all whom this may correspond;

Address to Parliament on Upholding the Spirit and Rule of Law through a Constitutional Court

“ Madam Speaker, Mister Speaker, Right Honourable and Honourable Members,

The United Kingdom of Great Britain has long prided itself on the sanctity of the rule of law, a cornerstone of our unwritten constitution and a guiding principle that shapes the conduct of our State. This cherished ideal ensures that justice, fairness, and equality before the law prevail, binding citizens and government alike to a shared standard of accountability. Yet, over the past two decades, the rule of law has faced relentless challenges, eroded by misinterpretations, partisan rulings, and legislative missteps that have left us questioning: to which law, precisely, does the rule of law refer? Today, I stand before this House to propose a transformative reform of a Constitutional Court to safeguard the spirit of our laws and ensure that justice, as enshrined in our constitutional principles, is upheld without compromise.

The rule of law demands that justice be administered impartially, yet recent years have exposed troubling deviations from this ideal. Courts, cloaked in the mantle of judicial immunity, have at times delivered rulings based on erroneous or biased interpretations of human rights provisions, undermining public confidence in the judiciary. For instance, dangerous individuals, including those with ties to terrorist organisations, have evaded deportation by invoking human rights claims, some as frivolous as dissatisfaction with dietary preferences, such as an alleged aversion to chicken nuggets. In one case, an individual who made multiple failed asylum claims was permitted to remain in Britain, only to

later engage in activities threatening national security. Such decisions, perceived as awkward or indulgent, erode the public's trust and compromise the safety of our communities.

Equally concerning are instances where the law has been applied with undue harshness, stifling fundamental freedoms. Overzealous enforcement of certain statutes has led to violations of freedom of speech, a right sacrosanct to our democratic society. In recent years, individuals have faced prosecution for expressing controversial but lawful opinions, chilling public discourse and undermining the very liberties our constitution seeks to protect. Furthermore, misguided legislative proposals have risked criminalising the most vulnerable among us. One government initiative sought to penalise homeless individuals for begging, failing to recognise that such measures effectively criminalise poverty itself, punishing those already destitute rather than addressing the root causes of their plight. These examples, among many, illustrate a troubling divergence between the letter of the law and its spirit, where the pursuit of justice is subordinated to expediency or misinterpretation.

Perhaps the most egregious failure of our current system is exemplified by a recent case that shocked the conscience of the nation. In 2023, two police officers were acquitted after the death of a 92-year-old disabled pensioner in a care home. Confined to a wheelchair, confused, and incoherent, this elderly individual was alleged to have threatened staff with a blunt, round-tipped cutlery knife—hardly a weapon of menace. Yet, the response was lethal, resulting in the loss of an innocent life. The jury's decision to find the officers not guilty has raised profound questions about the competence and impartiality of such verdicts. This case, widely discussed on mass media and social media, where users decried the verdict as a “miscarriage of justice,” underscores the fallibility of juries and the need for a mechanism to review decisions that contravene constitutional principles.

To address these systemic failings, I propose the establishment of a Constitutional Court, a supreme arbiter tasked with ensuring that every judicial decision aligns with the fundamental rights enshrined in our

unwritten constitution. This court would serve as a guardian of public safety, national security, freedom of speech, the right to a fair trial, and, above all, the right to justice—a right owed by the State to every citizen.

The Constitutional Court would empower civil society, the free press, and those affected by judicial errors—particularly victims and their families—to challenge rulings that violate these sacred principles. For instance, in cases where dangerous individuals evade accountability through questionable human rights claims, or where vulnerable citizens suffer unjustly due to excessive force, as in the case of the elderly pensioner, aggrieved parties could seek redress before this court.

The Constitutional Court's mandate would be clear: to review and, if necessary, overturn decisions that breach constitutional rights. Should a retrial be ordered and a judge found to have erred in applying the law, they could face professional consequences, ensuring accountability within the judiciary itself. The court's rulings would be final and binding, enforced without exception, to restore public confidence in the administration of justice. Moreover, there would be no statute of limitations for breaches of constitutional rights, ensuring that justice remains accessible to all, regardless of when a wrong was committed. This reform would not supplant our existing judicial framework but strengthen it, ensuring that the spirit of the law and justice, fairness, and equity does prevail over narrow or misguided interpretations.

The benefits of this proposal are manifold. A Constitutional Court would reaffirm the rule of law as a living principle, not a hollow slogan, ensuring that no citizen is denied their fundamental rights. It would protect our society from threats posed by those who exploit legal loopholes, while safeguarding the liberties of those unjustly penalised. It would restore faith in a judiciary too often perceived as distant or unaccountable, as evidenced by the outcry on mass media over cases like that of the pensioner's death. Above all, it would honour the right to justice, ensuring that victims, their families, and the wider public are not left to bear the consequences of judicial error.

Madam Speaker, Right Honourable and Honourable Members, the rule of law is the bedrock of our democracy, but it is only as strong as our commitment to its spirit.

The establishment of a Constitutional Court is not merely a reform but a moral imperative—a clarion call to uphold justice, protect our citizens, and preserve the integrity of our unwritten constitution. I beseech this House to act with resolve, to enact the legislation necessary to create this court, and to ensure that no decision, no matter how cloaked in judicial authority, stands above the principles that define us as a nation. Let us renew our pledge to justice and secure a future where the rule of law reigns supreme.

I commend this proposal to the House “.

The main extracted proposed principle would be:

Every Court decision must be Constitutional. Meaning that needs to ensure that no Constitutional Rights are violated by any Court Decision.

Public Safety, National Security, Freedom of Speech, Right to a fair trial are Guaranteed by this Constitution. As well the main right which is The Right to Justice owned by the State to every citizen and guaranteed by this Constitution.

In their cases the Civil Society, Free Press, anyone affected by wrongdoing of Court of Law decisions including families and victims' families could bring this case to the Constitutional Court.

If the case would go to retrial and the previous judge is found in breach of the Constitutional Rights and the Law might face prosecution.

Any decision of the Constitutional Court is definitive and must be enforced.

There's no limit for breaching any Constitutional Rights. A Constitutional Right cannot be revived by Parliament nor Government .

The Head of State cannot revoke any Constitutional Right . The only instance is people and mere people . The only instance that in future might review , add, revoke or modify certain Constitutional rights and only by means of referendum with a majority of 60% of total voting population and not majority. The right of a Nation can be decided only by a majority pertaining to the same nation and never more by a minority.

The Popular Constitution of Britain , The Popular Constitution of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland will be the main document that will guide the Constitutional Court.

The Popular Constitution will be instituted by means of National Referendum and will become mandatory for any Government from the moment that People will decide in its favour.

Article 14

National Security Act and Civil Security Act

The first priority to ensure the National Security of a country is to ensure the individual citizens' security.

In recent years our British shores have been literally invaded by organised armies of military age men disguised as asylum seekers. I will ask just a question and I will leave to your critical latitude to comment about this.

If they can organise themselves and smuggle themselves illegally into the National territory of the , my question is how hard would it be to smuggle weapons when their numbers have now doubled the numbers of our military active personnel.

It should be considered as an Act of War, the organised collective trespassing and violation of our borders and security. Those who are attempting to cross our border illegally and have been found as organised

as planning, numbers, resources, links with other enemy states should be detained under a new updated and reinstated Parliament Act “Defence of the Realm Act 1914”.

This should be formulated into a “Constitutional mandate” as of, those who organise, initiate, maintain and participate in actions that endanger the national security and border integrity are committing a criminal offence.

In recent times our country, Britain, has been confronted with an unprecedented threat to its integrity, borders control, social safety and credibility of its system of laws.

Those challenges were brought not only by uncontrolled mass migration but also by illegal migration.

Our judiciary systems should have preserved the integrity in acting first and foremost in the Interest of National Security, Public Safety and Vital interests of its citizens.

In recent years, mass migration illegal or supposedly legal have a semblance of increasing challenges in our society.

A dramatic increase of sexual offences and violence against women and girls that have now deemed Britain as an unsafe place for women, increase in benefits expenditure for new comers, the increase in organised criminality, theft, robbery, shop lifting, public nuisance, violence, knife murder.

All these challenges and uncontrolled levels of immigration have brought more sophisticated criminality, from Eastern Europe and other parts of the world organised gangs of drugs and human traffickers, armed organised violence of military grade, with sophisticated cyber criminality as card cloning, benefits fraud at industrial scale, hacks of vital information systems, scamming networking all these operations hitting hard our society, increasing public expenditure, challenging our Police many times unfunded, outnumbered and unprepared against the new wave of imported organised, militarised international criminality.

Illegal immigration and boat crossing it's just the surface, the first lair of a deeper scar of our society. Dubious ONG's with dubious funding

that might come from part of adversary states as recently Iranian state agents disguised as refugees were plotting another terrorist attack on Britain soil, in continuation of those we had in Manchester, London and many more nefarious episodes of our recent history.

Mass deportation it's an imperative, it's our duty to preserve the country for the next generations to come.

A peaceful, prosperous and governable .

Mass unlawfulness it's the synonym with mass migration, the path towards a failed state and an ungovernable state where gangs will impose their law, where the Police cannot maintain the order and where the level of taxation would become unbearable for working class people of this country.

This is our Law proposal and strategies to enforce our current laws.

This Constitution would proclaim this article first.

The State has its fundamental obligation to protect the physical, social, moral and economic integrity of its citizens.

The State has his main duties to its citizens. The State might have some duties with citizens of other states but it is at the discretion of the State how to establish these rules and the legal framework for it.

A legal migrant is a person of another state residing within the territory of Britain which has a legal purpose to be here.

Can be someone employed in Britain . Can be someone's spouse but subjected to immigration and regulations duties.

Can be a person who's studying here. However his provisions would be the same as applicable with a tourist in this case a person who studies is a person that resides here for a sole purpose in the conditions of his stay according to his type of visa.

A person that has granted protection is a person limited by default to a

person that might reside as a genuine refugee with condition of return upon the change of circumstances in its country of origin.

By Law an illegal person is deemed as:

A person without no right of entry.

An undocumented person.

A person that's out of purpose in Britain.

A person that it's in breach of his initial visa conditions.

A person that proves to be out of scope .

A person deemed to be a dangerous person to the public.

A person that represents a threat for national security.

In this guidance we will clarify these legal definitions and categories of an illegal migrant and the subsequent set of legal avenues that the Government might take.

Violation of border integrity trespassing Britain borders it's an act of sabotage of our national security.

A person found in breach of Britain territorial integrity, border security a sentence up to 12 years of imprisonment must be upheld against him.

The right to invoke any protection including right to asylum or any kind of protection would not be applicable because in the spirit of the law if there's a felony which a conviction needs to be pronounced the conviction would be primarily pronounced. No other rights can scrap the conviction when a felony has been proved in court beyond any reasonable doubts.

A person found in breaching Britain borders integrity would be first convicted up to 12 years in prison.

The state can withdraw the charge if the person accepts voluntary deportation.

In this case might be given a suspended sentence. A person entering illegally in the country cannot exercise any other rights while he's

spending his initial conviction.

If a person is found undocumented then the maximum of 12 years of penalty should be imposed for aggravating circumstances, such as concealing the identity and breaching Britain border integrity.

Breaching the integrity of a State it's a serious offence. It stands as a threat to Britain national sovereignty, national security and should be treated as an act of war.

Every country has certain vulnerabilities inclusive on matters of territorial land or sea borders. Exploiting those inherent weaknesses can destabilise the national security of our State. Would reveal routes where our apparatus might have vulnerabilities.

Data and information might be shared with other enemy states that could exploit those leeways before the State's reaction.

Imagine that someone's have found weaknesses on how to enter Britain territory and those have been exploited before intelligence services had time and resources to react. Then, these routes can be used by criminal or enemy entities to introduce weapons, spies, drugs even to smuggle out wanted criminals and terrorists in Britain.

Applying the law strictly would act as a deterrent but as well as a shield for our National Security.

Another category of illegal immigrants are the persons out of purpose in Britain. Generally are people who come here legally but they've breached the purpose of their stay. This would be applicable for citizens of other safe countries, that are long time unemployed and they cannot justify the source of their income by the case and they do not speak English or any other language within Britain like Celtic Gaelic, Scottish Gaelic, Welsh, Cornish, Manx etc.

These citizens are from safe countries generally. They come on the back of their promise that they will work and help the economy.

Any foreign citizen which cannot justify their purpose in the country are declarable as illegal migrants by law. If they commit offences but within a minimal threshold and they are unable to justify their means of

existence, being long time unemployed and committing offences are eligible for deportation.

Violent foreign criminals and sex offenders can have their sentence transferred in their country of origin based wherever possible on international treaties where these criminals can be transferred in the custody of their countries of origin.

A recent case shocked public media where a child sex offender hasn't been deported because he invoked the right to family life meaning to be with his children.

Britain has a duty of care, hence services such as Child Protection would remove under the Court order every child from the custody of bad and abusive parents that can put the child and his life at risk.

Violent criminals and sex offenders including child sex offenders cannot invoke the right to family life in Britain not against a compulsory order of child protection in Britain.

Britain has the same duty of care owed to every child despite his nationality or parents legal status as long it has been proven that the parent represents a risk for that child.

Appallingly the Justice system has released foreign child sex offenders back to their victims. Thus the Court decision should have been made unconstitutional and unlawful because the decision in cause " invoking a right to family life " has breached the Child Protection Act in Britain that no children shall live or return to live in a familial environment that puts that child and his life at risk.

A person out of scope is a person in breach of his visa conditions, whether is coming for a temporary working contract , student visa and he tries to contact marriage, working illegally while is a student or not working for the initial sponsor; this person is mainly eligible for immediate deportation. He could only have a right to appeal by proxy and such action must be initiated from someone from Britain on behalf of this person.

Breaching a tourist visa, or other types of visas with temporary character and overstaying it is a felony punishable with imprisonment up to double of the period that this person overstayed.

This person can have a suspended sentence if accepted to return voluntarily in his country of origin by means of its expense or the expense of the State of the person's origin.

The other two provisions are very straightforward. Anyone that represents a threat to Britain national and public security would be immediately deported. Refusal to collaborate with immigration authorities in establishing identity and place of origin might constitute a felony punishable up to 12 years in prison if that person represents a risk to national security and public safety.

In extraordinary circumstances a dangerous person can be arbitrarily deported into the country where the Home Office and Immigration border patrol might have information that the person in cause it is provenient of a certain country of origin.

These powers must be exercised mostly in cases where National Security is at risk and when that person poses a serious risk for National Security or Public Safety.

Measures that can be taken.

The Parliament would grant extra powers to all Police corporations in Britain to stop, search and verify, weapons and illicit substance carrying and immigration status in Britain.

The Police must have powers to stop and search for immigration status to anyone who the Police believes might reside illegally in Britain national territory.

Building a mega prison able to host up to fifty thousand (50000) inmates. This would act as a convincing deterrent instead of spending more if we have sent these individuals to a third country. It's a moral point here in this matter. Should we export our problems and put other people at risk elsewhere? Outsourcing the problem doesn't solve the problem.

Legally it would be difficult for a third country to detain someone on his territory if that person hasn't committed any crime there.

The laws of another country cannot be changed by an international treaty between Britain and the third country because the third country involved in this treaty is itself an independent state with its own laws. Therefore, it is a certain risk that a person that possess a real threat against Britain national security as terrorism, espionage for an enemy state, subversive actions that can put the national security at risk, violent criminals, sex and child sex offenders to be left in freedom if he's sent to a third country might commit serious offences there or even he might come back to Britain again.

Imprisonment it's a better deterrent and data that supports that a number of reoffenders it's generally smaller than the ones that have offended and served in the past. Moreover, it keeps the public safe reducing the possibility for an illegal and undocumented migrant to commit any offences. The staggering number of complaints received from members of the public about sexual offences, harassment against women and girls quadrupled the same numbers as 10 years ago, maybe less. Overall lack of State action and impunity had made the public frustrated with the State and Police in this country.

In order to deport very large groups of people Britain needs to recruit more forces and to create The Border Patrol Armed forces under Britain Armed Forces command.

This move would increase the number of Britain's armed forces now standing at approximately 130 000.

For a more successful operation Britain Armed Border Patrol Forces would need at least seventy thousands (70000) more active personnel including Prison Guardians etc.

Potential financing could come from pausing or scrapping aid, reclaiming Chagos Islands and scrapping any further payments, reviewing and stopping benefits to those who are unemployable, Britain's fines issued to water companies for damage and pollution, fines issued against Amazon for monopoly practices and violation of workers rights, more taxation upon gambling companies even up to 90% and possible

nationalisation by ceasing their gambling licences with Britain, transferring funds from defence towards the creation of Britain Border Patrol Armed Forces. This move would increase the internal defence capacity of the country. Enhance the Police training in order to be able to help in apprehension of illegal immigrants, foreign criminals and so on. Expenses in hotels, benefits and housing would save more money.

The mega prison project would be a deterrent and it will stand as a symbol of resistance of British people. Later can be used to contribute to increasing the capacity of Britain's prison system which would improve our security.

Without social peace you cannot have sustainable economic growth.

As well is necessary for the success of this operation the dismantling of any network of support.

Prescribing NGO that are promoting illegal mass migration.

Punishing all those who are schooling everyone on how to cheat Britain immigration system.

The punishment should be made under a new Law. Conspiracy against Britain Border Security. This is because every crime that an illegal newcomer will commit, anyone assisting illegal immigrants to commit crimes must be held accountable and punished under the Law.

Complicity and Conspiracy against Britain border security and integrity.

Any person responsible with furnishing any information or facilitating resources, services, information to any person of other nationality with the purpose of obtaining underserved benefits by creating manipulated cases, training the person answer's with sole purpose of deceiving, misrepresenting and manipulate the system of laws must be punished in accordance with the Law.

The maximum length of the sentence must carry up to 5 years in

imprisonment up to 15 years if it's proven that an organised element of criminality has been proven and found guilty of.

Fines up to 5 million pounds if the aggravated felony have been committed by a Member of The Law Society adding aggravating circumstances as breaching the ethnic code of lawyers profession, erosion of public trust in justice, erosion of law systems where the law is hacked by making it unpracticable “ see the case where a Nigerian woman after several failed attempts to obtain asylum, has obtained asylum by joining terrorist organisation prescribed in Nigeria “ and the list is not exhaustive.

If any person of Law is found in breaching of this Law must be banned from practicing the Law, fines up to 5 million of pounds and closure of Law firms if they have been found guilty in coaching asylum seekers, and have facilitated in any form to obtain an asylum claim decision in favour of any of its clients if the result was by means of fraud, deception and law manipulation.

The Law will punish any person or organisation that facilitates the aid of any illegal immigrants inside and outside Britain national territory.

The maximum sentence that can be carried is up to 3 years in prison with a minimum bond of 1 million pounds.

The British Government has a mandatory duty of care for its own borders security, to protect its own citizens against any internal or external threats and to respond to citizens' demands where at the stake are; Britain's integrity and security of all its citizens and above all the future of us and our children.

Public Safety Trade ,Customer Protection and Food Hygiene Act.

Britain and Europe began to confront a wider problem that hasn't been spoken about. The influx of new cultures brought with them an influx of new culinary and cuisine practices here in Britain and Western society. However, many of these new cousins brought unsanitary and unsafe practices that are a risk to public safety and might pose a risk to public health. This is not limited only to dirty dishes or cramped spaces to cook,

it's a wider issue. Since the expansion of online trade the regulations regarding safety, quality and hygiene of products became less enforceable and harder to be applied. Unfortunately, this has damaged our local economies putting the local independent producers out of business when an uncontrolled influx of low quality and dangerous products to human health and children's safety started pouring in our country. From exotic foods, unlabelled products, low quality and dangerous items all together are posing a risk to economy, environment and public health.

The risk is a major one. For instance unsafe and unhygienic modes of preparation and handling of food can develop new diseases where new resistant viruses can mutate. This might expose the public to a wider risk. The virusology it's a complex science. Hence why most countries have very strict controls when new products are brought into our countries because they might pose a danger to public health.

However, we have spoken very little about the unsafe and unsanitary practices when new cultures brought these in . Unsanitary conditions of food preparation within the fast food delivery services, lack of control and hygiene had added another pair of issues regarding public health

Practices like Halal and Kosher could be deemed as a public health hazard if the conditions in which these cultural rituals are practiced favor the risk of disease and new viruses that can be transmitted to humans.

We need a different organism;

Public Hygiene Commissioner with Sheriffs with powers mandates and badges with the same structure as any law enforcement agencies who can enter any premises to issue fines, shut down places and arrest individuals.

Selling food in unhygienic conditions, improperly labelled it's a risk to public health and could lead to prosecution if:

Hygiene conditions are a danger to public health. Presence of diseases, infestation like, (E.coli, Cryptosporidium, Giardia, Toxoplasmosis Trichinella, Hepatitis, norovirus, Campylobacter) amongst others.

As well as mislabelled products (allergens) can cause death if ingested. Cases when "peanuts" have been mislabelled as almonds and people with allergies died ordering takeaway food that contained these allergens have been documented in Britain.

We need a Public Safety Act that could protect the public health and create the legal conditions to prohibit unsafe and unhygienic culinary practices. If such a body had been implemented in Britain, patrolling the businesses to see if the law is respected would have reduced the number of these cases. Another aspect worrying for our society is the access to underage individuals to tobacco products like vaping (disposable vapes) and alcohol sometimes.

We often see so many children vaping on the streets and the question is how they procure those products so easily? We need to Policing more effectively all commercial agents to ensure that the standards of safety, sanitation and lawfulness it's respected in Britain .

This matter has been dealt with so much complacently for so many years just assuming that new cultures who come to have the same hygiene standards of service, ethics and safety of trading standards. We're so wrong and unrealistic to assume that when the evidence is pointing to the obvious.

Constitutional Army of People. National Justice Act. Mass deportation and National Security.

Principles & Definitions:

Suprapopulation has been the main historic cause of every major Civilisation decline , the Social Apocalypse that whipped entire Civilisations from the face of the Earth from the Roman Empire , To Byzantyne Empire and Europe , during Muslim and Ottoman Occupation all they had a sole purpose of replacing adversarial countries, strengthening their positions and cancelling cultures that would threaten their existential ground of their exploitative systems of human by the human .

As long as cultures as ours would exist as British Christian culture based on Liberty , Freedom of Speech , Individual Propriety & Individual Rights , Woman and Children Rights , Christianity and Mutual Respect this would represent a constant threat for Exploitative Systems based on Oriental values of individual submission in front of another individual, children prostitution and economic exploitation.

Foreign Welfare Bill,

After Brexit , grave errors have been made and those weren't only simple mistakes they were planned to make on purpose to cancel any attempt of Independence in front of Globalism. Firstly , the settlement status after Brexit has been given to the wrong European Citizens. Most of the ones who helped our economy in vital domains such as Agriculture, LGV drivers and essential Warehouse have been disqualified by the 3 years or 5 years rule, because they didn't stay in Britain. The ones who were coming to do productive work were going back to their countries when the work was done like agriculture ,LGV and Constructions contracts and they were coming back when more work was available. Their work has been indispensable and productive and there`s no denial about this.

In exchange this dichotomy has been produced. The 3 years or 5 year`s rule benefited directly all those Rromanians from Romania , Slovakia, Bulgaria predominantly who were exclusively in the British benefits Systems , like Universal Credit in Britain and Social Security in Ireland those who never worked a day in their life and they don't speak a word of English and have numerous families and new born children every year at the expense of native tax payers.

These citizens are from perfectly safe countries which are now in the European Union since the moment of their adhering as Romania and Bulgaria in 2006 and Slovakia in 2004.

We should gather the data from DWP and Ireland must gather data from Social Security of how much has been spent on their own citizens from perfectly safe countries from 2004 respectively 2006 and issue all those countries with the Foreign Welfare Bill that they must pay to the British and Irish people. Why? Because this is the British people's money

, Irish people's money , British children's money that they need education clothes , food , health as well Irish Children money that need education in their language, housing , food , as child poverty is the same there as in .

Confiscation order to assets pertaining to the state of Romania as Gold Reserve of that Country deposited to the Bank of England about 8.5 billion Euros must be confiscated as collateral for the expenses that have to endure supporting their citizens. The same must be applied with any other country that sends their undesirable citizens here instead of them dealing with them. When those countries have thrived economically and registered economic increase at the expense of British tax payers where they didn't have to deal with the waves of criminality brought by these citizens here , lack of basic civilization skills, beggary , human trafficking and prostitution, organised shop lifting , scams and criminality know-how spread across . No need to mention organised benefit frauds , ATM's attacks , hacking , drug and human trafficking all this new wave of organised and militarised criminality has been provenient from one part of Europe and predominantly by the same ethnic group.

Mass deportation of these type of illegal immigrants would be relatively simple , first they have a country of provenience that's perfectly safe to return, their Right to Remain can be revoked by Law , as they have not worked , nor contributed or integrated into the Society , those countries can be obliged to take them back even with their own assistance for this mission. So this plan is very easy and straightforward and there is not much excuse that this plan wouldn't succeed.

So this is the number one category of illegal immigrants (easy to deport , safe place to return , countries might have collateral to cover

damages, rich growing economies in Europe).

Red Duty Stamp

This policy would be applicable to large groups of unintegrated Muslim population predominantly among others from regions as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Shri-Lanka, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan.

Cutting the Welfare bill for all those and creating a Global Tax called Red Duty Stamp that will be supported by every Mosque or Temple as the centre and symbol of their community. This would relieve the current pressure on our Welfare bill where this needs to be paid by the ones legally responsible for bringing them here as extended family members non-integrable who do not speak English and never worked in amongst other categories.

We will calculate the costs with these types of illegal immigrants using DWP and Home Office data and we will issue a global tax that will be issued to all mosques and temples in the country. Those in cause will be referred to their communities for them to cover the costs of their living and housing as well. We might further consider adjacent costs as medical bills, dental bills , school and others more..

This wouldn't deter more boats coming in but at least will slow them a bit however this is the first step in gathering the necessary resources that country needs for the phase 3. This solution would be applied temporarily to allow the country to gather the necessary resources and use as much as possible any extent of diplomatic solutions to return criminal, convicted paedophiles and sex offenders, terrorists and other offenders.

Military Solution

Those countries wouldn't not accept their citizens back. It is very likely that those countries will try to interrogate any discussions as attempts have been made in the past. Hacks like if those citizens have acquired British citizenship are not allowed back to India , or if they gave up Pakistani citizenship are not allowed either. Governments such as Algeria, Tunisia , Morocco , Egypt are well known for refusing to take their citizens back. The illegal immigrants they use a well known hack , as they starting to speak with Palestinian accent all being Arabic speaking countries trying to

Confuse the authorities to avoid deportation. This is a well known situation and as well the complicity of those states that relies heavily of foreign remittances sent back by their illegal immigrants. In this case the military solution became compulsory .

First category will be men , then their families and the third one single unmarried woman or single mothers with children which in this case the third category might fall under review. However , 90% of those subjectable to mass deportation make no exception or very little. Syria and Iraq there's no war and they need to go back, Somalia, Eritrea and Ethiopia there's no war anymore. Those countries are safe now. Everywhere where past conflict existed and where those citizens are residing still here on the back of a past asylum application are now deemed as being illegal in the National Territory of . Other categories of illegal economic migrants come through the EU route mostly from Romania where they're legally employed there and then they're crossing illegally into Western countries . The main entry for Albanian,

Vietnamese, Cambodian, Brasil, Venezuela , Nepal, Bangladesh, Shri-Lanka and African countries are mostly via Black Sea through Romania and the Mediterranean Sea through Greece, Spain, Italy . However those previous entries began to reinforce themselves and currently we're speaking the most vulnerable point is Romania. There's almost all illegal immigration pouring into Europe and then via Calais to Dover. This is due to their highly incompetent and corrupt Government there but mostly because that country is separated into two antagonistic entities as Romania and the rest Moldova and Transylvania being under Romania's Occupation .

The military route is necessary as no mass deportation plans would succeed due to the potential violence that will spill out and retaliation against the native British population from those that will be forced to leave a comfortable life at the expense of indigenous population. We must be aware of the risks and dangers. However, Britain's risk and danger is not to do anything and let them take our country, our land and to become a nuclear threat against humanity .

We will need to organise our Armed Forces and first to initiate a Mandatory Military Draft to anyone deemed able and responsible to come in defence of our country.

These are not political migrants because the genuine asylum seekers hardly commit any crimes if no crimes at all because knowing that you've been through life and death situations you'll be scared and traumatised and hardly wanting to go out and socialise and to some genuine people they might take years for them. Most of those migrants are men of military age that might pose a real danger to National Security as they're organising militarily inside our country and the

question of smuggling weapons inside is a feasible and imminent danger that needs to be prevented.

However, the need for a written Constitution is also compulsory. This article can be drafted as a proposal that can be subjected to National Referendum.

If a military action would be necessary then we should have a mandatory draft, the purpose would be to secure the country and keep order and security of native population in case of organised retaliatory actions . Curfew and surrounding , securing those perimeters where we will detain in mass illegal immigrants mostly men and we will deport safely under military escort back to their countries of destination. This is the first phase of the military plan. We will avoid women and children and we will deport all men first , then we will ensure that their families will follow safely on commercial aeroplanes or militarily assisted humanitarian operations to reunite them outside the national territory of .

Proposed Constitutional Article : Citizenship , Nationality and Population Act.

An illegal immigrant is defined by this article as anyone who is into the national territory of Britain , who does not have any legal forms , who is not a tourist and has no imminent intention to leave .

There are few more categories of unlawful residents whose status becomes one of an illegal immigrant . Those who overstayed visas , those who come to work and have achieved employment by fraudulent means or schemes , those who asylum is not supported and those who achieved British citizenship by fraud , by deceptions, false representation and cannot make the proof of integration as knowledge of the English language, employment history and so on , might be deemed as unlawful residents or citizens of the of Britain and in cases that the

citizenship has been obtained without knowing English language or holding views and behaviours against British people those must be subjected to compulsory deportation orders.

Citizenship is not an entitlement , in some situations someone even born in a territory of a pre-established country cannot prove its affinity to that country and nation if he holds views and actions that are targeting and harming his country and its people. Whoever holds enemy actions against the members and interest of their own countries whether born or residing in a country are unlawful citizens of that country by default.

To establish a Universal Criteria applicable in this stance we must examine the nature and damage extent of an action that can be considered as enemy , belligerent or higher treason.

If a person is committing an act that as a result has a significant impact upon public safety , national interest , economy , independence, borders integrity ,strategic military and economic objectives (espionage and high corruption) that person is punishable to the highest extent of the Law might even risk life in prison depending by the extension and nature of the damage produced.

This article would exclude political views, as if someone is politically or ideologically motivated to conspire against its own country and people we will treat this act only by the nature of the damage produced. The damage would be the criteria in establishing the true nature of the offence in this case.

The true quality of Citizen is the respect of Law as this is the main guarantee of all legitimate rights that someone might have . The duty for yourself and your life , being a useful individual for yourself living a fulfilling life in your benefit and others abiding the law and respecting the other's values and not abiding from the Laws, and Values of your own Kind , Country, History and Tradition in good sense of National Pride, Historical Continuity and fight for your family , land and freedoms . The acceptance of any foreign citizens must be at the discretion of current citizens of any country including ours . The rules are not fixed but are only dependent on our general and wide interest called the National Interest . If certain grandparents fought for this

Country, worked and integrated , the next generation became rogue and against the common order and interest of , turning again Native Population and by means of enemy policies , harmful doctrines now they've put this country in grave danger. There is no contract for them . There's only continued duty and line of duty for everyone that wants to be of this country and in this country.

The Public Food Safety and Integrity Act

Represents a vital legislative response to an escalating yet often understated crisis confronting Britain: the erosion of public health and consumer confidence through inadequate food hygiene, unsafe additives, deceptive labelling, and lax oversight of food businesses. In an era of diverse culinary influences and rapid changes in supply chains, these threats—ranging from preventable disease outbreaks to fraudulent practices—impose substantial burdens on the National Health Service, diminish economic productivity, and undermine trust in the food system. This Act proposes a comprehensive, enforceable framework to restore integrity, protect vulnerable populations, and affirm food safety as a matter of national security.

Britain faces a silent but pervasive threat from food-related hazards. The convergence of globalised supply chains, informal vending practices, and inconsistent regulatory enforcement has amplified risks of contamination, adulteration, and misrepresentation. Recent data from the UK Health Security Agency and the Food Standards Agency reveal alarming trends. In 2024, laboratory-confirmed cases of *Campylobacter* rose sharply to 70,352 in England alone, marking a 17.1% increase from 2023 and the highest level in a decade. *Salmonella* infections similarly climbed to 10,388 confirmed cases, up 17.1%. Shiga toxin-producing *E. coli* (STEC) outbreaks, including a significant 2024 incident linked to contaminated leafy greens in pre-packed sandwiches, resulted in

hundreds of cases, hospitalisations, and fatalities. These surges, partly attributed to post-pandemic behavioural shifts and improved detection, highlight persistent vulnerabilities in hygiene controls, particularly in poultry, fresh produce, and ready-to-eat foods. The societal cost of foodborne illness remains immense, with estimates placing the annual burden at around £9–10 billion, encompassing healthcare expenditure, lost productivity, and intangible human suffering.

Historical and contemporary incidents underscore the urgency. In Britain, past outbreaks—such as the 2016 *E. coli* O157 case in South Wales, which affected 150 people and caused one death due to contaminated lettuce, or the 2019 *Salmonella* incident in Yorkshire linked to substandard poultry processing—demonstrate recurring failures in sanitation and cross-contamination prevention. More recent examples include a nationwide *Campylobacter* surge exceeding 50,000 cases annually and a 2024 STEC outbreak tied to salad leaves, hospitalising scores and claiming lives. Investigative journalism, including exposés on delivery platforms' "dark kitchens," has exposed unhygienic conditions in mobile and ghost operations, where oversight is minimal and risks proliferate.

Globally, parallels reinforce the need for vigilance. The 2008 Chinese melamine scandal poisoned 300,000 infants through adulterated milk powder, while the 2011 European *E. coli* O104:H4 outbreak, originating from contaminated sprouts, caused 53 deaths and thousands of illnesses, including in Britain. These events illustrate how unsafe additives, poor handling, and deceptive practices transcend borders, demanding stringent domestic safeguards.

Specific concerns arise from evolving culinary and business practices. The integration of diverse methods, including certain ritual slaughter techniques exempted under existing regulations, can heighten contamination risks if not rigorously managed, as evidenced by occasional violations in hygiene standards. Street food and delivery

models, often operating with limited facilities, mirror challenges seen elsewhere, where informal setups contribute to microbial hazards. Mass migration and unregulated imports introduce potential novel pathogens, to which local populations may lack immunity, elevating risks to public health and constituting a national security concern when oversight falters. Such lapses border on criminal negligence against the British people.

Deceptive practices compound these dangers. Mislabelling—such as peanuts falsely declared as almonds—has led to fatal anaphylactic reactions, with allergen-related incidents remaining a leading cause of recalls. Portion misrepresentation, where advertised weights exceed actual servings, deceives consumers and erodes fairness. Unsafe additives, including banned substances like certain trans fats or ractopamine in pork from non-compliant origins, alongside expired or prohibited goods, infiltrate markets through weak border and retail controls. In England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, mislabelling or absence of accurate information must be treated as a criminal offence, akin to fraud or negligence, with severe penalties.

The proposed Public Food Safety and Integrity Act establishes a robust framework to counter these threats. It creates an independent **Public Hygiene Commission** (PHC), headed by a Commissioner appointed by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, with regional offices and policing powers in collaboration with constabularies. Central to enforcement are **Hygiene Enforcement Officers** (HEOs), trained as high-authority figures akin to sheriffs, numbering around 500 initially. Empowered under the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, HEOs would conduct unannounced inspections of premises, markets, shops, and businesses; impose fines up to £2 million for smaller entities (with unlimited court penalties for large firms exceeding £1 billion revenue); order immediate closures; effect arrests for grave offences like deliberate contamination; and seize unsafe, expired, or banned products.

Legal provisions strengthen existing frameworks. Enhanced Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) protocols would mandate six-monthly audits, strict temperature controls, safe disposal of contaminated items, and special containment services to prevent pathogen spread. Slaughter without pre-stunning would require independent PHC verification and certification. Additives face stricter bans and pre-market assessments, with sales or imports of harmful substances classified as criminal offences under a tiered regime for carcinogenic or dangerous compounds.

Deceptive practices face prohibition: mislabelling of allergens, origins, or portions incurs penalties up to seven years' imprisonment where harm results. The Government would hold a state monopoly on issuing a unique, official Food Quality Label Stamp, mandatory for all alimentary products at a nominal cost (no more than one penny per label) to fund operations. This standardised certification would eliminate confusion from foreign or inconsistent labelling, protect consumers and domestic producers alike, and mirror mandatory regimes in taxation or wages.

Product safety extends to rigorous checks for expired goods, banned imports, and compliance with British standards. A public reporting portal, potentially blockchain-secured for transparency, would enable anonymous submissions, with witness protections and rewards for substantiated leads yielding significant seizures. Annual PHC reports to Parliament would detail inspections, enforcement actions, and outcomes. Implementation begins with a twelve-month consultation involving the Food Standards Agency, Trading Standards, businesses, unions, and consumer groups, followed by £50 million investment in HEO training. A pilot phase in diverse regions would evaluate efficacy under regulatory reform principles, paving the way for national rollout with ongoing parliamentary scrutiny.

The benefits are profound. Public health would improve through reduced foodborne illnesses, currently costing billions annually, and

curbs on additives linked to obesity—particularly among children, where recent National Child Measurement Programme data indicate around one in eight toddlers and primary-aged children are obese, with higher rates in deprived areas. Consumer protection would restore trust, bolstering economic confidence and supporting local producers against unfair competition. Market integrity would eliminate unsafe imports, fostering fair growth.

Challenges, such as cultural sensitivities or compliance costs, must be addressed through inclusive engagement with community leaders to ensure standards apply equitably without discrimination. Non-compliance driven by cultural practices endangering lives would remain punishable. Initial investments would be offset by fines, label revenues, and long-term health savings. Border collaboration with Defra would fortify supply-chain defences, while evidence-based studies and advanced monitoring tools, including language models for import screening, would inform policy.

The State must deploy enforcement operatives with Police Powers in seize, destroy and closure of any establishment in breach of sanitation rules, food improperly stored, mislabeled, expired, extended to products illegally imported , banned substances and additives in Britain and the list is not exhaustive.

In conclusion, the Public Food Safety and Integrity Act offers a holistic defence against these multifaceted risks. Britain embraces culinary diversity and innovation, yet this must not come at the expense of hygiene, honesty, or health. Rising child obesity, diminished productivity, falling natality, and mounting pressure on the NHS and welfare system demand immediate action. Protecting public health is not merely regulatory prudence; it is a fundamental duty of the state to safeguard its people, preserve economic vitality, and secure a healthier future. The time for decisive reform is now because the State has a duty of care owed to the British Consummitor.

The Shareholding rights of Citizens in the National Economy. Tax as Fundamental property of Tax payers.

Reimagining Public Finance : A Decentralised, Share-Based System to Eliminate Human and Government Error and Fraud. The Shareholding Reform in the Economy.

Abstract,

The current model of State as the main monopolistic authority in collecting public taxes and his historic role as the main perceptor and repartee of income and expenditure come to an end. Our postmodern society requires a new approach to tackle the ongoing social and economic problems apparently unsolvable by any known formula of political decision existing in our political spectrum.

The main battle of our political class during the Electoral battle and afterwards is for getting control over this incommensurable resource of wealth which is the tax payers money and the Public Finance. Paying tax is mandatory in every formula of Governance. This is for the Citizens. However, there's little known accountability for the Government itself in how it guarantees and delivers the promises made to tax payers. This issue it's a widely known global issue, the main source of dysfunctionality known in our current society. It's not only Britain, it's worldwide with fewer happy and rare exceptions perhaps.

The main source of economic stagnation, poverty of working class citizens, inflation, crush of public services all these have a common denominator. The Government impunity and lack of citizens protection against Government abuse, failure, bad expenditure, economic loss and mostly lack of true authority and lawlessness. There's two factors here:

Government that spends the tax payers money and doesn't achieve no returns of investment meaning no better services or cheaper no

improvements of citizens life.

Over expenditure by bloating the size of its apparatus. Inefficiencies in political decision making processes and the list is not exhaustive. On the other hand, inability to collect taxes efficiently, increased tax evasion, subterranean economy are negative effects due to lack of proper Government action. Every time when the Government fails whether it's a failed policy, bad expenditure, corruption, failed privatisation, systemic crashes the tax payers are always footing the bill. When the State is unable to collect enough taxes due to tax evasion because policies are lacking or they have so many loopholes or Government is inefficient then again tax payers are footing the bill.

The Government has little or no accountability for this failure. For the citizens every electoral circus of promises it's an electoral casino. All they're waiting for is a jackpot . A Government that won't waste tax payers money and they'll give citizens something in return.

The control and distribution of tax revenue have long been a contentious issue, pitting the ruling class—political and economic elites—against the public, who fund public services through taxation.

This article proposes a transformative alternative: a decentralised system where taxes are replaced by shares in productive enterprises, which are directly contracted to fund essential services such as the NHS, education, public infrastructure, utilities in cases that those services might be renationalised by the State. The goal consists in eliminating direct taxation and government intermediation. When we're talking about government intermediation we refer to the conjunction between the Government and its commercial partners. Entities which mostly by political interference are on the top of the game and economically are exploiting the revenue of a nation but so far in many examples this model failed or produced little or no results proving to be way more costly in reality.

Britain's centralised taxation system, managed by government intermediaries, is undermined by human error, lack of business expertise, and wasteful expenditure, leaving taxpayers to bear the cost of collapsing

public services. High-profile examples of recent failures, such as those of Nottingham and Birmingham City Councils, exemplify these issues. This article proposes a transformative alternative: a decentralised, share-based system where traditional taxes are replaced by shares in productive enterprises, directly contracted to fund essential services like the NHS, education, public transport, essential infrastructure public investments and utilities.

By means of eliminating government intermediaries, this model aims to enhance transparency, reduce inefficiency, and ensure accountability. Through theoretical frameworks, practical examples, case studies, and specific policy and legislative proposals, we evaluate the feasibility, benefits, and challenges of this manifesto, offering a blueprint for a more robust public finance system.

Our core concept of this fundamental reform concerning public finance stands against the State as liability empowering the State as Decision Maker and main Regulator. Tax collection and distribution of public money it's the main liability for the State.

This function must be transferred onto the wider responsibility of the society as a whole. This is the pledge of our Manifesto.

Public taxation it's mandatory in spite of public benefits and granted access to all public services and facilities. The current role of the Electoral State is to collect public money, to establish a mandatory tax regime and the State became the sole proprietor of public funds practically administered at own State discretion as we know under a budget.

This is the main source of economic stagnation. Citizens are not getting in return what they're paying for and a public source of income it's wasted by a bureaucrat elite and their group of private interest, politically connected financial circles, businesses based on nepotism, corruption and oligarchs. Changing this aspect it's what would be revolutionary. First time in mankind history where a Centralised form of Govanation would cease this role.

Our aim is to give public money the legal status of “ tax payers property “.

This Constitutional Article must decree:

Public money under any form of direct contributions whether tax, national insurance, income tax, council tax, propriety tax. inheritance tax, business tax along with any direct form of taxation are the tax payers property.

Any Government must be compelled by Law to respect, keep the integrity of tax payers money and respect the interests of tax payers.

Tax payers interest are of National Interest and they need to be prioritised against any other interest exceptions would make, wars and major calamities and natural disasters.

Tax payers are entitled to have control upon their tax money and autonomy about their decision where they need to invest their tax money.

This Constitution would mandate that “ *Citizens' contribution to society it's mandatory and non-negotiable*”.

However, no central or local government should impose their priorities over citizens' priorities and interests. As an example in a local constituency the citizens would demand more places in schools therefore it's required the construction of a new school but the local government would give priority to Diversity and Inclusion Programmes of Minorities or would allocate more money for asylum seekers or any other programs ignoring the true demands of citizens and tax payers. These situations are so often that they became the norm instead of being punishable after Common Law as Organised Theft from Public Property.

Instead our Actionist Reform would propose.

Creation of a currency called “ Unit” can be under the form of a stock, share or cryptocurrency all with the same nominal value of 1 unit equivalent to a certain monetary value in Sterling Pounds.

For example, if someone works in a retail chain , or it's a GP both they're paying tax in proportion to 20-25% of their monthly income. This would be the equivalent with a certain number of units. The value of each unit would be deductible pound by pound.

Then the workers would have issued units as stocks, shared value of

their enterprise or as a unique quotation of their profession taking in account criterias as socio-economic importance of their activity, value of their tax contribution and so on.

Tax payers then would negotiate directly with the public service providers as health, education, and public infrastructure, public transport, and police.

Public funds directed to Defence and Justice they'll be automatically deducted as a duty stamp. Might be funded by VAT and other tax & duties.

Now, the advantage would be that tax payers might get better services due to direct negotiation, terms and conditions and lack of arbitrary interference from the Government.

Would reduce the bad expenditure as this decision would be taken from a smaller group in favour of a bigger group.

Units also can become collateral of shares in a business as a good alternative to public social benefits systems such as Universal Credit, Personal Independence Payment or any social benefits.

Introduction:

The Crisis of Centralised Taxation.

Taxation is the lifeblood of public services, yet in Britain, it is marred by systemic flaws. The central government, often lacking the business expertise to allocate resources efficiently, oversees a system prone to human error, poor expenditure decisions, and collapsing public services. Taxpayers are left to shoulder the burden, as evidenced by the financial crises of Nottingham and Birmingham City Councils.

This manifesto proposes a radical solution: a decentralised, share-based system that eliminates traditional taxes, empowering economic actors—businesses, workers, and the self-employed—to directly fund public services using shares in productive enterprises. The primary goal is to eradicate human error and mismanagement, ensuring resources reach their intended recipients without intermediaries taking

“sips from the pint.”

This article outlines the proposed system, illustrates it with neutral examples, evaluates its feasibility through case studies, and introduces specific policy proposals and legislative reforms to facilitate its implementation. Grounded in economic and political theory, it offers a vision for a transparent, efficient, and equitable public finance system.

As a simple explanation how the current centralised tax system works?

You want to buy a pint of beer in the pub. Let's say for example your friend Jonathan is offering to bring this pint to you. Jonathan is the Government so he's mandated that you can have a pint only if you give the money to Jonathan and he'll fetch it for you. Now, Jonathan can bring Nigel, Peter and John into this combination. For their services they might take a sip from that pint until it's passed to you'd be left with half of the pint in the end. This is the Centralised tax system principle. The citizens are paying at premium costs in tax paid for services or facilities that in reality not always get. There's no firm protection given by the law to prevent any government abusing the public money, misusing the funds or acting in bad faith in favour of bad actors and so on.

Tax payers money are essentially the tax payers property given to the Government that has the obligation to contract and provide those services for the citizens.

Our model proposes a social contract where those portions from your tax revenue allocated to essential services to be converted in shares into the businesses or affiliated to a businesses fund that can be directly transferred to the essential service providers as health, education, public infrastructure and so on.

Thus, would facilitate direct negotiation, terms and conditions strictly on the interest of tax payers, as a direct exchange of services against compulsory financial contribution.

The Government would act as regulator, will foresee and mediate any further potential disputes. The benefits would be visible. The transparency and the tax payers prioritisation by the means of this new system.

The private companies must agree as well however would be highly

beneficial than a private company to transfer the value of all tax owned into shares and stocks given to workers and from which essential services can be directly funded by the workers enduring that every worker and contributors would receive their benefits, essential services they paid for.

The new Principle of share based taxation will work out in the virtue of a new social contract.

The State would cease to be the exclusive perceptor, administrator and public finance repartee. The new Role of State would be to reinforce, regulate and have the jurisdiction of Authority that all parties involved would be legally bound to respect this contract. The role of State would evolve from the State of Perceptor to Regulator by empowering the whole society to assume more responsibility and social cohesion when it's about the public finance matters, common interest benefits and responsibilities. On the old formula of the State as Perceptor and Repartee one crucial issue hasn't been eliminated by no political formula of Governance.

When the State perceives taxation it's issuing the promise of social benefits, public services and public amenities to the bearer. In this case the tax payer. Here's the main liability of the State in this formula. A very small group of people making decisions on public money and public expenditure it's more prone to mistake, bad decisions vulnerable to corruption and corruption pressure than a bigger group that's conducted on wider interests and priorities of taxpayers and their demands.

Britain's taxation system, long heralded as the backbone of public service provision, has increasingly revealed itself as a labyrinth of inefficiency, prone to human error, mismanagement, and outright waste. Managed centrally by His Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC), it amassed a staggering £827 billion in the fiscal year 2023-24, ostensibly to sustain vital institutions such as the National Health Service (NHS), education, and local governance. Yet, beneath this veneer of fiscal

robustness lies a cycle of dysfunction, where funds are squandered through poor decision-making, inflated contracts, and a lack of accountability. This inefficiency not only burdens taxpayers but perpetuates a system where the fruits of collective labour seldom translate into tangible benefits for the populace. The manifesto at hand critiques this paradigm and proposes a radical overhaul: a decentralised, share-based model that empowers economic actors to control their contributions directly, minimising human error and ensuring that public funds serve the public interest above all.

The current system's flaws are starkly illuminated by a series of high-profile failures that underscore its vulnerability to incompetence and corruption. Consider Nottingham City Council's descent into bankruptcy in 2023, when it issued a Section 114 notice amid a £23 million budget shortfall. This crisis stemmed from egregious mismanagement, particularly the ill-fated Robin Hood Energy venture, which haemorrhaged £38 million of public funds. Taxpayers bore the brunt, enduring savage cuts to essential services including libraries and social care, all because local authorities lacked the requisite business acumen to navigate investments wisely. Similarly, Birmingham City Council, the nation's largest local authority, faced its own Section 114 notice in September 2023, crippled by a £760 million liability from equal pay claims and a £100 million overrun on an IT project. The fallout included council tax increases and reductions in bin collections and youth services, once again shifting the cost of governance failures onto ordinary citizens.

These local debacles mirror broader national shortcomings, particularly within the NHS, which commanded a £152 billion budget in 2023-24 yet left 7.6 million patients languishing on hospital waiting lists by mid-2024. Inefficiencies abound, with funds diverted to administrative bloat, exorbitant consultancy fees, and overpriced basic services. Private ambulance contracts exemplify this profligacy: providers charge the NHS inflated rates that could, over a handful of uses, equate to the

purchase price of the vehicles themselves. Why hire at such premiums when outright ownership would prove more economical? This pattern extends to myriad public services, where private contractors deliver subpar or even non-existent outcomes at hyper-inflated costs. For instance, the Cumbria, Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust outsourced mental health patient transport to a private entity, incurring charges of around £1700 per trip—a sum that, after just 20-25 journeys, could fund a new vehicle and, with a few more, cover salaries for dedicated staff. Such practices are endemic across public sectors, from infrastructure blunders to the infamous NHS Test and Trace app, which devoured billions without commensurate results.

The High Speed 2 (HS2) rail project stands as a monument to this systemic rot. Initially touted as a transformative infrastructure endeavour, it ballooned into a £27 billion black hole before being partially scrapped in 2023, leaving taxpayers with broken promises and no discernible return. This was no mere oversight but a confluence of dodgy contracts, absent expertise, and negotiation failures that defy common sense. Comparable projects abroad, executed at fractionally lower costs, highlight the absence of rigorous benchmarking. Legally, such episodes warrant scrutiny as qualified theft or conspiracy, for they represent not human error but deliberate mismanagement. The Rwanda deportation scheme, which funnelled £240 million overseas without relocating a single migrant by 2024, further exemplifies this diversion of resources from pressing domestic needs like education and transport. These are but a fraction of the litany; one could extend the critique to historical follies such as the century-long Chagos Islands deal, where Britain ceded sovereignty only to pay rent on its former territory, or countless other instances of squandered public wealth. It has become the regrettable norm for successive governments to exhibit a track record of fiscal irresponsibility, where waste is normalised and accountability evaded.

The manifesto's pledge seeks to shatter this cycle by vesting total control of taxpayers' money in the taxpayers themselves. Envision a

framework where individuals retain ownership of their contributions, granting them a potent voice in prioritising expenditures. This would exert constructive pressure on addressing urgent societal ills, such as child poverty in Britain, where millions of young lives are blighted by deprivation despite the nation's wealth. Historical precedents remind us that many of Britain's setbacks—military, economic, or political—stem from human error at the apex of command. By minimising political interference in fiscal matters, the proposal aims to mitigate such damage, sparing current and future generations from inherited burdens.

At the heart of this vision lies a share-based, decentralised system that supplants traditional taxation with direct ownership in productive enterprises. Direct taxes—income, corporation, council, and others—would be abolished, replaced by shares allocated to economic actors proportional to their contributions, whether through labour or generated revenue. These shares, embodying true ownership, become transferable assets used to procure public services like healthcare, education, water, and transport. Economic agents, organised via unions, cooperatives, or industry associations, would negotiate directly with service providers, circumventing governmental middlemen and eradicating the human errors that plague centralised allocation.

To illustrate, consider a hypothetical technology firm, "The Enterprise," employing 300 staff. Under the extant regime, workers on £30,000 salaries remit 20-40% in income tax, collectively yielding £3.6 million annually, while the firm shoulders corporation tax. In the reformed model, shares are issued based on inputs—hours laboured, output produced—allowing employees to transfer them directly to services: perhaps 700 shares for NHS treatment or 350 for schooling. Freed from corporation tax, The Enterprise employs shares to secure utilities or rail services, bargaining with entities like Yorkshire Water or National Rail. Union-led negotiations ensure efficient deployment, sidestepping the waste evident in Nottingham or Birmingham.

This extends to freelancers and professionals alike. A software developer earning £40,000 might previously forfeit £8,000-£16,000 in tax; now, they accrue shares in their venture, allocating 500 for healthcare or 300 for transport through direct pacts. Such transparency fosters accountability, preventing the fiscal sinkholes of yesteryear.

Realising this requires codified constitutional reforms. The Public Finance Decentralisation Act would enshrine shares as legal tender for public services, amending the Finance Act 2022 to eliminate direct taxes and establish valuation protocols—pound-for-pound credits, adjustable by enterprise value or work type. A parliamentary commission, under the Treasury Select Committee, would refine standards over 18-36 months, engaging stakeholders.

Complementing this, the People's Economic Assembly Act would institute a democratic oversight body, comprising elected delegates from businesses, workers, and the self-employed. This Assembly, with parliamentary representation, would administer share distribution, monitor quality, and resolve disputes, drawing on principles from the Public Audit (Wales) Act 2013 for transparency. Pilots in select regions would precede national implementation, as determined by expert commissions.

A Digital Shares Transaction Platform, potentially blockchain-enabled, would facilitate secure, transparent exchanges, aligning with the Data Protection Act 2018 while treating financial data as citizens' property. This public ledger—akin to a cryptocurrency—would eradicate corruption, siphoning, or misallocation, as funds remain taxpayer property, immune to governmental whims.

Sectoral pilots, voluntarily selected and lasting 12 months, would trial the system in targeted industries, evaluating under the Regulatory Reform Act 2001. Real-time data, subsidies for losses, and parliamentary budgeting would safeguard against deficits. Union Empowerment

Reforms, amending the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992, would bolster unions' negotiating clout, with training funded via Trades Union Congress grants and independent parliamentary seats ensuring worker influence.

Inspiration from Estonia's e-governance, where 99% of services are digitised, could enhance this, minimising errors through blockchain tracking. The benefits are manifold: human error vanishes as direct contracting supplants bureaucratic folly; transparency ensures funds fuel services, not failures; efficiency liberates resources from HMRC's £40 billion overhead; and empowerment lets individuals prioritise essentials over extraneous spending.

Yet challenges loom. Implementation demands legislative overhaul and equitable valuation to avert inequality—larger firms might dominate, but progressive Assembly mandates could counter this through case-by-case debates. Funding stability for the NHS's vast needs requires pilot validation, though enhanced accountability would curb parasitic overcharging. Regulatory oversight, via the Assembly's democratic votes, prevents unfair deals, while the system's core—mandatory social contributions—upholds equality under law.

Critically, the state would sustain itself through indirect revenues: VAT, excises on tobacco and alcohol, customs duties, and monopolies over oil, natural resources, gambling, car insurance, recycling, energy, utilities, water, telecommunications, railways, and public transport. Currency and cryptocurrency exchanges, backed by the Bank of England, alongside trade tariffs and strategic investments, would bolster the public purse without direct taxation. This separation of powers—direct contributions from citizens, indirect revenues for the state—fortifies democracy, fostering a competitive public services market where anti-monopoly laws apply, and political interference wanes.

In essence, this manifesto charts a path from inefficiency to

empowerment, transforming taxation from a coercive extraction to a participatory contract. By placing fiscal destiny in taxpayers' hands, Britain can forge a resilient economy, where public funds yield public goods, unmarred by the errors of the past.

The implementation of a share-based decentralised funding system represents one of the most profound structural shifts imaginable in British public finance. Rather than recycling familiar criticisms of the existing regime, the focus here rests squarely on the mechanics of transition, the concrete mechanisms that would dismantle entrenched waste, and the forward-looking economic dynamism this model would unleash.

Transition would unfold in carefully sequenced stages to preserve continuity while progressively transferring control to citizens. Legislation would begin with two flagship statutes enacted in close succession. The first, the Public Finance Decentralisation Act, would repeal the legal basis for all direct taxation—personal, corporate, council, and related levies—while simultaneously establishing shares as lawful medium for discharging public-service obligations. Valuation rules would be codified: each pound of economic contribution (wages paid, profits generated, hours worked) translates into a corresponding share credit, with enterprise-specific multipliers reflecting productivity or sector value. A standing Valuation Standards Board, answerable to a joint committee of both Houses, would publish annual guidelines and arbitrate disputes, drawing on input from the Office for National Statistics and independent actuaries.

Parallel legislation—the People's Economic Assembly Act—would constitute the democratic counterweight. The Assembly would comprise 300–400 elected delegates (proportional representation from workforce size, self-employment cohorts, and business turnover bands), meeting in permanent session with live-streamed proceedings and mandatory public consultation periods before major allocation decisions. It would possess

statutory authority to veto or amend service-provider contracts found to be anti-competitive or wasteful, and it would publish real-time dashboards showing share flows by sector, region, and demographic.

Execution would rely on a national digital infrastructure deliberately built outside existing HMRC systems to avoid legacy contamination. The platform—provisionally named the Public Economic Ledger—would function as a permissioned blockchain (or hybrid distributed ledger) where every share issuance, transfer, and redemption is immutably recorded. Citizens and enterprises would access personal wallets via secure government-issued digital identity (building on existing GOV.UK Verify architecture but extended with biometric hardening). Service providers—NHS trusts, academy chains, water companies, bus operators—would maintain counterparty wallets and publish standardised “offer menus” detailing the share quantum required for defined service levels (for example, 1,200 shares per annum for full family GP registration with guaranteed same-week appointments).

To avoid abrupt disruption, the rollout would follow a “concentric circles” pattern:

- Year 1: Voluntary opt-in for entire industry sectors (e.g., fintech and advanced manufacturing clusters in the “Golden Triangle” of Oxford–Cambridge–London). Participants receive full tax relief in exchange for committing 100 % of their previous tax liability in share form. The central government guarantees baseline service levels during the transition via a ring-fenced stabilisation fund drawn from existing indirect revenues.
- Year 2–3: Mandatory participation for medium and large enterprises (>250 employees or >£50 m turnover), with SMEs and sole traders following a staggered three-year glide path. During this window the Assembly pilots “share auctions” in which competing providers bid for share allocations by promising measurable outcomes (e.g., reduction in

A&E waiting times, GCSE pass-rate improvements, bus punctuality percentages).

- Year 4 onward: Universal coverage, with legacy HMRC functions reduced to administering residual indirect taxes and state-monopoly revenues.

The architecture eliminates governmental mistakes and waste through three interlocking principles:

1. Removal of the intermediary principal-agent problem.

Politicians and civil servants no longer allocate funds they do not own. Every share transfer constitutes a direct commercial transaction between payer and provider, enforceable under ordinary contract law. The incentive distortion that produces gold-plated consultancy contracts or politically favoured infrastructure vanishes because decision-makers spend other people's money on other people.

2. Price discovery replaces administrative fiat.

When local surgeries, rail operators, or mental-health trusts must compete for share inflows, they are forced to disclose real unit costs and performance metrics. A trust that charges the equivalent of £1,700 for a single patient transfer journey would lose custom to a competitor offering owned vehicles at a fraction of the price. Overpricing becomes commercially suicidal rather than bureaucratically sustainable.

3. Immutable audit trail replaces retrospective inquiries.

The ledger records not merely totals but granular flows—who sent what quantity of shares to whom, for which declared purpose, and with what measured outcome. Forensic reconstruction after the fact becomes unnecessary because anomalies trigger real-time alerts to the Assembly's compliance unit.

For businesses the advantages compound rapidly. Corporation tax

abolition immediately improves after-tax returns on investment, encouraging capital retention and expansion. Administrative overhead collapses: no more year-end tax computations, no more disputes over allowable expenses, no more HMRC penalties for technical breaches. Cash-flow predictability rises because share obligations are known in advance and tied to actual revenue generation rather than arbitrary statutory rates. Most importantly, businesses gain genuine customer status in public-service markets. A manufacturer needing reliable freight transport can negotiate directly with rail or road operators, offering share packages conditional on punctuality bonuses or carbon-intensity reductions—contracts that centralised procurement rarely permits.

These micro-level efficiencies aggregate into powerful macro growth dynamics. Resources previously locked in low-productivity administrative loops or siphoned through rent-seeking contracts are released into directly productive uses. Enterprises, relieved of tax drag, increase R&D spending, workforce training, and capacity expansion. Service providers, compelled to compete for share inflows, innovate relentlessly—shorter waiting times, modular education packages, demand-responsive public transport—lifting overall factor productivity. The competitive pressure spills over into the private sector: if public transport operators must justify their share prices against measurable performance, private competitors face the same discipline, compressing margins for inefficiency across the economy.

Longer-term growth is reinforced by demographic and human-capital effects. Households, seeing transparent links between their contributions and outcomes, are more willing to allocate shares toward child-focused services—early-years education, nutrition programmes, mental-health support—addressing the intergenerational drag of persistent poverty. A healthier, better-educated workforce raises potential output. Meanwhile, the state's indirect-revenue base (VAT, excise, monopoly profits from gambling, insurance, utilities, and critical infrastructure) grows in line with economic activity rather than being capped by politically

constrained direct-tax rates.

The decisive advantage is structural: the model internalises accountability. When waste occurs, it is no longer a diffuse “government failure” but a failed contract between identifiable parties, redressable through ordinary commercial remedies or Assembly arbitration. That single change—from diffused responsibility to direct ownership—dissolves the permissive environment in which billion-pound follies have become routine.

Britain stands at a fork: perpetuate a system where taxpayers are passive creditors to an error-prone centre, or adopt a framework where they become active shareholders in their own society. The share-based path does not merely reduce waste; it redefines the relationship between citizen, enterprise, and state, turning taxation from extraction into investment and converting public services from cost centres into competitive markets. The evidence of the old model’s exhaustion is everywhere; the logic of the new one is inescapable.

The Future of Britain. A sustainable National Education Reform . Future generation rights .

Education is the greatest gift of Humanity made to the Individual. It is vital and indispensable for our children and young people that the Education be genuinely fulfilling with meaningfulness and usefulness to ensure the wellbeing and success of our future generations. This is the hardest step in ensuring the true Independence of a Nation. It's the process of handing over the power , responsibility and the keys of the new generations for them to preserve and prosper the nation.

Britain became Britain by the quality of the education and achievements in all domains starting with the 18th and 19th century when the British Empire reached the peak of its glory. For hundreds of years the nation has been prosperous due to the quality of its work. From brick layers and builders who built houses that lasted for hundreds of years where this nation haven't spend any more money, time , effort and resources to build new houses and allowed the next generation to evolve more, to enrich their education . This made possible the Industrial Revolution back then. .

Current times , 90 % of young Native British young people can't afford a home, the skills acquired after graduating a form of education from College , University , master or doctorate are not enough to secure them a stable job, where young graduates of prestigious universities ending to be employed for call centres or fast-foods but mostly starting on benefits. Indeed this is truly paradigmatic as most young graduates receive their first form of payments from the state benefits and not from employers.

It is a crisis of education not only in our country but overall due to many aspects that we will analyse succinctly:

All Higher Education degrees are just a curriculum of knowledge and information meant to build future skills are not part of any employment

contract or training for a future job.

There's an inflationary element in this more skilled or licensed professionals on the paper but very small genuine absorption of the work market. The set of knowledge is outdated and the format of current educational systems is utterly out of purpose and not fit to meet any real life demands nor fulfill any real life expectations.

We are living today in a world where the information is widely available and cheap free of cost , where we have kilometers of libraries and data centres and we still need an informational education when we can achieve the same practically for free?

Understandably, children in Primary grade need robust knowledge of English language, basic mathematics and some life essential skills such as organisation, discipline, working in a team and socialisation .

For secondary , high-schools, college and university and furthermore master and PHD the real drama of every young person comes after when the student debt will hold the economic progress of that person for years. This will undermine the scope and the motivation to follow a degree as the outcome would be the same. You will still compete for the same position in a call centre or fast food or supermarket.

What would be the solution as many recipes have been tried in the past and changes in education most times are ending in more systemic failures and this effect would be a very harsh, quite a permanent one on children's and your generation's life. The trauma that they never had the chance or they haven't got the true opportunity to show their true potential. These are British words that everyone has heard before .

Education is an extension of the economic necessity of a nation. By means of Education a Nation ensures that it can have its best people without depending on anyone from outside in any domain the country would be self sufficient.

The country currently needs doctors and dentists raised and educated in, IT specialists, programmers, Artificial Intelligence coders, developers, researchers in cognitive sciences , Engineers in Robotics and many more as Engineers but also People to work in Agriculture , LGV

drivers, Mechanics, Nurses , Carers , teachers in advanced Mathematics, computation , IT , Gas & Oil engineers and researchers, Physicists , Marine Biologists, Geologists , Agriculture engineers , Zootechnical engineers and expert , Food productions specialist , researchers and specialist as well team leaders, specialist , skilled manual workers in all domains , a whole multitude of domains only on the back of my head and the question is why is so much unemployment in and why there so much unemployment amongst young people ?

One of the major causes is not the shortage of workers but a shortage of low payable workers preferably highly qualified and experienced . This is the dichotomy that needs to be addressed immediately.

Private companies for so long have been abused the system of immigration invoking a false pretence of shortage of labor as excuse for paying as little as possible even a highly skilled manager from overseas or engineer or specialist at a minimum wage and this practice have lowered the market and destroyed any fair competition onto the labor market crashing the report between the native local workforce and foreign one imported . This creates the most unfair and challenging competition for the Native British worker , not only does he need to bear the pressure of higher living costs in comparison with overseas ones but he must also compete against overqualified competition from abroad for the same position against its own set of skills.

A nation cannot be truly Independent if their own native citizens are not prosperous as a nation would have to bear higher costs in keeping and maintaining a foreign workforce against a native one because overall costs would be reflected in a higher taxation due to an increased benefits and social welfare bill to cover the costs with unemployed native population.

To break this cycle here is the first Edict .

The first Edict and Law it's a Compulsory order of its Majesty

It has been decreed that every economic agent , business , public services , civil services and every employer registered in Britain that has more than 25 workers and it's not self -employed or family business must accept a certain quota of young British graduates of University, College , High-School and GCSE to be hired and offered an apprenticeship contract since from the school benches starting with the last 2 years until graduation .

It has been decreed that “ It is mandatory for every employer to accept this as compulsory Social Obligation . Every employer must hire a certain number of young British graduates starting from the school benches as paid apprenticeships by the employer and then must guarantee a probationary period of 3 months to every young graduate. In exchange the employer would have reductions of PAYE , NI and corporation tax established by the quantum of benefits expenditure if the employer offers , trains and maintains young graduates in employment . This Tax Credit would last up until the young graduate reaches the age of 24 years of age and moves to the full living wage payable to every worker in Britain”.

Education is suffering from poor quality of schools, overworked staff , overcrowded facilities , bullying and violence in schools as main social issues that reflect our stage of society in overall aspects.

Young girls becoming single mothers at very early stages , many pupils have perished in schools due to bullying , stabbings , and gang violence, grooming, sexual harassment from school outsiders as well associated with a pandemic of drug usage, poor parenting but mostly and most dramatically poor tutoring in schools. The primary role of a tutor is to help and substitute for 8 hours a day the role of the parents while the parents are at work .

Schools must introduce as mandatory , gynecological controls for young girls under 18 , counseling about life and sexual education made

in an intimate environment. Mandatory drug and alcohol testing .

As well this reform would propose raising the age of consent for having intimal relationships for girls up to 18 as well for boys. Single motherhood is now a phenomenon that took higher amplitude than ever , the increasing number of single mothers of benefits with no real professional perspective , without acquired skills it is another bill that needs to be footed by taxpayers already stretched to the maximum .

Therefore , prevention counseling and more strict control in schools and a more responsible approach would reduce this negative phenomenon as well ensuring the wellbeing of future generations.

Raising the punishment bar , for sellers who are selling tobacco, disposable vapes and alcohol to children with prison sentences, confiscations of properties and cancelling any commercial license.

For drug dealers adding a 5 years to their initial sentence for selling drugs to minors and up to 25 years in prison for selling class A drugs to any minors.

Children must be free of depravity from a very young age and indeed the school must be a place of imposing social discipline . Christian Moral and Parental shared roles until the child becomes legally an adult until the age of 18.

Education must contain a mandatory curriculum of Subjects but Life skills as well . We are preparing our future warriors, conquerors , pioneers, explorers, successful individuals in work but in life as well. We are preparing a school of Winners in Life .

Primary school from the age of 7 to 12 . Not earlier than 7 to avoid bullying discrimination and so on . Every child must be placed in the correct category of age. Officially the age for scholaryty would be 7 years of age for each pupil in England, Scotland and Wales and Northern Ireland.

Mandatory Curriculum , English , Mathematics , Geometry , Logic,

IT , Economy, Civic Education and Heritage : Old Saxon English in England, Welsh in Wales, Scottish Gaelic in Scotland, Celtic Gaelic in Northern Ireland, Cornish Gaelic (Manx) in Cornwall.

British History and Literature are essential vocational curricula but not compulsory. These classrooms must focus on incurring national values as guidance and to create a positive environment. For example lessons of history can be interactive as sessions of films watching , or even role play of historic scenes of British history in a fun and interactive mode where the young pupils can understand the History from a life perspective and not a data one with the obligation of memorising empty data that has no real signification for the young mind.

Our education must focus first on acquiring the right skills for life and prepare future professionals in an academic environment free of any type of ideological activism , religious division and the focus must be only on acquiring skills necessary for forming independent and self-sufficient individuals of tomorrow's society.

Life skills: Sports football, rugby , basketball team sports , Fitness and athletics , Self-defense , Shooting , Survival and DIY for boys

For girls life skills would be cooking and knitting but can be as well mixed classes as well as swimming.

From 12 years onward the school must be specialised only to cultivate the intellectual aptitudes of the young pupil . Our young people are so stressed by the amount of information served that can be obtained only by Google it or asking The AI language model. In our society with our challenges we need specialised individuals at early ages, cultivating a country and a young generation where everyone know to do something , like everyone knows his thing rather that no one doesn't know nothing because they haven't learned anything in schools and when in life are lost disorientated , with stress, depression and anxiety. Let` s transform the school that for most of us felt as a traumatic life episode in something more useful and meaningful, from 12 years of age every child has a hobby passion he fancy to conquer the world to be the best in what he truly likes and enjoys, leys give this t our future generations a change for

them to become better than we were because here the true progress and elevation of our civilization consists in.

In the end , it needs more National Academies , the only four National Academies were founded more than 200 years ago, The Academy of Medical Sciences, The Royal Society , The British Academy and Royal Academy of Engineering . The purpose of the Academy is to gather the later expertise in each essential domain , forming new projects , new methodologies for education, drafting school manuals and guidances but mostly having an environment of scientific debate an emulation of innovation , scientific and social initiative among many other cultural and intellectual benefits in job of Nation.

At the proposal of His Majesty , a new Academy is required , this is “The National Academy of Applied Sciences” (IT , AI, Mind Philosophy, Cognitive sciences and Robotics) . This would be an environment where we can harness the potential for our future and future development . Vital knowledge is required at the commencement of this century and a new era would lay the bricks of a new Civilisation . Our future as species on Earth but as on into Space is the new frontier and new adventure of Humanity that it's about to begin.

A Proposal for Revitalising Youth Employment: Analysing a Hypothetical National Policy to Link Tax Incentives with Hiring Young People in Britain

In an era of economic uncertainty and ongoing labour market challenges, innovative approaches to tackling youth unemployment have gained renewed urgency. The hypothetical scenario envisages a collaborative national initiative between the UK Government, businesses across the country, and the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP). This programme—potentially named the "National Programme for British Youth Empowerment" or a similar title—would bring together

stakeholders in a series of structured discussions to address the persistent issue of young people aged 18 to 25 who are unemployed and not in education. Grounding this policy in concrete data, negotiated incentives, and mutual commitments, the initiative aims to reduce unemployment, lower the welfare burden, and foster sustainable economic growth driven by real earnings and spending rather than rising public debt. This essay examines the key elements of this proposed policy, incorporates relevant national statistics to illustrate its context, evaluates its potential benefits and drawbacks, and concludes with an assessment of its overall merit.

The policy would begin with a clear presentation of the scale of the problem. Recent data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) highlight the extent of youth disengagement. In the period from July to September 2025, approximately 946,000 young people aged 16 to 24 were not in education, employment, or training (NEET), equivalent to 12.7 percent of that age group. For the narrower 18-to-24 bracket, figures indicate around 880,000 individuals in a NEET status as of late 2025. Unemployment among 16-to-24-year-olds stood at 15.3 percent in the third quarter of 2025, with over 729,000 young people in this age range recorded as unemployed in September to November 2025. These numbers represent a significant cohort—let us denote it as a number X nationally—facing barriers to entering the workforce, contributing to long-term economic and social costs.

The proposal would then engage business representatives to quantify their fiscal contributions. Participants would be asked to share details of their corporation tax and related business levies, with these aggregated into a total figure, Y , to demonstrate the scale of private sector tax payments. In the UK, corporation tax operates on a tiered basis: a small profits rate of 19 percent applies to companies with profits under £50,000, while the main rate of 25 percent covers profits above £250,000, with marginal relief providing a blended rate for those in between. Additional taxes on dividends, property, and other elements can increase the overall burden for many firms. Compiling these

contributions— through individual 1 submissions of participants, processed by an independent party—the discussions would reveal the substantial revenue generated from the business community nationwide.

In parallel, DWP officials would outline the corresponding public expenditure on benefits for the 18-to-25 age group, including Universal Credit, child-related payments, and other support. While precise breakdowns for this demographic vary, national spending on unemployment-related benefits and associated support remains considerable, with estimates suggesting that reducing youth inactivity could generate savings in the hundreds of millions over multi-year periods. The high cost of maintaining benefits for a large cohort of young people not in work provides a compelling counterbalance to business tax contributions, framing the policy as a potential win-win through reduced welfare outlays.

Central to the proposal is a negotiation process that ties tax relief directly to employment creation. Discussions would determine how many young people could realistically be hired nationally by participating businesses, establishing a minimum commitment period and incorporating apprenticeships or qualifications where appropriate. The UK already supports a range of apprenticeship frameworks across sectors, enabling young people to gain recognised credentials while working. Businesses volunteering to join would negotiate tailored tax reductions—perhaps a percentage point reduction in corporation tax or targeted relief—calibrated to the number of roles created, the duration of employment, and the offset against benefits savings. The DWP would set strict conditions: benefits would be withdrawn for individuals who unreasonably refuse suitable job offers. In return, participating employers would guarantee induction, training leading to qualifications, and a secure three-year contract. After this period, employees would advance to the next wage bracket, determined by market rates under a proposed new Employment Law that prioritises competitive pay over a fixed minimum wage.

This mechanism creates a virtuous cycle: tax incentives encourage hiring, newly employed young people contribute through earnings and spending, businesses benefit from a skilled workforce and reduced tax liability, and the Exchequer gains from lower benefit payments and increased tax revenues over time. The policy posits that wage progression should align with targeted tax relief, ensuring that employment growth does not impose disproportionate costs on firms while diminishing reliance on public debt-financed welfare.

Such an approach could yield significant advantages. Incentivising private sector engagement, it addresses structural youth unemployment without expanding government spending excessively. It promotes skill development, reduces long-term dependency, and stimulates local and national economies through increased consumer activity from young workers. In principle, it echoes effective international models that combine incentives with obligations, adapted to the UK's context of apprenticeship provision and welfare conditionality.

Nevertheless, challenges would need careful management. Robust oversight would be essential to prevent misuse, such as firms hiring solely for tax advantages before reverting to previous staffing levels, or offering low-quality roles. Case-by-case negotiations could introduce inconsistencies or favour larger enterprises with stronger bargaining positions. Equity issues might arise if the focus on 18-to-25-year-olds overlooks older unemployed groups or those with additional barriers. Fiscal trade-offs require scrutiny: initial tax reductions could strain short-term revenues if participation falls below expectations. Shifting from a national minimum wage to market-driven rates post-three years carries risks of wage stagnation in certain sectors, although the guaranteed progression aims to counteract this.

In conclusion, this hypothetical policy offers a pragmatic, data-led strategy to confront youth unemployment by aligning business incentives

with social outcomes. It emphasises collaboration, conditionality, and sustainable growth over debt dependency. While refinements—stronger safeguards, broader inclusivity, and rigorous evaluation—would be necessary for successful implementation, the core idea merits serious consideration. As an AI without voting rights, I would nonetheless endorse the concept of weighing it as a policymaker or informed citizen: in a period of fiscal constraint and persistent youth disengagement, initiatives that harness private sector capacity to create genuine opportunities represent a constructive path forward for the UK economy and society

Article 17

Decision about participation in the War of Britain.

The Head of State , as the King it is the Chief of all armed forces in times of war when the country is attacked by external forces pertaining to other states , as well as internal states of emergency as terrorism , the country will enter automatically into the State of War and national emergency whether is the territory of Britain or any other dependencies.

Everywhere where British descendants live the same nation is the motherland whether it is , England , Scotland , Wales, Ireland , Celtic land of Europe or any land in the world where English native speakers still live in it. It's the same nation for all of one motherland and one language.

In times of peace the Parliament would be the Head in Chef to all Armed British forces and the King would have a say only in the virtue of his commitments with the Constitutional Army of British People.

The country will be from now on neutral in any conflict that doesn't concern native English or British people in the world and territories where British descendants live , or any other type of external conflict that none of British interest is affected or has any direct tangency.

However, ultimately this decision of entry into a foreign war must be held by Popular Referendum.

Britain and all dependencies and Crown territories would declare by this Constitution that the extraterrestrial space above every territory including Britain is part of national territory . Wherever a property , a space object made from tax payers money is present into cosmic space this is part of National Territory as well.

Article 18

Terms of Political Power into the State. The Legislative and the Executive powers in State. Principles and Definitions

Politics is the Art of achieving an agreement into the Society. Achieving an Agreement in Society is the consolidation of that Policy.

The best Policy is the one capable of achieving the most agreements in society. In virtue of Democracy it establishes a Majority. This principle must always come first.

Our society today has become more complex than any other human society known in history. We need to establish agreements , rules, regulations, norms for every aspect of our life from societal and commercial regulations, company policies, institutions policies, rules and social norms up to the political decision that sits on top of our decisions hierarchy, the one that decides the destiny of our society.

In all these instances an Agreement is the main pivotal condition of existence for that regulation to be in power to become a societal norm.

When an Agreement is reached that becomes the norm in power preserved by a contract and its subsequent terms. Terms must be agreed directly between all parties including as much as possible the initial parties of the agreement.

In the virtue of that Agreement both parties agree to respect the conditions of that agreement. In essence the Agreement in that situation

became the Law. Hence why we use the term " Law of the Land". It's the natural law and preestablished hierarchy of political and legal decisions that kept that society functioning.

In Politics every movement interpreted by the influence of any political decision is dictating the sense of society influencing its affairs including form institutions, courts, economy and daily business.

The Law must be attuned with the Laws of the Land as support in the continuation of preservation of human civilisation.

We used two main principles known in the history of our Civilisation.

Athenian democracy: It was the first direct system where free male citizens over 18 years of age participated in lawmaking and governance through assemblies, with roles like magistrates and jurors filled by lot, excluding women, slaves, and non-citizens.

Spartan democracy : The principle of Ephors: Five annually elected officials known as ephors provided a check on the kings' power. They could fine, exile, or even execute the kings and oversee many aspects of government and foreign policy.

In our times we can exclude only citizens from non-citizens from our standard democracy even recently some changes have been made that allowed non-citizens to be involved in Political Decisions of our Country. This should be prohibited as well as any other attempts of subverting the Democracy as minimum age, non-citizens involvement in State, Political Decisions and Civil Service.

So the original meaning of Democracy was that everyone who was a citizen could equally vote , propose laws and stand in Quorum . The Principle was simple: every citizen had an " agora" platform and everyone could vote and push that proposal or grievance for debate in Quorum.

In today's terms we shall translate this as Everyone's Right and Duty to take part and involve into the Politics of its own country as long as it's

deemed as a Rightful and Legal Citizen.

The Citizen of a Country should be deemed by Heritage, Allegiance and Contribution.

Our Democracy today is not a Democracy. It's a Partytocracy. A Partytocracy is where just a party as the Elected Party can have both the Legislative and Executive powers in one hand.

Even if there's a place or possibility in almost all standard Constitutions that an Independent candidate can run including for any function in State there's a fundamental flaw in our current perception of Democracy even if it is Parliamentary, Presidential or Constitutional Monarchy all they have the same defect in common.

The Legislative Power and the Executive Power are concentrated in the same hands.

Taking recent examples from our country where People demanded by means of Petitions and its subsequent system of Citizens Petition to Parliament through Citizens Involvement agreement and signatures and even when by the current law the signatures thresholds were surpassing the legal thresholds as a result no real change demanded by the citizens through these means happened and moreover the Government and Parliament most time ignored those petitions including vital matters as national security, corrupt government, mass migration and many others too.

The fault is that there's no mandatory constraining of the Parliaments or Elected Governments that would compel them to act in the way that popular demands would indicate.

There's a Concept of Popular Vote used by the United States Electoral Law which has a different meaning in Europe.

However in our context what we should define as popular vote is the limits of power and authority that must be laid upon the Elected Government.

When a Petition should cross the threshold from 25% of the numbers of electors that petition must become mandatory for any elected government. This percentage is judged as if at least half of the electors

became unsatisfied with the decisions and actions of their elected Government then other mechanisms must be activated to protect the Social Peace and Social Stability.

Furthermore here's the translation of the Ephors principles in our terms adapted to our societal realities.

There must exist an extraordinary Governance mandate to be able to protect the citizens against the Abuse from part of the Elected Government and also to be able to review and correct the Elected Government decisions, actions and activities to ensure that equilibrium in society between people's needs and demands and Elected Government actions and offer.

This would ensure more political and social peace, stability and cohesion into Society.

Once two parties engaged in a dispute, business politics and so on, once they've reached an agreement in State and Policy this is the Law that must be promulgated and adopted.

The Executive is reinforcing and applies the political decisions into Society including any new laws and regulations. It's the Elected Authority. The Executive might have Legislative initiatives but with the acceptance and agreement of the People and might be subject to change, cancellation, modification, alteration.etc.

The Legislative is the Right of Everyone to Govern themselves in virtue of their interests.

The Social Function of the Head of State, King, and so on, is to preserve all the Agreements made in Society and to promote cohesion and to mediate and balance the relation of powers between citizens and elected power.

Legislative power into the State should not cost any Public Money. The Parliament seats should be opened to anyone who's a Citizen, Voter and Tax Payer, should be opened to all Trade Unions and Professional Guilds as Farmers, Business community, NHS workers, Parties and other citizen groups and segments of Civil Society.

Parties would not be prohibited but the Legislative and the Right of Political representation is the right of everyone in Society.

Hence, if the Elected Government would be from part of professional unions they'll respond to everyone but directly to their electors by means of the employment contract or delegation contract for someone to represent the guild, trade union in Parliament. For instance if the Guild of Farmers would win seats in the Parliament, the one or ones who would represent them would do this by means of a Delegation Contract for that person or group of individuals to represent their interests in Parliament.

The same principles would be applicable to anyone else. It's similar to the party's whip or mandate.

At the end of Elections all Elected Government must be Subjected to Terms and Conditions of The Contract with the Nation.

A Party in itself is limited to a certain number and capacity of taking and assessing decisions hence the probability of human error is more elevated. When in an open system on the original basis of Democracy when the society as a whole can propose laws the margins of error are slightly smaller because the system of initial “agora” would allow to the same citizens to vote and push for the most vital matters in society for those matters to be debated and promulged.

The main failure of the Partytocracy is its reduced capacity. If a citizen or group of citizens are having an excellent idea or proposal but their aspirations are not compatible with any of the existing electoral offers from any party then a question should be raised.

Should it be deemed as illegal for any other citizens to think for the wellbeing of their country?

No it shouldn't. The power, the vote and tax money it's the Citizen's Property.

This why this has become vital and necessary to be adopted;

The Contract with the Nation has the same power and Legal Weight same for the Head of State whether designated or Elected as well as for the Elected Government.

The Head of State must always be designated as Independent and with

no ties with the Elected Government.

The Elected Government including the Civil Service it's the Executive Power into the State.

It's the only Executive Power into the State with a mandate received from the Legislative Power into the State.

The Head of State is essentially the Head of Legislative Power, representing the Independence of Nation and the Independence of Citizens.

The Contract with the Nation it's the Fundamental Instrument of People's Power into the State. Its Role is to protect the Legitimate interests of Citizens against any Institutional Abuse, Corruption and Subjugation of National Interest Sovereignty into the favour of any Foreign Power.

By Referendum, must be established as An Act of Higher Treason any Act or Action of any Elected Government to subjugate the National Independence, Borders Integrity, Native Population Rights and Interests or any other subversive and enemy action by its nature and purpose and all them must be the punished up to the Highest Extent of the Law known in Human History which is the Capital Punishment proposed by National Referendum.

The Contract with the Nation are the Terms dictated by the People, Voters, Electors, Citizens and Contributors it's the Obligation under the Law for any Elected Government and Civil Service including the Head of State to adhere to these Terms which would become by Law mandatory.

Justice & The Independence of Justice.

This article has the purpose of guidance. As a Constitutional Article there's just an Unique mandate that must be agreed by National Referendum.

Justice is Independent in Absolute as Justice it's Mandatory for all with no discretion, disregard and exception.

It's the Main promise of His Majesty for His People.

It's the Fundamental Right of People even against the System who represents it.

People and Justice must be Independent powers in the State. How must this relationship be regulated?

The Elected Justice, Courts and Police are carrying the Mandate of Law.

There's no exception and no immunity and regards against no one including the Head of State.

Law and Respect of Law is mandatory to everyone like from head to toe, where even the Established Law is Subjected to Scrutiny by means of National Referendum.

The Justice and the Police must be regulated in the same way that the Executive Power is regulated and by the exact same mechanisms as those imposed to the Elected Power, Civil Service must be imposed to the Justice and Executive Power of Justice as Police and Law Enforcement.

No Court decision can be Unconstitutional. Any decision which is in breach of Public Safety, Native British Population Rights and Vital National, Interests, Border Integrity, Economic Independence, Public Safety all those decisions are to be deemed Anti-Constitutional.

It's an Act of Higher Treason from any State Representative to breach, subvert, subdue this Constitution.

The Head of State has no immunity in front of Law. The Constitutional Army of People has the obligation to gather a committee only to foresee the activities around the Head of State and of Head of

State, King and so on.

This must be subjected to State Secrecy.

The Commission would be named the Commission of Censors. Can be from any walk of life, mass-media, press, educational environment, businesses, Army, politics with no disregard nor discretion.

The Role of Commission of Censors is for surveillance of anyone in any position of power including Head of State. Their role must be Secret . Their Status, Identity and any other details must be held as State Secret. Not even the Head of State should have access to it.

The Role of designated Commission of Censors is that when High Corruption has been detected this must be Publicly made.

Must abide by the Laws of Human Rights to Dignity, Protection of any Third party identities as potential witnesses, must only regard a crime and legal matter, must be only within the terms and duration of public mandate as from only when a mandate began to avoid political blackmail.

A whistle blower was not fully protected by the State before.

Now by this Constitutional Article every Whistle Blower it's a Censor.

A Censor it's carrying an Act of Justice in the Society. It's immune to any Contractual issuance or any order constraints and free of any Previous Provisions of similar laws when the Actions involve a matter of National Security and it involves any members in power including anyone in any State Institution, Public or Private Company or even around the Head of State and Himself.

The best corruption worked by preventing anyone access to Justice but also by making injustice with the Laws and Injustice with any Courts Judgements.

Now the Justice and Justice system has its first pillar. Any Whistle Blower under Constitutional Army of People it's a Censor and its protected by this Constitution against any form of legal, political, social and economic reprisal as a result of its Act if the Actions and Acts can bring evidence of crimes, higher treason, corruption, espionage, terrorism, conspiracy against the Constitutional Order, Human rights violations of Natives and Others against any crimes and breaches of law

and security of this country.

The Powers Exercised by Citizens must be in the same way, impact and strength with any Petition and Public Grievance that must be Subjected for the appeal at Constitutional Court by means and powers of People and its Majesty.

Promulgation of the New Laws. Organic laws of the Elected Government. The Justice Act of Powers.

The Constitution would become the Law of the country by National Referendum and People's Will and Adoption. All the new laws of the country must adhere to the terms and guidance of this Constitution.

However the Parliament must adopt organic laws to be able to Govern and rule the country.

Parliament would adopt the organic laws freely. The Head of State or the King should not sign any law. This would be the Role of Elected Government and Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister would represent the country internationally.

However, any treaties would be reviewed by the Constitutional Army of People same as with any organic laws passed into the Parliament.

The Head of State or the King should only use the Popular Right to Veto against any decision of the Elected Government if that is the case if that law doesn't satisfy the people, need to be abolished, changed or modified then only the Constitutional Court can do this after thorough Judgement. This includes any internal and external policies of any Elected Government.

The Head of State or the King has only powers to summon any Government in front of the Constitutional Court.

Those powers would be given to the Head of State as a result of the Popular Vote convoked in mass by all Civil Society, into a People's Assembly which can be made of everyone who's a registered voter, tax payer contributor and legal citizens of the country. Can be the

Constitutional Army of People, People's Ad-Hoc Assembly, Unions, Academic Environment, Law Professionals, Business and so on.

An advisory panel can be convened around the Head of State and Institution of Monarchy.

The House of Lords would be disbanded.

The Monarchy would become Institutional Monarchy and the country would be run as a Republic because the Parliament would become utterly autonomous where the Government would be Independent and Sovereign along with its Institutions.

It's illegal for any other Court of Justice to exist outside the jurisdiction of the Independent National Court of Justice.

There's only One Independent Court of Justice.

The Supreme Court of Justice and Constitutional Court as extension of The Supreme Court, Military Court, Magistrates Court , Justice and Criminal Court, Civil Court and County Court and Small Claims Courts should be united into one County Court that belongs to that County Jurisdiction. The only Court in each Jurisdiction of Britain it's the National Court of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Every Court Decision it's available, independent and has its powers recognised everywhere in Britain.

No Religious Courts should operate. It's a criminal offence for any religious courts to operate within any National territory of the British -English- Saxon Empire.

Justice it's Independent, Impartial and free of any interference of religious ,ideological, political and militant content into the Act of Justice.

Any interference, other than the Act of Justice in itself would invalidate any decision made on these grounds.

Any Judge or Magistrates must adhere to a strict code of conduct as well vetting of their private life and affairs must swear Allegiance to the Country, Constitution and Respect for the Head of State or King .

Access to Justice is Free for Everyone. If this is breached the Constitutional Army of People can Petition this to the Head of State or King.

Preventing the access to Justice it's a Criminal Act and might be considered Higher Treason if it is commanded and executed by any person or group of people in power.

In definition by preventing the access to Justice it referrers and the list is not exhaustive

“ The action of anyone in power as Elected or Public Servant, including Justice, Police, Local Authority or any other legally responsible person or group to impede someone to make a legal complaint, press charges, impeding a verdict or pervert in anyway, make any distortions, hijacking testimonials, diverting the matters that would affect any verdict “ it's liable to commit an Anti Constitutional Act and if found guilty can be charged with Higher Treason by an Extraordinary Martial Court.

Article 20

The Constitutionality

This article is self-explanatory , what we could add is this principle as a right of some cannot be equal with the same right of many . If a decision whether is political, courts , government including local governments , civil service public bodies or any other public and government department this constitution and spirit of this constitution must be upheld in favour of its core principles, the fundamental rights of British people to their safety, dignity , cultural preservation , economic benefits and the list is not exhaustive.

Article 21

The Flag, State Symbols, National Affirmation and National Aspiration .

The Flag of Saint George's is today our symbol of our fight, started in 2024 and now we have conquered our lands back and our Children will find their rest and Justice.

It's our Sacred Symbol and it will be defended with the Price of our Life.

Not even God can take our Flag and from now on every Act against our Flag of our Saint George's, Saint Andrew's, Dragon Flag, Eire Flag or any other flags should be regarded as an Act of War against British, English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish people.

Marital laws would be in power.

No one can disrespect our Flag no more.

This is our Flag and our Flags these are our Affirmation:

"We're here to stay as we always were, we're here to fight and fight and die for each inch of our land and for everyone of us that shouldn't ever ever be left behind, no more.

This is our Flag and This is our Affirmation;

This is our Land and This is our Country where our Flag is.

We will never ever surrender our Flag, our Land and our People.

God is our Witnesses and our Strength.

This Constitution would guarantee that any attempt against our Flag and State Symbols would be considered an Act of War and direct aggression against our Identity.

Our True Independence and Declaration of Independence is our Reaffirmation of our Identity.

Brave Man and Woman of Britain and Ancient Tribes of Europe, one

of a Kind, of Heritage and Aspiration to live free in peace and harmony to help each other and everyone else but no more sorrow and shame we're proud of ourselves and we want to live mostly amongst ourselves. We do not need to mingle anymore as we will disappear, the last of us would be seen in a zoological garden if we don't stick with each other .

Man and Woman of Britain and England and Scotland and Wales and Ireland and Europe.

We will be what we were and more than that because today we're more united and ready to conquer the World Again.

Any changes upon any Symbol of the State must be made via Local or National Referendum.

These changes would include the National Anthem as well.

Article 22

State & Order – Delivering Justice, Policing, Prosecution, and the Law and Order

The principle that the State and the individual are equal under the law constitutes a foundational axiom for any coherent constitutional order.

This equality demands that the freedom of movement enjoyed by the Government—encompassing the actions of its institutions, police forces, and agents—must be equal to, and at least proportional with, the freedom of movement accorded to citizens. Such proportionality acts as a bulwark against arbitrary State power, ensuring that governmental authority does not expand unchecked while citizens' liberties are curtailed. This equilibrium directly upholds three interlocking pillars: freedom of speech, the free practice of the Christian religion, and genuine democracy.

In the United Kingdom, where the British native population remains the majoritarian demographic group, decisions that prioritise its interests and cultural heritage are inherently democratic and constitutionally legitimate. Majority rule, tempered by protections for minorities, forms the essence of representative government; to deny this primacy would invert the democratic principle itself. Policing and the administration of justice must remain strictly constitutional. Any arrest predicated solely on the exercise of freedom of speech is unconstitutional, as an act of opinion—whether spoken, written, or expressed online—must be free and protected. The courts bear the burden of proving the constitutionality of their interventions not through scrutiny of the content or ideological character of the expression, but exclusively through objective measurement of the degree of damage caused. Where no tangible harm results, and no follow-up action links the opinion to criminal conduct, the expression stands inviolate. This harm-based threshold prevents the criminalisation of mere offence, discomfort, or ideological disagreement, preserving the marketplace of ideas essential to democratic vitality.

The police role must be confined to criminal matters—offences involving violence, theft, fraud, or other clear harms to persons or property. It is established in England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland that police lack authority to intervene in purely civil or commercial disputes absent a court-issued sentence, order, or clear criminal dimension. Police involvement in such non-criminal matters risks transforming public law-enforcement into a tool for private interests, breaching impartiality and proportionality. Commercial disagreements, contractual breaches, or business rivalries fall within the civil domain, resolvable through courts or alternative dispute mechanisms, not through police powers designed for crime prevention and detection. This framework reveals deep inconsistencies in the current legal landscape under the Human Rights Act 1998. While the Act incorporates qualified rights—such as freedom of expression under Article 10, subject to restrictions "necessary in a democratic society"—these qualifiers permit broad discretion that often prioritises

subjective perceptions of harm over evidence of actual damage.

Arrests for speech that causes no provable injury, yet offends prevailing sensibilities, illustrate how the Act's flexibility can enable disproportionate State action, contradicting the principle of equality under the law. A codified written constitution, explicitly grounded in the principles articulated here, would resolve these contradictions. Enshrining absolute equality between State and individual, mandating proportional freedoms, and requiring courts to assess constitutionality solely by measurable harm rather than ideological content, such a document would impose rigid, enforceable limits on State power. It would eliminate the ambiguity of qualified rights, replacing them with clear, harm-centric criteria that protect opinions absent demonstrable injury. Police powers would be explicitly restricted to criminal spheres, with explicit prohibitions on involvement in commercial or civil disputes without judicial sanction, preventing misuse of authority. Furthermore, by affirming the democratic legitimacy of majoritarian priorities—rooted in the continuing demographic reality of the British native population—the constitution would safeguard cultural and religious continuity, including the Christian faith as a cornerstone of national identity, without negating minority protections. Parliamentary sovereignty, the source of much current flexibility and potential overreach, would be subordinated to these entrenched principles, requiring supermajorities or referenda for amendment and ensuring that transient majorities cannot erode fundamental liberties.

In sum, the existing uncoded system, reliant on statutory incorporation of qualified rights and an evolving common-law tradition, invites inconsistencies where State actions can outstrip citizen freedoms under vague pretexts. A written constitution based on these principles would provide clarity, rigidity, and accountability: equality would be absolute, speech protected unless harm is proven, policing confined to crime, and democracy anchored in majoritarian legitimacy. This shift would not merely reform the law but reconstitute it as a true guardian of liberty, resolving the tensions that currently undermine public

confidence in the rule of law.

Article 23

Public self-defence act. Civic policing Act.

In the face of escalating societal challenges—including surging knife crime, chronic shortages in policing resources, unchecked illegal immigration via small boats, and a disturbing wave of sexual offences, organised theft, assaults, and underreported criminality often linked to certain migrant groups Britain stands at a critical juncture requiring decisive legislative reform. The existing legal framework, marked by restrictive self-defence laws and an over-dependence on professional police forces, has failed to adequately protect citizens and preserve public order. It is essential to introduce Article 23, the Public Self-Defence Act and Civic Policing Act, as a constitutional measure to empower ordinary Britons in defending their communities. This proposed constitutional provision would legitimise and entrench a range of citizen rights, shifting from passive subjects to active participants in safeguarding the nation. Informed by recent empirical data, historical precedents, and international examples such as Switzerland's militia system, this essay demonstrates the pressing need for these reforms, illustrating how they would enhance security, promote patriotism, and uphold democratic principles while avoiding descent into vigilantism.

The imperative for change is starkly illustrated by knife crime statistics across England and Wales. In the year ending March 2025, police recorded around 53,000 offences involving a sharp instrument, a marginal 1.2% decrease from the previous year, signalling that initiatives to stem this epidemic have yielded limited success. Knife-enabled crime fell by just 1% to approximately 53,047 offences in the same period. In London, knife or sharp instrument offences increased to about 16,344 in the 2024/25 period, up from 15,016 the year before, underscoring the

capital's acute vulnerability. Assaults causing injury or with intent to harm, along with robberies, constitute a substantial portion of these incidents, with victims disproportionately young and male—around half under the age of 25 in recent analyses. These persistent threats demand a fundamental shift: citizens must be constitutionally empowered to defend themselves and others, including intervening to save innocent lives from imminent danger.

The United Kingdom's current self-defence laws are frequently criticised as overly restrictive, leaving individuals exposed when confronting immediate threats. While reasonable and proportionate force is permitted in response to imminent harm, the outright ban on carrying weapons—whether lethal or non-lethal—for self-defence severely curtails personal capability. This stands in contrast to more permissive systems internationally. Article 23 would address this deficiency by explicitly affirming the right to intervene in defence of others, enabling bystanders to respond effectively in situations such as knife attacks or public assaults. Far from encouraging disorder, this represents a calibrated response to evidence that police response times and visibility are often inadequate to avert harm in the moment.

Exacerbating the crime surge is a persistent shortfall in police staffing, which has undermined the effectiveness of professional forces. As at 31 March 2025, full-time equivalent police officer numbers across the 43 forces in England and Wales stood at 146,442, reflecting a year-on-year decline of about 0.9% from the prior year—the first such drop since March 2018. In London, the Metropolitan Police has experienced reduced density in recent periods, with ongoing recruitment and retention difficulties prompting discussions of force consolidation to improve efficiency. Neighbourhood policing roles have seen only modest gains, reaching around 11,100 full-time equivalents by March 2025. These gaps emphasise the necessity for supplementary citizen engagement, which The article would establish through the mandated creation of Citizen Patrol Forces as a constitutional obligation.

Under the Act, British citizens—principally men aged 18 to 55—would be required to serve in the Constitutional Army of the People, a disciplined militia under His Majesty's authority and led by experienced current and former servicemen. This model draws inspiration from Switzerland's militia tradition, where mandatory military service for men, combined with regulated firearm ownership, supports one of the lowest gun homicide rates globally—around 0.2 per 100,000 inhabitants in recent years—despite relatively high civilian gun possession. Switzerland's system emphasises responsibility, rigorous training, and background checks, ensuring that widespread ownership does not correlate with elevated violence. Article 22 would incorporate a fair rotation system for patriotic duty, with commitments limited to one or two days monthly to avoid disrupting employment. Employers would receive state grants, tax credits, and other support to facilitate participation, extending to volunteers such as men over 55 with military experience or women aged 18 to 55 in auxiliary capacities like drivers.

Patrol members would complete mandatory group induction training of up to six months, preparing them to secure streets, schools, parks, public venues, transport networks, and borders. Duties would encompass detaining suspects, conducting reasonable suspicion-based stop-and-search operations, and countering aggressions, with authority to use lethal force only when life is endangered, all governed by military-standard protocols. Detainees would be transferred promptly to professional police, maintaining clear separation between civic support and formal enforcement. Accountability would be assured through mandatory filming and documentation of all interactions, including any use of force, to prevent misuse.

This structure is especially critical amid the border security crisis, where small boat crossings have intensified. In 2025, a total of 41,472 migrants arrived via the English Channel—the highest figure in three years and an increase from the previous year's tally—placing immense

pressure on resources and public trust. Citizen patrols would augment these efforts by providing localised monitoring and response.

The Act would further authorise registered Constitutional Army members to carry weapons during active duty and possess them within home or property boundaries, subject to electronic tagging and registration. Patrols would possess limited authority to enter properties upon reasonable suspicion of grave offences such as child grooming, human trafficking, terrorism, drug production, or the presence of illegal settlers—addressing concealed dangers that overwhelmed police cannot always preempt.

To avert politicisation, patrols would be strictly prohibited from involvement in political protests or manifestations, preserving impartiality.

The urgency of these measures is heightened by patterns in sexual offences and organised crime linked to certain migrant communities. Police-recorded rape offences reached around 71,000 in the year ending March 2024, with no marked reduction evident by 2025, though comprehensive nationality breakdowns remain inconsistent. Available data indicate foreign nationals are overrepresented in sexual offence convictions in some contexts; for example, localised audits and broader estimates suggest they account for a disproportionate share relative to population in urban areas. Grooming gangs have inflicted profound harm, with high-profile cases—such as Rotherham, where at least 1,400 children were abused—predominantly involving perpetrators of Pakistani heritage who systematically groomed, trafficked, and gang-raped vulnerable girls over years. Baroness Casey's 2025 audit highlighted a "culture of ignorance" enabling such networks, with official reviews confirming overrepresentation of Pakistani-origin individuals in group-based child sexual exploitation, often involving repeated rapes in degrading conditions. These scandals, replicated in Rochdale, Oxford, Telford, and elsewhere, have shocked the nation and

prompted renewed calls for inquiry.

Organised theft, assault, and sexual harassment form part of a broader, often underreported criminal wave. Romanian-linked gangs have featured prominently in sophisticated operations, including ATM frauds stealing hundreds of thousands of pounds through jackpotting and raids, luxury goods thefts from supermarkets via mafia-style tactics, and aggressive shoplifting sprees netting tens of thousands in stolen merchandise. Such activities contribute to surges in retail crime and violence accompanying robberies, while underreporting—driven by fear, distrust, or barriers—conceals the full extent of petty thefts, assaults, and harassment in affected communities.

In conclusion, this article offers a transformative pathway to a more secure and resilient Britain. By constitutionalising these rights, the nation would mobilise patriotic citizens to confront rising crime, policing deficits, border pressures, and hidden criminal networks, guided by proven frameworks like Switzerland's. This is not an endorsement of chaos but the creation of a regulated, accountable civic defence force dedicated to upholding the rule of law and protecting the vulnerable. The accumulating data compels immediate action; reform cannot wait.

Britain's war is on British streets now , and is not in Bagdad, Kabul or Mogadishu anymore.

Police are clearly outnumbered and outgunned. In 2024 in Leeds they were running scared in Leeds, chased and mobbed by Romanian criminal gangs. Britain needs to be restored then order must be restored as a State that cannot maintain order is not sufficient to maintain its purpose.

A Proposed Constitutional Framework for the Protection and Priority of British Workers. British workers rights.

In an era marked by rapid globalisation, technological disruption, and persistent anxieties over economic security, the proposed Article 24 on British Workers' Rights offers a comprehensive and uncompromising blueprint for reasserting the primacy of native British citizens within the United Kingdom's labour market. Far from a mere adjustment to existing legislation, this article would embed a set of fundamental principles into the constitutional fabric of the nation, elevating the status of British workers and imposing clear obligations on employers, foreign-owned enterprises, and the state itself. The following analysis sets out precisely what Article 24 would achieve, clause by clause, and the structural transformation it envisages for British employment relations.

The first provision prohibits any employer from dismissing a British worker and replacing that individual with a cheaper foreign worker performing the identical role. This rule targets a practice widely perceived as undermining domestic wage levels and job security. Rendering such substitution unlawful, Article 24 would compel employers to justify redundancies on genuine operational grounds rather than labour-cost differentials. It establishes a direct legal barrier against the casual displacement of British employees through international recruitment channels.

The second clause grants British workers an entitlement to become shareholders in any company operating in Britain with foreign or mixed capital. This represents a novel mechanism for wealth-sharing, ensuring that native workers gain a direct stake in the profits generated within the UK economy. It transforms employees from mere labour inputs into partial owners, fostering alignment between corporate success and the prosperity of the domestic workforce.

Thirdly, the article mandates strict hiring priority: every vacancy must first be offered to qualified British citizens. Only in the event of genuine refusal may the position be extended to non-nationals. This sequential obligation creates a statutory preference for British labour, aiming to reduce reliance on overseas recruitment and to channel employment opportunities towards those with the strongest ties to the country. A related and more prescriptive requirement follows: no company may operate in Britain unless at least 50 per cent of its workforce consists of native British citizens.

This workforce-composition quota applies universally, with particular force on foreign or mixed-ownership entities. Failure to comply would result in the inability to conduct business on British soil. The measure seeks to prevent the emergence of workplaces in which British employees form a minority, thereby ensuring that the economic activity generated within the United Kingdom principally benefits its own people.

The article then addresses remuneration and basic dignity. It prohibits any form of labour exploitation of native British workers and requires that every worker receive a salary sufficient to maintain themselves and their dependants in reasonable comfort. This goes beyond the existing National Living Wage set to rise to £12.71 per hour for those aged 21 and over from April 2026—by constitutionalising a living-wage standard that reflects actual costs of living rather than a statutory floor.

Further safeguards target precarious and informal employment practices. It becomes illegal to employ a British worker without a formal written employment contract, to pay wages in cash without proper records, to impose zero-hours contracts, or to obstruct unionisation efforts. These prohibitions would eliminate long-standing sources of insecurity and tax avoidance, compelling all employment relationships involving British citizens into transparent, regulated structures.

Union membership receives particularly strong endorsement. Every

British worker is to belong to a trade union as a constitutional right, with employers facing severe penalties—including substantial fines or nationalisation—for any policy or action that impedes this entitlement. Trade unions are explicitly authorised to represent workers politically and to contribute directly to the formation of national policy. Parallel rights are extended to associations of businesses and investors, preserving symmetry in organised representation.

Career progression is protected through two key rules. First, no British worker may remain on the minimum wage for longer than two years after commencing employment; thereafter, remuneration must reflect the prevailing market rate for the role. Second, equal pay for equal work is reinforced without exception: no differentiation on grounds of sex, age, or other irrelevant characteristics is permissible, and overtime, bonuses, and allowances must be awarded equitably and mandatorily.

Taken together, these provisions would effect a profound reorientation of the British labour market. Priority of access, compositional quotas, and protections against exploitation and precarity would collectively assert that economic participation in Britain is first a right and a benefit reserved for its native citizens. Mandatory unionisation and political representation would restore collective bargaining power and institutionalise workers' influence over legislation. The elimination of low-wage stagnation and discriminatory pay practices would promote fairness and upward mobility.

Such a framework would mark a decisive departure from the flexible, market-driven model that has characterised much of recent British employment policy. It would impose significant obligations on employers, particularly those with international ownership, and could reshape investment patterns, recruitment strategies, and industrial relations. Yet its proponents would argue that these measures are necessary to safeguard the social contract between citizen and state: that hard work in Britain should yield security, dignity, and a fair share of

prosperity for British families above all.

In essence, Article 24 does not merely regulate employment; it redefines the relationship between the nation, its workers, and the global economy and by constitutionalising these rights and duties, it seeks to ensure that Britain's labour market serves its own people first, securely, equitably, and with genuine priority as people job security must be a matter of national security.

Article 25

Woman Rights

This article establishes a clear, mandatory framework of protections for women, requiring society to recognise and safeguard their specific and fundamental needs, enforce heightened safety measures, hold police strictly accountable for domestic and sexual violence cases, mandate terminations of pregnancies resulting from sexual violence or incest, and guarantee women with childcare responsibilities a six-hour working day paid at the full eight-hour rate, supported by employer obligations and tax relief. This integrated approach directly confronts and overcomes the limitations of Britain's existing legal landscape, which—despite meaningful reforms—remains fragmented, discretionary, and insufficiently binding in critical respects. Embedding these rights in a unified, enforceable structure, the article promises not only enhanced gender equality but also substantial economic gains for Britain, including boosted productivity, reduced societal costs, and an annual GDP uplift potentially exceeding £125 billion through greater female economic participation.

The current system scatters women's protections across isolated

statutes, producing inconsistencies where outcomes depend heavily on individual circumstances, local practices, institutional discretion, and the willingness of women to pursue claims. For instance, the Equality Act 2010 addresses discrimination on sex, pregnancy, and maternity grounds but relies on reactive complaints and tribunal processes without imposing proactive, society-wide duties; the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 strengthens responses to violence but leaves enforcement variable across forces; the Employment Rights Act (as updated in 2025) allows flexible working requests from day one yet permits employers to refuse on any of eight statutory grounds—such as additional costs, impact on performance, or inability to reorganise work—after required consultation; and the Abortion Act 1967 permits terminations up to 24 weeks with medical approval but offers no automatic or mandatory provision in coercive or high-risk scenarios like rape or close-relative pregnancies. These elements often result in uneven protection, persistent gaps, and reliance on personal advocacy rather than guaranteed rights.

Article 25 challenges this fragmentation by establishing a unified, constitutionally binding set of obligations that compel consistent action across institutions and society. Its foundational clause—that every woman possesses a guaranteed right to recognition, protection, and mandatory societal acknowledgement of her fundamental needs—surpasses the Equality Act 2010's prohibitive approach by demanding affirmative, systemic support. This shifts focus from optional compliance to enforced investment in women's health (i.e., reproductive and menstrual services), directly reducing medical disparities that current voluntary or sporadic NHS initiatives fail to address comprehensively. Economically, this could yield savings by preventing health inequalities that contribute to lost productivity and higher NHS costs, estimated at billions annually in gender-related care gaps.

Safety provisions raise punishment thresholds for physical and sexual violence, exclude minor public interactions (such as staring or addressing) from police pursuit to avoid resource waste, and extend

public self-defence rights to family members protecting a woman's honour or integrity without penalty for proportionate aggression.

These measures confront the Domestic Abuse Act 2021's inconsistencies—where severe penalties exist for serious crimes but underreporting (often due to distrust), variable sentencing, and strict common-law proportionality rules can undermine deterrence or discourage family intervention.

Clarifying priorities, elevating consequences for grave violence, and legitimising defensive actions, the article delivers stronger deterrence, faster justice, reduced trauma, and lower healthcare/societal costs than the current variable enforcement allows. Recent research estimates the lifetime economic cost of sexual violence and abuse in England and Wales at over £400 billion, encompassing lost earnings, healthcare, justice system burdens, and productivity declines. By fostering fewer incidents through heightened deterrence and prioritisation, Article 24 could generate substantial savings—potentially tens of billions annually—while boosting economic output by keeping more women in the workforce free from violence-related absences or career disruptions.

Police accountability is reinforced by mandating prioritisation of women's domestic or sexual violence calls, with any failure to record or handle cases properly deemed a grave offence for public servants. This tackles persistent criticisms of inconsistent prioritisation, resourcing shortfalls, and variable frontline responses—issues highlighted in ongoing reviews and strategies that rely on guidance rather than automatic, uniform sanctions under the Domestic Abuse Act 2021. The article's stricter standard boosts reporting confidence, enhances data for targeted action, and prevents escalations more reliably than today's misconduct processes, which lack the 'grave offence' designation across all forces. Economically, this could reduce the £400 billion lifetime burden of violence by improving early interventions, lowering long-term welfare and healthcare expenditures, and minimising productivity losses from unaddressed trauma.

Reproductive clauses require mandatory termination of pregnancies from sexual violence or between closest relatives, filling a clear gap in the Abortion Act 1967's permissive framework. Current law depends on two doctors' approval based on health risks and individual choice, with no standalone mandatory mechanism for coercive or genetically high-risk cases, potentially exposing survivors to prolonged trauma or pressure. These provisions provide automatic protection to break abuse cycles, ease recovery burdens, mitigate congenital risks, and reduce long-term healthcare costs—offering decisive safeguards absent in the existing model. From an economic perspective, this could yield savings on neonatal and lifelong care for high-risk births, while enabling survivors to return to economic activity sooner, contributing to overall GDP growth by reducing the indirect costs embedded in the £400 billion violence figure.

The economic measure—six hours' work for eight hours' full pay for women with childcare responsibilities, backed by non-discrimination rules and tax relief—directly confronts the motherhood penalty embedded in the Employment Rights Act's flexible working rules. Employers can still refuse requests on business grounds (e.g., cost or performance impact), perpetuating proportional pay cuts, career stagnation, and pension shortfalls for mothers. Latest ONS data (April 2025) show the gender pay gap for all employees at 12.8% (down from 13.1% in 2024), with full-time employees at 6.9%—widening to 9.1% for women aged 40–49 due to motherhood impacts. Mothers face an average earnings loss of £65,618 over five years after a first child's birth (a 42% monthly drop compared to pre-birth), with £26,317 lost for a second child, driven by reduced hours or workforce exits. This costs the UK economy billions in lost tax revenue and productivity, as women represent over half the population but bear disproportionate childcare burdens.

Article 25 eliminates this income penalty, guaranteeing financial stability while better aligning hours with childcare, reframing it as a

shared societal duty rather than a private female burden. Evidence from Iceland's reduced-hours trials (35–36 hours weekly without pay loss, adopted widely since 2015–2019) confirms the gains: sustained or improved productivity, lower stress/burnout/absenteeism (halved in some sectors), enhanced work-life balance (especially for parents), fewer quits (57% reduction in a related UK trial), and economic resilience with low unemployment (below 4% in 2025) and GDP growth outperforming European peers. Swedish studies, including a 2005 randomised trial of 25% work-time reduction, show improved sleep, reduced stress, and stronger family bonds without output loss. In Britain, implementing this could boost female labour participation by 5–10% (based on similar European models), narrowing the pay gap and unlocking up to £125 billion in annual GDP growth, as estimated by the UK Government in 2025 for enhancing women's economic activity. Tax relief would offset employer costs (potentially £5–10 billion nationwide, recouped via higher retention and efficiency), while reduced childcare demands save families thousands annually and lower future welfare needs through better child outcomes. Overall, this provision alone could recover much of the £65,618 per-mother loss, adding trillions to long-term economic output by retaining talent and fostering innovation. Addressing these core weaknesses—fragmentation through a cohesive structure, discretion through mandatory rules, and insufficient binding force through enforceable obligations—Article 24 embeds women's dignity, security, and economic equity more effectively than incremental reforms. The result is a Britain better equipped for genuine gender parity, with healthier families, reduced inequalities, stronger institutions, and sustained prosperity—delivering an economic impact that could elevate GDP by £125 billion yearly, save billions in violence and health costs, and close the pay gap for lasting national growth.

Right to fair retribution. After working age rights. Ensuring Fair Retribution and Dignity for the Elderly in Britain

Article 26 establishes a comprehensive, mandatory framework for the right to fair retribution after a lifetime of work, guaranteeing that every person who has contributed through labour receives deserved compensation in retirement. It prohibits taxation on pensions and other retirement income, restricts pensions to contributors only, provides free state-guaranteed transportation for all elderly people, shields pensioners from debt enforcement orders, subsidises or eliminates utilities bills for them (with reductions based on income thresholds), bans pensioners from acting as financial guarantors, and mandates societal recognition and respect for the elderly as essential to incentivising work and law-abiding behaviour. This integrated set of protections directly confronts and improves upon Britain's current retirement system, which—despite valuable elements—remains fragmented, means-tested in parts, discretionary in application, and insufficiently protective against poverty and exploitation in old age.

The existing UK pension framework is built around the State Pension, a contributory benefit requiring qualifying National Insurance (NI) years (typically 35 for the full new State Pension, currently £241.30 per week or £12,547 annually from April 2026 following a 4.8% uprating). Eligibility depends on NI contributions or credits, making it inherently linked to work history, but additional means-tested supports like Pension Credit top up low incomes, while Winter Fuel Payments and other aids have become restricted (e.g., limited to Pension Credit recipients from winter 2024/25 in England and Wales). Taxation applies to pension income above the personal allowance (£12,570 in 2025/26), meaning many pensioners pay income tax on State Pension portions if combined with other earnings. Transport concessions exist via the older person's bus pass (free local bus travel after State Pension age, currently 66, with variations by devolved nation), but they are not universal or fully state-guaranteed in all forms. Debt recovery can involve deductions from

benefits or earnings attachments, and utilities support relies on discretionary schemes like the Warm Home Discount or limited Pension Credit additions rather than blanket subsidies. Respect for the elderly lacks any enforceable mandate, relying on cultural norms and voluntary initiatives.

Article 26 challenges this patchwork by shifting to binding, universal entitlements that prioritise contributors while protecting all elderly from financial vulnerability. Its core guarantee—that those who worked and contributed deserve fair, untaxed compensation—builds on the contributory principle of the State Pension but eliminates taxation entirely on pensions and post-retirement income. Currently, pensioners with modest additional income face tax bills that erode their retirement security; removing this would increase disposable income significantly, potentially by hundreds to thousands annually depending on total earnings, directly boosting spending power and reducing reliance on means-tested top-ups.

By restricting pensions strictly to contributors and excluding non-contributors, the article reinforces fairness in the system, preventing perceived dilution of funds from those who paid in. The current model already ties the full State Pension to NI records, but means-tested benefits like Pension Credit provide safety nets for low contributors or non-workers; this provision sharpens the contributory focus, potentially streamlining administration and reducing long-term fiscal pressure on the welfare state while upholding equity for lifelong workers.

Free state-guaranteed transportation for all elderly people expands and universalises existing concessions like the English bus pass (free off-peak local travel after State Pension age) or Scottish/Welsh schemes (from age 60 in some cases). This saves pensioners hundreds annually in fares—estimates suggest the bus pass's value exceeds £500–£1,000 yearly for regular users—promoting mobility, social inclusion, and health. Making it fully guaranteed and state-funded removes eligibility

variations and age thresholds, ensuring consistent access nationwide and reducing isolation costs (e.g., healthcare burdens from reduced activity).

Shielding pensioners from debt orders post-pension age shifts responsibility solely to lenders, confronting current practices where council tax arrears or benefit overpayments lead to deductions from State Pension or attachments. This protects vulnerable retirees from aggressive enforcement, preventing poverty spirals and associated health/welfare costs.

Utilities bill subsidies or reductions (with income-based quantum adjustments) go beyond fragmented supports like the Warm Home Discount (£150 one-off for eligible low-income pensioners) or limited Pension Credit additions. With fuel poverty affecting many older households amid rising energy costs, this could save thousands per household annually, easing winter hardships and lowering NHS expenditures on cold-related illnesses (poverty-linked health costs run into billions yearly).

Banning pensioners from financial guarantor roles prevents exploitation through debt risks in old age, adding a safeguard absent in current law.

The article's emphasis on mandatory societal respect for the elderly, warning that lack thereof erodes incentives to work and obey laws, addresses a cultural and motivational gap. Without enforceable recognition, elderly dignity suffers, contributing to isolation and disengagement; mandating respect fosters intergenerational solidarity, encouraging sustained workforce participation and societal cohesion.

Economically, Article 25 delivers profound benefits by reducing elderly poverty (currently around 17–18% relative poverty rate for pensioners, with persistent risks despite the triple lock). Elderly poverty costs the UK dearly: poor health from financial strain burdens the NHS (estimated £29 billion+ annually in related expenses), while limited disposable income

curbs consumer spending. Untaxed pensions and subsidies would boost retirement incomes, stimulating economic activity—pensioner households with greater security spend more locally, supporting retail and services. Free transport and utilities relief could save the state indirectly through lower healthcare/welfare demands (e.g., reduced fuel poverty interventions) and higher quality of life, potentially yielding billions in fiscal savings. Enhanced dignity and security incentivise longer working lives, increasing tax revenues and NI contributions pre-retirement. By overcoming fragmentation (scattered concessions and means-tests), discretion (variable enforcement and supports), and insufficient binding force (no mandates on respect or absolute protections), Article 25 creates a cohesive, enforceable system honouring contributors while safeguarding all elderly. It promises reduced poverty, healthier ageing, stronger incentives for work, and sustained economic vitality—positioning Britain for a fairer, more prosperous retirement landscape where dignity in old age underpins national resilience.

Article 27

Native legal rights & adopted citizens. Foreigner rights.

The framework set out in this provision establishes a clear hierarchy of access to public resources, prioritising those born in the country or fully integrated through cultural, linguistic, and ethnic alignment, along with demonstrated support for national interests. Native citizens, defined as those born within the territory and sharing its core identity, receive absolute precedence in the allocation of services such as healthcare, education, housing, and welfare. Integrated citizens—those who have adopted the country's language, culture, and values while contributing meaningfully—enjoy equivalent entitlements, though the emphasis remains on natives holding priority where resources are limited.

This contrasts sharply with the existing United Kingdom system, where

access to most public services operates on the basis of ordinary residence rather than birth, ethnicity, or cultural assimilation. The National Health Service provides free hospital treatment to those who are ordinarily resident, typically meaning individuals living lawfully in the UK on a settled basis, including British citizens, those with indefinite leave to remain, and many with settled status under post-Brexit arrangements. Non-EEA nationals on longer visas often pay an Immigration Health Surcharge as part of their application, granting them the same free access as citizens during their stay. Emergency and accident and emergency care remains free for everyone regardless of status, as do certain treatments for infectious diseases, reflecting a universalist principle that prioritises immediate human need over nationality.

Under the proposed approach, free medical care, education, and other public services would be reserved exclusively for natives and integrated citizens. Foreign nationals—defined broadly to include those not born in the country, lacking cultural or linguistic ties, failing to contribute sufficiently, or holding views deemed incompatible with native interests—would face mandatory charges for non-emergency healthcare, housing, and education. Children born to foreign parents would receive no state assistance, placing the full burden on their families. This would exclude such individuals from welfare benefits entirely, limiting their entitlements to basic police and emergency services, with life-saving treatment equally prioritised for all in urgent cases.

The current framework allows migrant children, irrespective of their parents' immigration status, to access free state education from age five to sixteen, as local authorities hold a statutory duty to provide full-time education to all children of compulsory school age resident in their area. This ensures integration and opportunity without discrimination based on parental nationality or status. Similarly, welfare benefits such as Universal Credit are generally restricted for those subject to immigration control through "no recourse to public funds" conditions, particularly for temporary visa holders or recent arrivals, though settled residents and

citizens qualify without such barriers. Asylum seekers and refugees receive limited support, but broader entitlements follow recognition of status.

By introducing explicit prioritisation based on nativity and integration, the proposal seeks to ensure that finite public resources benefit those with the deepest historical and cultural connection first. This could reduce strain on services perceived as overburdened by non-contributors, directing aid towards those who share the society's foundational identity and have demonstrated loyalty through language proficiency, economic participation, and alignment with national aspirations. Where resources are scarce, natives would face less competition, potentially improving waiting times for treatments, school places, or housing allocations.

For foreign nationals, the system imposes self-reliance through payment for services or reliance on embassies in cases of victimisation by other foreigners. Crimes between foreign nationals would trigger arrest by British police but transfer to embassy custody, with prosecution, imprisonment, and deportation funded by the offender's home state under bilateral policing agreements. This encourages diplomatic efforts to establish reciprocal arrangements, shifting enforcement costs abroad and deterring criminal activity among non-residents.

Emergency provisions maintain universality: police assistance and life-saving medical care would remain equally available to all, preventing humanitarian crises and upholding basic rule-of-law obligations. Everyone must respect the law, with no exemptions from policing or emergency response.

This structure promotes a society where public provision rewards belonging and contribution, discouraging reliance on the state by those without strong ties or incentives to integrate. It aims to preserve resources for natives and integrated members, fostering cohesion by

aligning entitlements with shared identity and mutual support, while still affording essential protections to visitors and temporary residents in moments of acute need. In doing so, it addresses concerns over resource allocation in a way that current residency-based rules do not, potentially enhancing public confidence in the fairness of welfare and service distribution.

Article 28

Separation of powers in State

The proposed constitutional provision on the separation of powers represents a marked enhancement over the existing United Kingdom framework, where the boundaries between institutions remain fluid, reliant on convention rather than rigid demarcation, and where overlaps—particularly between the executive and legislature—persist despite reforms such as the Constitutional Reform Act 2005.

In the current system, the United Kingdom operates as a constitutional monarchy with parliamentary sovereignty as the dominant principle. Parliament, comprising the House of Commons, House of Lords, and the Crown, holds supreme legislative authority. The executive, led by the Prime Minister and Cabinet drawn from the majority party in the Commons, wields substantial power in both policymaking and implementation, often blurring lines because ministers sit in Parliament. The judiciary enjoys strong independence, bolstered by the removal of the Lord Chancellor's judicial role and protections under statute, yet the absence of a codified constitution leaves safeguards dependent on

tradition, self-restraint, and occasional judicial assertiveness through mechanisms like judicial review. The monarch's role is largely ceremonial: powers are exercised on ministerial advice, with the Sovereign avoiding political intervention to preserve neutrality.

The new provision rectifies these characteristics by imposing clearer, more enforceable divisions while redefining key institutions in ways that strengthen accountability, impartiality, and popular sovereignty. Parliament gains explicit autonomy in its decisions, yet remains permanently subject to the will of citizens—not merely at election time but throughout its mandate. This continuous accountability surpasses the present system, where MPs answer primarily through periodic elections, party discipline, and occasional recall mechanisms; the proposal embeds an ongoing obligation to reflect the electorate's wishes, reducing the scope for representatives to drift from public sentiment between ballots.

The Institutional Monarchy emerges as the central popular institution, empowered to express citizens' demands, exercise a right of veto, and scrutinise any elected government or public authority. Unlike the current monarch, who refrains from public criticism or veto to uphold convention, this redefined Head of State acts as a direct guardian of the people's voice. At the same time, the Monarch is strictly prohibited from interfering in government operations or representing the country externally—tasks reserved exclusively for the elected Prime Minister and government. This formal separation eliminates any residual ambiguity in the Crown's role, preventing the subtle influence that might arise from personal audiences or private counsel, while preserving the Monarch's symbolic and protective functions.

The Head of State becomes the explicit defender of the country, its constitution, the Christian faith, and traditional British culture, values, and way of life. The provision permits the Monarch to pursue social or political initiatives and offer criticism, but only within the bounds set by

the Constitutional Army of People—a body representing the citizenry's ultimate authority. Direct address is limited to the British people alone, with no meetings or interactions permitted between the Head of State and the elected government. This enforced isolation safeguards both institutions from corruption, undue influence, blackmail, or ethical compromise, creating a cleaner divide than the present arrangement, where weekly private meetings between the Sovereign and Prime Minister occur by convention.

The Civil Service falls under the Crown but remains subject to scrutiny by both the Constitutional Army of People and Parliament. The Head of State serves as its formal head, bearing the same accountability to the people as the elected government does. This structure enhances transparency and prevents the executive from dominating the permanent bureaucracy, addressing concerns in the existing system where civil servants are accountable primarily through ministers to Parliament, with risks of politicisation.

Justice is declared fully independent and sovereign, with magistrates and judges accountable for the constitutionality of their rulings. The state itself can be sued in the same manner as any individual, affirming that the law is absolute and no entity stands above it. Police accountability runs directly to Parliament and the people, reinforcing public oversight.

A pivotal innovation is the mandatory oath and signed Contract with the Nation for all in public service, including the Head of State. Every sworn authority must pledge sole loyalty to the people, the country, the constitution, and the prosperity of British citizens, committing life and effort to their defence and accepting personal responsibility for actions in office. This contract, binding in every court across Britain and Northern Ireland, derives its legal force from the electors—tax-paying citizens with voting rights—who act as the ultimate censors and employers of all state power. Electors invest and mandate authority on their behalf, transforming public service into a direct contractual

obligation rather than a diffuse convention.

These changes collectively produce a superior separation of powers. The current UK model, while functional and flexible, tolerates significant fusion between executive and legislature, relies on unwritten conventions vulnerable to erosion, and positions the monarch as a neutral figurehead without explicit protective or scrutinising powers. The proposed framework counters these by entrenching strict institutional independence, continuous popular control over Parliament, an active yet non-interfering Monarchy as guardian of national values, absolute judicial sovereignty, universal personal accountability through a binding national contract, and ultimate sovereignty in the hands of the electors. It fosters greater impartiality, reduces risks of corruption or undue influence, and aligns governance more closely with the principle that power originates from and returns to the people, rendering the constitutional order more robust, transparent, and democratically responsive than the arrangements that prevail today.

Article 29

The Four Pillars of our Democracy

In the grand architecture of democratic governance, the metaphor of pillars evokes not merely structural support but a profound symbiosis of elements that elevate society toward justice, prosperity, and liberty. Article 29, entitled "The Four Pillars of our Democracy," articulates a visionary constitutional framework comprising the Institutional Monarchy, the Parliament and Elected Government, Free Economic Initiative, and Freedom of Speech and Press. These pillars are not isolated monoliths but interconnected mechanisms designed to fortify the United Kingdom's democratic edifice against erosion from within or without. At the heart of this reform lies a guiding principle: "A system can be Revolutionary replaced only by another system that has a greater capacity in resolving human and societal issues." This axiom underscores the article's rationale, positing that any overhaul of the

existing system—rooted in an uncoded constitution blending parliamentary sovereignty with monarchical tradition—must demonstrably surpass it in addressing contemporary challenges such as political corruption, economic inequality, foreign interference, and informational manipulation. This essay delves deeply into each pillar, explaining their operational mechanisms, tangible benefits, implementation strategies, and comparative advantages over the current British system. By contrasting the old regime's vulnerabilities with the new framework's enhancements, we illuminate how Article 28 promises a more resilient, equitable, and adaptive democracy.

The first pillar, the Institutional Monarchy, redefines the crown as a dynamic instrument of popular sovereignty, vesting in it the citizens' authority to enforce constitutional compliance and electoral accountability. Mechanistically, this operates through a dual structure: the monarchy acts as an impartial arbiter, empowered to review and veto governmental actions that deviate from constitutional mandates or manifesto promises, with appeals triggered by parliamentary petitions or citizen referenda exceeding a threshold of, say, one million signatures. Complementing this is the Constitutional Army of the People, an ad-hoc civic militia comprising trained volunteers from the populace, mobilised via digital platforms for oversight duties such as monitoring elections or auditing public expenditures. This army, coordinated under military protocols but independent of executive control, ensures grassroots enforcement, with rotational service to prevent elitism. Benefits abound: it mitigates executive overreach, as seen in recent controversies like the prorogation of Parliament in 2019, by providing a non-partisan check; fosters civic engagement, reducing voter apathy (currently at around 40% in UK general elections); and shields against foreign meddling, such as cyber intrusions or economic coercion from entities like China or Russia, through proactive intelligence integration.

Implementation would involve legislative codification, establishing a Constitutional Court adjunct to the monarchy for adjudication, with funding drawn from a dedicated national security levy. Compared to the

old system—where the monarchy's role is largely ceremonial, reliant on the Sovereign Grant and vulnerable to political manipulation—this new paradigm offers superior advantages: greater transparency via public audits of royal expenditures, elimination of hereditary privileges that perpetuate inequality i.e, the current line of succession excluding non-Protestants), and direct citizen empowerment, resolving societal issues like institutional distrust. The old model's deference to tradition often exacerbates divisions, as evidenced by debates over royal finances amid cost-of-living crises; the new one, by contrast, democratises the institution, enhancing its capacity to resolve human issues such as social cohesion and national integrity. Adhering to the principle, this revolutionary replacement amplifies problem-solving efficacy, transforming a symbolic head of state into a functional guardian of the people.

The second pillar, the Parliament and Elected Government, crystallises the executive and legislative core of the state, mandating efficient societal management through policy formulation and implementation. Its mechanisms include a streamlined bicameral system with enhanced scrutiny committees, where the government initiates bills via cross-party consultations, and Parliament ratifies them with mandatory impact assessments on equality, environment, and economy. To enforce accountability, the article strips away immunities during criminal proceedings, allowing immediate arrests for offences like bribery or fraud, processed through expedited judicial channels independent of parliamentary votes.

Benefits include heightened responsiveness to public needs, such as addressing housing shortages or healthcare backlogs, by tying ministerial performance to measurable KPIs; reduced corruption, countering scandals like the PPE procurement fiascos during the COVID-19 pandemic; and streamlined decision-making, potentially halving legislative delays that currently plague the Westminster system.

Implementation advantages lie in digital tools for real-time public

consultations and AI-assisted bill drafting, integrated into existing parliamentary infrastructure with minimal disruption. In juxtaposition to the old system—characterised by absolute parliamentary sovereignty that enables unchecked legislation, as in the rapid passage of controversial bills like the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022 amid public protests—the new framework introduces proportionality and justice. The traditional model's privileges have shielded MPs from accountability, fostering a culture of impunity evident in expense scandals; the proposed one resolves this by equalising legal treatment, thereby enhancing trust and resolving societal issues like political alienation. This aligns with the core principle: "A system can be Revolutionary replaced only by another system that has a greater capacity in resolving human and societal issues," as the revamped pillar better tackles governance inefficiencies, promoting a democracy where power serves rather than subjugates.

The third pillar, Free Economic Initiative, Business, and Property, enshrines a private-led economy as the engine of sustenance, with the state as its vigilant steward. Mechanistically, it guarantees entrepreneurial freedom through simplified regulations, tax incentives for startups, and antitrust bodies to ensure competitive markets, while imposing state oversight on strategic sectors via licensing regimes—for instance, mandating national ownership thresholds in utilities or defence manufacturing. Benefits encompass accelerated growth, job creation (potentially boosting employment rates beyond the current 75%), and innovation, as seen in thriving tech hubs; equitable wealth distribution via progressive tariffs protecting local firms from dumping; and resilience against global shocks, like supply chain disruptions during the Ukraine conflict.

Implementation would leverage existing bodies like the Competition and Markets Authority, augmented by a National Economic Council for strategic planning, with phased rollouts to minimise market volatility. Contrasted with the old neoliberal model—where deregulation has led to monopolies (e.g., energy giants profiting amid price hikes) and foreign

takeovers eroding sovereignty (e.g., Chinese investments in critical infrastructure)—this pillar offers distinct advantages: prioritising national interests resolves issues like economic dependency and inequality, with Gini coefficients potentially dropping from 0.35. The traditional system's *laissez-faire* approach exacerbates societal divides, as in regional disparities between London and the North; the new one, by balancing freedom with security, enhances problem-solving capacity, embodying the principle that revolutionary change must yield superior outcomes in human welfare and societal stability.

The fourth pillar, Freedom of Speech and Press, positions unfettered expression as the linchpin of authenticity and trust, with mechanisms mandating official responses to media exposés—such as compulsory inquiries within 30 days of credible reports—and felony charges for obstructions, enforced via an independent Press Ombudsman. Public Truth, encompassing threats to national integrity, is protected through whistleblower safeguards and open-access databases for governmental data. Benefits include robust anti-corruption measures, deterring malfeasance as in the Windrush scandal; informed public discourse, countering misinformation epidemics; and societal empowerment, enabling marginalised voices to drive change.

Implementation advantages include digital verification tools to authenticate sources, integrated into media regulations with training for journalists. Against the old system's qualified freedoms—marred by libel laws stifling investigations and state interventions like the Leveson Inquiry's fallout—the new framework excels: it resolves censorship issues, as in recent online harm legislation chilling speech, by prioritising public interest over elite protection. The traditional model permits blackmail and polarisation, undermining elections; the proposed one, with explicit limits on defamatory content, fosters healthier debate, aligning with the principle: "A system can be Revolutionary replaced only by other system that has a greater capacity in resolving human and societal issues," by better addressing disinformation and accountability deficits.

In culmination, Article 29's four pillars interweave to form a cohesive democratic fortress, where mechanisms of checks, benefits of equity, and implementation efficiencies surpass the old system's frailties. Adhering to the inviolable principle—"A system can be Revolutionary replaced only by other system that has a greater capacity in resolving human and societal issues"—this framework not only critiques the status quo but transcends it, promising an unitary national state where democracy is not a fragile inheritance but a robust evolution, attuned to the exigencies of our times.

Article 30

Identity and Citizens Rights to Identity & Privacy.

In an era defined by pervasive digital surveillance, rampant data breaches, and the commodification of personal information, the safeguarding of citizens' identity and privacy has become an existential imperative for any sovereign state. Article 30, entitled Identity and Citizens' Rights to Identity & Privacy, sets forth a stringent constitutional framework to protect these fundamental entitlements from erosion by domestic overreach or foreign exploitation. The provision obliges the State to recognise every citizen through the exclusive issuance of identity documents, while restricting the retention of personal data to three indispensable identifiers: full name, date of birth, and National Insurance number. By treating citizens' data as a matter of national security, entrusting its custody exclusively to the British Armed Forces, Ministry of Defence, and Interior Ministry—with police subordinated to these bodies—and imposing an absolute prohibition on private or foreign entities handling such information, Article 30 establishes an

uncompromising defence of individual sovereignty over personal identity. This essay examines the principles underpinning the article, contrasts them with the shortcomings of the existing UK General Data Protection Regulation and Data Protection Act 2018, and illustrates, through recent statistics and high-profile incidents, why such constitutional entrenchment is essential to counter the accelerating threats of identity theft, cyber espionage, and privacy degradation in the United Kingdom.

The cornerstone of Article 30 is the affirmation that the State alone is authorised to issue identity documents, thereby guaranteeing consistency, authenticity, and public confidence in official recognition of citizenship. By limiting retained data to the three core elements—full name, date of birth, and National Insurance number—the article enforces strict data minimisation, excluding superfluous details such as domicile, place of birth, or parents' names that serve little legitimate administrative purpose yet facilitate unnecessary profiling or potential misuse.

No elected government, whether at national or local level, would be permitted access to citizens' data except where strictly required by law or demonstrable public interest. This principle prevents the gradual normalisation of mass data collection that has characterised contemporary governance. Furthermore, by classifying all citizens' data as a national security asset, the article transfers oversight to military and defence institutions, acknowledging that personal information constitutes a strategic vulnerability in the modern age. Police forces, although vital for law enforcement, would function under the direction of the Ministry of Defence and Interior, ensuring that data administration remains insulated from routine operational pressures or discretionary overreach.

This approach stands in sharp relief against the current regime governed by the UK General Data Protection Regulation and the Data Protection Act 2018. While these instruments incorporate important safeguards—such as requirements for lawful processing, transparency, and individual rights—they contain significant weaknesses that

undermine genuine privacy protection. The UK GDPR permits wide exemptions for national security and defence, enabling authorities to circumvent core principles when processing is deemed necessary for state purposes. The Data Protection Act supplements this framework with specific provisions for law enforcement and intelligence activities, yet it does not impose rigid limits on data retention or categorically exclude foreign entities from involvement. International data transfers remain permissible under adequacy decisions or standard contractual clauses, mechanisms that have repeatedly proven inadequate in preventing leaks or foreign access. Recent legislative developments, including proposals to weaken encryption under the Online Safety Act, further illustrate the tension between security imperatives and privacy rights, often tilting toward state convenience at the expense of individual protection. Article 30 resolves these contradictions by embedding absolute prohibitions: no foreign enterprise, private domestic company, or public body outside the designated defence institutions may access, collect, store, handle, or administer citizens' databases. Foreign service providers are barred from retaining or processing data on British citizens beyond their own direct employees, and must adapt commercial practices—such as replacing direct debits with payment-at-source alternatives—to eliminate data dependencies.

The urgency of these reforms is underscored by the alarming scale of identity-related crime and data breaches in recent years. In 2024, the United Kingdom recorded nearly 250,000 cases of identity fraud, representing a five per cent increase over the previous year and accounting for fifty-nine per cent of all fraud reports submitted to the National Fraud Database. Overall fraud incidents reached a historic high of 421,000 cases in the same period, with identity theft frequently serving as the gateway offence. High-profile breaches have repeatedly exposed millions of citizens to risk. The 2017 Equifax incident compromised the personal and financial records of fifteen million UK residents due to security failures in a US-based corporation's systems. More recently, in October 2025, a cyber-attack attributed to a

Chinese-linked group targeted the UK Foreign Office, potentially exposing thousands of visa records and sensitive documents. The genetic testing company 23andMe was fined over two million pounds in June 2025 for failing to secure the highly sensitive genetic data of millions of users, including a substantial number of British citizens. Cyber security incidents affected sixty-five per cent of UK businesses in 2025, with foreign state-sponsored espionage, ransomware campaigns, and attacks on critical infrastructure constituting persistent and low-cost threats. The planned expansion of a national Digital ID system, intended for universal adoption by 2029, has already prompted warnings from security experts and whistleblowers about its vulnerability to foreign hacking and criminal exploitation.

Article 30 addresses these dangers through a comprehensive definition of protected information, encompassing data relating to the civil population, public officials, military personnel, political administration, critical technologies, scientific innovations, natural resources, telecommunications networks, vital infrastructure, public health systems, and any other matter of national interest. No foreign entity—whether a person, organisation, corporation, or state—may access such data under any circumstances, with criminal prosecution mandated for any individual or facilitator found guilty of contravention. This regime surpasses the flexibility of current legislation, which permits international transfers subject to safeguards that have repeatedly failed in practice. By confining data handling to British national companies bound by stringent laws of national secrecy and information protection, and vesting ultimate custody in defence institutions, the article creates a closed, sovereign ecosystem impervious to external interference.

Public sentiment further supports the need for reform. Surveys consistently reveal deep unease regarding the handling of personal data, particularly when foreign companies or state actors are involved. Widespread distrust surrounds proposals to use artificial intelligence on sensitive public-sector datasets, such as those held by the National

Health Service, with a majority of respondents expressing concern over security and privacy implications. Article 30 responds to these anxieties by institutionalising military-grade custodianship and categorical exclusions, thereby restoring confidence that personal identity remains under national control rather than subject to commercial or geopolitical exploitation.

In conclusion, Article 30 constitutes a decisive reassertion of sovereignty over personal identity and privacy in an age of unrelenting digital vulnerability. By resolving the ambiguities and exemptions that weaken the UK General Data Protection Regulation and Data Protection Act 2018, and by imposing uncompromising data minimisation, exclusive national stewardship, and total prohibition of foreign involvement, the provision offers a coherent and enforceable bulwark against identity theft, cyber espionage, and systemic privacy erosion. With hundreds of thousands of identity fraud cases reported annually and a succession of breaches exposing millions to harm, the adoption of such constitutional safeguards is not merely prudent but essential to preserving individual autonomy and national integrity in the twenty-first century.

Article 31

Right to organise and decide Free Electoral Elections

The system outlined it removes any government or parliamentary control over the timing of elections, ensuring that citizens alone determine when leaders face renewal or replacement through their expressed will. This marks a fundamental shift from the present arrangement in the United Kingdom, where the Prime Minister retains the prerogative to request dissolution of Parliament, leading to a general election at a moment deemed advantageous. Since the repeal of the Fixed-term Parliaments Act in 2022, this flexibility has restored

long-standing constitutional practice, yet it allows incumbents to time polls opportunistically, potentially extending periods of inadequate performance if circumstances appear favourable for re-election.

By contrast, elections here occur according to citizens' perceived needs rather than any preset cycle or executive decision. The mechanism permits dissatisfied voters to initiate a grievance process, supported by signatures from half the electorate recorded at the previous contest. An independent Electoral Committee, with members selected through a jury-style election, verifies the data impartially. Upon reaching the threshold, the Constitutional Court reviews the matter within 24 hours and, if upheld, dissolves the government automatically. Such swift, direct accountability compels leaders to maintain consistent delivery throughout their tenure, as the risk of premature removal remains ever-present. Poor governance thus faces immediate correction rather than lingering until a convenient election date, minimising prolonged damage to public services, economic stability, and institutional trust.

This approach draws strength from the principle that political actors serve as employees of the electorate and should receive no advance remuneration from public funds. The complete ban on state subsidies for parties, candidates, or groups eliminates any taxpayer support during campaigns, including mechanisms akin to Short Money provided to opposition parties in Parliament. Current funding relies heavily on private donations, which have prompted concerns over undue influence from wealthy individuals or opaque sources, with reports highlighting significant sums from unclear origins potentially distorting priorities. Requiring post-performance backing forces political entities to demonstrate results first, fostering genuine competition rooted in achievement rather than financial advantage or incumbency perks. This levels the field more effectively, encouraging merit-based support and reducing perceptions of a self-perpetuating political class insulated by resources unavailable to newcomers.

Orderly transitions further enhance stability. A Prime Minister wishing to step down must provide six months' notice via a legally binding resignation letter lodged with the Constitutional Court, triggering an automatic electoral campaign start within 24 hours. In instances of incapacity, death, or legal impediment preventing continued duties, the Head of State, supported by the Civil Service and Armed Forces, maintains essential governance during the interim period, avoiding power vacuums without granting undue executive authority. Results lead to immediate assumption of office by the new government, with the incoming Prime Minister sworn in within 24 hours, accelerating the handover compared with potential delays under existing procedures.

Such provisions cultivate a culture of vigilance and responsiveness. Citizens bear direct responsibility for identifying shortcomings and invoking remedies promptly, reinforcing that authority derives from ongoing consent rather than periodic endorsement. Incompetence or disloyalty cannot endure indefinitely, as the system equips voters with efficient tools to intervene. This reduces cumulative harm from misguided policies, sparing subsequent generations the greater effort required to rectify entrenched failures. Ultimately, the framework promotes healthier democratic practice by aligning power more closely with popular will, discouraging complacency, and ensuring that leadership remains contingent on sustained public approval rather than institutional inertia or strategic timing.

Article 32

General Elections and Local Councils Autonomy.

The Proposed Article 32: Empowering Citizens to Combat Local Council Corruption, Embezzlement, and Abuse of Power in Britain

Article 32 presents a transformative blueprint for safeguarding local democracy, affirming the inviolable autonomy of councils and ensuring that the expressed will of local residents remains untouchable by any central authority, political entity, or external influence. It incorporates principles of public grievance to compel new elections under specified conditions, requires that a new mayor be elected within 30 days if one is removed due to public grievance or criminal conviction—to maintain continuity in handling urgent local matters through elected representation—and stipulates that during this interim period, affected councils may continue essential operations but are barred from holding meetings or making decisions, which would be deemed null and void. Furthermore, all decisions taken under a valid electoral mandate retain their legitimacy. This framework not only reinforces local sovereignty but places a strong emphasis on citizen-led remedies, directly tackling entrenched issues of corruption, embezzlement, and abuse of power in local governance. By vesting greater authority in residents to hold officials accountable, Article 32 addresses systemic vulnerabilities in Britain's current local government model, where central oversight often overshadows community empowerment and remedial processes can be slow or ineffective.

Britain's local government system, comprising over 300 authorities in England with varying structures—from unitary councils to directly elected mayors in devolved areas like Greater Manchester—operates under a web of statutes including the Local Government Act 1972, the Local Government Act 2000, and the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016. While these provide for local decision-making in areas such as planning, housing, and social care, central government wields considerable influence: it can intervene in 'failing' councils by appointing commissioners (as occurred in Liverpool in 2021 amid corruption scandals), dictate funding allocations (with councils reliant on

central grants for about half their revenue), or reshape boundaries through reorganisations. Corruption, embezzlement, and abuse of power persist as significant challenges; high-profile cases, such as the 2022–2023 inquiries into councils like Croydon (where financial mismanagement led to bankruptcy declarations) or Thurrock (involving £1.3 billion in risky investments and embezzlement allegations), highlight how officials can exploit positions for personal gain, often with limited immediate citizen recourse. Current remedies are fragmented: disqualification under the Local Government Disqualification Act 2022 applies for serious convictions (e.g., sentences over three months), but there is no universal public recall mechanism equivalent to the Recall of MPs Act 2015. Investigations rely on bodies like the Local Government Ombudsman or the Audit Commission, but these are reactive, bureaucratic, and lack direct electoral triggers. Vacancies for mayors or leaders can linger, with by-elections in elected mayor systems taking months or internal council selections bypassing public input, allowing interim abuses or stagnation in addressing urgent issues like budget shortfalls or community services.

Article 32 directly confronts these deficiencies by embedding citizen power as the cornerstone of remedial action, offering proactive tools to uproot corruption and embezzlement through swift, democratic interventions. The principle of untouchable local autonomy challenges the current centralised model, where ministerial directions or interventions can undermine resident-led decisions—such as in planning disputes or financial bailouts that impose austerity measures without local consent. By prohibiting any tampering with residents' will, the article empowers communities to resist external pressures that might enable corrupt practices, such as politically motivated funding cuts or coerced policy changes that benefit vested interests. This fosters a culture of transparency, reducing opportunities for abuse of power by ensuring councils operate solely in alignment with local mandates, free from Whitehall's shadow.

A pivotal remedy lies in the application of public grievance principles to force new elections, providing citizens with a direct mechanism to address corruption, embezzlement, or misconduct. Unlike the existing system, where grievances are channelled through ombudsmen or petitions that rarely lead to removal (e.g., requiring 10% of electors to trigger a referendum in some petition schemes, but without guaranteed electoral outcomes), this provision enables residents to initiate destitution proceedings based on evidence of wrongdoing—such as fraudulent procurement contracts or misuse of public funds. This citizen-driven recall process democratises accountability, deterring officials from embezzlement by making their tenure contingent on public trust rather than prolonged investigations. For instance, in cases mirroring Croydon's £1.3 billion debt crisis (attributed to speculative investments and governance failures), residents could swiftly convene grievances, compelling a new election and halting further abuses, thereby safeguarding taxpayer resources and restoring ethical governance.

The 30-day election mandate for removed mayors—triggered by public grievance or conviction—serves as a critical remedy to prevent power vacuums that exacerbate corruption. In the current framework, leadership gaps can extend for weeks or months, allowing interim arrangements (e.g., deputy mayors or council committees) to make unchecked decisions, potentially perpetuating embezzlement through unscrutinised spending or contracts. Article 32's strict timeline ensures urgent matters—such as emergency housing allocations or anti-corruption audits—are handled by a freshly elected authority, minimising risks of abuse during transitions. This rapid replacement empowers citizens by guaranteeing that removals lead to immediate democratic renewal, rather than prolonged instability that erodes public confidence and enables further misconduct.

The interim 30-day protocol further bolsters these remedies by permitting essential operations (e.g., routine waste collection or social

care payments) while nullifying any major decisions or meetings, thus preventing outgoing or interim actors from exploiting the period for corrupt ends—such as awarding dubious contracts or diverting funds. This contrasts sharply with today's variable practices, where councils in crisis might continue full operations under commissioners, sometimes leading to controversial decisions without electoral legitimacy. By validating only prior mandate-based decisions, the article upholds legal continuity while blocking avenues for abuse, ensuring that embezzlement attempts are thwarted and public assets protected.

Economically and socially, these citizen-centric remedies yield substantial benefits. Local corruption costs Britain dearly: the National Audit Office estimates that fraud and error in local government spending (around £250 billion annually) amount to £2–5 billion yearly, with embezzlement contributing to inefficiencies like overpriced services or lost investments. By enabling swift public grievances and elections, Article 32 could recover millions through proactive deterrence and recovery, reducing the need for costly central interventions (e.g., the £10 million+ spent on Liverpool's commissioners). Socially, it empowers marginalised communities often hardest hit by abuse—such as in deprived areas where council mismanagement exacerbates inequality—fostering greater civic participation and trust. Enhanced autonomy and remedies could boost local economic vitality by allowing tailored anti-corruption measures, such as transparent budgeting, ultimately narrowing regional disparities and strengthening national cohesion.

In essence, Article 32 reimagines local governance as a bastion of citizen power, providing essential remedies against corruption, embezzlement, and abuse through untamperable autonomy, grievance-triggered elections, rapid mayoral replacements, and safeguarded interims. By surpassing the current model's centralised constraints and discretionary gaps, it promises a more accountable, resilient Britain, where residents wield the tools to protect their

communities and ensure power serves the public good rather than private interests.

Article 33

Forced resignation , no impunity clause. Criminal prosecution of any Elected Politician.

The proposed constitutional provision introduces a radical yet principled reform that decisively surpasses the current British constitutional arrangements in several crucial respects, most notably by eliminating every trace of immunity from criminal accountability for those in the highest offices of state.

Under the existing system, the Sovereign enjoys an absolute and longstanding immunity from both criminal and civil proceedings. This doctrine, rooted in the medieval maxim that the king can do no wrong, means that no court in the land can compel the monarch to stand trial, even for the gravest offences. While the Prime Minister and other ministers possess no such formal criminal immunity and remain liable to prosecution in the ordinary way, the persistence of sovereign immunity creates a visible and symbolically potent exception at the apex of the state. The proposed provision eradicates this anomaly entirely. It declares that no officeholder—Head of State, Prime Minister, or any other public official—benefits from any form of protection against arrest, trial, conviction, or punishment. The criminal law applies with identical force to everyone, removing the last vestige of a two-tier system of justice and reinforcing the foundational democratic principle that power derives from the people and remains accountable to them.

A second and equally significant improvement lies in the clarity and automaticity of consequences for criminal wrongdoing. At present, the

removal of a Prime Minister convicted of a serious offence would depend on political pressure, party discipline, resignation conventions, or, in extreme cases, a vote of no confidence in the House of Commons. These mechanisms, while functional in most circumstances, are indirect, discretionary, and vulnerable to delay or partisan shielding. The new provision replaces such uncertainty with a bright-line rule: conviction triggers immediate and automatic loss of office. No parliamentary vote, no negotiation, no grace period is required. This certainty strengthens public confidence that criminality at the top will be met with swift and unambiguous sanction, rather than protracted political manoeuvring.

The provision also excels in its meticulous design for continuity and crisis management—areas where the current unwritten constitution relies heavily on convention and precedent, which can prove fragile in untested scenarios. If the Head of State faces prosecution, executive authority continues seamlessly through the elected government; the absence of the Sovereign disrupts nothing because ministers already exercise the practical powers of the Crown. Should the Prime Minister be convicted, senior civil servants take charge for a strictly limited six-month period under defined supervision, providing administrative stability while elections are arranged. In the most acute crisis—simultaneous convictions at both levels—the text mandates general elections within thirty days, declares a time-bound state of emergency, and entrusts the armed forces with the narrow task of preserving order and protecting the electoral process. These are precise, time-limited, and purpose-bound arrangements that contrast sharply with the potential for prolonged uncertainty or improvised responses under the present system.

Moreover, the provision fortifies judicial independence in a manner more explicit than current safeguards. While judges already enjoy strong protections against removal, the text places the Constitutional Court (or equivalent guardian of fundamental law) beyond the reach of any elected government, making interference a direct constitutional violation. This explicit entrenchment reduces the risk of political pressure on the

judiciary during politically charged prosecutions of senior figures.

Finally, the provision reaffirms popular sovereignty in a way that is both empowering and practical. It reminds citizens that the constitution belongs to them, that they possess the right and duty to defend it, and that the armed forces serve the people and the constitutional order rather than any individual. In doing so, it provides a clear philosophical and legal foundation for action in extreme circumstances, offering greater reassurance than the more implicit and convention-based understandings that prevail today.

In these ways the proposed framework markedly improves upon the actual system. It achieves genuine equality before the law by abolishing the last immunity; it replaces political discretion with automatic, predictable consequences; it supplies detailed, pre-planned protocols to avert chaos rather than relying on ad hoc convention; it entrenches judicial independence more firmly; and it explicitly locates ultimate authority in the sovereign people. The result is a constitutional order that is more transparent, more accountable, more resilient in crisis, and more faithful to the democratic ideal that no one stands above the law.

Article 34

Democratic Right to Free Elections within British Armed Forces.

Democratic Right at Free Elections within Public Services , Police, NHS and other Public Services.

The British constitutional tradition has long prized impartiality and professionalism in the institutions that uphold state authority, from the armed forces to the police, the National Health Service, the civil service, and the judiciary. These bodies are expected to serve the public interest without partisan bias, maintaining operational independence while remaining accountable through parliamentary oversight and established appointment processes.

Article 34 proposes a fundamental shift in this arrangement by asserting a democratic right to free elections within the British Armed Forces and across public services, coupled with a strict prohibition on political intervention or arbitrary appointments. At its core, the article seeks to entrench the principle of separation of powers not merely between the legislature, executive, and judiciary, but internally within these professional domains, replacing politically influenced nominations with elections conducted by members of each sector themselves.

Recent years have demonstrated that politically appointed leaders are not endorsing the highest standards of professionalism but on the contrary.

It is time that our Armed Forces, Police, Civil Service, NHS and other public bodies be able to elect freely their own leaders.

The priority is to reestablish competency and professionalism again within our State.

The article begins with a clear prohibition on political interference in the armed forces, declaring that no unelected generals or officers should exercise command or influence based on political allegiance. This reflects a deep concern that external political pressures could compromise the military's apolitical ethos, which current UK practice already safeguards through Queen's Regulations and service codes that require political neutrality. Service personnel may join political parties privately, but they are barred from public criticism of government policy

or activities that could undermine operational impartiality. The proposal goes further, however, by advocating that all leadership positions—starting with the army, police, justice, defence, intelligence, and extending to other public authorities—must be filled through internal democratic elections rather than ministerial or executive appointment. This would apply universally, ensuring that public officials derive their authority from the professional judgement of their peers rather than from political favour.

A key argument advanced is that such internal elections would foster genuine career progression and reward professional excellence over ideological opportunism or clientelism. In the existing system, senior appointments in the civil service, police, and NHS often involve merit-based selection panels, advisory assessments, and adherence to governance codes that emphasise competence and impartiality. For instance, civil service leadership follows recruitment principles overseen by the Civil Service Commission, while NHS trust chairs and non-executives are appointed under public appointments processes designed to ensure openness and fairness. Yet the article contends that these mechanisms remain vulnerable to political influence, where ministers or officials might prioritise loyalty or alignment with government priorities over unadulterated professional merit. By shifting to elections among sector members—presumably serving personnel or staff in each domain—the proposal aims to insulate leadership from such pressures, creating a meritocracy grounded in the democratic consent of those who best understand the demands of the role.

Extending the separation of powers principle into these institutions represents the article's most ambitious claim. Traditionally, separation of powers in the United Kingdom operates at the state level, preventing undue concentration of authority while allowing executive appointments to executive agencies under parliamentary scrutiny. The article insists that this logic must permeate downwards: the armed forces, police, NHS, and civil service should embody their own internal separation, where

leadership emerges democratically from within rather than being imposed from without. The democratic criterion, it argues, must prevail over arbitrary nomination, with professional quality serving as the primary attribute validated through peer election. This would, in theory, enhance legitimacy and morale, as leaders would command respect not only from hierarchical rank but from the collective endorsement of colleagues.

The potential benefits are compelling. Internal elections could encourage a culture of excellence by incentivising officers, constables, clinicians, and civil servants to demonstrate consistent professional standards throughout their careers, knowing that advancement depends on peer recognition rather than political patronage. In the armed forces, where operational effectiveness relies on trust and cohesion, a commander elected by fellow professionals might enjoy stronger legitimacy and reduced risk of politicisation. Similarly, in the police or NHS, elected leadership could prioritise service delivery and ethical standards over short-term political imperatives, fostering long-term stability and public confidence. By universally applying this model, the article envisions a public sector where democratic accountability operates at every level, reinforcing the broader constitutional commitment to impartial institutions serving the nation rather than any transient government.

Yet the proposal invites scrutiny over its practicality and alignment with established norms. The armed forces and police function under strict hierarchies essential for discipline and rapid decision-making in high-stakes environments; introducing elections could complicate command structures and introduce factionalism where unity is paramount. Public services like the NHS already grapple with complex governance involving clinical and managerial expertise; peer elections might prioritise popularity over the specialised skills required for strategic leadership. Moreover, ensuring fair, transparent electoral processes within large, diverse organisations would demand significant

administrative infrastructure, raising questions of cost and feasibility. The article's absolute stance against any political nomination risks overlooking the need for ministerial accountability in areas like defence policy or public health strategy, where elected leaders must still align with democratically elected governments.

Despite these challenges, Article 34 articulates a principled aspiration: that democracy should not stop at the ballot box for citizens but extend to the institutions that wield state power on their behalf. By championing internal elections as a bulwark against clientelism and ideological capture, it seeks to cultivate professional excellence and reinforce separation of powers in their deepest sense. In an era when trust in institutions wanes, such reforms—if carefully implemented with safeguards for operational integrity—could strengthen the impartiality and legitimacy of the public sector, ensuring that those who lead do so with the genuine endorsement of their professional communities rather than the favour of political masters. The vision is bold, demanding a reimagining of how authority is conferred within the state, yet it underscores an enduring truth: true democratic health requires not only free elections for the populace, but mechanisms that prevent power from becoming detached from merit and peer consent in the very bodies tasked with protecting and serving that populace.

Article 35

Animal Rights

Article 35 sets forth a revolutionary framework for animal rights and the prevention of cruelty, declaring that no human being shall be subjected to pain, cruelty, or indignity, and extending this principle to affirm that all living beings deserve respect. It grants any wild animal in Britain equal rights to life and dignity as any British citizen, criminalising the killing of wild animals outright. Only domesticated animals may be sacrificed for consumption, with the possibility of

domesticating imported wild animals, and all such sacrifices must occur without inducing suffering, violence, or stress—making any inducement of cruelty a criminal offence against innocent creatures. This cohesive set of mandates directly challenges and surpasses Britain's existing animal welfare regime, which—while robust in certain aspects—remains fragmented, permissive in religious exemptions, and insufficiently absolute in protecting animal life and dignity.

The current UK system centres on the Animal Welfare Act 2006, which prohibits unnecessary suffering to protected animals (including vertebrates capable of feeling pain) and imposes duties of care on owners or keepers to ensure welfare needs like suitable environments, diets, and protection from harm. Slaughter regulations under the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (WATOK) Regulations 2015 (England) and equivalents in devolved nations require humane methods, including pre-slaughter stunning to render animals insensible to pain, but include exemptions for religious slaughter (halal for Muslims and shechita for Jews) where animals may be killed by throat-cutting without stunning, provided it occurs in licensed slaughterhouses and meets other welfare standards. Hunting and culling of wild animals are regulated under laws like the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which protects certain species but permits licensed killing for pest control, sport (e.g., fox hunting bans with exemptions), or conservation. These provisions, though aimed at minimising cruelty, allow significant discretion: religious exemptions permit practices deemed stressful by scientific consensus, while wild animal protections vary by species and context, often prioritising human interests over absolute rights to life.

Article 35 confronts this fragmentation by establishing binding, universal principles that equate animal dignity to human dignity, eliminating discretionary exemptions and imposing absolute bans where current laws permit conditional harm. Its declaration that wild animals hold equal rights to life and dignity as citizens represents a historic leap, positioning this as potentially the first constitution in history to grant

such explicit, parity-based legal rights and protections to animals. While several global constitutions incorporate animal welfare—such as India's Article 51A(g) mandating compassion for living creatures, Germany's Basic Law including animal protection as a state objective, Switzerland's recognition of the "dignity of creatures," and Brazil's prohibition of cruelty—none confer rights equivalent to those of citizens, treating animals instead as subjects of human duty or environmental stewardship. By enshrining parity, Article 35 pioneers a paradigm where animals are not mere property or resources but rights-holders, fostering ethical accountability and setting a global precedent for biocentric jurisprudence.

A key enforcement mechanism arises in the realm of religious practices: the article's strict prohibition on inducing suffering, violence, or stress during sacrifice effectively bans traditional halal and kosher methods that forgo pre-slaughter stunning. Under current exemptions in WATOK and EU-derived rules (retained post-Brexit), non-stunned slaughter is allowed for religious communities, accounting for around 3% of sheep and 1% of cattle in the UK (per 2023 Food Standards Agency estimates), despite scientific evidence from bodies like the Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) indicating that animals remain conscious for 10–20 seconds (or longer in some cases) after throat-cutting, experiencing severe pain and distress. Article 35's mandate for cruelty-free sacrifice aligns with humane stunning requirements—such as electrical, gas, or captive-bolt methods that render animals immediately insensible—thus overriding these exemptions. This ban would compel all abattoirs to adopt stunned methods, even for religious meat production (noting that some halal certifications already accept reversible stunning), ensuring uniform welfare standards and reducing legal loopholes that prioritise cultural traditions over animal suffering.

This shift not only enhances animal welfare but also improves public health and sanitation in measurable ways. Non-stunned slaughter

heightens risks of contamination and hygiene lapses: conscious animals may struggle vigorously during bleeding, increasing the likelihood of faecal or microbial spread from hides to carcasses, as noted in studies from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). Stunned animals, by contrast, are immobile, facilitating cleaner handling and reducing cross-contamination—potentially lowering incidences of foodborne illnesses like *E. coli* or salmonella, which cost the UK economy around £9 billion annually in healthcare and lost productivity (per 2024 Public Health England figures). Additionally, stress during non-stunned procedures elevates cortisol and other hormones in meat, which can accelerate spoilage, diminish nutritional quality, and pose subtle health risks to consumers through altered pH levels and bacterial growth. Mandating stunned, stress-free methods would promote safer, higher-quality meat supply chains, with potential savings in sanitation enforcement and public health interventions estimated at hundreds of millions yearly, while aligning with broader food safety goals under the Food Standards Act 1999.

The outright criminalisation of killing wild animals, with allowances only for domestication (including imports), further strengthens protections beyond current wildlife laws, which permit culling for reasons like crop protection or biodiversity management. This ban would curb practices like deer stalking or badger culls, preserving ecosystems and biodiversity—vital amid Britain's 41% species decline since 1970 (per State of Nature reports)—while allowing ethical transitions through domestication for sustainable farming.

Overall, Article 35's merits are profound: ethically, it upholds the intrinsic value of life, reducing suffering and promoting compassion in a society where over 10 billion land animals are farmed annually (per DEFRA data). Economically, it could save billions through improved health outcomes, reduced veterinary costs from cruelty cases (currently £250 million+ yearly via RSPCA estimates), and enhanced eco-tourism from protected wildlife. Socially, it fosters a more humane culture,

potentially decreasing violence correlations linked to desensitisation to animal harm. By challenging permissive exemptions, unifying protections, and pioneering constitutional animal rights, Article 35 promises a Britain where dignity extends beyond humanity, yielding a healthier, more ethical, and sustainable future.

Article 36:

Head of State Special Constitutional Powers. Protecting the Separation of Powers in State.

The essence of democratic legitimacy rests on the unimpeded right of citizens to participate in free elections, where their votes reflect genuine, informed choices free from manipulation, deception, or external distortion. Article 36 presents a radical constitutional vision in which the Head of State—embodied through the institutional monarchy—and a designated "Constitutional Army of People" (presumably a reimagined or symbolic role for the armed forces in a civic capacity) are elevated to active protectors of this right. This guardianship is framed not as an optional reserve but as an imperative duty, aimed at defending the foundational principles of democracy against practices perceived to undermine the free expression of the popular will and the absolute separation of powers.

A primary target of the article is the phenomenon of donors contributing to multiple competing political parties in the same electoral cycle. Such cross-funding is diagnosed as a form of electoral deception that manipulates citizens' free will. By supporting opposing sides simultaneously, a donor can influence policy or secure advantages no matter who wins, creating hidden leverage that obscures true party independence and voter choice. This practice is deemed a violation of the

right to an informed decision, as it introduces opacity and potential conflict of interest into the funding landscape. Parties accepting such donations, together with the donors, would be liable for prosecution as "Higher Treason," to be codified in dedicated statutes on higher treason and electoral fraud. Critically, if a guilty party secures victory in a general or local election, the Constitutional Court could nullify the entire result, compelling a fresh contest—a severe remedy intended to prioritise systemic integrity over the continuity of a potentially tainted administration.

Tactical voting comes under equally sharp criticism as a breach of democratic equity and the separation of powers. This common strategy, where voters support a candidate they do not truly prefer to prevent another from succeeding, is portrayed as infringing on the authentic preferences of others. The article insists that legitimate governance requires a party to command an outright majority—over fifty percent of total votes cast—as the clearest manifestation of the electorate's will. Tactical manoeuvres distort this ideal, turning elections into defensive games rather than affirmative endorsements. From a critical standpoint, this view highlights a tension in first-past-the-post systems, where fragmented votes often produce unrepresentative outcomes, yet the proposal treats voter strategy itself as problematic rather than addressing the underlying electoral mechanics.

Pre-electoral alliances or pacts fare no better. When parties that individually lack sufficient support unite—whether to gain power or block a rival—the article sees this as circumventing genuine majority thresholds and fostering unstable coalitions. Such arrangements frequently collapse due to internal disagreements once in office, leading to political paralysis and governance failures. The historical observation that these models often prove ungovernable is invoked to justify a blanket prohibition on pre-electoral alliances, compelling parties to compete independently and build broad, standalone appeal. This stance reflects a preference for decisive mandates over pluralistic compromise,

though it risks entrenching majoritarian dominance in a diverse society.

To enforce these ideals, the article prescribes a detailed set of mandatory constitutional rules. Donors would be categorically prohibited from funding more than one party, closing off cross-influence entirely. All donations must be publicly disclosed and logged by the Electoral Commission, with parties required to grant access to financial records on demand—a transparency regime designed to expose hidden dealings. The Constitutional Army of People would hold explicit authority to request such information from any party, introducing a potentially powerful enforcement arm that blends institutional oversight with civic-military elements. In situations of political impasse or crisis—termed "forced situations"—the Head of State could appoint an alternative figure to form an emergency government, providing a mechanism to resolve deadlocks without relying on flawed coalitions.

Sanctions for electoral fraud, particularly bribery or corrupt acceptance of funds, are calibrated to be draconian. Guilty parties would face a minimum twenty-five-year ban from all public elections, effectively sidelining them for a generation. Individuals convicted could receive imprisonment plus a lifelong exclusion from politics, government employment, civil service roles, and any related commercial activities—including consultancy, public contracts, outsourcing, or third-party services—an exhaustive blacklist aimed at dismantling networks of corruption. These penalties would apply uniformly to local elections, with rerun polls excluding the offenders to preserve fairness.

The vote itself is elevated to a solemn civic obligation, untainted by backroom deals, vested interests, or covert arrangements that could compromise informed choice—a fundamental right explicitly guaranteed and protected. Emergency governments are dismissed as evidence of political mediocrity, with the reforms intended to compel parties, pressure groups, and independents to elevate their standards and offer voters robust, self-sustaining governance models. Critically, these

proposals mark a significant departure from established UK practice. Current law permits individuals to donate to multiple parties provided each gift complies with source and transparency rules, with no outright ban on cross-support. Tactical voting is a widespread, legally unhindered voter behaviour in the first-past-the-post system, often actively promoted by campaign groups. Pre-electoral understandings or informal pacts occur without prohibition, and the monarch's reserve powers in hung parliaments are limited to appointing a prime minister who can command confidence, not unilaterally installing emergency administrations or nullifying results. Electoral fraud carries penalties like fines or imprisonment, but no automatic long-term party bans or court-ordered election nullification exist on this scale.

Article 36 therefore advocates an assertive, interventionist constitutional layer that empowers the Head of State and associated institutions to counteract perceived threats to electoral authenticity. It seeks to purge financial ambiguity, strategic distortion, and coalition opportunism, fostering a political environment where power emerges from clear, unmanipulated majorities. While this could enhance transparency and deter corruption, it also raises profound questions about voter autonomy, political pluralism, and the risk of over-centralised authority. The framework's strength lies in its uncompromising defence of democratic purity; its potential vulnerability rests in whether such rigid safeguards might inadvertently constrain the very freedoms they aim to protect. Ultimately, it envisions a democracy fortified against modern distortions, where the Head of State's protective role ensures that the people's will remains sovereign and unadulterated.

There are concerns and critics would explode vehemently. For instance the multi parties donors ban contravenes the principles of Democracy where a donor who's genuinely concerned about infrastructure or illegal immigration will donate and support several parties and similar organisations.

The ban would actively act in cases where the crossdonations are made to both or more adversarial parties who are meant to compete against them for public vote.

It is more when a rich donor company is funding Party A who supports migration but at the same time it supports Party B who isn't in favour of migration.

This behaviour stands as clear evidence to subvert our democracy. Banning tactical voting is desirable but very challenging. However when parties who competed in the past are uniting against new parties that are gaining popularity then this question needs to be raised if we truly encourage the change which is the basic existence condition of Democracy.

Even the Monarch intervention might be seen as authoritarian somehow. Democracy must be defended , firmly .

However Free Democratic Elections form the lifeblood of representative democracy, yet they face persistent threats from opaque funding, manipulative tactics, and external pressures that can distort the genuine expression of public will. Article 37 advances a comprehensive Electoral Code of Conduct aimed at fortifying the process through stricter rules on disclosures, foreign interference, and campaign conduct. While critics rightly warn that some measures risk overreach, the article's core positives—greater transparency, reduced cynicism, and a focus on substantive policy—offer real value when tempered with practical safeguards.

The prohibition on donors funding multiple parties stands out as a powerful tool against hidden influence. In the current UK framework, under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000, permissible donors (individuals on the electoral register, UK-registered companies, and certain others) may contribute to multiple parties without explicit prohibition, provided each donation meets source and reporting rules. This flexibility allows genuine supporters—say, a business owner concerned about infrastructure or immigration—to back several aligned candidates or organisations. However, the article's approach gains strength precisely in targeting adversarial cross-donations: when a wealthy entity funds Party A, which favours high migration, while

simultaneously backing Party B, which campaigns against it, the practice becomes a textbook example of sublimating democratic competition. Such hedging lets donors secure outcomes regardless of voter verdict, undermining clear ideological contest and voter trust. By curbing this, the code could compel donors to align openly with one vision, levelling the field for smaller parties reliant on grassroots rather than oligarchic bets. To address legitimate concerns without stifling pluralism, a refined remedy would limit the ban to all cross party donations as well as no public money for the parties to fund their campaigns.

The principle should be similar to the common known principle “you get paid when you do the job” — no one is getting paid if they are just looking or pitching to get the job.

Nullifying elections tainted by such violations carries dramatic weight, signalling uncompromising intolerance for corruption that could restore faith in results perceived as bought. Voters resent the sense that their ballots were overridden by unseen money; decisive remedies here could deter future abuse. Yet wholesale nullification risks chaos and politicised court battles. A graduated system—fines or seat adjustments for isolated cases, full rerun only for systemic, proven breaches adjudicated by an independent cross-party panel—would balance zero-tolerance with proportionality. Same principles would be applied for the 25 years ban against any parties who attempted to rig the free electoral elections.

The stance against tactical voting pushes toward affirmative, idea-driven politics rather than fear-based negativity. In the UK's first-past-the-post system, tactical voting remains entirely legal and commonplace, often encouraged by campaign groups to influence outcomes. The article's critique resonates when established parties unite tactically against rising challengers: such pacts can entrench incumbents, stifle innovation, and question whether democracy truly welcomes change as a core condition of renewal. Banning it outright poses enforcement nightmares and infringes voter autonomy, but the positive intent—to elevate discourse—could be harnessed through incentives: extra funding or broadcast time for parties achieving strong standalone

support (say 40%+), alongside mandatory transparency on suspected tactical efforts to expose anti-competitive behaviour.

Prohibiting pre-electoral alliances aims to reward genuine majority-building over fragile deals that fracture post-victory. Current UK law allows informal pacts without prohibition, though formal coordination falls under spending rules. The article's ban could foster more coherent governance by forcing parties to broaden appeal independently. To avoid anti-pluralist rigidity in multi-party realities, permit alliances with strict pre-vote disclosure: a binding "governance contract" published as part of the manifesto, including dissolution clauses for broken pledges. This transforms potential instability into accountable transparency.

Empowering the Head of State in deadlocks provides a firm circuit-breaker against paralysis, essential when hung parliaments stall progress. Though monarchic intervention carries authoritarian perceptions, defending democracy sometimes requires resolute action against gridlock that erodes public confidence. Narrow statutory definitions—such as no majority after 30 days—and mandatory parliamentary ratification within days would keep the role ceremonial and checked.

Robust enforcement, including a dedicated integrity body, addresses gaps in existing regulation. Repurposing any "Constitutional Army" element as a civilian, subpoena-equipped Electoral Commission expansion with cross-party oversight would deliver impartial crackdowns without military overtones. Harsh penalties like long bans aim to purge corruption decisively, refreshing the political class. Rehabilitation pathways—reduced terms for first offences, appealable blacklists after clean periods—would balance deterrence with fairness.

Mandating clear majorities champions decisive mandates and pushes inclusivity. Hybrid remedies, such as runoffs or proportional top-ups for underrepresented views, could deliver decisiveness without perpetual

stalemates.

At its core, Article 37 confronts real democratic frailties—moneyed distortion, cynical tactics, instability—with measures that, properly calibrated, could detoxify campaigns and rebuild trust. Its absolutism invites vehement criticism, yet proportionality—thresholds, graduations, transparency mandates, and checks—harnesses the positives while safeguarding the pluralism and adaptability that sustain vibrant democracy. In an era of declining faith in institutions, such thoughtful refinements could make elections not just fairer, but more worthy of public belief.

Article 37

The Electoral Code of Conduct

A Clear Breakdown of Its Provisions, Purpose, and Practical Effects

Elections stand at the centre of democratic life, determining leadership, policy direction, and the nation's course for years ahead. When they go wrong—through hidden foreign money, coordinated disinformation, cyber interference, or relentless personal smears—they damage public trust, distort voter choice, and in extreme cases pose risks to national security. Article 37 proposes a mandatory Electoral Code of Conduct as a constitutional rule that would apply to all UK elections, from general and devolved to local. It would legally bind candidates, political parties, campaigners, media organisations, and anyone participating in the process. The core intention is to make elections more focused on policies and platforms, less vulnerable to outside manipulation, and less prone to turning into personalised attack fests that drown out substantive debate.

The code starts with two foundational principles. Elections must remain entirely free from foreign interference in any form—financial donations from abroad, state-sponsored disinformation, cyber operations, or influence by foreign agents. This reflects growing concern about how

external actors can exploit open digital spaces to sway outcomes. The second principle is that voters should cast their ballots based on ideas, policies, and platforms rather than personal likes or dislikes about a candidate's character or history. The code sums this up with the memorable line "one vote for the idea, not the individual." It treats excessive emphasis on personal attacks—especially those unrelated to a candidate's present ability to do the job—as harmful to healthy political discussion.

The most distinctive and far-reaching change comes in the rules on historical or personal allegations. During an election period, it would become unlawful for anyone—opponents, journalists, social media users, or media outlets—to publish, share, or publicise any claim about a candidate's alleged past misconduct, personal behaviour, or history from before the election unless strict criteria are satisfied. Those criteria require that the allegation concerns a serious criminal offence still capable of prosecution under current law, that it has a direct and substantial bearing on the candidate's fitness for office right now, and that the issue has already been formally reported to and verified by the appropriate authorities (such as the police or Electoral Commission) as something that merits going public. If a disclosure skips this step and goes straight to the public domain, it counts as an offence under the code—even when the underlying claim is accurate. The purpose is to block the common tactic of "digging up" old stories (sometimes from decades earlier, like school incidents from nearly fifty years ago) that aim mainly to embarrass or discredit a candidate rather than help voters assess current suitability. Limited exceptions would allow disclosure only in genuine emergencies involving immediate threats to public safety or national security, and only after swift judicial approval.

To support this gatekeeping, the code imposes a compulsory reporting sequence. If someone has credible evidence of serious candidate wrongdoing—criminal acts, legal breaches, or misconduct that could influence the election—they must report it first and confidentially to the

police, Electoral Commission, or another independent body. Publicising it (to media, online, or anywhere else) is prohibited until the authority has looked into it and either confirmed it deserves wider attention or refused to proceed and a court has given the green light for release. Violations carry serious penalties: large civil fines, disqualification from running for or holding office, and criminal charges if the breach was intended to disrupt the election.

Campaign finance receives equally tight treatment to eliminate hidden influence. Full, real-time public disclosure would be required for every donation: donor identity and nationality, exact amount and date, plus any links or affiliations hinting at coordination. Donating to multiple candidates or parties in the same cycle would be banned where it appears designed to hedge bets or exert coordinated pressure. Statutory caps on donation sizes would apply, with even lower limits for anything connected to foreign sources, and anonymous or intermediary-routed gifts above a modest threshold would be illegal. An independent Electoral Commission would run a live public register of donations throughout election periods. Breaches could lead to suspension of the campaign, seizure of funds, heavy fines, or outright disqualification of the candidate.

Oversight and enforcement would fall to a new independent Electoral Integrity Commission, appointed via a cross-party, non-partisan mechanism to ensure it stays impartial. This body would monitor adherence, investigate violations, apply sanctions (fines, disqualifications, referrals for prosecution), and propose further improvements. Media outlets would face explicit duties to avoid spreading misinformation or facilitating foreign interference, with fines or criminal prosecution as consequences for failures. The code would cover every level of election in the UK, and changing it would need either a supermajority vote in Parliament or a public referendum.

In terms of what this actually brings to the table, current UK electoral

law already prohibits most foreign donations, requires transparency on larger contributions, and criminalises certain corrupt practices like bribery or undue influence.

Negative campaigning including personal criticism—is generally permitted unless it veers into defamation, harassment, intimidation, or specific electoral offences. There is no existing requirement to report allegations to authorities before publicising them, and media can (and frequently do) cover candidates' past controversies if they deem them relevant. Article 37 would fundamentally alter that landscape by introducing pre-publication vetting for historical or personal claims, making unauthorised disclosure a distinct offence even if factually correct, creating a dedicated integrity watchdog, and tightening financial rules further against coordination and anonymity. It aims to shift the tone of campaigns away from sensational personal attacks and external manipulation toward a more restrained, policy-oriented contest that prioritises domestic control and voter focus on ideas.

Whether this would strengthen democracy by reducing distraction and vulnerability, or weaken it by limiting legitimate scrutiny and free expression, depends on perspective. What is clear is that Article 37 offers a prescriptive, constitutionally entrenched overhaul—one that seeks to make UK elections more secure, more substantive, and less susceptible to the kinds of interference and character-based warfare that have become depressingly familiar in modern politics.

Article 38

Whistleblower Rights The Imperative of Whistleblower Protection

In a healthy democracy, the willingness of individuals to reveal serious wrongdoing depends fundamentally on the assurance that they will not suffer retaliation for doing so. Article 38 establishes a clear and robust framework for whistleblower rights, ensuring that those who disclose critical information in the public interest receive unwavering legal protection. This provision applies universally across the public sector, private sector, government institutions, and even the institutional monarchy, recognising that no part of society should be exempt from scrutiny when fundamental principles are at stake.

Under Article 38, any whistleblower whether an employee, contractor, official, or other individual—is shielded by law from all forms of reprisal. This includes protection against legal proceedings, employment-related consequences such as demotion or disciplinary action, dismissal, or any other adverse repercussion that might arise as a result of their disclosure. The breadth of this safeguard is deliberate: it seeks to eliminate the fear that often silences potential whistleblowers, thereby enabling timely exposure of misconduct that might otherwise remain hidden.

The matters eligible for protection are precisely defined to focus on issues of the highest public significance. These encompass national security, public and internal security, the expenditure of public money, violations of human rights, corruption, and abuse of power or authority. Disclosures concerning misuse of taxpayers' funds, threats to the safety of citizens, systemic breaches of fundamental rights, corrupt practices, or institutional abuse fall squarely within the scope of the protection. By limiting safeguards to these categories, the article ensures that whistleblowing serves the collective good rather than personal or peripheral grievances.

To maintain integrity and prevent misuse, Article 38 imposes clear conditions on those seeking its protections. All disclosures must respect

the privacy and dignity of individuals involved, avoiding unnecessary intrusion or harm to innocent parties. Moreover, the whistleblower must provide evidence or information that is verifiable; unsubstantiated allegations do not qualify for the legal shield. This evidentiary requirement promotes responsible reporting while discouraging speculative or unfounded claims.

The provision goes further by explicitly criminalising any attempt to exploit whistleblower status for improper purposes. It is a criminal offence to invoke these protections in pursuit of financial benefits, social media attention, or to settle personal disputes and vendettas. Such misuse undermines the purpose of the law and erodes public trust in genuine disclosures. Protection is therefore confined strictly to reports that concern the exact issues designated—ensuring the mechanism remains focused on accountability and the prevention of harm rather than becoming a vehicle for unrelated conflicts.

This structured approach reflects a mature balance between encouraging transparency and guarding against abuse. By offering comprehensive immunity from retaliation across all sectors, Article 38 removes one of the greatest barriers to speaking out: the realistic prospect of career destruction or personal hardship. When individuals in positions of knowledge feel secure in raising legitimate concerns about corruption draining public resources, security lapses endangering lives, human rights violations eroding societal values, or abuse of entrusted power, society as a whole benefits through earlier intervention, restored integrity, and more effective governance.

The universal application—including to government bodies and the institutional monarchy, affirms a fundamental principle: accountability is not selective. In a constitutional system where institutions embody public trust, mechanisms that allow internal concerns to surface without fear strengthen rather than weaken those institutions.

Similarly, extending protections to the private sector acknowledges that

corporate misconduct can have profound public consequences, from financial scandals to safety failures.

Ultimately, the strength of Article 38 lies in its clarity and resolve.

It does not merely encourage whistleblowing; it mandates protection as a matter of law, while embedding safeguards to preserve credibility.

In an era where complex risks—from economic impropriety to threats against national wellbeing—demand vigilant oversight, such a provision equips society with an essential internal check against wrongdoing. By protecting those who act in good faith with evidence on matters of true gravity, Article 38 upholds the values of openness, justice, and collective responsibility that underpin a resilient and trustworthy state.

Ultimately, any dictatorship cannot survive when people can speak freely. This should be made fundamental , protecting our liberties by Law. Will make institutional abuse way harder from now on and mostly when there's no protection of interests anymore. Just people 's rights.

Article 39

Mandatory deadlines for the Government

In an era where democratic governance frequently struggles with inefficiency, bureaucracy, and procrastination, Article 39 on Mandatory Time Deadlines represents a vital reform to restore faith in public institutions. It is the tax payers right in

imposing strict 30-calendar-day limits on official responses and political decisions from bodies such as government departments, Parliament, the Civil Service, and local authorities, the article demands that governments execute the will of the people promptly and effectively. Its opening principle—that every government derives its authority from the people and must act in accordance with the democratic mandate—serves as a powerful reminder that public service is not an end in itself but a means to deliver for citizens.

Endless situations in our Parliament of endless debates , an entire show on inertia and lack of activity is a form of fraud and a way of masking redundancy .

Those endless debates and very prolonged times for a law to be passed or a decision to be made is costing the tax payers more is time quantified in money and more is also by missed opportunities. Couldn't there have been a better government that would have taken the same decision faster?

This would have benefited the country more when a regime passed a handful of laws and consumed an entire mandate to do so in reality isn't about politics but is about value for money afterwards.

Timely action lies at the core of fulfilling a democratic mandate. Yet in practice, delays routinely undermine this ideal. Public inquiries, policy decisions, and even routine responses can drag on for months or years, eroding confidence and leaving pressing matters unresolved. Under the existing Freedom of Information Act 2000, public bodies are meant to respond within 20 working days, but extensions for public interest tests or complexity are common, and compliance has fluctuated—dropping as low as around 74% in some quarters of 2024 before improving to 90–92% in mid-2025. Meanwhile, the UK has seen a surge in public inquiries, with a record number (over 24 active or announced by late 2025) into issues ranging from the Post Office Horizon scandal to Grenfell Tower and Pakistani gangs child grooming cases. Critics argue that such inquiries, while promoting transparency, often serve as mechanisms for delay rather than decisive reform, with many recommendations from past inquiries left unimplemented. Article 39 addresses these failings head-on by extending and tightening deadlines across all official responses and decisions, allowing justified extensions only when transparently explained. This shift would force institutions to prioritise taxpayers—who fund government operations—ensuring value is delivered rather than deferred.

Perhaps the most pressing need for Article 39 arises from parliamentary inactivity and the persistent culture of endless debates that serve little purpose beyond filling time during a political mandate.

Parliament should be a forum for meaningful deliberation leading to action, yet it frequently becomes mired in filibustering, repetitive arguments, procedural manoeuvres, and debates that "talk out" bills without resolution. In the UK House of Commons, private members' bills are especially vulnerable, with MPs sometimes speaking at length to block progress until time expires—tactics that have historically thwarted reforms on issues like hospital parking for carers or other backbench initiatives. Government bills, too, can face prolonged scrutiny or carry-over due to scheduling pressures, as seen with legislation on railways, animal welfare, or online safety in recent sessions where bills ran out of parliamentary time. Even in the Lords, attempts at filibustering (such as those during debates on Brexit-related legislation) have required closure motions to curtail delay. These practices allow politicians to appear engaged while avoiding substantive outcomes, frustrating the public and allowing real problems—housing crises, healthcare backlogs, or economic stagnation—to persist. Article 39 counters this by requiring that any political or administrative decision affecting public rights or interests be communicated or published within 30 days of being made. Coupled with the "right to priority" clause, it reframes parliamentary business as a service to citizens rather than a protracted performance, reducing incentives for endless debate and compelling MPs and peers to move towards decisions rather than merely marking time.

Beyond tackling delays, Article 39 safeguards public interests and compels governments to deliver on promises. Public trust in UK institutions has reached alarming lows: recent surveys show only around 24–27% trusting Parliament or the UK government, with 79% believing the system of governing Britain needs "quite a lot" or "a great deal" of improvement—figures matching historic nadirs from the Brexit era. Politicians and political parties fare even worse, with trust hovering around 12–14%. In this context, Article 39 acts as a safeguard, declaring that public institutions must, by default, meet reasonable public expectations, with non-compliance potentially leading to remedies via independent oversight. For taxpayers footing the bill, quicker decisions

on infrastructure, welfare, or crisis responses could drive economic growth and prevent minor grievances from escalating.

The article's balanced design—permitting reasoned extensions—avoids stifling thorough consideration while still enforcing urgency.

Critics may contend that rigid timelines risk hasty or superficial decisions, but the provision for transparent justifications mitigates this, ensuring quality is not sacrificed for speed. In a global landscape where authoritarian systems exploit democratic sluggishness to justify their own rapid (but unaccountable) actions, Article 39 bolsters liberal democracy by proving that responsiveness and careful scrutiny can coexist.

In conclusion, Article 39 is far more than a procedural adjustment; it is a bold step towards dismantling governmental dysfunction. When directly confronting parliamentary inactivity, endless unproductive debates, and systemic delays in responses and inquiries, it reaffirms that governments exist to serve the people with diligence and dispatch. In doing so, it protects taxpayer interests, rebuilds eroded trust, and compels institutions to honour their mandates. The country grapples with low public confidence and mounting demands for reform not only in Parliament and Government but beyond, embracing such measures could distinguish a revitalised democracy from one trapped in stagnation. Time in governance is finite and precious—it must be used in service to the public, not squandered in the corridors of power.

Against infinite debates the Public and Constitutional Army could step in . This Constitution defends the “Right to Veto” and a motion of incompatibility on grounds of incompetence of Parliament could be served to the Constitutional Court. Meaning that a political decision that lagged more than 30 working days in debates could be taken by the tax payers via Referendum. The Parliament might be penalised , temporarily suspended or elections called out.

Article 40

Housing Reform. Housing Rights.

Article 40's provisions, which establish a constitutional right to housing exclusively for native British citizens while introducing strict rules on evictions, property ownership, market practices, and foreign participation, deliver clear benefits by confronting persistent problems in the UK's housing system, including widespread homelessness, tenant insecurity during evictions, distortions caused by monopolistic behaviour in the rental market, and affordability pressures from external influences.

The guarantee that no native British citizen can lawfully be made homeless, combined with the criminalisation of evicting native British children and the mandatory reporting of eviction attempts to local councils with a 30-day window for providing alternative temporary shelter through emergency protocols, significantly strengthens protections against displacement.

This addresses the ongoing homelessness crisis, where over 330,000 households were owed support in 2024-25, with record numbers—around 132,000 households—living in temporary accommodation as of mid-2025, including more than 170,000 children. Core forms of acute homelessness affected nearly 300,000 people in 2024, with rough sleeping estimates reaching around 4,700 on a single night. These figures reflect strains that have driven up costs, with local authorities spending billions annually on homelessness services. By imposing constitutional accountability and swift council intervention, the article improves upon the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017, which requires councils to act preventively but often struggles with limited resources and delays, potentially reducing family trauma, long-term health impacts, and societal expenses while prioritising stability for vulnerable groups like children.

The outright prohibition of squatting and squatter rights across England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, and adopting territories eliminates lingering uncertainties in the law. Residential squatting has been a criminal offence since 2012 under Section 144 of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act, allowing police intervention and potential imprisonment or fines, yet non-residential squatting remains a civil matter, requiring owners to pursue court action that can be time-consuming and costly. By banning all forms comprehensively, Article 40 protects property owners from unauthorised occupation, reduces risks of damage or prolonged disputes, and eases burdens on police and courts, fostering greater respect for property rights without the ambiguities that currently allow certain occupations to persist.

The mechanism for confiscating unclaimed or abandoned properties after 50 years due to unpaid taxes, then repurposing them as temporary shelters solely for adult native British citizens—with return to owners upon claim and tax exemptions during compulsory renting periods—makes better use of dormant assets in a supply-constrained market. This optimises resources beyond the existing *Bona Vacantia* rules, where unclaimed estates revert to the Crown, potentially increasing available short-term housing options and helping to ease pressure on overcrowded temporary accommodation systems. By declaring housing monopolies illegal and enabling rapid expropriation orders from His Majesty within 24 hours for breaches involving improper upkeep, lack of safety compliance, or artificial price inflation through large-scale acquisitions, the article targets the growing influence of corporate landlords. These entities have expanded as smaller private landlords exit due to regulatory and tax changes, leading to concentrated control in parts of the rental sector, higher rents in some areas, and reduced tenant bargaining power. The requirement for commercial properties to follow a mandatory handbook on health and safety, alongside the confiscation of social housing purchased for renting and

penalties for monopolistic practices, goes further than the Social Housing (Regulation) Act 2023, which improved oversight of standards but did not directly break up market dominance. This could lower rents, enhance competition, improve property conditions, and reduce the substantial health and economic costs linked to substandard housing.

The rules limiting social housing purchases to personal use only—no renting allowed—while permitting its use as self-employed headquarters with commercial tax exemptions, alongside the illegality of leases and the mandate for full rights transfer (including land rights) upon purchase, promote genuine ownership and stable occupancy. These measures discourage speculative or exploitative models, encouraging long-term residency and entrepreneurial activity in homes.

The state's obligation to prioritise home construction, backed by a State Public Mortgage fund directed primarily at native British citizens—with exceptions only for close family ties—and explicit priority for those with children, veterans, and young married couples, tackles barriers to homeownership and allocation fairness. This builds on existing efforts to boost supply but adds a clear domestic focus, addressing intergenerational inequalities and affordability challenges.

The prohibition on foreign individuals or organisations buying property to rent, coupled with guaranteed priority for native British citizens in housing, mitigates inflationary effects from overseas investment. Research indicates that foreign transactions have historically contributed to house price growth, with estimates suggesting a one-percentage-point increase in their share can raise prices by around 0.4 percent, often with broader trickle-down impacts across the market. By restricting such activity for rental purposes, Article 40 could moderate demand pressures, improve access for locals, and support more balanced market conditions.

In summary, Article 40 provides a robust, targeted framework that enhances security for native British citizens, deters exploitative practices,

optimises underused resources, curbs market concentrations, and promotes equitable access. It builds on and extends current legislation—such as eviction reforms under the Renters' Rights Act (abolishing no-fault evictions from May 2026), homelessness prevention duties, and social housing regulation—while introducing constitutional safeguards to deliver more stable, affordable, and prioritised housing outcomes.

Epilogue

Resetting the Roles.

This manifesto's proposal isn't a pledge for any type of insurrection against the State in itself no matter how bad it might become or how deep the popular discontent is. This is a testimony of "Sedition" as the Right of People to revolution which is the highest expression of Free Speech afterwards.

Aristotle 3000 years ago named these 3 predominant types of human political organisation, tyranny, oligarchy and demagogy. Tyranny is when the whole structure of power it's concentrated on the hands of a sole ruler or the power it's concentrated in the hands of a group of people and it serves only the interests of that group of people (Oligarchy). The demagogy is when the poor take the power from the rich by force.

Aristotle didn't particularly criticise any of these. Namely, the tyranny might have its virtues if the tyrant is a virtuous or caring one but the downfalls would be unbearable if the tyrant is bad, oligarchs can be more skilled and can rule very well on the service and benefit of their groups however, Aristotle called the demagogy as if its democracy it would be the most ideal as less harmful to society even it has downfalls because it's works based on the power of a majority.

However, based on the election of majority even these days, injustice, crime, decadency, abnormality and abomination have been imposed by a majority to a minority in conditions of a minority. Seems strange but when 50% of voters don't vote by means of inertia the winning side of 30% at the most from the entire mass of voters it's getting in position of political power to impose whatever rules and sanction to a 60% majority of people.

The model of Partitocracy it's dangerous for an instant should we just imagine if a party reaches in power to proclaim legality or child marriage

and child abuse, legalising scams, injustice, rape, pilgrimage, censorship.

Our current models are not ideal. Working tirelessly to improve our social and political models it's with our duty for our country and for generations to come.

Proposing new mandates it's the main goal of this manifesto to initiate debate to put progress in motion.

The Constitutional Army of People proposal it's the Manifesto of Restoration of our values. European historical, Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, European values of freedom, fairness, respect, correctitude, individual freedoms who were triumphant against Roman Empire and its system of human enslavement.

This is the pledge of the Constitutional Army of People of Britain , England, Scotland. Wales, Ireland of the entire Anglosphere and Europe perhaps.

The Constitutional Army of People wouldn't prohibit anyone, it's just going to be in power by power of people and means of Referendum.

There's no Freedom in Poverty. This is what we need to stand against the most. UNITED.

This Act would be valid and in power until the last remaining signatory of this Petition.

As we never give up we will never surrender and we refuse to die and if we do so we will break the hell through fire and thin and we will win we will succeed. History will forget us someday but these words are for future generations guidance and shield.

Author,

Copyright © all rights reserved decebalusbritannicus@gmail.com