

A Layman's Guide to the English Constitution

Albert Burgess



England is still ruled by Alfred the Great
Through the laws he gave us

This is the story of how the Constitution was formed and how High Treason has been and is being committed at the highest levels of government.

Contents

	P
1. Introduction- Know your Constitution or loose Your ancient freedoms.	1
2. The origins of our Constitution.	2
3. The Great Charta.	5
4. Early Constitutional rulings.	7-9
5. The Petition of Rights 1628.	10
6. The Grand Remonstrance.	10
7. The Declaration of Rights 1689.	11
8. The Bill of Rights 1689.	12
9. Asquith's Finance Bill 1910.	12
10. The Structure of Parliament.	12
11. Parliament Act 1911.	13
12. Conclusions.	15
13. Some Important Court Rulings.	15
17. Bibliography.	17

I believe there is a need for a layman's guide to the English Constitution. The guide to the constitution issued by the government is a work of pure fiction designed to mislead the ordinary man woman and child in this country. The government guide allows government to enslave the indigenous population, destroy our culture and way of life, and destroy a thousand years of history.

I want you to remember one thing. England is ruled, not by the Queen or by Parliament and not by the Queen in Parliament. England is ruled by the law of the very good constitution left to us by our forefathers.

In every man and woman's life there comes a time when their character is defined. Will they go with the flow no matter what, or will they say "No", this is not right and I will not have it. As it is with people so it is with countries.

I could have started my guide with Boadicea. Whose defining moment came when she was publicly whipped and her two daughters were raped by Roman soldiers. She became a great Queen and general, went to war against Rome and very nearly won. Boadicea took her own life rather than live as a slave. I have chosen not to begin my story here.



Boadicea leading her army against
The Romans

Every work on the constitution needs a starting point. I have chosen the year 841, the year in which King Alfred the Great was born. Alfred was the youngest son of King Ethelwulf by his first wife Osburh. Alfred was sent to Rome at an early age to study. It is probably to this early period that we can trace the formation of his character and love of learning.

Alfred's life was not easy. He spent most of his early life fighting the Danes. Each of his brothers became King in turn, and to each Alfred gave unswerving loyalty until in his own right he inherited the Crown in 871. The Vikings were on the attack and Alfred had to take control of his army at the same time as he was mourning the loss of his Brother King Aethelred. At this time Alfred was also affected by an illness. He

could hardly have picked a worse time to become King. He was ill and a Viking army was at his door banging to get in.



The shepherd's wife giving Alfred a hard time for burning the cakes

Alfred managed to defeat the Viking army. He established his Kingdom from Watling Street to the south coast. Alfred set about making his country strong enough to defend itself, by building a strong navy capable of defeating the Viking long ships at sea. He built fortified towns and set up a form of national service with half the men in arms whilst the other half worked the land. This allowed him to defend a town until a larger army could be mustered to come to its aid.

It was not only Alfred's ability as a war leader which earned him the title Great. He set out to educate his people even the elderly were encouraged to learn. An Ealdorman who could not, or would not learn, was retired and replaced by a younger man who was learning. It is in the field of law that we owe most to Alfred. He visited all the old Kingdoms and took the best laws and customs from each of these Kingdoms. He recorded these laws and customs in a book of law he called the Dome (Doom meaning punishment). Each of Alfred's laws was based on the teachings of the Holy Bible. Alfred showed the Dome to the Witan who agreed it was good law. The Dome was issued throughout Alfred's England as the Kings law. It was not until his grandson Athelstan united the whole of England under one King that Alfred's Law covered the whole Kingdom of England. It is because of this book of law, that Alfred is still held in the hearts and minds of the English people.

Alfred had a suitable candidate he wanted to appoint Archbishop. The Pope sent an Archbishop from Rome. Alfred turned the Pope's choice around and sent him back. The Pope sent the Archbishop back to Alfred with the message *that he the Pope appointed every King in the world*. If Alfred wanted to remain King, Alfred would accept the Popes choice of Archbishop. Alfred sent back the Archbishop with a message to the Pope **saying that he was elected King by the English, and he would do only what was in the best interests of the English. This incident started England's refusal to accept any foreign interference.**

Custom is a law which has been in use from times of greatest antiquity with the approval of the people. By its very nature custom can not be repealed, as it is the custom of the land and its people and makes up a large part of our common law.

When in 1066 Duke William of Normandy invaded and killed King Harold at the place which is still known as Battle, one of the first things he did was to keep the laws of King Edward the Confessor, which was Alfred's law.



Coronation of William I

In 1100 when King Henry I came to the throne, he like his father William Rufus believed he could rule by divine right. He was very quickly disillusioned by the Barons and forced to issue the Charter of Liberties, a restatement of Alfred's law.



King Henry I

In 1213 King John, a very bad King, was having a great deal of trouble with the Barons, and the population generally. King John was using foreign mercenaries to suppress the population. He feared for his safety. John gave England to Archbishop Pandolph, the Papal Legate, receiving it back again to rule as a vassal King to the Pope for a payment of 1000 Marks a year. John also took on the mantle of a Crusader so that any one who attacked him would face excommunication



King John surrendering England to
Archbishop Pandolph the Papal Legate

In 1215 John was forced to meet with the Barons and thousands of the freemen of England at Runnymede. It was at Runnymede that he was forced to sign the Great Charter; this was a restatement of the Charter of Liberties of Henry I, a restatement of Alfred's law. Magna Charta, or the Great Charter, was made by all the estates of England, the King, the Barons, and the Freemen of England. It can only be undone by all the estates of England meeting again. Consequently it is beyond the reach of Parliament.



King John in a Rage after signing
Magna Charta

King Henry II had Henry de Bracton Chief Justice of the Kings Bench. Bracton is still taught in law schools today so important are his rulings. He ruled, "That the King is beneath no man, but he is beneath God, and rules England as Gods Lieutenant and according to Gods laws. And he is beneath the law for it is by the law that he becomes King". Bracton's other very important ruling is that; "The laws of England, having been approved by those who use them, and having been confirmed by the Oaths of Kings, cannot be changed or disposed of without the common consent of those by whose council and consent they were promulgated". For those who are unaware this is how our forefathers established the principle, that the people must approve any changes to our laws. This principle they handed to us.



Deposition of King Edward II

Edward II was not a good King he lost everything gained to England by King Edward I, he had favourites and he failed to govern the country preferring to enjoy himself with his friends. What he did do he did badly. Edward was killed with a red hot poker up his back passage. If you have the ability and you visit Berkeley castle they say you can still hear his screams as he died in agony.

In 1345 Chief Justice Stonor said, "Law is that which is right".

In the second half of the same century, Judge Hilary said, "We will not and we cannot change the Ancient usages".

Chief Justice Beresford said, "You should not only look at the letter of the law, but at the spirit of the law".

Beresford also said, "There is no such thing as a bad law for if it is bad it is not law".

It is to judges like these that those good sound principles espoused by the common law of England owes so much, and Englishmen had just cause to feel safe under English law.

In 1351 King Edward III issued the Statute of Treason, Provisors, and Praemunire, anti Papal laws designed to keep foreign interference out of England.



King Edward III

The ultimate legal defence of Crown and realm depended on the treason law"

In 1366 King Edward III received a letter from the Pope asking for the 1000 Marks a year for those years for which it had not been paid, threatening to take action against

him if Edward failed to pay. Edward spoke to the Bishops, and the Lords, who spoke to the Commons. First the Bishops, then the Lords, and finally the Commons, came to Edward and they told him that England did not belong to John. King John only held England in trust for those who follow on. Therefore it was not King John's to give away. By handing England to the Pope, King John broke the law. As such, the agreement King John made with the Pope did not count. The money was not owed, and should not be paid. This constitutional ruling ensures that the Kings of England were not, and can never be, vassal Kings to anyone. This is a most important constitutional ruling which applies as much today as it did then.

When John Major came back from Maastricht and said the Queen was now a citizen of Europe, he attempted to destroy a constitutional principle, that our Kings can never be vassal Kings to any one. In so doing John Major committed the Major Crime of High Treason.

King Edward also claimed the Kingdom of France. Parliament made him sign an undertaking that, as King of France, Edward could have no say in England.

In 1392 King Richard II issued his Statute of Praemunire, breaches of which amounted to High Treason. The Statute of Praemunire was repealed in the Criminal Law Act 1967, just in time to prevent Edward Heath's government committing a Praemunire by placing Her Majesty's Courts under the dominion of the European courts.



**King Richard II insisting on his
Supremacy against Rome**

I asked the Law Commission why this most important statute of Praemunire had been repealed. The reason given by the given by the Law Commission was that the law had not been used for many years and so they inferred it was obsolete. Yet the principle of obsolescence of a law is unknown in English law. Who is to say it had not been used because, like all law it is designed to prevent crime? In preventing crimes which were treasonable King Richards Statute had worked very well.



King Henry VIII

Under King Henry VIII we see the final parting of the ways between the Roman Church and England. The 1351 Treason Act remained the predominant Treason Act. King Henry VIII was an arrogant bully! Who gave to himself what came to be known as Henry VIII powers. The cook of the Bishop of Rochester who had poisoned to death 17 people; Henry ordered that Richard Rose should be boiled to death. Richard Rose was taken to Smithfield and dully boiled to death.

Parliament today claim that they rule with Henry VIII powers, they evidence this by claiming that they could pass a Bill saying all blue eyed baby's, born in July must be killed, and that would be the law and the baby's would be killed. Chief Justice Sir Edward Coke of the Kings Bench ruled that when a law is repugnant or impossible to perform the common law will intercede and strike it down. Now I believe such a law would indeed be repugnant to the English, and I believe the English would stand together to protect the baby's so it would be impossible to perform. And the common law as expressed by the will of the English people would strike down both the Bill and the parliament which passed it into law. This would as it has in the past included the Monarch who gave the Bill the Royal assent.

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, the Pope attempted to have Queen Elizabeth murdered. The Pope said that whoever killed her would not suffer, and would receive both earthly and heavenly rewards. Queen Elizabeth was understandably far from amused by this and she reissued her fathers Act of Supremacy in 1559. This Act contained an Oath, part of which said, "No Foreign Prince, Person. State or Potentate. Hath or ought to have any Power, Jurisdiction, Superiority, Supremacy, or Authority Ecclesiastical or Spiritual in this Realm". The Tudors in the main ruled according to the prerogatives given to them by law.



**Queen Elizabeth I asserting her
Authority over Rome**

The Stuarts, on the other hand, believed they ruled by Divine Right and were answerable only to God. As a result, two out of the four Stuarts lost their crown. Charles I lost his crown and his head. James the II was forced to flee the country for France.

In 1628 Charles I was presented with the Petition of Rights, a restatement of Alfred's law. Later, in 1641, the Grand Remonstrance was a request by Parliament for Charles to rule according to the law, and was another restatement of Alfred's law. Charles refused. He was then put on trial for treason against the people, found guilty and executed.



King Charles I summoned for execution

King Charles I was beheaded on the 30th January 1649, Charles died better than he had reigned.

James II was told by Parliament that by attempting to catholicise the country he was acting illegally. James retaliated, dissolved Parliament and carried on as before.



King James II receiving a bribe from the French Ambassador

Prince William of Orange was asked by the now out of work politicians if he would like the Crown. William's wife Mary was next in line to the throne. William and Mary would rule as joint rulers; because Mary said she would not be over her husband. William said he would not be a servant of his wife. William landed at Torbay with an army much smaller than that commanded by James. When James saw his army deserting in droves, he sent his wife and son to France and followed them a short time later.

William was asked to take on the administration of the country; However William despised the English, and replaced a number of our senior military and civil servants with Dutchmen. The politicians, thinking they had just got rid of one bad King, and it looked like they were about to get another, went and spoke to the Alderman and 50 of the Common Council of the City of London.

William heard about this, and issued instructions for writs to be sent to every Borough in England. The Boroughs were to send representatives to Westminster, and tell the politicians, and William, how we, the English, wished to be ruled.

The representatives came to Westminster and met with the Lords, the politicians, and the Aldermen and Common Council of the City of London, at a convention. It was not a parliament because only a King or Queen can call a parliament. James was in France, and had no interest in or desire to call a parliament. After much discussion the convention produced the Declaration of Rights, which was a restatement of Alfred's law. This Declaration was shown to William and Mary who were told by the representatives of the people, that if they wanted the Crown they had to accept the terms of the Declaration of Rights. These were the minimum rights and freedoms the people would accept. William and Mary accepted the crown under these terms.



William and Mary offered the Crown

Now he was King, William called a parliament. William did not have an election but instead said the people's representatives would be his parliament. The first thing parliament did was to pass the Declaration of Rights into law as the Bill of Rights 1689. Two codicils. Were added to the bill, first any amendments after the 23 September 1689 were void and not lawful, and second, this Bill is for all time.

Now it is a convention that no parliament can bind another. So how could this parliament bind every parliament for ever? The answer is simple. This parliament was made up of the people sent to Westminster as the representatives of the people. The will of the people is supreme over both parliament and over the Sovereign. Until such time as the representatives of the people meet and change the 1689 Bill of Rights, this Bill of Rights remains the law for eternity and clear beyond.

In his Commentaries on the Laws of England, Chief Justice Blackstone in 1765 said that he was writing about the laws of Alfred. This makes it clear that Alfred's laws were still in place during the life of Chief Justice Blackstone.

Since the time of King Alfred, our law has developed over more than a thousand years. Developed by our forefathers, because from time, bad or frankly useless Kings have needed to have their ways corrected. Kings who would not listen were removed.

Edward II was such a King Removed in favour of his son; Edward was subsequently killed. Charles I had his head removed for treason against the people, as did his Lord Strafford. James II was forced to flee to France. Each and every time a King has been removed, or had his ways changed, the reason has been because he has tried to rule outside the law, Alfred's laws of England.

We have dealt with the constitutional law as it is written. The law does indeed give us protection from despotic government. Our forefathers, however, did not trust just to law. They built into our system of government extra safeguards, specifically in the way parliament itself is required to work.

Parliament consists of three parts the Commons, the Lords, and the Sovereign.

Individually none of these parts can make or repeal law

Our forefathers foresaw that if any one part was able to claim supremacy in the system, we would suffer from oppressive government.

Parliament works by the Commons originating legislation, which is then passed to the Lords for scrutiny. It is the function of the Lords to refuse the legislation if they believe it to be oppressive, or in any other way not good legislation. If the Lords approve the legislation, it then goes before the Sovereign who may refuse the Royal Assent if they believe the legislation is not in the best interests of their subjects.

Such a situation occurred in 1910. The Asquith government attempted to put through a Finance Bill. The Lords rejected the bill because it imposed too high a tax burden on the Subject. Asquith went to the Lords and told them he was putting forward a Bill which would limit their authority to reject a Bill. If they did not pass this Bill, he Proposed to put 500 new Peers into the Lords and they would vote for the closure of the Lords. The Lords gave their consent to the 1911 Parliament Act under duress. **The Bill was presented to King Edward VII who refused the Royal Assent on the grounds that it removed a protection given to the Subject by the Constitution. King Edward told Asquith he would have to go to the country.**

Shortly after this the King died. King George the V came to the Throne. He was told by a government minister that, as King he kept all his prerogatives. He could not use any of the Royal prerogatives without the backing of a government minister.

This ministerial advice has no basis in our constitutional law and amounts to a clear act of treason. Since it imagines the death of the King as a Sovereign King it is an act of High Treason under the terms of the 1351 Treason Act.

Meanwhile, Asquith went around the country telling every one about the Lords refusing the consent to a Bill. He told the public this Bill would give them a pension, but failed to mention the tax burden it would impose upon them.

In one fell swoop Asquith had neutered the power of the Lords to protect the subject from bad law, and removed the right of the Sovereigns to refuse the Royal Assent to a Bill. **Asquith was a Fabian. I believe the undeclared policy of the Fabians was the destruction of the Constitution and our way of life.** Consequently Asquith's actions amounted to a clear **Act of Sedition which at this level, amounts to High Treason**

All subsequent Parliament Acts have continued to restrict the authority of the House of Lords. Finally, the plan to remove all but ninety two hereditary Peers was passed by parliament in 1998. Currently, government plans are to remove all hereditary Peers from the House of Lords.

Constitutionally, a Peer can only be removed by a Bill, after committing a serious crime. A Bill is required for each peer before he can be removed. It is unconstitutional, and therefore illegal, to remove every hereditary peer in a general Bill. **Baroness Ashton said in the Lords that a general Bill cannot be used to remove the hereditary peers.**

Why do we want the hereditary peerage? Well on the whole they were honest and honourable. They had large estates and money they were most unlikely to take a bribe, they were also very protective of the family reputation.

Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II was taught constitutional law by a **Fabian**, and the **Fabians we believe want to destroy our way of life**. Her Majesty will always do what her ministers say she must. **We. Are now governed by an elected dictatorship**

What has this treacherous dictatorship illegally achieved?

(1)Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights state we cannot suffer any fine or forfeiture unless we have been found guilty of an offence in a court of law. Fines should not be excessive, and no cruel or unusual punishments inflicted.

We now have a whole range of fixed penalty fines for which we are not permitted to appeal in one of Her Majesty's Courts of Law. These are constitutionally illegal.

(2)The Bill of Rights says that any threat of a fine or forfeiture voids the offence. **Yet we are told that if we drop litter don't have a TV Licence we will be fined £1000, we are told that if we do not insure or tax our car it will be seized and crushed. These threats are constitutionally illegal.**

(3)The Bill of Rights states we may not be imprisoned unless we have been found guilty of an offence in one of Her Majesty's Courts of Law. **Yet we have 42 day detention under the anti terrorist laws, detention without any evidence being produced to any one, let alone one of Her Majesty's Courts of Law. This detention is constitutionally illegal.** These illegal laws are subverting the constitution, the major crime of Sedition, which at this level amounts to high treason against Her Majesty's subjects.

(4)Edward Heath set up a conspiracy to subvert our ancient constitution, **the Major Crime of Sedition, sedition at this level is High Treason.** Heath also conspired with others to hand over this country to a foreign power, the EEC/EU, **the Major Crime of High Treason.**

Every succeeding government has signed treaties with the EU, surrendering our rights to govern ourselves under laws passed by the Queen in Parliament. In so doing every government since the Heath government has committed the **Major Crime of High Treason.**

(5)The restrictions of the ability of the hereditary peerage to play their proper part in government, as defined by the constitution, constitutes the Major Crime of Sedition which at this level is High Treason.

(6)The removal of the hereditary peerage from the Lords constitutes an act of Sedition amounting to High Treason.

(7)The usurping of the Royal Prerogative by a minister from the Asquith government, advising King George V that he keeps all his Royal Prerogatives, but may not use them unless he has the backing of a minister, is to usurp the Royal Prerogative which is an act of High Treason.

It is a fundamental part of our constitution that parliament, may not surrender any of their rights to govern, to a foreign power unless we have been defeated in war. **To do so constitutes an act of High Treason**

It is a fundamental part of our constitution that a statute law cannot repeal by implied repeal a constitutional law.

It is a fundamental part of our constitution that when a law is repugnant, or impossible to perform, the common law will intercede and strike it down.

Parliament is governing outside of the rule of the constitutional law of England. **This constitutes an act Sedition amounting to an act of High Treason.**
Scotland have their own constitution. I leave it to the people of Scotland to deal with government over breaches of the Scottish constitution.

I do not want you to take my word for any of this. My teacher at school used to tell me to look it up and then you will remember it, so I am saying to you look up in particular look up the legal codes of Alfred, the Charter of Liberties of Henry I, 1100

Magna Charta 1215, the Petition of Rights 1628, the Grand Remonstrance 1641, and the 1689 Bill of Rights. Please also look up the law on Sedition and Treason.

Then I want you to look out of the window and see just how thoroughly government are destroying the constitutional laws of England, and by destroying them **are all guilty of High Treason**

Now you understand how our ancient constitution works, you have to choose whether you are going to roll over and become a slave, or live as free born Englishmen like our forefathers, many of whom died to give us the rights and freedoms the world believes we enjoy.

I am not yet asking you to risk death. We are not anywhere near there yet. I am asking you to fight back. England is ruled by law. Parliament is ignoring the best laws in the history of the world. Let us use the law to get back that which is ours, our constitution and our country.

On the dispensing power of the King to dispense with a penalty for an offence. Hales case.

In 1674 Chief Justice Vaughn of the Common Pleas, explained the ability of the King to dispense with a penalty for an offence.

Vaughn Ruled that the King can dispense with a penalty for a statute offence, but he **cannot** dispense with a penalty for a common law offence. But there are some statute offences the King cannot give a dispensation for, for example the King **cannot** allow

some one to commit murder. The King can dispense with a penalty when he is the victim, but he **cannot** dispense with a penalty when it affects a third party who could claim for damages in a court of law. He **cannot** for example allow some one who has a duty to repair a bridge, to avoid liability to any one using the bridge. Because that would remove the right of anyone injured by walking over the bridge due to it's lack of repair from claiming damages against those whose duty it was to keep the bridge in good repair.

Queen Elizabeth I forgave the Earl of Essex personnel treason when he went to strike her with his sword. But Elizabeth removed his head when his treason was against the State and her subjects.

The 1695 Treason Act

This Act puts a three year limitation on prosecutions for treason. Bearing in mind the ruling of Chief Justice Vaughn above and the actions of Queen Elizabeth I. We can clearly see that apart from it being completely nonsensical, to allow any one who commits treason to get away with it just because they avoid arrest for three years. It is also ultra vires because the King cannot give the assent for what is a partial dispensation for an act of treason. Because we all suffer a loss should treason succeed? We all of us have a right and a clear duty to prosecute those who commit this most serious crime. As such it is clearly constitutionally impossible for such a dispensation to be given.

Stokedale vs Hansard 1839 ruling given by Judge Patterson on behalf of eight judges sitting on the Bench Chief Justice Denman presiding.

In the beginning parliament met under one roof, with the Lords one side the Commons the other with the King at the head. Parliament was the highest court in the land and could not be challenged in any other court. But for their own ends they now meet in separate houses, the House of Lords is where the Law Lords and the Sovereign sit and it is the highest court in the land, and cannot be questioned in any other court. The House of Commons is the main inquisition in the land, but is in no way a court of law. The common man must be able to sue the Commons in any of the ordinary courts of the land for wrongs done to him by the actions of the Commons. Taking this ruling given on behalf of eight high court Judges by Patterson, it seems to me that now the law Lords have been removed from the Lords, and the Sovereign is themselves subject to the laws of England. We are now able to sue parliament in any of the ordinary courts of the land for wrongs done to the ordinary man.

William Joyce

William Joyce was an American citizen of Irish descent who applied for and was granted a United Kingdom Passport. On the outbreak of the Second World War, in 1939 Joyce and his wife ran off to Germany where he made several anti British broadcasts. Joyce's United Kingdom passport ran out in 1940, Joyce was captured by the allies in 1945 some five years after his treason. Parliament passed the 1945 Treason Act in order to allow the trial of William Joyce on the charge of treason; Joyce was convicted and executed in 1946 some six years after his treason.

Sedition is any act designed to subvert the constitution.

High Treason is any act designed to betray the Sovereign, constitution and people of England.

Can you recognise these acts of betrayal by parliament today?

Bibliography and further reading

Adams, G. B. and Stephens, H.M.eds., (1921), 'Select Documents of English Constitutional History.' London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd.

Bede, (731) 'A History of the Church and the English people Translated by L Shirley-Price, and revised by R.E.Latham, (1974). Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd

Blackie's, 'Blackie's Comprehensive History of England. (Vol 5) London: Blackie and Son Ltd Figure 12

Blackstones, Commentaries on the laws of England. Blackstone Chief Justice of the Kings Bench.

Cassell, 'Illustrated History of England' (vols 1-3) London: Cassell, Petter and Gilpin. Figures 1-11

Elton, G.R. ed.,(1972, The Tudor Constitution: documents and commentary.' Cambridge: University Press.

.Feiling, K., (1959), 'A History of England: From the coming of the English to 1918.' London Macmillan and Co.

Green, J.R. (1902), a Short History of the English people.' (Vol 1-4), London Macmillan and Co Ltd.

Keynes, S., Lapidge, M., (2004), 'Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of King Alfred and other contemporary sources; London: Penguin books

Macaulay, Lord., (1895), 'The History of England: From the Accession of James II.' (Vol 1), London: Longman's, Green and Co.

Maitland, F.W., (1908), The Constitutional History of England., Cambridge University Press.

Robertson, C.G., Sir., (1947), 'Select Statutes, Cases and Documents to illustrate English Constitutional History, 1660-1832.' 8th ed. London Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Taswell-Langmead, T.P., (1896) English Constitutional History.' From the Teutonic Conquest to the Present Time London: Stephens and Hayes., Law Publishers.

Trevelyan, G.M. (1934), History of England.' London: Longman's, Green and Co.

Stubbs, W., (1873), 'The Constitutional History of England: in its origin and development,' 5th ed Vol 1-3, Oxford Clarendon Press.

Sturdy, D., (1995), 'Alfred the Great,' London: Constable.

Statutes

Act of Supremacy 1559

Criminal Law Act 1967

The Statutes of Treason, Provisors, and Praemunire 1351

The Statute of Praemunire 1392

The Parliament Act 1911

To learn more Google Albert Burgess on Treason

My thanks go to Judith Hitchin who proof read this paper and whose Suggestions were gratefully accepted.

Any comments corrections or amendments to albertburgess@hotmail.com

