

Wed 13th May 2009

David Cutler
Detective Chief Inspector
Suffolk Constabulary
Ipswich Police Station
Civic Drive
Ipswich
Suffolk

Dear David

UK Government War Crimes
Event Number 264 of 23rd March 2009

I am in receipt of a letter incorrectly addressed to a Mr. P Hayer and opening with "Dear Mr Hayley". Although this is not me (I am Paul of the family Haley) I believe it was your intention to write to me as I had reported the above crimes and previously lodged documents via Jo Garrard.

I note that you "... do not believe this is a matter for Suffolk Constabulary to investigate..." and that you will "...not be recording any allegations of crime in response to this matter...".

This surprises me, as I understand that England is a common law jurisdiction and that under common law these serious crimes have evidently been committed. The Queen took an oath at her coronation in 1953 to uphold this law as required under the Coronation Oath Act 1688. This act was introduced to ensure the Monarch always swore an oath to the people before being allowed the throne, the monarchy having lost this as part of the Glorious Revolution. The oath she swore in answer to the Archbishop of Canterbury included the following text:

Archbishop. Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the Peoples of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Pakistan, and Ceylon, and of your Possessions and the other Territories to any of them belonging or pertaining, ***according to their respective laws and customs?*** (my emphasis)

Queen. I solemnly promise so to do.

Archbishop. Will you to your power cause Law and Justice, in Mercy, to be executed in all your judgements?

Queen. I Will.

The "respective laws and customs" referred to here are those of the common law established by Alfred the Great (AD 871-899). The British people have developed Common Law for more than a thousand years. It is common because it applies to everyone equally.

In the year 1100 the English Monarch Henry I took the first step towards rationalising the situation by actually writing it down. He issued what is known as the Charter of Liberties. It was a small step towards codifying the customs and traditions at the time.

Common Law is treating others as you would be treated. Common Law was developed by British people so they could settle their differences peacefully and fairly.

Common Law incorporates the Charter of Liberties (1100). The Charter makes the Sovereign subject to the law and affirms that no person is above the law.

Common Law includes the Council of Westminster (1102), which ended slavery in England.

Common Law protects the right established in the Petition of Right (1627) that no person can be arrested for disagreeing with the government.

Common Law defends your property rights, your right to self-defence and your right to be secure in your own home.

Common Law establishes every person's right to a jury trial and the freedom of juries to declare a person innocent. If a jury believes that a person has been charged under an unjust law, it has the right to acquit. For this reason Common Law is superior to the statute law created by Parliament.

Under common law there are only three ways one can become a criminal; by causing harm or injury to ones fellow man, by causing damage or loss to his property or by acting fraudulently against him.

By committing genocide, those members of parliament responsible for authorizing the illegal invasion and continued occupation of Iraq etc have clearly committed a criminal act under common law as defined, and as you state in your letter that you are "...the Detective Chief Inspector with responsibility for the management of crime across the Ipswich area..." and that Ipswich is part of England and therefore part of the territory governed under the Queen's Oath you have a duty to investigate this crime.

I understand also that The [Police Reform Act 2002](#) requires the constable of a territorial police force to take the following oath:

"I, .. <Officer's Name> .. of .. <Police Service> .. do solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm that I will well and truly serve the Queen in the office of constable, with fairness, integrity, diligence and impartiality, **upholding fundamental human rights and according equal respect to all people**; and that I will, to the best of my power, cause the peace to be kept and preserved and **prevent all offences against people and property; and that while I continue to hold the said office I will to the best of my skill and knowledge discharge all the duties thereof faithfully according to law.**"

Presumably as a constable you took this oath? Do you no longer stand by it? If so how can you ignore these brazen contraventions of it and sleep soundly in your bed at night? Shame on you sir!

Even under the system of Acts & Statutes given the force of law by this society that we live in, these crimes have evidently been committed, most notably by contravening sections 51 & 52 of The International Criminal Courts Act (2001).

I understand that this country is supposedly governed as a Parliamentary Democracy and a Constitutional Monarchy. Under this system a Statute is the final result of a Bill placed before Parliament. If the Bill is passed by Parliament, it becomes an Act of Parliament. Upon receipt of the Royal Assent it becomes a Statute. According to the Statute Law Database (which can be found on the internet at this address: www.statutelaw.gov.uk) The International Criminal Court Act came into operation on 13th June 2001 and therefore became part of UK law, the UK of which Ipswich is a part. So, here also you have a duty to investigate.

It is also my duty to draw to your attention your own personal and criminal liability and the criminal liability of the Suffolk Constabulary and of every taxpayer of the UK in this matter.

What is the point of creating a society, establishing a constitution and a parliament and giving that parliament the ability to introduce statutes unless we are all to be bound by them equally? No one should be allowed to break the law, whatever office they hold. And what is the point of establishing a force of Police defined by Blacks Law Dictionary as "... Peace Officers responsible for preserving public order, promoting public safety and **preventing and detecting crime...**" and ensuring that these officers swear the oath I quoted above if this oath is to be ignored once a government minister becomes the subject of alleged crime?

By refusing to investigate these crimes you are inferring that you think it is ok for ministers to break the law without punishment. I trust you will be as forgiving with me should I be found to have broken any of these laws in the future.

However, I do not wish to waste my time and you can rest assured that I will not be writing to you adnausium on this matter just because I now have a name to write to. You are only answerable to yourself and your own conscience at the end of the day, as am I, but I want to be able to say to myself with integrity at the end of my life that I did everything I could to perform my duties to myself and my fellow man and to uphold our natural, fundamental, human rights to the best of my ability and so with this in mind I must continue to pursue a conviction where these undoubted war crimes are concerned.

As you have stated you will not investigate, as you do not believe it is a matter for your constabulary, perhaps you would enlighten me as to which constabulary of the UK it is a matter for. Would perhaps the Metropolitan Police cover the area of Westminster where in effect these crimes were committed? Please let me know by return which force I should continue this case with.

I look forward to your reply, which again may be sent care of < *at the time* >

Yours Sincerely

Paul, of the family Haley