

Accepted for publication in:  
*Hypercultura* (ISSN 2285-2115)  
Tuesday, September 8, 2015  
Submission Manuscript

# **The British<sup>1</sup> Interregnum: a yesterday that never happened**

**MERVYN HAGGER**

John Lilburne Research Institute (for Constitutional Studies) USA  
and

**ERIC GILDER**

The Papua New Guinea University of Technology (UNITECH)

**Abstract:** Three hundred years before George Orwell wrote his 1949 novel *Nineteen Eighty Four*,<sup>2</sup> Seventeenth Century events referred to as the ‘Interregnum’, could have served as one source for his inspiration. Several themes run through Orwell’s musings, and one pertains to the compilation of a dictionary scheduled for publication by the year 2050.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of Orwell’s lexicon is to document the finality of a process achieved through ‘extirpation by redaction’. By intentionally reversing common definitions of specific words, and then interjecting those alternative renditions into common usage, they eventually lose their original meanings, and those words can be then be removed from the dictionary. Orwell explained that it is part of a process to control human memory: ‘*You are unable to remember<sup>4</sup> real events and you persuade yourself that you remember other events which never happened.*’<sup>5</sup> Today, each time the word ‘Interregnum’ is substituted for events which took place between the years 1649 to 1660, the process of ‘extirpation by redaction’ is being employed.

**Keywords:** Interregnum; Orwell; Cromwell; Lilburne; Charles II.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a geographical reference to the British Isles where the main events described herein, took place.

<sup>2</sup> Penguin Books, original Edition 1949; cited edition 1984.

<sup>3</sup> *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: p.48, *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> In Orwell’s novel he uses word ‘remember’ over 100 times; ‘memory’ 47 times; ‘memories’ 15 times; ‘recall’ 11 times.

<sup>5</sup> *Nineteen Eighty Four*: p.212. Italics added.

During April 1946 in a lonely farmhouse on the bleak outer Scottish island of Jura<sup>6</sup>, George Orwell commenced work on a novel containing several themes which collectively became known as *Nineteen Eighty Four*.<sup>7</sup> One theme or ‘thread’ pertains to the compilation of a new dictionary scheduled for completion by the year 2050.<sup>8</sup> Its purpose is to document by publication, the finality of a process which has achieved ‘extirpation by redaction’. By means of intentionally reversing common definitions of targeted words, and then interjecting those corrupted definitions into common usage, they eventually lose their original meaning. Once that occurs, those words can be removed from the dictionary, while new words that describe the corrupted rendition, can be supplemented in their place. Orwell explained that it is all part of a process to control human memory so that: ‘*You are unable to remember<sup>9</sup> real events and you persuade yourself that you remember other events which never happened.*’<sup>10</sup> Three hundred years before Orwell wrote his novel, the *raison d’être* behind his dictionary had already been invented in order to obliterate real events that took place between the years of 1649 and 1660 on the island of Great Britain.

### **A CLANTON CONUNDRUM**

If cultural memory is one of many ways to remember the past, then what is a life lived, if it is based upon distorted recollections of past events? How much of a false cultural memory can be incorporated into a single life lived, before a corrupted cultural memory seriously distorts the past to the point where it is safe to say that the life lived was a living lie, because the past, as remembered, never happened?

Judgments made today, which are based upon such distorted recollections of yesterday, merely add to the mass-distortion of cultural memory that will be recalled by other lives tomorrow. When cultural decisions made today require the addition of foundational legal precedent, a conundrum is created. The past so-called, then becomes a phantasmal illusory mental image which has been conjured-up by words and pictures, rather than by a truly recalled transcribed memory reflecting an actual event which once occurred in the space of time and place.

Cultural memories are layered, one on top of another; generation after generation. Today’s corrupted precedents merely add to the distortion of tomorrow’s recalled record of

---

<sup>6</sup> A Scottish island located in the Inner Hebrides and off the northwest coast of the main island of Great Britain.

<sup>7</sup> See Note 2

<sup>8</sup> *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: p.48, *supra*.

<sup>9</sup> See Note 4.

<sup>10</sup> See Note 5.

unreality. It's in our mind that we could recall that 'swamp-pop' nasal recording of Jimmy Clanton as he describes his own cultural nightmare:

*Just a dream, just a dream, all our plans and our all schemes, how could I  
think you'd be mine, the lies I'd tell myself each time.*<sup>11</sup>

## IMMORTAL MEMORY

The mournful lyrics of Clanton's ballad tell of attempts to drown-out thoughts regarding an impossible relationship, along with counter-thoughts suggesting impractical romanticism. Orwell's sub-plot involving the creation of a dictionary is about redacting words so that they cannot be used to establish a true account of the past. The word 'Interregnum' when applied to actual events that took place in the British Isles between the years 1649 to 1660; creates a spurious alternative romantic account of monarchical lives lived, and it was invented to support a manipulative political agenda which resonates into political lives lived, today. When used in this context the word 'Interregnum' might be better suited to the title of a novel, or even to the lyrics of a pop song in which "any resemblance to real persons, living or dead is purely coincidental."<sup>12</sup>

If lives lived are rooted in the oxymoron of 'corrupted factuality', then it is no wonder that life on this Planet seems to be a game of chance where nothing is certain, because nothing can ever be certain concerning all of the events of today which are in turn based upon events that took place yesterday. As individuals, we are limited in our first-hand observations, and what we perceive may not be a true interpretation of an actual event. Distortions abound when we as individuals have to rely upon the recall of others, if their observations are preserved in the written word.<sup>13</sup> In a legal setting, even first-hand observations are not necessarily reliable guides to what a person may think they just observed.<sup>14</sup> However, the laws which govern society today are all rooted in past precedents which have all been "written down".<sup>15</sup> Therefore it is well to recall Emerson's observations about the past: "All history becomes subjective; in other words, there is properly no history; only biography."<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Idielyrics "Jimmy Clanton Lyrics—Just a Dream" Retrieved:

[http://www.aldielyrics.com/lyrics/jimmy\\_clanton/just\\_a\\_dream.html](http://www.aldielyrics.com/lyrics/jimmy_clanton/just_a_dream.html) (accessed 15 November, 2014).

<sup>12</sup> Standard legal disclaimer as used in novels.

<sup>13</sup> *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: p.214: "*Does the past exist concretely, in space? Is there somewhere or other a place, a world of solid objects, where the past is still happening?*" (Italics added.)

<sup>14</sup> See: *Res gestae - the whole thing that happened*. Ross, Margaret L and Chalmers, James P. "Hearsay" *Walker and Walker: the Law of Evidence in Scotland, 3rd Edition*. Practical Law 8.5.1 Retrieved: <http://uk.practicallaw.com/books/9781845921651/chapter8> (accessed 15 November, 2014).

<sup>15</sup> *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: p.214: "...where does the past exist, if at all?" asked O'Brien, to which Winston replied: "*In records. It is written down.*" (Italics added.)

<sup>16</sup> Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "History" in: *Essays*. Houghton Mifflin Company. 1883.

But if history is biography, then history is really the corrupted collective record of faux lives lived.

If we as individuals continually attempt to reassert our own individuality by referring back to our own corrupted cultural memories, then we as individuals are lost before we start: because we are looking for memories born within corrupted cultural files. We again recall Orwell's words: '*You are unable to remember real events and you persuade yourself that you remember other events which never happened.*' That Orwellian scenario also depicts one of the basic flaws built into *Wikipedia*, because its policy controllers forbid the entry of what they call 'original research' and therefore *Wikipedia* relies upon information which has already been widely disseminated. But if that existing information is in error because it has been drawn from corrupted sources, it reinforces the caveat that anyone undertaking serious research should not rely upon *Wikipedia*, and yet it is surprising how many official sources currently link to *Wikipedia* as their source of information.<sup>17</sup>

### **CORRUPTED MEMORY RECALL**

In court cases human memory is known to be a most unreliable source of information;<sup>18</sup> yet a hysterical wave of human memory recall is now being fostered in the United Kingdom to send individuals to prison on the basis of memory recall.<sup>19</sup> Even when eye-witnesses to an event have reduced their observed experience to writing, they have subjected that redaction to Orwell's mantra that: *Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.*<sup>20</sup> While "a camera may not lie"<sup>21</sup>, its human

---

<sup>17</sup> See: "What's Wrong with Wikipedia?" Harvard Guide to Using Sources A Publication of the Harvard College Writing Program. Retrieved: <http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=k70847&pageid=icb.page346376> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>18</sup> See: Engelhardt, Laura. "The Problem with Eyewitness Testimony: Commentary on a talk by George Fisher and Barbara Tversky." *Stanford Journal of Legal Studies* 1(1): 25-30. Retrieved: <http://agora.stanford.edu/sjls/Issue%20One/fisher&tversky.htm> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>19</sup> Primarily due to the efforts of Mark Williams-Thomas, a student-lecturer at (UK) Birmingham University, the name of deceased UK radio and TV personality Jimmy Saville has become a rallying call for 'sex-crime' investigations which have resulted in lurid headlines and prison sentences for a number of well-known individuals. These alleged offences stretch back into the 1950s and they are all based upon memory-recall by alleged victims who appeared in court decades after the claimed events occurred. See: Mark Williams-Thomas webpage, <http://www.bcu.ac.uk/social-sciences/criminology/employability/mark-williams-thomas>, and: Mathews, Jane. "Operation Yewtree investigating 12 new suspects including police officers and politicians." *Express Online*, October 5, 2014 – Retrieved: <http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/519115/Operation-Yewtree-12-new-suspects-police-officers-politicians> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>20</sup> *Nineteen Eighty Four*: p.34

<sup>21</sup> An interesting essay on this subject is available at: Photographic Fictions: "The Camera Does not Lie." *The American Museum of Photography*. Retrieved: <http://www.photographymuseum.com/phofictionsreading.html> (accessed 15 November 2014).

operator can selectively record some images while not capturing others, and thus distort the representation of a past event perceived by viewers at a later time.

Almost as soon as it became possible to make copies of documents, enforced licensing by governing bodies formed the foundation for institutionalized censorship,<sup>22</sup> and by content expurgation, overseers controlled all potential influence those documents might have on the public at large. Sometimes complete works were removed from general circulation, but quite often redacted versions containing intentionally corrupted information were also put into wide circulation.<sup>23</sup> In many instances, with the passage of time, the propaganda value emitted by such corrupted texts has become the accepted version of particular events, because they have drowned-out all pointers to the existence of alternative renditions. To make matters worse, the chief proponents of mass learning; mass-redaction and mass-propaganda, have often been religious organizations masquerading as the official voice of the source of all that exists, or will ever exist. They thereby impose nonsense by means of fear, in a similar manner to the scenario described in Orwell's 'Room 101'.<sup>24</sup>

### **THE VANISHING ACT**

Three hundred years before Orwell wrote his seminal work, an interlocking series of civil wars took place on the British Isles archipelago. On the main island of Great Britain between the years 1649 and 1660, a republican form of government was introduced but its official memory was later expunged by employing the highly subjective and suggestive label of 'Interregnum'. This closed cultural laboratory by 'time-branding' has resulted in the implantation of an alternative, but bogus chronology, wherein the reign of one monarch has immediately followed another. Both of them were named Charles, and the second was the son of the first.

However, the execution of the first king Charles was followed by a unitary republic, and not by his son reigning as Charles II over his father's two kingdoms.<sup>25</sup> In 1660 that intervening republic was terminated, and King Charles II began two new monarchies,<sup>26</sup> since the original monarchies reigned over by his father had terminated with his execution in 1649.

---

<sup>22</sup> Historical overview of book censorship.

Retrieved:<http://viking.coe.uh.edu/~wmasterson/cuin7337/history.htm> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>23</sup> See: Gilder, Eric and Mervyn Hagger. I Started a Joke - Text, Cotext, Content: The Rouge Rendering of 'Piracy' as a Vexed Legal Construct over Time and Place. *University of Bucharest Review* 12(2) ( 2010): 39-62.

<sup>24</sup> *Nineteen Eighty Four*: p.243

<sup>25</sup> Separate kingdoms of England and Scotland having a shared king.

<sup>26</sup> Same as Note 25

During the creation period of those two new monarchies of King Charles II, his henchmen<sup>27</sup> manufactured a *faux* timeline by making it illegal to refer to past events.<sup>28</sup>

When Samuel Pepys was a fifteen-year-old schoolboy, he was present at the execution of Charles I .... Eleven years later .... Pepys .... was desperate that his youthful desire to obliterate the king's memory should itself be forgotten. Fortunately, he had not only chance but the law on his side. Forgetting was officially sanctioned: the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion banned 'any name or names, or other words of reproach tending to revive the memory of late differences or the occasions thereof.'<sup>29</sup>

While "The official website of the British Monarchy" of today acknowledges that there was no seamless continuation connecting the reigns of Charles I and Charles II, it does misleadingly call the intervening years an 'Interregnum'.<sup>30</sup>

Clearly, there is no scientific evidence to show that human beings have the ability to roll back time. In this instance, however, it is as if Chapter One is followed by Chapter Three, while pretending that Chapter Two had never been written. Therefore, according to this alternative scenario, Chapter Three is really Chapter Two. It is a truly proto-Orwellian concept. It is also a current concept, because in 2014 it could be imagined that executives at Google were performing as a 1955 Presley tribute act<sup>31</sup> when they told European officials that "forgetting isn't easy".<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Although the implication is that the king is also the institution of the Crown, this is obviously not the case. Here the word 'crown' has two meanings: 1. a type of hat; 2. institutions managed by a variety of people sheltering under the name of a collective umbrella. While there is a little more transparency in their actions today, the record of individual administrators has been one of political infighting gaining enough power to unseat one king and install another to their liking. It is generally conceded that without the military masterminding of Major-General George Monck; creation of the new monarchies established in the name of King Charles II could not have been accomplished, although: "*Centuries later, historians cannot agree on whether or not the restoration of the Stuarts was Monck's intention...*" Citing p.129; *The King's Revenge*, by Jordan, Don and Walsh, Michael. Abacus, London. 2013. ISBN 978-0-349-12376-9 (Italics added.)

<sup>28</sup> "Forgetting was officially sanctioned: the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion banned 'any name or names, or other words of reproach tending to revive the memory of the late differences or the occasions thereof' In Norbrook, David. Introduction: acts of oblivion and republican speech-acts. Excerpt *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660*. Retrieved: [http://assets.cambridge.org/052178/5693/excerpt/0521785693\\_excerpt.pdf](http://assets.cambridge.org/052178/5693/excerpt/0521785693_excerpt.pdf); Charles II, 1660: An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indemnity and Oblivion: 'XXIV. Persons, within Three Years, using any words tending to revive the Memory of the late Differences...' Retrieved: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47259> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>29</sup> Norbrook, David. 1.

<sup>30</sup> See 'The official website of the British Monarchy' at: <http://www.royal.gov.uk/historyofthemonarchy/kingsandqueensoftheunitedkingdom/thestuarts/charlesi.aspx>.

<sup>31</sup> I Forgot to Remember To Forget, Elvis Presley at: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HaqjSCx\\_3uw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HaqjSCx_3uw)

<sup>32</sup> See: Google says 'forgetting' isn't easy, as requests mount: After Europe's 'right to be forgotten' ruling, the technology giant claims requests are so many, it is proving difficult to follow. *The Telegraph* (1 August 2014). Retrieved: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/google/11005027/Google-says-forgetting-isnt-easy-as-requests-mount.html> (accessed 15 November 2014).

In the real world of 1649, England became a republic, and then, three years later, Scotland began to be folded into that same unified nation.<sup>33</sup> But in 1660, that singular republic vanished from the legislative books, and depending upon their geographical locations, its inhabitants became subjects of one of the two new kingdoms which were created to take its place. Inhabitants were forbidden by law to even mention the existence of that unified republic,<sup>34</sup> or to discuss the act of legal magic which pretended that in 1660, the monarch who now reigned over both of these new kingdoms, had begun his reign back in 1649. The truth of the matter is that in 1649, one king had been executed, and both of the separate kingdoms over which he had ruled came to a cessation. There was no ‘Interregnum’.

### “SING TANTARARA, ROGUES ALL ...”

The idea of intentionally removing information from public scrutiny is not a new one<sup>35</sup>, but in this instance it served the purpose of obliterating legal precedent. This aspect of tampering with collective cultural memory is actually the result of a legal fiction derived from the ability to exercise *nunc pro tunc*<sup>36</sup> in a most dishonest manner. By removing one document and substituting another, and then by pretending that the document substituted contains the same information as the document removed, *sans* inconsequential typographical-style errors, the past can be made to vanish within the twinkling of mischievous eyes.

While Thomas Jefferson was not above interpreting past events to suit his own needs, the mocking lament he once recited in a letter to a fellow believer comes to mind: *What a conspiracy this, between Church and State! Sing Tantarara, rogues all, rogues all, sing Tantarara, rogues all!*<sup>37</sup> Silently resonating into the 2014 Referendum in Scotland was this mocking

---

<sup>33</sup> The process of assimilating Scotland with England into a unitary republic was gradual and in April 1654 this procedure resulted in ‘An Ordinance for uniting Scotland into one Commonwealth with England.’ See: April 1654: An Ordinance for uniting Scotland into one Commonwealth with England. *British History Online*. Retrieved: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=56540> (accessed 15 November, 2014).

<sup>34</sup> See Note 28.

<sup>35</sup> See Note 23

<sup>36</sup> A Latin term meaning *now for then* which in the USA has been retroactively employed in legal practice to substitute one record for another. One such example is substituting an adopted child’s original birth certificate with a document that replaces birth name(s) with adopted name(s), but retaining other details. Another example is in the revival of a business corporation wherein the name of the original founding owner is substituted for a new owner who has bought the shell corporation as a result of a bankruptcy. In both instances the actual historical record on file can be legally changed to reflect manufactured events that never happened, and only a court order can unseal the original document, which requires knowledge that the existing document is not a true historical reflection of the original events that took place. Co-author Mervyn Hagger has personal family experience of the first example, and cites the Texas legal history of the jingle company known as ‘PAMS’, as a second example of *nunc pro tunc* document substitutions for other than typographical errors.

<sup>37</sup> Letter of reply dated June 3, 1824 to Major John Cartwright. Retrieved: <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/presidents/thomas-jefferson/letters-of-thomas-jefferson/jefl278.php> (accessed `15 November 2014).

regale of Jefferson, because according to the standardized political parlance of today, the period of time now known as the ‘Interregnum’ began on January 30, 1649 with the execution of King Charles I of England, Scotland and sundry other places.<sup>38</sup> It ended on May 8, 1660 with a proclamation that King Charles II had seamlessly stepped into his father’s shoes at the very moment his father died. That product of *nunc pro tunc* laid the foundation for yet another work of legal fiction with the proclaimed union of 1707 which merged the Kingdom of England and the Kingdom of Scotland, into a joint Kingdom of Great Britain. It was from that Kingdom which many in Scotland wanted to secede in 2014 as a result of a referendum.

However, back in 1651, just before Scotland joined England in the creation of a united republic, the same King Charles II who in 1660 became the separate King of England and King of Scotland; had already been crowned in Scotland as ‘King of Great Britain’.<sup>39</sup> The problem with that ceremony was and is that the Kingdom of Great Britain did not come into existence until the year 1707. That was when the bogus Kingdom of England and the equally bogus Kingdom of Scotland, both of which were created in 1660 with Charles II as their shared but individual monarchs, formed the Kingdom of Great Britain after the separate Parliament at Edinburgh was folded into a single Parliament at Westminster.<sup>40</sup> In order to deal with this glitch in the thread of the historical timeline, many records falsely claim that the son of King Charles I was actually crowned “King of Scots”, which of course, he was not.<sup>41</sup> He was falsely crowned ‘King of Great Britain’.

## **INDEPENDENCE: FROM WHAT?**

On July 4, 1776, which was a mere sixty-nine years after the creation of the Kingdom of Great Britain in 1707, thirteen colonies united in a North American confederacy<sup>42</sup> and it

---

<sup>38</sup> He also claimed to be King of France.

<sup>39</sup> Great Britain is the largest island among thousands of islands which form the archipelago of the British Isles, including the island of Ireland. At that time, ‘Great Britain’ was limited to a geographical description of an island comprising most of the territory of two independent political sovereign nations called England and Scotland.

<sup>40</sup> Queen Anne became the last monarch in line from Charles II, to rule separately over England and Scotland, and the first Queen of the Kingdom of Great Britain. Ireland would not be added to this mix for almost another hundred years in 1800.

<sup>41</sup> Several preceding monarchs beginning with James VI of Scotland who subsequently also became James I of England, tried to imply that their ‘Union of Crowns’ was their authority to claim title as ‘King of Great Britain’, but the validity of those claims was not accepted by either the ruling elite in England or Scotland.

<sup>42</sup> The USA did not become a federal nation under its present constitution until June 21, 1788 with George Washington as its first president who held that office from April 30, 1789 to March 4, 1797.



became known as the ‘United States of America’.<sup>43</sup> This confederacy of colonies issued their own unilateral divorce decree from the Kingdom of Great Britain, and they called their act of disconnection a ‘Declaration of Independence’.

Those former British colonies replaced the institution of the British Crown with an undefined ‘Supreme Creator’, although this source of their ultimate authority was further specified as being ‘Nature’s God’, author of ‘Nature’s Laws’. As we shall see, it was by referring to this Higher Power that these confederated former colonies overcame the legal fiction that Jefferson later drew attention to in his letter to Major Cartwright.<sup>44</sup> While a Supreme Creator was immediately declared to be the ultimate source of all authority in the confederated United States of America, when the USA became a federal nation in 1789, its founding laws were set forth in a written constitution which named ‘The People’ as its authors. However, ‘The People’ retained in their laws this same unspecified deity as their ultimate source for of all that exists.

The institution known as the British Crown is in law defined as a corporation sole<sup>45</sup> which, because it is an artificial creation, outlives its monarchical representatives who wave to citizen-subjects in much the same way that Mickey and Minnie Mouse wave to Disneyland tourists. It gives rise to the sloganeering chant that “The King is dead. Long live the King!”<sup>46</sup> It is this institution which holds the real power in today’s United Kingdom of England, Scotland and Northern Ireland. It is to the British Crown that the military swears its allegiance, and it is in its name that British courts administer their version of justice, and hold prisoners, and most importantly, it is by means of this institution that the wealth of the nation is controlled.

During the recently failed Referendum<sup>47</sup> regarding the question of whether Scotland should be an independent country<sup>48</sup>, the hope of the ‘Yes’ vote was to merely untangle the Union of 1707. Voters on both sides remained silent about the bogus coronation of 1651

---

<sup>43</sup> See: Primary Documents in American History: The Articles of Confederation. The Library of Congress. Retrieved: <http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/articles.html> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>44</sup> See Note 37.

<sup>45</sup> Maitland, Frederic. The Crown as Corporation. *Law Quarterly Review* 17 (1901): 131-46. Retrieved: <http://socserv2.socsci.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/maitland/crowncor.mai> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>46</sup> A cliché with both secular and religious claimed origins; in this instance it indicates continuity of Office (Crown), not current Office holder (or current monarch representing the Crown.)

<sup>47</sup> Scotland’s Referendum. The Scottish Government. Retrieved: <http://www.scotreferendum.com> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>48</sup> As of January 2014, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is comprised of England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. England absorbed the area known as Wales beginning in 1536. According to the official *nunc pro tunc* version of current history, Scotland politically united with England in 1707. Ireland was absorbed into the UK during 1800, but in 1920, subsequent losses of territory on the island of Ireland, shrank UK territorial claims on that island to its north-eastern sector, which approximated the territory of an ancient kingdom called Ulster.

when some in Scotland had crowned Charles II as “King of Great Britain”. They also remained silent on the subject of the republic which had united Scotland with England.

Therefore, it was not surprising that both sides in the 2014 Referendum debate remained silent about the true status of the currency presently in use by the United Kingdom; yet both sides danced around this currency maypole while chanting questions about ownership of the currency. However, neither side really wanted to answer that question because it was a conundrum from which neither side had an escape plan. Neither side wanted to tell the truth regarding the fraudulent way in which the governance of Great Britain has been conducted since 1649; nor the manner in which its bogus history has been promulgated to the masses.

The reason for their silence is easy to explain: The Crown is a subject that remains ‘off limits’ because it is founded upon a fraudulent series of events, and it is controlled by operatives who remain hidden within the shadows of Privy Council secrecy.<sup>49</sup> The identity of the Crown cannot be partially unraveled without taking events back to 1649, and that is why the term ‘Interregnum’ has always been used to prevent that from happening.

### **JEFFERSON’S PERSONAL LINKS**

When Jefferson wrote to Cartwright on June 3, 1824,<sup>50</sup> his letter of 1824 was penned a mere forty-eight years after Jefferson had helped to write the ‘Declaration of Independence’ on behalf of the USA confederacy, and it was only thirty-five years since the USA had been transformed into a federal nation. But in-between those two events, Connecticut’s Danbury Baptist Association had written to Jefferson on October 7, 1801 and they were complaining that their State legislature did not believe that the First Amendment to the 1789 U.S. Constitution applied to their State. In reply to this Baptist organization on January 1, 1802, Jefferson who was President<sup>51</sup> at that time, wrote in part:

---

<sup>49</sup> It is interesting to note that the official Parliamentary explanation refers to the secret nature of the Privy Council while ‘The official website of the British Monarchy’ pretends that today there is nothing secret about it. See: Gay, Oonagh Gay and Rees, Anwen. The Privy Council: Standard Note: SN/PC/3708 (5 July 2005). Retrieved :<http://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons/lib/research/briefings/snpc-3708.pdf> and Queen and Privy Council. The Official Website of the British Monarchy. Retrieved: <http://www.royal.gov.uk/MonarchUK/QueenandGovernment/QueenandPrivyCouncil.aspx> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>50</sup> Cartwright had attempted to foster republican ideals by establishing ‘Hampden Clubs’ in England and Scotland, which were named after John Hampden who helped to trigger the first of the civil wars. In Glasgow the famous Hampden Stadium still celebrates the lead-in to the ‘Interregnum’.

<sup>51</sup> March 4, 1801 to March 4, 1809.

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God .... the whole American people .... declared that their legislature would ‘make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof’, thus building a wall of separation between Church and State<sup>52</sup>.,.

Three years before the U.S. adopted its federal Constitution in 1786, Thomas Jefferson toured some of the civil war battle sites of England with his friend and travelling companion John Adams. Both men had been instrumental in creating the ‘Declaration of Independence’ and rather than visiting a nation where all previous ill-feeling about that document was forgotten and forgiven; a mere eighteen later, British warships had fired upon the USA in an action which gave rise to events described in its national anthem ‘*The Star Spangled Banner*’<sup>53</sup>. It was also during that time that British troops invaded Washington, DC and then set fire to both the White House and the Library of Congress. The British waited to invade New Orleans after that phase of hostilities had nominally come to an end.<sup>54</sup>

Even before the creation of the confederated United States of America in 1776, political and religious refugees had struggled to reach America’s shores. On board the *Mayflower* which had sailed one hundred and fifty-six years earlier in 1620, there were passengers with neo-Anabaptist beliefs<sup>55</sup> seeking freedom in the ‘New World’. Anabaptists had suffered persecution both on the Continent of Europe,<sup>56</sup> and on the British Isles. Their

---

<sup>52</sup> Unfortunately there is no historical collection of Baptist archives, as such. See: American Baptist Historical Society. Retrieved: [http://abcconn.org/history/index.php?title=American\\_Baptist\\_Historical\\_Society](http://abcconn.org/history/index.php?title=American_Baptist_Historical_Society) (accessed 15 November 2014). “*The American Baptist Historical Society (ABHS) is the oldest Baptist historical society in the United States ... It was established in 1853 .... Destruction of archives in 1896 ... when a fire destroyed the ABHS collection.*” The collection was reassembled from other sources after this date, such as Hutson, James. ‘A Wall of Separation’

FBI Helps Restore Jefferson's Obliterated Draft. Library of Congress. Retrieved: <http://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danbury.html> and Jefferson’s Letter to the Danbury Baptists (1 January 1801). Retrieved: <http://www.heritage.org/initiatives/first-principles/primary-sources/jefferson-s-letter-to-the-danbury-baptists> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>53</sup> Visit Baltimore. <http://baltimore.org/see-do/fort-mchenry> and The Lyrics. The Star-Spangled Banner: The Flag that Inspired the National Anthem. The Smithsonian. Retrieved: <http://amhistory.si.edu/starspangledbanner/the-lyrics.aspx> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>54</sup> In 1959 the ‘Battle of New Orleans’ became a hit for singer Johnny Horton. Retrieved: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nfESmRwHCMc> (accessed 15 November 2014).

<sup>55</sup> The history of the Anabaptists is both complicated and lengthy and beyond the scope of this article. Also see Note 56. Therefore as a means of linkage only, we offer this basic explanation: On the island of Great Britain Anabaptists eventually became known simply as ‘Baptists’. They were divided theologically into two distinct groups identified as being ‘General’ (Arminian) or ‘Particular’ (Calvinistic). Retrieved: [http://www.abc-usa.org/what\\_we\\_believe/our-history](http://www.abc-usa.org/what_we_believe/our-history) (accessed 15 November 2014). Many on board the *Mayflower* adhered to “The Believers Baptism’ (submersion of adults instead of sprinkling upon infants), and concurred that: “...all that believed were together, and had all things common.” Cited: *Book of Acts 2:44*, King James Version.

<sup>56</sup> See: Bax, E. Belfort. *Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists*. New York: American Scholar Publications, 1966 (1903). Print. Page 332 *supra* – Retrieved: <http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=zZhKAwAAQBAJ&pg=PA336&lpg=PA336&dq=anabaptists+expelled+fr>

tormentors included officials in control of the State Church of England which specifically named Anabaptists as enemies.<sup>57</sup> All of this was more than mere national history to Jefferson, because it was specifically a part of his family history.

In 1649, which was twenty-nine years after the *Mayflower* sailed for North America, King Charles I was executed and the era of republic began in England. Unfortunately the departed king's son decided to fight on until he was finally defeated at Worcester. Jefferson had reason to know the intimate details of the Royalist defeat, because Royalist reinforcements were cut-off before they reached Worcester by an Army led by Colonel Robert Lilburne. He was a Baptist fighting for issues with which Jefferson identified.<sup>58</sup>

The First Amendment to the federal U.S. Constitution specifically forbids the federal government from interfering with the free exercise of religion: it can neither assist, nor resist religious worship.<sup>59</sup> While this was a doctrine that Jefferson agreed with, it also provided another reason why there was more than a genealogical bond between the Lilburne and Jefferson families. When Thomas Jefferson arrived as a tourist accompanied by his on-again, off-again, on-again friend John Adams, both men were well aware of the Lilburne name. It was no coincidence that the Virginia house Thomas Jefferson was born in was called 'Shadwell', because it had been named after a parish east of the City of London where his grandfather Isham Randolph on his maternal line, had married Jane Lilburne. But when the Shadwell family home burned down, Thomas' father moved his family into a house name Edge Hill<sup>60</sup>, and that is where Thomas grew up.

Thomas Jefferson's mother was the daughter of Jane Lilburne who came from a line stretching back to an uncle of Robert and John. Jane married twice, and as Jane Rogers she married Isham Randolph. This couple produced Jefferson's mother who gave birth to his sister named Lucy. She married Charles Lilburne Lewis who gave one of her sons the first

---

[om+england&source=bl&ots=J0Jyty8Zz\\_&sig=MUZl-gwNXUNw1s4VtztHauljPkY&hl=en&sa=X&ei=DiJeVMzCB6mt7gbH34CoBQ&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=anabaptists%20expelled%20from%20england&f=false](http://www.churchsociety.org/issues_new/doctrine/39a/iss_doctrine_39A_Arts37-39.asp) (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>57</sup> *Article XXXVIII. Of Christian men's Goods, which are not common. The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.* See: Articles 37-39, The Thirty-Nine articles of Religion. The Church Society. Retrieved: [http://www.churchsociety.org/issues\\_new/doctrine/39a/iss\\_doctrine\\_39A\\_Arts37-39.asp](http://www.churchsociety.org/issues_new/doctrine/39a/iss_doctrine_39A_Arts37-39.asp) ) Accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>58</sup> "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson - Author of the Declaration of American Independence of the Statute of Virginia for religious freedom & Father of the University of Virginia." Jefferson's Grave. The Jefferson Monticello. Retrieved: <http://www.monticello.org/site/research-and-collections/jeffersons-gravestone> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>59</sup> See: First Amendment. Legal Information Institute. Retrieved: [http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/first\\_amendment](http://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/first_amendment) (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>60</sup> Named after the first major battle of the civil wars.

name of Lilburne. Thomas' brother Randolph also gave one of his children the first name of Lilburne.

### **JOHN ADAMS' SPEECH AT WORCESTER, ENGLAND**

Colonel Robert Lilburne was only one of several in the Lilburne family who played important parts during the civil wars. After his Army caused the final collapse of the Royalist military cause at Worcester, Robert Lilburne was sent to Scotland to maintain martial law from a headquarters at Dalkeith,<sup>61</sup> and that is where he became Acting Commander of all Military Forces on land.

It was because Robert was in command, that he was able to throw open the doors to the founding of both Baptist<sup>62</sup> and Quaker congregations in Scotland. However, post-‘Interregnum’ accounts of Baptist congregations in Scotland are a prime example of Orwellian expurgation at work. In this instance its victims are ‘... *unable to remember real events*’, because the history of the Baptist Church in Scotland just vanishes from the scene once the republic is overthrown. The Baptist Union of Scotland reports that many of Robert Lilburne’s men were “. . . Baptist soldiers who used their influence to establish small churches in Leith, Perth, Cupar, Ayr and Aberdeen”.<sup>63</sup>

When General George Monck<sup>64</sup> took over from Lilburne about a year later, he turned back the hands of time by re-imposing religious intolerance once more.<sup>65</sup> Consequently Baptist congregations disappeared for the next one hundred years, and during that time “. . . Baptist life in Scotland ceased to exist.”<sup>66</sup>

In April 1786, while Jefferson and Adams were on their tour of England, they arrived at Fort Royal Hill in Worcester. That is where the Royalist dream had been finally terminated

---

<sup>61</sup> Near Edinburgh, see retrieval:

<https://www.google.com/maps/place/Dalkeith,+Midlothian,+UK/data=!4m2!3m1!1s0x4887b8df46ee3db9:0x3b282fa3a5acb1a0?sa=X&ei=MSRrVP7rL4jqaKuXgLG&ved=0CIABEPIBMAs> (Accessed 18 November, 2014).

<sup>62</sup> About Us: The Baptist Union of Scotland Today – Scan down to ‘History’. Retrieved:

<http://www.scottishbaptist.org.uk/about-us> (Accessed 16 November, 2014).

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> Monck became a failed mentor to General Benedict Arnold who adopted the code name of ‘Monck’ during the U.S. Revolutionary War when he switched sides as Monck had done, because Arnold thought that the British would win. While it worked well for Monck, Arnold’s side lost and he went down in history as being a byword for traitor. Retrieved: <http://clements.umich.edu/exhibits/online/spies/stories-arnold-1.html> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>65</sup> ‘*Monk, indeed, did all he could to repress them.*’ In Douglas, David. *History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England from 1648 to 1845*. London: Houlston and Stoneman, 1846. Print, p. 4. Retrieved:

[https://ia700308.us.archive.org/7/items/MN5122ucmf\\_0/MN5122ucmf\\_0.pdf](https://ia700308.us.archive.org/7/items/MN5122ucmf_0/MN5122ucmf_0.pdf) (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>66</sup> See Note 52.

on September 3, 1651, with the essential assistance of Robert Lilburne's troops. The former battlefield was not far from Edgehill where the first battle in a series of civil wars had begun at during 1642. But it was in Worcester that Adams delivered a speech which he noted in his diary:

Edgehill and Worcester were curious and interesting to us, as Scaenes where Freeman had fought for their Rights. The People in the Neighbourhood, appeared so ignorant and careless at Worcester that I was provoked and asked, "*And do Englishmen so soon forget the Ground where Liberty was fought for? Tell your Neighbours and your Children that this is holy Ground, much holier than that on which your Churches stand. All England should come in Pilgrimage to this Hill, once a Year.*" This animated them, and they seemed much pleased with it. Perhaps their Aukwardness [sic] before might arise from their Uncertainty of our Sentiments concerning the Civil Wars.<sup>67</sup>

Adams asked in amazement: '*And do Englishmen so soon forget the ground where liberty was fought for?*' His answer would have to wait until it arrived in the form of a novel explanation hundreds of years later during April 1946. That is when it was penned by George Orwell in that lonely farmhouse on the bleak Scottish island of Jura. Orwell might well have re-written his answer as, "they are unable to remember real events and they persuade themselves that they remember other events which never happened."

However, by 1786 it was not only a case of Englishmen at Worcester forgetting about "the Ground where Liberty was fought for", or Scots who forgot to ask the real question about their union with England during their failed Referendum of 2014. Americans have seemingly joined the ranks of the forgetful and adopted the attitude that Jefferson and Adams must have dreamed-up a concept of individual rights when they wrote the 'Declaration of Independence' Although Jefferson did not acknowledge his real sources of inspiration, a United States Supreme Court Justice undertook that task for him, albeit about a hundred and twenty years after Jefferson's death.<sup>68</sup>

## THE SUPREME COURT REMEMBERS

---

<sup>67</sup> John Adams diary 44, 27 March -21 July 1786: Adams Family Papers. Massachusetts Historical Society. Retrieved: <http://www.masshist.org/digitaladams/archive/doc?id=D44> (accessed 14 November, 2014). 'Some of the lines of the original diary are preceded by what appear to be quotation marks,' and highlighted above with italics. (John Adams' original handwritten pages are also reproduced on this site).

<sup>68</sup> See: Gilder, Eric and Hagger, Mervyn. The Pedigree of America's Constitution: An Alternative Explanation. *British and American Studies* (University of the West, Timisoara) 14 (2008): 217-26. Retrieved: <http://foundthreads.com/page1.html> (accessed 16 November 2014).



While Robert was a Baptist, his brother John had drifted from Puritan to Quaker<sup>69</sup> by the time he died. ‘Freeborn John’ was more-or-less led by the circumstances in which he found himself, and this is how he developed his skills as both a writer and orator. His fiery legal career began with a landmark trial<sup>70</sup> in 1637 when he established his right to remain silent, and he made it clear that he would be a slave to none.

That Star Chamber court hearing took place during the reign of Charles I, and its importance was later noted by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black. Beginning in 1947, Black began to footnote the works of John Lilburne in several of his written Opinions,<sup>71</sup> and he also cited them as being a precursor to the U.S. Bill of Rights.<sup>72</sup> He was joined by fellow Justice William O. Douglas and Chief Justice Earl Warren who also noted the contributions made by John Lilburne. But it was Warren who delivered the majority Opinion in that landmark case of *Miranda vs. Arizona*,<sup>73</sup> and supported his Opinion with references to John Lilburne. However, on October 31, 1988, *Newsweek* magazine ran a major article, “Loss of Liberties, Britain’s war on terror”, which began with these words:

In 1649 John Lilburne fought a charge of high treason in a London court by claiming that ‘the good old laws of England’ permitted silence on questions ‘against or concerning myself’ . . . . Last week the Lilburne principle fell victim to London’s stepped-up war against Irish Republican Army terrorism.<sup>74</sup>

The visit by Jefferson and Adams during 1786 took place a mere ten years after they crafted the 1776 *Declaration of Independence*, and noted that the reigning King George III of Great Britain had created, “. . . a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States.”

---

<sup>69</sup> Feuer, Lewis S. *Spinoza and the Rise of Liberalism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958. Print. p.39. Retrieved: [http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=U4698YERGPmC&pg=PA39&lpg=PA39&dq=Quietism+the+inner+light&source=bl&ots=4srqOeLAEX&sig=2jGnewgEuWe7LFKbVkk3zhMxsHw&hl=en&sa=X&ei=cW\\_IUqrJGKTIOAWX-oCYDA&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Quietism%20the%20inner%20light&f=false](http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=U4698YERGPmC&pg=PA39&lpg=PA39&dq=Quietism+the+inner+light&source=bl&ots=4srqOeLAEX&sig=2jGnewgEuWe7LFKbVkk3zhMxsHw&hl=en&sa=X&ei=cW_IUqrJGKTIOAWX-oCYDA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Quietism%20the%20inner%20light&f=false) (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>70</sup> February 13, 1637. Court of Star Chamber. British History Online. Retrieved: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=74904&strquery=john%20lilburne> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>71</sup> *Adamson v. California*, 332 U.S. 46 (1947); dissent: Hugo L. Black. Retrieved: [http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/332/46#writing-USSC\\_CR\\_0332\\_0046\\_ZD](http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/332/46#writing-USSC_CR_0332_0046_ZD) (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>72</sup> Hugo L. Black (U.S. Supreme Court Justice), *Democracy’s Heritage: Free Thought, Free Speech, Free Press*. *Britannica Book of the Year 1968*. London: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1968: 39-43; and Gilder and Hagger: *The Pedigree of America’s Constitution: An Alternative Explanation*, *British and American Studies*, University of the West, Timisoara, 14, 2008: 217-26.

<sup>73</sup> *Miranda v. Arizona*. Legal Information Institute. Retrieved: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/384/436> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>74</sup> Page 47

However, Jefferson remained politically quiet during his visit, and his own notes were made as a tourist about the architectural, botanical and scientific information that he stumbled across during his vacation.<sup>75</sup>

### **OBFUSCATING THE ISSUES**

Several decades ago on November 17, 1989; Roy Hattersley<sup>76</sup>, then Deputy Leader of the British Labour Party, appeared on CSPAN television in the USA. Mervyn Hagger had the chance to ask him why a written constitution does not govern the affairs of the people in the British Isles. A portion of his response in the context of this article is quite illuminating, and therefore it is worth repeating here. Hattersley replied:

...why don't we have a written Constitution? .... it doesn't fit our Parliamentary system of government. If we incorporated a written Constitution into our processes, any government could overturn it in a single line Bill.<sup>77</sup>

The Parliament to which Roy Hattersley referred is the Parliament in London, of which only the House of Commons is a body whose membership is elected by the people. Hattersley used to sit in that House as an elected Member of Parliament, but not anymore. He is now a Member of the unelected House of Lords and a Member of the secretive Privy Council.<sup>78</sup> Hattersley has for years claimed to be a republican<sup>79</sup>, and therefore on paper, against a monarchical form of government. Although he said that a written Constitution “doesn't fit our Parliamentary system of government”, it is because the Crown occupies the same spot that would be occupied by a written Constitution, that it “doesn't fit our Parliamentary system of government.” That is the reason why Parliament has limited powers that would enable a written Constitution introduced by Parliament at a level beneath the Crown, to be overturned by Parliament “in a single line Bill.”

Hattersley admitted that this was true, but said that ‘The People’ liked it this way:

---

<sup>75</sup> Notes on a Tour of English Country Seats, &c., with Thomas Jefferson, 4–10? April 1786. Founders Online, The National Archives. Retrieved: <http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Adams/01-03-02-0005-0002-0001> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>76</sup> Lord Hattersley Retrieved: <http://www.parliament.uk/biographies/lords/lord-hattersley/858> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>77</sup> CSPAN, November 17, 1989, *Brian Lamb Book Review Program*: with printed words as transcribed by Mervyn Hagger from a recording of this broadcast.

<sup>78</sup> See Note 49

<sup>79</sup> “As an anti-monarchist...” and “If monarchists condescended to argue with republicans like me...” excerpts from Hattersley, Roy. The Queen can help free Ireland from history. *The Times* (London); May 17, 2011. Retrieved: <http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/opinion/columnists/article3021622.ece> (accessed 16 November 2014).



The tradition of Great Britain, the spirit of Great Britain, the feelings of The People of Great Britain is that we run by individual items of legislation and you can't superimpose a written constitution onto a system where People are expecting and reacting and supporting something quite different.<sup>80</sup>

Then Hattersley claimed that:

a declaration, ...a statement, ...a Constitution is putting the interpretation of those powers into the hands of the courts, and in our experience, the sort of freedoms that we want to see, the sort of extensions of liberties are not best interpreted by courts, but by politically motivated, intentionally motivated Parliaments...<sup>81</sup>

In other words Hattersley believes that a “one man show” that can dictate to ‘The People’, is what ‘The People’ want. This was the basis upon which the autocratic BBC was originally formed, because it bowed to the will of John Reith, and John Reith was quite specific about why the BBC was formed and what it intended to do. His reasoning was that ‘The People’ did not know what they wanted, and so he would tell them, while making sure that his view about what was good and what was bad, was imposed upon them, for their own good.<sup>82</sup>

It was this dictatorial approach that allowed Oliver Cromwell to become ‘The Protector’ of the new republic that was created following the abolition of the monarchy, because while Cromwell executed a man, he did not destroy the institution of the Crown. The thirteen North American colonies did that with their ‘*Declaration of Independence*’, but Cromwell’s cronies even offered him the title of ‘King’<sup>83</sup>, if he wanted it, because they had retained the very institution that was the cause of the problem, no matter who was the monarch, or what title that person was known by. Cromwell presided over a faux republic.

---

<sup>80</sup> See Note 77

<sup>81</sup> See Note 77

<sup>82</sup> Gilder, Eric and Hagger, Mervyn. John Reith and the Feudal Values of British Broadcasting in a Modern Age. *University of Bucharest Review: 'Modernity: The Crisis of Value and Judgement'* 8(3) (2006): 137-44. Retrieved: <http://foundthreads.com/page3.html> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>83</sup> The interchangeability of the words ‘monarch’, ‘king’ and ‘queen’ with ‘crown’, when talking about the representative of the Crown as an institution, can lead to confusion, which may or may not be intentional. It is another example of words losing their ability to communicate in an Orwellian manner. See: “In February 1657, a group of MPs headed by Lord Broghill presented a new constitution known as *The Humble Petition and Advice* under which Cromwell was formally offered the crown.” Oliver Cromwell, 1599-1658. BCW Project. Retrieved: <http://bcw-project.org/biography/oliver-cromwell> (accessed 16 November 2014).

John Lilburne repeatedly clashed with Oliver Cromwell on the issue of the nation's sovereignty, because Lilburne was pushing for the adoption in England of a written constitution called '*An Agreement of the Free People of England*'<sup>84</sup>. If such a document had replaced the institution of the Crown, then the people of Scotland would have been free to decide upon their own legal framework for governance. The result of Lilburne's continual confrontations with Cromwell's supporters was resolved by imprisoning him for the remainder of his life in Dover Castle<sup>85</sup>.

### **EXTIRPATION BY REDACTION**

It is only necessary to see what happened after Charles II died on February 6, 1685 to understand the *modus operandi* of both the English and Scottish Crown institutions at work. His successor was James II in England and James VII in Scotland (and a list of other titles.) But he didn't last long, because the movers and shakers who controlled both the Crown corporation sole in England and Scotland, deposed him. Then they ran him out of the county when he would not abide by their wishes<sup>86</sup>.

The next move by these people behind the scenes was to invite a Dutch prince to take over the vacancy left by the king who had just been forced out, and that is when William of Orange was installed with his wife Mary as co-monarch. They arrived with enough foreign troops to make sure that their coup would not be overturned by supporters of the king who been thrown off his throne. With a flourish of Orwellian irony their supporters branded the arrival of this pair as the 'Glorious Revolution'<sup>87</sup>.

After William and Mary came Anne, and it was during her reign as the separate Queen of England and Queen of Scotland that the controlling agents in England blackmailed their counterparts in Scotland into accepting a financial bail-out for their failed South American colony of Darien.<sup>88</sup> That was to be the price paid<sup>89</sup> for shutting down their Scottish

---

<sup>84</sup> See details of various editions at An Agreement of the People. BCW Project. Retrieved: <http://bcw-project.org/church-and-state/second-civil-war/agreement-of-the-people> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>85</sup> See details of his imprisonment through letters to his wife, The Resurrection of John Lilburne, Now a Prisoner in Dover-Castle. Street Corner Society. Retrieved: <http://www.strecorsoc.org/docs/resurrection1.html> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>86</sup> King James II (1685-1688). Royal Family History. Retrieved: <http://www.britroyals.com/kings.asp?id=james2> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>87</sup> "Revolutionaries .... hope to recast popular memory to justify the new order." See: "*The Bloody Azzines:*" *Whig Martyrdom and Memory after the Glorious Revolution*, by Zook, Melinda. Albion: Vol. 27, No. 3 (Autumn, 1995), pp. 373-396. Retrieved: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4051734> (accessed 18 November, 2014). and: *The Glorious Revolution*. Retrieved: <http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/evolutionofparliament/parliamentaryauthority/revolution> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>88</sup> See map and other details in, Cavendish, Richard. *Founding of the Darien Colony*. Retrieved: <http://www.historytoday.com/richard-cavendish/founding-darien-colony> (accessed 16 November 2014).

Parliament. Thus, in 1707, the Kingdom of Great Britain finally came to life with the same Queen Anne as its first monarch<sup>90</sup>.

From here the story of the Kingdom of Great Britain switches to a line of German kings who led the way to King George III. About this king Jefferson identified wrote in the U.S. *Declaration of Independence*, “A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people”. The North American colonists decided that the only way to free themselves from the British Crown was to issue a declaration of independence. Their Declaration was not accepted at face value by the British Crown which then turned to German mercenaries<sup>91</sup> in order to wage war on the renegade colonists. By 2014 this lesson had been lost on the Scots who in turn lost their Referendum seeking independence. Debates surrounding the issue of Scottish independence were redacted in order to prevent the issue of the Crown from being discussed. Therefore, since the Crown holds the finality of power governing today’s United Kingdom, by not discussing Crown sovereignty, both sides of the issue failed to discuss whether Scotland should be an independent country, with the corporation sole which currently holds that sovereignty.

After reviewing the record of actual events which have taken place, it becomes readily apparent why Orwell could write: *You are unable to remember real events and you persuade yourself that you remember other events which never happened*. Therefore we should try to discover what it is that we should collectively remember, but which we have collectively forgotten. It is the opposite of the lines sung by Elvis: *I forgot to remember to forget her...*, because we have remembered something that never was, and in doing so we have thus forgotten to remember something that did happen. We have forgotten why in 1786 John Adams attributed so much importance to the events which had taken place in 1651 at Fort Royal Hill, just outside of Worcester in England, and we have forgotten to remember why Thomas Jefferson would have immediately picked up on Adams’ reference to Edgehill.

If civil war reenactments have not buried the real story by diverting our attention to battles over shed blood, instead of considering the spilled ink that has blotted-out the basic question of individual human rights, then obfuscation by glorification of the present Queen Elizabeth, surely has. But even here obfuscation is at work. There has only been one Queen

---

<sup>89</sup> Robert Burns penned his 1791 poem marking this episode with the title: ‘Such A Parcel Of Rogues In A Nation’. Burns Country. Retrieved: <http://www.robertburns.org/works/344.shtml> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>90</sup> Anne (r.1702-1714). The Official Website of the British Monarchy. Retrieved: [http://www.royal.gov.uk/historyofthemonarchy/scottish%20monarchs\(400ad-1603\)/thestewarts/anne.aspx](http://www.royal.gov.uk/historyofthemonarchy/scottish%20monarchs(400ad-1603)/thestewarts/anne.aspx) (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>91</sup> Hessians. Chronicle of the Revolution. Liberty! The American Revolution. Retrieved: [http://www.pbs.org/ktca/liberty/popup\\_hessians.html](http://www.pbs.org/ktca/liberty/popup_hessians.html) (accessed 16 November 2014).

Elizabeth in Scotland, and that is the present monarch. The ‘other’ Queen Elizabeth was a product of English monarchical madness that had nothing to do with the Scots. Yet we persist in calling the current Queen, ‘Elizabeth II’. This is part of the transfer of terminology whereby the word ‘British’ has come to mean ‘English’, as though the Scots do not exist. It is the equivalent of describing all Americans as Californians.

But this process of obfuscation does not stop there. The world of anniversaries is now about to once again celebrate ‘Magna Carta’ of 1215, ignoring the fact that there were several of these documents. The celebrations also ignore the fact that the 1215 edition was annulled by the Pope, one month after it had been signed by King John of England.<sup>92</sup> But what did King John or his Magna Carta have to do with the Kingdom of Scotland? The answer is nothing, nothing at all, because John was not the King of Scotland<sup>93</sup>. But this will not deter the many engaged in obfuscation as a means of selling a fantasy version of history to tourists as ‘British’ history.

While critics may laugh<sup>94</sup> at the idea of an Australian reenacting the life of William Wallace and events that never happened, while at the same time ignoring many events that did happen during the actual life of this man; the 1995 movie *Braveheart* has been taken to heart by the promoters of Scottish tourism as a useful tool to rid visitors of their ‘spare change’.

Therefore, we should also remember that Orwell wrote his tale about a dictionary while huddling from the cold on that bleak Scottish isle. Unlike the title of his novel, the publication date of that dictionary is still in the future, because the work of ridding our collective lives-lived of reality by means of obfuscation through redaction; is still a work in progress. Best of all for the scriptwriters, it is also a process that seems to be both entertaining and one that makes money.

Perhaps one day we will all come to love ‘Big Brother’. There is still time, because 2050 is still well into the future, our future, the future of us all.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> “His conflict with the Church led to his excommunication. The annulment of Magna Carta by Pope Innocent III in August 1215, at John’s request, led to a renewal of the baronial revolt which was still raging when John died in October 1216”. Magna Carta: People and society. Magna Carta. British Library. Retrieved: <http://www.bl.uk/magna-carta/articles/magna-carta-people-and-society> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>93</sup> After King James VI of Scotland who was King James I of England, references were made to the king ruling over territory, and not people.

<sup>94</sup> “*Critics Consensus: Distractingly violent and historically dodgy.*” *Braveheart* (1995). Retrieved: <http://www.rottentomatoes.com/m/1065684-braveheart> (accessed 16 November 2014).

<sup>95</sup> “...the struggle was finished. .... He loved Big Brother.” The concluding words in Orwell’s novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: p.256.