

DIGITAL ID: IS IT THE HILL?

By LW

The Plan is “Announced”

There has been wall to wall coverage on the serious matter of digital ID over the last few weeks. It was about three weeks ago, that Kier Starmer announced the Government's intention to roll out a digital ID in the form of the Britcard. This to be free to all UK citizens, but a mandatory requirement if you want to work in the UK. There is so much opposition to this course of action: a petition against it with around 3 million signatories (to which the Government has responded that they are going to do it anyway), politicians on the left and the right denouncing the plan, and even Boris Johnson has said a big “No”. Most people recognize that this plan would move us into a permissions based society, needing ‘papers’ in order to participate. Kier Starmer has now suggested that it may be necessary to have the card in order to access our own bank accounts! (And to buy a pint). At the same time, the government is rolling out facial recognition cameras around the country, and this, together with mandatory biometric ID seems to lead to only one place - a surveillance state and the implementation of a social credit system. In such a system, if you don't behave as the state requires, for example, you refuse to get the latest vaccine, then it could mean you are automatically shut out of buying food, accessing medical care, using the internet, and so on.

Red-Herring

Commentators rightly point out that, in order to implement such a surveillance state with social credit scoring, we do not need a card. So, it seems that the Britcard is something of a red herring - something for the people to protest against while the building out of the digital prison carries on around them, regardless. Because digital ID is already here. You will not need to be sent a card, or download an app in order to have one. You have various digital IDs for different things, and the plan is to centralize where all this data is held. In the UK, it seems that the vehicle for this is the Gov.UK One Login. Many people have already signed up for One Login, probably not realizing the dangers of this, and the Government tells us that we will need a One Login account to access any government agencies from 2027. So many people have biometric driving licences, passports and bank cards, that we are already well on the way to the surveillance state. Most of this ‘on-boarding’ is voluntary on our part, for our convenience. The plan is clear, that the information will be centralized (through mechanisms such as One Login), and, at that point, the digital trap will be shut behind us and there is no way back. This is a very real concern, but we are already in the digital ID mesh network, and probably started on this path decades ago.

Social Credit Scoring

We speak of social credit scoring as if it is something coming in the future, but already, our insurance premiums and the like will be decided not just on information and categories of risk we know about, but some we do not¹. We are already on various lists². Many people have already had their lives affected by something which other people (or computers) who compile these lists have categorized as wrong: opposition to

¹ Business Reform, *Social credit system*: <https://youtu.be/52OobWtMiMA?si=5tUcwrphX0lVbfSf>

² Business Reform, *Are you on a List*: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HTEpV8qa_mc

government policies, or recommended (pushed) medications, eating too much lard, drinking too much alcohol. Many aspects of our lives leave a digital footprint which is affecting us without us knowing. These judgments, the consequences of which will become more serious over time, are made with no due process; our court systems are bypassed and many people have only just started to notice this.

Is Digital ID Necessary for Tyranny to Occur?

Of course, we should not walk further into the digital trap, and we must resist the plan by not agreeing to any more digital or biometric identity verification. We must take the paper route, or refuse to provide the ID if there is no paper route. Sometimes, the need to verify ID at all seems totally unnecessary, and should be called out. However, I have been running through, in my mind, the scenarios we fear, (I fear), and which we are told could happen as a result of the digital ID trap. I've been wondering whether centralized digital ID is necessary for these scenarios to occur, and also whether the damage of digital ID is already done. Please come with me whilst I think aloud... Here are some examples:

1. A "Minority Report" type criminal 'justice' system, with people being captured and imprisoned ('haloed') without trial, based on the predictions of the pre-cogs, (or, in our case, more likely algorithmic predictions). Police forces already use algorithmic predictors of crime³, and would already be able to find and capture most people even now, before a centralized digital ID system is in place. So, this could happen without a fully centralized digital ID network. A form of this could even have happened before we went digital at all. Admittedly, the biometric surveillance aspect would make it harder to evade capture, if you wanted to evade capture. At least in a pre-biometric digital ID era, you would not have had to change your eyeballs in order to remain a fugitive, but really, who wants to live 'on the run', as an outlaw, even an old-style one?
2. With Central Bank Digital Currency (programmable money) and social credit systems we could be prevented from being able to use our own money, or buy food, if we do not behave as the state would wish. But we saw in the truckers protest in Canada that the State has the ability already to stop dissident's accessing their bank accounts. We are told that many people, including, Nigel Farage, were 'de-banked' in recent years—no centralized digital ID required.
3. During the 'pandemic', people were prevented from being with their dying loved-ones. People died over zoom. No digital ID was required for this particular tyranny.
4. During the 'pandemic', people were precluded from going to certain events if they had not been vaccinated. No digital ID was required to facilitate this.
5. In 1930s Germany, the Nazis carried out the Holocaust. It was a 'papers please' society, but no digital ID was required.

³ A Critical Examination of Contemporary Forms of Policing in the UK: <https://www.commonlawconstitution.org/resources/a-critical-examination-of-contemporary-forms-of-policing-in-the-uk?c=essays-and-articles>

6. We are told that centralized digital ID could lead to us having our water or electricity cut off. We will no longer be able to live off grid and outside the system, because this new technocracy will come for us all. But, is that true? They may well be coming for us all, I don't doubt that. Is this why we care more? Because it's not just the Jews, or just the mentally ill or disabled? This time, it's all of us. They could have moved against those living off grid in the past, they just chose not to. Do you think that if a group of Jews had moved 'off-grid' in Nazi Germany, they would have been left alone? It would not require digital ID to be able to move against those people who are trying to live off-grid.
7. We are told that in India, where digital ID has been centralized, people who have chosen not to have this ID, or where the ID has malfunctioned, have starved to death because, without ID, they are precluded from buying food. We need to see, however, that it is the people around them who have allowed this to happen. Yes, wrong pressure has been applied by the State, but ultimately, the people have allowed this, just as the people allowed the care homes and hospitals to exclude many from the bedsides of their loved ones who were dying, just as the people allowed children to be masked during covid, mothers to give birth wearing masks, and people to be coerced into taking experimental vaccines. Just as it was that people stood by and allowed small children to die up chimneys in Victorian times. In many instances, these things were not mandated by any government; it was left to individual organisations to decide their own policies. Even when evil acts are mandated by governments, such as happened in Nazi Germany, in order to 'succeed,' those governments still required the people to allow it, or to facilitate it. "I was just following orders, just doing my job, just minding my own business." We have heard all the pretended justifications many times before.

What We Really Fear

So, it seems to me that what we really fear is what will the other members of our community stand-by and allow to happen to us? And, what will the other members of our community participate in facilitating? Or, what will *I* allow to happen to my fellow men before *I* stand up?

When looked at in this way, the digital ID in and of itself, is not the root of the problem. It is our fellow men, and our governance. I am not saying that centralizing digital ID and a surveillance state are good things. For one, it makes the task of those who wish to perpetrate evil an easier and quicker one. It might mean that it is even easier for our fellow men to fail to notice what is happening. But, as things stand today, when humans do notice what is happening, are we happy and confident with how they (we) presently respond (even before the final flick of the switch on the digital trap)?

We Do It to Ourselves

People say that centralization of all our Digital ID is an altogether different prospect than just having a biometric driving licence, or passport. Some say that it would currently be illegal to centralize the information (without consent), and we also have the protections of the ECHR regarding privacy. However, since most people believe in the power of the state to legislate anything they like, the legalities of the thing could soon be dealt with. Again, when looked at in this way, we see that the Digital ID issue is masking a deeper one—that of governance. My feeling is that they (yes, them) want us to agree to the digital trap ourselves, and so any

suggestion of government mandate may not last. The centralization will become ‘mandatory’ in effect, by the back door. They want us to imprison ourselves and each other. For those at the apex of evil, the reason for this is twofold (at least). One, to lessen their karmic burden (the order followers pay more heavily than the order givers or manipulators) and, two, for the sadistic thrill of seeing us harm ourselves, a kind of humiliation ritual. Looked at from an evolutionary perspective, will the centralization of digital ID make us see how it is that we harm ourselves, and each other, and thereby facilitate an understanding that harming another is harming ourselves? Will it make the choices more stark so that we see yet how foolish we have been in walking into this trap?

The Universe at large has no problem turning the heat up and making you more and more uncomfortable to the point of crisis in order to influence you into making a change for your own benefit.

Teal Swan

We have already consented, through convenience, and by not thinking about the danger, to the provision of the framework for the digital prison⁴. We are already in the pitcher plant, waiting to slide into the dissolving ooze. Will it be death, or will we have ‘haloed’ ourselves by imprisoning ourselves in a virtual reality? ⁵.

Trust in a Time of Anonymity

We put much store by privacy. We have become accustomed to living an anonymous lifestyle if we wish. Many of the ID procedures which have led to where we are today, have been taken up through a desire to establish, in a time of anonymity, whether a person is trustworthy. One reason for using some of the payment methods we have is because we do not want the people we do business with to know where we live, or have any of our personal details. Because of this, we can’t let them drop some cash round or send us a cheque, or a postal order (remember those?).

Back in the day, your village, your community, would have known what you were about and whether you could be trusted.⁶ You would have demonstrated, or not, your trustworthiness to your village over time. Everyone knew everyone else’s business. We rail against this now. We want to be the anonymous stranger and be trusted just the same, which is just not possible. It is right and natural that the stranger to the village is not trusted the same as the people who live and work there. We want to be removed from the registers, for people not to know where we live, or how to contact us, and to be trusted just the same. It is understandable that we do not want our addresses to be public anymore, and an act of self-preservation to not want our untrustworthy governments or big corporations to know very much about us at all (although they already do), but we have to see that there was a protection and a trust when the village knew exactly what everyone was about. We cannot hold people to account, should the need arise, when we do not know their names or contact details. If people are too private, we cannot know what they stand for, nor whether to trust them.

⁴ Miles Harris, *The Digital ID Trap: Millions On Board* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mFG-81xK2tE>

⁵ Gigi Young, *Electric Apocalypse*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0dn5vlpGwVQ>, and Rudolf Steiner, *Electronic Doppelgänger: The Mystery of the Double in the Age of the Internet*, Rudolf Steiner Press, 6 May 2016

⁶ Stephen Jenkinson: *Come of Age*, North Atlantic Books, Berkeley, California, 2018

Community Justice

When a community member transgressed the rights of another, when they did not do unto the other..., when they took away the choice of another, the community itself would decide how to deal with that offender. A method grew up over time, a natural law tribunal, which is our Jury system. It has been watered down and gradually removed from more and more cases over centuries.

Juries are now told that they must follow the direction of the judge as to the law, and only concern themselves with the facts. But can this be right if the law in question is abhorrent? Can this be right if the law in question says that these people must be handed over for killing because they are Jews? Can it be right if the law in question says that this man, working without a digital ID, is committing a crime? Is that a crime? Can it be right if the law in question says, this man who gave food to someone who had no digital ID has committed a crime? What if the man with no ID was starving? Is that a crime?

Court of Conscience

What jurors are told is not true. They do have the power, and the duty, to decide a case according to their conscience, independent of the direction of the judge, and independent of the legislation. This means that they can find a man not guilty even when the legislation in question has been transgressed, if that is what their own conscience decrees.⁷ This mechanism would be of vital importance, for example, should an employer be prosecuted for deciding, in defiance of legislation which might purport to mandate such a thing, that he will not insist on his prospective employee showing him a Gov.UK One Login. Think about it. Think about why any such offence would probably be made summary only (unconstitutionally precluded from Trial by Jury). Is it right that the state should decree which cases should go before a jury and which cannot? If the state can decide such things, has not equity been broken?

Here, the problem is not the digital ID itself. The problem is allowing the state, and not the people to tell us what is the law (or for big corporations to implement laws and judgments based on criteria we don't even know about).

Mob Rule and a Predominantly Collectivist Mindset

We have been told for so long, and have gone along with the consensus view that the state tells us what the law is, that we have forgotten our standing. We have outsourced our law-making to perceived authority figures. We have been led to believe through the notion of majority voting that the greater number of people can enforce their will on the smaller number of people, and that this will be enforced by legislation. We have been okay with this mob rule. Shame on us. How have we come to this place? If we were able to stop the roll out of Digital ID tomorrow, stop the centralization and the final flick of the switch, we would still be in this place. We would still, in the main, have a collectivist mindset.⁸

⁷ See Case of Solicitor General v Trudi Warner 2024 <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/HM-Solicitor-General-v-Warner-Judgment-22.4.24-KB.pdf>, <https://www.commonlawconstitution.org/resources/my-letter-to-brian-leveson?c=letters-and-communication>

⁸ Individualism and collectivism video series, LawAndAlchemy <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLXrEbAWj1bAJmFr4WEfF-zc8DLmmTMrT8>

Erosion of the Trial by Jury

The mechanism that grew up naturally, for the people to decide each case, each dispute, on an individual basis according to conscience—the Jury, has gradually been removed from more and more cases, and is under threat right now of further erosion. The threat is such that they may disappear almost entirely. You can see the proposals in the Leveson Review⁹. Yet, it should be through authentic Trial by Jury that we, the men and women of this land, govern ourselves; this is how we, the people, are the Law of the Land. This mechanism, so much more than a fact-finding tribunal in some criminal (and a few civil) cases, is being removed, dismantled. Hardly any voices are discussing this issue. This, our governance, our *self-governance*, is a causal issue (a fundamental issue that goes to the heart of whether we experience freedom or external control). Digital ID and its possible consequences, are the effects of us outsourcing our governance and having adopted a collectivist mindset. We are allowing the centralization of digital ID to become a different form of governance, one which by-passes our own choices and our courts, an illegitimate form of governance. Allowing our courts of conscience gradually to disappear has been part of this process.

Robot Rule v Appeal to a Human

We are rightly concerned about a future where decisions and judgments will be made, in ‘courts’ and in society, by computers, by algorithm. Ultimately, we fear the time when the robots come for us and there is no human to whom we can appeal. We are not quite there. There are still human beings to whom we may appeal. But, in a world where many humans are operating according to algorithms, or behaving robotically and just following orders, succumbing to a ‘computer says No’ mindset, how is this ability to appeal to a human working out for you?

There are, rightly, concerns that senior members of our judiciary are being influenced by WEF representatives as to the implementation of AI into our justice system¹⁰. Sir Brian Leveson in his review of the Criminal Justice System said the following:

“This is all to say, the speed of justice cannot be pursued at any cost. This is why I will not advocate, by way of example, for a reversal of the many safeguards introduced to the justice system or propose that the rights of participation for victims and defendants be reduced or suggest that AI should wholly supplant the role of judges in sentencing, even if this offered the theoretical potential of increasing throughput in the courts.” p. 78

‘Praise the Lord’, he sees that we should not move to making AI the judges, but the fact that this needed to be said at all, I find chilling, especially when you consider that he also said:

‘AI will be approached as the starting point for a long-term vision for criminal justice beyond the immediate crisis. The pace of change in technology is such that, within ten years, the landscape within which any criminal justice system will operate is beyond our ability to visualise.’ p. 8

⁹ CommonLawConstitution, *Leveson at a Glance* <https://www.commonlawconstitution.org/news-and-thoughts/leveson-at-a-glance>

¹⁰ Legal Futures <https://www.legalfutures.co.uk/latest-news/susskind-named-chair-of-expert-group-to-advise-judges-on-ai>

We already have sentencing guidelines which form an algorithmic decision-making matrix which fetters almost all discretion—yet, many people spent an inordinate amount of time protesting about the minutiae of particular phrases within these guidelines which they had been whipped into a frenzy to believe amounted to two-tier justice. This, instead of seeing the danger of the algorithmic nature of this framework, and, further, the fact that deciding whether to punish, or not, was something which the ordinary members of your community were supposed to decide.¹¹

The Urgent Need for Righting Our Governance

With Digital ID already here, the righting of our governance, and the raising of human consciousness become even more important and urgent. These aspects are what is left to us—the matters that we should always have put first, and which we are now being pulled, kicking and screaming, towards seeing for the foundational issues which they are.

Learning to Care

To transcend Digital ID and social credit scoring, we need the people to pay attention. When the insurance broker enters what appears to be the same risk factors for Mr. X as Mr. Y, but Mr. Y's insurance premium quote is £500 more, they need to spot this, *and care enough* to take action. We need to care and act if someone has been prevented from accessing their money because of the algorithm; we can no longer just turn a blind eye or pretend that we believe what we have been told: that it's because they are some kind of domestic terrorist.

Analogue Tyrannies

We are told we need to fight for legislation to ensure that non-digital ID will be accepted—so that there will always be a paper route, and I believe that we should, but remember the examples I gave above of occasions where tyranny reigned before a digital ID system was anywhere near fruition. I am sure you can think of other examples. These tyrannies can and will occur in an analogue society, just the same, unless we address the foundational issues.

A New Dawn?

Hopefully, we will begin to trade in different ways. Businesses may refuse to go along with guidance that requires them to establish a person's identity on a digital basis. Hopefully, they will get to know their customer and establish trust that way. Why did the professions ever agree to be the police for the surveillance state by acquiescing to conduct anti money-laundering procedures, when all the time our own governments traded with whichever undesirables they wished, and provided weapons to whomever they chose? It may be that these conscientious businesses of the future have to stop going along with the guidance of their professional bodies, or with the accepted procedure which becomes a 'radical monopoly' (Ivan Illich¹² —something which, although not forced by legislation neither available from only one brand, becomes a thing one must have or do

¹¹ Lysander Spooner, *An Essay on The Trial by Jury* <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/lysander-spooner-an-essay-on-the-trial-by-jury>

¹² Ivan Illich, *Tools for Conviviality*, Marion Boyars 2001

in order to be able to participate in society). Maybe new, conscientious professional bodies will grow up, or maybe we will do our own research and consider personal recommendations and the like when we decide to instruct a professional. Maybe we will come to realize that a professional body is not required and is always a weak link towards a path of ensuring that professionals toe the government line.

Maybe we will realize, as employees, that we can and should stand up to immoral activities perpetrated by our employer; we should be ready to leave, not carry on for our pay cheque. A recent example of this was when Google employees and some directors refused to continue if Google AI was used for the development or deployment of weapons, or human rights abuses. As a result, Google did not renew their lucrative contact with the US government (leaving Palantir to it)¹³.

Maybe a similar thing could happen where employees are required to travel abroad and do not wish to have to comply with the biometric checks to enter the Schengen area. If enough employees refused this, maybe the companies would stop sending them. Maybe the larger companies, or sufficient number of smaller companies, would be forced to put pressure on the EU to abandon the biometric checks.

If we see our colleague object to providing biometric data for clocking into the workplace, and they are summarily dismissed shortly thereafter, maybe we should **all** walk out.

Transcending Materialism

Is the real work we need to do, not just about demanding paper routes, but to transcend Digital ID, CBDC, UBI, and the like, altogether? Is this all really an opportunity to transcend materialism? Is it the start of our evolution out of the material world? To no longer be enslaved by money—of the paper, **or** CBDC variety, or Tokenism¹⁴. Is this the beginning of people realizing that money only has value because of our belief in it? Maybe the instant and unreal nature of tokenism will help us to see this more quickly. Maybe we will come to see money as more akin to monopoly money and like a game we can have fun with, and in this way we create abundance, or maybe we come to realize what has real, intrinsic value, and eschew money altogether.¹⁵

I was struck by a video I saw recently of Yuval Noah Harari¹⁶ in which he was describing social credit in what sounded like a positive light—a way in which people could be rewarded for all their good behaviours, the good things they do, for which they cannot currently be paid. This is similar to my description in ‘Bank of Reality’ (see references below) of how we could come to appreciate the things of true value and do what needs to be done. The difference is that Harari, in the context of social credit, describes it as monetizing everything, thereby trapping us within the digital matrix, an inversion; whereas my wonderings on the subject amount to

¹³ Business Reform *Palantir: Because There Are Some Lines Google Won't Cross* <https://youtu.be/vXnik-R-i-c?si=8jEHOhSQj6fa5UYB>

¹⁴ Miles Harris, *When Your House Becomes a Stock: Tokenization & the Future of Housing* https://youtu.be/6WDQJTU-T0g?si=dQ0n0w_340Ox73Aj

¹⁵ LW Substack *Bank of Reality* <https://substack.com/home/post/p-172808747>, *Money Musings* <https://www.commonlawconstitution.org/resources/money-musings?c=essays-and-articles>, Calvin Perrins, *What has True, Intrinsic Value* https://youtu.be/sn1Ic36fztc?si=J1Bap_PPVviPp058

¹⁶ Yuval Noah Harari, *The Idea of a Social Credit System has Positive Potential “in Some Regards”* https://youtu.be/UO_zaiW3Big?si=hl4OUGXS0hfweOf-

the unmonetizing of everything, thereby freeing us—an evolution. We see, and do what needs to be done, and we do it, for nothing—but it is not nothing, it is everything. We need to do what needs to be done, guided by our conscience, and not just because we will be rewarded. Similarly, we need to show gratitude to those who do the doing—to be able to receive the gift of their service, and express our gratitude, not just be content that the system will reward them. Even the monetary exchange we have now is something of a resistance to the ability fully and gratefully to receive.

Protest or Education?

If digital ID is already here, what does it mean to protest against it? What does it mean to petition the government not to bring it in. These petitions usually involve a convoluted double-negative, or double-double-negative! Is this the people shaping the world they want, or ensuring that we are forever banging our heads against the proverbial brick wall? What does it mean to say No to digital ID... this is the Hill? Does it mean we will die on this hill for our right to refuse the thing we already agreed to for convenience a decade ago? Can we even put this particular genie back in the bottle?

Our demand is really that paper options always remain available, (and to refuse unnecessary verification even if it is 'only' paper) and nobody must be penalized for choosing that route. But can we be sure we won't be penalized, by the algorithm, that a radical monopoly will not develop?

Transhumanism

Digital ID, and the centralization of it, could mean we further forget our standing as we “step into the Borg”, which is what we are being invited to do. I see the increasing centralization and proliferation of digital ID and verification as part of the move to merge us with machines—transhumanism. Many already wear devices which log their heart rate, blood pressure, menstrual cycle and other health data. It is obviously of great concern from a security perspective that, as well as the risk of data breach in relation to biometric and other personal data, this extremely personal health data, is not only accessible to the government and their One Login partners, but also to hackers. One Login has already lost its safety verification in regard to data security.¹⁷ If a person with ill intent got hold of your centralized Digital ID: your fingerprints, your iris scan, your biometric photograph—it would be easier than ever for them to frame you for an offence, or just use your identity for *their* fraud; in which case, who will believe it wasn't you? We might well wonder why we have exposed such personal and health data to the digital world, never mind why we do not seem to be concerned about the effect of the EMFs from these devices on our bodies and minds. Some people have already had microchips implanted to access buildings or bank accounts.¹⁸ Some already allow iris scans for the same reasons.¹⁹ Tech sorcerers are waiting

¹⁷ Computer Weekly, *Government faces claims of serious security and data protection problems in One Login digital ID* <https://www.computerweekly.com/news/366622533/Government-faces-claims-of-serious-cyber-security-and-data-protection-problems-in-One-Login-digital-ID>, Mobile ID World, *UK's One Login Digital ID System Loses Government Security Certification* <https://mobileidworld.com/uks-one-login-digital-id-system-loses-government-security-certification/>

¹⁸ BBC, *The Microchip Implants that Let you Pay with your Hand* <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-61008730>

¹⁹ France24, *Cash Strapped Argentines Queue for Eyeball Scan* <https://www.france24.com/en/live-news/20240409-cash-strapped-argentines-queue-for-eyeball-scans>

to put chips in our brains. There has been discussion as to how to treat augmented humans versus organic humans.²⁰

So, whilst we have always been encouraged to identify overly with our worldly roles and titles, the over identification with our digital identity has much more serious consequences. We forget our standing. We pour our creativity—our souls, into our devices and our interactions with AI. We morph and merge with the machines.²¹

A Way Out

As the mesh becomes more complete, and tightens around us it may mean that people are less likely to notice atrocities being perpetrated on their fellow men. This trap, which was sprung in convenience, plays into our apathy and will encourage more. But the root issue, even without the digital ID, is still our apathy, our collectivist mindset, and the inverted state of our governance, which will always remain when we do not participate, shape, make and own the laws of our community. In our Western tradition, we own our law through our Trial by Jury. We may be about to lose it. Surely this is the Hill?

Certainly the restoration of authentic Trial by Jury in all cases is a practical step we can take which will help us align with Natural Law. We need to study Natural law, we need to study the different ideologies of Individualism and Collectivism—the lesson of our time. We need to come to see how Individualism is the Golden Rule, is correct, and then we need to eschew all forms of Collectivism. We need to understand how our true constitution, with authentic Trial by Jury at its heart, is aligned with Natural Law, and is still there, under the centuries of obfuscation, waiting for us to excavate and reclaim it.²²

Article 39 of Magna Carta is really another expression of the Golden Rule:

“No free man shall be taken or imprisoned, or disseised, or exiled, or in any way destroyed, nor will we go upon him, nor send upon him, except by the lawful judgment of his peers or [and/‘in other words’] by the law of the land.”

In other words, absent a situation of immediate threat, the **only lawful way** that we may take away the choices of another: impinge on a man’s free will, or harm him in any way—is by the lawful judgment of a jury of his social equals. Such judgment can only be lawful (aligned with natural law) if the jury is sure that the man has harmed another (taken away the choices of another). Considerations of intent, self-defence, justifications and whether the defendant is deserving of punishment or segregation are all encompassed within the concept of ‘lawful judgement’ here and are made according to conscience.

²⁰ Ministry of Defence (UK Gov), *Human Augmentation – The Dawn of a New Paradigm* https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/609d23c6e90e07357baa8388/Human_Augmentation_SIP_access2.pdf

²¹ Gigi Young, *Electric Apocalypse*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0dn5vlpGwVQ>, and Rudolf Steiner, *Electronic Doppelgänger: The Mystery of the Double in the Age of the Internet*, Rudolf Steiner Press, 6 May 2016

²² William Keyte, *The Dangers of Denying the Constitution*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RTguNsozOc8>

As with the Golden Rule, the breadth of what is contained within the ostensibly simple expression of Article 39 becomes apparent in any attempt to explain it. So much is implicit within such expressions—inherently understood, but inexplicable in succinct format. This illustrates the impossibility and futility of attempting to legislate for all eventualities.

I have heard senior lawyers scoff at, try to shame almost, those lawyers who would treat the Common Law articles of Magna Carta as scripture. I rather think the shame is on those who **do not** appreciate that this is hallowed ground, for every time you tear out another piece of the heart and soul of your law tradition, you turn it to system and prime it for the machine.

Alchemy by Jury

We may have concerns about the people, who, we have demonstrated above, often behave robotically, follow orders and make algorithmic decisions. How can these people be trusted to stand in judgment over their fellow citizens? The reason they can is because there is an Alchemy in the deliberative process of the Jury, which is not available when people make decisions alone, without the *Other Eleven*.²³ You see, we are currently already captured by the 'moral' compass of the general public—but in a removed way which people cannot see or course correct. Our parliament, our lawyers, our police, our public servants more generally, are all 'recruited' from the general public. In the consensus reality we are in, when the mass of people go along with immorality, it impinges on the minority who **do** want to live in a moral society. So, you are already captured by the immorality of the mass of the people, but in a way that is amorphous and unaccountable. Trial by Jury, on the other hand, still relies on the people, but in a way where they are making a focused decision, in a room with eleven other people from different walks of life, with different experiences and so on. The views of each and every one of them will be put on the mat and they cannot just leave the discussion or flounce-off in the same way they can in social discussion or on social media. The jurors rise to the occasion and you can see from memoir and research that they hold each other accountable.

Now, imagine if the power of the jury was raised in the consciousness of the people. Imagine if they were taught this from an early age—the power they have. See, the jury is not just a tribunal which deals with the guilt or innocence of the defendant before them, but a way in which society becomes more conscious and more reliant on their consciences. In this way, it is a form of restorative justice which has positive benefits for the jurors, their families and communities, and for society as a whole. As Alexis de Tocqueville said: the jury 'Is both the most effective way of establishing the people's rule and the most efficient way of teaching them to rule'.²⁴ Or, as Trevor Grove put it in his memoir "The Juryman":

"We had become professionalized... They say the office helps to make the man. Even within the much briefer compass of most trials, jury membership does seem to summon up people's civic-mindedness—"

²³ LJH Alchemy and Annulment: The Power of the Jury as Portrayed in Popular Culture, <https://www.commonlawconstitution.org/resources/alchemy-and-annulment-the-power-of-the-jury-as-portrayed-in-popular-culture?c=essays-and-articles>

²⁴ Alexis De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, George Lawrence Translation, 1969

perhaps for the first and only time in their lives. Although this is a cynical age, honesty, fairness and justice are concepts nearly everyone believes in, even if they do not personally live up to them.”²⁵

Conclusion

The Centralization and proliferation of digital ID is a serious, clear and present danger. It heightens and makes more urgent the need to correct the underlying causal factors which have brought us to this pinch point. We will **all** be dying on the hill if we do not prioritize the study of Natural Law, and how our constitution aligns with it. But if we begin this study, we will be able to grow up and govern ourselves. Then, maybe, just maybe, we will not need to be dying on any Hill.

Further Research

UK Government One Login: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/govuk-one-login-privacy-notice/govuk-one-login-privacy-notice>

AI Technology: Alan Watts Predicted the Future, <https://youtube.com/watch?v=Rr5qCuPGTH0>

²⁵ Trevor Grove *The Juryman's Tale*, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2000