

INTERIM RULING

re: Pax regium for first and second term co-rulers

Unto TIMs Dame Elizabeth and Sir Karl,

Your servant, Sir William, sends greetings and the following ruling on law, as commanded.

HRM Dame Aislyne de Chartier, Queen of Umbria, requested a ruling of law:

"If a seated Crown successfully bids for a second consecutive reign, but wins the Crown with a new co-ruler, one Crown is in his or her second reign and the other is in his or her first. A second reign has no pax regium, but a first reign does. Does the Crown who is seated for a first reign forfeit his or her right to a pax regium by virtue of the fact that the co-ruler does not have one?"

Ruling:

Yes. I have reviewed of the relevant law. Imperial Bylaws VI. F. 3. The Crown, b. Royal Crown; XIV. Term of Office, B. King/Queen; XV. A. Pax Regium; these sections are all silent on this issue. However, VIII. B. General Requirements for Crowns/Ruling Nobles, 1. h. is explicit, "Their reign is limited to two (2) years consecutive, removing the Royal Crown Pax Regium in the second year." No exception is made for the first term co-ruler.

Discussion:

When the bylaws were amended to permit the second term, the issue was hotly and thoroughly debated. Strong opposition to two term Crowns was accommodated by elimination of a second Pax Regium. This was to safeguard the ability of the populace to prevent an entrenched and irremovable Crown/government.

In a worse case, the 2/3rds vote of the Estates to remove a Crown, can be interfered with by manipulation of Estates composition; but, the Civil War remedy would still be available. Civil War against one Co-ruler could result in the government being unchanged. Further, to address the issue of fairness, it is the decision of the first term co-ruler to run with the second and therefore forfeit the right to a Pax Regium.

In service,

Sir William Baine,

Chancellor, Adria

2/25/03