

If Sark was forced to reform its feudal system of gover...

Published: January 12, 2026, 9:51 pm

Sark, in the Channel Islands, had to reform its system of government in 2008. Pit simply the system of government it operated was deemed to be feudal and unacceptable under the [European Convention on Human Rights](#). Its old system, in place since 1565, consisted of a 54-member chamber consisting of the Seigneur, the Seneschal, 40 tenant members and 12 deputies. This was unacceptable because the Tenants were seen to be able to sit in Chief Pleas as of right, and the new system has been described as democratic, and hence acceptable.

Let's leave aside for the moment the fact that the new system is still subject to challenge, and that the Barclay Brothers have tried to dominate it, and let's note that an undemocratic system had to be changed to meet the requirements of the EU.

And yet, [as I noted yesterday](#), in the City of London there is an older system of government in operation where a person living in the City, and with a right to vote, may not stand for election unless a Freeman of the City of London - a privilege that it is admitted is granted through the City Livery Companies - which are exclusive clubs designed to serve the interest of an elite to which most will be never invited into membership.

This then is a feudal system of government - with what is in effect a property qualification designed to exclude those who vote from being eligible for election. And that's before we consider the fact that working in the City qualifies a person to vote there even though they also vote elsewhere - a blatant case of gerrymandering if ever there was one.

Why is this situation tolerated when that in Sark was not?

Isn't it time for Europe to intervene?