The Australian Heritage Society

The Australian Heritage Society was launched in Melbourne on 18th September, 1971 at an Australian League of Rights Seminar. It was clear that Australia's heritage is under increasing attack from all sides; spiritual, cultural, political and constitutional. A permanent body was required to ensure that young Australians were not cut off from their true heritage and the Heritage Society assumed that role in a number of ways.

The Australian Heritage Society welcomes people of all ages to join in its programme for the regeneration of the spirit of Australia. To value the great spiritual realities that we have come to know and respect through our heritage, the virtues of patriotism, of integrity and love of truth, pursuit of goodness and beauty, and unselfish concern for other people - to maintain a love and loyalty for those values.

Young Australians have a real challenge before them. The Australian Heritage Society, with your support, can give the required lead in building a better Australia.

"Our heritage today is the fragments gleaned from past ages; the heritage of tomorrow -
good or bad will be determined by your actions today."

SIR RAPHAEL CILENTO

First Patron of the Australian Heritage Society
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PARENTS can expect a national school curriculum regardless of which party wins the Federal election this year. A national education curriculum appears a certainty in Australia, with unions and teacher groups joining the Government and Opposition in support of developing uniform standards for all schools across the nation. The State and National teachers unions have admitted that it was only a matter of time before Australian students were taught a uniform curriculum.

The Howard Government’s proposed model, known as the Australian Certificate of Education, would replace the existing nine State and Territory Year 12 certificates. It would see the development of a common framework for reporting student achievement, with levels from E (lowest) to A (highest) in each subject, and would include a midyear test known as the Key Capabilities Assessment.

The Opposition Labor leader Mr Kevin Rudd has joined the coalition to push States and Territories to set common standards, and has said “Under the Labor Policy, children across the country would learn the same core content in Maths, English, History and Science subjects, from Kindergarten to Year 12 as soon as 2010”. Mr Rudd has pledged an “education revolution.”

This so-called “education revolution” the national curriculum, is based upon the American education system of Outcome-Based Education. Advocates claim OBE is designed to improve our children’s education, but the chilling truth is that OBE is designed to change our children’s values from cradle-to-grave.

Outcome-based education differs from traditional education in both structure and content. In a nutshell here are a few defined differences. (Cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Education (ABCs)</th>
<th>Outcome-Based Education (OBE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Level/ Standards of Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grade Level/ Standards of Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific grade levels.</td>
<td>No specific grade levels. (multi-age groups). Intermittent benchmarks gauge progress toward mastering learner outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each grade level has distinct subject content that each student is expected to have earned at the end of each grade.</td>
<td>Graduation Requirements Students master specific learner outcomes, which include non-academic, subjective attitudes to earn a certificate of mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Requirements</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focus of Teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must pass specifically defined academic courses, earning points towards a high school diploma.</td>
<td>Affective in nature. Emphasis on application of skills and knowledge (how the student uses information).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus of Teaching</strong></td>
<td><strong>Method of Teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic in nature. Emphasis on content of academic material (what the student knows).</td>
<td>Information in broad themes, taught across the curriculum (interdisciplinary). Individuals learn within groups or using individual education plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method of Teaching</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grading Scale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information taught in specific (Maths, History, English, etc.). Which each student is responsible for learning over a specific time - frame (one school year).</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F – grades reward each student according to his/her achievement level. Students are responsible for earning passing grades in order to advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading Scale</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B, C, D, E, F - grades reward each student according to his/her achievement level. Students are responsible for earning passing grades in order to advance.</td>
<td>Schools are part of the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher assesses behaviour, values, and attitudes – self-esteem, coping skill, compromise skills, proper citizenship attitudes for an interdependent, global society (“Higher order thinking Skills”)

Teacher is “coach”; facilitator. Computer learning is emphasised (reading is passive). Textbooks are discarded. Students are self-directed learners.

No grouping by ability. Faster or older students tutor slower or younger pupils.

A, B, I (Incomplete) – no one receives a C or below. Students are remediated until achieving “mastery” of a learner outcome. No one fails.

Community is part of the schools.
The assault upon our children’s values

Former U.S. Secretary of Education William J. Bennett did not mince words when he said “the OBE is a “Trojan Horse” rolled into our elementary and secondary schools – filled with “political correct” thinking”. But, even more serious, according to Bennett, “OBE can be used to undermine parental authority and traditional moral beliefs.”

Once OBE is implemented, students will be required to master both academic and non-academic “outcomes” before they will be allowed to advance. This means the state will define what is acceptable in terms of lifestyle, behaviour, and beliefs – and our children will have to conform or they will fail as future “global” citizens. The psychological problems associated with failure are manifested in the questioning of self-worth, leading to feelings of hopelessness, despair and disillusionment which in turn can lead to alcohol abuse, drug abuse and suicide.

There is no doubt at all that there is a problem existing in the current Australian education system, many students are leaving school unable to read, write, spell or apply elementary maths, and comprehension skills are exceedingly low in many instances. Parents suffer from a feeling of guilt when their child fails, or plays truant from school, (the truancy rate is soaring).

But, why are our schools failing? The changes which have taken place, and those which are being introduced into our colleges and schools, are not happening by chance, it is all part of a carefully planned strategy in the betrayal of Christendom and the Western world; The conditioning of the minds of our young through global subversion, and to accept a “new world order” described by Julian Huxley: “as a single world culture with its own philosophy and background of ideas, and its own broad purposes”.

“Progressive” education has flourished and has played a major role towards the implementation of a “Global” society. It has been instrumental in the breakdown of traditions, integrity and sovereignties of the Western world. Outcome-Based Education is NOT the solution.

Song from Heritage Park

Dear Editor,

My name is Danielle, I am 9 years old, and I live in a lovely suburb in Queensland called Heritage Park. I go to Yugumbir State School and last year when I was in Grade Four my teacher Miss MacGregor taught us this song called “Aussie Jingle Bells” for Christmas.

My Nanna gets your “Heritage” magazine and after I sang it to her, Nan thought perhaps some of your other readers might enjoy it also. I think that it is really funny, and I hope you all like it as well. I have sent you a photo of myself.

Cheers, Danielle Vlahov.

Aussie Jingle Bells

Dashing through the bush in a rusty Holden Ute’
Kicking up the dust, esky in the boot,
Kelpie by my side, singing Christmas songs,
It’s summer time and I am in my Singlet, Shorts and Thongs.

CHORUS
Oh! Jingle bells, Jingle bells, Jingle all the way,
Christmas in Australia on a scorching summer’s day, Hey!
Jingle bells, Jingle bells, Christmas time is beaut!
Oh what fun it is to ride in a rusty Holden Ute.

Engine’s getting hot, we dodge the kangaroos,
The swaggie climbs aboard, he is welcome too.
All the family’s there, sitting by the pool,
Christmas day the Aussie way, by the barbeque.

CHORUS
Oh! Jingle bells, Jingle bells, Jingle all the way,
Christmas in Australia on a scorching summer’s day, Hey!
Jingle bells, Jingle bells, Christmas time is beaut!
Oh what fun it is to ride in a rusty Holden Ute.

Come the afternoon, Grandpa has a doze,
The kids and Uncle Bruce are swimming in their clothes.
The time comes round to go, we take a family snap,
Pack the car and all shoot through, before the washing up.

CHORUS
Oh! Jingle bells, Jingle bells, Jingle all the way,
Christmas in Australia on a scorching summer’s day, Hey!
Jingle bells, Jingle bells, Christmas time is beaut!
Oh what fun it is to ride in a rusty Holden Ute.
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John Grainger was an architect and civil engineer, and shared with his wife a love of music. She herself had been Rose Aldridge before her marriage, and in her home city of Adelaide was well known for her skill and artistry at the piano. A Melbourne couple, however, were to have a son who was to show signs of genius at an early age.

George Percy Grainger was born at North Brighton, Melbourne, on July 8th 1882. His father, John Grainger, was an architect and civil engineer, and shared with his wife a love of music. She herself had been Rose Aldridge before her marriage, and in her home city of Adelaide was well known for her skill and artistry at the piano. It was his mother who was young Percy's teacher, and she remained his guide and confidante all her life.

The main burden of raising the boy rested with Rose Grainger, for his father left Australia when his son was seven. Percy Grainger's early school life was varied, and he attended several establishments of learning during his youth, one of which he left very suddenly because some of the other boys were given to the practice of torturing hens.

An Outstanding Talent for Music

When Rose Grainger realised that her son really possessed an outstanding talent for music, she knew she herself would not be able to teach him all he should know, so put him instead into the care of Adelaide Burkitt, one of Melbourne's best teachers of the piano. He was so advanced by the age of ten that he was considered ready to give a public recital. This was held in the Melbourne Town Hall before an enthralled audience to whom he played works by the great masters.

It was not long before Adelaide Burkitt also realised he was reaching a stage where he needed someone even more skilled than she to help him. He became a pupil of the great Louis Pabst, but while the master directed his instruction she continued to assist the boy in his studies.

Again he outgrew his teacher, as it were, and in turn Pabst thought the time had come, after two years, for his pupil to study on the continent, the home of the great musicians. But, such a course required money, and the Graingers were not in affluent circumstances. To help supplement funds for the move to Germany, the young artist gave a number of concerts in Melbourne and Adelaide.

Percy Sets Out on a Great Adventure

And so, Percy Grainger and his mother set out on the great adventure which was eventually to make his name known all over the world. Although, he was still a lad, his mother exacted a promise from him that he would never drink or smoke, a promise which he kept throughout his lifetime.

The pair took up residence in Frankfurt, where Grainger studied at Dr. Hoch's Conservatorium under Professor James Kwast. He remained there for several years, and in addition to his schooling in piano with Kwast and Busoni, he was fortunate enough to receive a sound grounding in the art of musical composition from Professor Ivan Knorr, director of the Conservatorium. His teaching and encouragement exercised a strong influence on the young pianist's subsequent career.

And while Percy Grainger studied, his mother taught English in Frankfurt to help pay their expenses. It was in his eighteenth year that the two of them went to England, where Percy saw his father once again. Here he gave recitals which brought him immediate success. They had only just returned to Frankfurt when his mother met with an unfortunate accident by slipping on a frozen pavement. This unfortunate occurrence made it necessary for the boy himself to earn money, which he did in the only way he knew, by giving concerts.

Speaking of this period, Grainger says: "It was a terrible time of life. I found myself beginning to be lionised. I got out by signing up with Ada Crossley, the Australian singer, for a tour through Australia, New Zealand and South Africa."

So it was that Percy Grainger returned to Australia at the age of twenty-one, and gave recitals in his home city of Melbourne, where he had first made his debut eleven years before,

Only five feet four in height, he was spare and sinewy. His hair was a vivid colour most nearly described as "orange" and it had a tendency to stand straight upwards on his head. The passing years changed its hue to grey, but still it refused to lie flat.

The Australian tour was a great success, but even familiarity with popular applause did nothing to lessen Grainger's diffidence. He was always certain that a proposed concert would be a complete "flop" and that the attendance would be poor.

A Great Friendship Is Forged

A Scandinavian tour with Herman Sandby, the cellist, followed the next year, and in 1905, in company with Adelina Patti, Grainger gave a series of concerts throughout Great Britain.

Then came a memorable event in his career, Grieg, the great Norwegian composer and pianist, heard Grainger play, and invited him to stay at his home in Norway. The invitation was enthusiastically accepted, and the two became firm friends. Music was not their only link, for both shared a love of the Scandinavian language and folklore.

During the next two years Grainger spent much time with his new friend, and learnt to appreciate Grieg's music to the full. So much a part of him did it become, that he has (Cont.)
been acknowledged as the best interpreter of the Norwegian’s music. For the Leeds Festival Grieg asked Grainger to play his Piano Concerto in A Minor. To this Grainger agreed, but when the time came he played it in memory of his friend, for Grieg died just a month before the festival.

It was not longer afterwards that the Midland towns of Manchester and Leeds were thrilled with the beautiful Grieg C Minor Sonata for violin and piano performed by Lady Halle and Grainger. Subsequently Percy Grainger performed as solo pianist at the Grieg Memorial Concert conducted by Svendsen at Copenhagen.

But, although during the next few years Grainger’s name became more and more widely known as a concert pianist of distinction, he yet had no love for this work. To him concerts were always an ordeal, and as for the piano, he considered it a most useless instrument on its own for the expression of music. It was too limited by the fact that it could only be played with the ten fingers. “In my opinion the piano has practically no value at all,” he said on one occasion.

PERCY GRAINGER TURNS TO MUSICAL COMPOSITION

It was to musical composition that Grainger turned to find expression. Folk songs and native music had long exercised a fascination over him, and he devoted much of his time to researching into the native music of Polynesia, Africa and Australia and the folk songs of England and European countries. Many old native airs he arranged into delightful pianoforte solos; others he used as themes for orchestral works.

In 1909 when Delius and Elgar insisted that he should allow one of his ultimately most famous compositions, the Irish Tune from County Derry, which he arranged for strings and horns, to be performed in public for the first time, he was struck dumb by the delight of the London audience to whom it was presented. Describing Grainger’s reaction, Taylor, and American writer, says, “Although, as a reluctant pianist, Grainger was hardened to acclaim, he now was seized with violent stage-fright and, dashing to a nearby circular staircase, he clambered rapidly to the organ loft. The most frenzied importuning of the crowd failed to bring him down.”

GRAINGER MOVES TO THE USA

A visit to the United States of America in 1915 resulted in Grainger making his home there, and later becoming an American citizen. As always his mother went with him. When his new adopted country entered the Great War he joined up as a US private without revealing his identity, but as was inevitable it was soon discovered, and he found himself transferred to an entertainment group as one of a band touring the country to arouse interest in the war effort and to encourage people to buy bonds. The two years he spent in the army were very happy ones in which he met and became friendly with people of every type. His famous “Country Gardens” dates from this period.

After the war Grainger and his mother remained in America. The devotion between the two was a deep one, in fact he included her maiden name in those he adopted as a composer. His work appears as written by Percy Aldridge Grainger. It was a bitter blow for the musician when the bonds of affection which had always bound them together were severed by his mother’s death in 1922.

Two years later Grainger became a vegetarian, not so much because he had a strong conviction himself on the subject, but on the suggestion of a woman convert. He agreed then that he would never again eat anything that “wagged a tail”, an undertaking that he kept in spite of the fact that he disliked vegetables. His diet consisted mainly of hard bread, cheese, cereals and fruit.

During his Australian tour of 1926, Grainger gave a large sum of money to the Lady Northcote Permanent Orchestra Trust Fund. Such gifts were typical of him. From the earliest days when he began to earn big money from music he had helped others, at one period he was supporting wholly, nine dependants and contributing towards the upkeep of fourteen others.

Writing for the Australian Press during the 1926 tour, Grainger gave some of his ideas on music and catholicity. “Have you ever thought,” he asked, how much treasure there is in the hidden music of the world? I should like to see the foundation of an International Musical Society which would conduct tours all over the world for the presentation of the music of all countries of the world – China, Japan, Greenland, Polynesia, India Persia, Africa and all the rest. What is keeping music back is the thought that the music of Europe is the music of the world.”

PERCY GRAINGER FALLS IN LOVE

There were rumours while he was in Australia that Grainger had fallen in love with Ella Viola Strom, a Swedish poetess and painter. When questioned regarding her Grainger would not commit himself, except to say “Miss Strom is the very prototype of a radiant Nordic, as lovely as the morning to look upon, and a regular Amazon to walk, run, swim, dance and play games.”

And Grainger wooed and won his “Nordic princess.” The couple were married in Hollywood in 1928. The wedding festivities included a concert in the famous Bowl to which 20,000 guests were invited. Grainger composed a March especially for the occasion.

This marriage proved to be a rare one, a truly happy partnership between two people peculiarly suited to one another. Both of them enjoyed their own means of expression and although interested in each other’s work, kept their realms of art separate. However, they both shared a leaning towards the inclusion of unusual instrumental combinations in symphony orchestras. (Cont.)
The virile music of this great Australian composer comes from a healthy mind. He loved wide open spaces, the blue sky, work, workers and everything natural. He was always at his happiest when, in shorts and with a rucksack on his back, walking in the countryside. During one stay in Australia he walked eighty miles [128km] of the way from Adelaide to Mt. Gambier, through the desert from Tüllim Bend to Keith, just to get the “smell” of the country into his system. Nobody on the road guessed that the small hatless man with the heavy swag was a world-famed musician.

On arrival at one little bush public house the hostess regarded him with immediate suspicion. When he said that he was a musician he was asked to oblige by playing a tune, and he immediately played himself into the hearts of the company present. Afterwards the hostess confided to him that one had to be careful of tramps. He left without revealing his identity.

Another of Grainger’s eccentricities is the manner in which he would arrive at a concert. Wearing old clothes, and still with the rucksack on his back, he would turn up just before the performance. Delving into his pack he would produce his evening suit, a 1909 model, and he would change then and there. When he crossed the stage the suit would “eddy and flap about his slight figure, and he often had to hitch up his trousers as he walked to and from the piano.”

Sometimes a caretaker, on going his rounds after a concert, would find the inert figure of a man lying full length on the piano top. On closer examination the man was found to be Grainger, taking a quiet nap after the exertions of the evening.

On one occasion Grainger’s peculiarities of dress led to his being taken into custody. It was in Wausau, Wisconsin, and Grainger had arrived by train for the concert, dressed as usual more like a tramp than anything else, and not travelling as a person of importance and of world fame. In the belief that he was a vagrant who had “jumped” the train the local police took him to the goal. Here he was asked his name, and replied frankly, “Percy Grainger,” to which the Police Chief answered, “yes, and mine’s William Tell,” a reply which the Chief was finally convinced of the identity of his prisoner by the concert promoters his chagrin was deep indeed, especially since he was going to the concert to hear Grainger play.

As regards to the material from which Grainger’s clothes were made, he possessed an overwhelming preference for towelling. He said that it was the most sensible wear for either winter warmth or summer coolness, and whenever he and his wife came across a particularly colourful towelling in the stores they would buy a large quantity, and would soon afterwards appear in brand new shorts, jackets, skirts and capes. Says Grainger “I should prefer to appear in them at concerts, but it might cause talk and that would mean injecting my personality into the music. I am against the injection of personality into music of any kind.” He would then go on with a tirade against his own personality – “Furthermore, I have always hated my personality – it’s one of the most unfortunate I have ever encountered.”

The years have in no way dimmed the glory of Percy Grainger. Acclaimed a prodigy at the beginning of the century, with twenty-five years of sustained success as a concert performer, his withdrawal from the public stage to give more time to composition did not detract from his fame. A Grainger recital was always a drawcard. Although he avoided publicity whenever he could, he remained almost a god on the concert platforms of the United States.

Esteemed by most American music authorities as the finest interpreter of Bach they had ever heard. Percy Grainger had one of the greatest classical repertoires of any virtuoso. His eccentricities on the concert platform brought him closer to the audience than the orthodox behaviour of the ordinary platformer. When interpreting one of the great masters, he was just as likely to interpolate a cadenza of his own, or even a whole movement, if he felt so inclined. He was also apt to give a running commentary as he played, sometimes stopping in mid-passage to pass on an interesting thought or anecdote to the listeners. He had, also, a rare point of view regarding his earnings. He could demand his own figure in payment for a concert, but he did not do so. He would accept no more than five hundred dollars because he felt the managements did all the work. He was just as happy playing with a school orchestra for nothing as he was on a famous concert platform.

For many years Percy Grainger was at work on his autobiography, but was not sure about it being published. “Certainly it won’t be published in my time” he would say, and then would add, and no doubt with a twinkle in his eye, “I would be put in prison immediately.”

Such is the story of Percy Grainger, a modest man, dismayed in his early years by the brilliance of his success as a concert performer. This son of Melbourne became a world figure, for he won fame not only as a great virtuoso, but as one of the world’s leading contemporary composers. Percy Grainger and his music, will live on in our hearts and minds the world over forever.

He died at New York on 20th February 1961, and is now buried in the family grave at Adelaide, South Australia.
A DIRECT link exists between credit and wealth creation or economic prosperity.

Lest there should be any doubt about that statement simply look at the activities of the Nobel Peace Prize winning Bangladeshi banker Mohammas Yunus and his Grameen bank. The Grameen bank makes available credit to the poor of Asia to enter into business enterprises. The credit extended is only small but the results are enterprises that create either self-employment or employ others and make the poor richer increasing the wealth of their nation.

On a larger scale this is how wealth was created in the industrialised Western world. Bank credit extended to entrepreneurs was transformed into business enterprises and industries creating real wealth.

The fact that the credit is created out of thin air by the lending authority, the banks, makes the process seem like some sort of magic converting the imaginary into the real and substantial.

All money is credit (from the Latin credo meaning “I believe”). If someone believes something is worth exchanging goods or services for, then that something functions as money. Throughout history various items at various times in various places have functioned as money—salt, shells, stones, feathers, cattle, sheep, cowhide, gems, gold, silver, paper, cigarettes, etc. Money is simply a belief system. All money is credit.

The money we use today, the notes and coin issued by the government, represent a quota (about 10%) of the total annual credit issued by the commercial banks of the nation. This quota is designed to meet the demands of the public for cash transactions, but the money that gets businesses operating and gets things done in society is bank credit. The total of bank credit plus savings deposits in banks plus cash issued by the government is the money supply. The amount of credit a bank can issue is directly related to the money it holds as deposits from the public. It is in the ratio of 90 units of credit per 10 units of deposits. A bank with $10 million in deposits can issue credit worth $90 million at any given time. That is, it can create $90 million in new money that did not exist before.

Banks have a monopoly on credit. Every time a bank extends credit it creates new money out of thin air by the mere stroke of a pen. It creates a belief that the person getting the credit can obtain goods or services at the behest of the bank. In effect the lending bank is merely honouring its own cheques out of savings held on deposit. Banks do not lend money; they extend credit, no cash changes hands. And every extension of credit, by creating new money, inflates the total money supply in society causing the units of currency held by each individual to diminish in value. That is “inflation” and its effect.

Inflation occurs not merely because the banks have created new money but because the supply of goods and services lags behind such creation. If the new goods and services were available to the public at the same time as the new money was created there would be no inflation, prices and currency values would be stable. This problem was discerned by Scottish-born Major C. H. Douglas who devised the concept of “Social Credit” as a means of countering the banks’ monopoly of credit and the process of inflation.

The Social Credit is the entire wealth of a nation, its productive assets and infrastructure. This wealth has been created by labour funded by past credit and is society’s heritage. While the wealth may be privately or publicly owned, in toto it belongs to every member of society as his heritage. Society advances and progresses on the legacy of our forefathers, it does not progress in isolation from that Social Credit. One reason hippie communes fail as social and economic enterprises is because, like Robinson Crusoe, they have no Social Credit to back them up. The tale of Robinson Crusoe exemplifies that fact.

If the nation’s Social Credit were given a monetary value and this was used as the basis of the money supply on which to extend credit to new entrepreneurs then inflation should not occur. When the new enterprise comes onstream producing new goods or services entering the community it immediately increases the total Social Credit money supply and has an effect to lower prices of those goods or services because more are available to the community in the marketplace. Therefore the value of the currency held by each individual rises as prices fall and purchasing power increases when the new enterprise comes onstream—the opposite to what currently happens under the bank credit inflation system. Profit, instead of being measured in arithmetical denominations of more money held by the business or individual would be gauged by increased value of money earned or held.

The prospect is for societies to rely on the exploitative money market (Cont.)
of the commercial banks for their credit or rely on their own credit and create their own wealth free of money market debt by using their Social Credit. This is important for "poor" countries such as Timor Leste (East Timor) who can go into massive debt by relying on external loans for financing their development or, by judicious creation of their own credit—even utilising the existing bank credit system to set up a National Development Bank to issue credit to government like the original Australian Commonwealth Bank—can stay free of massive debt and the tentacles of commercial banks.

Douglas believed that if a Social Credit monetary system were introduced in any given country then workers would have the real prospect of being able to save enough money to enter into a business undertaking without going cap-in-hand to a bank for a loan (credit) as happens at present. This would promote Free Enterprise freed of the banks' control over who can go into what business. He called this process Economic Democracy, the only type of democracy which is important and worth having, the ability to earn a living free of state interference or control.

Douglas also saw that industrial nations had reached a stage where many people were redundant to the industrial economy. Experience of the Great War showed him that all the goods and services needed to sustain the nation could be produced by just one-fifth of the available workforce, so four-fifths were redundant. Further, people were continually being made redundant by automation as some of the best minds in the business tried to put people out of work replacing them with machines and robots. Therefore he proposed that since there was no need for most of the people to have to work to earn a living, but just to serve as a means of recycling wealth by consuming goods and services, the government should pension off four-fifths of the workforce with a national stipend sufficient to maintain them in a dignified lifestyle and allow volunteers making up one-fifth of the labour force to do the available work required of an ever-diminishing workforce.

A glance at the composition of the Australian (and US) economy between productive enterprises (28% of the labour force) and services (72%) that recycle the wealth of the production sector show Douglas' ideas are certainly rational if presently politically unpalatable. The Protestant "work ethic" has

The manipulation of money and credit creation affects every country in the world, in peace or conflict. It is little understood by ordinary people as well as most bankers, accountants and economists. Credit creation is not a popular topic in the world of finance. The less the average citizen knows, the easier the money trick is played out. An informed population can take steps to end this dictatorship of finance so the power of credit can be harnessed for the common good, not for greed and power.

The Social Credit is the entire wealth of a nation, its productive assets and infrastructure. This wealth has been created by labour funded by past credit and is society's heritage.
What are keylines and how do they work?

The key feature of keyline farming systems is to increase organic matter in the soil which, in turn, will increase soil productivity. Biologically fertile soil has better structure and reduces run-off, so limiting erosion and salinity problems.

Keyline farming practices were first developed by Percival Yeomans in the early 1940s. His philosophy was that permanent agriculture must materially benefit the farmer, the land and the soil. Keyline farming aims to increase the productivity of the soil to levels greater than were present before the land was farmed, to the point where the soil does not need or respond to chemically processed fertiliser. The emphasis is placed on improving soil and increasing soil organic matter by deep non-inversion tillage combined with cyclic high-density grazing or mowing.

Keyline Planning

A keyline design is unique to each property and will be formed from evaluation of water movements over the land with the idea of controlling and making use of this resource in the management of the land. Water movement over the land and the land’s features are directly related to each other, and water resources can only be used if they can be controlled. Other factors such as climate, geology and rainfall patterns originally determined the land’s topography. Water is the main focus in keyline planning as this is one variable which is easily controlled and manipulated.

Keyline Cultivation

Once the keypoints and keylines have been identified the control of water movement over the land can be achieved through a keyline pattern of cultivation. Keyline cultivation aims to spread the run-off water away from the centre of the valley to minimise the flow concentration in this area. By cultivating parallel to identified keylines, both above and below the line, a cultivation pattern is developed which spreads the run-off evenly across the valley and does not allow the water to follow its natural path and concentrate in the valleys. This aids in the stabilisation of the valley and increases its ability to resist erosion and wash-outs.

Primary Land Forms

Main ridge: The land between the junction of two watercourses looking upstream.

Primary valley: Moving along a main ridge, the succession of valleys which fall from both sides of the main ridge towards the stream course below.

Primary ridge: On each side of a primary valley lies a primary ridge, the two primary ridges give the primary valley between them its shape.

Keypoint: Occurs at the base of the steepest part of the slope in the centre line of a primary valley.

Keyline: The keyline of a valley is a contour line that runs through the keypoint; the ends of a keyline are where the contour changes direction from valley to ridge.

Water Control

Water control is paramount in keyline designs and water lines are fundamental to the planning process. A water line is a predictable path of movement for water, either natural or artificial. Natural water lines include stream courses and water divides, while artificial water lines are constructed to divert water from a natural water divide and into dams and channels. All other aspects of farm construction such as roads, tree lines and fencing need to take water lines into consideration. Keylines, keypoints and keyline cultivation are used firstly to identify water lines and then to control the water and allow it to be stored or put to use irrigating surrounding country. Keyline principles emphasise that the cheapest storage of farm water from rainfall is in the soil itself. This storage system is increased greatly by deep non-inversion tillage and subsequent enhanced fertility. Keyline design also aims to make use of water from rainfall by diverting and storing the run-off for future use. The construction of artificial water lines is used to control and divert water to storage dams. In keyline planning a series of dams equipped with a lock-pipe system are positioned throughout a property to allow water to be stored and then used for irrigation. A pipe positioned beneath the wall of the dam allows stored water to be gravity fed from the dam into a channel for irrigation. Keyline design allows for the irrigation of undulating country by understanding a few of the principles of water movement in these areas. In undulating country a large stream of water will concentrate in the valleys. This can be overcome by using the keyline pattern of irrigation that spreads the water by spilling it gently over a wide section of the irrigation channel onto land which has been cultivated using the keyline pattern of cultivation. Improvement of the overall sustainability of the farming practice through less erosion and salinity and more fertile soils is achieved through the control and efficient use of water in a well-designed and planned layout of the property.

Opium grown in Afghanistan could be used legally to deal with a chronic shortage of pain-killers, British doctors said.

Afghanistan produces 90 per cent of the world’s illegal opium. The British Medical Association, which represents Britain’s doctors, added its voice to critics of Western anti-narcotics policy which is trying to stamp out the Afghan opium industry.

Afghanistan’s Western Allies say the drugs industry finances Taliban insurgents but acknowledge that it also provides livelihoods for millions of Afghans.

The BMA said the opiate-based drug diamorphine, used to relieve pain, was in short supply yet it could be produced legally from Afghan poppies.

Afghanistan’s pro-Western Government opposes any cultivation and favours destroying the crops, though only after farmers are given other ways to earn their living.

Britain is the main Western donor supporting Afghanistan’s anti-drug policy.

The BMA’s head of science and ethics, Vivienne Nathanson, told BBC: “While we have such a dramatic shortage of diamorphine, it does seem that, as the crop is there, rather than destroy it let’s at least harvest it and use it medicinally.”

Dr. Nathanson said the shortage stemmed from a global move, led by the US, to avoid the use of diamorphine, though doctors in Britain and other European countries favoured the drug over other pain-killers.

However, Britain’s Department of Health said the shortage of the drug was because of limited production and not the lack of the raw product. It said supply should improve this year.

The Foreign Office said the idea of using opium to make legal medicines had been considered in the past by the Afghan Government and rejected.

A spokesman said: “Illicit cultivation is not the way forward.” Officials say there was a record harvest for opium production in Afghanistan last year (2006) and that efforts to combat the drugs trade showed little signs of success.

Much of Afghanistan’s illegal opium comes from the southern province of Helmand, where British troops are fighting the Taliban-led insurgency as part of a NATO force.

Nearly 50 British soldiers have been killed in Afghanistan since the Taliban government fell in 2001.


Tall poppies: Mohammad Agha inspects his opium crop in southern Afghanistan.

"Today the world is the victim of propaganda because people are not intellectually competent. More than anything, the United States needs effective citizens competent to do their own thinking.” William Mather Lewis

In a continuing effort by the best-seller author of Future Fastforward, the erudite scholar of political intrigue and conspiracy, Matthias Chang, sets forth the modus operandi of the Zionist masterminds to brainwash and program the minds of the peoples of the world to achieve their goal of global domination. Tracing back four decades and more, Brainwashed for War Programmed to Kill documents atrocities carried out by the forces of imperialism to subjugate the citizens of the world.

Replete with documentary evidence, the volume exposes the vile propaganda warfare, mind-control and brainwashing operations carried out by some of the most powerful clandestine intelligence agencies in the world – which includes Israel’s Mossad, the CIA and the M16 – and how these operations have come to impact upon our lives today.

Included in this opus of veritable knowledge for our future true independence and freedom are 14 appendices containing historical speeches and literature, declassified top secret documents and intelligence doctrines – of which all but three are reproduced in full – amounting to 200 pages of ardously researched must-read background information!

Matthias Chang is a Chinese Catholic and a barrister of 29 years who once served as the political secretary to former Malaysian Prime Minister Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamad. It is the earnest desire of the author that the people of America wake up to the reality of our calamitous situation to become one with humanity at large; to recognize all human beings as a part of the divine whole (not by class or religious differences) and to free themselves from the mental enslavement of the imperialist power elites.

Matthias Chang’s Brainwashed for War Programmed to Kill: The Zionist Global War Agenda

The Companion to the Bestseller Future Fastforward

HOW WE BECAME WAR JUNKIES

Available from Australian Heritage Society. See order form in this issue.

Softcover: 556 pages.
MORE than three-quarters of Australian teenagers do not know that Australia Day commemorates the arrival of the First Fleet and the beginning of British settlement.

A report commissioned by federal, state and territory education ministers shows an overwhelming majority of school children are also ignorant of the reason for Anzac Day, or for the inclusion of the Union Jack on the Australian flag.

About 77 per cent of Year 10 students and 93 per cent of Year 6 students across the nation cannot nominate the official responsibilities of the Governor-General, and the great majority do not know the Queen is Australia's head of state.

The report which is yet to be released but has been obtained by The Australian, reveals surprisingly high levels of ignorance about basic historical facts and Australia's system of government, and question the effectiveness of the teaching of civics and citizenship.

"The widespread ignorance of key information about national events and nationally representative symbols, which, it had generally been assumed, had been taught to death in Australian schools, was a surprise", the report says. "More targeted teaching is required if students are to learn about these things. Formal, consistent instruction has not been the experience of Australian students in civics and citizenship."

The report says only high performing students "demonstrated any precision in describing the symbolism of the Union Jack in the Australian flag."

Regarding the students' lack of understanding of the role of the governor-general, the report says "One can only infer that students are not being taught about the role of the governor-general.

"Many of the year 10 students clearly did not have the knowledge outlined ... as being designated for year 6," the report says. "This was especially the case in relation to information about the constitutional structure of Australian democracy in Year 10."

The report was prepared for the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs by the Australian Council for Educational Research.

STUDENTS IGNORANT OF AUSTRALIAN HISTORY

Lacking Knowledge

Proportion of students who do not know what Australia Day Commemorates
Year 6 - 84% Year 10 - 77%
Do not know why Australia Day is known as invasion day
Year 6 - 80% Year 10 - 65%
Do not know the main function of the Governor General
Year 6 - 93% Year 10 - 77%

Source: Australian Council for Educational Research

It tested about 10,000 Year 10 students and 10,000 Year 6 students in every state and territory.

Federal Education Minister Julie Bishop said the ignorance of Australian students about their own country revealed in the report underlined the need for the federal Government's push for Australian history to be taught as a compulsory, stand-alone subject in years 9 and 10.

"It is disappointing that so few Australian students know the basic facts about our national events and icons such as Anzac Day and the Australian Flag," She said. "I am concerned that only a small minority of year 10 students know the reason for the national public holiday on Australia Day."

"Young Australians have the right to vote at 18 years of age and should have knowledge about our nation's history and traditions." She said.

The Howard Government introduced a Discovering Democracy program in 1997, producing and placing curriculum materials on civics and citizenship in all primary and secondary schools in 1998. The program aimed to promote students' participation in democratic processes by equipping them with the knowledge, skills, values and dispositions of active and informed citizenship."

According to the federal Education Department, "it entails knowledge and understanding of Australia's democratic heritage and traditions, its political and legal institutions and the shared values of freedom, tolerance, respect, responsibility and inclusion". In August 2006, education ministers approved national Statements of Learning for Civics and Citizenship, setting out common knowledge all students should possess in years 3, 5, 7 and 9, ahead of national assessment tests from 2008.

The report says half of Year 6 students achieved a proficient standard in the test, while 39 per cent of Year 10 students reached the proficient standard.
It says the level of ignorance will restrict students’ involvement in democratic processes.

“Ignorance of such fundamental information indicates a lack of knowledge of the history of our democratic processes.”

“Ignorance of such fundamental information indicates a lack of knowledge of the history of our democratic tradition, and this ignorance will permeate and restrict the capacity of students to make sense of many other aspects of Australian democratic forms and processes,” it says.

“Without the basic understandings, they will be unable to engage in a meaningful way in many other levels of action or discourse.”

The report identifies two main concepts with which students struggle the most “iconic knowledge” of Australia’s heritage and the idea of the common good. Students had difficulty grasping the idea of a common good or strategies that refer to how individuals can influence systems for the benefit of society.

“It is unclear whether students do not have such a concept at all, do not believe in the common good or do not see how individuals can act for the common good.” The report says.


THE JUDAS GOATS The Enemy Within By Michael Collins Piper

The shocking story of the infiltration and subversion of the American Nationalist movement

In a time of tsunamic ideological shifts, in which audacious groups propagandists are relentlessly engaged in frenzied efforts to rewrite the facts of history, to challenge these truth-twisters Michael Collins Piper arrives: The American Voltaire, an enlightened thinker and polemicist who has no fear of confronting harsh realities, doing so with elegance and verve.

In recent years Piper has emerged as the unrivalled ambassador of the American nationalist movement to peoples all across the planet: from Moscow to Abu Dhabi to Kuala Lumpur and on to Tokyo and Toronto. In no uncertain terms, he has issued a clarion call – a rallying cry – for all of us to join together, to reclaim our heritage and to sweep away the corruption of international capital and the consequent malign force that’s come in its wake, driving our world to the brink of nuclear annihilation.

Piper’s message is loud and clear: real Americans do not support the Zionist scheme to exploit America’s military might to conquer the globe; that good people who oppose the Zionist Imperium must put aside differences and close ranks, united for the final battle. Passionate, making no pretence of being without bias, Piper identifies and savages those who manifest attitudes of open hatred for nationalism and freedom. Having fashioned historical writings into an art form, Piper has no peers. Nor are there many who speak truth to power as Piper does so well.

Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Weisenthal Centre has said that, because Piper criticizes Israel, he is “anti-American.” In fact, Piper’s work proves precisely how pro-American he is.

-Ryu Ohta, Chairman of the Society for the Critique of Contemporary Civilisation. He is based in Tokyo, Japan.

Further recommended reading:

Final Judgement
Michael Collins Piper
The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination
Softcover: 768 pages: $54.95 Posted

Dirty Secrets - Michael Collins Piper
Crimes - Conspiracy and Cover-Up in the 20th Century.
Softcover: 250 pages: $42.95 Posted.
THE BATTLE of BANNOCKBURN, 1314.

Many would have seen and enjoyed Mel Gibson's great film "BRAVEHEART" based on the events of Scotland's struggle for independence from England. The film demonstrates how the Scots, led by the great Scottish Freedom Fighter and hero Sir William Wallace, fought and beat the English Army which was under the command of the Earl of Surrey, at "Stirling Bridge" on the 13th September 1297.

In the film, Sir William Wallace was played by the world renowned actor Mel Gibson. The film won five Academy Awards in 1995.

SIR WILLIAM WALLACE, FREEDOM FIGHTER, HERO AND MARTYR

The angry English King Edward I. Commonly known as 'longshanks' due to his long legs, returned to England from France, and put together a powerful and well-trained army, which then attacked Wallace's smaller Scots army at "Falkirk".

Wallace had taken up a strong defensive position; many of his brave Scots Infantry were armed with long spears which prevented the English horsemen from riding them down.

In the film it shows Wallace's Cavalry deserting him, which did in fact happen, but the major factor in the Scots defeat at "Falkirk" in 1298, was due to the fact that Edward's Army had too many of the famous English Longbowmen, who poured their deadly and accurate arrows into the Scots army at short range.

Later came the capture of Sir William Wallace. He was transported to London where he was imprisoned, tried and sentenced to death by the means of beheading, drawing and quartering of his body. His body parts were then delivered to a number of Scottish Nobles, as a warning what would befall them if they persisted in opposing the crown. This event was in the year of our Lord 1305.

Many Australian's may still remember the lovely Scottish song "Loch Lomand".

"Me and my True Love will never meet again. By the bonnie banks of Loch Lomand.

Y'll take the high road,
And I'll take the low road,
And I'll be in Scotland afore ye."

This song is said to represent Wallace telling a person very dear to him, that the Spirit of the dead Wallace would fly back to Scotland faster than his companion could by the land road.

The brutal killing of Wallace gave Scotland a Martyr. Wallace's Spirit would give courage to the Scots at the battle of "Bannockburn" some few years later.

THE STRUGGLE FOR SCOTTISH INDEPENDENCE

Under their King, Robert The Bruce, the Scots carried on their struggle for independence.

In Scotland the English had garrisons of soldiers stationed in castles to suppress the Scots. The most important and strategic of these was Stirling Castle on the Southeast edge of the Highlands, and the controlling of the main crossing of the river Forth.

The English were besieged in Stirling Castle by the Scots. In that period of history, often an arrangement was made between the soldiers defending a castle, and those troops attempting to capture it. The Castle Commander could proposition the force attacking him "we have food and supplies in our castle to defend it for so many days. If at the end of the specified period, my allies have not arrived, then I pledge to surrender our castle to your forces." With Stirling Castle the surrender date was set for the 24th June 1324.

By the year 1314 the capable and competent King Edward I was dead, and his son Edward 11 was now King of England. Edward 11 was not the man his father was, the film "Braveheart" again suggests this.

None the less Edward 11 put together a powerful army of 20,000 men, and set out to relieve Stirling Castle before its surrender date.

Robert The Bruce, with his smaller army of 8,000 men, had, had the time to select a strong position astride the English approach road to Stirling Castle. With his army to protect the right flank and front, Bruce had pits dug in the ground, in which sharpened wooden stakes were placed, and then camouflaged by a covering of thick foliage. Bruce also had metal Caltrops made, and were placed on the ground to cripple the English horsemen. These consisted of four sided iron pieces with sharp points so that when arranged and scattered on the ground one point always stood upwards, thus spiking the hooves of the horses causing acute lameness and agony.

THE SURRENDER OF STIRLING CASTLE

Bruce's Scots Infantry and small Cavalry Unit, with their long spears would stop the English Cavalry charge, although due to the English Army numbers, and Edward's highly skilled and well-trained units of the famous Longbow archers, an English victory appeared to be assured. The English Army was running behind time to keep Stirling Castle from surrendering to the Scots. On the 22nd June 1314, two days before the castle's pledged surrender, Bruce learnt of the English Army's advance from Edinburgh, and that the army was taking the route along the Old Roman Road. Bruce marched his men into their prepared positions across the road, blocking the English advance. On the Scots left the ground slopes (Cont.)
down to the river Forth and marshy tidal flats. Across the front of the Scots Army ran the little river Bannock as it flowed down to join the Forth. On the afternoon of the next day the 23rd June, Edward's troops weary from forced marching came in sight of the blocking Scots army.

As the van of Edward's army approached the Scots army, Robert The Bruce was out in the front of his forces making his final adjustments. He was not attired for battle and was astride a medium sized riding horse or pony in place of his great War Horse; he wore only his Crown for identification, and carried in his hand his favourite Battle Axe.

Seeing Bruce on his own, the English mounted Knight Sir Henry de Bohun, lowered his lance into the attack position and galloped furiously at the Scots King. If the English Knight hoped for the satisfaction of seeing the King of Scotland flee to the safety of his troops he was to be sadly mistaken.

In the spirit of the late William Wallace, Bruce did not decline the unequal encounter, but instead raced towards the Knight. Just as they were about to clash, Bruce pulled his light horse swiftly out to the side, and as the English Knight's lance harmlessly passed him by, Bruce swung his horse in sharply, and killed his adversary with a mighty blow, and split the Knight's helmet and head through, but in the process broke his own favourite Battle Axe.

The surrender of Stirling Castle under its Commander Sir Robert Mowbray could now be at the most only hours away. Edward sent about 500 Cavalry across low ground near the river Forth, to relieve the castle. This would allow with honour, its garrison to sortie out and attack a Scots flank in the battle. While this English flanking force nearly succeeded in reaching the castle, Bruce saw them in time and drove them back in disarray and disorder.

One would assume the best course for Edward's Army would have been to destroy the Scots force with his famous English and Welsh bowmen. But that night Edward took his army on a detour march around the left flank of the Scots Army on the low ground near the river Forth. One has to ask, had the events of the 23rd discouraged Edward?

Was he not thinking straight? He must have been desperate to save Stirling Castle due to the castle's surrender the next day? Maybe he intended to attack the Scots Army on its vulnerable left wing?

Midsummer nights in Scotland are short, and when the sun rose on the 24th June 1314, Edward's Army was in a disorganized state. Many of his 'heavy' Knights were struggling in the mud, and his army was not formed up ready for battle. Some of his troops were still crossing the Bannock River or "Bunn".

Bruce saw his golden opportunity. He seized the moment and wheeled his infantry with their long spears to face his left flank, and launched them down the slope into Edward's army, bringing even further confusion to the English troops.

The nimble light English archers may still have saved the day, running out onto the far flank they began to form into formation, and to pour their deadly arrows into the Scots.

Again Robert The Bruce rose to the occasion, charging them with his Cavalry and dispersing the archers before they could begin to reform into their fighting formation.

By now, Edward's army was in a sorry plight. Routted by Bruce's hardy Scots, the escape to their rear was blocked by the Forth and Bannock rivers. The English casualties were heavy. The battle of Bannockburn had been hard fought and won by the brave Scots.

THE SEQUEL TO "BANNOCKBURN"

This was long before the future Protestant Reformation; it appears all the Christian nations of Europe held their lands as a form of tenants to the Pope in Rome.

Following "the Battle of Bannockburn" either:

(a) Edward II beaten in the field but representing a larger nation than Scotland, petitioned the Pope to again place the Scots under English control.
(b) Or the Pope approached Edward seeking more soldiers for the Middle East Crusades.

Edward's reply may have been that it would be easy to give the Pope his required soldiers, if in return the Pope would then take the appropriate steps to hand Scotland over to England, and thus place Scotland under English control once more.

SCOTTISH DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

On learning of this plan, King Robert The Bruce with approximately forty of his Nobles, checkmated Edward diplomatically by signing and issuing their "Scottish Declaration of Independence". This was signed at Arbroath Abbey on the 6th April 1320. The original document can still be seen in Edinburgh today.

From the wording of this document as well as reading between the lines the Scots gave a strong message to the then reigning Pope John X X I I . They pointed out that they were a small nation, and did not covet the possessions of others.

That England was large and ambitious, that its area once consisted of seven individual kingdoms. The Scots hinted that if something became too large and too centralized it may become a "Pawn of Satan".

The Scots reminded Pope John that their ancestry went back to Abraham and the Holy Land of Israel, and was second to none, and no doubt purer than the English ancestry.

They reminded the Pope how their ancestors had migrated to Scotland via the Straits of Gibraltar, Spain and Ireland.

Then for good measure the Scots threw in some heavy guns. They said that the gentle Saint Andrew, the first Disciple (Cont.)
to follow their Creator’s son Jesus, and who was brother to the blessed Peter, had chosen to be the Scots Patron and Protector. The Scots also mentioned that freedom was God-given, and that they valued their freedom fiercely, so much so, that should England invade Scotland again, they would defend themselves to the last man standing.

The Pope concentrating upon the Crusades in the Middle East, had no wish to see fighting amongst his extended family, therefore Edward lost the peace, as well as the war.

In real life as in the film “Braveheart” Edward’s marriage to the French Queen Isabella was not a happy one. Edward was murdered in Berkshire Castle on the 21st September 1327.

**FREEDOM REQUIRES CONSTANT VIGILANCE**

Freedom can never be taken for granted. There is always someone or something, for example tyrannical laws and legislation, constantly trying to wrest from us our God-given rights as individuals and the right to choose. Today our battles are fought mostly via the pen and the Ballot box.

In such uncertain times as the present day, we should take time to reflect upon some of the great people of our past Heritage. Men like Banjo Paterson, Henry Lawson, Clifford Hugh Douglas and the late Eric D. Butler who passed away in 2006, and many more, who have fought the battle of hard-won freedom. But of course the greatest of all being our Creator’s Son, the man from Galilee.

While I am grateful of my ancestry and heritage, which comes from all corners of the British Isles, as well as the Netherlands [Holland] this article is written with my “Blair” pen.

The British Historian Donald Featherstone gives an excellent account of the famous battle of “Bannockburn” I have taken the liberty and borrowed some of his words for this article. I say thank you to him.

**Australian Constitutional Brochures and Australian Flag Stickers**

For those wishing to purchase our informative Australian Constitutional Brochures and Australian Flag Stickers:

**Please Write To:**
Mr Ron Barnett
46 Dennis Street
Lakemba, Sydney, NSW 2195

**Australian Flag Stickers**
- Large $1.00 ea
- Australian Flag Stickers
- Small $1.00 per sheet
- Australian Flag Stickers
- Small Free Limit of 5 (9x7cm)

Postage on Stickers Add 50c (Postage Stamps are acceptable).

All Brochures $8.00 per hundred plus $2.50 Postage.

Note: Postage may vary for out of State customers.

Please make Cheques / Money Orders Payable To: R. Barnett.

Credit Card Payment NOT accepted

Prompt Service Guaranteed

**Song Of the Bow**

What of the bow?
The bow was made in England:
Of true wood of yew wood,
The wood of English bows;
So men who are free love the old yew tree
And the land where the yew tree grows.

What of the cord?
The cord was made in England:
A rough cord, a tough cord,
A cord that bowmen love;
So we'll drain our jacks
To the English flax
And the land where the hemp was wove.

What of the shaft?
The shaft was cut in England:
A long shaft, a strong shaft,
Barbed and trim and true;
So we'll drink together
To the grey goose feather
And the land where the grey goose flew.

What of the men?
The men were bred in England:
The Bowman - the yeoman -
The lads of dale and fell.
Here's to you - and to you!
To the hearts that are true
And the land where the true hearts dwell.

**Arthur Conan Doyle**
The Common Man Of England
(Written on St George's Day, 1945, two weeks before VE-Day)

There's a crowd on Heaven's wall today
A throng at St. Peter's Gate;
As the long night ends in the morning,
They are gathering their to wait -
Just as if they hadn't seen this thing
A hundred times before -
The Common Man of England
Coming home again from war.

They are lining in their thousands
The rampart of the years;
Crusaders of the Lionheart,
Who fell on Acre's shore,
And brave King Harry's archers
From the field of Agincourt -
Mere Englishmen whose little ships
Destroyed the Spanish might,
And tars who sailed with Nelson
To win Trafalgar's fight.

Redcoat ranks from Plassey,
Quebec and Waterloo,
Who built a mighty Commonwealth
Far better than any they knew;
Men of Mons and Jutland,
The Somme and Suvla Bay,

The Navy crew who stormed the Mole
Upon St. George's Day.

Men who dared and waited,
Deep beneath the cruel sea;
Who rode the skies in gimcrack planes
To fight for you and me.
And this man in shabby battledress
Has nothing here for shame,
In thinking of himself beside
Their thousand years of fame.
For he doffed his civvy jacket
To begin a job of work,
They brought him down from
Narvik's shore
To hell before Dunkirk.
To Alamein and Anzio,
To Crete and Mandalay,
And halfway across a continent
To meet his peers today.

As he stands to take their homage now
He knows them, every one
And each of them acknowledges
His body's true-born son.
The sweetest music ever,

The late 1960's and early 1970's
weren't only about Woodstock, flower
power and Vietnam moratoriums: at
the same time that feminism, multi-
culturalism and victim politics emerged,
the 'cultural warriors' of the left decided
that the quickest way to change society
was to take the long march through the
education system.

The result of these 'culture wars'?
Competition and rewarding merit are
replaced by the notion that everyone
succeeds; black armband history
teaches students to feel guilty about the
past; and the 3 R's are re-badge as
'reconciliation, the republic and refugees'.
Out the window go classic subjects and
tried-and-tested teaching methods and
in come 'outcomes-based education',
'whole language', fuzzy maths' and an
English syllabus which puts Big Brother
and Australian Idol on the same stage as
Shakespeare.

Ultimately, our kids are short-
changed and have little opportunity to
study history or literature in a systematic
or balanced way. And while the truancy
rate soars, academic standards plummet
and students are left morally adrift.

In Dumbing Down, acclaimed
education expert Dr. Kevin Donnelly
advocates an alternative based on a
liberal/humanist approach, where the
focus is on education, not indoctrination
and where students are taught to
think independently. Shocking and
enlightening Dumbing Down is essential
reading for anyone concerned about
how we can strengthen our education
system and safeguard the nation's future.

Available from Australian Heritage Society. See order form in this issue.
Worthless money ruins Zimbabwe

HARARE

Inflation in Zimbabwe has reached such proportions that it destroyed the value of the new national currency before a single banknote had been spent.

The world's highest inflation rate, which has risen to a record 1594 per cent, rendered the new money worthless before it could be distributed. Mounds of bank notes—all paid for in scarce hard currency—are lying unused in warehouses.

Against such economic upheaval, the regime spent $1.5 million on celebrating President Robert Mugabe's 83rd birthday which was on February 21st.

The public were asked to make donations. The regime ordered the new money from German firm Giesecke and Devrient in 2004.

At that time inflation was a relatively modest 400 per cent and Mr Mugabe was anxious to avoid the impression of economic chaos.

Jonathan Moyo, then information minister, disclosed that Mr Mugabe personally insisted a banknote of 1000 Zimbabwe dollars would be the highest denomination of the new currency.

“In early 2004, Mugabe thought that inflation had been conquered and refused to allow notes of a higher value,” Mr Moyo said.

But by the time the new currency had been printed, $21000 had a purchasing power of about 20c.

Rather than release a currency whose largest banknote is roughly the value of one tomato, the Reserve Bank in the capital Harare simply stockpiled the useless money.

Prices in Zimbabwe are doubling roughly every 30 days. By next month (March) the new currency's largest banknote will be worth about half a tomato.

Food prices are believed to be rising even faster than the general inflation rate.

One supermarket chain estimated grocery inflation was running at about 3000 per cent and predicted food prices would be changing hourly by May.

“To survive, we have to increase prices every time new stock arrives,” said the owner of one supermarket.

Inflation began accelerating after Mr Mugabe's regime crippled commercial agriculture—Zimbabwe's biggest export earner—by seizing white-owned farms.

Having disabled the engine of the economy and destroyed its tax base, the Government resorted to printing money to pay its bills.

This boosted inflation and drove down the value of the currency. Prices soared in 2005 when Mr Mugabe repaid Zimbabwe's debts to the International Monetary Fund.

The Reserve Bank accomplished this feat by the simple expedient of printing about $21 trillion.

Editor's note: The collective conscience of Australian's should be pricked by the state of affairs existing in this once prosperous nation of Zimbabwe [Rhodesia], which used to produce enough food for its own consumption and all surrounding nations. It was the Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser in his role of Chairman of the Commonwealth Heads of Government who played a definitive role in the hand-over of Zimbabwe to the dictator Robert Mugabe. If Zimbabwe had been left alone it would still be the 'jewel' of Africa, with one of the highest standards of living in the world for both Blacks and Whites.

I wonder what Malcolm Fraser is thinking now of his "fine achievement" regarding the state of affairs in Zimbabwe?
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"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2:38
HAS lived long enough to know that things never remain quite the same for very long. One of the things that has not changed all that much for me is the celebration of Christmas. It remains a time when I try to put aside the anxieties of the moment and remember that Christ was born to bring peace and tolerance to a troubled world.

The birth of Jesus naturally turns our thoughts to all new-born children and what the future holds for them. The birth of a baby brings great happiness - but then the business of growing up begins. It is a process that starts within the protection and care of parents and other members of the family - including the older generation. As with any team, there is strength in combination: what grandparent has not wished for the best possible upbringing for their grandchildren or felt an enormous sense of pride at their achievements?

But the pressures of modern life sometimes seem to be weakening the links which have traditionally kept us together as families and communities. As children grow up and develop their own sense of confidence and independence in the ever-changing technological environment, there is always the danger of a real divide opening up between young and old, based on unfamiliarity, ignorance or misunderstanding.

It is worth bearing in mind that all of our faith communities encourage the bridging of that divide. The wisdom and experience of the great religions point to the need to nurture and guide the young, and to encourage respect for the elderly. Christ himself told his disciples to let the children come to him, and Saint Paul reminded parents to be gentle with their children, and children to appreciate their parents. The scriptures and traditions of the other faiths enshrine the same fundamental guidance. It is very easy to concentrate on the differences between the religious faiths and to forget what they have in common - people of different faiths are bound together by the need to help the younger generation to become considerate and active citizens.

And there is another cause for hope that we can do better in the future at bridging the generation gap. As older people remain more active for longer, the opportunities to look for new ways to bring young and old together are multiplying.

As I look back on these past twelve months, marked in particular for me by the very generous response to my eightieth birthday, I especially value the opportunities I have had to meet young people. I am impressed by their energy and vitality, and by their ambition to learn and to travel.

It makes me wonder what contribution older people can make to help them realise their ambitions. I am reminded of a lady of about my age who was asked by an earnest, little granddaughter the other day “Granny, can you remember the Stone Age?” Whilst that may be going a bit far, the older generation are able to give a sense of context as well as the wisdom of experience which can be invaluable. Such advice and comfort are probably needed more often than younger people admit or older people recognise. I hope that this is something that all of us, young or old, can reflect on at this special time of year.

For Christians, Christmas marks the birth of our Saviour, but it is also a wonderful occasion to bring the generations together in a shared festival of peace, tolerance and goodwill.

I wish you all a very happy Christmas together.

---
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Fromelles causalities should be **HONOURED**

Ross McMullin writes on the worst 24 hours in Australian History

**ON JULY 19th, 1916, Australian soldiers participated in their first significant operation at the Western Front, near the French village of Fromelles. It was a disaster, with 5533 Australians becoming casualties in one night. Our casualty toll at Fromelles is equivalent to our total casualties in the Boer War, the Korean War and the Vietnam War put together.**

It was not just the worst night in Australian military history, but the most tragic 24 hours in Australia's entire history.

The Fromelles fiasco lacked the slightest redeeming tactical justification. It was conceived as a feint. The idea was to deter the Germans from transferring units from Fromelles to the Somme. But the plan was gravely flawed.

The Germans were well entrenched at Fromelles. Aided by higher ground, they could see the hasty preparations unfold. Furthermore British and Australian artillerymen, inexperienced and ill-prepared, were unable to deal with vital German positions, notably the lethal machine-gun strongpoint known as the Sugar Loaf.

**DISASTER PREDICTED**

Three Australian brigades attacked on July 19. The 15th Brigade, advancing opposite the unsubdued Sugar Loaf machine guns, had no chance. W.H. Downing was there, "Stammering scores of German machine guns spluttered violently," he wrote. "The air was thick with bullets, swishing in a flat criss-crossed lattice of death. Hundreds were mown down in the flicker of an eyelid like great rows of teeth knocked from a comb."

Observers groping for words to describe the indescribable resorted to analogies with butchers' premises. The 15th Brigade commander, the legendary Harold "Pompey" Elliott, was inconsolable. He was not the only Australian brigadier in tears.

Elliott, a brilliant tactician, had grasped that the operation was a looming calamity, and had unsuccessfully tried to prevent it. He was devastated by the disaster he had predicted.

Two rungs above Elliott in the military hierarchy was Richard Haking, a British corps commander. No one was more culpable for the worst 24 hours in Australian history than Haking. He persistently advocated that the attack should proceed, insisted that the infantry and artillery were able and eager to do it when they were not, and managed to persuade senior strategists who were distracted by developments elsewhere. Not even the fundamental aim of deceiving the enemy was achieved. With only two divisions attacking on a narrow front, it was obvious that this was not a substantial assault. Besides, the Germans obtained from a casualty or a prisoner a copy of the operations order, which told them it was a feint. Accordingly, they could transfer formations from the Fromelles sector to the Somme with impunity.

The way to keep the Germans guessing would have been to launch an artillery bombardment, or a series of cannonades, without sending infantry forward. At least the Germans may then have wondered whether an infantry attack might follow. Not even the appalling aftermath of the battle disturbed Haking's delusions.
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After the war Charles Bean’s official history outlined what had occurred in comprehensive measured detail. In contrasting style Elliott lambasted the “tactical abortion” of Fromelles in a controversial lecture not long before he committed suicide.

On July 19, 1916 when Elliott lost contact with the 60th Battalion commander, Geoff McCrae, he directed his intelligence officer, Dave Doyle, to get in touch with McCrae. Venturing into no-man’s-land, Doyle encountered exceptionally heavy machine-gun fire and considered his survival miraculous. Doyle could not find McCrae, the talented product of a well-known family prominent in the arts. McCrae, as with so many of his men, was already dead. Hardly any battalion anywhere during the war suffered more casualties more rapidly than the 60th did at Fromelles.

90 YEARS ON - LEST WE FORGET

Fifty years later, Doyle made a speech during a commemorative ceremony at the Shrine of Remembrance in Melbourne. From the perspective of July 1966, Doyle said, when a single death or injustice was front-page news, it was bewildering that the catastrophe of Fromelles had received such little attention.

On the 90th Anniversary of the battle July 19, 2006 there was another ceremony at the Shrine, a gathering arranged by the Friends of the 15th Brigade. This organisation has made an admirable contribution, enlightening descendents of Fromelles casualties about what happened to their relatives. There were many at the Shrine who knew nothing about Fromelles until recently.

Australians should remember McCrae and the thousands of his comrades who suffered and died during the worst night this nation has ever endured. “Lest we forget”.

Ross McMullin is the author of the award winning biography Pompey Elliott and most recently, Will Dyson: Australia’s Radical Genius.

Source: THE AUSTRALIAN July 18 2006

---

Letters to the Editor...

The ways we farm pigs and chickens

The following letter was forwarded to “Heritage” by one of our New Zealand Subscribers. It appeared in Auckland’s Western Leader above the name of 12-year-old Jenna Smith, Royal Heights, Auckland, NZ.

“I am writing this letter to you after going to the Pet Expo and reading about pig farming in New Zealand.

I think it is cruel how the pigs are kept in these so called pig farms.

I don’t get how the lambs and cows get to run free in a paddock but the pigs and chickens get cooped up in cages.

The lambs get to frolic and jump in fresh grass and play around with each other in an open field.

The cows get to graze on the grass wherever and whenever they please.

The pigs are kept in tiny cages where all they can do is sit down or stand up and they hardly have enough room to lie down and some of them can’t even do that.

Some of the pigs suffer from a thing like depression and some were found biting the metal bars of their cages trying to get out!

When the mummy pigs have piglets they have to lie, pinned down with their feet and teats through the bottom metal bars of their cages so the piglets can get some milk. The mummy pigs don’t get to interact with their babies.

This is the same with the chickens.

They are kept in small cages by the hundreds and most of them are skinny and have bald patches all over them. I think this is cruel and unfair.

Keeping the animals locked up like this can spread diseases throughout a group of chickens or pigs really quickly and we could all get sick by eating one of these undetected diseases.

Could someone please do something about this? Like make a law that chicken and pig farms have to be SPCA approved or something like that because this means a lot to me.”

Jenna Smith
BETWEEN 1840 and 1860 China fought two Opium Wars against predatory foreigners making great profits peddling opium to the Chinese. At the time China’s population was expanding rapidly but without an accompanying increase in economic prosperity. Corruption and foreign influences such as Christianity fostered rebellion which racked the country in the period between the wars. The two Opium Wars, combined with these internal factors, so weakened the Chinese state that China almost ceased to exist as a nation, a situation not fully redressed until 1949 when Mao Tse Tung and the communist party came to power.

China is a large and populous country. Encompassing Manchuria, Xinjiang and Tibet as well as China proper, its total area is about 3.8 million square miles—slightly larger than Australia (3 million square miles)—and its present population is about 1,100 million people.

Less than half of this area is essentially “Chinese”. Chinese civilisation was built upon agriculture, so as a dominant institution Chinese culture extended only to where cultivation was possible. The majority of China is too dry, hilly or cold for farming so these large areas contain relatively few people, mainly non-Han Chinese people with cultures and economies distinct from the pattern of life in Han agricultural China.

The agriculture area of China proper embraces 18 provinces bounded on the East by sea, to the South and West by mountains, and by desert to the North. The Great Wall of China marks the line between farming and grazing along the desert border of China. Three-quarters of the area in the West and North cannot be cultivated because of a combination of mountains, hills and climate.

The heartland of Han Chinese culture is central China, the area between the three great rivers flowing from West to East, the Huang river in the North and the Xi river in the South, with this area cut in half by the Yangzī in the centre. Half the country’s people lived in the Yangzī basin. From this heartland Han culture because of population pressure expanded after the middle of the 19th Century, but the heartland between the rivers contains most of the agricultural land, most of the Han people and constitutes the core of Chinese civilisation.

China is a large and populous country.

Encompassing Manchuria, Xinjiang and Tibet as well as China proper, its total area is about 3.8 million square miles—slightly larger than Australia (3 million square miles)—and its present population is about 1,100 million people.

Tibet, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia and Taiwan were incorporated into China under the Manchus, the last imperial dynasty to rule China (also called the “Ching” dynasty) who held power from 1644 to 1911. Although conquerors of China, the Manchus adopted Chinese ways, perpetuated the time-honoured administrative machinery and laws, associated themselves with Chinese and did not discriminate in awarding even the highest public offices to Chinese. But they guarded against revolt by forbidding any Chinese to hold office in his native province, by frequently shifting officials, and by dividing administrative responsibility in a province between several officers who served as checks on each other. They vigorously suppressed any revolt. The Manchus continued the culture of the preceding Ming dynasty with flourishing ceramics and painting. Manchu China was what most foreigners encountered when they eventually ventured to the Orient in search of trade, treasure and religious converts, an encounter that became dominated by opium trafficking.

The opium poppy was unknown in ancient China and China only became acquainted with it as a medical herb in the 7th Century AD. There are many species of poppy but only two contain morphine, the active ingredient in opium, and one of the two is an insignificant wild plant of the Mediterranean area. Opium eaten or smoked by addicts is the dried sap of a particular species of poppy, *papaver somniferum*, which is wholly cultivated. Any plants of this species found growing wild are escapes from cultivation. This poppy derives from the Mediterranean area and has been spread by man.

Opium smoking, the curse of Asia, only started after the discovery of America. There was no custom of smoking anything in the Old World, smoking was introduced from the New World. Opium cultivation entered Japan about the 15th Century but India became the major source of opium production for the China trade and a problem for China about the middle of the 17th Century.

The main reason for opium cultivation is as a cash crop. It will grow in cold dry climates on poor soil that will not support other crops, although it prefers rich soil, it has a high value relative to its bulk and weight and poses no transport or storage problems... and it is addictive so once a market has been created it is sustained and demand for opium is “inelastic”—a rise in price does not result in a drop in demand. Because China was an agricultural (Cont.)
country where the people lived in harmony with the rhythms of nature, opium was regarded as medicine and a recreational drug. Old people, who in modern Western society would be thrust into a nursing home to spend their final years, lived out their lives in Chinese villages and farms among their extended families treating the ailments of old age with opium-fed dreams and herbal remedies.

In the deteriorating social and economic conditions of 19th Century China it served to relieve depression and misery the way alcohol serves today in Western society. Corrupt Chinese, notably in Southern China, exploited a growing demand for opium. Southern China was where the foreigners were confined in their efforts to trade. Here they found a demand for opium imports that corrupt Southern Chinese officials and traders circumventing the government surprisingly were willing to pay for with silver. This departed from the normal pattern of Chinese trade. While Chinese goods were in great demand by foreigners the Chinese only wanted gold or silver as payment, they did not want foreign goods in exchange. When the British, French and Americans discovered they could exchange opium for Chinese silver the opium trade exploded, the foreigners pressing opium on China for maximum gain against the express laws and wishes of the Chinese government. The country was in the process of being subverted physically, culturally and morally.

The Chinese government restricted commerce to just one port, Canton. This was the only port open to foreign traders at the close of the 18th Century and all foreign trade was conducted through an official consortium of Chinese merchants, the Co Hong. Westerners chafed at these and other restrictions, including the absence of fixed tariffs, “squeeze” payments for venal officials, unwillingness of Chinese officials to deal with westerners on a basis of equality, prohibitions on Chinese teaching foreigners the language, and Westerners being subject to Chinese law and courts. Repeated attempts to obtain more favourable terms were rebuffed. The Chinese, never accustomed to dealing with foreign governments as equals, regarded all foreign envoys as bearers of tribute. From the Westerners’ point of view such conditions could not endure.

The Western world was industrialising. Besides expanding economically, merchants and financiers were the power in government replacing the former landed aristocracy. They desired markets for industrial produce and their economies had a need for raw materials and a growing demand for luxuries. Pressure on China came first from Britain but European pressure to gain a foothold in China became a problem for the Chinese government.

Catholic Jesuit missionaries who entered China in the 17th Century were followed by other Catholic orders who did much to acquaint the Chinese with European science and religion. Likewise, through their writings published in Europe they acquainted the West with China and its culture. But European merchants did not penetrate inland China the way the Catholic missionaries had done.

In the mid-1700s British trade through the East India Company was the most important of the Western merchants’ attempts to penetrate China. Chinese tea, silks and cotton were in great demand in Europe, all paid for largely by specie.

The East India Company’s monopoly on trade with China was abolished in 1834 by popular demand from British merchants. Thereafter came an influx of British merchants to the China trade demanding more privileges than the Chinese were willing to concede. A clash of cultures occurred over protocol of international intercourse, the British demanding equality between nations while the Chinese knew only the concepts of empire and subject peoples. Legal conceptions differed also. Chinese traditionally hold the family or group responsible for any misdeeds by one of its members whereas the British contended punishment only should be meted out to guilty individuals not to the group.

These conflicts came to a head over importation of opium. The Chinese government prohibited the import of opium but British and other foreign merchants brought it into China from India and Indochina in ever-increasing quantities that indicate the ease with which it could be sold, the great profits to be made, and extent of corruption in Southern China in the period. The Americans, then as in recent years, traded with Thailand guns for opium which was then converted to cash in the China trade. The central government in Beijing, after many futile attempts to halt the trade, took stern action sending to (Cont.)
the South a special commissioner with full authority to stamp out the opium trade.

The commissioner Lin Tse Hsu arrived in Canton in 1839 and demanded foreign merchants surrender their stocks of opium for destruction, further demanding they enter into a bond not to import opium in future. The British objected and in November 1839 hostilities broke out.

The Chinese forces armed with swords and spears were no match for the musketry of the British who repeatedly defeated the Chinese whenever they clashed. But the war lasted five years because the British confined their attacks to population centres South of the Yangzi river and alternated fighting with attempts at negotiation. After a major strategic loss the Chinese government signed the Treaty of Nanking in 1842 ceding Hong Kong island to the British and opening five ports—Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai—to foreign residents with permission for foreign Consuls at each port, and allowing communications between Chinese and British officials of the same rank to be based on equality. The Treaty also abolished the Co Hong trading consortium, set a fixed tariff on goods and allowed for an indemnity to be paid to the British for their troubles. In 1843 the Chinese signed a supplementary treaty setting the stage for the beginning of extraterritoriality for the foreigners. Other nations rushed to exploit China's defeat.

The fourteen-year period between the British, Americans and French all demanded revision of the 1844 treaties and in October 1856 war again broke out between the Chinese and British started by a trivial incident. The Chinese arrested the Chinese crew of a Chinese-owned but British-registered ship, the "Arrow". This was seen as a violation of British flag sovereignty. The French got into the act alongside the British being allied to Britain in the Crimean War. They found a pretext for joining the conflict in the execution earlier that year of a Catholic missionary in Guanxi province. Because the French and British had their hands full with the Crimean War they did not at first press the war in China. Their troubles were compounded by strife in Persia and the Indian Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. But late in 1857 British and French forces captured Canton. The following year a naval squadron went North to Tientsin, the port for the capital, to threaten Beijing itself into submission. The forts guarding Tientsin were captured and, to save the capital, the Chinese caved in and granted the desired treaties. Other foreigners including the Americans and Russians rushed to exploit China's submission with revised treaties. The Russians obtained all the Chinese territory North of the Amur River.

The Treaties of Tientsin signed in 1858 provided: 1) a tax was set on opium imports thereby making the drug a legal import and permission was obtained for opium cultivation in China itself; 2) foreign diplomats could reside in Beijing; 3) foreigners could travel within China; 4) Christian missionaries were allowed to preach within China and Christians guaranteed freedom to practise their religion; 5) the Yangzi River, navigable for 1,000 miles inland, was opened to foreign shipping; 6) more ports were opened to foreign residents and shipping; 7) extraterritoriality was expanded; 8) regulations were developed for ease of trade and collection of Customs duties; 9) indemnities were provided to the British and French.

But in 1859 when foreign emissaries came to ratify the treaties and assume residence in Beijing they found the road from Tientsin port blocked and were confronted with Chinese demands for revision of the treaties.

British and French troops attempted to force the blockade but were repelled so the two powers resumed the war. In 1860 they fought their way through Tientsin to capture Beijing itself. The Emperor fled his capital and the British and French torched the undamaged remains of his summer palace. The Chinese were forced to agree to the earlier treaties of 1858 and pay further indemnities, to open Tientsin as yet another port to trade, and allow residence of diplomats in Beijing. Kowloon promontory opposite Hong Kong island was ceded to the British and the Russians moved to gain all the territory East of the Ussuri River, a long stretch of coastline that included the site of Vladivostok.

The treaties derived from the two Opium Wars, that of 1842-44 and of 1856-60 served as the basis for all foreign intercourse with China until 1943.

While the treaties seemed to solve problems for foreigners dealing with China they weakened Chinese sovereignty to the point where the very existence of the Chinese state was threatened by removing foreigners from Chinese legal jurisdiction and by making Christian communities in China "imperia in imperis" (greater than the Emperor). Apart from its problems with foreigners in this period China was confronted with internal revolts and rebellions that challenged the government.

By 1800 when foreign trade with China was blooming, the population since the beginning of Manchu rule had swollen threefold to about 300 million people but agriculture, industry and commerce had not kept pace with the expanding population. Landlordism became widespread, taxes became heavier, and corrupt officials squeezed the people to enrich themselves. After a century of peace the serious socio-economic problems resulted in rebellions breaking out. (Cont.)
In South China, in Guandong and Guanxi provinces, anti-Manchu forces formed secret societies. These became linked to pirates, opium smugglers and gangsters. After 1820 the opium trade was draining silver from China disturbing the economy, particularly in Guandong home province to the city of Canton and to Hong Kong.

The first Opium war of 1842 was a blow to prestige of the Manchu Dynasty. It broke the Chinese government’s ability to maintain order in Guandong against the anti-Manchu league of secret societies, pirates, smugglers and gangsters. This condition was exacerbated by famine in 1840 in Guandong and Guanxi provinces, causing an increase in banditry and disorder making an uprising inevitable.

In 1850 the Tai Ping (Great Peace) Rebellion shook the imperial structure but it had another unwelcome ingredient—Christianity. The leaders in this rebellion were mainly Hakka, an ethnic minority derived from North China who migrated to the South of China. One of them, Hong Xu Chuan, an unsuccessful candidate in the civil service examinations, suffered from bizarre visions. He interpreted his hallucinations in the light of books given him by Protestant missionaries some years before. He preached a new Christian religion and formed religious communities among the Hakka in the Southern provinces. By 1848 after the first Opium War these religious communities were welded into fighting units to form an army.

In 1850 conflicts erupted between the Hakka “Society of God” converts and the non-Hakka authorities in Guanxi province. By this time secret society and pirate adherents had infiltrated the religious movement.

Chinese government resistance was weak and the Tai Ping rebellion swept North from Guanxi in the South to Hunan in Central China, and along the Yangzi basin gathering thousands of supporters. In 1853 the Tai Ping rebels captured Nanking where they ruled for a decade as a fanatical sect espousing a blend of Christian and Chinese beliefs. Attempts to expand further North failed. In 1864 a Chinese officer Ceng Guo Fan aided by foreign officers advising Chinese forces suppressed the movement. The Tai Ping Rebellion cost millions of lives and wasted some of China’s finest provinces.

But the combination of foreign incursions and foreign cultural ideas, together with the decline in authority of the Manchu dynasty through the Opium Wars and the Tai Ping Rebellion contributed, just 50 years after the second Opium War, to the demise of Imperial China replaced in 1911 by Sun Yat Sen’s Republic of China.

In 1906 Imperial China struck an agreement with India in a serious attempt to resolve the opium problem within 10 years. India would cease cultivating opium and ban its import while the Indians phased out opium exports to China over a 10-year period. Initially both sides faithfully carried out the agreement and by 1917 China, now a republic, had almost freed itself from the poppy’s curse. But then China descended into political turmoil and opium production again increased making it an international as well as a national problem.

As early as 1909 an international conference of 13 nations was held in Shanghai to attempt to regulate the trade in opium and opium products. In 1912 an Opium Convention was drawn up in the Hague to control and suppress opium production, to regulate exports of narcotics, to control manufacture of opium-based products under government licence, and specifically to help China with its massive population of addicts to suppress the drug. This and other conventions were taken over as a duty by the League of Nations which pressed the need to regulate opium trading through an estimates system of national needs. Countries were to submit to controlling authorities annual estimates of their national requirements of opium products for medical and scientific uses so production of opium could be brought under international control. The United Nations Economic and Social Council in 1946 assumed responsibility for narcotics control from the League of Nations conventions. It is under these auspices that countries around the world today are involved in a “war on drugs” such as heroin and cocaine.

From creation of the Republic of China in 1911 the nation again faced disintegration and collapse, political turmoil resulting in warlordism, and a weak central government ruling in name only. For almost 40 years the republican government never came to grips with China’s opium addiction problems and in latter years the government was a direct beneficiary of the opium trade. These problems only were resolved with the advent of the communist regime in 1949 when “The New Legalists” under Mao Tse Tung took power, restored national sovereignty in a unified state, and China finally tore up the “unequal treaties” of the Opium Wars.

Perhaps an interesting footnote to the history of China’s Opium Wars is the fact that Deng Xiao Ping, successor to Mao Tse Tung and father of China’s current industrialisation programme that has created so much turmoil in modern China, was a Hakka.

(END)
Finding answers to salinity and climate change

BIG trucks are queuing on the outskirts of the wheatbelt town of Merredin, WA., then moving on steadily with their valuable loads.

However, it is not local grain that is keeping them busy this summer, but carting water for road works – water that has been harvested from beneath the town.

Using saline water for road construction, as is happening in Merredin, is believed to be a first for WA, and possibly Australia.

It is an example that could be followed by other rural towns adversely affected by high groundwater beneath their streets and homes.

The Merredin Water Initiative is an alliance of the Merredin Shire Council, the Department of Agriculture and Food, Avon Catchment Council and ALine East, to provide water for the Great Eastern Highway road works between Hines Hill and Walgoolan.

Part of the Rural Towns - Liquid Assets project, a collaboration between the department, CSIRO, CRC LEME, Chemistry centre and the University of WA, the Merredin approach is to take problem groundwater and turn it into a resource.

To do this, water is pumped from beneath the town and desalinated for use in road construction, as an alternative to using valuable scheme water.

A reverse osmosis desalination plant for this purpose was officially opened by Agriculture and Food Minister Kim Chance just before Christmas 2006.

The ‘desal’ plant is housed in a sea container which could be moved from Merredin to other locations. It was purpose-built by Coates Hire which is leasing it to ALine East, the road construction consortium.

A pilot desalination plant was first used in Merredin in 2001, which proved that water production from saline groundwater was feasible. Brine and excess water from the process were pumped to evaporation ponds west of the town. These were recently upgraded by ALine East are being used again.

In 2001, two production bores had been installed in the central business area of the town for the pilot project. This has now been increased to six bores north of the railway line which are pumping around the clock.

Each bore produces 70 to 200 kilolitres (kL) per day of water, at a salinity of about 3000 millisiemens per metre (mS/m), or half as salty as sea water.

Pumping will maintain the watertable at least 3m below ground surface and out of the danger zone for building foundations and roads.

The plant has a daily capacity of 300kL of fresh water, and with a recovery rate of about 75 per cent also produces about 100kL of highly saline water which is pumped to the evaporation basin. Before desalination, the water has to be aerated and filtered to remove dissolved iron and manganese.

The reverse osmosis desalination unit is working well after overcoming initial frothing problems.

Mr Mark Pridham, of the Department of Agriculture and Food, said “the Merredin project was the culmination of many years of hard work by many local people, backed by a long research and development effort by the department”.

“The successful integration of salinity control and new water supply development is also a model for a number of other towns participating in the Rural Towns – Liquid Assets project.” he said.

“It provides some help to two big current issues – salinity and climate change.”

ALine East alliance manager Mark Sutton said the project was producing water cheaper than could be purchased from the Water Corporation.

He would definitely consider the desalination option for future road work projects throughout the State.

Over the next few months the project should provide clearer answers to the real cost of the desalination option, long-term effects on groundwater levels, beneath the town and, hopefully, provide an indication of further uses for the previously unwanted Wheatbelt water source.

Source: Department of Agriculture and Food. WA.

A water tanker loads up at the Merredin desalination site
Wing Commander Leonard Young was educated at Cheltenham College and the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, and joined the Royal Engineers in 1919. Three years later he transferred to the Royal Air Force where he remained until his retirement in 1946. He served in the aircraft carriers Hermes and Eagle in the Home Mediterranean and China Stations. In 1932 he formed the No. 803 Fleet Fighter Squadron. From 1938 to 1940 he commanded the No. 50 Bomber Squadron. In 1941 he became Senior Training Officer at Kirkham and Cosford. From 1942 to 1945 he was appointed Flying Accident Investigator, first in Bomber Command and then later in India. In the last year of his service he commanded RAF Hakimpet, Secunderabad. During the later years of his service, his thorough investigations and candid comments produced a number of clashes with the authorities.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION

According to Lord Chief Justice Coke (1552-1634) the laws which used to protect the British liberties stem from approximately 1100 BC when King Brutus selected them from the ancient Greek and Trojan institutions. They were re-codified by King Molmutius about 450 BC and were known as the Common rights or later as the Common Law.

Under them every subject was as free as the King and they could not be altered by any act of the Crown or National Convention. They were the inalienable rights to which every Briton was born and of which no legislation could deprive him.

Later the laws were re-codified by King Alfred, who quoted extensively from Moses, and in due course they were incorporated as a legal force into Magna Charta (1215), reconfirmed in the Revolution of 1399 when Richard 11 was deposed; re-affirmed in 1660 at the restoration of Charles 11 and again in the Revolutionary Settlement after the abdication of James 11 in 1688. In 1784 they were once again confirmed after George 111 admitted defeat.

They conferred LEGAL DEMOCRACY upon our own people, thereby ensuring that they were ruled with their own consent and enjoyed the right to trial by jury and to liberty, property and vocation. These same laws led to the evolution of our Common Law Constitution, which was based upon certain essential requirements, including:

1. Separation of LEGISLATIVE and EXECUTIVE functions as explained by Blackstone (1723-1780) in his "Commentaries on the Laws of England". This meant that if a member of the House of Commons was appointed to the government he had to resign his seat in the House in order to maintain the purity of the REPRESENTATIVE principle.

The LEGISLATURE consisted of the King, Lords and Commons and the EXECUTIVE of the King alone.

2. FREEDOM OF ELECTION which required freedom of nomination in the constituency and freedom of the ELECTED representative from all influences of "fear, favour, punishment or patronage".

[Today we see all too clearly how that freedom of election has vanished!]

NO ARBITRARY POWER HERE

Under our Common Law Constitution the kings were sovereign under God and the Law, which they were sworn to administer but powerless to change. They ruled with the advice and consent of the Ministers which THEY appointed (sic) for their skill and capacity. These Ministers, in carrying out their duties of State, needed to command the confidence of the freely elected and independent House of Commons, which they were responsible.

To maintain and enforce the people’s Rule of Law against rulers and subjects alike, the High Court of Parliament was so constituted that Parliament itself could not establish supremacy over all law, by virtue of the fundamental condition that the overall supremacy of Parliament only became an active force upon the Common Written Agreement of the three independent co-ordinate institutions, each subject to the law of the land.

Firstly, there was the supreme Executive authority of the nation vested in the King, acting as described above. Secondly, there was the House of Lords as the Supreme Court of English Law acting with the advice of the English Bench of Judges. Thirdly, the supreme law enforcement authority of the nation vested in the freely elected House of Commons, being the Grand Inquest of the Nation, to which all authority, Executive, Administrative and Judicial was finally responsible.

Thus constituted Parliament could not exercise despotic power, because the common agreement of the three independent institutions could only be obtained by reason and consent.

THREAT TO THE CONSTITUTION

This free legal democracy began to be challenged during the 18th Century (Cont.)
by the modern doctrine of Parliamentary Sovereignty, first mooted by Lord Mansfield, a Scottish Jacobite who became Lord Chief Justice of England. He did not appreciate the value of the English Common Law system, preferring the autocratic CIVIL LAW systems of Europe.

THE MISCHIEF OF 'CONVENTIONS'

In order to explain away the destruction of our legal constitution, the (political) parties say that we have an unwritten one, consisting of the ‘conventions’ which they themselves have devised to regulate and give an appearance of legality to their unconstitutional and hence (according to Walter Paley’s book “Political and Moral Philosophy”), illegal operations.

GOVERNMENT INSIDE THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Now, during the same period [Lord Mansfield] the House of Commons completely destroyed the ancient and inalienable right of the British people to freedom of election (as defined above), by COMBINING its legislative functions with the secret and unconstitutional PARTY CABINET arrangement inside the Commons. By adopting the principle of ‘collective responsibility’ in the Cabinet the Ministers sought to avoid the risk of being impeached by the Commons for their appalling misgovernment!!!

Further, by means of the highly organised and disciplined Party and Whip systems the elected Members of the House changed from being free members acting in accordance with their consciences in safeguarding the liberty of their constituents into being the obedient ‘lobby fodder’ of the professional party politicians who obtained control over the Party Machines. Sir Ivor Jennings in his ‘Law and Constitution’ stated that these conventions have never been formally recognised by Parliament or the courts, which DO recognize the constitution of the Revolution Settlement, and that the institutions and practices which have grown up are not in legislation nor in Common Law nor in the law and custom of Parliament.

The above situation has resulted in the entirely LAWLESS, despotic and unstable PARTY government under which we suffer today and which has been the means of destroying [from within] the greatest Empire in history and reducing the British people to a state of frustrated impotence. The resultant disgust and distrust in which Parliament is held today by the indigenous Britons is inevitable. This gives rise to the popular perception ‘they’re only in it for themselves’, which is reinforced publicly on our television screens, radio and newspapers by a jeering and impotent Opposition...(impatiently waiting for the system to give it its turn at the reins of power and who will behave in the same identical manner! Ed.) faced with a large government majority.

The House of Commons is therefore, responsible for robbing us of our legal democracy under our legal constitution. The Parties tell us we have political democracy but it needs no genius to point out that such democracy is only possible in small, simple organisation in which members are ALL knowledgeable. Today, the last things our present rulers are concerned about are the true interests and freedom of natural Britons. This false idea of political democracy combined with the doctrine of Parliamentary sovereignty (of the Commons alone) based on PARTY GOVERNMENT has resulted not only in the virtual disfranchisement of the indigenous British people, but it has placed Parliament under powerful hidden influences and pressures which have nothing whatever to do with benefiting society as a whole!!

LAW AND THE CONSTITUTION

In the beginning God gave mankind a law and we are told that Abraham walked according to it (Gen.26.5). It was observed by the patriarchs of the East, as is shown by the fact that contemporary of Abraham, Hammurabi, embodied it in his Code. In the Book of Jasher we are informed that Abraham learned it in the household of Noah and Shem, and that he introduced it into his father’s house in the Ur of the Chaldees.

Later this law was given by God to Moses who wrote it down in the Pentateuch. It was brought to Britain by the earliest settlers when they came from the Crimea area and was embodied in the original laws of Britain by King Brutus, about 1100 BC, after the arrival of himself and other Trojans.

Lord Chief Justice Coke wrote:

“The original laws of this land were composed of such elements as Brutus first selected from the ancient Greek and Trojan institutions”.

A later king, Dunwall or Molmutius, re-codified the laws, about 450 BC, and Coke, in his ‘Origin of the Common Law of England’ wrote that:

“The molmutius laws have always been regarded as the foundation and bulwark of British liberties”.

Under the laws of Brutus every subject was as free as the King. The laws in force were cyfreithiau or ‘Common Rights’. The usages of Britain could not be altered by any act of the Crown or National (Cont.)
Convention. They were now considered as inalienable rights to which every Briton was born, and of which no human legislation could deprive him. One of these usages was:

“There are three things belonging to a man, from which no law can separate him - his wife, his children and the instrument of his calling, for no law can unman a man or uncall a calling”.

Among the laws enacted by Molmutius is the following:

“Three things are indispensable to a true union of nations: Sameness of laws, rights and language”.

Later again the laws were codified by King Alfred, who quotes almost verbatim from Magna Charta and later again in the Bill of Rights and Act of Settlement.

This very ancient system of law, for long known as the Common Law has been retained throughout the ages by England alone. From a time centuries before Christ, the Jews had been losing it under the influence of the Talmud and of subjection to other peoples. The East eventually became subject to Mohammedan Law. The Roman Civil Law came to hold sway in Europe, except Britain.

**COMMON LAW - ENGLAND’S GREATEST EXPORT**

The Common Law of England has, of course, been spread about parts of the world during recent centuries where Britain has held sway. A great difference between the Civil Law and the Common Law is that the Civil Law holds that every man- and every nation- is guilty until he has proved himself innocent, whereas the Common Law holds that every man - and every nation- is innocent until he has been proved to be guilty. This Common Law applies equally to all in the land from the Monarch to the lowest and has the effect of conferring legal democracy on the people. It is essentially the most righteous system of Law in the world, as has been stated by a number of eminent foreign Jurists.

**LEGAL DEMOCRACY**

This legal democracy based on our Common Law led to the evolution of our Constitution which, throughout the ages, until the last hundred years or so, was described by Blackstone in his ‘Commentaries on the Laws of England’.

“In all tyrannical governments the supreme magistracy, or the right of both making and enforcing laws, is invested in one and the same man, or one and the same body of men; and whenever these powers are united together, there can be no public liberty. The magistrate may enact tyrannical laws and execute them in a tyrannical manner, since he is possessed in quality of dispenser of justice with all the power which he, as legislator, thinks proper to give himself. But where the legislative and executive authority are in distinct hands, the former will take care not to entrust the latter with so large a power as may tend to the subversion of his own independence and therewith, the liberty of the subject. With us, therefore, in England this supreme power is divided into two branches - the legislative, to wit, the Parliament consisting of the King, Lords and Commons, and other - the executive consisting of the King alone”.

**THE KING’S LAWFUL PATRONAGE**

The House of Lords: Under this system it was the duty of the King to command to his Privy Council the men he thought most fitted to enable him to govern the country. If a member of the House of Commons was appointed to the Government he had to resign his seat in the house. The House of Lords, besides being a Senate, was the supreme Court of Common Law in the country.

The House of Commons: Was composed of men elected by the constituencies to represent them in Parliament. There were no political parties and therefore all the members of the Commons were ‘Independents’. Their duty was to represent their constituents and to act in accordance with their conscience. As there were no party organisations the constituencies were free to choose the men they thought best for the job. There was FREEDOM OF ELECTION (Emphasis Added).

**THE POWER OF THE COMMONS**

The duty of the members of the Commons was to keep vigilant watch to see that none of the King’s Ministers in conducting government did anything that would infringe the liberty of the subject. Their power of sanction lay in the fact that they controlled the purse and could impeach any Minister before the House of Lords, if they thought such a course to be necessary in the interest of good government.

**ESSENTIAL BALANCE OF POWER**

This idea was that the three parts of the Parliament - King, Lords and Commons - were of equal standing and the system worked best when they worked together amicably in equality. Trouble was apt to arise if the balance was disturbed by one of the parts getting, or trying to get, too powerful at the expense of others, as happened in the Stuarts.

This ancient and historic constitution based on the principles of English legal democracy under the Common Law has proved to be the finest and most enduring system of government in the civilised world and under it every Englishman had freedom of action.

The resulting achievements of the British at home and abroad were remarkable. This legal democracy rested on fundamental law, applied to the (Cont.)
wide divergent social issues by the reasoned decisions of the lawyers in the course of law, and the separation of the legislative and executive authorities. The whole system rested on the consent of the people and all its officials were responsible to the people through their elected representatives in the Commons.

THE CIVIL LAW – IN CONTRAST
The Civil Law must now be described: Roman Law was the great achievement of Roman lawyers applying fundamental principles of the Twelve Tables to the problems of Roman social life. With the passing of Rome its authority ended but when rediscovered in the revival of learning, a call arose for the Civil Law to be adopted in place of the native laws of the various countries of Europe. Being of a highly technical character, it could only be imposed by order of the ruler or, as in England used as a source of legal reasoning and brought into native law as the Lex Regia and is described in the ‘Institutes of Justinian’ as follows:

"That which seems good to the Emperor has all the force of Law; for the people by the Lex Regia which is passed to confer on him his power makes over to him their whole power and authority. Therefore, whatever the Emperor ordains by rescript or decides in adjudging a cause or lays down be edict is unquestionably law...."

The idea of will and caprice as the sole source of law gave birth to the idea that rulers derived their absolute authority from God alone and not from the people. Outside England law ceased to be a subject for lawyers, who became mere civil servants applying the will of the ruler, and instead it became a subject of academic speculation on constitutional and legal principles in the universities.

Under these theoretical conditions all sorts of ideas of political democracy took root and led to the ecclesiastical and political movements and revolutions of western civilisation which were aimed at the revocation the Lex Regia but failed, in that the result was merely to substitute the will of the people in place of the will of the ruler, i.e. one source of lawlessness for another.

The effect of the adoption of the Roman Civil code is the total destruction of all constitutional law and the subversion of all constitutional institutions. This was clearly shown in the case of Scotland which had for centuries been a Common Law country, with legal ideas and institutions similar to those of England. The Declaration of Arbroath had been the Magna Charta of Scotland, but in 1370 the Scottish Parliament gave up its power to an independent committee which became the College of Justice and which adopted Civil Law in Scotland although it was never authorised by a Scottish Parliament. The result was that the Scottish Parliament became a mere rubber stamp for the use of the King of Scotland and for any ruling factions that arose. The King became a legislative sovereign ruler, the source of all law. This is why there was so much trouble when the Stuarts mounted the English throne! They had been brought up in a constitution diametrically opposed to that of England and failed to adapt themselves to it.

NO ROYAL DICTATORSHIP
The English opposition to the Civil Law idea has been on record as long as seven hundred years ago in the writings of Bracton and his successors, Five hundred years ago Fortescue, in his De Laudibus Legum Angliae, made the contrast between Common Law and Civil Law kingships when he wrote:

"For the King of England is not able to change the laws of his kingdom at his pleasure, for he rules his people with a power not only regal but political. If his power over them were only regal then he might change the laws of his realm and charge his subjects with taxes and other burdens without their consent; and such is the dominion that the Civil Laws claim when they state: "The Prince’s Pleasure has the force of Law". But the case is far otherwise with a king ruling his people politically, he can neither change the law without the consent of his subjects nor yet charge them with impositions against their will. Wherefore his people fairly and freely enjoy and occupy their own goods, being ruled by such laws as they themselves desire”.

After nearly a century of trouble with the Stuarts and with Cromwell, the English Constitution was again re-affirmed in the Act of Settlement and Bill of Rights. The Act of Settlement had the following peroration:

"Whereas the laws of England are the birthright of the people thereof and all the Kings and Queens who ascend the throne of his realm ought to administer the government of the same according to the said laws and all the officers and ministers ought to serve them respectively according to the same; the said Lords spiritual and temporal and Commons do therefore humbly pray; The laws and statutes of this realm for securing the established religion and the rights and liberties of the people therefore and all other laws and statutes of the same now in force, may be ratified and confirmed and the same are by His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the said Lords, spiritual and temporal and Commons and by the authority of the same, ratified and confirmed accordingly.” The principles thus enacted remain to this day the fundamental law of our constitution.

MALIGN INFLUENCES ARISE
But after that we began to run into further trouble. Corruption set in as a result of (a) political parties beginning to emerge, (b) of the union with Scotland, a Civil Law country, and (c) of having more kings brought up with Civil Law ideas.

The union with Scotland had unfortunate results in that the House of Lords now had to deal with appeals from the Court of Session and it knew nothing about Civil Law. The members began to lose interest in their legal duties through being unable to understand the new jurisprudence about which English judges were of little help. (Cont.)
At the same time, a rapid increase in the membership of the House began as a result of party political activities and this led to a great decrease on the part of the membership in their traditional pride and in their duty to understand and judge in accordance with the Common Law. Eventually, by the Judicature Act of 1870 our Supreme Court of Common Law was virtually suppressed.

The Act of Settlement contained the following vitality important clause relating to the purity of the representative principle:

“No person who has an office or place of profit under the King or receives a pension from the Crown shall be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons”.

GOVERNMENT

INSIDE PARLIAMENT.

The House of Commons:

But the new interests achieving power by means of constitutional corruption managed to get the clause amended in 1706 so as to allow members of the House of Commons to retain their seats while holding office in government or administration, under conditions by which the intention of the clause was virtually defeated and the House of Commons became open to the influence of public patronage and the management of its members. Instead of being a control on those who exercised national authority it became subservient to them. (See Edmund Burke’s quote in “Warnings Past and Present).

MALIGN INFLUENCES AT WORK

George 111 had been brought up under the influence of his mother who was a German Princess from a Civil Law principality. She also took care to surround him with tutors and advisers holding similar conception of kingship. The result was that Scotsmen played a leading part in his education and in his early administrations, notably William Murray, as Solicitor General and later as Lord Chief Justice of England under the title of Lord Mansfield.

Now Mansfield, though an English judge, was a Roman lawyer, seeing the foundation of jurisprudence to be the Roman Civil Law and not appreciating the merits of the Common Law or the love of public liberty displayed by many of its maxims.

By means of the power given to him by patronage, George 111 found himself able to achieve a personal rule with the support of the Commons as complete as Charles 1 had tried to establish in opposition to the House. Under Lord Mansfield the entirely new conception was introduced that an absolute passive obedience was due to parliament which must not in any way be questioned, much less, resisted by the people. He insisted that:

“When the supreme power abdicates, the government is dissolved and therefore, that every means of coercion is justified to enforce authority”.

THE WARNINGS

OF EDMUND BURKE

As a result of these ideas, Mansfield was partly responsible for the revolt of the American colonies and other troubles. Opposition to Mansfield’s ideas was strongly expressed by men like Edmund Burke and William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, but in spite of this, we have now for all practical purposes a Civil Law set-up of government by the Prime Minister, who has usurped the Royal Prerogative power of patronage.

CONVENTIONS

OVER-RULE THE LAW

This unconstitutional state of affairs has been attained by the development of the PARTY SYSTEM and of what are known as Constitutional Conventions, although they are, in fact, unconstitutional and opposed to the fundamental law of the land. It is interesting to note that when the American colonies obtained their independence they introduced a written constitution based on the Common Law of England with the President performing, more or less, the functions which the King should perform in our constitution. The result is that they have been able to keep their political parties under legal control and their legal democracy has been able to confine and control the will as expressed by political democracy.

RULE BY PARTY

Government and the Opposition: What we now call Parliamentary government is really Party Government and the fundamental difference between it and the old English and present American systems is that by the party system the supreme executive authority is appointed by the Legislature from among its own members, i.e. the legislative and executive functions have been combined in one body, the Cabinet, whereas under the latter systems the supreme executive appointments are made by the legal head of the State from outside the members of the legislature.

The Americans have retained Rule by Law, which we have abandoned in favour of rule by Party. The Conventions referred to above are merely the rules the party system has adopted to enable it to exercise power outside the Constitutional Law.

As Sir Ivor Jennings writes in his “Law and Constitution”.

“Most of the ‘conventions’ relate to the operation of the party system, which is merely an aspect of Cabinet Government. The principles governing the working of that system have never been formally recognised by Parliament or the Courts. So far as the Courts are concerned, they developed too late. The principles of constitutional law established by the courts recognise the constitution of the Revolution Settlement. Institutions and practices which have grown up since that time have not received formal recognition by the Courts and the rules relating to them are not part of the Common Law. Accordingly, the rules relating to the (Cont.)
foundations and operation of the Cabinet, the relations between Prime Minister and other Ministers, between Government and Opposition and many more are not in legislation nor in the Common Law nor in the law and custom of Parliament."

The Party System is composed of private organisations under no legal or public control and by means of conventions, it has destroyed all constitutional restraints. There is nothing democratic about it. What we really have now is party dictatorship.

**THE POISON OF THE PARTY SYSTEM**

Referring to the nature and character of Party Government, Burke, in his "Vindication of Natural Society", wrote:

"The great instrument of all these changes and what infuses a particular venom into all of them is Party. It is of no consequence what the principles of any party, or what their pretensions are, the spirit which actuates all parties is the same, the spirit of ambition, of self-interest, of oppression and treachery. This spirit entirely reverses all the principles which a benevolent nature has erected within us - all honesty, all equal justice and even the ties of natural society, the natural affections. In a word, we have all seen ... we have some of us felt such oppression from the Party Government as no other tyranny can parallel!"

Such men as Lord Brougham, John Stuart Mill and Lord Bryce in England, and Washington and John Adams in America, also gave warning against the party system.

**PARTY LOYALTY BEFORE DUTY**

The parties form an effective barrier between the people and their government. Under the Whip system, the MP owes allegiance to the party, not to the people. The system crushes personal independence a totalitarian not a democratic feature. Party rivalry is no guarantee of protection of our rights and liberties as the parties will always unite to keep out Independents and in defence of the powers of prerogatives which they have stolen from the people.

**FREEDOM OF ELECTION DESTROYED**

In order to usurp the legal supremacy of parliament the first step is to destroy FREEDOM OF ELECTION, which besides the secret ballot, requires freedom of nomination and freedom of the elected representative from all influences of "fear, favour, punishment or patronage". Although these freedoms are an essential part of our constitution and are incorporated in the Bill of Rights, they have been eliminated by the Party System.

The idea of making candidates for election to Parliament put down a forfeitable deposit is one of the tricks designed to impede freedom of election by discouraging anyone, other than party-sponsored candidates, from standing for election. A parliament cannot be true and legal unless elected under conditions of proper freedom. What we have now is a modern form of livery and maintenance and an abuse of the legal procedure of the High Court of Parliament beside which abuses like packing a jury are insignificant.

**REAL DUTY TO GOVERN**

The Monarch is the centre of our whole constitutional system because in the Monarch is vested all the sovereignty of the British people and it is from this sovereignty that all legal authority is derived. By law the Sovereignty is in the Crown and cannot be delegated.

It can only be affected by an Act of Parliament. Under the law the Monarch has only one personal function, that of being controller of public patronage and the grant of office and honour.

The appointment of executive office was only limited by the need to appoint a person or persons who would command the confidence of the House of Commons.

**PARTY CONTROL OF THE COMMONS**

But with membership of the House of Commons under party discipline and control, it was only necessary for party managers to inform the king that no confidence will be shown to anyone not acceptable to the majority party and the personal and most significant prerogative of the Crown - of appointments to public office - immediately passed to the party managers. This is without any act of parliament having been passed.

The Crown is now in the position, purely by illegal rules, of having to treat as a command the very humble advice Ministers choose to give. By the repeal; of the clause in the Act of Settlement prohibiting members of the Commons from holding office and the usurpation of the Royal prerogative, the party managers became free to nominate themselves to the highest offices, so that, by party action in the Commons, the sovereignty of the English Monarchy and therefore, of the English people and the supremacy of English Law has been usurped and destroyed.

As Sir Lewis Namier said in 1952:

"The Prime Minister replaced the sovereign as actual head of the executive when the choice of Prime Minister no longer lay with the sovereign. The sovereign lost the choice when strongly organised disciplined parties came into existence, and party discipline depends primarily on the degree to which the member depends on the party for his seat".

**REPUBLICAN ‘MONARCHY’**

For all practical purposes we now have a REPUBLIC with only the trappings of a monarchy and the whole process has been carried out in complete contempt of the ancient law of the land. The experience of Cromwell and the Protectorate showed the central truth that our constitutional monarchy in its sovereign capacity was the guardian of the rights and liberties of all Englishmen and their free parliamentary institutions. Now, Prime Ministers have usurped the Royal Prerogative, we have become for all practical purposes a nation of serfs.

**‘SINGLE CHAMBER’ GOVERNMENT**

We have seen how the Monarchy and the people, as represented in the Commons, have been eliminated from the Constitution. We have also seen earlier how the House of Lords ceased for all..."
practical purposes to be our Supreme Court of Common Law, and this was probably one of the biggest factors leading to the present corruption of the constitution and the reception of the alien jurisprudence which made that corruption possible. But as one of the institutions of Parliament, the House of Lords could have been a barrier to the usurpation of government by private political organisations, but when Royal Prerogative as the fountain of honour, came under the control of the party managers, it was used for party ends to get representation in the Lords and to raise money for party funds by the sale of honours, thus bringing discredit on the House and destroying its constitutional power.

The predominately hereditary character of the Lords changed with the party actions creating so many peers. The threat of an unlimited creation of peers was used to force through the Parliament Act of 1911, thus destroying the co-ordinate independence of the Lords. (We now see the 'elective dictatorship' of Tony Blair poised to give the coup de grace to the Lords, who were supine enough to give in.

**ELECTIVE' DICTATORSHIP QUEEN ELIZABETH II OPENING PARLIAMENT**

The party usurpation of our parliamentary institutions is now complete. The sole duty of Parliament, consisting of Queen, Lords and Commons, being to approve the commands of Cabinet acting under what has now become, for all practical purposes, the dictatorship of the Prime Minister, and to give legal form to those commands. The Party System has the inevitable effect of producing a partisan, as opposed to national, outlook. It divides the nation, keeping it in a sort of cold civil war state. While the attention of everyone is concentrated on this suicidal pastime, the Satanically-inspired forces of evil are left free to get on with robbing the nation of everything of value that it possesses.

Walter Paley, in his "Political and Moral Philosophy", published in 1782, wrote:

"By the Constitution of a country is meant so much of its law, as relates to the designation and form of the legislature, the rights and functions of several parts of the legislative body and the construction, officers, offices and jurisdiction of courts of justice. The constitution is one principal division, section of title or code of public laws distinguished from the rest only by the superior importance of the subject of which it treats. Therefore, the terms 'Constitutional' and 'Unconstitutional' mean legal or illegal. The distinction and ideas which these terms denote, are founded in the same authority with the law of the land on any other subject, and to be ascertained by the same enquiries. In England, the system of public jurisprudence is made up of Acts of Parliament, of decisions of Courts of Law, and of immemorial usages consequently these are the principles of which English Constitution consists. The sources from all our knowledge of its nature and limitations is to be deduced and the authorities to which all appeal aught to be made and by which every constitutional doubt and question can be alone decided ..."

**CABINET NOT A LEGAL BODY**

The Parliamentary Committee: The Cabinet is not, and never has been, part of our legal constitution. From the beginning it has been a malevolent growth which has destroyed the most vital principle in our constitutional system, that of ministerial responsibility to Parliament, having adopted secrecy (Vide: 30-year rule) and collective action so that Ministers cannot not now be impeached (i.e. punished Ed.), by the Commons as the Commons cannot find out for what any individual minister is responsible. (Even if it can, the said Minister has a party majority behind him/her. Even if Committee investigations are impotent against a government majority. Ed.)

Thus we who pride ourselves on democracy have allowed ourselves to reach the stage of being despottedly governed by a secret council, sworn to silence, for which there is no basis in English Law.

There is nothing to safeguard the national interests and our national destiny is bound to party appointments made for party ends, regardless of the suitability of the men/ women for the posts to which they are appointed.

Besides being unconstitutional, the system is criminally insane. Under irresponsible and unsuitable ministers we naturally get an immense army of government officials who exercise despotic power in all sorts of ways and who are exempt from any public and personal responsibility to parliament. There is no room for Statesmanship or integrity. Everything is reduced to the sordid immediate consideration of deluding (or bribing Ed.) the public into voting as required by the respective parties in order to retain or obtain the sweets of office.

**PARTY SYSTEM GAVE RISE TO FASCISM AND NAZISM**

The Party System denies the existence of fundamental law and this modern denial is associated with John Austin who repudiated English Common Law ideas and turned to aspects of Roman Civil Law. He got his ideas in Germany when the Philosophy of Totalitarian Dictatorship was being incubated. (Adolph Hitler took 'democracy' or 'majority rule' to its ultimate conclusion! Ed.)

Popular institutions such as Parliament can only retain their character if they are subject to a fundamental law which holds them true to their purpose and, if the law is destroyed, there is nothing to prevent them being corrupted into the instruments of despotism instead of being the guardians of law, as was clearly shown by the experience of Scotland, mentioned earlier.

**'PARLIAMENTARY SOVEREIGNTY' – DICTATORSHIP OF THE COMMONS**

Austin and Dicey supported the idea that the sovereignty of Parliament is, from the legal aspect under the British Constitution, absolute to the extent that it could even ignore the law of nature, although that law was a common feature of all civilised legal systems, and although for example, the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland gives no hint of an absolutely sovereign legislature but throughout conveys the idea of a supreme Parliament bound by fundamental law. What the modern idea that there is no fundamental law means in..."
constitutional matters is made quite clear by Professor Gough when he states:

"It is with the Benthamite principle of utility (although this itself was only natural law in a new form) accompanied by the introduction of Parliamentary reform, that modernity really began to make itself felt. Then at last, the relics of the idea of fundamental law gave way before the realisation that there was nothing to hinder the possessors of power from using it to promote their own interests, and that how to do so most successfully is the art of politics".

Obviously, no constitutional system of value can survive on these principles. Dicey, when defining Parliamentary Sovereignty, was forced to do so in terms of constitutional and fundamental law. Parliament has no legal authority whatever unless it is conforming to law. We have a legal constitution based upon the fundamental Common Law of England, laid down as described by Walter Paley, but smothered by unwritten Conventions. Dicey confused the issue. In law our Constitution is as rigid as is the American with its written Constitution.

CHURNING OUT LEGISLATION

The Statutory rules and order now flooding our legal system have no validity, being only accepted as law in conformity with the Austrian doctrine, as stated by C.H.S. Fifoot, in his "English Law and its Background". A sinister development has been the setting up of independent Courts of law, known as Administrative Courts, which have developed a procedure incompatible with English law procedure. They are based on Civil Law and not on Common Law principles and are designed to dodge the Statute of Northampton in which it is enacted that justice and right should be done regardless of the command of the government. They have no 'day in court', no jury, no decisions governed by precedent; the judges are civil servants and the decisions given are not even those of the hearing judges, The judgements are not reasoned. Their purpose is to enforce the will of the rulers regardless of justice and right, or of the consent of the people. It is now being firmly established in our modern system that even in peacetime Britons have no fundamental or constitutional rights, such as were guaranteed forever by our fundamental law contained in Magna Charta, et cetera, and expressed in the Petition of Right in the following terms:

"That all and singular the rights and liberties asserted and claimed in the said declaration are the true, ancient rights and liberties of the people of this Kingdom".

David Hicks

BILL OF RIGHTS CANCELLED

One example of loss of rights is that of the right to appeal to the Sovereign. If anyone now writes appealing to the Queen in connection with what is thought to be unjust treatment received at the hands of a government department, all that happens is that the bureaucracy surrounding the Queen, in accordance with modern "Convention", passes the Petition to the department in question, where it is put in a pigeon hole.

The remarkable split-mindedness of our modern legal authorities is well illustrated by the fact that Sir Harley – now known as Lord Shawcross – had to appeal to Common Law principles in order to make a case against the Germans during the shocking mockery of justice in the war crime trials at Nuremberg, because it was not feasible to do so under Civil Law principles, but, at the same time, when feeling it to be necessary to praise at home the principles he had been condemnation as criminal at Nuremberg, he could say to an English audience, as reported in the "The Times" on 13th May, 1946:

"Parliament is sovereign; it can make any laws. It could ordain that all blue-eyed babies should be destroyed at birth, but it has been recognised that it is no good passing laws unless you can be reasonably sure that, in the eventualities which they contemplate, those laws will be supported and can be enforced".

The above is pure Civil Law and amounts to the fact that in the opinion of such lawyers the Cabinet now has the legal power to do anything, not being bound by any consideration of natural or fundamental law.

This is utter lawlessness and a fatal corruption of the soul of the British people. As Burke said, the whole point about the English Constitution as it developed under law over the ages was that it was designed to produce good Governors, whereas other constitutions were satisfied with trying to produce good subjects.

It is clear that if you have good governors you have a very good chance of having good subjects and it should now be obvious, judging by what has happened in Britain since the last war (and in Australia regarding the case of Australian David Hicks, and his five year imprisonment without charge or trial at Guantanamo Bay Prison, by the United States authorities, and without sympathy or responsible commitment from the Australian government under Prime Minister John Howard, but with a Federal election looming in 2007 this scenario has changed for political reasons only.Ed.), that if you have bad governors you also get corrupted subjects. It is hoped that enough has been said above to show that we now have a government based on a system entirely contrary to the ancient Constitution and fundamental law of the land and completely contrary to the dictates of common sense, in that it cannot fail to do other than result in the greatest possible corruption of the character of the people and the destruction of all proper national interest.

SUMMARY

Since the former Dominions all obtained their system of government from England, it follows that their problems are identical and the function of Governor General in place of the Queen still has urgent validity, especially here in Australia where the debate on the Monarchy being replaced with a Republic, will continue to rear its ugly head, without respite and regardless of the will of the people.
SOCIAL CREDIT ECONOMICS
By Anthony Cooney

Why should money come into existence only and always as a debt?

Most Social Crediters must have been asked the question from time to time: 'What is Social Credit?' There is no short answer. Social Credit is a way of looking at things, a point of view that seems to bring every branch of knowledge into a new and clearer perspective. Equally all knowledge is relevant to Social Credit.'

"An Introduction to Social Credit." Bryan W. Monahan

A century ago C. H. Douglas revealed to the world that banks create money out of nothing. He challenged the monopoly of credit and those who control it. Increasing and unrepayable world debt has rekindled interest in Douglas' works, his practical proposals and glimpse of reality.

(48 pages.)

"If we do not restore the Institution of Property we cannot escape restoring the Institution of Slavery"
An introduction to this celebrated thinker and writer. He challenged the state on social and economic issues by contending that the dignity of man as a rational being require both freedom and security.

(28 pages.)

Heralded as the Einstein of economics, Douglas gave a glimpse of reality to the world. He warned that debt, heavy taxation and inflation was inevitable under centralised financial policies which are in need of correction.

(20 pages.)

Those who possess the skills hold the whip-hand of financial power – if they did but know it. And there is no great difficulty about their being made to know it. Indeed the secret can no longer be kept.

(68 pages.)

That the financial mechanism infiltrates all means that its raw nerves are exposed at every point. If the octopus has its tentacles everywhere, all you have to do is bite!

(44 pages.)

Prices include postage and handling within Australia. Order direct from: The Australian Heritage Society PO Box 163 Chidlow WA 6556. Tel/Fax 08 9574 6042
The manipulation of money and credit creation affects every country in the world, in peace or conflict. Credit creation is not a popular topic in the world of finance. The less the average citizen knows, the easier the money trick is played out. An informed population can take steps to end this dictatorship of finance so the power of credit can be homesteaded for the common good, not for greed and power.

The late 1960's and early 1970's weren't only about Woodstock, flower power and Vietnam moratoriums: at the same time that feminism, multi-ethnicism and victim politics emerged, the 'cultural war' of the left decided that the quickest way to change society was to take the long march through the education system.

The result of these 'cultural wars?' Competition and rewarding merit are replaced by the notion that everyone succeeds; black armory homey teaches students to feel guilty about the past; and the 3 Rs are re-badged as 'reconciliation,' the republic said refugee. Out the window go classic subjects and tried-and-tested teaching methods and in some classrooms-based education,' whole language,' fuzzy maths and an English syllabus which puts Big Brother and Australian Idol on the same stage as Shakespeare.