JOY TO THE WORLD — THE CHRIST HAS COME

Joy to the World, the Lord is come!
Let earth receive her King; 
Let every heart prepare Him room,
And Heaven and nature sing,
And Heaven, and Heaven, and nature sing.

He rules the world with truth and grace,
And makes the nations prove
The glories of His righteousness,
And wonders of His love,
And wonders, wonders, of His love...

— To our Readers —

We Wish You A Joyous and Happy Christmas
And a Prospering New Year for Everyone

Not Exaltation of State Power But Breaking Bank Monopoly of Credit Creation

"Trying to make reality fit into our limited and often false methods of representing reality is equivalent to Procrustes trying to make his 'guests' fit into his beds by cutting off their legs."

******

The following is another of Wallace Klink’s observations: Douglas advocated not the exaltation of State power through the sole right to create credit, but rather the breaking down of monopoly creation of credit through its universal distribution to the consuming community, in order to compensate the trend to reliance upon new bank loans to bridge the growing disparity between earned incomes and ultimate consumer prices. The primary emphasis must be the elimination of the need for debt, and a not and unthinking merely reflexive headlong attack on interest itself.

This, of course, is not only a rational solution to the debt problem (and the "usury" problem that attaches to debt) but an absolutely necessary remedial and compensatory policy, as automation and artificial intelligence replace human effort as factors of production. The implementation of Social Credit policy would be an incarnation in the practical affairs of mankind of the Doctrine of Salvation through Grace as an alternative to the un-Christian and Pharisaic Doctrine of Salvation through Works.

Analysts are now predicting that within perhaps the next twenty-years approximately fifty per cent of American "jobs" will be eliminated by automation and artificial intelligence. We had best awaken to the situation and learn to distribute these blessings of Abundance and potential Leisure bequeathed unto us by God and Nature. Otherwise as the declining number of income earners who will be increasingly requisitioned to support the growing multitudes which have become redundant to industry will bring social chaos resulting in blood in the streets—all because we have too much! What a blind and ungrateful civilization!
My translation:

I am of the generation without remuneration
And this situation does not even bother me.
What a fool I am!

Because this is bad and will continue,
It's lucky that I might be able to intern.
What a fool I am!

And I keep thinking,
What a very silly world it is
where, in order to be a slave, it is necessary to study.

I am of the 'house of the parents' generation,
If I already have everything, why want anything more?
What a fool I am!

Children, husband, I am always putting it off
And I still have to pay for the car.
What a fool I am!

And I keep thinking,
What a very silly world it is
where, in order to be a slave, it is necessary to study.

I am of the 'why should I complain?'
generation,
There is someone much worse than me on television.

What a fool I am!

And I keep thinking,
What a very silly world it is
where, in order to be a slave, it is necessary to study.

Yes, the very silly economic situation, both in Portugal and elsewhere, has lasted long enough. It IS silly ... very silly ... because, given the enormous productive capacity (both actual and potential) of the modern, industrialized economy, there is no good reason for poverty (a generation without remuneration), for servility in its various forms including the inane policy of full employment (you have to study in order to be a slave -- it's lucky that I might be able to intern), for chronic and ever increasing debts (and I still have the car to pay for), or for the social and psychological fallout of a failed economy (I am of the 'house of the parents' generation -- children, husband, I am always putting it off -- what a fool I am!), etc., etc. And it HAS lasted long enough because both the explanation for the great discrepancy between what a modern economy can do and what it actually does, as well as the correct solution to that particular paradox have been known -- not widely known -- but known for many decades.

The Anglo-Scottish engineer, C.H. Douglas (1879-1952), correctly identified the core cause behind modern economic dysfunction and also devised apposite remedial measures. The resultant body of thought became known as Social Credit.

Portugal, along with the rest of the world, suffers, not because of a lack of 'competitiveness' or a lack of sound management as such, but because the conventional financial system is not properly designed to begin with. It is not designed to facilitate, to the greatest possible extent, the delivery of goods and services as, when, and where required, with the least amount of trouble to everyone. Instead, the physical economy is hemmed in, restricted, and distorted by a financial system that does not adequately reflect reality. If one were to sum up the problem in a single phrase that phrase would be: 'chronic lack of consumer purchasing power.' To make matters worse, recurring financial crises are bound to occur just so long as this underlying gap between prices and incomes is not adequately addressed. The appropriate solution is for the financial system to be suitably modified so as to restore a real (i.e., self-liquidating) balance to the circular flow. A compensatory flow of debt-free money must be created by a National Credit Office and issued directly (via a National Dividend) or indirectly (via a National Discount on retail prices) to the consumer. Once an endogenous financial homeostasis has been achieved, all the other symptoms of economic dysfunction will dissipate. Portugal does not need involuntary austerity measures, nor does it require the intervention of the globalist troika (the unholy trinity of the IMF, the European Commission, and the European Central Bank). What Portugal needs is Social Credit!

Another beautiful composition from Deolinda’s repertoire which likewise touches on a variety of Social Credit themes is “Um ontra O Outro” – “One Against the Other”. This particular song challenges people to opt out of the rat-race – yet another phenomenon which can be traced back to the dysfunctional financial system.
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“We reckon that these are the first dolls to be made in London since Victorian times,” says Alice Taylor, co-founder of Makie Labs, as she strokes the voluminous red hair of the latest Makie doll to be assembled in its cramped Shoreditch workshop. “We can’t actually prove that, of course,” she adds, laughing, “but we’ll keep saying it until someone challenges us.”

The Makie she’s cradling is the offspring of a fortuitous marriage between 3D printing technology and online gaming, and it’s tearing up the rule book of toy manufacturing. These dolls are designed online by children, for children, using the same kind of interface that they would use to create an avatar in an online game. Crucially, that avatar goes on to lead a double life, participating in online games, but is also printed out as 3D parts, assembled, dressed, made up and shipped to your door. Sixty per cent of these dolls are currently being sent across the Atlantic to Hamleys are now, in the run-up to Christmas, waking up to the burgeoning Makie phenomenon.

“The idea stemmed from imagining if the characters from World of Warcraft, Second Life and so on could be made real,” says Taylor. “I used to work at Channel 4, commissioning digital content for kids, and I found myself at this event in New York which had a digital conference upstairs and a toy fair downstairs. There was no evidence of any crossover between the two and I started wondering if you could make an avatar into a doll using 3D printing.”

Taylor’s 2011 prototype, drawn on paper, constructed using 3D modelling software and printed in Belgium for €220 (£176), proved that it was possible, but transforming that idea into a functioning business would require the nascent technology to become cheaper, faster and better.

“The idea stemmed from imagining if the characters from World of Warcraft, Second Life and so on could be made real,” says Taylor (Teri Pengilley)

“For the first 18 months,” says Taylor, “everyone was saying, ‘No, you can’t do that. If you’re going to make dolls you’ve got to involve Chinese factories.’”

Taylor’s colleague, Jo Roach, recalls asking 3D printing companies if they’d consider printing dolls. “They’d been making bits of aeroplanes or whatever,” she says, “and we walked in with a consumer product and they laughed us out of the room.”

“Kicking Barbie’s butt: How the growth of 3D printing enabled me to make an army of custom-made figurines”, The Independent 20 November 2014

Fast forward a year or so, however, and big toy manufacturers began calling Makie Labs to find out what exactly they were up to. “I think it scared them a bit,” says Roach. “We were making dolls without using any of the established routes; working totally under the radar.”

Independent toy manufacturers are few and far between. While start-ups might pitch ideas to industry giants such as Hasbro, any dreams they might have of making their own toys are inevitably shattered at the point where they look into the logistics. “Toy manufacturing is an enormous machine and it all happens in the Far East,” says Taylor. “Making the moulds is hugely expensive, the best factories are tied up by the biggest companies and the lead times are incredibly long. People tend not to have a spare £150,000 and a working relationship with Toys R Us. So they just sell the idea.” 3D printing, however, made it possible for Makie to produce the items quickly. Their first dolls, printed under a dentist’s surgery in the West End of London, went on sale in mid-2012 at £99 each. They sold a hundred in a fortnight. The Makie Labs online tool allows children to choose gender, skin colour and clothing for the doll and offers such granular control over its facial features that each doll is almost guaranteed to be unique, while still retaining the distinctive Makie look. When you pick one up, you definitely sense something unusual about them and that’s partly down to the nylon material used in their manufacture, making them slightly weightier than traditional dolls.

“The idea stemmed from imagining if the characters from World of Warcraft, Second Life and so on could be made real,” says Taylor (Teri Pengilley)

“When we tested them with kids,” says Roach, “they were being really careful with them. We had to show them that they could be chucked around and it would be OK.” The layered texture of the 3D print also gives them a sophisticated matt finish that would turn a shiny Barbie doll green with envy. “Again, that’s accidental,” says Roach, “but we’ve been learning all this stuff as we go along.”

Makie Labs found itself raking up a whole collection of firsts, from dyeing bone-white 3D-printed nylon using vats of tea to achieve the right skintone, to putting the same material through arduous toy-safety certification procedures. “We had no idea what was involved,” says Roach. “And there was no one to ask!”

The innovative brand 3d prints each Makie doll and many accessories to order, meaning that children get a unique Makie which they can design online themselves.
The author of this refreshing scientific study of the Holocaust, Nicholas Kollerstrom, may be the most honourable man whom I have ever had the pleasure to know. In response to PM David Cameron’s denunciation of 7/7 and 9/11 skeptics as on a par with ISIS, he went to Scotland Yard with a copy of “Terror on the Tube” (3rd ed., 2011) and turned himself in. Scotland Yard declined the honour, but this act—which symbolically castrated the PM’s outrageous stance—was a striking illustration of his ability to tackle a problem by going right at it. A distinguished historian of science with multiple degrees, including from Cambridge, he has published on 9/11 and especially 7/7, about which he appears to be the world’s leading expert.

When his attention turned to research on the use of Zykon B as a delousing agent in the labour camps run by the Germans during World War II, however, he was treated as an outcast. He lost his position at University College London, which he had held for 15 years, where university officials did not bother to extend the opportunity of a rebuval before they sacked him. He and I both spoke at the recent conference, “Academic Freedom: Are there limits to inquiry? JFK, 9/11 and the Holocaust”, where this book reports the results of the research for which he was banned. The book, a stunning historic expose, has just been published.

The Holocaust — Myth and Reality

The situation is completely absurd. No subject generates responses as extreme and irrational as what has come to be known as “the Holocaust”. Unlike any other event in human history, including even the most sacred religious beliefs, for anyone to question, dispute or deny its occurrence qualifies as “a hate crime,” where Holocaust denial is even a prosecutable offense in certain jurisdictions. Unlike any other, this crime involves the expression of forbidden thoughts about a subject that has become taboo.

The underlying desideratum is whether history is supposed to be accurate and true or, as Voltaire has put it, be merely “a pack of lies the living play upon the dead”. Just so we know what we are talking about: In its broadest outlines, “the Holocaust” can be defined by means of its three primary elements, which I shall designate here as hypotheses (h1), (h2) and (h3):

(h1) that Hitler was attempting to exterminate the Jews and succeeded by putting around 6,000,000 to death; (h2) that many of those deaths were brought about by the use of cyanide gas in chambers for that purpose; and, (h3) that the chemical agent that brought about those deaths was Zykon B, to which the victims were subjected.

The science of the Holocaust does not leave any room for doubt about (h2) and (h3), since laws of biochemistry and of materials science—laws which cannot be violated and cannot be changed—entail that the bodies of those who are put to death using cyanide turn pink, while the walls of chambers used for that purpose would turn blue. But none of the bodies from those camps has been reported to have been pink; and examination of the “gas chambers” has determined that none of them turned blue. Which means that (h2) and (h3) are not simply false but have been scientifically refuted.

Holocaust science “cut and dried”

As Nicholas Kollerstrom documents in this astonishing and brilliant book, the science of the Holocaust is this “cut and dried”. To the extent to which the Holocaust narrative depends on (h2) and (h3), therefore, it cannot be sustained. The questions that remain about (h1) are a bit more complex but appear to be equally contrived. There are more than 236 references to 6,000,000 Jews who are either in acute distress or about to be assailed in the newspapers of the world prior to the Nuremberg Tribunal—the first of which appeared in 1890. The number seems to have no basis in fact but to have theological origins—from a disputed passage in Leviticus—as to how many Jews must perish before they can return to “The Promised Land”.

To the extent to which the number of Jews who died in the camps can be objectively determined, the most reliable numbers appear to come from the records of the International Committee of the Red Cross, which visited the camps and kept meticulous records of the identities of those who died and their cause of death. Not one is reported to have been put to death in gas chambers, and the total it reported in 1993 for all of the camps was 296,081 combined. Even rounding up to an even 600,000 victims—gypsies, Jews and the mentally and physically infirm—the empirical evidence thus contradicts the contention that 6,000,000 Jews were put to death and thereby falsifies hypothesis (h1).

Counting deaths attributed to the Holocaust—apart from the records of the International Committee of the Red Cross—turns out to be an exercise in “fuzzy math”, because none of them add up. As Faurisson observed during an interview on 13 December 2006, the Yad Vashem database was built up by “simple unverified declarations emanating from unverified sources and processed in such a way that one and the same person can be recorded as having died several times, even, it seems, as many as ten times”. [1]<

And even the most complete archives are not collated to make total numbers accessible but only individual cases—which appears an obvious measure to preserve the untestability of (h1), the hypothesis that 6,000,000 Jews had perished.

Holocaust story falsified

So, insofar as we depend upon empirical evidence and laws of science, the Holocaust story appears to be false and cannot be sustained. The question that therefore arises is how the Nuremberg Tribunal—widely cited as a paragon of intellectual integrity and of the application of moral principles to historical events—could possibly have produced such a highly misleading account of crucial events at the conclusion of World War II. The answer to this, I believe, has been provided by Robert Faurisson in his paper “Against Hollywoodism, Revisionism,” who explains the daunting task confronting the Allies to conceal or justify war crimes that they had committed in winning the war.[2]

The Allies’ systematic and massive destruction of German cities not only brought about the deaths of hundreds of thousands of German civilians but also ridiculed the railroad lines that would have re-supplied those camps, which were located near major industrial plants and whose inmates were providing labour to run them. It would have been poor business practice to exterminate the work force, but the large number of deaths from starvation because the Third Reich could not re-supply them provided an opportunity to deflect responsibility from the Allies onto Germany, which the Allies seized. A Hollywood director was brought in and shot 80,000 feet of film at the...
A stellar example arises in the context of the attempt to explain away why the number of those who died as substantiated by the meticulous records of the Red Cross supports the inference that less than 10% of the 6,000,000 claimed actually died from all causes—and none from death in gas chambers. To cope with that finding, the claim has been made that the records are incomplete because large numbers of Jews were taken directly to the gas chambers and never registered—not even by name. Not only are contentions of this kind unfalsifiable, untestable and hence unscientiﬁc, but they reﬂect the degenerating character of the Holocaust paradigm, which has spawned no new data or research that could possibly overcome the mountain of evidence against it.

Excluding falsifying data

Another method for immunizing a hypothesis from refutation is by the exclusion of falsifying data. The defenders of hypotheses (h1)-(h3) have committed a mind-boggling example of fallacious science, which further manifests their commitment to a degenerating research program. When the Auschwitz museum was confronted with the fact that the innocuous delousing chambers at Auschwitz have blue walls—due to being saturated with blue iron cyanide compounds—but the alleged homicidal gas chambers have not, they commissioned their own chemical research. Instead of testing wall samples for the chemicals that had caused the blue stains, the researchers they commissioned simply excluded those chemicals from their analysis by employing a procedure that could not detect them.

They justiﬁed this measure with the claim that they did not understand exactly how these compounds could form and that they might therefore be mere artifacts. Researchers who don’t understand what these compounds could form and that they might therefore be mere artifacts. Researchers who don’t understand what they are investigating have no business becoming involved. In this case, however, it appears to be deliberate. They have deliberately ignored an obvious explanation—that Zyklon B was only used for delousing—which would have remedied their lack of comprehension.

As a result of this failure to adhere to the principles of science, they produced a report of no scientiﬁc value, which they used to arrive at a predetermined conclusion.

That Nicholas Kollerstrom was booted from his post at University College, London—and without any hearing or opportunity to present his defense, where the truth of his observations, one might have thought, would have made a difference—is one of a large number of indications that even our best academic institutions and societies are not capable of dealing objectively with the history of World War II. Indeed, it struck me like a bolt of lightning out of the blue when, during a talk by Gilad Atzmon in Madison, Wisconsin, about Jewish identity politics, I realized that the Holocaust mythology beneﬁts Zionism and the government of Israel by playing, in the promotion of its political agenda, upon a Western sense of guilt for the death of 6,000,000 Jews during World War II.

The claim that someone is “anti-Semitic” or a “Holocaust denier” is taken to be the most severe form of ethical damnation possible in this time and age. But distinctions must be drawn between criticism of the acts and policies of the Israeli government and discounting the worth or value of human beings on the basis of their ethnic origins or religious orientation. Condemning the Israeli government for its vicious and unwarranted onslaught of the people of Gaza, for example, is not “anti-Semitic”. And if exposing the Holocaust narrative as political propaganda makes one a “Holocaust denier,” all of us who put truth before politics ought to wear that label as a badge of honour.

The ISIS fiasco

As an illustration of the depths of depravity of those who would uphold the myth, consider that, as an historian of science, Kollerstrom was invited to contribute three entries—including that on Sir Isaac Newton, which is the most important—to the Biographical Encyclopedia of Astronomers (2007), which has more than 1550 entries by some 400 authors from 40 countries. Yet Noel M. Swerdlow of the University of Chicago, a reviewer for Isis, the journal of America’s History of Science Society, recommended that the book be sent back to the publisher and pulped because Kollerstrom had been involved in research on the Holocaust! This was such an outrage that I wrote to the editorial board of Isis, which allowed a Letter to the Editor to appear. Something is terribly wrong, when the world’s leading society on the history of science does no more to correct a grotesque abuse by one of its reviewers on a book that involved so many contributors and an enormous investment in time and money, where the moral issues are so blatant and obvious. It is ironic that the Nuremberg Tribunal would declare “collective punishment” a war crime. The
(Continued from page 5)

Allies were responsible for the collective punishment of German civilians by their systematic bombing of German cities. Isis has committed a comparable intellectual crime by tolerating collective punishment of 400 scholars for the purported offenses of one. By acquiescing to its reviewer’s abuse, Isis has committed the fallacy of guilt by association and has displayed an appalling lack of journalistic ethics.

Nick Kollerstrom is the only party here who has displayed a commitment to exposing falsehoods and revealing truths. His defense is very simple: the hypotheses on which the Holocaust narrative has been based are provably false and not even scientifically possible. I have written about this in my articles “The War on Truth: Research on the Holocaust can end your career,”[9] “ISIS trips, stumbles and falls,”[10] and discussed it during my presentation at the 2014 conference “Academic Freedom: Are there limits to inquiry? JFK, 9/11 and the Holocaust,” at which Nick and I both spoke.[11]

But far better than reviewing them, read this brilliant study by the world’s leading iconoclast, Nick Kollerstrom, my dear friend, whom I admire beyond words as a splendid example of what historians should be doing in their professional work by getting history straight—lest Voltaire’s admonition continue to apply—including about the atrocities of World War II. There were real atrocities committed by all sides, just not the ones about which we have been told.

LIFE WAS HARSH IN THOSE DAYS
Source: Andrew Bolt’s Blog

The Greens are outraged that Tony Abbott said something so … true about what the first British settlers said when sailing to where Sydney now stands:

So what do the Greens believe the first white settlers saw if not bush and more bush? Paved streets? Neat suburbs? Hospitals? I’m guessing the Greens really do not want to confront the conditions in which Aborigines then actually lived - and what gifts colonisation eventually brought their descendants:
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My wife and I made the first Aboriginal flags, back in 1972, and more than a hundred of them up to 1981 or so, and sent them all around Australia. We were ardent supporters of land rights and self-determination and used to devour any new book on the subject. Invariably these books were based on secondary and tertiary historical sources, but they fitted in with our way of thinking at the time. Later, I was to find that without attention to primary source documents, indigenous history will remain seriously defective.

In the 1980s, I found the journals of George Taplin, the missionary who set up the Point McLeay Mission on Lake Alexandrina (where my wife was born) and managed it between 1859 and 1879. The journals were (and still are) in the State Library in Adelaide, in an old typewritten copy. At the time, I thought that some fool should type them up again. As it turned out, I was that fool. But I had discovered a goldmine of information, much of which did not conform to the dominant narrative.

A friend gave me some old letter-books from the mission, covering up to 1900, which I carefully copied. By then I was hooked on searching out first-hand sources and went on to type up the thousand pages of the various Royal Commissions “into the Aborigines”, of 1860, 1899 and 1913–16. Many other documents have now suffered the same fate. More recently, I have been typing up the correspondence of the Protector of Aborigines in South Australia, more than 13,000 letters in, and 8500 letters out, 1840 to 1912. All in all, I’ve transcribed around 6000 pages of primary-source material and put it all on a website: www.firstsources.info.

Comprehensively, this primary source material does not support the current narrative. In fact, it supports a more complex and interesting perspective. The dominant paradigm, which is being taught around Australia, in schools and at universities, asserts that

- Aboriginal people were “herded” onto missions;
- Aboriginal people were driven from their lands;
- Countless children were stolen from their families.

I have found no unambiguous evidence of any of this. Let’s look at each of these assertions in turn.

**Herding Aborigines onto missions**

Between 1840 and the present, the Aboriginal population on missions never exceeded 20 per cent of the total Aboriginal population in contact with the state, except during the Depression when it rose to about 30 per cent. In other words, for most of the time, more than 80 per cent of the Aboriginal population lived away from missions, across the state.

The total number of full-time staff of the grandly-named Aborigines Department was one, the Protector. His main task was to set up and supply up to forty ration depots, as well as roughly as many issuing points for individuals and families. Issuers, who were mainly police officers, station managers and pastoral lessees, and missionaries, were not paid. So: one full-time staff member and seventy-five or more issuing points. Who was doing the “herding”?

Mission staff rarely numbered more than three or four. They were flat out issuing stores, building cottages, supervising farm work, running the schools, providing medical attention. As far as I know, no mission ever had a fence around it to keep people in. Many times in the Protector’s correspondence, an issuer would ask urgently for more stores as a large number of “Natives”, sometimes hundreds, had arrived at their depot. A few weeks later, they were gone again. People came and went as they chose.

The Protector sent rations to a mission near Port Lincoln, located on 18,000 acres of crop and grazing land, with the express instruction that the rations were not for the residents but for “travelling people”, passing up and down Eyre Peninsula to and from Port Lincoln, and that the rations were to keep them supplied on their journey. The mission population there were supposed to be self-supporting (which they were from about 1868 onwards). The “travelling people” camped a couple of miles from the mission and occasionally worked for wages on the mission, grubbing stumps.

At Point McLeay, from Taplin’s journal, from the letter-books and from the Protector’s letters, one can read of hundreds of people suddenly arriving from down the Coorong or from up the Murray for ceremonies. They camped a mile or two away, and needed provisioning. A week or two later, they had gone back to their own country.

Rations were strictly for the sick, aged and infirm, mothers with young children, and orphans. Able-bodied people were expected to hunt or fish or gather, or work for farms and stations. Families that had been deserted or widowed were also provided with rations. Rations included: flour, tea, sugar, axes, rice, sago, tobacco, soap, fishing lines, fish-hooks, netting twine, needles and thread, clothes, clothing material, blankets, blue serge shirts, cotton shirts, spoons, quart-pots, pannicins, billy-cans, tomahawks, bags and tarpaulins for wurlies, occasionally tents, and free medical care and travel passes to and from hospital. Rations were provided to isolated individuals. For example, on many occasions, an old man or woman on a station might need to be looked after. The Protector asked the lessee to ask the person if they wanted to go to a mission to be better cared for there, but they said no, they wanted to stay on their land, so he arranged for the station-lessee to provide that person with rations, often for years. One Aboriginal woman on Kangaroo Island, originally from Tasmania, was supplied with rations in this way for at least twenty years. A deserted wife and her family in Adelaide were provided with rations for many years, at least until the record ends.

Missions regularly expelled people who had behaved badly or immorally. In other words, they were fairly particular about who could and couldn’t stay on a mission. I suspect that one mission had to wind down in the 1890s simply because it couldn’t get enough working men to stay there: it seemed to have a chronic shortage of labour from the late 1870s as capable men found better-paying work in the district.

In sum, there does not seem to be any evidence of “herding”, or any obvious intention to ever do so.

**Driving Aborigines from their lands**

There is only one instance in the Protector’s letters of a pastoral lessee trying to drive people from his lease (in 1876), and as soon as the Protector was informed, he wrote to remind the lessee that if they wanted to go to a mission to be better cared for there, but they said no, they wanted to stay on their land, so he arranged for the station-lessee to provide that person with rations, often for years. One Aboriginal woman on Kangaroo Island, originally from Tasmania, was supplied with rations in this way for at least twenty years. A deserted wife and her family in Adelaide were provided with rations for many years, at least until the record ends.

Missions regularly expelled people who had behaved badly or immorally. In other words, they were fairly particular about who could and couldn’t stay on a mission. I suspect that one mission had to wind down in the 1890s simply because it couldn’t get enough working men to stay there: it seemed to have a chronic shortage of labour from the late 1870s as capable men found better-paying work in the district.

In sum, there does not seem to be any evidence of “herding”, or any obvious intention to ever do so.

**Driving Aborigines from their lands**

There is only one instance in the Protector’s letters of a pastoral lessee trying to drive people from his lease (in 1876), and as soon as the Protector was informed, he wrote to remind the lessee that he would be in breach of his lease, which stipulated that Aboriginal people had all the traditional rights to use the land as they always had done, “as if this lease had not been made”, as the wording went. It was assumed that traditional land use and pastoral land use could co-exist, as, of course, they could and still can. I’m informed that that condition still applies in current legislation.

By the way, six months later, that pastoralist was applying for rations. The depot there was still issuing rations at least thirty years later.

(Continued on page 8)
The Protector provided dozens, perhaps a hundred or more, fifteen-foot boats, and fishing gear (fishing lines, fish-hooks, netting twine) to people on all waterways, even Cooper’s Creek, so that they could fish and “stay in their own districts”. He provided guns to enable people to hunt more effectively. Boats and guns were provided free—as well as their repair—to people unable to earn a living, and able-bodied people were expected to pay half their cost. The Game Act has always expressly exempted Aboriginal people from restrictions on hunting and fishing in “close season”, even now. The Protector advised a woman who had been living on a mission, but whose husband had been knocking her around, that he could provide her with rations at a town near her own country. Over the years, whenever particular individuals or groups were “loafing about the City” or drunk and disorderly, or begging (what we call “humbugging” these days) about the streets, he provided them with rail or steamer passes to “go back to their home districts”.

From the earliest days, Aboriginal people were encouraged to lease plots of land, up to 160 acres rent-free, and to live on the land, which was usually in the country they came from. The earliest record seems to be a woman who had married a white man. Often white men thought that, if they married an Aboriginal woman, they could get a piece of land, but no, the lease was always vested in the Aboriginal partner.

During the 1890s, more than forty Aboriginal people, including at least three women, held such leases. One mission may have wound down precisely because the more capable men took out leases of their own, leaving the mission bereft of labour and in debt.

In sum, there does not seem to be any evidence of any intention to drive people from their country. Again, quite the reverse.

Stealing children from their families

Colonisation disrupted Aboriginal traditional life and family patterns. Women had children by white men (as well as by Africans, Chinese, Afghans and West Indians) and lived peripatetic lives around the towns. Many children were abandoned or orphaned by single mothers who either could not support them or died. Many children were brought down from the north by stockmen and survey teams, sometimes from interstate, and then abandoned in the city.

All states have fiduciary obligations to their inhabitants, especially to children. The Protector was, in effect and in law, the legal guardian responsible for the well-being of such abandoned children. Facilities in those days were either rudimentary or non-existent, so the most suitable place for such children, short of locating their living relatives (which occurred occasionally), was to ask a particular mission if they could take them. Often this was not possible, so the Protector had to look around to find a place for a particular child.

So how many? I typed up the School Records, 1880 to 1960, from one mission/government settlement and found that, for example, between 1880 and 1900, only eight children—out of a roll of 200 over those years—had been brought to this mission. There were barely as many again in the next fifty years.

And just in case “stealing children” means taking them from missions and settlements, it should be pointed out that, in that period 1880 to 1960, during which 800 children were, at one time or another, enrolled at that school, a total of forty-seven school-age children were transferred to homes or institutions or the Adelaide Hospital, and the vast majority of them came back within a year or two. Mothers died, fathers died and mothers remarried, families fell destitute or broke up for all manner of reasons. The reasons for Aboriginal children being put into care of any sort were not much different from those for any other Australians, and at 4 per cent, neither was the rate of “removal”. Incidentally, more than thirty years ago, I got hold of the birth and death records from an Aboriginal community covering the period from 1860 to 1965. I typed them up and tried to identify the decade in which infant mortality was highest. I was surprised to find that the worst decade in all that time for infant mortality (including one poor child who died of “starvation”), was the 1950s. Why so?

Tentatively, I would suggest that, after the war, the movement away from the community by more enterprising Aboriginal men and their families, in search of better work and schooling opportunities, left the community short of carers, people who had customarily been expected to provide food and shelter for the children of the “stayers”, so that levels of neglect rose significantly.

In the period under study, 1840 to 1912, under the Protector’s watch, if children knew their own country and wished to go back there, he arranged for their travel home. At one mission a boy from the far north was unhappy and wished to return home, so the Protector promptly arranged for him to travel up to Oodnadatta and then on to his own country. A year or so later, he was back at the mission, working and asking for some financial support to buy a harmonium.

So, from the record, there does not seem to be any concerted effort to take children from their families. In fact, the Protector notes that he does not have the legal power to do so, and I suspect neither did he have the intention.

So why did I believe as I did, without evidence?

Because the conventional paradigm, the “black-armband” version, fits together. It makes sense. It doesn’t need evidence. And perhaps in other states—Queensland, for instance—conditions were harsher for Aboriginal (and Islander) people. But that’s for researchers up there to follow up on, if they will. There are such things as facts. There was only one full-time staff member of the South Australia Aborigines Department. There were forty or more official ration depots from around 1870 onwards. Sometimes facts are like rocks in a stream of interpretation: flow this way or that, twist and turn as one may, the interpretation of history still has to deal with the facts. What comes first, reality or ideology?

It may not have been all sweetness and light, but neither was it as brutal as the conventional paradigm supposes. Nineteenth-century people were no different from ourselves. It’s time we relied more on evidence than on feelings or suspicions, otherwise we will forever be getting it wrong.
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