I last spoke to this national conference some 13 years ago and whilst we are today different people and, indeed, in many ways different organisations, I find that our purpose and our values remain the same.

In 2002, the Australian Monarchist League was still somewhat fresh out from the 1999 referendum and was still grappling with the aftermath of that event as we saw our politicians whittling down what should have been a reinstatement of our monarchical values following the people’s will that they wanted to retain our safe and secure system of constitutional monarchy. In those days we faced political interference and were in many ways viewed as outcasts because we did not conform to the politically correct standards required by politicians of us. Because we did not conform, we were attacked viciously. People openly said their purpose was to destroy us. BUT we persevered. We stood firm to our values and we grew…

TRADITIONALIST ORGANISATION
Because we have been consistent in standing up for our Australian values under the Crown for over 20 years, we are viewed as a conservative organisation, but we are not. We are more a traditionalist organisation seeking to maintain those things that have made this country great and virulently opposing anyone who seeks to demean and to denigrate these values. Today, many politicians give us a grudging respect, not because they like us and definitely not because most agree with us, but because they view us with some concern as they do not know how far our influence extends, particularly through the ranks of young people and young Liberals…(continued on next page)
NEW CITIZENS

We must have in place a proper civics education which explains the role of the Crown not just within our Constitution but the manner in which it protects our daily lives.

New citizens must be taught why Australia is a constitutional monarchy and how the Crown keeps politicians from total and absolute power and authority thus creating a Parliamentary democracy which few other countries enjoy.

Whilst ethnic leaders have a responsibility to ensure that their youth do not become isolated from the community at large which is said to be responsible for leading to their radicalisation, successive governments must also be blamed for young people rejecting Australian traditional values….

MEMBERSHIP

In 1999 many of our people were elderly. We had people in their seventies and eighties who stood at their post at their polling booths all day, literally dropping where they stood, so important was it to them that we not become a republic. Of course, the retired veterans and their generation believed implicitly in putting their duty to their country first before self.

Whereas until recently a lot of our active members used to favour attending social occasions, the majority of our current membership today, we know only through interaction via social media. Most of our members today are under forty years of age and many of our office bearers are in their twenties. It is a far different world than before, but it is one that we have embraced, otherwise we will fast be left behind.

Therefore, unlike your usual Loyalist-type organisation holding functions and the like we have become a pro-active lobby group….

ACTION

As well as protecting the Crown, the Queen and our monarchical symbols and traditions, the League has as its motto: “protecting the Australian Constitution” and we have been active in so doing.

In recent times we have organised opposition to proposals to amend the Constitution. Recently, we were the largest online presence opposing the constitutional recognition of local government and our submission influenced both the Victorian Liberal party and the Queensland LNP government to oppose the proposals…

CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

According to the Museum of Australian Democracy, Australia is a liberal democracy which is based on four main principles:

- A belief in the individual
- A belief in reason and progress
- A belief in a society that is consensual
- A belief in shared power

These beliefs are very similar to and are essentially taken the rudimentary tribal laws of the Saxons which evolved into the Witan, or Council. It was the Witan which selected the king and even the Norman, William the Conqueror, sought the approval of the Witan to take the Crown.

In the 9th century A.D. Alfred the Great established a constitution for England. That constitution was the 10 Commandments verbatim. Winston Churchill in his ‘History of the English Speaking Peoples’ wrote of this time: “We are witnessing the birth of a nation.” It was a birth which commenced the long pathway towards constitutional government up until today when all who are under the Crown are entitled, with few exceptions, to vote whatever their religion, race or background.

From the time of Alfred, the Ten Commandments have formed the basis not only of the British constitution but of all constitutions that have emanated therefrom, including that of Australia. We should not forget that our Constitution begins with the words: “humbly relying upon the blessing of Almighty God…”

The Westminster system of government we inherited means that we elect a parliament from which a government is chosen comprising the political party that is able to muster the largest number of votes in the lower house of the Parliament.

Albert Venn Dicey in his ‘Law of the Constitution’ of 1885, distinguished Westminster democracy as:

- The legislative supremacy of parliament
- The prevalence of the rule of law
- The dependence of the Constitution on the conventions

AUSTRALIA’S CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In Australia, the evolution of democracy did not happen overnight. It was a lengthy process that commenced in seriousness some fifty years after white settlement began. In the declining years of the 19th century Australians held a number of state and national conferences all designed to bring together the turbulent and often disparate six colonies into one nation.

That the leaders of these conferences were able to resolve individual differences and through a process of discussions, deliberations and consensus, free from the influences of revolt and war, to join together in agreement culminating in independence in 1901 was nothing short of phenomenal.
The new constitution was put to a democratic vote of the electors in each of the six States and whilst, admittedly, not everyone was able to vote, the majority of people did and what they created was a system that eventually brought all Australians together with all citizens today entitled to vote on how each one wishes to be governed...

As our first Prime Minister, Sir Edmund Barton had earlier commented: “For the first time in history, we have a nation for a continent and a continent for a nation”.

POLITICIANS STIFLING THE SYSTEM

Whilst the Australian Constitution has stood the test of time, I am afraid that the political system it espoused has not and that is because politicians control that system and have warped and moulded it to suit their own political ends.

However, our democracy is fast becoming subservient to the will of politicians because of democracy itself where, because it becomes necessary to elect politicians, we face a three or four year cycle during which those politicians will do everything they can to ensure their re-election, bribing the electorate with untold promises regardless of the consequences to our economy, our nation and, above all, ultimately the people they are supposed to serve. As George Bernard Shaw wrote: “A government which robs Peter to pay Paul can always depend on the support of Paul.”

There are so many issues of great import for the future of this nation that could be more easily resolved by all politicians putting aside differences and sitting down and working things out...

MEDIA

One of the greatest impediments to a true democracy is the media. No longer does it report news in an impartial and unbiased manner but generally slants whatever news there is to assist the political party it supports. As Mark Twain has been often quoted as saying: “If you don’t read the newspaper you are uninformed, if you do read the newspaper you are misinformed.”

Indeed, as far as the subversion of our democracy is concerned, the media must bear the brunt of the blame. Its consistent 24 hour thirst for news, however erroneous or inept, gives politicians little time to carefully consider their actions. Government ministers should be governing not having to pander to the media every five minutes, particularly an avaricious media which pits politician against politician for the sake of feeding its news cycle...

MONARCH

Traditionally, the monarch exercises, or rather should exercise, the Royal prerogative to ensure that the freedoms and liberties of the people are never oppressed by the nobles, or in current day language, by the politicians. This does not occur today.

Over the past 50 years we have seen successive governments interfering in the day-to-day lives of the individual to an extent never before known before the enactment of the Bill of Rights over 300 years ago. The masses of government legislation and regulation extend the right into an individual’s home on what they can do and what they cannot do...

At the same time, we have imposed from on high strictures on what we can say and what we cannot say, what we can do and what we cannot do and even what we should believe and what we should not believe. These are all retrograde steps and impose the authoritarian will, not of the monarch but of what had become the political classes, our new rulers.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

However, one cannot blame the political parties alone. The people themselves must end their indifference and accept that they are a major part of the problem as they, themselves, have it within their power to hold their elected representatives to account. However, most remain uninterested, even apathetic, both in the actual electoral process and in not holding their members of Parliament accountable, preferring to get on with their day-to-day lives, caring little except about themselves.

As Mahatma Ghandi said: “true democracy cannot be worked by twenty men sitting at the centre. It has to be worked from below by the people of every village.”

So long as people take our hard won democracy for granted, it will be subjugated to the will of others. Plato had said: “The price of apathy towards public affairs is to be ruled by evil men” and those who are able to manipulate the system for their own ends will succeed, but barred only by the fact that our constitution is ‘under the Crown’.

Being ‘under the Crown’, provides us with checks and balances ensuring that politicians are not able to attain supreme power, for the Crown holds that power in trust for the people ensuring that the ‘temporary’ authority given by the people to a Government must return to the people at the designated times for election. The Queen is truly the guardian of our freedoms under the Crown, but democracy in Australia cannot survive by this alone. It will be subverted unless the people themselves stand up and fight for our freedoms and for our democracy.

Note: The entire text to Philip Benwell’s Address to the ALOR is available here…


***
Since the dawn of history the cry of reformers has always been for a “change of heart.” Of the practical efficacy of that unqualified appeal we have no means of judging other than an examination of the actual condition of the world as it is today. Under that test it would appear to have failed. Nevertheless, the great majority of society, with, it must be admitted, considerable encouragement from the press and the pulpit, and the pronouncements of bank chairmen, still holds blindly to the belief that a change of heart is an essential preliminary to any change for the better in social conditions, and denies environment any claim as a means to a change of heart.

In short, although we like to think of this world of aeroplanes and scientific wonders as very modern indeed, the truth is that the pre-Darwinian, pre-Baconian attitude of mind still rules. In support of this attitude Christ’s words are often quoted: “Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you,” manifestly a searching truth; but it seems to me the weak point in the argument is always the fact that so few of those who hold the view appear themselves to have experienced the change they recommend.

Until the rise of the Social Credit movement, there has never been a constructive, co-ordinated opposition to the monopoly which this theory enjoys, and a challenge to it is long overdue. As Major Douglas very profoundly says in his book “Social Credit”: “Virtue may flourish in the gutter, but if virtue can only flourish in the gutter, as some people would have us believe, then it is time that the nature of virtue received severe scrutiny.”

Social Crediters, applying the discoveries of Darwin, assert that if the conditions of life are changed, the heart will respond. That, shortly, is the Social Credit declaration of faith, and I believe it to be both sound and Christian.

Christ fed the five thousand in the wilderness. He was not of the opinion that they would be more spiritually minded fasting than fed.

It is just here that the problem reaches a deadlock. It is a sort of spiritual stalemate, and in the ensuing check and pause an acute sense can plainly detect the premonitory tremors of a vast society breaking up. It can serve no purpose to become either impatient or “rattled,” but it must be admitted that the matter is urgent, since it is quite possible that the future of an entire civilisation depends on its solution. If it were just a question of giving a decision on the side of one or the other school of thought--the change of heart or the change of environment--how simple it would be; but we must not forget that the core of the problem, our practical difficulty, is that both sides appear to lack the essential dynamic that is needed to stir up the public to a realistic sense of the present state of affairs.

My personal belief is that judgment cannot be given to either; that the truth of the matter lies somewhere between the two; as I firmly believe Truth itself to be a balance of forces. I suggest the two changes are interdependent. They must, so to speak, occur together; the job is to be tackled at both ends simultaneously, like a tunnelling of the Alps. In his book “Social Credit,” contrasting the claims of what he calls the classical and modern spirit which, broadly speaking, correspond to the two schools of thought I am considering - Major Douglas says, “It is probable that, as in many controversies, there is a good deal to be said for both points of view, but it is even more probable that approximate Truth lies in an appreciation of the fact that neither conception is useful without the other.”

Or, as I wish to suggest, it may be just their combination that would produce the spiritual impulse for which we are searching.

For since it is a fact that the nearest the human mind and language can get to a statement of Truth is a paradox - “For whosoever will save his life, shall lose it,” and many others - it is quite probable that the approach to a practical problem, even our very actions themselves, may require to be in a sense paradoxical in order to be sound.

It is, you see, a “live” problem, a spiritual problem, which is a conclusion that we Social Crediters have to some extent avoided, for the reason that, as a class, we possess that trained cast of mind that is intensely apprehensive of emotional excess. I believe that it is our destiny to live down that fear, as, indeed, in the near future many fears and prejudices will have to be overcome; and that the road by which it will be achieved is through a realisation of the fact that the scientific mind is the type of the modern religious mind, in fact the neo-Christian. Science is knowledge.

(continued on next page)
In action it is the research and documentation of natural law. For that job there is only one essential, besides training and common intelligence, and that is integrity, singleness of purpose: the “single eye” that, as Christ said, is the only means to enlightenment. In that sense the scientist is truly religious in spirit. He knows that all personal bias and preconception must be eliminated from the mind; that facts as they come to light must be accepted, not for any moral reason, involving punishment, but simply because it is only in that obedient, impersonal, selfless spirit that Truth, his objective, can be attained.

To me Christianity is realistic in the highest degree; but it was not the Church, but two superficially mundane interests that brought me to an appreciation of the realistic and practical quality of Christ’s teaching. In the first place it was the study of art, and later the study of that philosophy we call Social Credit. And the more I examine them the more do Christ’s teaching and Social Credit identify themselves and fuse in my mind. I put down here my interpretation of the fundamental principles of Christianity, solely for the purposes of my analogy; not minding though I must be treading on ground already covered and re-covered by commentators and theologians, whose books I have never read and never shall read.

What I have found, then, in Christianity is a technique of living; and it is with me that, whatever adherence I may give to Social Credit or anything else, the technique of personal existence must be my primary concern. I cannot, I will not, let my interests be an escape from my personal problems. Rather, I must solve my personal problems for the sake of prosecuting my interests more effectively.

Christ was a realist, the greatest that ever lived by my definition of Realism, which is a concern with the immediate present, with facts as they are. “The Kingdom of God is within you,” said Christ, and that to my mind is an eminently realistic statement. It was Idealism that shoved Heaven up into the sky, and that has persistently postponed human blessedness to any time and place except here and now; when just here and now are all that we really possess to work on. It is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a bedevilled world that displays all this passion for possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only time and place except here and now; when just here and now are all that we really possess to work on. It is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours. And it is surely a devil’s trick to rob us of the present, the only possession we can really call ours.

“I am not a realist,” said Christ, “I am a Christian,” and that defines Realism, which is a concern with the immediate present, with facts as they are. “The light of the Kingdom of God is in your hearts,” postulates, gives stable government its proper place and emphasis, as a means to an end; but “. . . unto God the things that are God’s,” postulates, without defining, the end to which government is to be the means. The true, democratic, interpretation of the Sovereignty of the People, as defined by Social Credit, is exactly this attitude applied to the structure of the State and the place and the function of the individual, as that for which and by which the State exists.

Christ's short life was spent in defence of the individual, and nearly two thousand years later Social Crediters find themselves waging the same battle. He clearly foresaw the danger of the elevation of means into ends, which has culminated in the Collectivist State and its suppression of the individual to the group.
No dogmatic Church could have bound Christ in His lifetime. It was only after His death, and not until several centuries after, that it succeeded in shackling and dogmatising his troublesome dynamic philosophy; but in the eyes of Him Who had created the philosophy, “the sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath.”

The identity of Christ’s teaching and what we call Economic Democracy is, I believe, fundamental. The two are in contact at every point - even to this extent, that the primary obstacle to the realisation of both of them is the same. That obstacle is, literally, the very devil, and its name, for want of a better term, is Puritanism.

To any that are hurt by that use of the word, I say, give me a better or as good, and I will gladly substitute it. But puritanism as I understand it (erroneously connected in many minds with purity) has, I affirm, nothing in common with Christ’s teaching. Again we are in need of a definition; although, indeed, this quality is so diffuse, so universal, so “human,” as to be almost indefinable in a phrase. The will-to-power perhaps comes nearest to the root of it, but that phrase itself requires defining.

Let me put it negatively. When Christ, One Who for all His countrified simplicity, understood more of life than anyone before or since, said to the young man who asked Him for a decision between his brother and himself, “Man, who made Me a judge or a divider over you?” He was demonstrating in the highest degree the opposite impulse to that which I designate Puritanism. “Judge not, that ye be not judged.” There is a law of life; and I think that Christ has plainly demonstrated for us that the primary fact of existence is that we are here and conscious, for the purpose of learning to understand it. The puritanical misconception is that we are here to administer the law. Is it surprising, therefore, that the world presents the picture it does, when the individuals, who compose society, each of them to a greater or lesser degree, conceive of themselves as administrators of their own interpretation of a law that has as yet been only faintly apprehended by a handful of choice spirits?

Puritanism, as I said, is of the devil, clothing the very deepest and darkest passion of the human mind - the impulse to dominate over one’s fellow mortals - in a moral disguise. And can we wonder if the hedonist, who for all his shallowness, at least has sufficient love for his neighbour to allow him to work out his own salvation, gets away with so much of our sympathy? It is the Puritan who has always been ready to shed blood in the past (for there is no more terrible human phenomenon than the man who identifies God with his own abysmal will-to-power), and it will be the Puritan who will be ready to shed it in the future.

Christ’s realistic mission was to free man, and the opposition He met is precisely the opposition presented to Social Credit. The truth is that the Puritan element in man does not wish to be free. Because its desire is to dominate over its fellows, it opposes the idea of their enfranchisement, which is its own. The Devil fears freedom above everything, and his own most of all.

It is quite natural then that when applied science comes along offering material freedom and abundance, the Puritan - the Devil’s advocate that lurks in each one of us - should be arrayed against it; or that when we espouse a movement calling for a realistic acceptance of the fact of economic freedom, we are met with deadly resistance from the vested interests of the Prince of Darkness.

The foundation of the Christian teaching is Love. It is a difficult matter to grasp, and very wide in its application, and the word itself has been so narrowly identified with sexual attraction that we can hardly employ it profitably. There are many definitions, but it will serve our purpose to take one; trust, in the sense of absence of fear - “perfect Love casteth out fear.” That form of love Social Credit represents.

Social Crediters affirm a belief in the fundamental decency - goodness, if you like - of human nature in the face of a world covering abjectly before its own degraded picture of itself. Coercive legislation, and armaments, and leagues, are all the direct outcome of fear and hatred - distrust of human nature. Into that dark abyss our present civilisation seems to be descending; and constructively opposed to that world-wide tendency there are literally only two forces, the teaching of Christ, and the philosophy of Social Credit, which I say are one and the same.

The actual clash that is to herald the social breakup cannot be very long delayed. In the interval still remaining, can these forces not be brought together, and from their identification a real Christian democratic nucleus be created, round which the remnant of this present marvellous and tragic civilisation might re-form?

It is conceivable that the actual break-up might even be averted, and the spirit of the age take that sudden renewal and swing upward with which an apparently dying piece of music sometimes starts off again on a fresh and finer flight.

That, as we know, is the vision that Social Credit has opened up for some of us; but, so far, we have not been able to communicate it to the great mass of the people. In this combination I have suggested, may lie the secret of the dynamic we search for, when the change of heart and the change of environment become, as I believe they should, complementary to one another.
This book was written... because many conservative Catholics were disturbed by and did not agree with the 2015 papal Encyclical Laudato Si’. Many Catholics... were concerned at the Encyclical’s message which some thought was confusing and contrary to previous teachings. Others were aware that the Encyclical was a preamble to influence decisions to be made at the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Convention in Paris (COP21/CMP11, 30 November-11 December 2015).

(extract pp. 344 - 347) The Pope's promotion of renewable energy shows that he was not well advised. Wind, solar, wave and tidal forces do not have the energy density to keep modern society alive. Wind and solar industrial complexes release more carbon dioxide than they save and are inefficient, unreliable and need back up all day and all night from coal, gas, nuclear or hydro.

In order to try to make renewable energy more competitive, governments have increased the costs of conventional electricity to the point where there is fuel poverty in Western countries and employment-generating businesses are closing down or moving.

No Third World country, trying to escape from poverty, can afford renewable energy and it is only Western countries that use renewable energy because they are wealthy. Wealthy countries didn't become wealthy overnight and centuries of the evolution of free trade, democracy, creativity, resource utilisation and property rights made wealth creation possible. Governments, collectives or international treaties did not create this wealth. Individuals created it. By denying poor countries access to fossil fuels, Pope Francis condemns them to permanent poverty with the associated disease, short longevity and unemployment.

In his (second) Encyclical, Laudato Si’, the Pope seems to have swallowed hook, line and sinker the new environmental religion. The Encyclical is an anti-development, anti-market enthusiastic embrace of global green left environmental ideology. Much of the 40,000 word Encyclical is a denunciation of free markets. This is dressed up as religious instruction from the largest church in the world. I am sure that he is only too familiar with the Parable of the Talents (or the Parable of the Bags of Gold) in Matthew 25: 14-30.

The Pope may be trying to revive Roman Catholicism, especially amongst young people, by being an environmental populist and wants his Encyclical to be part of Catholic teaching.

The Encyclical is meant to be a teaching letter with the Pope speaking as a moral and spiritual guide and not as a scientist or politician. The Encyclical is not meant to be a document of public policy yet it is.

Most Encyclicals are about hope whereas Laudato Si’ is actually a depressing doomsday view of the future strengthened by the absence of evidence, science and discussions about uncertainty. The Pope shows concerns for the poor yet only offers constraints that would make the poor poorer. There are no scientific references in the Encyclical even though much of it is about science and it attempts to use science to make comments about the future.

The Encyclical warns of "doomsday" yet it was written at a time when hundreds of thousands of Christians in the Middle East are facing actual doomsday. Christians are suffering calculated slaughter, beheadings, torture, abduction, slavery and rape by Islamists. This is the real doomsday about which the Pope writes nothing in the Encyclical.

The Pope has only listened to a small group of green left environmental activists, some who are in a warm embrace with communism. The Pope was very poorly advised. He clearly did not consult eminent people with contradictory evidence and conclusions. He did not consult conservative Christian scientists. The Encyclical provides support for the one thread that runs through the whole green left environmental activist movement. It is deceit. Whether it is in scientific methodology, scientific publications, media reporting or political spin, deceit is always present. If an ideology cannot be promoted without deceit, then it should be abandoned. The Encyclical will survive the test of time but for the wrong reasons.

Green left environmental activists have shown that they are mean, treacherous, shameless liars who are vulgar, cowardly, anti-environmental and ignorant. Their embrace of the principles of communism should send shivers down the spine of anyone who has a sense of history or who lived through these times (including millions of European Catholics).

Communism as an ideology, is anti-democratic and anti-human and is totally opposed to Catholicism. The green left environmental activists are anti-industry, anti-capitalism, anti-advertising, anti-selling, anti-property, anti-profit, anti-patriotism, anti-monarchy, anti-empire, anti-police, anti-armed forces, anti-A bomb, anti-authority and anti-Christianity. They are against almost everything that made the world a freer, safer and more prosperous place.

Prof Plimer has published more than 120 scientific papers on geology and was one of the trinity of editors for the five-volume Encyclopedia of Geology.

Ref: http://www.connorcourt.com/catalog1/index.php?main_page=product_info&cPath=7&products_id=348#.VkU3S4TS3C4
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As I approached the valley (after having climbed several hills that morning - ed) I saw that there were several cottages at which my bicycle might have been left by the boy who had agreed to ride it round the hills for me. Then I noticed a girl standing at a gate-way watching me, so I turned and went across to her.

She looked at me keenly, greeted me with the single Irish, or as I know it, Gaelic word, 'Thig', meaning 'Come', for some ten thousand words in Irish, Gaelic, and Welsh are said to be the same or similar. I followed her, and she opened a door, and I expected to find the bicycle inside; instead I saw an old Kerry cow in the last stage of exhaustion stretched out upon the floor. I looked at the girl, she gestured towards the animal, and walked out.

As my eyes became accustomed to the gloom I saw the cow was calving with some complication. So taking off my coat, for there was not a moment to lose, I found quite a simple mis-presentation, the calf being still alive, and in a few minutes I delivered it safely. Putting it in front of its mother, when she quickly recovered as only cows can, and started licking it, I knew that all was well, and went along to the house.

At this I sat up, for this was the native village of my Gallovidian shepherd (who had taught me all I knew about shepherding many years before - ed).

What was he like? I knew the answer before it came; a tall, thin man, with piercing eyes, and a long divided beard.

What a fine example this would be for an investigator of psychic phenomena, supraliminal communication; the fact that while I received an urge to hurry from the hill, when all my mental faculties had been refreshed, the girl in her intensity of prayer conjured up a vision of the man who had taught me, in the days before she was born. For how else can it be explained?

You would have to wait a long time at the foot of the Magillicuddy Reeks for an ordinary hiker who had calved five-hundred heifers in his time.

As a gift from one book lover to another, The Farming Ladder turned out to be a master work of perserverence, seizing every available opportunity to practice the wonderful craft of husbandry.

I thoroughly enjoyed the read and will utilise those lessons dutifully - ed
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