



CONTENTS

DEDICATION

FOREWORD David Mitchell, B.A., LL.B., LL.M., Ph.D. Graduate Diploma of International Law. Diploma of Human Rights. Barrister and Solicitor.

AUTHOR'S PROLOGUE

Chapter 1

DEMOCRACY and TREASON in AUSTRALIA

THE TRAGEDY OF POLITICAL PARTY GOVERNMENT

What went WRONG?

The Australian Constitution.

Chapter 2

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO AUSTRALIA?

The Australia Act

What Did Section 53 Actually Say?

Chapter 3

COMMENTS FROM RELIABLE CITIZENS

First Hand Experiences

Chapter 4

THE BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY SITUATION

Deceived in Her Grants
Deprived of Sovereignty
Shakespeare in Prophecy
Rule of Law
All International
Trade Manipulation

Chapter 5

RECOVERING OUR INHERITANCE

Citizen Initiated Referenda (CIR)

Chapter 6

THE MONEY MYTH

Chapter 7

WHAT IS TREASON ABOUT?

Why MUST They Destroy Population?

Chapter 8

WHAT IS COMMUNISM ABOUT?

What do Communists Say?
Don't be Fooled by Fabian Tricks.

Chapter 9

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION

Chapter 10

TREASON GOES DEEPER!

EPILOGUE

AUSTRALIANS SPEAKING TO AUSTRALIANS

What Can be Done?
Our Sword
Letters

WE HAVE THE AMMUNITION - Do we have the COMMITMENT?

THE CHALLENGE!

1. THE CHALLENGE TO POLITICAL PARTY GOVERNMENT IS SIMPLE
2. THE CHALLENGE TO MASS MEDIA IS SIMPLE
3. THE CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS IS SIMPLE

ADDENDUM

FOREIGN CONTROL OF AUSTRALIA
OUR AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION
WHY SHOULD REFERENDUM QUESTIONS THAT, ON THE FACE OF IT, GIVE US NO
ADVANTAGE ON PRESENT LAW, BE MATTERS OF GREAT URGENCY?
THE ORIGIN OF LAW
The WRITTEN document
THE DEPTHS OF DEGRADATION
THE THIN END OF THE WEDGE
SATANIC SYMBOLS
SUMMARY
FIRST THINGS FIRST
4/10/88: LATE-FINAL-EXTRA
THE CONSTITUTIONAL HERITAGE PROTECTION SOCIETY
THE TEST OF TIME W.H. Garing, Air Commodore, C.B.E., D.F.C., R.A.A.F. (Retired)

"... many who think themselves infinitely superior to the aberrations of Nazism and sincerely hate all its manifestations, work at the same time for ideals whose realization would lead straight to the abhorred tyranny." F.A. Hayek (Professor of Economic Science) *The Road to Serfdom*, 1944.

Copyright C Alan Gourley 1987

ISBN 0 9588651 2 4 0

First published as a complete edition in 1987 by First & Last Christian Publishing for the *Constitutional Heritage Protection Society* campaign to reclaim the heritage to which Australians are rightly entitled.

Enquiries to; C.H.P.S.
P.O. Box Q381,
Sydney, 2000, AUSTRALIA.

This book was preceded by a booklet named *Call it TREASON* of which an emergency edition (10,000 copies) was printed May 1986. A revised edition (5,000 copies) was printed October 1986.

First edition *Democracy & Treason in Australia* 1987 (18,000 copies) Second revised edition October 1988.

Other books by same author are in print and available from First & Last Discussion Papers, P.O. Box Q382, Sydney 2000.

Even Gods Err, 1979, a trilogy of three books comprising:

Book 1, *A Fresh Look at Creation*

Book 2, *Social Order Today*

Book 3, *Of Truth* (as related to self and society)

The *Even Gods Err* series take us from the mysteries of the past to the philosophy of today.

How to Avoid the LOOMING CATASTROPHE, (1985. Reprinted 1985, 1986).

Everyone's introduction to the secret society

Assault on Childhood, 1986

A Guidebook for Parents who want to protect the Human Rights of their children.

Quotes should be given the due acknowledgement. Permission to use extensive quotations should be obtained by conventional process.

First & Last Christian Publishing, P.O. Box Q381, Sydney, 2000. AUSTRALIA.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD by Dr Mitchell.

Author's Prologue.

C 1. The Tragedy of Political Party Government.

What went wrong; the Australian Constitution.

C 2. What is Happening to Australia?

The Australia Act; What did Section 53 actually say.

C 3. Comments from Reliable Citizens.

First-hand experiences.

C 4. The British Parliamentary Situation.

Deceived in Her Grants; Deprived of sovereignty;

Shakespeare in prophecy; Rule of law; All intentional; Trade manipulation.

C 5. Recovering Our Inheritance.

Citizen Initiated Referendums.

C 6. The Money Myth.

C 7. What is Treason About?

Why must they destroy population?

C 8. What is Communism About?

What do communists say? Don't be fooled by Fabian tricks.

C 9. The Constitutional Commission.

C 10 Treason Goes Deeper.

EPILOGUE. Australians Speaking to Australians.

What can be done? Our sword; Letters; We have the ammunition;

The Challenge! People you have POWER!

ADDENDUM Foreign Control of Australia

DEDICATION

To all who care about truth, reality, and the survival of life on earth.

I would like also to include in this dedication those who assisted in the writing of this book but to whom, because of the nature of the work, the old saying 'no names no pack drill' applies.

This work would be far less readable without the help of those proof- reading, advising and otherwise helping to bring my amateur writing to a more acceptable standard, nor would it be of much consequence without the help of those sending in a mountain of literature.

FOREWORD

This is an amazing book! Some readers claim it frightening, others say it rests on theories of 'dark conspiracies', but all find astonishing revelations about Australia's recent political history.

Although many thousands of copies have been sold, and the book is now in its second edition, no response has been made to the author's invitation to challenge its truth.

How many members (from all parties) are in Federal Parliament contrary to the express provisions of the Constitution? How many Australians understand their system of government? How many politicians fail to represent their constituents? How many electors know the protection provided for by the constitution? How many know the value of their heritage? To what extent do treaties with other countries impact on the rights of Australians?

Treaties like the Economic and Social Covenant and the Civil and Political Covenant. Conventions eliminating all forms of discrimination on the grounds of race and sex, and agreements prohibiting compulsory work for unemployment benefits (forced labour) already exist. A Declaration relating to the freedom of religion is under consideration for preparation as a Convention and a Declaration relating to local government is in process. How many Australians understand the extent to which these treaties bring Australia under international supervision and control?

The Australia Act purports finally to establish Australia's total independence and, thus, to place U.K. citizens on the same footing as any other 'foreigner'. If section 44 of the Constitution and the Australia Act are enforced many politicians will be forced out of parliament.

This book is a key to understanding the contemporary political history of Australia. It should be studied carefully by every Australian.

When you read it, draw your own conclusions. Your future, and the future of this great land, might depend on it.

David Mitchell, B.A., LL.B., LL.M., Ph.D.

Graduate Diploma of International Law.
Diploma of Human Rights.
Barrister and Solicitor.

8/9/1988 A.C.T.

AUTHOR'S PROLOGUE

ONCE UPON A TIME a rather innocent young woman complained to her doctor of sickness in the mornings.

The doctor mentioned a growth that a small operation could remove. Had the young woman known what the growth was, she and her husband would rather have killed the doctor than their unborn child. More unfortunate, after the abortion she was unable to conceive again.

Now that may sound rather like the beginning of a Grimm's Fairytale, but sadly, although the story of *Democracy and Treason in Australia*, is grim, it is no fairytale. The political parties entice us to an abortion of the 'embryo democratic' and if the planned abortion is allowed to proceed it will be no less a disaster to our future as a people or as a nation.

We live in a Democracy! A free country! Such comments are commonly made with a wry smile - sarcasm is commonplace. There must be very few Australians today who really believe that the common definition of Democracy (supreme power of government vested in the people) applies to Australia.

In fact the government of Australia is little more democratic than the government of the USSR. Our main advantage is that the bureaucracy is not yet military and if enough Australians knew the situation we would still have the power to change. To begin that change let us first replace the common definition of what constitutes a democracy with something more specific.

The three imperatives of democracy are:

1. public authority over political decisions;

2. national control the money supply;
3. national affairs free of external instruction.

Our present Constitution does provide for these but we, the people, are not told. Has ANY political party EVER campaigned for ANY of them?

NEVER! They have suppressed the first to sell us out on the second and third. What can we do?

Just as the great Judge Sir Edward Coke stood up to King James I and said, *You may not rule this country by proclamations out of your head ... you only have the power which the law gives you ...* so we Australians have to stand up to the political parties.

We have to say to them, "You are not authorized to exercise the power of life or death over us, you are not authorized to change the nature of our culture so as to suit your own ambitions. The Australian Constitution does not allow political parties a mandate to rule, nor are the Courts entitled to interpret the Constitution so as to make us subservient to overseas agents at your demand."

We have to say to them, "Such actions are in contempt of our people and heritage and are either acts of treason or of certifiable stupidity."

We can influence our future! We do not need sell our souls to foreign despots. This nation is ours and contains everything we need for prosperity. But freedom and prosperity must be earned; these blessings are not given to us by others!

How can we regain our self-respect?

We have to face up to our past mistake of expecting others to look after us at their expense. Human nature is not like that.

A factual knowledge of human nature is essential to any sorting out of the massive misinformation thrust on us today, it is difficult to make any realistic assessment of our situation without that base. My own investigations of human and worldly nature began in childhood so I am not easily surprised by events and attitudes, but some public attitudes are disconcerting.

One such disconcerting attitude is the unhealthy apathy toward the evidence of world conspiracy by people who know that conspiracy is, and always has been, almost as common to the human as the common cold.

As Abraham Lincoln said:

When we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places by different workmen, and when we see these timbers joined together and see that they exactly make the frame of a house ... we find it impossible not to believe that they all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan . . .

A second puzzle is that people so easily accept disbelief when it comes to facing up to dangers generated by those with a fanatical greed for PERSONAL POWER. Here is a helpful quote from *The Hidden Hand* by A. Ralph Epperson:

*Those who seek power will be corrupted by it. They will be willing to intentionally cause depressions, revolutions and wars in order to further their desire for more power. :b This corrupting nature of the very pursuit of power explains why the moral mind of the individual who **neither desires power over others nor understands the desire for such power**, cannot fathom why power-seekers would want to create human misery through wars, depressions and revolutions. [E.A.]*

In other words, the conspirators are successful because the moral citizen cannot accept the conclusion that other individuals would actually wish to create incredibly destructive acts against their fellow citizens.

A third cause of frustration is a common attachment to either capitalism or communism that prevents many people from accepting what should be patiently obvious, that these ideologies work as a nut-cracker toward the goal of destroying our present culture and setting up enslavement on behalf of a world-wide Super Mafia type of organization.

So I hope that the reader, if only from a sense of self-preservation, will make an effort to take an open mind to information in this book.

Among ideas implanted by brainwashers is the idea that we should fill the mind with pleasant thoughts and be happy, but would it not be better to be torn limb from limb than to go through life with no soul to feel the distress of another soul - no eyes to see injustice - no ear to hear the cry of distress - no will to make things right.

Let us pity the wise monkeys (so acclaimed) who see no evil, hear no evil - who live in dreams; their God, whoever they may imagine God to be, will, in the end, not know them. Will say, "I never knew you." for 'in reality' they deny themselves the feelings of life and evade life's responsibilities.

In short, when we truly know life, then we truly know that we have an obligation to it and that the ultimate success of our own life depends on our success in performing this duty.

That is the nature of life. If we know life then the cause of the so-called 'public apathy' is not so difficult to find. It is that a great proportion of Australians are already confused in their ability to read effectively and understand their world. They blindly follow blindly chosen leaders.

We have been indoctrinated by educators to the belief that we are no more than animals caught up in a life without future or purpose, as a result we tend to seek that which is futile and self-destructive.

We have a growing list of young suicides and mass media has to be careful when reporting not to trigger a follow-the-leader (lemming-like) self destruction. But of course the power-seeking mass media only exercises this self-restraint to a minimum because mass media is a vampire living off the death and destruction it so eagerly reports.

The obvious suicides are only the 'tip of the iceberg'; the majority of distressed minds prefer to destroy themselves by means of drugs and reckless living. Quite plainly it is the fundamental nature of humanity that is under attack, an attack so merciless and devoid of compassion that we may think those who plan it must be alien to our planet. However, our enemies are simply people who have been made incomprehensible by generations hooked on the drug of personal power-seeking.

So before getting down to the serious work let us recall a well established fact that was long ago put into words by Disraeli, *Governments do not govern, but merely control the machinery of government, being themselves controlled by the hidden hand.*

The question we have to decide is who will own the hidden hand tomorrow; will it be the hand of the electorate using the heritage of our present Constitution, or the hand of the power fanatics who must continually progress to greater and greater atrocities to satisfy their uncontrollable lusts?

DEMOCRACY and TREASON in AUSTRALIA

*Treason never prospers; what's the reason?
For when it prospers, none dare call it treason.
Sir John Fortescue.*

THE TRAGEDY OF POLITICAL PARTY GOVERNMENT

THE NATIONS of the British peoples (with constitutions and laws based on those of the mother country) were long the envy of other nationals. Many Europeans migrated to these countries to enjoy the privilege and security. However the best of law, in corrupt hands, can be turned against us. It is cause for suspicion that we are no longer warned of the fact that no law or constitution (or Bill of Rights) can protect us against corruption. We no longer learn that only by our own continual vigilance can we ensure that the rules are kept.

Although Australians today know little about the Australian Constitution, that document provides opportunity for the most advanced form of government so far developed. Its history goes back some four centuries before Europeans settled Australia and in fact its beginnings were in Magna Carta - the time English barons demanded certain rights and freedoms from kingly oppression.

It was the development of those ideas that led to the concept of 'government of the people by the people' and the *Common Law* system that has been the model for the most advanced forms of democracy known.

Let us begin with a simple outline of our present situation and how it came about. Most of us should know that the ideal of the Common Law system is *equality under law*. All are equal under the law and we are *innocent until proven guilty* rather than 'guilty unless you can prove yourself innocent' as with 'despotic law', and we are entitled to be judged by a jury of our peers. However the really important thing about the Common Law system is that **AUTHORITY belongs to the people.**

Our present LEGAL Constitution provides a three way arrangement of administration based on the AUTHORITY of the people, the JURISDICTION of the Crown and the SERVICE of the Parliament. Because of the fact that the Jurisdiction of the Crown is bound by historic Law such as the British Bill of Rights, Act of Settlement, etc., jurisdiction cannot be simply removed from the Australian Constitution without mutilating its power. It would seem undeniable that if all constitutional links with the U.K. are now broken, then Australians no longer have the protection of those Statutes which provide the legal base for our government and culture.

From the first edition of *Call it Treason* it was indicated that Australia became a quasi-republic at the signing of the Australia Act. This becomes more clearly evident as each item of evidence comes to light. Unless the Australia Act can be withdrawn (or we write a new constitution to include our Common Law protections) we Australians now have little or no constitutional protection.

However, on the other hand, you and I would say that the enactments that have brought us to this sorry state of affairs are illegal because they have bypassed the democratic and constitutional authority of the people.

The Common Law concept gave people the right to express their authority through an electoral system in which each electorate SELECT and ELECT, its own representative to a parliament that would administer the government of the nation. To make sure that these representatives did not band together to betray their trust, there was a Crowned Head of State who was the ultimate military commander and who was entitled to step in and dismiss the parliament should its actions be seen to be not in accord with the will of the people.

To ensure that the Crown also performed its duty, it was required that a very explicit Coronation Oath (on the Holy Bible) must be sworn. This Oath contained the promise to rule in Law, Justice and Mercy.

This is a very solemn and important part of the Coronation. After the Oath, the Holy Bible is presented and the Moderator says:

Here is wisdom; This is the Royal Law; These are the lively Oracles of God.

The important thing in all this is that the Queen swears to govern according to LAW and although that may seem a promise full of loopholes (are not the laws changed almost daily?) the fact is that the LAW referred to in the Coronation Oath is not that produced by day-to-day parliamentary activity.

The Laws of the Oath are firstly the Laws of God and, secondly, those Laws, Statutes and customs established in certain fundamental ways which, all together, could be described as the British Constitution. These Laws, established over years of struggle, can only LAWFULLY be changed (if at all) with the knowledgeable consent of the people.

You may wonder at the 'if at all' but, apart from the normal longstanding intent of constitutional type laws, at least one, the British Bill of Rights, declares certain things to be 'forever' or to cover future generations into an indefinite future, as we might expect from law establishing fundamental principle.

Our present Queen has sworn to uphold the rule of LAW and it would be difficult for her to now be relieved of her Coronation Oath even if the people, in full possession of the facts, agreed that it should be so. Such a move would be (at least) morally questionable. The Oath is sworn, not for a period of years but for her entire reign. It is sworn to God and to all her subjects (born or unborn) for the length of her reign.

So the full importance of the Coronation Oath is not apparent in the words themselves because the LAW referred to does not represent the civil laws passed by parliament but the Law established by various Statutes and ancient customs and the teachings of the Holy Bible.

The Law of the Coronation Oath is not something that can be altered by the Crown or the parliament or the Law Courts at will; where it can **legitimately** be altered it can only be altered with the **knowledgeable** consent of the people.

It is essential to appreciate that this Common Law system is not a system (or ideology) dreamed up by political fanatics or power-crazy manipulators, it is a system developed over years of trial and error and heartbreaking struggle by a community of peoples.

Now I think you will agree that very basic principles are involved here and the fact is, that these principles are based on Statutes that are part and parcel of the British system. **These protections are not written into the Australian Constitution directly but are part of our Constitution only by virtue of our constitutional ties with the British Crown and law.**

From the opening paragraph of the Australian Constitution:

... have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and under the Constitution hereby established.

So the point to highlight, is that if our Constitutional links with the United Kingdom can be cut by legislation such as The Australia Act (even though not one word of our Constitution is changed), then our Constitution becomes worthless and no more than an historic curio.

Does the Queen have the right to deny her loyal subjects, residing in Australia, the safeguards of the British Statutes without the people individually (or by referendum) petitioning her for this? Even were the Australia Act constitutionally legal we, individually, have an agreement with the Crown and our Constitution is **WITHIN** this agreement. By proclaiming the Australia Act does she not break her oath on this agreement?

The entire base for our political freedom is under threat. Be sure to understand the above and the rest of the book will be much easier to follow.

What went WRONG?

At the time the Common Law system became fully operational it must have seemed a very secure and watertight system of public authority. What could possibly go wrong?

What went wrong was that somehow or other the people got the impression that the political ELECTION was the important part of the process - that by the very act of election the people controlled the parliament. This lie is now commonly maintained by mass media and our parliamentary representatives.

In truth the important part of the process is the SELECTION, not the election, of the candidates. If you allow me to select the candidates I will be entirely happy for you to elect any of them you like.

Party politics probably developed because the first selected and elected parliamentarians felt proud of their position and the respect it gained them. When it came time for re-election it is not unlikely that most would desire re-election and be prepared to do a little 'campaigning' to improve their chance against any new candidate that may be proposed. It is also easy to see that selected popular issues would be good talking points. This desire for re-election and the desire to 'sell' popular issues would soon lead to the formation of political groupings and the introduction of political parties would soon lead to the squeezing out of most independently selected and elected parliamentary representatives.

The Australian Constitution.

A reading of the document called the Australian Constitution gives little understanding of what is involved. The historical roots and meaning of that document are not apparent without research. As we have seen the Australian Constitution is not complete in its own right but transfers a long political heritage to the authority of an Australian administration.

The Australian Constitution gave Australia independence WITHIN the British Empire. There was no reason to believe that Australia would need a full constitution because the British Crown and Common Law system guaranteed us the liberties of the best system of democracy then known. At that time (as now) it was not suspected that the advent of political parties had created a serious flaw in the democratic ideal.

The great failure of our founding fathers was the failure to foresee the dangers presented by a party political system. Political parties are extremely vulnerable to infiltration and control by vested interests. The main parties, once under control, can be used as a foil to each other and to deceive the electorate.

Had the risk been appreciated and some simple mechanism placed in the constitution to require consultation between the elected representative and the electorate, or, had the electorate been given power to force a referendum on any matter should a reasonable percentage of the electorate petition for it, then the electorate would not have been tricked into a gradual loss of its power and authority.

A good example of this is Switzerland, where the government must hold a referendum should 50,000 voters (less than 1% of the population) petition for it on matters of constitutional amendment, or 30,000 on matters of laws and international treaties. As a result of this, Switzerland (a country very poor in natural resources) is one of the best governed and wealthiest of nations, while Australia (a country very rich in natural resources) is one of the worst governed and indebted of nations. In fact, on last report (early 1987), we were third from the bottom of the list and rapidly moving lower. Debt wise, a 'banana' republic.

Had authority been established as being VISIBLY in the hands of the electorate, then we would not today be at the mercy of sects and subversive interests but would be politically aware, prosperous and leading the world in responsible government. We would not have political parties conspiring to deceive the public (now so visible) or suffer the electoral frustration of choice between evils.

It is not, as some will argue, a matter of buying a dog and barking yourself. The electorate does not have to instruct the representative in every matter but must be seen to have the power to instruct when necessary.

For instance the electorate need not give instruction on details of taxation but should DIRECT limits which, in various circumstances, it is prepared to suffer; **and for what purposes.** The electorate need not say which person may come into the country but should DIRECT what the immigration policy is to be. The electorate need not decide who should be hanged but should DIRECT if capital punishment is to be a meaningful part of law enforcement. All proposed CHANGES to national policy should be put to referendum as part of the election process.

The disasters of recent years were not a public choice. Did the electorate ever ask its representatives to increase taxes so that youth could destroy itself in mindless pursuit of pleasure without responsibility, or so that unmarried partners could live comfortably on social service payments and raise a family without working? Did the electorate ever ask that laws be made easy and so help the international mafia to destroy thousands with drugs and disease? Did the electorate ever say we should hand control of the economy to the international money-lenders?

In present circumstances we are, year after year, harassed by media and pressure groups which create division, confusion, trauma and social problems. Cultivated problems and the damage they cause, result (directly or indirectly) from political party conspiracy. With public control of parliament our most serious problems would not have even begun; others would have been aborted by referendum.

Our paid representatives, in the main, represent political parties not the electorate, in fact they scorn the electorate. The decay over the last century is marked. Lord Shaw (1910) said an M.P.:

... is not to be the paid mandatory of any man, or organisation of men, nor is he entitled to bind himself to subordinate his opinions on public questions to others . . .

In the modern political party there is obviously an involvement that causes an M.P. *to bind himself to subordinate his opinions on public questions to others* ... that is clearly the effect of political party discipline. Wilberforce, at Liverpool (the election of 1812) put his position so well as to expose the great tragedy of our political degeneration. He said to his electorate:

It may happen that your own judgment may occasionally come in conflict with my own ... but I promise you that any difference of opinion between us will always lead me to distrust my own views, carefully examine, and, if erroneous, frankly to correct them. . . .

... if, unfortunately, occasions should occur ... on which there should arise between us, on points of serious importance, a radical and irreconcilable difference of opinion, I will not abuse my trust, but will give you the earliest opportunity of recalling or reconsidering your delegation of it.

Compare those past attitudes with the attitudes of arrogance and impudence common to present leading M.Ps.

Liberal Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs for the Coalition Government, Mr. Ian Macphée, is reported as saying (Hobart 1981) that he did not take notice of public opinion, his job was to change it!

Or this from Bill Hayden, Labour Minister for Foreign Affairs, 1984, in response to a letter from his electorate:

Unfortunately, my "will" on these matters is just the opposite of yours and even more unfortunately, I have taken a vote to establish which of our two "wills" will win out ... It is my melancholy duty to advise you that you lost . . .

At one time, both the representative and the electorate understood something of their correct relationship. Unfortunately, the political greed for power progressed and public understanding of their right to exercise authority was dispersed. A process of gradualism, supported by the Fabian socialist movement over our present century, undermined public understanding and led political party despotism to the tragedy we suffer today.

Far from accepting the will of the people, politicians now reject referenda on the grounds of obvious public disapproval of the party position.

The original Australian Constitution makes no place for political parties; they are neither necessary nor desirable. Their deceit is that they offer to take responsibility for people who find responsibility irksome; their treason is that they sell it to the highest bidder.

The evidence today is a tremendous and traumatic evidence of what results from political party government. The damage is plain but there is no publicity to show it as the inevitable consequence of allowing unfettered power to political parties and so **TO THOSE WHO CONTROL** these parties.

Just how serious our situation has become is evidenced on the one hand by our disastrous economic plight and on the other by the continual erosion of public understanding and authority. The attempt to force on us a Bill of Rights and identity card which would introduce law to further undermine the authority of the people, produce despotic law situations and transfer authority to centralist government (a dictator's servant), indicates the nature of the power they now seek.

Above all was the sly introduction of the Australia Act which, in effect, vanguards the **LEGAL** transfer of all authority to the political parties via centralist government. It allows all those potential abuses (visible in the Australia Card and discredited Bill of Rights) to be established, without public choice, in a new constitution.

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO AUSTRALIA?

Why are we being deceived?

Whatever the reason, it is not just an Australian sickness. What is happening could not happen in Australia alone. What is happening here is happening in all English-speaking nations and apparently in all European nations as well.

In the introduction to a 1986 booklet called *The Queen Betrayed and the Nation Sold into Captivity* we find this comment:

A Bill is now being pushed through Parliament by the British Government without the consent of the people which, if passed, will transfer major powers over legislation and social and economic policy in the U.K. from the British electorate and Parliament to Brussels and Strasbourg. This transfer of power, and loss of British sovereignty, goes far beyond anything contemplated in the Common Market referendum of 1975. It reneges on assurances given by the Government that remaining in the Common Market would involve no further loss of self-government - more serious still, it causes H. M. The Queen to break further her Coronation Oath.

Or this from the Phyllis Schlafly Report U.S.A.:

Thank you for inviting me to testify on the Four International Human Rights Treaties. I oppose Senate ratification of these treaties for the following reasons:

1) The treaties do not give Americans any rights whatsoever. They do not add a minuscule of benefit to the marvelous human rights proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence, guaranteed by the United States Constitution, and extended by our federal and state laws.

2) The treaties imperil or restrict existing rights of Americans by using treaty-law:

- a) to restrict or reduce U.S. constitutional rights,*
- b) to change the U.S. domestic federal or state laws,*
- c) to upset the balance of power within our unique system of federalism.*

3) The treaties provide no tangible benefit to people in other lands and, even if they did, that would not justify a sacrifice of U.S. rights or upsetting the American system of checks and balances.

The above two items are mentioned here to help us understand from the beginning that what is happening in Australia is the result of secretive international plotting. Wealthy internationalists worked for many years to erect and control an international financial system. This achieved, they now work to complete and establish, direct political control of nations. Present political parties (without informing the people and in contempt of constitutional obligations) are contracting our national sovereignty to an international 'world government' concept.

The Australia Act

First a short reminder of the proper working of our legal constitution. Here are quotes from A.A. Chresby's book *Your Will Be Done*. Chresby, research analyst in constitutional law and formerly Federal Member for Griffith in the House of Representatives, states:

*"THE SOLE LEGAL FUNCTION of a Member of Parliament IS TO FREELY ADVISE the Queen in the government of the country, according to the **clearly expressed will** of the people, ... [EA]*

"... On the other hand, the permanent legal government or Monarchy IS WHOLLY AND SOLELY LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE DIRECTLY TO THE PEOPLE, ...

The submission of elected members to party discipline is in contempt of electorate authority and may be considered an act of conspiracy against the nation. The above quotations are basic to this argument and reflect the common judgment of constitutional authorities. Should there now appear lawyers who dispute this, then their opinion is irrelevant. New interpretations are no more than an attempt to deny the people their heritage.

The aborted move to force on Australians a Bill of Rights without a public referendum and full public understanding, is part of the sad story of the planned corruption of our constitutional heritage. A similar example is *The Australia Card* which, in use, would also extend despotic control over the people.

As to The Australia Act itself, ALL main political parties, both State and Commonwealth, spent more than five years preparing and passed, (quietly, with media discrimination) what is known as *Australia (Request and Consent) Act 1985*. This resulted in the Australia Act being assented to on December 4th 1985 and proclamation of the *Australia Act 1986* being signed by Her Majesty the Queen, in Australia, on Sunday March 2nd to bring it into force on March 3rd 1986.

The signing ceremony was the first and possibly the only hint that most Australians have had that a very important Act has been passed into law. But even then, there was no hint we are being cut off from our British Christian heritage and constitutional right to democratic government.

Although the Australia Act 1986 states specifically that the Commonwealth Constitution is not affected (it applies to the States) the balance of constitutional power is very definitely changed and by that the Constitution is changed. The act most certainly undermines the conventions, protections and meanings of our Constitution.

Legal interpretation of the Australia Act is obviously open to argument but the intent of the Act was clearly stated in Parliament itself, and explanations made in Parliament are considered as evidence when it comes to interpreting an Act. The General Outline in the Explanatory Memorandum relating to the Australia Act (House of Representatives) begins:

The purpose of the Australia Bill 1986 and the Australia (Request and Consent) Bill 1985 is to sever the remaining constitutional links between Australia and the United Kingdom.

Constitutional lawyers may argue and confuse us (and themselves) about the meaning of the words used in the Act but, in the end, the stated purpose must prevail. Despite what we were told officially about the Act being of no consequence we find, within days of the Act being Assented to, a Constitutional Commission being formed to advise on changes to the Australian Constitution.

Also, within a few months of signing, constitutional lawyers begin coming into agreement that the Act does open the way to alteration of the Australian Constitution without public consent.

It appears inevitable that Australia must have a new Constitution because if, as stated above, all constitutional links with the United Kingdom are now broken, or if, as seems likely, the United Kingdom becomes part of the new European Economic Community with laws overruling British Common Law, then, in either event, the foundations of our present constitution disintegrate.

HOWEVER, on the other hand, it is clear that the enactments which have brought us to this sorry state of affairs are illegal (both here and in the U.K.) because they have bypassed the democratic and constitutional authority of the people.

So where does that leave us? It leaves us (as I have all along seriously insisted) living under a government whose operation is illegitimate and whose actions are TREASONABLE.

An enactment that is without expressed public WILL or knowledge or option, is clearly not an enactment giving effect to the will of the people and, when such an enactment has the effect of totally dismissing all the lawful safeguards (by both its own force and the deceit of its enactment), then the deliberate nature of the sell-out is beyond doubt.

There are many anomalies and contradictions related to the Australia Act and the publicly stated reasons for the Act. For example, the heading to Section 5 of the Act states: Commonwealth Constitution, Constitution Act and Statute of Westminster not affected but Section 12, headed: Amendment to the Statute of Westminster, reads as follows:

Sections 4, 9, (2) and (3) and 10 (2) of the Statute of Westminster 1931, in so far as they are part of the law of the Commonwealth, of a State or of a Territory, are hereby repealed.

Obviously some legalistic double-talk is prepared to explain such contradictions, but equally obvious is that resort to such trickery merely adds to the evidence of deception.

The people now find it almost impossible to exercise any authority; this was never more clearly evident than in the example of public appeals against the Australia Act based on Queensland legislation produced precisely to protect the people from just such legislation as the Australia Act.

On the 7th of December 1977 Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen presented to the Queensland Parliament *The Constitution Act Amendment Bill*. Extracts from Hansard:

My Government believes that writing these existing provisions of constitutional law and practice into the constitution will safeguard the existing system of parliamentary Government in Queensland but it believes that it is necessary to entrench this safeguard against the possibility of changes being brought about by Parliament contrary to the wishes of the electorate.

Few people in Queensland today want a republic - especially the socialist republic which so many Labor Party people appear to want. We do not want a Government of this State at any time taking advantage of the people to produce a republic by stealth. If the people want it, then they should be able to clearly indicate so at a referendum. Only if the people of Queensland vote for a change will it be possible for Australia as a whole to become a republic, because you cannot change the monarchy in one part of Australia unless you change it in the whole.

To entrench the present system, the Bill provides that none of its clauses can be altered by Parliament unless the Bill is first presented to the people by way of referendum as prescribed in this Bill.

The requirement of entrenchment (Section 53) is also itself entrenched so that the guarantee cannot be undone, such as has been done in other parts of the Commonwealth of Nations where a republican form of government has been brought about contrary to the constitution.

As I have said, a great deal of thought has gone into this Bill. What has been done in other parts of the British Commonwealth has been taken into account and we have considered all of the implications of entrenchment and the way in which the entrenchment can be brought about constitutionally. My Government is confident that this is a measure which will meet with the whole-hearted approval of the people of Queensland and will attract a great deal of interest among the parliamentarians and people of other States of Australia and overseas. I commend the Bill to the House. Hansard - as reproduced in Wake Up, Australia November 1986.

What Did Section 53 Actually Say?

Requirement for Referendum

53. Certain measures to be supported by referendum.

(1) A Bill that expressly or impliedly provides for the abolition of or alteration in the office of Governor or that expressly or impliedly in any way affects any of the following sections of this Act, namely - section 1,2,2A,11A,11B,14; and this section 53, shall not be presented for assent by or in the name of the Queen unless it has first been approved by the electors in accordance with this section and a Bill so assented to consequent upon its presentation in contravention of this subsection shall be of no effect as an Act.

(2) On a day not sooner than two months after the passage through the Legislative Assembly of a Bill of a kind referred to in subsection (1) the question for the approval or otherwise of the Bill shall be submitted to the electors qualified to vote for the election of members of the Legislative Assembly according to the provisions of the 'Elections Act 1915-1973' and of any Act amending the same or of any Act in substitution therefor.

Such day shall be appointed by the Governor in Council by Order in Council.

(3) When the Bill is submitted to the electors the vote shall be taken in such manner as the Parliament of Queensland prescribes.

(4) If a majority of the electors voting approve the Bill, it shall be presented to the Governor for reservation thereof for the signification of the Queen's pleasure.

(5) Any person entitled to vote at a general election of members of the Legislative Assembly is entitled to bring proceedings in the Supreme Court for a declaration injunction or other remedy to enforce the provisions of this section either before or after a Bill of a kind referred to in subsection (1) is presented for assent by or in the name of the Queen. Wake Up, Australia.

Only a few years later we find enacted in all States, including Queensland, the *Australia (Request and Consent) Act 1985*. This act requested the British Parliament to change the constitutions of all States. This was done without any referendum or general publicity. As a result two Queenslanders decided to bring legal proceedings as section (5) above advised. Both were dismissed. The first, a case against the Minister for Justice and Attorney General was lost because the Judge found:

... that while the applicant contended that the Act of 1985, at least impliedly, provides for alteration in the office of Governor and that it expressly affects ss 11A and 11B and 14 of the Constitution ... the Act does not of its own force, purport to affect any provision of the Constitution or the office of Governor or indeed to work any change in the law of Queensland, although it is true that it seeks to have the Parliament at Westminster and the Parliament of the Commonwealth make the relevant alterations.

Who changed the meaning of the words expressly or impliedly, section (1)? Or, shall not be presented for assent by or in the name of the Queen unless it has first been approved by the electors?

In the second attempt the case was brought against the Governor and fared even worse, the court ruling that the Governor was not the appropriate person to be held accountable.

The clear intent of the legislation was to prevent Acts such as the Australia Act being used to change the Queensland Constitution without a referendum, but equally obvious is that if the powers behind the scenes want something, legality, in our present situation, becomes almost irrelevant.

If the parliament is seen as THE AUTHORITY then almost any document can be interpreted to suit. But the Parliament is not constitutionally the authority, nor is the Court. In Common Law it is the PEOPLE who are the authority and in case of dispute of constitutional meaning, they, by means of referendum, are the only authority that can properly give a final answer. The political parties have (not surprisingly) never seen fit to legislate a procedure whereby the people may express their authority.

In the absence of any practical mechanism whereby the people can express their authority, and in absence of education to keep the public aware of the overall nature of their responsibility, then the parliament can claim to represent the people and do just as it likes.

So long as the people can be by-passed, then, no matter how clearly the law is expressed, lawyers can always read in a loophole to suit those who manipulate governments. The judgment that the *Australia Act (Request) Acts* (as they were called prior to the 'requested' Australia Act being introduced) did not constitute an act altering the Queensland Constitution but only a request to another parliament for alteration, is certainly avoiding the practical and intended meaning of the legislation.

The Australia Act deception, supported by all represented parties in both State and Federal parliaments, makes a mockery of our democratic system and makes irrelevant any legal interpretation of our Constitution.

If the base of legal government can be abused in this way then a precedent is created which, if accepted by the public, allows other unconstitutional power grabs. The significance is that:

- (1) it makes parliament illegitimate in terms of our legal Constitution;
- (2) it denies Australia the safeguards and privileges of the British parliamentary heritage and, because of agreements signed with the United Nations, places us under United Nations control;
- (3) it makes way for a new Constitution;
- (4) it makes way for Australia to become a socialist puppet-republic.

Despite the silence of the mass media, and the claims of political party politicians that the Australia Act is of no political consequence, we now have a *Constitutional Commission* to advise on changes to the Constitution. Also comments as below from constitutional lawyers.

Reported in TIME magazine (10/11/1986):

Melbourne University Constitutional Lawyer Bernard O'Brien says the recent Australia Acts, which severed the country's remaining constitutional links with Britain, also removed the need for referendums, an idealistic but invariably frustrating requirement that not only a majority of the people endorse any proposed change but also a majority in most states. Since 1901, referendums have been a barrier to substantive constitutional reform.

O'Brien believes the recent unannounced change may be no accident. He quotes Adam Smith, the 18th century English economist, who said: "People in the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public." . . .

But according to O'Brien, who says he has tested his theory on other constitutional lawyers, the Australia Acts do more than appears on the surface. He says they "appear to introduce a procedure whereby the Commonwealth constitution can be altered by the Federal parliament at the request or with the consent of the state parliaments without having recourse to people voting at a referendum." Even more controversially, he also says it is possible the agreement of the states may not be necessary.

Independently of O'Brien's work, another Melbourne University constitutional lawyer, Greg Craven, has studied a 1985 High Court judgment and concluded that the logical implication of the position adopted by three of the judges is that a simple legislative amendment would be all that would be needed to bring the constitution under the power of the Commonwealth parliament.

Others also bring up valid points.

But why should we expect any of the political parties that conspired to bring in the Australia Act to now act to prevent the implementation of its provisions? There must surely be a lesson from having seen what may happen to preventive legislation when actually put to the test.

Are the arguments of our 'learned friends' relevant? Does it not seem that if the law can say that legislation which does not in itself alter the constitution but only asks another authority to do so, is legitimate, and if

severing the constitutional links between Australia and the United Kingdom does not require popular referendum, or is also legitimate because it does not actually alter a word of the Australian Constitution, then why should parliament not write a new Constitution? After all they are not altering the present Constitution (now without force) but merely consigning it to the rubbish bin.

If they now do so, who can we (the people) appeal to?

Irrespective of the legal base for the above comments, it cannot be denied that if the Constitution can be changed without the knowledge or understanding of the people at one time it can be done in the same way at another. What is legal or illegal makes little difference so long as the people remain ignorant.

Letters received from readers who have written to parliamentarians show that parliamentarians still maintain the constitution is unaffected; example from Ian Sinclair, M.P.:

The proposition that this legislation will alter the Constitutional balance of powers between the Commonwealth and State Governments is certainly not correct.

The legislation was the result of lengthy consultations between the Commonwealth and State Governments, and the British Government. The States had the opportunity to protest if there were any change in either their relationship with the Monarchy or with the Commonwealth . .

It is quite normal for politicians to evade or ignore important points and to give an opinion rather than to present any evidence or logic. Well the facts are that a Queensland Judge said the Act WAS a request for illegal changes and several constitutional lawyers say that it HAS resulted in important changes, and the legislators themselves say that the purpose WAS to sever the remaining constitutional links and what we are complaining about is the conspiracy between the political parties. Is that all totally beyond the ken of a mere party politician?

Clearly, as we do not select our representative, it is natural that 'our' representatives represent those who do manipulate the choice.

There is one thing we Australians have to do at the next election .. get representation in OUR parliament. The opportunity is certainly there, two strongly contested by-elections in NSW (early 1987) resulted in a marked swing from the major parties. A newspaper report (Sunday Telegraph) said that more than 30% of voters in each seat ignored the two main parties in a growing disillusionment. Significantly, it was also reported that many of these did not even give a preference to a major party. We may be sure that if 30% voted against major parties then a majority in the electorate is disillusioned - most electors simply do not know how to handle the situation.

A politician is not legally empowered to represent the will of a political party, nor to represent his own desires, nor to represent any foreign power of any kind. A politician is, by rights, totally and solely a servant of those who elect him and must act for them only. He may not represent pressure groups or international gangsters. For an elected M.P. to disregard this duty and, in conspiracy with other elected members to serve alien interests, would seem, in common convention, to constitute treason. All represented parties must be counted equally guilty in this.

Unless we understand our rights and privileges as set out by the legal Australian Constitution, it is not so easy to see the full significance of secret manipulation.

Section 128 of the Australian Constitution says:

*... the proposed law shall be submitted in each State **and Territory** to the electors.*

And Part 1, Section 1, of the Constitution states:

The legislative power of the Commonwealth shall be vested in a Federal Parliament, which shall consist of the Queen, a Senate, and a House of Representatives.

If a 'tricky-dicky' use of words to mislead the people and bypass the Constitution is not deceit, what is?

Many Australians are aware that our Constitution demands a democratic majority approve of changes but, if we do not know the Constitution and the historic ties that protect and give it meaning, we are easily deceived. Our Constitution has three basic elements and if any two of these unilaterally declare the third powerless, then we no longer have a legally constituted government because the deprived element does not have the right to accept emasculation nor do they altogether have any legal right to change the Parliamentary power balance without the consent of the electorate and in accord with the clear intent of the historic purpose of government directed by the will of the people.

So while all States must agree to constitutional change, the actual Constitution makes clear that the people are the authority. It can NEVER be acceptable that constitutional change can be made without the understanding and desire of the people. The parliamentary representative is properly the representative of the electorate and may not make such a decision on his own behalf or on behalf of some alien influence.

Furthermore, any re-arrangement of State powers which alter relationships between States and Federal is, effectively, an alteration of Federal power. Even were each State government legally free to act without a referendum, to do so as a means of re-arranging constitutional power without the expressed will of the electorate is not within the spirit, meaning or content of the Constitution.

What we are concerned with here is not just simple law; what we are concerned about is our rightful heritage which gives us, the people, control of the political process. We have (what amounts to) a mutual defense pact with the Crown to ensure that we maintain that control. However written, our forefathers died for and achieved for us the right of 'government of the people by the people'. Deliberate by-passing of this heritage, in fact or in spirit, is betrayal.

Only when one understands the importance of these changes does one begin to appreciate the significance of the secrecy and tricky legality with which these Acts and other changes have been introduced by political party connivance.

Once we understand how these changes unite the Bill of Rights, the Australia Act 1986, the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission, the proposed Australia card, and agreements signed with the United Nations (which are based on socialist concepts), then we begin to appreciate the enormity of what is so deceitfully imposed.

The above are designed to impose on honest Australians (as a first installment) the following reforms:

- Secret trials by non-legal bodies.
- Denial of legal redress or representation.
- Denial of right to know your accuser.
- Denial of due process of law.
- Denial of right to privacy (any documents, either private or business, can be demanded).
- Denial of right to own property.
- Greater legal protection for crime.
- Legal protection for moral subversion and subversive government.

These are only the first step! What comes next?

It's much later than you think. The powers of the Spanish Inquisition are being re-created in an unelected body called the *Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission*. In Inquisition days such people claimed to work for God; now they mask their activities under the name of Human Rights. What's in a name?

COMMENTS FROM RELIABLE CITIZENS

If we do not want to believe the evidence and our own common sense, let's see what reliable citizens say about certain legislation introduced into Australia since 'behind the scenes' agreement was reached on the Australia Act. A large part of this chapter will be devoted to the thrown out Bill of Rights.

Why bother with something already defeated? Because it is not defeated, only delayed. Also it has been widely discussed and provides an excellent example **of a form of legislation now being introduced, at both State and Federal level, and not generally reported or discussed in the mass media.** But first Andrew Kirk on the *Australia Card*:

... the greatest affront to our civil liberties in this nation's history ... the beginning of a whole new relationship between the state and its citizens ... the Government is going to be able to profile every 'entity' operating in the economy. One's financial privacy will be utterly destroyed ... The Health Insurance Commission which would administer the data base if the Bill becomes law, will initially have access to the confidential records of at least eight Government bodies. It will be able to delve into the records of the Australian Taxation Office, the Electoral Commission, and the Departments of Defence, Social Security, Immigration, Foreign Affairs, Ethnic Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs. Once the Australia Card is introduced it will be easy for the Government to extend the base ... The Optimist (September/October 1986).

What is the Australia Card about? Politicians tell us that it is to stop tax evasion and social security fraud but The Joint Select Committee in its report to parliament reject this, so do other authorities. People who should know claim this device is ineffectual for such a purpose and also claim that proper enforcement of the existing laws would do the job more effectively.

When we look more closely at what is going on we must be excused for thinking that the present laxity in enforcing existing law was encouraged so as to create a situation, and excuse, for introduction of legislation designed to force on us a sick world of computer surveillance quite foreign to Western democracy.

The Australia Act 1986, by making vulnerable our constitution, provides the key to later enforcement of the assorted proposals which make up the present attack on our civil liberties. Some of the features of this 'new law' plot were expressed in the so-called "Bill of Rights" which brought much comment from mature and responsible people.

A book could easily be filled with such comment but all sound criticism of that Bill covers much the same range of objections as are covered by the selected quotes and comments made in this book.

First Mr. J.K. Bowen, a Victorian Barrister, Treasurer of the Victims of Crime Assistance League, and former Commonwealth Principal Legal Officer. The following quotations are from his paper headed *THE AUSTRALIAN BILL OF RIGHTS - SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR OUR SOCIETY*:

In late 1983, the then Federal Attorney-General, Senator Gareth Evans, declared that Australia needed a Bill of Rights ...

One would have expected from its very nature that a Bill of Rights would have been exposed to the widest possible public scrutiny and discussion - from conception to first draft, and beyond. But that was not to be the case ... The conception, birth and early life of Senator Evans' Bill were shrouded in secrecy. ...

As the Federal election drew near in December 1984, the shadow Attorney-General, Senator Durack, pressed Senator Evans to give Australians an indication of what their rights and liberties were to be. Senator Evans rejected the opportunity ...

Similar "Human Rights" Bills have been adopted by Warsaw Pact countries, but England - the home of the common law - has always rejected such devices.

On the surface, the Bill's declarations of freedoms and rights such as freedom of expression, freedom of movement, the right of peaceful assembly, and its prohibitions against torture, slavery, and scientific experimentation upon prisoners, sound good - but hopefully, you will be asking yourselves 'why does a Human Rights Bill containing such fine declarations of rights, not work in those totalitarian countries which have such Bills? The answer is that we have strong institutions to protect our rights and freedoms in Australia. Totalitarian countries like to have 'window-dressing' such as a Human Rights Bill; but behind the facade there are no institutions, such as an independent judiciary and a democratically elected parliament, to protect the rights and freedoms declared in such "scraps of paper".

We will see the end of the centuries-old constitutional separation of the functions of Parliament and the Law Courts if a Federal judge is given that kind of power to nullify a law passed by a democratically elected State Parliament. The Bill would make State Parliaments, Governments and Local Authorities subject to control and censure by the Federal Human Rights Commission and Federal Courts. The Bill would effectively re-write the Constitution without a referendum.

I am deeply concerned about the Bill's implications for State criminal justice systems, State police forces, education systems, families, and employer/employee relationships - to name but a few of the institutions and important relationships likely to be affected by the Bill. The Bill contains provisions which will remove important police powers . . . potential to interfere with existing sensitive relationships between parent and child, employer and employee, teacher and pupil . . .

The intrusions by the Bill into all kinds of important institutions and relationships are likely to be highly destabilizing to our society. In short, the Bill appears likely to offer nothing but harm to ordinary law-abiding, decent and hard-working citizens, and clearly has the potential to undermine social cohesion in Australia.

Matching this preoccupation with social engineering ... we can expect to see Governments in Australia continue to exalt even the slightest evidence of improved economic performance ... when the wealth of the Nation, and of each hard-working Australian, is drained away by the intensive social welfare schemes required by a sick society.

. . . One of the major factors contributing to the destabilization of Australian society since the fifties, has been the undermining of this family unit by such measures as the continual withdrawal of economic support for it, easy divorce laws, and the elevation of 'alternative' life-styles, such as the voluntary single parent family, to a status equivalent to the traditional family. The Bill's potential for legalizing homosexual marriages and adoptions would represent a further devastating blow to the traditional family.

. . . suspicion concerning public education . . . Without any apparent qualification, Article 7 grants to every person the right "to impart ideas or information of any kind in any form, without interference".

This provision of the Bill could provide a lawful foundation for the indoctrination of children at Government schools with ideologies and moral values completely foreign to the attitudes and values of their parents and the community at large.

Article 12 of the Bill sweeps away the sensible and flexible common law rules relating to search and seizure by police . . .

Article 21 appears to be designed to deter suspects from confessing to police.

At present in Victoria, s.460 of the Crimes Act allows police to question suspects in their custody. Article 22 of the Bill appears likely to deny this vital power to the police . . .

"In my opinion the Bill will produce changes to the criminal law that will severely hamper the efforts of the police to control crime . . .

I suggest to you that a Bill of Rights is part of the package of social engineering laws of all kinds currently being introduced throughout Australia.

... The Bill will virtually become a license for the misfits of our society to emerge and claim a legal right to engage in behaviour that is unacceptable to most Australians.

... Code words and phrases are commonly employed in the context of social engineering to avoid causing concern to those who find radical social change alarming. . .

... It is highly unlikely that the Bill is intended to protect the rights and freedoms of the vast mass of ordinary well-adjusted Australians, because their rights are already adequately protected by the rules of common law, the laws passed by democratically elected Parliaments and by our independent Judiciary. These existing institutions are flexible and such laws can be altered to meet changing circumstances - if the majority demand it! It follows, in my view, that the real purpose of the Bill of Rights must be to promote and entrench values, ideologies and life-styles that are unacceptable to the vast majority of Australians.

As a lawyer who has spent over twenty years practicing before judges and juries, in open courtrooms with representatives of the media present if they choose to be, and lawyers representing all parties, I find the implications of the proposed Australian Bill of Rights, and the means of its enforcement, frightening. Perhaps it is fitting that these developments were announced in that most ominous of all years - 1984.

The following extract was from a letter printed in *The Age* Melbourne 17/2/1986:

I am writing to express my concern at the lack of public debate, particularly through the news media, concerning the proposed Bill of Rights. Considering the importance of such proposed legislation, I am surprised that the Australian people have been told very little about what exactly the Bill of Rights (based on the United Nations International Covenant) is to commit us.

The Bill of Rights legislative package was pushed through the House of Representatives during a late night and early morning sitting late last year. It will come before the Senate shortly.

Surely the public deserves to be told precisely what is in the draft legislation so that it can, in turn, decide on its validity. It should know that the United Nations International Covenant of Civil and political rights upon which the third reading of the Bill is based, has been rejected by the United States of America and Great Britain but was accepted by the Warsaw Pact countries.

Forty-three signatories of this Covenant are military dictatorships which have little or no concern for human rights in their own countries.

It should be of greatest concern to people committed to our democratic ideals that the Bill of Rights should be administered by the Human Rights Commission, which is an unelected body of people with powers that are outside the normal processes of law. . . .

Furthermore, under section 46, the Commission's power cannot be challenged in court. The implications of such legislation ought to be given considerable public exposure before the Senate commits it to law.

The December 1984 issue of the Queensland Law Society Journal said "the potential exists within the Human Rights Commission to actively suppress the rights it has been created to protect". . . .

Rev. J.N. Hewitt, of the Apostolic Church, Wantirna, 3152.

An article by Bill West in *The Australian* newspaper 20/11/1985, refers to Sydney law and human rights lecturer Dr. Gabriel Munz (NSW Institute of Technology) and the Munz campaign against the Bill of Rights.

Dr. Munz claims that the Bill of Rights is more likely to take away rights. Here are some quotes from the West article:

... He [Dr Munz] says the government has not given any convincing reasons for the Bill or explained how it will protect rights.

He describes it as vague, ambiguous and imprecise and argues the content of its rights will have to be filled in by policy makers and judges who will be in a position to read in their own biases and prejudices.

A major criticism of Dr. Munz is that the Bill is an attack on the federal system of government . . .

. . . The Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission which will be established as a consequence of the legislation, will be empowered to determine whether State Acts and practices infringe a right set in the Bill.

These powers are absolutely excessive for an unelected body," Dr. Munz said.

But that is just the beginning. The commission also has the power to compel people to attend compulsory conferences - which are going to be held in private without any entitlement to legal representation - under threat of fine or imprisonment.

ARTICLE 4, section 2 . . . says Dr Munz, this section would legalize any form of reverse discrimination and would thus be a license for discrimination in favour of a particular class or group.

ARTICLE 7 ... would give the right to a teacher to indoctrinate children in his personal beliefs or a homosexual teacher to impart his or her lifestyle to children.

ARTICLE 14 . . . the reference to the age of the individual child will almost inevitably lead to different views as to which rights and freedoms are possessed by children and that the section could be interpreted as a license for permissiveness.

. . . 'What are the advantages which will follow from the introduction of a Bill of Rights?'

'That is a question which in my opinion has never been satisfactorily answered by the Government.'"

Let us now look at an article by Christopher Dawson in The Australian (20/11/1985) referring to comments by Professor Mark Cooray, Associate Professor of Law at Macquarie University:

The Government should not be allowed to get away with a passage of the Bill in Parliament in order to prevent and stifle public opinion and deceive the public.

"It fails to substantiate, advance or improve any of our existing rights or freedoms," he says. "It tends to devalue some of them by exclusion.

"The document is a propaganda exercise to present a selected package of rights as the totality of rights which we require. Thereby the stage is set for the gradual de-recognition and eventual abrogation of fundamental liberties and rights through social engineering and the gradual destruction of the liberal democratic system."

"The exclusion of property rights from the Bill deprives the document of much of its effective content and reduces it to the level of a socialist program on human rights.

"In societies which deny the right to hold, enjoy and productively use private property, citizens are dependent for their employment and livelihood on the government. They have therefore no capacity to oppose the government or to exercise their fundamental political rights.

"The exclusion of property rights . . . is a deliberate omission from a document designed to promote a socialist agenda.

". . . Why is the Government refusing to submit the Bill to the people?

Is it because of the Left's traditional mistrust of the electorate? If so, it has no moral authority to speak on behalf of the Australian people . . ."

Article by Alan Fewster The Australian (25/3/1986) relates to the Law Council of Australia:

The Law Council of Australia has published a critique of the Bill of Rights and the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission, saying there is room for "serious concern" about both in their present form.

Under the Bill a limitation to a right or freedom will be permitted "only if it can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society."

What is a free and democratic society? How do you judge if a society is free and democratic?

Note: The government of the USSR claims to govern a free and democratic society.

The above gives a fair cross-section of opinion by thoughtful and qualified people. The point to emphasize is that the emasculation of the Australian Constitution and the imposition of a new constitution, based on a communist type Bill of Rights, provides a base for pagan religious values. It is extremely important to understand this because it signposts the manner in which these new requirements will be enforced and reveals that the change is not simply political but marks the imposition of a new law and a new religion.

By the laws now being introduced or proposed, if a homosexual school teacher is given the right to teach homosexuality, then a paedophile is equally entitled to teach paedophilia, a drug pusher to teach drugs, a sadist to teach sadism or a Satanist to teach devil worship.

But the average trusting citizen will exclaim, "Oh no! The Government would NEVER allow that!"

Government could easily legislate to prevent instruction by such people but then, it might equally make a law to say Christianity is deviant and disallowed. The latter would be entirely within the socialist line and, as party government is introducing communist laws and practices, it should be expected to continue the present program of moral deformity and mind-warp that is designed to weaken our ability to resist takeover.

We must not forget that already there are in force many dozens of laws which over-rule our Common Law rights.

More rights and protections for homosexuals and deviants and further restriction of Christians and the traditional family is in direct line with present policies. See First & Last publications *Assault on Childhood aoncindx.htm* and *How to Avoid the LOOMING CATASTROPHE avoidx.htm*.

In a Common Law democracy, deceitfully introduced legislation such as the Bill of Rights, The Australia Card and the Australia Act serve no legitimate purpose, but in a dictatorial regime they are imperative. Perhaps we should look at an advocate for this socialist type of society - The Fabian Society - for answers, but of course they are unlikely to tell us. Nevertheless you should know a little about them.

The Fabian Society is a socialist organization founded in England in 1884. Operating under the symbol of a wolf in sheep's clothing and a policy of 'gradualism', Fabianism has, for years, been very influential in English and Australian politics. Prime Minister Hawke, in a 1984 speech to the Society, named Frank Crean, Jim Cairns, Kim Beazley, Race Matthews, and Gough Whitlam as Fabians. While he baulked at revealing which of the present cabinet were members, he did say, "and in this I gladly acknowledge the debt of my own Government to Fabianism."

It is known that many members of the Constitutional Commission are Fabians but the important thing to know is that this group, and the Super Mafia in general, are dedicated to the achievement of political power by deceit and subterfuge - they make of the lie an art form.

First Hand Experiences

What further evidence is there to verify the capture of our political and media institutions by an international mafia?

The massive evidence that our legal Constitution and the safeguards it embodies are now ignored by political parties, is verified by the many organizations that fought very hard to get a hearing on the Australia Act. For instance Mrs. Joyner, on behalf of the thousands of members and supporters of the *STOP & CARE* group, wrote letters to the Queensland Attorney-General, to the Governor of Queensland and to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, along with representations to the Queensland Premier.

Other organizations made similar representations and at least one delegation went so far as to go to England to make representations to the British Parliament, the Prime Minister and the Queen. There was no noticeable media reporting of these efforts.

After meeting a deputation of concerned Australian citizens in London, Dr. Ian Paisley, MP MEP (a person not treated kindly by the media, no doubt for the same reason that anyone who opposes the power elitists receives a bad press) issued the following Telex to the world media (shortened):

The Australian Federal socialists have long desired and planned a centralist republican takeover of the nation.

These strategies were already envisaged as early as 1975. In this year Labour Prime Minister Gough Whitlam and Justice Lionel Murphy were foiled in their clandestine attempt to remove the Monarchy and introduce a socialist republic with Viceroy. Their attempt to pave the way for constitutional change was seen when all the Australian Premiers went to the British Parliament where they received from the British Prime Minister, Sir Douglas Home, the assurance that it would never be permitted - especially since the entire notion was repugnant to all these premiers, even those who were Labour Party men and to the Australian people at large. In spite of these assurances by the then British Government it is now clear that, after a decade, Australia is about to sever its monarchical constitutional links with Great Britain and move into socialist republicanism with Great Britain's full endorsement.

All this has been designed and put into action without any reference to the desires of the Australian people by way of a piece of legislation The Australia Acts (Request) Act 1985.. . .

Disturbing as this is, concerns about The Australia Acts (Request) Act 1985 are even deeper. The legislation is designed, it is claimed, to cut residual links with Great Britain and thereby remove the archaic anachronisms of an earlier irrelevant colonial era. In point of fact however it destroys the basic integrity of the entire Westminster system by removing the Queen's prerogative to disallow and reserve bills submitted to her. A Queen who lacks the power to accept or reject what is legislated in her parliament (no matter what one's personal view of the monarchy is) is no Queen at all. It is almost incredible that legislation designed to do this could have been formulated - especially when section 1 of the Australian Constitution clearly states:

"The legislative power of the Commonwealth shall be vested in a Federal Parliament which shall consist of the Queen, a Senate and House of Representatives and which is hereafter called 'The Parliament' or 'The Parliament of the Commonwealth'."

How could The Australia Acts (Request) Act 1985 have been designed to remove the Queen's prerogative when the Queen embodies the permanent government with a perpetual mandate to govern with the clearly expressed will of the people of Australia at both Federal and State levels? The Australian system is not built upon a republican foundation; its foundation is monarchical and cannot be tampered with without putting the government system erected upon it at great risk. This legislation is fundamentally inconsistent with and antagonistic to the entire Westminster system.

How has it happened then that this legislation was so readily accepted throughout Australia and passed by every State - even strongly anti-socialist ones?

. . .

The Australia Acts (Request) Act 1985 bypasses the people's right to referendum concerning this massive constitutional change. . . .

Two states of Australia - namely Queensland and Western Australia - even went so far as to entrench this important safeguard of the people's right to referendum by entrenching it in their own state constitutions. Tragically this was disregarded in both of these states where the people were never consulted or asked whether they wanted these socialist republican changes, and it is interesting to note that the press stayed silent throughout . . .

. . .

Furthermore the British Parliament not only accepts this legislation as wholesome but obviously sees it as truly representative of the desires of Australians generally. . . .

[Hansard Thursday 16 January 1986 page 1169 para 3: The Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Baroness Young): I am sure that the whole house will wish to join with the Government in welcoming this Bill. It represents and embodies Australian wishes. All parties in all state legislatures and the Commonwealth Parliament support the proposals outlined in this Bill. As I said at the beginning, legislation has been enacted in all state and Commonwealth legislatures, smoothly and without controversy. It is right that this House should agree to the removal of these residual constitutional links at the request of the representatives of the Australian people.]

Hansard Monday 3rd February 1986 page 83, para 5:

"Matters which have been agreed by Australians ... we note the unanimous approval in Australia ... with such unanimity of approval how can we oppose the Bill?"

It seems that even the British Parliament also has been deceived - even misled? . . .

Thus it can be seen that the centralist socialist aim to remove the constitutional checks and balances of the Monarchy in order that neither individuals nor states will have an appeal to a higher authority of political transcendence has virtually been all but achieved through this subtly acceptive legislation. If the Queen does complete this final act of severance of these residual links in March 1986 then Australia will indeed be a republic without safeguards and will be prey to international socialism.

The situation in Northern Ireland demonstrates how hard-won liberties can be swept away by the stroke of a pen.

(Newspapers did not publish that letter).

We now know that the devious nature of the Australia Acts was ignored, and the Queen was enticed to sign. We may note that while the Crown, constitutionally, represents and protects the people from misuse of parliamentary power, advice to the Crown has become virtually exclusively the prerogative of the parliament.

The Governor of a State is now appointed, advised and, in the end, dismissed by the Premier of the state and no act of parliament assented to by the Governor shall, since the commencement of the Australia Act, be subject to disallowance or suspension by Her Majesty.

What deceit is used to cause the Queen to ignore an appeal supported by evidence of illegality?

Can any threat be used to cause sincere battlers such as Queensland Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, to surrender without explanation? Whatever the threat, or reason, he surely did not appreciate that annihilation will occur once world political power is in the hands of the "One World Government" gang.

THE BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY SITUATION

An address by A. Ross McWhirter, M.A., delivered originally to the 54th Annual Congress of the British Israel World Federation at Sheffield on the 29/9/1973, was reprinted in *The Queen Betrayed - and the nation sold into captivity*. I include this condensed, but still unusually long quotation because I believe it will not only help explain the British situation but also help us understand the history and meaning of our own Australian Constitution.

It is important that we know something of the basic foundation of our Constitution and of how the events of recent years have acted in betrayal of our rightful heritage as free and self-governing people. The betrayal of the British system of Common Law, as it is happening in Britain, is not only very similar to what is happening in Australia, but is equally a betrayal of Australia.

It is on record that Mr. McWhirter was shot down and killed on 27/11/1985 by two IRA gunmen. What is not on record is who ordered the killing.

If we allow those who would tell us the truth to be killed then we share the guilt. The sins of the fathers (and mothers) will be paid in the blood of our children. Here is the essence of Mr. McWhirter's address:

Deceived in Her Grants

The principle at Law is that the 'Queen can do no wrong'. Now, if the Crown performs an illegal act, and of course the Crown acts by advice of the Ministers, then - since the Queen can do no wrong - there is apparently a paradox or impasse to be resolved. So lawyers use the formula that the Queen has been 'deceived in her grants' of the power or whatever prerogative act gave rise to the illegality. It is my submission that much that has been going on in Government in recent years has been illegal in that it was contrary to the constitution of this country. The greatest of these illegalities culminated in the ratification of the 'Act of Accession to the Treaty of Rome'. At that moment, this country lost a very substantial slice of its Sovereignty and I hope to be able to show to you that this was achieved by a series of illegal acts and that the Queen's part in it was undoubtedly an example of her being 'deceived in her grant'. . . .

- I should like to take, by way of illustration, this whole question of the handing away of the Sovereignty of this country; why it was illegal and what in technical terms could be done to correct it so that we can get on with the job which is our destiny.

The Treaty of Rome is not a Common Law conception in any sense. Legally, it is entirely alien to our Common Law traditions and also to the twenty-six counties of the Republic of Ireland. It was therefore perhaps reasonable to expect that, if we were going to accede to such a treaty, we might require certain amendments.

The fact is that in 1972 we ratified the agreement seeking accession to the Treaty of Rome without the alteration of one dot or comma. Except for the fact that the name of our nation is included in its new preamble, the Treaty of Rome remains absolutely unaltered and does not draw anything from the constitutional experience or, this country, nor does it reflect our own national aspirations as an Island, a maritime, mercantile race People seem to forget that we still have thirty Crown Colonies. It was considered by various politicians, of both major parties, that there would be material advantages in going into Europe. Accordingly, they decided to pursue this end by every conceivable means, without any attempt to procure the consent of the people, as a whole, to such a move.

Deprived of Sovereignty

It stands to reason that it should not be and indeed cannot be, an easy thing to deprive an ancient and great nation of its Sovereignty. It will be appreciated that part of the Treaty requires that the institutions of the Community will have pre-eminence over all national institutions. In other words the what the European

Parliament decides ... what the European Courts decide . . . take precedence over what they refer to as our 'Municipal law' - our Law - which is made by our own elected representatives and is part of the contract between Sovereign and people. So you have a situation in which we have voluntarily given away our Sovereignty, and at no time have the people of this country been effectively consulted on the matter. Those who take a contrary view make a point that Parliament is composed of our elected representatives and therefore, 'what am I complaining about?' I make the accusation that the so-called entry into Europe was and is, illegal. . . .

The Heath Government (I quote) 'picked up the hand of cards.' There were the words used in the White Paper of that month, for there was an agreement - or some might say conspiracy - between the major parties to press this matter through. . . .

With Mr. Heath, it became a point of total obsession and obstinacy that this would succeed. Negotiations were not over any words of the Treaty of Rome, as I have already indicated. They were only on the transitional entry provision. And the public were deceived - they actually thought that we were negotiating about the conditions under which we would join and the basic constitutional point of view. . . .

None of this was in tune with what was said on the last occasion on which the people were given an opportunity to vote.

The commitment of the Government was 'we are committed to negotiate terms of entry, no more, no less.' In other words, on that occasion when there was an opportunity for people to speak on this, there was no talk of actually entering and ratifying. That came only after we had given a five-year mandate to the administration. Thus there was a basis deceit with the famous phrase 'we wouldn't go into Europe except with the wholehearted consent of the people and Parliaments' (Parliaments in plural meaning the Parliaments of the other countries). The opportunity for the wholehearted consent or disapproval had not been given.

Then came what I call the 'clicks of the ratchet'... The clicks in this case were, first of all, the negotiations of the terms about which we were deceived. Then came the declaration of principle by Parliament. Next came the drafting of the Treaty by the Treaties Department of the Foreign Office . . . An important part of the Treaty, which was signed on the 22nd of January, 1972, was the part in the preamble which said that the Contracting Parties would assent to this Treaty in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements.'... I suggest that our constitutional requirements were not then met and never have been met on this matter. I think I must make this point clearer, in order to explain why I take that view so strongly.

The next 'click' of the ratchet was the drafting of this Treaty of Accession. Before this country signs a Treaty it is necessary that signatories receive from the Queen what are called the 'Full Powers' - which are in fact a document saying this man or this woman is empowered by the Nation to sign this Treaty on behalf of the nation. That is what 'Full Powers' are, and they have to be signed by the Queen. None of this has been published. The Queen delayed as long as she could, hoping presumably for an earthquake or something of that sort, and the Full Powers were in fact only signed 48 hours before Mr Heath, Sir Alec Douglas Home and Mr Rippon took themselves off to Brussels to sign the Treaty of Accession. . . .

Shakespeare in Prophecy

You will recall that day, 22nd January, 1972, when Mr Heath had a bottle of ink thrown at him . . . It made me think back to something almost prophetic and I would like to read you eight lines: 'England, bound in with the triumphant sea, whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege of watery Neptune, is now bound in with shame. With inky blot and rotten parchment bond, that England that was wont to conquer others, has made a shameful conquest of itself....' (John O'Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, in Shakespeare's Richard II).

Extraordinarily prophetic . . . On the 22nd January, 1972, these three gentlemen signed away something which was not theirs to give, namely the Sovereign Power of this country to determine laws with the consent of our people. They purported to hand all that away. One thousand years of Sovereignty was handed away at that moment, subject to two things, namely the enactment by Parliament of the necessary statutes to confirm

all the changes of law and the Royal Assent to the Bill, and then also the ratifications of the Treaty. So the ratchet clicked up to about two points from home, from Mr Heath's point of view.

The Labour Party, who had given a great deal of thought, of course - for they were attempting exactly the same thing until they were dismissed by the Nation in 1970 - said that it would require two acts to get us into Europe. One would be a short Constitutional Act, and the second would be a Bill of 1,000 Clauses - in other words a massive piece of legislation so that every conceivable Act that was affected (and of course practically every Act is affected by the giving away of Sovereignty) would have to be amended The Law Officers and their Advisers, the top echelon of Whitehall, brought their brains to bear on this and they thought, 'a Bill of 1,000 Clauses - that will keep us up all night for months and months and give endless possibilities for the destruction of our determination to succeed.' So it was abandoned - there was now no Bill of 1,000 clauses. Clearly, for them, the attractive thing was to have a little short Bill, just one clause - 'which we can whack through the House.'

So there was a Bill of thirteen clauses and a very short repeal schedule - nothing of which mattered in the least, the only repeals being things like the Film Quota Act and various agriculture Acts. None of the basic constitutional Acts were amended or repealed at all, and that is one of the main facts of my accusation of illegality. This Act went through Parliament and, you will recall, there were a series of 'cliff-hanger' Government escapes . . . It is significant that there never was a defeat on it, because there were essential elements in the Opposition who wanted this to go through . . . The Labour Party very conveniently furnished whatever majority was necessary to defeat the element in the Conservative Party, led by Enoch Powell, who was determined to resist this outrageous giving away of sovereignty . . .'

. . . I think that, theoretically, it is possible that this country could legally give away its sovereignty, provided of course that it was by the plain, clear, majority consent of the people. But it would involve a very elaborate constitutional proceeding, including an alteration of the basic constitutional contract under which we have lived since the year 1688 'the Glorious Bloodless Revolution' when James II fled to France. And what happened was that the contract from that point on was, that the people would 'owe allegiance,' which is a personal contract between themselves and their sovereign. I say a 'personal contract' for this reason - if you break your allegiance and commit an act of treason, you can jeopardize your personal neck on the gallows.

Rule of Law

The idea of this allegiance in theory being an 'impersonal' thing is absolute nonsense - it is duty in persona, as Lord Haw Haw for example found out; for which he was executed for treason . . . Everyone has an individual contract of allegiance to the Sovereign. In return, our Sovereign swears at us in accordance with the laws and customs of this realm.

I submit to you that by the words 'Laws and Customs of this Realm', these are the words which are spoken at the very moving Coronation Service which is legally required by Parliament - the Coronation Oath is not a figment of the imagination. It is a Statute of the Realm . . . She promises then, in return for our allegiance, that she will govern us in accordance with the laws and customs of this Realm. And these do not include laws concocted and designed by the unelected representatives of eight other countries in concert with certain gentlemen nominated by our legislature . . .

. . . This is the law and the rule of law requires that no executive Act may be performed unless the performer can point to the due authority to do it ... In the case against proclamations in 1611, one of our greatest of all judges, Sir Edward Coke, in the era of Divine Rights of Kings, stood up to James who was King and said, 'You may not rule this country by proclamations out of your head... you only have the power which the law gives you, and the only supreme power above that is the power of God'.

So the King is ruled by God and Law. and this was the decision of 1611 and the actual words were, 'The King has no prerogative save that which the law alloweth him' - and that is the plain authority for the supposition that the Queen, in 1972, could not invent a new prerogative to make Treaties which give away the Sovereignty of this country the Treaty of Rome is totally different from any other Treaty in which we have ever

participated, for the reason that it gave away power to another authority to legislate on our behalf on matters unknown and unknowable, without our consent.

. . . the second requirement of any exercise of prerogative power is that it should not be against the liberties of the people. There is excellent authority for that: it is assumed at law that the Queen will never exercise her prerogative to the detriment of the rights and liberties of the people of this country. Plainly the Treaty of Rome is in that category. No prerogative power may be exercised contrary to a statute in force. That was, in fact, the third point on which I particularly held out in the Courts because the other arguments would be regarded by judges nowadays as being somewhat theoretical. So I stood firm - I said, 'A Statute - there are at least eight statutes in force in this country' (because, as you know, we have no written constitution as they have in the U.S.A.) But the idea that we do not have any constitution at all is absolute rubbish.

. . . Now the particular statute on which I relied was the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights is a confusing title because people think that it is a Bill, therefore it is not an Act or it is not an ordinary statute. The Bill of Rights is in fact a very special statute. It is better than a statute in many ways. It declares that certain things are to be 'for ever', for theoretically, under the sovereignty of parliament nothing is for ever, but it was a plain manifestation of what was intended by Parliament. . . .

. . . in the European Communities Act they did not mention it - they did not attempt to repeal or amend any part of it . . . Now, a passage in the Bill of Rights says, 'and that the entire perfect and full exercise of the regal power and government be onely (i.e. exclusively) in and executed by his majesty ... and his heirs at law.' The present queen is the heir at law of William III. So the declaration is that the entire, perfect and full sovereignty of this realm shall be in the Crown . . .

At this moment . . . laws can be made and edicts can be sent from Brussels, from Bonn and Strasbourg. Edicts can be made in the European Courts and we have agreed to be bound by these edicts . . . So it is in breach of a statute in force. The Bill [of Rights] goes on to say, 'and there unto . . . the Lords spiritual and temporal and the Commons do, in the name of all the people as aforesaid, most humbly and faithfully submit themselves (that is the Parliament of 1689 . . .) their heirs and posterities for ever . . . and do faithfully promise that they will stand to maintain and defend their said Majesties. . . and also the limitation and succession of the Crown . . . to the utmost of their power with their lives and estates against all persons whatsoever that shall attempt anything to the contrary.

. . .

The Court of Appeal . . . in a most peculiar judgment? said that all that the Act was doing was handing on the power of King James II to King William III, and that was their judgment. I consider it a patently unsatisfactory judgment . . . After all, part of the Revolution of 1688 was precisely to prevent the abuse of prerogative power.

I had never expected to win that action because I felt that it was not in the heart of the Judiciary of that moment to give an individual citizen the declaration he sought that his birthright was in fact being given away without his leave. There is another very important statute called the Act of Settlement . . .

Section 3 of the Act says, 'And whereas the laws of England are the birthright of the people thereof, and all the Kings and Queens who shall ascend to the throne of this Realm ought to administer the government of the same according to the said laws and all their officers and ministers ought to serve them respectively according to the same - the said Lords Spiritual and temporal and commons, do therefore humbly pray that all our laws and statutes of this realm for securing the established religion and rights and liberties of the people thereof, and all other laws and statutes of the same now in force, may be ratified and confirmed. 'That is as good law today as it was in 1701. It is on the Statute Book, it is unrepealed - it is no accident that it is unrepealed - it is a basic constitutional requirement. To be governed by the laws of this realm is the birthright of everybody in this land, and until repealed by Parliament it remains so.

So you now have a situation that the European Communities Act was eventually Passed by both Houses, and Royal Assent was given. You have that Statute conflicting with the basic constitutional Statutes - the Bill of

Rights, the Act of Settlement and six others. The Act of Union with Scotland provides . . . there shall be no legislation in future on matters of private rights, except that they be to the evident utility of the Scots.

. . . 'The Declaration of Clergy Act'... the Queen is declared, by Act of Parliament, to be the supreme authority . . . and accepts no foreign supremacy.

We now see something of the evidence presented by intelligent investigators. The deliberate lies told the people of the United Kingdom are so similar to those told to Australians and, if you look into it, also to Americans, South Africans, New Zealanders and many others. The simple meaning of what our (?) leaders are doing reveals that, in their minds, the existing Constitutional Law is cancelled!

No permission, no announcement, no beg-your-pardon. The international mafia have simply bought the guard-house and stolen our heritage.

The Sovereignty that is rightly the heritage of Australians, is being stolen. In our ignorance we are sold to, and bound to, alien masters. Not only are Australians coming under despotic law as espoused by the United Nations, but Great Britain is also betrayed to come under the despotic law imposed on a European super-state.

I feel it unwarranted for a book of this kind to devote more space to the British situation, but I must say that later news confirms and expands the situation set out above. The most extreme and illegal changes are being made. As in Australia the guillotine and late night sittings combine with no media reporting or trivial and misleading reporting.

A most critical letter by two Queen's Counsel; Mr. P. Horsfield Q.C. and Mr. L. Price Q.C. was published in 'The Times', London, May 1986 but still the mass media remained quiet. And do not forget this is the Thatcher Government. The most important political changes For several hundred years are being made under cloak of secrecy and treachery.

All International

Other nations are all in a similar state of subversion. These blatant acts of treachery go on unknown to our people because, on the one hand, they do not understand their Constitutional rights and, on the other, because neither their Government, their parliamentary opposition, nor their news media ever reveals what is going on.

Trade Manipulation

In addition to accepting direct money manipulation, the 'free world' governments have each signed hundreds of agreements with the U.N. Among these is the 'Lima Declaration'.

Business people, farmers and others who wonder why Australia cannot now sell enough goods to pay its own way, may be interested to learn that the Lima Declaration, signed by Australia in 1974, provides for the transfer of industry from developed countries such as Australia, to third world and developing countries.

Knowing this we may see reason for the restraints and difficulties placed in the way of small business and the reason for the kind of aid to developing countries that sets up an overseas sugar industry while Australian cane growers go bankrupt. The development of the 'world car' and export of Australian industrial self-sufficiency makes us now beggars to the international money market.

That is the most obvious reason for our present social and economic distress. A deliberate plotting to distract our attention and to destroy our financial ability to fight back even if there should be an awakening.

Knowing the prize is ownership of the whole earth, who can we believe?

Firstly, so long as we are prepared to give fair value to the evidence, we may believe our own intelligence. We may take note of those who present the evidence fairly and expose vested interests. We may also accept that the meaning of the Australian Constitution would have been most reliably expressed before the Australia Act

was introduced because the prize is such, and the power of wealth is such, that we can no longer accept the word of people who may support those who so blatantly ignore OUR rights and THEIR responsibilities.

Back in 1981 the Federal and state Attorneys-General reported to state Premiers on ways to sever colonial constitutional ties with Britain. (Reported in *The Courier-Mail Brisbane* 23/6/1981). In that article was mentioned the need for referendum. Most re-assuring, but in the event there was no referendum or even a public poll. Obviously, to get a public opinion would have required that the public be told what was happening!

You will recall that the British Parliament was told there was no opposition to the Australia Act. Obviously; it is easy to get consensus if these things are kept secret.

An editorial in *The Australian* (14/8/1986) also mentioned the need for referendum in relation to a new Australian Constitution. Will we get a better deal with a new constitution than with the Australia Act?

Let there be no confusion. We are told that the Australia Act is of no consequence and served merely to delete a few outdated ties with the mother country. If so, why did it take so long to organize and why with so little publicity that even today few Australians know of the Australia Act or have any idea what it is about?

Arthur Chresby (whose claim was that he would not appear on the platform if he could not prove his claims in the courts) in a talk given in 1984 reminded us that the *Statute of Westminster Adoption Act of 1942* allowed the political party in power to make Australia a republic and mentioned the three clauses effective in this.

As that power DID NOT apply to the STATES it was therefore ineffectual. Should we be surprised to see these same three clauses now appear in the Australia Act which DOES apply to the states?

Clauses 2, 3 & 4 of the Westminster Act appear as clauses 3, 2 & 1 in the Australia Act and the first paragraph of the Australia Act says:

An Act to bring constitutional arrangements affecting the Commonwealth and the States into conformity with the status of the Commonwealth of Australia as a sovereign, independent and federal nation.

Does that seem to be deleting a few outdated items of no significance?

If our politicians were honestly asking us to consider our historic constitutional safeguards and recommending that these be strengthened within a new republican form of government, that would be fair enough. But no, they do not do that because that is not what they are about. Their clear intent is to impose a dictatorial republic based on a 'Despotic Law' Bill of Rights so as to keep to commitments already signed and which make us subservient to the program of the United Nations organization.

To do that, the political parties must deceive us by use of secrecy and misinformation.

To insist that the Australia Act does not affect the Australian Constitution can, at best, be based only on flimsy technicality such as was used to prevent challenge of the Queensland Act.

RECOVERING OUR INHERITANCE

If we ask those innocents who support a republic and/or socialism, to tell us what kind of government they want, they mainly set out the kind of rights our British Common Law was designed to provide. Yet they support the political forces that have undermined this heritage! If they succeed in finishing the job then there is no practical way we can regain these privileges.

Our Australian Constitution gives to us the British heritage and Common Law system which is so different from that of most other European countries whose people live under Roman Law.

Magna Carta, the British Bill of Rights etc., - the whole panoply that led to the achievement of government of the people by the people, is ours - all that was gained in English Law before our constitution was written is constitutionally ours. If Britain is absorbed into the European Economic Community then all this will be lost to Britain and (if we have not similarly cut our own throats) to Australia! It is already decided by our leaders that we are to become a vassal state subject to the United Nations.

What is it that is so valuable about the Common Law system?

It is equality under law; it is 'innocent until proven guilty'; it is freedom to be an independent, self-deciding, human being.

An Englishman's home is his castle (hard to believe now that practically every petty official has some right to come in and do almost anything from search your papers to taking your children) but before we were robbed, that is the way it once was, and lawfully, still is.

In essence, Common Law decrees that the Crown holds sovereignty on behalf of the people. This sovereignty is granted on the sworn promise that the Crown will control parliament in so far as to see that custom and Law are obeyed and that the parliament legislates, **WITHIN LAW**, by the will of the people. The parliament is elected only to serve.

What went wrong in our case, is that although we were given the documents of Common Law and the right to set up our own government, we had already political parties who were hungry for power. These political parties, like their brethren in other countries, never at any time sought to provide the electorate with understanding of our system. Nor did they provide mechanisms which would give to the public some way to exercise their responsibilities.

We were told that by electing **OUR** political party we were controlling our parliament and, if our parliament became unworkable or tried to do illegal things, the Crown could dismiss the parliament and call a new election so that the people could exercise their authority by electing a new parliament.

What is not advertised is that the party representative is chosen by, and gives his first allegiance to, his party. His parliamentary vote is directed by his party not his electorate, and we (the people) are allowed no practical means of objecting to anything our parliament does. We are led to believe that the elected party has a mandate to govern, so even keeping within the law they can do many things detrimental to public desire or benefit.

Although the Crown is sworn to protect us, the Crown is instructed by the parliamentary representatives and no comment is ever made about **THOSE WHO INSTRUCT** 'our' political parties.

Citizen Initiated Referenda (CIR)

In Switzerland this system is working, and has worked, for many years. So let's translate it to our situation.

In the Swiss system (as in common law) the highest authority is vested in the electorate. To make effective this authority, the electorate (apart from electing its representatives to the Parliament) has the power to reject or introduce laws so as to control administrative policy (both internal and foreign) or change the constitution. This power applies equally to the revoking of past administrative decisions which may, or may not, have had public approval.

This, translated into the Australian situation, would mean that, on matters of general policy, a referendum is forced on the petition of 77,000 of the electorate (equal 0.5% of our total population). For constitutional amendment, 123,000 (equal to 0.8% of population). These numbers are based (in proportion to population) on the Swiss system.

To bring in such a system would require a certain amount of thought and discussion, it may well be possible to improve on the Swiss system and it may well be that it would take a few years for people to become used to exercising this power. But we should be careful not to let 'experts' 'sell' us some 'watered-down' version and it is vital that we be given our say on a number of things already passed into law.

Could the system be taken over by large organizations?

The international manipulators greatly fear any input of public control of legislation and will push all possible arguments to try to influence people against the idea. Only this morning, on the ABC I heard it forcibly expressed that the Australian people hate referendums. Actually Australians have rejected items put to referendum because most proposals have been designed to increase the powers of government.

In the first year or two there may be some grandstanding as people flex their newly found muscle, but a few defeats will soon show that there is no profit in special interest groups wasting their time and money. Having a referendum does not mean it will be passed and the public anger at moves to 'muscle-in' make such attempts counter-productive.

CIR is a two edged sword and people will soon learn to handle with care.

THE COST. The cost is insignificant in relation to the cost of dictatorial government. Switzerland has few natural resources and is one of the richest countries; Australia is one of the natural resources richest of countries and yet third most indebted. Our national debt is reported to have risen from about 2 BILLION (1975) to over 102 BILLION by Jan 1987. This is a result of political sell-out. A lot of referenda can be purchased for that. Also, once established, an electronic system could be set up for both referenda and elections and the total bill become less than at present.

To ease the system in to the community, we might be offered a package deal.

The ability to initiate legislation could be delayed for three to five years to give a little time for education and adjustment. As a trade off for delaying the power to initiate policy, it will be important to offer a package of issues for public decision. There has been a lot of political action not approved by the general public over recent years and people must have the chance to reverse these items of legislation to 'clear the boards' and save both public money and agony.

There is a long list of things I believe the people would be very interested to have their say about and I will try to list in order of importance as I read public feeling.

Let the first bundle of referenda be arranged within six months of the election. Subjects to be individually voted on at the one time may be:

- a) Non-European immigration;
- b) Limit to taxation for social services;
- c) Removal of foreign affairs power over internal policy.
- d) Limit to Government overseas borrowing and freedom from the world economy.
- e) Heavy Tax on payment of interest on overseas loans for

takeover activities.

Second year:*

- f) Work for dole
 - g) Social engineering in schools.
 - h) Abortion.
 - i) Pornography.
 - j) Closed shop or forced unionism.
 - k) Death penalty for child rape, drug pushing, assassination.
- *may be seen as a State issues but the Feds hold the money.

I have probably forgotten some important matters but the above give the idea. I am sure that if any CREDIBLE group were to go to the people with such a policy they would be certain of victory.

I have great faith that if you give people responsibility they will exercise it responsibly, and we must accept that Australia is now, constitutionally, a quasi socialist republic. Without some such return of power to the people, even with someone like Joh as PM, there is no way that the takeover of the nation can be prevented.

Chapter 6

THE MONEY MYTH

How were we brought to this level of disaster? Who is to blame?

Obviously we are all, to some extent, to blame. We have been far too lax and too trusting. But who are they, our opponents, who engineer deception?

There are a lot of ideas about this; various people blame Communism, Capitalism, Humanism, Evolution Theory, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, Political Parties, Religion, The Fabians, Satanism, the Jews, The Illuminati, to name a few.

Without trying the impossible job of allotting degrees of blame there is still something that can be said clearly and with certainty. But first a few quotes:

From a featured article by Bill Weekes (Senior lecturer in management at Deakin University) *The Australian* (18/12/1986):

To all intents and purposes Australia can't pay its way and is going broke. But nobody seems to care because, superficially, we still seem to enjoy a reasonable standard of living. However that standard is being propped up by money borrowed from overseas. A family of three children in Australia would now owe \$30,000 in overseas debt.

All this has happened in the last five years.

According to an article in the *Sunday Mail* (5/10/1986) based on the National Australia Bank October review:

Australia stands to "suffer considerably" as the emergence of a global economy erodes the power of national governments, . . .

Mr. John Fletcher, Chief General Manager of the Commonwealth Development Bank:

The multinational bankers should never be underestimated in the lengths they will go and the dirty tactics they will employ in search of their profit objectives.

First-hand experience of what the international bankers did to Mexico when it was on its knees in early 1983 made me acutely aware of the dangers . . .

Just think! Australia is up to its ears in debt, so are the nations of South America. The USA, Great Britain and yes Poland and the Communist countries, all have massive debts. All the world is in debt, but to whom?

The 'International Financiers' have long had the power to influence the destiny of nations; today they have the power and position to make or break any nation on earth **so long as the nations accept the rules imposed.**

For the untold billions that they rake in in interest payments what do the International Financiers produce?

Nothing!

In what way do they benefit the nations to which they lend money?

In no way.

When I think on this subject a song, which mature-age readers will remember, runs through my mind, It's Only a Paper Moon. With apologies to whoever wrote that song here is my version:

'It's only a paper bag,
holding all that pie-in-the-sky
but 'twould all be make-believe
did we not believe it true'.

The concept of a global economy is a confidence trick - the power of the international financiers is a confidence trick. It is a make-believe represented by magical numbers printed on pieces of paper and it is these pieces of paper that, over the years, have bribed, bought and corrupted our institutions, our religions, our mass media and our political parties.

No government needs to buy this paper; we can print our own magical numbers thank you. But over generations of conditioning we are fixed in the belief that we must take part in the world economy and trading charade. We buy these 'pie-in-the-sky' book entries, we pay interest in real wealth, and we are bled white.

Almost without exception every overseas loan is unnecessary and a disguised tax on the community; every community tax has become a weapon for weakening our resistance, and every license a payment to bureaucracy to control some right we once freely enjoyed.

Politicians and political parties, bowing to international finance, co-operate to impose a two-level system of public deceit. On one level are the highly publicized and emotional issues such as the Australian Bill of Rights which, to reluctant extent, are open to public opinion and political argument. On the other are the unpublicized items, such as The Australia Act, which are introduced without public awakening. The purpose is to give total political power to the international money lending establishment.

What name can we give these international power brokers? As they organize and behave so much like the Mafia let's call them the Super Mafia, SM for short.

To escape the 'paper bag' of economic mythology the nations only need cancel these international loans that have been sold by stand over tactics and confidence trickery, and which have been entered into without public authority.

What would happen if every country was to say to the International Financiers, "Look, we owe you \$x so we propose to write you a cheque for that amount of money."

Well obviously the IFs would scream to high heaven, "We don't want your worthless paper. That would just be cancelling out your debt."

And the nations would say, "Right, here is your cheque, consider our debt paid. Thank you, we each now have our own national monetary system. Have a good day."

For a year or two there would be some distress but no more overall than exists now. International trade would quickly decline to a fraction of present volume as the nations rebuilt their own independent industries.

There would remain a significant level of international trade bartered on a gold standard but each nation would run its own internal economy, print its own magical numbers and issue its own form of currency just as nations have done for most of recorded history.

The only restraint on national money production is that each dollar must be devoted to a genuine economic purpose. Whether we want to build a bridge or a home or a factory, just so long as what is produced serves a genuine economic benefit to the community, then the government can safely make the loan. Housing, farm and industrial loans of 2% to 3% would show the government and the community a profit. A Christian economy is an economy that the normally intelligent citizen can understand and appreciate. He does not want to cheat his neighbour and indeed is so well off that he has no need to do so. There is work for everyone but each person needs spend far less lifetime working.

There is no need to go into this subject in depth here. Actually the facts are so self-evident that long explanation seems pointless and confusing. So long as a nation has the workers and the materials, then a loan becomes a 'self fulfilling prophecy' to produce wealth. It is no more than a book entry. In fact it is a credit .. a credit to someone who has a plan to produce wealth and should be seen more in the nature of a permit to acquire the needed materials.

A natural economy is simple and the benefit is obvious. Many countries, including Australia, have, in the past, used internal financing with complete success, but we would be hard pressed today to find a political party, or economist, willing to admit that this option exists.

Chapter 7

WHAT IS TREASON ABOUT?

There can be left no doubt that, in any historic meaning of the word, we are faced with treason on a grand scale. A scale that would be impossible in a less technical age with a less sophisticated education and mass media. Do we still dare to call it treason?

If you still dare to call it treason then we may still have a little time in which to save our lives.

That is what we are talking about, saving first the lives of the Christian community and incidentally the lives of some three quarters of the people living, or potentially living, on earth.

What we have to face is that the gigantic swindle which has been organized by the international money-lending Super Mafia is MORE than an exercise in power grabbing. Of all the evidence that has been so painstakingly uncovered not least is the evidence of subversion by use of drugs, mis-education and moral perversion. The evidence of political misuse of health and education shows very clearly that human life has no value to the stooges of the SM.

Now already within the minds of many readers there is an imp busily switching off switches and ringing alarm bells. Most people, especially those who have come through the public education system, have implanted in the mind aversions and fears to make them blind to certain realities.

The Super Mafia want you blind so that you will have to follow where they lead and fall when pushed. To understand life we must try to gum up some of those switches and alarms.

Especially they want you to ignore all evidence of mass murder - just very unusual incidents that may never happen again and certainly .. COULD NEVER happen HERE.

You have heard of the holocaust in which six million Jews were said to have been slaughtered. This is mentioned only because it is the best known of such events rather than because we want to discuss whether it was really six million or perhaps six hundred thousand. The fear we have to learn to face is that when it comes to such events the number is not important. What the power maniac is about is DEMONSTRATING POWER.

Inhumanity extends back to the beginning of humanity. Like most drugs the delight in PERSONAL POWER may begin quite innocently, perhaps as a desire for just sufficient wealth for comfort. But success in wealth accumulation :b leads to the experience of POWER over others and some find this power so exciting that the accumulation of wealth turns to an accumulation of power **which is in no way satisfied by wealth alone.**

Like 'snuff' movies the power to kill becomes the ultimate turn-on, first one then several, then any mass of people for just the 'glory' of exercising POWER. Kill A community, a nation, a race = POWER.

Communists kill - an IDEOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE. It is in the nature of the ideology that people are given power of life or death over others and those who find power most irresistible will claw their way to more Power.

Although capitalism and communism are the two levers of the nut-cracker, we give far more space to communism here because, while capitalism is the economic destroyer AND EQUALLY blameworthy, communism is the people destroyer. People have far more reason to be afraid of communism than of capitalism. Do not forget - killing - an IDEOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE.

Freedom House in London is reported to have established a verifiable figure of more than 95 MILLION deaths throughout the world in the name of communism. So do not imagine (when we talk of the killing of

incredible numbers of people) that it is not possible. For those who have the lust for it the greater the number the better.

We all have to die. Will we prefer to die standing and defending justice and humanity or will we prefer to die cringing and begging a few more hours by offering betrayal of family and neighbours?

Be assured, neither money nor betrayal will buy life for you or me, or any member of our families. Any deal any one of us can make is worthless because the Elitist Super Mafia have it as principle that any deal with outsiders is not morally or legally binding; the Fabian logo of a wolf in sheep's clothing portrays their philosophy of deceit. The Super Mafia always follows the attitude that any deceit is justified by benefit - TO THEM.

By taking action against those who want us at their mercy we do not put our lives at risk; our lives are already at risk - the action we take is defensive. Those who sell the soul for a reprieve or promise of leadership in the new society (and there are obviously quite a few) will find, when they deliver their part of the bargain that, by advancing the plans of the power-hungry, they have reduced their time.

What is at stake is ownership of the world and there exist far more people than a despotic world government needs in an age of technology.

Why MUST They Destroy Population?

To understand that we first have to ask ourselves WHY the desperate and secretive push to world government. That the plan for world ownership is of very long standing is, on the evidence, beyond logical denial, but this does not explain the fanatical post-war activity generated. What has happened during the last thirty or forty years to add urgency to the plan?

Some years ago a report showed it to require the expense of more world- based energy to produce food than was obtainable from that food. Meaning we have entered a time of diminishing resources on 'Spaceship Earth'.

To analyse the problem of using resources at a faster rate than replenishment is a technical matter, but the problem can be presented in a more meaningful way:

- 1) population has now come close to (or passed) maximum continual use of the easily available fresh water required for agriculture;
- 2) growing population is causing increasing loss of agricultural land to housing and services;
- 3) land over-use (or misuse) is causing more and more of the productive land to become eroded, infertile, drought-stricken and taken over by expanding deserts;
- 4) massive use of fossil-fuels (oil and coal) together with the destruction of forests all around the globe, is causing a change in the balance of the atmosphere;
- 5) careless use of pesticides and pollutants, plus over- fishing, is causing an imbalance in ocean life with the potential for considerably reducing the available supply of food from the ocean.

ITEM: Heading, *Sydney Morning Herald* 22/3/1986, There's no way out of Earth's Greenhouse, scientists say. Quote:

Australian scientists have confirmed that the burning of fossil fuels is almost solely responsible for alarming increases in the atmospheric concentrations of "greenhouse" gases.

ITEM: Article in WAKE UP September '85: 1000 million could die in next 15 years. Quote:

As the World Bank unveiled its annual world development report last month, an astonishing attack on the institution was made by The Ecologist magazine:

A special double issue of the British periodical consists of 13 articles which accuse the Bank and United Nations agencies of contributing to "misery, malnutrition and famine in the Third World".

. . . the magazine's publisher foresees that 1000 million people will die of starvation in the next 15 years as a result of misconceived development projects spearheaded by the Bank.

Most of these 1000 million people have been condemned to death by large- scale development projects, says Goldsmith, who also singles out the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization as a major culprit.

The above is supported by another report virtually ignored by the media. This time from an international group of doctors who claim that international aid to Ethiopia has been massively misused to round up about 750,000 starving refugees and, using famine aid trucks, transport them into barren areas. To time of report it is said that some 100,000 had died from starvation in the re-settlement areas and that people trying to escape were either shot or had their legs broken.

In our present situation we must also consider the advances of modern technology. In advanced countries at least half the population is now not needed for production and distribution. If that half were eliminated then the production and services of the remainder would be double what is required.

Items come to hand but this book does not have space to pursue matters already well documented or known to the observant public. Massive evidence combines with the vital philosophical motivators of the Super Mafia and the physical threat that would come from maintaining a uselessly large population.

The Super Mafia do not have to be correct in their interpretation of ecological events. The fact is that their record of inhumanity is historic and, so long as they BELIEVE they are threatened, they will act accordingly. Nevertheless, in this matter they do have reason for concern; it is their heartless solution that we can object to.

The Super Mafia are able to exterminate three out of every four people and still leave more than enough productive labour to serve the technological ambitions of an elitist government. For them, it would be vastly beneficial to do so.

People try to avoid facing these facts, but bury your head in the sand at your own peril because the reasons for massive extermination are quite sufficient to excuse any socialist purge the SM may demand as they concentrate power in a dictatorial World Government.

Leaders of the free democracies make deals. They are desperate to believe it is all for the best so they talk free enterprise and serve elitism; they talk opposition but play into the hands of our enemies. They run the Christian free-enterprise nations into bankruptcy to finance our enemies. THINK!

WHAT IS COMMUNISM ABOUT?

We are brain-warped to believe that Capitalism and Communism are ideological opponents and the only ideological choice we have. That is deceit. You only have to read the financial news to know that Capitalism finances Communism. Capitalism produces nothing and lives on usury; the communist elite lives on usury of the workers. Both Capitalism and Communism (in their perfect form) are elitist dictatorships. Lenin knew that Capitalism had provided the finance necessary for the Russian revolution and would continue to provide the finance for creating an armed state.

So WHO IS the opponent of the Elitist Super Mafia? The opponent is the Christian free-enterprise democracy that made possible the great human advance of the last five hundred years. A force so powerful, and yet so passive that it has let itself be led by its enemies.

Many today ask what is wrong with Communism? Is it really very different from Christian democracy?

The difference in the two systems is, in essence, that those who run the socialist/capitalist systems believe that man can be moulded by force and brainwashing to become a willing slave in a perfectly regimented State - they believe that man has no more importance than other animals and can be mentally zombified to serve. It denies the fundamental nature of what is human and the right of every human to be individual and to have a free choice of destiny.

This 'socially criminal' elite has held great power in the world for centuries, but has only recently moved seriously to obliterate Christian free enterprise democracy.

Although the examples to be given show the methods and values of the pagan Super Mafia to be sad enough, they may not sufficiently impress the reader that the use of terror to control people will be taken to any extreme necessary.

For instance to strip and impale people on wooden stakes set in the city street where the population must watch the chosen victims die in agony over a period of a few hours (as happened in Korea), or the mass reduction of population by starvation as is not uncommon in other parts of the world.

The use of naked terror has always been part of pagan philosophy. It is obviously effective. One cannot imagine the 'greenies' protesting at the cutting of trees for stakes or the B.L.F. at the use of non-union labour. No! They, along with most everyone else, will be cringing behind locked doors and praying to a God they have previously ignored while the gas seeps across a submissive city to eliminate an unneeded population.

We must examine the evidence to appreciate:-

1. That we must not confuse Capitalism with Free Enterprise.
2. That neither Communism/socialism nor Capitalism is a legitimate social system. Both are tools for power and social manipulation. (Capitalism is the executioner of the economic body and socialism is the executioner of the biological body.)
3. That world power is rapidly falling into the hands of people who believe, rightly or wrongly, that the world is over-populated and wasteful of limited resources.
4. That the Super Mafia do not hold to a Christian morality.
5. That, irrespective of over-population, technology is rapidly making large populations a plague and threat to the SM.

By eliminating excess population the SM will not only achieve resources security but the physical security that could be endangered by the practical difficulties of controlling a too massive population.

The shortened items about communist action in Cambodia, communist actions in the U.S.S.R itself and the communist comment that follows, are all offered as evidence of the inhuman violence of the socialist way and the fact that communists do actually practice what they preach.

Hopefully this will make it easier to understand the difference between free enterprise and elitist dictatorship. First:

The Murderous Revolution. A review of this book in News Weekly (26/2/1986) provides the following snippets:

What remained etched on his mind was a series of indelible images - the stunned disoriented mass of people evacuating the capital of Phnom Penh; the brutal arrogance of Khmer Rouge cadres; work with the Mobile Brigade of labourers of which he was a member; threshing rice; harvesting; attending 'consciousness-building' seminars; the prisons where his sister-in-law died; the massacre of 'new people'; and the bodies of the dead . . .

In the villages, antagonism was deliberately fomented between the "old people" (peasants) and the "new people" (town folk).

This was to create suspicion between groups so that the Khmer Rouge's information network could operate more easily.

The aim was to weaken the family as a cohesive unit so that in time of crisis, only Angkar, "the party leadership", would receive the first loyalty of every Khmer.

A revolt by revengeful villagers . . . resulted in all the local cadres being killed.

New party cadres from another Khmer Rouge faction came to the village and ferried 1,500 locals down river on the pretext of taking them to a new village site.

Ung went to investigate and witnessed the villagers being massacred in a sadistic orgy of violence.

These things do not happen only in Asian countries. They also happen in the USSR. It is reported that 600,000 Lithuanians were eliminated in a planned extermination after being occupied by the Soviet. Many millions were killed in the USSR itself as well as those terminated within the captured nations.

A book called The Harvest of Sorrow by Robert Conquest (Hutchinson) tells a story of the Russian Ukraine that exposes a greater horror than the worst stories of Belsen. An area containing 40 million people was sentenced to death by starvation. Conquest has written many books about Russia and believes the actual death toll was near 15 million. But perhaps (even more than the number) it is the way they died that is horrific. I will not go into the sickening details except to say that sometimes people became mad and even ate their own children. The book contains the first-hand accounts of survivors.

This horror came about because of the communist enforcement of collective farming. The farmers resisted the forced takeover of their farms and retaliated with their own version of 'scorched earth', killing their own animals and destroying crops. Communist reprisal included shooting heads of families and driving millions off their farms. It was decreed that what they called the 'Kulaks' were to be liquidated, however there was no definition of what a 'kulak' was.

The USSR has never recovered from the farm purge and, as you know, Capitalism supports them with food at give-away prices.

People do not yet understand why communists kill so massively, so (to us) needlessly and so cruelly. The following extracts from *The Heart, Mind and Soul of COMMUNISM* by Dr. Schwarz explains the New Order World Government Plan and may help us understand the inevitability of mass population destruction as part of the New World Order. Quote:

The Communists have always been perfectly frank on this subject. Beginning with the Communist Manifesto, which says, We openly declare that our ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions, the identical sentiment has been repeated ad-nauseam in all the writings of the Communist hierarchy and in official pronouncements of the Comintern and the Cominform. They categorically reject any suggestion that the transition from Capitalism to Socialism can be by the peaceful pathway of reform. One of the principal epithets of abuse in a somewhat extensive vocabulary is the word "reformist," a term of ridicule and contempt. Scientific law [in the socialist concept of science] has written that the change-over must be both revolutionary and violent. This is determined both from their philosophy of dialectical materialism and from a fake evaluation of the economic forces in society. To use a Marxian analogy: Force is the midwife to deliver the socialist order from the womb of a decadent Capitalism. ... Lenin, the founder of Bolshevism, and thus of Fascism, substituted the idea that the revolution was to result from the scientific planning and execution of the party, which was the class-conscious vanguard of the Proletariat. He replaced the idea of spontaneity with the idea of planned conspiracy. Every party member became a disciplined conspirator dedicated to the goal of the overthrow of the government by force and violence.

*Beset as he was with incredible difficulties, Lenin nevertheless took the requisite time in 1920 to write a textbook to direct the Communist conspirators of the world in the technique of organizing the violent revolution to seize power in their own respective countries. The book is one of the Communist classics, a "must" in reading for every recruit, and is entitled *Left wing Communism - An Infantile Disorder*. It is the blueprint for the internal conquest of countries by Communism. It is one of the most cynical, yet Satanically clever, books ever written. Lenin shows how as true [communist] scientists Communists must manipulate the forces in each country from behind the scenes and have millions unconsciously working for them. The key to the program is the word "Infiltration" - infiltration of governments, of churches, of sporting bodies, of social clubs; infiltration of institutions of any and every kind, but above all, infiltration of industrial labor unions. All of these named and implied organizations are to be so scientifically manipulated as to bring to pass a violent revolution. . . .*

In effect he [Lenin] said: "My dear friends, you have forgotten something very important. You are really a crowd of idealistic utopian dreamers. Certainly all human frailty, ignorance, and avarice are derived from the Capitalistic system. That is axiomatic. But you say that all we have to do to remove sin is to destroy the Capitalistic System. You try to go too quickly. When you have destroyed the root of all evil, the fruit remains in the characters of the many millions of the earth who are diseased and deformed."

. . .

Before the true Communist Society can be created, these disease characteristics, a hangover from Capitalism, must be eliminated.

To do this, an intelligently applied scientific program, based on the established principles of animal husbandry, must be implemented. To do this it is necessary to have a strong and intelligent power to carry out the program. In the progressive quality of its dialectic heart, history has appointed the Communist Party, the self-conscious, enlightened vanguard of the Proletariat, for this role. Therefore we must establish an absolute dictatorship for this party. We will call it the Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

*Nearly all of the above paragraph is constituted of ideas and thoughts which Lenin expressed to his less realistic Marxist friends. On page 43 of his book *Problems of Leninism*, published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House of Moscow, Stalin defines the term "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" as **the rule, based on force and unrestricted by law, [EA] of the Proletariat over the Bourgeoisie**. Put simply this means the rule, based on force and unrestricted by law, of the Communist Party over everyone else.*

Stalin's definition, as given above, is profoundly interesting. He, along with all other true Communists, rejects two cardinal principles of civilization. The first principle is "The Government of Law." The power of the Communists is specifically to be unrestricted by law. The second principle is "Government by Consent." The power of the Communists is openly based on force. In this way do the Communists turn back the clock from civilization to barbarism.

...

They do not punish or reward. These are Bourgeois ideas that have no place within a redeemed Communist mind. No enlightened Communist blames me for my opposition to Communism. I am merely the unfortunate victim of my economic environment. Unfortunately I am diseased, and thus a danger to the whole program of human betterment. So I must be liquidated, but no more so than all other members of my social class. Since all personality is derived from our social class, all members of a given class have actually or potentially the dangerous disease of character, and they must be eliminated. The treatment you are to receive should the Communists come to power is entirely unrelated to the attitude you have adopted to them in the past. Opposition begets no penalty, and support begets no reward. A Bourgeois class of origin begets liquidation.

Thus the mass-murder program of Communism is a logical and inescapable consequence of their basic beliefs. . . .

Thus we see the consistent logic of the Communists. Should you ask them, "You inhuman monsters; do you mean to say you would murder in cold blood millions of people?" they would unhesitatingly reply, "What do you mean by murder? That is a Bourgeois term. Nature has been killing people by countless millions for centuries, killing them by hunger, war, disease, and old age; killing them to no purpose. We have a purpose, and a noble one, and should we hesitate to take the necessary steps because they are unpleasant to our Bourgeois prejudices? How unworthy we would be of the task history has entrusted to us."

There is only one error in the Dr. Schwarz comment and that is a tendency to allow the communist misuse of the scientific concept. True science is the philosophy of discovering natural truth and the best understanding of human social order we have today is barely science.

Communist philosophy is based on animal science. It has never progressed, and never can progress, beyond Pavlov's dog. Pavlovian research is the basis of socialist philosophy; people are considered as animals and Communists recognize no science that goes beyond this. Of course they are quite overcome by fanaticism and incapable of rational foresight. The quotation shows clearly the nature of the socialist/capitalist 'philosophic imperative'.

The pagan Super Mafia do not care if you support Communism or Capitalism. They promote a principle of social demolition which consists of setting up two opposites and enticing their opponents to divide against each other. From the resulting rubble they will rebuild to their own design.

In the educated nations, with philosophy and behaviour (imperfect though they may be) based on Christian belief, all people carry the virus of information and ideals that are deadly to plans designed to create the totally manipulated zombie (new man) that elitism wants as its work force. It is a philosophic imperative that the Communist must eventually kill everyone who has knowledge of today's world, neither the seed nor the fruit of free thought must contaminate the slave class.

The great, indiscriminate, 'social reform' that will eliminate all memory of the kind of world we live in today, can only take place when all nations are dominated by a world government. The human destruction that has already taken place in communist dominated nations is merely a useful preliminary.

How naive are those who think they can escape the coming holocaust by serving it. When the population is suitably reduced the children will be segregated and when old enough to do the work, the remaining adults will be terminated.

The 'new man' that they talk about is the mind-slave (working class) of the new society. This worker will truly live among equals. He will be incapable of understanding science or social order because his language and education will be limited to the needs of his working life.

So many people today have the idea that the human behaviour we accept is the natural/normal behaviour of people. Most, even now, do not understand that our civilized world (though far from ideal) is very much the result of Christian understanding and morality.

It is known that if our understandings and ideals, and the words that express these understandings and ideals, are removed, and if our words and understandings are replaced by other words and beliefs, then people will behave differently.

If our words and understandings are to the belief that we are only animals, then it is possible that the human spirit will be destroyed and people will behave as animals. The Super Mafia elitists believe that people are only animals and that it is quite logical and acceptable that serving classes should be bred to fulfill the needs of the masters.

They believe that these zombies will not only behave as animals but will expect to be treated as animals. The SM will appear so different in dress and manner that the new worker will bow in awe before those able to control the seemingly magical powers granted by technology - powers that the man-animals will believe that they themselves can never understand or aspire to.

What the SM are doing is not understood by an outside world trying to see what it can through the warped mass media. Nevertheless, until the scheme is complete, there remains a risk that gullible people may awaken. However, once the SM Elitists have One World power, information and communication will be totally controlled and whole nations will, in safety, be 'purified' to become designated wilderness areas.

What do Communists Say?

You don't want to believe it! Things have changed! What do the communist leaders themselves say?

Comrade Manuilski, highly respected Russian winner of the Lenin peace prize on three occasions. Quote:

War unto death between Communism and Capitalism is inevitable. We are not powerful enough to defeat them yet. Our time will come within 20 to 30 years. In order to win we will need the element of surprise - we must put the bourgeoisie to sleep.

For this reason we will begin the biggest peace movement that history has ever seen. We will make proposals and concessions as have never been known. Because the West is stupid and decadent they will assist in their own destruction. They will do everything in their power to have us as their friend - and as soon as they drop their guard we will smash them with our clenched fist.

No doubt you have often seen such remarks reported in your daily newspaper or in warnings issued by other mass media? No! Well I wonder who controls the press?

Are the following any more familiar?:

"The leading and guiding force of Soviet Society . . . is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union [which is] armed with Marxism-Leninism and imparts a planned systematic and theoretically substantiated character to their struggle for the victory of Communism." Article 6 of the constitution of the USSR adopted October 1977.

"The Party will continue to follow the Leninist course." Mikhail Gorbachev - current leader of the Soviet Union.

"When we are reproached with our cruelty, we wonder how people can forget the most elementary Marxism." V.I. Lenin.

"Violence in itself is not evil. It depends on what its purpose is. In the hands of Socialists, it is a progressive force." Boris N. Ponomarev - Communist Party Secretary.

"The energy and mass nature of terror must be encouraged." V.I. Lenin.

"Trust us comrades, for by 1985, as a consequence of what we are achieving by means of detente, we will have achieved most of our objectives in Western Europe ... a decisive shift in the correlation of forces will be such that by 1985, we will be able to exert our will whenever we need to." Leonid Brezhnev in 1973.

"Imperialism accepted detente, not because it wished to but because it was forced to. It was compelled to accept detente because the correlation of forces in the world arena changed in favour of socialism." Yuri Andropov in 1979.

"The strategic purpose of peaceful co-existence is to assure favourable conditions for the world-wide victory of Socialism." World Marxist Review.

"In the present era, the struggle for peace and for gaining time presumes, above all, the steady strengthening of the military might of the Soviet Union and of the entire socialist camp." Marshal V.D. Sokolovsky - Chief of the Soviet General Staff.

"The struggle between world proletariat and bourgeoisie will continue until the final victory of Communism on a world scale." F. Rhyzhenko "peaceful Coexistence and the Class Struggle", Pravda, 22 August, 1973.

"Marxist-Leninists decisively reject the assertions of certain bourgeois theoreticians who consider nuclear missile war unjust from any point of view." General Major A.S. Milovidov and Dr Ye A. Zhdanov, in 'Questions of Philosophy', a Soviet Journal, 1980.

"The capitalists will supply us with the materials and the technology which we lack. They will restore our defense industry, which we need for our future victorious attacks upon our suppliers." V.I. Lenin.

*"... on the Communist side, nuclear war will be lawful and just ... the natural right and sacred duty of progressive mankind to destroy imperialism . . . It will resolve not just specific limited interests but a crucial historical problem, **one that affects the fate of all mankind.**" Colonel B.A. Byely in Marxism-Leninism on War and Army. (Emphasis added).*

"Comrades, I can understand your view of Australia as a country of little importance to your concerns . . . You are wrong . . . You must understand that if we wish to control Asia we must first control Australia." Boris Ponomarev.

Those we trust to keep us informed have never made plain to us what our enemies say and believe. They have not explained how it was that Lenin knew the Capitalists would support Communism to make Communism the major power in the world and would provide the rope for the hanging of the Christian free enterprise nations. Yet, over the history of the USSR, this proposition has been the one article of Communist faith that has proved entirely true.

It is difficult to appreciate the devious-meaning use of the word 'Capitalism'. It is always deceptive if we do not realize that Capitalism and Communism are part of an ideological charade. When Capitalism is contemptuously used to indicate the enemy which will be crushed by Communism it means "free enterprise" will be crushed, but when it is used to denote the fools who will supply the rope to hang themselves it means Capitalism will supply the means whereby Communism will be empowered to overthrow free enterprise.

The 'International Financiers' (SM) have been liberal in supply of money, food and technology to support Communist nations because Communism is a tool of the Internationals and would collapse without this support.

We should also take special note of the foregoing Byely comment. It is not so often that there is let slip a public comment that is only expected to be understood by the insiders. This comment admits that the program is not just political or ideological. It will resolve not just specific limited interests but a crucial historical problem, one that affects the fate of all mankind. What mysterious problem is being solved?

Don't be Fooled by Fabian Tricks.

On 13/8/1986 Attorney-General Bowen announced that the Bill of Rights legislation would be allowed to lapse. In revealing this he suggested it would be better within the proposed new constitution anyway. That is what the Australia Act is about and why the Bill of Rights served to 'run interference' and direct attention away from the Australia Act.

With the Australia Act in place it well suits the manipulators to enthrone the wanted powers within the Constitution and step away from the Bill of Rights. Fabian 'gradualism', a game of deceit, uses tricks as old as creation (a bird runs with dragging wing to lead the predator from the nest, having removed the danger it just flies away). To survive we have to be smarter than foxes. It is a tragedy that public anger generated by such issues is so often lost to simple enemy stratagem. So easily we forget.

The only way to stop political power-grabbing is to strip political parties of their illegitimate powers.

Nevertheless, congratulations to all 'troglodytes', 'Neanderthals', 'drones' and 'thugs', as Senator Evans calls those who carried the banner of public opinion against the Bill of Rights. Is he (and the Prime Minister who also calls us names) too ignorant to know that even a worm will turn? We see demonstrated yet again just how little respect political party people have for public opinion.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COMMISSION

Furtively, and by means of doubtful legality, Australians has been separated from their heritage. Unless we force a return to public control of Parliament we have no effective constitutional protection. Assuming Australians continue to keep their collective heads in the proverbial sand and do not take advantage of warnings, then we can expect:-

- 1) The Government (with the aid of international financiers) will continue to maintain an artificial economy until the Australia Act coup can be ratified at some convenient time such as the bi-centennial celebrations in 1988.
- 2) Every effort will be made to soothe social unease.
- 3) Assuming success of the above then there will come an announcement in terms such as this; " As Australia has been nominally a republic since the signing of the "Australia Act 1986", and as, in that period since, we have not had a legally sound constitution, it is thought appropriate that at this time of celebration the Government should announce and officially declare, Australia a republic. We proudly announce a new constitution and offer Australians a referendum of acceptance."

Of course the timing will depend on the continued success of political parties and mass media in misleading us as to what is really going on, so it is up to us to awaken enough people to force the delay or abandonment of the final takeover.

Our enemies never sleep. Since the first edition of the *Call it Treason* booklet was produced a highly paid *Constitutional Commission* has been made public. The stated purpose of this Commission is to advise the government on a MAJOR REVIEW of the Australian Constitution.

By the time you read this, that Commission will have finished taking 'submissions' from the general public, but do not be concerned, by now you should realize that any submission you could have made would not alter the result.

This commission was not formed at public request and so is democratically illegitimate and devoid of public authority. By submitting to it suggestions (as called for) we, in fact, acknowledge and grant it authority and the right to advise on changing the constitution.

It is well to remember that public understanding of our constitution has been so restricted that it is now impossible for the general public to make intelligent submissions. Even constitutional lawyers, because they do not make money from that aspect of constitutional law important to political freedom, are poorly informed.

As devious change to the national Constitution opens the way to political dictatorship and despotism, we should, in public if possible, ask what is the real purpose of this commission, given that:

- a) under the present Constitution the people are the authority and the only legitimate purpose of the parliament is to give effect (so far as is possible) to the will of the people. Therefore, any act of parliament not giving effect to the will of the people is democratically illegitimate;
- b) the people have made no request for major change to the Constitution;
- c) no attempt is being made to explain the present Constitution or make possible the effective expression of the will of the people;

d) any change to our present Constitution must (constitutionally) be put to referendum and passed by a majority in each State. As no such referendum has ever been passed except when supported by BOTH major political parties, can the present move have any purpose unless we assume the political parties are conspiring to impose further major constitutional change by trickery?

In view of the national importance of this matter we should try to publicize the following:

1. As Constitutional Commission members are political appointees, they must resign after recommending that there can be no legitimate review of the constitution without first:

(a) giving the public an understanding of the proper working and benefits of the present (legitimate) constitution;

(b) encouraging the proper working of the constitution.

(c) (after completion of a & b) receiving a public request. Should this request eventuate, arrangements may THEN be made for a Commission selected and elected by the electorate.

2. Or, if the Commission is determined to continue without public authority, it should recommend that:

(a) as any meaningful Government of the people by the people requires the electorate to choose and elect its own representatives, the Commission advise the Government to disallow political parties from nominating candidates for election;

(b) as the people have no enforceable avenue of complaint against parliament produced legislation, the Commission advise constitutional provision for a system of Citizen Initiated Referendum as exists in Switzerland.

(c) the voice of the electorate be RECOGNISED as law.

3. Or, if unwilling to expose the deceit of political party government to this extent, at least recommend that:

(a) as exercise of party discipline in Parliament constitutes contempt for, or conspiracy against, the electorate, it be henceforth disallowed;

(b) each elected representative must seek electorate opinion on matters of change to national policy and also seek electorate instruction when beginning a term of office;

(c) steps be immediately taken to repeal laws based on interpretations of the Constitution not approved by referendum and all change resulting therefrom.

Summing up. The Constitutional Commission is democratically illegitimate and has no right to give the parliament any recommendation other than to return authority to the people in the spirit and to the letter of the legal constitution.

GOVERNMENT IS FAR TOO IMPORTANT TO BE LEFT TO POLITICIANS.

A letter on the above lines was sent to *The Australian* newspaper but unpublished.

We may expect frivolous excuses/reasons presented to the Australian public and designed to deceive us that anything dangerous is happening.

Mass media will try to prevent dismay and apprehension by suppressing appearance of any political threat during the time elapsed between the Australia Act coup and a new Australian Constitution. They will virtually ignore political activity such as *The Education and Public Instruction Act* (N.S.W. 1987) designed to deny parents any choice of what their children are taught or legislation designed to deny the Sydney City Council

legal rights as well as various similar undemocratic (despotic law)* actions being taken by Australian parliamentary bodies.

NOTE: Despotic law = "the rule, based on force and unrestricted by law" = rule by despotism unrestricted by any enforceable civil law.

Legislation based on despotic law is being enacted by the States and by the Federal Government. If the public ever get to hear about this repressive legislation it is mainly as a result of chance stumbling rather than because it is reported by parliament or the news media.

We (the people) do not know what legislation is being passed through our parliaments. Even M.P.s often do not know, or understand, what they vote for.

One of our better known independent (N.S.W.) M.P.s, Mr. John Hatton, has called it "Government by Decree", and that is exactly what it is. He also says:

The most frightening thing about the gunning of legislation through the Upper and Lower Houses is the fact that much of the legislation is umbrella legislation, which gives Executive Government power to make regulations and these are made by the hundreds, tabled in the House and effectively become law without any consideration at all . . .

The Parliament is treated as a necessary nuisance by Executive Government and an arm of the public service . . .

The Member for Wagga, Joe Schill, pointed out on the last day of the sitting, that many of the regulations had not been tabled according to law . . .

Examples of the kind of legislation being introduced include the N.S.W. *Industrial Arbitration (Industrial Torts) Amendment Bill* which, had it not been exposed, would have created a legalized apartheid giving privilege to trade unions and going directly against the principle of "equality before the law".

Perhaps an even more glaring example is the N.S.W. Education and Public Instruction Bill of 1987. Let us read directly from a full page advertisement placed in the North Shore Advocate (4/3/1987) by Coalition Affirming Freedom in Education:

IF THIS LEGISLATION IS PASSED PARENTS AND CITIZENS WHO LOVE AND CHERISH THEIR BASIC RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS WILL BE THE LOSERS AND THEIR CHILDREN AND YET UNBORN GENERATIONS WILL BE THREATENED, . . .

NEW AND SWEEPING POLICE STATE POWERS -

- + *Forced entry, search, and seizure of property, records and materials in church facilities used by schools.*
- + *Forced entry, search and seizure of property, records and materials on private school property.*
- + *Forced entry, search, and seizure of private property, records, and materials in private dwellings upon suspicion that "illegal teaching" is being conducted.*
- + *Interrogation of parents and children.*

POWER FOR THE ULTIMATE REMOVAL OF YOUR FREEDOM TO CHOOSE -

- + *To begin to operate a school designed to reflect a unique philosophy, Christian or otherwise.*
- + *To select the system, methods, texts, resource books and content of programmes that now define and differentiate such schools.*

+ *To send your child to a private school of your own personal preference.*

POWER FOR ULTIMATE CONTROL OF ALL PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN NEW SOUTH WALES -

+ *To arbitrarily close certain existing private schools.*

+ *To disallow, impose difficult conditions, cause lengthy delays, and generally make extremely difficult if not impossible the opening of new private schools.*

+ *To remove present certification from some schools and force re-registration under completely new and unnecessarily strict intrusive measures, based upon many yet to be determined regulations and guidelines.*

+ *To require re-registration of existing schools upon the occasion of even relatively small and insignificant changes in facility or operation.*

+ *To dictate and impose : - patterns of study - teaching and learning methods - educational philosophy - curricula, materials, books, resources and programmes - religious philosophy and content through control of the above.*

+ *To devise and implement an unlimited and undefined number of rules, regulations and requirements under the definition of the clause, "any other prescribed matter", at the Minister's discretion.*

POWER FOR ULTIMATE DENIAL OF BASIC LEGAL RIGHTS AND PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE -

+ *The right of trial by a jury of one's peers.*

+ *The right of the assumption of innocence rather than guilt.*

+ *The right of freedom from prosecution at the discretion or whim of an official.*

+ *The right of a judicial trial and appeal.*

+ *The right to avoid an unfair trial by a tribunal appointed by your prosecutor.*

+ *The right to be free from the threat of harsh criminal penalties, including large fines and imprisonment, to be imposed through contempt proceedings.*

Making quite clear the purpose of such draconian legislation is the following article reporting on an English experience:

The Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) has suspended the headmaster of a primary school because he was too successful in improving the academic standards and sporting competitiveness of the school.

The headmaster, Brian Dugan, took over ailing St. Jude's Primary School in 1980. Since then the school has more than doubled the number of pupils, established a waiting list, and established an outstanding reputation for academic standards. In the last four years, nine children have won coveted scholarships to private schools.

Unfortunately, the 'modern' educationists at the left-wing ILEA were outraged at the success of St. Jude's. In a secret report the authority said St. Jude's was 'a cause of concern', and the school was described as 'an extremely formal school with a highly competitive ethos and, as such, stands well outside the established traditions of primary education in this authority.' In July the ILEA ordered an inquiry into St. Jude's and suspended Mr. Dugan!

That the general public sits still and allows a small group of fanatics to dictate that their children must receive a second or third rate standard of education defies all imagination. Unfortunately, as we have seen, this hypnotic trance extends worldwide.

It is also now discovered (reported Sunday Telegraph 26/4/1987) that there is a Federal law in place that allows children of any age to apply to the courts, and get legal aid, for any order they wish connected with guardianship, custody, access and maintenance.

This provision, in a Christian community could be used to protect children from brain damaged or irrational parents but under despotic rule is a fearful monster.

Who instigates this legislation? Who gives the orders? Who owns the hidden hand? We will never be told who is in control. They will never tell us that we are 'ruled by force unrestricted by law'. Your first indication that you have lost the protection of law will most likely be some bureaucrat kicking on your door and demanding .. Your books .. Your papers .. Your children .. Your life.

You may protest, "This is a free country" .. No one will listen.

You may scream, "This cannot be happening" .. but it will.

If we are too cowardly to act when we have legality, then we will have only ourselves to blame when we suffer, and know, that we had the opportunity to change things, but ignored it.

It is now obvious that, given another term of political party government, we will live under new 'law' bound by a new 'religion'. The army and police will be controlled by politicians not, as now, by the Crown.

We will live a few more years under increasing restraint as the elitist Super Mafia consolidate their control but we will no longer have a future to call our own.

Politicians may offer a referendum. However, unless we force the issue NOW, the referendum will not give us choice of a government controlled by the people. We will be given only trivial choices lacking authority. The purpose of it all will be the soothing of social unrest.

It will NOT be made clear that Australia has become a SOCIALIST republic with civil laws and behaviour subservient to the United Nations. It will always be maintained that we are a free democracy with a choice of political parties, but of course we will not have control of the political policy of the political parties.

Once our new national status has been accepted we can expect to see suicides by people who have no suicidal tendencies; heart failures by people having no history of heart problems; fatal accidents to those normally careful, and killings 'by robbers' of people who have little of value to robbers.

People will quickly become afraid. They will become afraid because they know what despotic law means. It is an old experience to many new Australians - where will they turn next? But if we are not prepared to act now when there are no military police in the streets we will certainly not act when there ARE military police in the streets.

Already many who are becoming aware of what is happening are afraid to speak openly.

A little later it will be announced that, as Australia is under United Nations 'protection', all foreign bases will be removed (as also in the Philippines). Without full communications and bases, it will be no longer safe for the USA to maintain a fleet in the Indian Ocean.

At the same time the moral subversion of the young will proceed unrestrained; child abuse, genuine suicides, murder, rape, robbery and all kind of crime will rise exponentially unless this population has already been decimated by means of the AIDS virus (Is this our first 'politically protected disease?')

A world-wide economic collapse (the basis for which has been well developed over recent years) will be forced on the nations so that social strains (race and culture) will be inflamed by hunger and extreme economic hardship. This will serve as a cover for further population reduction.

In the 1990s, the social decline of the West, coupled with the often quoted dominant superiority of USSR armed forces, will seduce all nations to accept (as did our own nation) agreements already secretly made. World Government will be promoted and celebrated as the way back to prosperity and the only alternative to world war.

Once World Government is accepted it will soon follow that all INFORMATION and COMMUNICATION will be controlled from the one source. This achieved, the indiscriminate genocide of all remaining immigrant life on the southern continents and islands can be carried out and the indigenous people 're-educated' to return to native lifestyles in (designated) 'wilderness areas'.

How often do you hear people say that Australians would never submit? Are we not submitting? We hear no cackle in the hen house at the entry of the fox; we see no demonstration in the streets at the removal of community responsibilities; we see no 'tar & feathers' being prepared for treacherous leaders.

When the Communists seize the farmlands will the farmers resist as strongly as the farmers of the Ukraine in the 1930s, and will millions of Australians die of starvation as violence gives cover and excuse for food and transport sabotage?

TREASON GOES DEEPER!

While the immediate benefit of population-slashing is a great spur to the elitists and unchallengeable power is an irresistible goal, there is another impulse that drives pagan internationalists to their orgy - hatred of their one substantial opponent - Christianity!

Treason is not just against the nation! Treason is also against Christianity. The same treason that has overcome the nation has overcome organized Christianity. Today Christian Churches rarely teach more than the labels, and people only knowing the labels will follow whoever carries the label.

A convenient example was reported in Sydney's "Sunday Telegraph" (23/3/1986). Quote:

A man accused of conning a fortune out of wealthy Christians was disclosed in court as a rapist, a robber and a spreader of venereal disease.

Satanist and former record producer Derry Mainwaring Knight is on trial charged with 19 counts of deception, involving a total of \$400,000.

It is alleged that he persuaded a Vicar to help him raise money to break a group of devil worshipers . . .

Naturally the money was used for, not against, corruption. If people only know Christianity by its labels then anyone can come claiming Christianity and get the support of Christians. If the preacher is subverted then the congregation follows along, falling into the same mud puddles, tripping obediently over the same stones, just because the leader wears the label.

The blind lead the blind! Religious leaders use a magnifying glass to read the label on the wolf's coat and say, "Ah! Pure wool!" So they embrace the wolf and display it to the congregation which, in blind trust of its leaders, also embrace the wolf.

Then leaders say, "This good sheep wants to fight the wolves so let us give it money to fight the wolves for us.

So they give it money and it goes and buys a few more sheep to eat.

The pampered leaders do not want to do the work they are paid to do; they do not want to dirty their hands. Besides, they see so dimly that they do not distinguish friend from foe.

Beware of Christians who struggle to reveal their Christianity but do not struggle to know and reveal truth. Be sure that had one substantial Christian Church had the faith to seek and reveal the scientific truth about the 'theory' of chance evolution, then the theory of chance evolution as a base for evil in the world, would not exist.

The hour is late. Your country has been sold and signed for. You have been sold and signed for. If you have the human spark, turn now! Open your eyes! Open your mind! Open your heart! For once you are delivered into the chains of your enemies, there will be no escape.

The overthrow of all human characteristics is necessary to produce the zombie (new man) who will gladly serve the Super Mafia.

EPILOGUE

AUSTRALIANS SPEAKING TO AUSTRALIANS

When one reads the recognized constitutional experts of the past, such as for instance Dr. Evatt, what we find is a great confusion of opinion about details of meaning. People like Dr. Evatt considered this a disaster; he wanted a legally precise and defined constitution (is there such a thing?). Others consider the strength of Common Law is that it is flexible, even though this very flexibility may create confusion.

However, despite this diversity of views, there is one point at which all acknowledged past authorities appear to agree; under our system ... **the people are the authority.**

Whenever a constitutional crisis occurs and the Crown dissolves a parliament, it is always in order to return parliament to the authority of the electorate. Parliament has only one legal duty, to serve the will of the people; the Crown has only one legal duty in its sworn commitment to ensure the parliament acts by the WILL of the people and WITHIN THE LAW.

So in the end it does not matter what the politicians say, or what a King or Queen may say, or what the Courts and lawyers may say, CONSTITUTIONALLY, it is the people who are THE ONLY authority RIGHTFULLY able to make a final decision on all matters of constitution and government.

BE REASSURED, THAT UNDER COMMON LAW, NO MATTER WHAT 'AUTHORITIES' MAY SAY, IT IS THE ELECTORATE THAT IS THE LEGAL AND FINAL AUTHORITY OF GOVERNMENT, TO GRANT THE POWERS OF GOVERNMENT AND TO GRANT AUTHORITY TO GOVERNMENT TO USE THE POWERS GRANTED.

It is well that we should make these things known within our community for we are, if ignorant, subject to grave and individual danger. We (who have been active in this matter) are neither rash nor ideological fanatics, we are not gambling our lives for some petty political end. The Common Law system, established on the will of the people, is your only legal protection. If the overthrow of the Common Law system is completed then the lives of all Australians will be in the hands of despots free to rule by despotic law.

The world has never, in national history, ever fully achieved 'government of the people by the people'. Perhaps, early this century, we came close to that ideal in Australia (as also in the U.S.A. and England) but failed because of lack of understanding and political will. The power-hungry were allowed to consolidate their control of the school-room, the church, the mass media and the political party system.

In true democracy there must be a public ability to:

1. exercise authority over individual political decisions;
2. control the money supply;
3. manage national affairs free of foreign instruction.

It was never clearly explained that we had achieved (by virtue of our Constitutional heritage) the three imperatives of democracy. No one ever told us of our need to protect this heritage. No political party ever campaigned for some mechanism whereby we might keep our servants honest.

The most effective way so far developed of keeping our servants honest, is the Swiss system of Citizen Initiated Referendum but even this may not be enough without Citizen Chosen Representatives in parliament.

The strange thing is that in order to create a technological society the power hungry had to give us a sound education beneath that overlay of ideological deceit. This has resulted in the opening of a narrow time- slot during which we may, so long as we still have the will and the courage to act, see the deception and escape.

Our future is our own responsibility. God gave us an option but it is we who have to take it up.

You may judge the tree by the fruit it bears.

As you now must surely see, the hour is late. Late indeed for those who would save family, nation, or soul.

The treason we talk of is one treason and the struggle is one struggle. The battle is for truth against lies; the battle is for justice against injustice; the battle is for good against evil.

Intelligence was given us to use.

What Can be Done?

If this book can strike a spark you can be a detonator. If the detonator fizzes rather than explodes, then the great force contained in the community population will not ignite. It is up to us.

Enough people are already reading this information to create a mighty explosion if they have the will to set in motion the chain reaction. We need to start an explosive reaction that will see sufficient of this information produced and distributed before the results of treason consolidate into a new, United Nations dictated, Australian Constitution.

We have to gain enough community enlightenment to charge the political parties with treason. The legal profession will not support us unless we have community support; lawyers will not put their heads on the block for a seeming lost cause even though their heads will come off if our cause is finally lost.

How can you spread this information? Do not go only to friends and those who already agree with you. Try your butcher, your baker, your chemist. As you buy your shoes it is not too difficult to ask, Are you concerned about the political situation? If he/she says No! all you need do is look surprised and try someone else; but if they give any positive response you can say, Well, the first thing you can do is to read this book, you can tell me what you think of it next time I'm in.

If, after reading, people respond negatively ask them to give you evidence to support their position but try not to get into an argument that will only set up an emotional blockage.

You can send a copy to your local newspaper (but don't expect too much). You can send it to any politician in whom you have some faith (are there any?), your favourite media personality or sports star. Business managers, clubs, committee members, etc. Some go from door to door or even hand them out in the street using the same approach as with your storekeeper.

Our Sword

DEMOCRACY and TREASON in AUSTRALIA is our Sword - our political weapon. Although the armour of generations of miseducation and dissipation is thick, we have to keep hacking away. More people are awakening and the more that do awake the more restless grow those still asleep. We have to get basic information to as many responsible people as possible, even repeating on political, business and media people who have been given less convincing material.

We must each become our own political campaign to get a voice in parliament.

Letters

Here are some sample approach letters:

Dear Mr. [Businessman],

You are no doubt concerned by the consistent deterioration of the Australian economy and equally consistent and progressive oppression of free enterprise through petty regulations, rip-off interest rates and crippling taxation. You may already have read similar material and found it incredible so I think you should know that almost 15,000 copies of a booklet preliminary to this were sold unchallenged over about twelve months.

This new book has so many additions and improvements that it is re-named. In view of the success of first booklet you will find this book worth reading and re-thinking. You may also give some thought to reading the supporting literature. After all, can so many prominent, successful and conservative people be wrong?

There is so much at stake and so little you need invest in time and study to check the facts.

If you take your troubles seriously you will soon see that the things that are happening are not the result of government mistakes. We no longer have representative government. What is happening is deliberate. Will you help bring these matters to public attention before it is too late?

Copies have been posted to politicians and if they have been misled they can now prove their worth.

If enough people learn the facts we CAN get our own representatives into Parliament to act on our behalf.

Sample letter to a media person:

Dear [Media person]

You will be aware of the extreme disquiet among the more alert of our community and a general dispute of what we were educated to believe. You may already be disturbed that certain 'educated' beliefs will not stand honest investigation.

You are no doubt concerned by the consistent deterioration of the Australian economy and equally consistent and progressive oppression of free enterprise through petty regulations and punitive taxation. You may already have read similar material and found it incredible so I think you should know that almost 15,000 copies of a booklet preliminary to this book were sold unchallenged over about twelve months.

This new book has so many additions and improvements that it is renamed. In view of the success of the preliminary booklet you will find this new book worth reading and re-thinking. If you follow up on the supporting literature you will soon see that the things that are happening are not the result of government mistakes. We no longer have representative government. What is happening is deliberate. Will you help bring these matters to public attention before it is too late?

I have posted the (copy enclosed) letter to my Federal and State MPs, others around Australia are doing the same. If MPs have been misled they now have a chance to prove their worth.

If enough people learn the truth we CAN get our own representatives into parliament to act on our behalf.

You can write your own version and similar formats can be used for other people. Impersonal distribution is not so good. A signed note proves a real person with real commitment.

Letter to political candidates or MPs

To.....

My [potential] representative in the electorate of

Dear Sir/Madam,

May I bring to your attention the enclosed book *DEMOCRACY and TREASON in AUSTRALIA* and mention that a preliminary booklet sold almost 15,000 copies unchallenged over about twelve months.

In view of the obvious fact that political party promises are rarely kept (a package deal never totally reflecting the desires of any group of electors and, in any event, having no constitutional relevance) I would like you to know it is my will that you study seriously the content of this book and respond to the following questions:

1. What do you believe are your duties as a MP? Who told you your duties? 2. Do you see yourself as representing your electorate, your political party, or some other authority? 3. If you represent your electorate, what have you done to ascertain the viewpoint of the electorate on any matter of consequence? 4. If you represent your electorate why did you not fully inform your electorate of the potential consequences of the Australia Act; the politically appointed Constitutional Committee, etc, and ascertain electorate response? 5. Having read this book are you now prepared to take steps to discover, and represent, the views of your electorate?

To avoid excessive duplication of effort it would be appropriate if each reader approach only one member of the Senate, your own State member and Federal member, and one media person.

Naturally the more local people you contact the better. Books should go to local R.S.L. members and any patriotic or activist people or groups as well as other responsible citizens.

WE HAVE THE AMMUNITION - Do we have the COMMITMENT?

"Power is the great aphrodisiac" says Henry Kissinger, and he should know. Do not imagine that power-crazed dupes who see themselves within reach of victory will be persuaded by fact or by argument; by law or by Constitution. At no time have they ever given in to reasoned public opposition unless it has suited them to do so. Treasonous people have to be dragged, kicking and screaming, to the 'tar and feathers'.

Remember this, the Bill of Rights, Human Rights Commission, Equal Opportunities, The Australia Card, The Education & Public Instruction Bill of 1987 (N.S.W.), The Industrial Arbitration Amendment Bill (N.S.W.) etc, are all try-ons for the fitting of our 'New Law'. The despotic 'law of authority'. The law of force that makes of every bureaucrat an authority and within his given authority he is THE LAW.

This is the law that is replacing our Common Law system which is now in process of being illegally overthrown. Our seeming victories in slowing some of these monstrosities will be irrelevant if we allow them to write the powers they want into a new Australian Constitution.

Make good use of all additional time; it is hard bought by a few concerned people.

Ultimately the only way to regain control is to choose people you know and trust in your electorate and BEG them to stand at the next election as independents. Rally support. Do not forget that one presentable local person with an honest proposition can influence more votes than \$100,000 of political propaganda. With sixty to seventy percent of people completely sick of the political parties there has never been a better chance for an honest, WELL-INFORMED, independent.

Persuasive political programs should feature promise of action on the following fundamental needs:

1. Citizen Initiated Referendums to return political power to the people as our Constitution intended;

- 2. exposure of the money myth (all legitimate loans needed for housing and business could be profitably loaned by the government at two or three percent interest);**
- 3. exposure of political party treachery;**
- 4. the return of status to the traditional family;**
- 5. outlaw political brainwashing in schools.**

These are weak points of the established political parties that crawl to the 'Internationalist Establishment'. Our weak point is public ignorance.

We have one avenue open to regain control and self-respect. Enough genuine independent MPs to gain the balance of power could be enough to save the nation.

THE CHALLENGE!

1. THE CHALLENGE TO POLITICAL PARTY GOVERNMENT IS SIMPLE:

- (a) If such governments are not guilty of treason, then let them give the electorate a voice in the future of Australia. Honest political parties will not separate us from our constitutional rights by secretive conspiracy, nor will they, by deceit, force on us despotic law. No! What they will do is first explain, and then give us, the rights to which we are already entitled.**
- (b) If political parties are honest to the electorate they will stop the use of schools for social engineering. They will stop encouraging children to use drugs and to disregard parents. They will stop the teaching of ideological lies. They will clean up the education system and get rid of those who teach political fantasy.**
- (c) They will support the natural family unit.**
- (d) They will allow freedom of truth.**

What do political parties fear? Do they fear too much public support for clean open government?

Or do they fear Internationalist masters?

*** * ***

2. THE CHALLENGE TO MASS MEDIA IS SIMPLE:

- (a) They will stop denigrating people who oppose socialist philosophy.**
- (b) If mass media truly support 'freedom of the press' then let them give equal space to the well reasoned literature of free people and not concentrate on the biased ravings of ideological captives. (First & Last literature is offered free for fair display and comment.)**

What do they fear? Do they fear the truth will be too obvious?

Do they fear the great increase of circulation will be too much to handle?

Or do they fear Internationalist masters?

3. THE CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS IS SIMPLE:

If big business is in service to Australia then let them spend some of the millions now spent on advertising the three S's (sex, sport and stupidity) and expose the sell-out of Australian sovereignty.

What do they fear? Do they fear too much goodwill and increased sales to a grateful public?

Or do they fear Internationalist masters?

PEOPLE, you have POWER!

Politically there are said to be three kinds of people:

Those who make things happen; those who watch things happen; and those who never know what hits them.

The challenge to you is simple - join with those who work to make things happen (The Constitutional Heritage Society). Elect a legal government to prepare legislation on your behalf.

People! You have power! But sadly you now live in a country where POWER is confiscated to a political party form of government that binds itself by treaty to the United Nations organization. You now live in a country where the bureaucracy is over-ruling your Common Law rights so as to install 'Despotic Law' (what the authority says is law, IS LAW) under this 'law' you have no right of appeal against government legislation and no authority to whom you can appeal.

Your rights will soon be no more than in any other communist country.

But! If enough people are alerted before the above situation is legalized by a new constitution we have another chance. By quick action in revealing the truth and creating political resistance, we may prevent the imposition of a new constitution and regain our freedom.

Do we still have the strength of purpose to force OUR government to sign a renewal of Magna Carta?

Do not rely on your historic concept of access to the Crown; that avenue is now effectively blocked. Your one realistic legal option is to elect your own independent political representative before that avenue too, is closed.

Do not support political parties that sign away Australia's sovereignty behind your back. Awaken your community so that treacherous people can be put on trial for treason. Do not support mass media (or those who advertise thereon) which do not expose treason. Do not support business which does not support a free and independent Australia.

Do not expect people to be easily awakened, be happy if they read and think about these things.

If we want our rights we have first to accept our responsibilities.

We must not submit to the 'One World' conspiracy.

AUSTRALIA . . . WAKE UP!

GET THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE INTO OUR PARLIAMENT

ADDENDUM

FOREIGN CONTROL OF AUSTRALIA

The first edition of this book is now more than twelve months old.

To bring this edition up to date we add this P.S.

'Sweet & Sour' is not a kind of food I particularly enjoy but is the taste of a satisfaction that comes from a work which time has proved sadly accurate. No revision of that already written needs be made but only the addition of words that confirm both the great disaster of our times plus the encouragement of recent events.

Research by Dr David Mitchell (and other scholars) has improved our understanding of the constitutional heritage we are in such grave danger of losing. At the same time political events expose more and more the treachery that installed a world-wide socio-economic system designed to steal a world from its people.

The bitterness and frustration of trying to awaken a people sedated by a Shangri-la of pleasurable misinformation must be coupled with a reluctant admiration of the patience and cunning of alien subverters. Alien, not from outer space, but still so alien to what we understand as human, that we were unguarded against the possibility of their existence in a form so like our own.

These aliens have plotted over a period of generations to place a cuckoo in the nest of humanity knowing that our human instincts would cause us to feed this monster to our own destruction. Survival will need an incredible awakening and a return to basic values offered us nearly 2000 years ago. Values that will have to be re-discovered after the deformity and pollution resulting from 2,000 years of worldly manipulation.

This manipulation and treachery still progress even though there has been a great stirring. We have to understand that seeing something is wrong is not enough, the cuckoo is still in the human nest and still being fed by human craft. Unless we can regain control of our political system the end result will remain as the alien gossellers planned.

Oil on the water has damped down some waves but the tide remains under the control of that socio-economic system now drowning humanity.

Politically we are told that Australia is now free of its ties with the mother country and fully independent. So how is it that we are subject to a new form of law set up and controlled by unknown foreign people? How is it that this transfer of Australian sovereignty has been done secretly and without reference to Australians?

Whatever our rights may be, there is one thing certain, if we do not defend our inheritance we will lose it. There is no document, constitution, promise, system of law, Bill of Rights or agreement that will stand without our vigilant care. We have powerful enemies but their power rests with illusion. We are educated to believe in illusions and these bind us more strongly than chains.

Everything said in this book is now doubly evident. Unless we can regain control of our government very quickly we will soon be totally regulated by a world system under the control of an international elitist religious sect who regard us as a living liability.

OUR AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION

It is revealing and exciting to learn that when Australia was settled, each State government was given its own constitution based on the law of England as of that date. This, as you will see, is a very important point.

When the States formed themselves into a Commonwealth, the new parliament was given only the powers needed to carry out its limited function. It was not given powers that would have tended either to clash with the States' Constitutions or make the States subservient to the Commonwealth Government.

You will appreciate now the insight of those who framed our national Constitution and retained that additional protection of freedoms defended by each individual and separate State. This safeguard should have made us secure but did not foresee the possibility of a conspiracy between political parties to transfer their power, in secret, to a Federal headquarters.

You will also appreciate the full cunning of the secretive *Australia Act (1986)* in making the States' Governors mere puppets, and how necessary this was to the achievement of the stated aim of the Act in divorcing Australia from all ties with the mother country.

Of even more importance however is that the Australia Act provided a cloak for the transfer of States' sovereignty to a Federal authority who in turn gave allegiance to foreign control.

It is the States which have been the custodians of the LAW and the gradual transfer of power has now progressed to give the Commonwealth Parliament the power (but not the right) to transfer Australian sovereignty to an international jurisdiction. Consequences of this betrayal are now becoming common in the news. Is it right and reasonable that an international court decide what we can or cannot do with our own land or laws'? Can you imagine the media outcry had this been a British or USA court.

WHY SHOULD REFERENDUM QUESTIONS THAT, ON THE FACE OF IT, GIVE US NO ADVANTAGE ON PRESENT LAW, BE MATTERS OF GREAT URGENCY?

Those who allow the news will know that our Australian Government needed an international court to adjudicate on the world heritage listing of an Australian forest. They will also know that other matters, such as labour management and social behaviour, are now subject to overseas control and decision-making. In addition the United Nations, through its agencies, is known to have prepared new agreements that will allow them control of local government and religion. The recent referendums were to clear the way for Federal use of the new agreements.

It is important to note that thousands of agreements have now been made with United Nations' agencies and this for no practical reason other than the specific purpose of overruling Australian sovereignty **and making us subservient to a foreign authority**. If you tend to doubt that this power could be obtained without going through the legal process of national referendum, here is just a sample of the authority on public record: Justice Dawson, Justice of the Australian High Court, as reported in *The Australian newspaper on 16/3/'88*: *There is now no practical limit to the scope of the external affairs power* [EAP].

The Australian Editorial 14/7/'88:

Mr Willis has widened the possible use of this [EA] power, this time through the international Labour Organization convention ratified by Federal Parliament . . . and We now have the possibility of the Commonwealth using the Closer Economic Relations treaty with New Zealand to change the laws governing our financial system and, headline July 16: Tertiary tax 'would flout U.N. treaty'.

So you see from this small outline that 'OUR (?)' Australian Government has been hijacked and is now intent on creating a public aura of legality for the gradual imposition of despotism. A despotism which, in turn, intermingles with a program of genocide. It is not unlike the progress of events in Hitler's Germany or red Russia.

Dr D.M. White, a Senior Lecturer in Politics at Monash University, wrote a long article called *The Constitution Under Siege* for the *IPA Review* (Feb, 1988). Referring to the effect of Constitutional Commission recommendations for changing our constitution, he says:

I shall be arguing that these amendments would upset every major balance in our constitution, and enshrine a number of sinister new possibilities. They would also make the central government much more powerful, and substantially more interventionist. It is ironical that this should be proposed at a time when the tide has turned against excessive regulation.

The community has been given almost no idea of what impact these amendments would have on Australia and our way of life

One glaring example of inadequate attention to consequences is the recommendation to give the Commonwealth power over matters affecting the national economy

What would be the consequence of giving this power to the Commonwealth in 1988?... There would be no sanctuary for anyone trying to escape from almost any conceivable form of Commonwealth economic control.
End quote (EA).

The above is of particular relevance at a time when the use of money can be outlawed and all transactions forced to be made via a plastic credit card and so allow 'authorities to monitor every move and purchase. We could be located by every phone call or bus ride we make. This with technology already in place. If we GIVE these powers to those who betray us we will no longer be able to claim that they misused their powers nor that they STOLE powers they were not entitled to. Their legal position and authority then become secure.

THE ORIGIN OF LAW

Every aspect of our social and economic life is now subject to foreign control through EAP treaty and yet, in origin, our Constitution and law were based on the Ten Commandments. Even less well known is that the role of the legal system was to interpret these commandments in the light of the Holy Scripture while the role of parliament was to correct any mistakes (deliberate or otherwise) that might be made by the Courts.

From this we see that neither the Courts of Law nor the Parliament were there to make laws. **They were there to preserve the law** and to defend the human welfare. Subsequent historic events were outlined earlier in this book.

Now here is another little-known fact:

In 1917 English law ruled (as part of a gradual usurping of traditional authority) that Biblical law was no longer relevant to British law. However, as the Australian States were formed before this date, they, in the strictly legal sense, are still under law **as at the date of their formation** and under law as at the date of their formation and, until this is legally changed, **your rights and responsibilities are as laid down by the Ten Commandments and Holy Bible.**

Does that surprise you? Do you appreciate what a restraint keeping to the law would place on the bureaucratic meddlers? Do you wonder why the political parties are so urgently and secretly trying to get rid of all restraints imposed on them by our legal constitution? Do you understand what an effective restraint our legal constitution places on the manipulators by enforcing law restricted to that proclaimed by a **WRITTEN unchangeable document?**

The WRITTEN document

In the interests of a better understanding let us deviate a little. Notice the key word in the preceding sentence is 'WRITTEN'. The history of communication is a long story involving feel, smell, sight and sound, but we need not study this story to appreciate that no civilization beyond the primitive can develop without the written word. The WRITTEN word is our most modern form of communication.

Now many people reading this may mentally 'jump up' and say, 'What about radio and TV?'

You only have to think for a minute to realize that these, no matter how sophisticated their means of transmission, deliver only the passing vibrations of sight and sound.

The international elitists understand very well that if they can divorce the people from effective use of written communication then they produce a society primitive in understanding and easily manipulated. No parent of young children should keep TV or radio sets in the home unless their use is severely restricted.

We, the peoples of the world, were able to be reduced to our present state of apathetic futility mainly because we have become so heavily conditioned to sight and sound for entertainment **and secret indoctrination what is socially acceptable.**

The virtual destruction of human development within the education system - revealed by the present upsurge of primitive tribalism, vandal morality and teenage suicide - is part of a well established Fabian plot based on 'gradualism'. Let us not forget that any reform of our culture must be based on written literature and logically connected to a scientific base rather than to an emotional ideology.

The predominant content and purpose of these writings is simply **to demonstrate a unified view of social reality based on information readily available in the public domain.** It must be seen as significant that the public response of the last few years only began after *How to Avoid the LOOMING CATASTROPHE* was distributed to the maincore of actively concerned people.

Do not be discouraged by a reluctant response from a brain-dulled community - it takes time. But also remember, that every year lost without our people regaining control of government, means we will have an increasingly primitive 'sight and sound' indoctrinated community. A community controlled by bureaucracy impossible to dismantle. Do not forget - our government is now alien-controlled.

This present revival has to be successful if we are to be saved an incredible death toll and unimaginable misery.

THE DEPTHS OF DEGRADATION

The depths to which we have been forced is perhaps best shown by an item of news in *The Weekend Australian* 25/6/'88. A Dr Paul Gerber, a reader in medico-legal studies, has suggested that brain-dead women, or "neo- morts", could be used as surrogate mothers. He described the proposal as "innovative and ethical". He thinks it a wonderful solution for surrogacy problems.

At the same time, millions of babies are aborted and people of foreign race and culture are imported, ostensibly, to fill the gap. Families are being discriminated against (very harshly) by taxation and welfare.

Complaints are answered with new swear words such as sexism and racism. Parents are crying out and threatening to sue State Governments because of the activities of so-called 'community welfare' workers who take children away from parents (Would kidnap be more accurate?) and charge the parents, often without benefit of legal evidence, with child abuse.

A recent visitor was one of many Australians complaining of such treatment. He had suffered for some years as a troublemaker reporting to welfare authorities but on every occasion nothing was found wrong. Then the complaint reached a zealot who was not prepared to look at the history of the case or consider the facts. His child was spirited away to an unknown hiding place. Lawyers were amazed but could make no headway with welfare authorities.

The bypassing of accepted standards of evidence and legal trial is a feature of the new law being **gradually imposed.** A form of law growing out of thousands of pieces of legislation designed to support foreign treaties. This rash of legislation is passing through our parliaments too fast for the elected members to read and digest even should they have the inclination.

It has become clear that the political parties, collectively, are already dedicated to introducing a totally foreign form of social dictatorship.

We no longer have secure law! There is a rapidly spreading despotism protected by United Nations treaties! Treaties which even go so far as to protect the killer disease AIDS. Effective action to counter this disease would breach anti-discrimination laws and contravene our commitment to international treaty (See booklet, *AIDS and the World Government Plot*).

Should we be concerned by such developments or should we support our governments to subsidize anti-social activities? *The Australian Money seized from drug traffickers was yesterday handed over to the Australian Prostitutes Collective by the Victorian Government as part of its campaign to return drug profits to the community.* That is what is called adding insult to injury.

Although it may be impossible for anyone to now become a Prime Minister or President unless he in some way serves the purpose of the international elitists, this does not necessarily mean that he knowingly serves. It is likely that most leading politicians know something of what is going on, but because this is often a vague understanding we sometimes see surprising diversions.

These independent forays also serve the internationalists in that they give the public the impression of just that lack of co-ordination that is essential to mask the activity of conspiracy.

In relation to the September 3 referendum John Howard campaigned quite positively but with little media reporting. Does this mean he is not a stooge for the conspiracy?

THE THIN END OF THE WEDGE

In the lead-up to the 1988 referendum the Solicitor-General, Mr Keith Mason, QC, advised the Greiner Government that a 'YES' vote could mean that the High Court and not the State's democratically-elected Parliament, would be the ultimate decision-making body.

The Attorney-General, Mr John Dowd, said he was compelled to draw public attention to Mr Mason's advice in the interests of the people of NSW.

Mr Mason also expressed concern over the vague wording and intention of some of the proposals.

The above, and a constant stream of similar incidentals, expose the thin edge of the wedge of overseas control. Already, through use of External Affairs powers, the Constitution is subject to the votes of a few unelected lawyers. So much for one vote one value.

It is interesting that all authorities and even leaders of the opposition are given scant space by the news media when they oppose the treachery. When they are reported they are reported in the way of matters of little public importance. As an example of this the Sydney Sunday Telegraph of August 28 gave a two-column headline to the above Solicitor-General/Attorney-General report. Alongside and in overpoweringly larger print and space, was a beat-up about the trivia of friction between the Treasurer and Prime Minister.

Anyone understanding the layout of news would instantly see that this was a 'set up' to attract attention away from the socially important and give the reader a feeling that the serious item was of little importance.

This censorship 'by manipulation' clearly demonstrates that the treason is established in the very soul of the administrative and communications establishment.

However the overseas dictators take great pride in their ability to manipulate. They won't destroy us in a direct manner, their way is to entice us to willing self-destruction.

The referendums program would not give central government significantly more power - **what more power can we give them now that the law courts give them access to total power through the external affairs scam?** No, the referendums are to give us, the people, the chance to freely and openly grant the transfer of powers already stolen. They want us to relieve them of their guilt by, of our own 'free' will, putting our necks across the chopping block.

This is all very difficult to accept by the average citizen who **has lived within the cocoon of personal needs and aspirations.** Perhaps the following quotation, taken from our most authoritative newspaper, will be convincing. On June 11, from *The Australian* Editorial:

We have stumbled into a Constitutional crisis that is likely to be remembered as one of the most significant political events in our history.

Few people realize that when, on September 3, adult Australians will be summoned to vote on four referendum questions designed to alter our constitution, they will be taking part in little more than a charade with horrendous implications.

Let the Government come clean, stop this charade and give us back the full strength of the rights we were given on January 1, 1901.

Any honest appraisal shows the referendum questions were outrageously dishonest. How could any elected politician ask people to vote on them? Every question misrepresented the powers publicly granted to political parties by a 'yes' vote.

"One vote one value" was a pure con. This system already applies to Federal elections in the House of Representatives, but at the 1987 election, Labour received 45.83% of the votes and 86 seats. Lib/Nat 46.07% and 62 seats. This is just as bad as the so-called Queensland gerrymander.

You see, the way in which the electorate is divided can be decisive. Suppose we have half the people voting for party A and half voting for party B. And suppose we have 10 equal electorates but in 9 of them we have 51% party A supporters and 49% party B supporters; $9 \times 51 = 459$ $9 \times 49 = 441$. In the tenth electorate we have 59% for party B and 41% supporting party A.

Equal votes, equal value? With equal support and careful arrangement of boundaries, one party may get nine seats and the other one Seat. As members of the United Nations we have one vote and China has one vote. What is the value of Australia's vote if 'one vote one value' is established as a principle of World Government?

In the last N.S.W. election it required 52% of electors to support the Liberal party before they could be elected. 'Fair elections!?' We all want fair elections but that was not advanced by the legislation proposed for referendum. What the legislation allowed was Federal Government dictate in review of States' electoral boundaries.

A four-year term of government. The proposed legislation did nothing to ensure a four-year term - the party in power could still call an election at and time within this term. The purpose of the States' interests. The proposed legislation would allow greater power to manipulate the electorate and effectively reduce the value of the Senate.

Do you know that Senator Gareth Evans himself said, You don't abolish the Senate by doing it up-front, you white-ant it from within?

L.J.M. Cooray, Associate Professor, School of Law, Macquarie University, puts a strong case, quote:

The view has been expressed and widely publicized that the Referendum Bills tabled by the Hawke Government do not involve an extension of legislative power to the Commonwealth. The Attorney-General, Hon Lionel Bowen, in his speech to parliament during the second reading of the Fair Elections Bill on May 10th, 1988 said, "The four bills that I have introduced do not involve any increase in Commonwealth power." This is not true. End of quote.

Professor Cooray then gives two pages of rather legalistic jargon with quoted authorities to back up this comment and ends with, quote:

The above analysis must be assessed in the context that the High Court has provided interpretations of the Constitution which would have been unthinkable five or ten years before the decisions were handed down. The High Court can be expected to continue its process of construing the Constitution in such a way as to provide more power to the Commonwealth Parliament. End quote.

In other words the original meaning and intent of the Constitution is now totally irrelevant and the Commonwealth Parliament is set on a course of misappropriation of powers by deceit and public misrepresentation.

Removal of power from the States and the investment of power in the Commonwealth Government was clearly and deliberately the real purpose of all four bills.

Not only that but also the means of gaining public consent for this treachery was by misrepresenting the facts to the voting public.

Do you want 'Freedom of Religion? Why did they ask us to vote on what is so obvious; something we already have? Why was the matter so urgent that we were only given a minimum of time for study? Why were the referendum questions 'guillotined' through parliament in such haste? Why could the referendum not have been left until the next parliamentary election? Why did the referendum not address matters of serious public concern such as immigration, Citizen Initiated Referendum or aboriginal land rights'?

Obviously there was no national emergency or any public feeling of urgency in respect of any of the questions asked, the only obvious reason for urgency was to get it over before the majority of people discovered the truth behind the question.

They would have done as well to just put one question; "Do you want good government?" Of course, people would have known that just voting for good government would not make it happen any more than it would make fair elections happen, but at least it would have shown that someone had thought the matter through to basics.

Most people now have some idea of what anti-discrimination means in practice. Do you understand that 'Freedom of Religion' means that the Federal government will have your expressed permission to enforce anti-discrimination in religion? This will mean that you cannot advocate the benefits of your religion in public because to do so would imply that your religion is better than other religions, i.e. you would be practicing discrimination. Do you know that the law they want to introduce is the same as that already used to prevent communal display of Christianity in some USA cities?

Do you realize that if this referendum had been carried, Satanism might have been promoted in schools in a policy of 'reverse discrimination'? The elitists are an anti-Christian religious sect most commonly known as the Illuminati'. Their policy is to use Satanism to destroy cohesion and make us defenceless.

When laws were introduced to outlaw discrimination on grounds of race or sex - women, Aborigines and Asians were given reverse discrimination to counter the assumed disadvantages they are ALLEGED to have suffered. This same reasoning can be used to destroy Christianity.

Do you realize that the religion of 'humanism' may not be classified as a religion in the true new order and thereby be free of control? Do you realize that the law said to grant freedom of religion was virtually the same as that in the USSR?

Do you realize that those four little referendum votes, seemingly so innocent and unimportant, allowed 33 constitutional changes? All were dishonestly presented and designed to serve one purpose only: to have the people of Australia officially hand powers of the State Governments to the Federal Government. They were to make legal some of the powers secretly and illegally gained by foreign affairs manipulation.

SATANIC SYMBOLS

For some time there has been a need to expose the meaning of the well-known 'peace' symbol, as represented by an upside-down broken cross placed within a circle.

This symbol is not a chance production; our enemy is very conscious of the influence of symbolism. To capture the minds of our young people they do not overlook the seemingly innocent symbol as part of the subversion and eventual destruction of our culture. Let us look at a little of the history of this symbol.

The main element of the 'peace' symbol is an ancient and well established Satanic insignia and relates to sacrifice and desecration. It can be traced back to Emperor Nero (54-68 A.D.) who is said to have designed it at the time of the crucifixion of Simon Peter as a symbol of contempt for Christianity.

The Legions of Titus carried this anti-Christ symbol to the sacking of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. and the Bolsheviks painted it on the doors of churches closed in Russia. It was also an element in the symbolism of Hitler's National Socialism.

You do not have to be a Christian to realize that life (if you're allowed to live) would be very different in a world controlled by an anti-Christ religious sect.

The broken cross of the 'peace' sign represents a perversion of the Christian Cross upended and with the arms broken. It was widely used during the Middle Ages by anti-Christian rebels but, to have it accepted by today's innocent and ignorant, it is presented as a peace symbol designed by Lord Bertrand Russell. Its disguise is that it represents the semaphore code for the letters 'N' and 'D' (nuclear disarmament) but both Bertrand Russell and his wife were known to be actively anti-Christian and members of that elitist, 'social subversion' group known as the Fabian Society. The well known symbol for the Fabians is of a wolf in sheep's clothing - they pride themselves in treachery.

The 'peace' symbol is a sign within a language. The broken cross represents 'the death of man'; the circle represents the unborn child. Therefore, in its 'peace' format, it is the Satanic symbol for abortion - the sign of the plot to abort Christianity.

The permeative nature of treachery is self-evident in our society today. The 'peace' symbol is commonly displayed at Labour Party events and rallies. However it is not confined to the left of politics and ignorant protest groups; in fact the 'peace' symbol was seen prominently on display at a 'peace rally' held at Parramatta by the N.S.W. branch of the Festival of Light. It was on the banner of one of the supporting groups displayed, appropriately enough, on the left side of the speakers platform.

In Language as a Communist Weapon. Professor Stefan Possony observes: The deception of the non-Communist world is, of course, a main objective of their [the communist] language manipulations.

Non-Communists are easily deceived because they are brought up to believe that words convey certain specified meanings. But Communists, to the instruction of those behind the mask, use semi-secret meanings and symbols to communicate with their followers.

'Peace' means the secret 'War' or, to follow through the treacherous reasoning, it means the peace of victory after the total destruction of all opposition. To achieve this 'peace' the opposing force must be induced to trust the killer and feel guilty if feelings of suspicion are entered into. The victim is luffed into the state of trust where murder and robbery is easy. In short. PEACE means killing without danger of reprisal, i.e. murder.

Have no doubt that the misleading referendum questions form a common unity with the campaign for the destruction of human justice and freedom. We need not go further to expose the attempted trickery of those referendum questions, two thirds of our people saw sufficient danger to vote 'NO'.

SUMMARY

The vital lynch-pin connecting Australia to world problems is political conspiracy. Our political parties well demonstrated this conspiracy in the early 1980s when, over a period of years, they conspired to introduce the Australia Act in such secrecy that the majority of Australians are still ignorant of this Act or its meaning. To achieve this cover-up required the FULL CO-OPERATION of ALL political parties. (Commonwealth and all States).

The officially stated purpose of the Act was to sever all ties between Australia and Great Britain. But those who heard rumours and asked questions were told that it was an Act of no public importance and only removed a few archaic ties. Some effects of the Australia Act are now becoming visible.

10/9/'88 - there is consternation in official circles. It has become public that many politicians have dual citizenship and the Australian Constitution (Section 44) expressly forbids such people M.P. status. This is made more intriguing because the Australia Act makes of Great Britain a foreign country. It is not easy to renounce British citizenship. If the law were to be kept it could mean the present parliament is unconstitutional. At best some parliamentary activity must be unlawful.

Much of what is happening could be challenged on legality. Unfortunately, as we have seen, High Court decisions over recent years have reflected the Canberra line. A general legal action would need large financial resources but the cost to challenge MPs with dual citizenship is not excessive. Is it likely the High Court will upset the Federal apple cart? Unfortunately, we cannot hold printing to see the result of this comedy.

Events of the above nature could be the key to a public awakening and make great legal debate a formality. An awakening that would necessarily mean a significant political reconstruction and, no doubt, treason trials.

To play your part in this awakening you need study this book and other Constitutional Heritage literature. But time is short, start now to help alert Australia.

The more we learn of the World Government plot the more obvious it becomes that this is a life or death struggle. World events, that previously defied explanation or reason, now (once we are awakened) shout their meaning so loudly that we wonder how we could have been so blind for so long.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

This comes down to the following essentials for the recovery and maintenance of political independence.

- 1: Inform the general public;
- 2: **Choose and elect our own representatives to OUR parliament**, a representative who contracts to serve the will of the electorate. It is already proven in Barambah Queensland that this can be done.
- 3: Withdraw from the United Nations: necessary to regain our political independence.
- 4: Create a mechanism to maintain control of our parliament: we need the protection of some practical form of Citizen Initiated Referendums.

The above come together to become complete: you use issues to awaken a political awareness: you use Citizens Electoral Councils to establish a community commitment and dialogue and from commitment and dialogue comes a reassessment of social reality and the correct instruction of your political candidate.

The objection is sometimes raised that a parliament made up of independents would be unworkable. Why should it be? Are any group of representatives naturally divided? It did work before the system was subverted by the introduction of political parties and there is no reason why it should not work now.

There is no more reason for difficulty in a group of independents electing a leader and an administration than for the elected members of a political party to do so. In fact there are less reasons for division as they do not suffer the ideological divisions. Once the Cabinet is elected the system can be very superior. If the Cabinet were kept in the minority and the balance of the MPs become the opposition, this would mean that all administrative decisions would have to get the approval of a majority not committed to voting on party lines. Consistent failure to produce acceptable legislation would result in changes in the Cabinet and allow any backbencher the chance to become a Cabinet Member.

It is now established beyond reasonable doubt that the political parties and media are combined in a conspiracy to deceive and betray the Australian people.

Barrister George Turner's research reveals that the meaning and consequences of section 44 were politically known at least from 1981 when the matter was written up by the Senate Standing Committee on Constitutional Qualifications of Members of Parliament". Other documentation includes Constitutional Convention reports in 1983 and 1985.

George Turner himself properly and formally brought this matter to the notice of the appropriate members of parliament, plus the Governor General and the main news media, on or about 28/8/'88. The cover-up of this dramatic story still remained in place at date of writing 4/10/'88. This proves conclusively that the political parties and the media are in conspiracy to deceive us. Why is this matter so important that contempt of the Constitution is necessary'?

It is an admitted thing that the political parties conspire to common policy in opposition to the will of the people. The political name for this is FASCISM. People must accept that it is now useless to send petitions and 'my will' letters to politicians and the Queen. Our rights are scorned and our Constitution is held in contempt, every day that passes we become weaker and their hold becomes stronger. We must face the fact of alien control or we are lost.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL HERITAGE PROTECTION SOCIETY

The Constitutional Heritage Protection Society is a group of citizens dedicated to the protection of Australia's legal Constitution, our heritage of Truth, Justice and Mercy and freedom within a common law.

The CHPS strategy is also simple, it proposes that every issue be used to publicize and expose the conspiracy behind the issue. If every meeting exposing the fake referendum or the fake Bill of Rights had promoted the sale of this book then Australians would be far more aware of what is going on and not be so naive next time.

The CHPS group has been working for some years to put together basic, authoritative, practical and economic literature. You do not have to join CHPS or use our experience but obviously we can all be far more effective if we are united. Small groups are great but only if they are united. The house divided will fall.

To follow a sound strategy is better than dashing off in a dozen different directions all making the same amateurish mistakes over and over again.

There are other sources of useful material. The CEC at Baramba produce material explaining how they performed their miracle.

But do not forget, talk is just vibrating air. Talk is very useful for awakening an emotional response but it is necessary to provide hard copy for study to ensure maximum long-term benefit.

Written material should be available 'at the time' of meetings and recommended to that people can take a quick look before going to bed. Otherwise, in the morning, the hard-to-convince will probably dismiss the whole episode as just a bad dream.

Sales help to pay costs. When you come to setting up your political independent you need all the help you can get; have these recommended materials on hand.

Written materials from the CHPS range provide support without overpowering the new recruit or introducing the contradictions and confusions of foreign material.

For information or prices of CHPS materials, enquire:
The Constitutional Heritage Protection Society,
P.O. Box Q381,
Queen Victoria Post Office,
SYDNEY 2000.

THE TEST OF TIME

In 1944 Congressman S. Pettingill revealed to the U.S. House of Representatives a socialist plan for the destruction of free culture. If that plan did not so well what has since happened this book would not be so urgently needed. To follow are the main points of the plan; why was it allowed to happen here?

* "Constitutional guarantees must be swept aside. This is accomplished in part by ridiculing them as outmoded and an obstruction to progress.

* Public faith in the legal profession and respect for the courts must be undermined. The law-making body must be intimidated and from time to time rebuked, so as to prevent the development of public confidence in it.

* Economically, the people must be ground down by high taxes, which under one pretext or another they are called upon to pay. Thus they are brought to a common level, and all income above a meager living is taken from them. In this manner, economic independence is kept to a minimum.

* A great public debt must be built so that citizens can never escape its burden, making Government the virtual receiver for the entire nation.

* A general distrust of private business and industry must be kept alive so the public may not begin to rely upon its own resources.

* Government bureaux are set up to control practically every phrase of the citizen's life.

* The education of the youth of the nation is taken under control so that all may be inoculated at an early age with a spirit of submission to the system.

* To supplement and fortify all the foregoing, there is kept a steady stream of Government propaganda designed to extol all that bow the knee and to vilify those who dare to raise a voice of dissent.

* The principle of local self-government must be wiped out.

ISBN 0 9588651 2 4

"Having read your book *Democracy and Treason in Australia*, may I congratulate you on its startling revelation. I recommend it to each and every Australian. *Democracy and Treason in Australia* provides the most disturbing and compelling reading - it bears a truth which cannot be denied."

Signed

W.H. Garing,
Air Commodore,
C.B.E., D.F.C., R.A.A.F. (Retired)

If you rely on others to tell you the truth, you will be told lies; If you rely on others to defend your freedom, you will be enslaved; If you rely on others to protect you, make sure you have no enemies.

Quote: "*The price of liberty is eternal vigilance.*"

Unless we retrieve our birthright we will be robbed! We will be deceived! WE WILL BE SOLD TO THE MERCY OF INTERNATIONAL VANDALS!