

"All that is necessary
for the triumph of
evil is that good
men do nothing . . ."
— EDMUND BURKE.



THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol.16, No.06

Registered Australia post — Publication PP343214 / 00016

June 2015

Contents

800 Years Of The Great Charter.....	2
The Old Island Spirit	2
Magna Carta – Clause 61 And The Barons	3
Dragon Slayers Data DVD - Advertisement.....	4
Magna Carta's Freedoms Never Penetrated The EU By Torquil Dick-Erickson	5
The Sacred Sceptre And The Rod (Or Staff)	7
Have You Heard Of Operation Indigo Skyfold or Jade Helm?	7
Most Important Element In British History – The Christian Tradition	8
Sound Principles Of Association By Wallace Klinck, Canada.....	8

Celebrating 800 years since Magna Carta (Latin for "the Great Charter"), also called Magna Carta Libertatum (Latin for "the Great Charter of the Liberties"), is a charter agreed by King John of England at Runnymede, near Windsor, on 15 June 1215.

MAGNA CARTA - A STEPPING STONE TO LIBERTY

Philip Benwell MBE

(National Chair - Australian Monarchist League)

Magna Carta is the single most important document that led to our system of constitutional monarchy.

It was not the beginning of British law and parliamentary democracy - for that began centuries earlier codified by Alfred the Great in the 9th century and affirmed by Henry I, son of the Conqueror in 1100 AD. However, it was the first time that a king had been forced to agree and abide by the ancient common laws of England.

It was Magna Carta that emboldened Simon de Montfort to call the first parliament which met in 1265 in the still standing Westminster Hall. Edward I in issuing writs for the 1295 'Model Parliament' said: "That which touches all should be approved by all".

Indeed, it was Magna Carta that set the foundation of constitutional liberty and Westminster Democracy which spread throughout the British Empire and are in place in one form or another in most countries in the world today. Its principles are echoed in the English Bill of Rights of 1689, that of the United States of 1791 and more latterly in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the European Convention on Human Rights (1950).

However, the problem facing the Western world today is that governments, the media and educationalists are forcing a Marxist-type doctrine onto our society fuelled by the apathy of the people. The fundamental principle of free speech seems to be rejected by those on the left in positions of authority and power but only against those who do not

agree with them. We are seeing taxpayer-funded journalists literally berating politicians and others of non-socialist viewpoints. Our schools and universities have become republican and socialist indoctrination centres. We have seen teachers and tutors actually lying to unwitting students about our monarchy and our system of governance in their bitterness against the British and their hatred of our Queen. The jury is still out on how the placing of very young children into crèches and the care of what is termed: 'early childhood educators' will have in the future.

In this, the 800th anniversary of the signing of Magna Carta, is it not time that the people of Australia took a stand against these attacks on our traditional and constitutional values - the things that have made Australia great - for otherwise we will face a bleak, indoctrinated, future? When so many countries have overthrown the shackles of communism, why are we allowing our progressive-socialist politicians and our Marxist teachers to take us down this pathway?

Our constitutional monarchy in Australia owes its very political existence to Magna Carta, the principles of which led to the creation of a Constitution that ensured that the rights of the people are maintained and that power could never be taken from them, whether by king or by politician.

Our founding fathers delivered the Constitution into the hands of the people ensuring that politicians alone could not change one word of it. We must cease our apathy and stand up for our inheritance and ensure that the underlying principles of Magna Carta are never discarded. ■

800 YEARS OF THE GREAT CHARTER

The civilisation of Christianity was incompletely embodied in the culture of mediaeval Europe, and is exemplified in Magna Carta. Its essential characteristic is courage, allied to "love," cf., "Perfect love casteth out fear (a rather unsatisfactory translation).

The knight of chivalry, the militant Christian ideal, watched his armour *alone* in the chapel through the night, and then went out to do battle *alone* for love against fear and oppression – a very complete allegory. - "The Realistic Position of the Church of England" by C.H. Douglas 1948

The Barons were: Richard, earl of Clare; William de Fors, count of Aumale; Geoffrey de Mandeville, earl of Gloucester; Saer de Quincy, earl of Winchester; Henry de Bohun, earl of Hereford; Roger Bigod, earl of Norfolk; Robert de Vere, earl of Oxford; William Marshal junior; Robert FitzWalter; Gilbert de Clare; Eustace de Vesci; Hugh Bigod... and so the list of Barons linked with that great historical event continue. But one notices these are hardly ancient Anglo-Saxon surnames – yet we are taught to look upon them as Englishmen who fought for the liberties and freedoms we now hold dear.

So, who were these men with such foreign-sounding names (to English ears), and what was their story?

First, who were the Normans who invaded the British Isle? Our history books tell us: The Norman forces were under the leadership of Guillaume I, Duke of Normandy, who invaded England in 1066 and defeated King



Harold II at the Battle of Hastings.

These Normans who had earlier invaded and settled in Normandy, the northwest region of modern France, in the 8th-10th centuries were descendants of Vikings from the northern countries of Europe (Danish, Norwegian, Orkney). The Duchy of Normandy was formed by the treaty of Saint-Clair-sur-Epte in 911 between King Charles III of the West Franks and Rollo (also known as Hrolf or Robert I of Normandy), leader of the Vikings known as Northmen (or 'Normanni', in Latin).

William "the Conqueror" became King William of England

Many of the men who fought at the Battle of Hastings alongside King William were rewarded for their loyalty

with baronages and large tracts of land in the conquered country. In this way, these families became the nobility of Norman England for the next several centuries. They were listed in the "Domesday Book", the great survey of land and material wealth carried out in 1086.

These first few generations of Anglo-Norman knights were also among the crusaders of the First Crusade in the late 11th century on their mission to capture Jerusalem. The 11th century was an eventful time of great change in the lifestyles and cultural experiences of members of these families.

Some, but not all of them, were titled nobility in Normandy and retained their holdings there as well; others were poorer men, who rose to power through their military or political service, and women, who gained power through their alliances and marriages into powerful families. Some anglicized their names over time, while others retained the French spellings and geographically-based surnames referring to their ancestral villages in Normandy.

It is noteworthy that these men were all layfolk, and for the most part members of the hard-line baronial opposition to the king. No bishop or other Churchman appears, not even, for example, Giles de Braose, bishop of Hereford, who had long been hostile to John. The committee was seen in clear terms as a committee of enforcers, a group whose main responsibilities were to be of a military nature. ■

Ref: <http://www.geni.com/projects/Norman-families-of-Normandy-France-and-England/49>

THE OLD ISLAND SPIRIT

Writing of Dunkirk and the Human Spirit Geoffrey Dobbs ("Home" May 1987) assured his readers: Sooner or later the human spirit expresses itself in material ways, and nearly half-a-century ago the Islanders fought alone against being swallowed into the Continental Mass. It is a part of their legend that they rescued their men from its grasp and brought them home across the Channel in a multitude of little ships, ready if necessary to 'fight on the beaches' to defend their Island.

Since then there has been an unremitting assault upon that spirit of independence, which has used every device of repetitive

suggestion and mob-psychology to destroy it, and to substitute a slavish desire to be merged and to lose the burden of identity in the remote-controlled Mass.

To our knowledge and belief the apparent success of this assault is superficial. The old Island spirit remains and will declare itself in its own time... Though objections, for instance, may be local and superficial, beneath them there is a deep abhorrence of Britain becoming a marginal excrescence upon the vast bulk of the Euro-Asian Continent, both of land and of people. ■

MAGNA CARTA – Clause 61 and the Barons

The committee of Twenty Five were a group of barons in the forefront of the opposition to King John who were entrusted by the terms of clause 61 of Magna Carta to ensure the king's compliance with its terms.

From the outset, the opposition barons had been aware of the danger that, once King John had left Runnymede, he would renege on the Charter on the grounds that it constituted an illegitimate infringement of his authority. The barons came up with a novel solution to the problem in the famous clause 61, the security clause.

Since the clause anticipated the election of the twenty-five at some time in the future, their names are not actually listed in the charter. Consequently, the committee's composition is known principally from the list given later in his chronicle by Matthew Paris, the celebrated chronicler of St Albans Abbey (Herts.).

Little by little the barons were driven into making a choice: They had either to destroy the Crown, and with it the order and unity on which the prosperity of the realm depended, or subject the wearer of the crown himself to it.

The first course might have been easy; the second was superlatively hard. It is the supreme measure of Henry II's achievement in educating his greater subjects that the best of them chose the second, and carried their reluctant fellows with them.

Yet the very cunning and ability of his son also impelled men to that wiser choice. Had John been a weakling as well as an impossible king, the monarchical power which had become the expression of England's unity could scarcely have survived the storms raised by his misdeeds. Yet for all his periodic lethargy, when driven into a corner he fought back with a fury that made even the most reckless or arrogant opponent chary of going to extremes. It was no child's play to dash from his hands the sceptre and rod he misused. The alternative of restraining and controlling him - and with him the royal power - was thus kept open.

It was an alternative, too, to which Englishmen now instinctively turned. It was of the Crown that they thought when they used the word England, for without it there would have been no England. Ever since the days of Alfred the monarchy had been implanting in the English the habit of acting together. The great alien princes who had grasped in their strong hands the athelings' sceptre - Canute the Dane, William and Henry the Normans, Henry II the Angevin - had all strengthened it. It had become natural even to Anglo-Norman barons to act with and through the Crown. They still tried to do so when its wearer of the hour became their oppressor and enemy.

Only the barons, with their armour, horses, castles and men-at-arms, had the means to withstand such a tyrant. Even for them it involved intense danger. But they had been driven to desperation. Some were reactionaries who sought to restore the untrammelled rights of provincial feudalism. Others were selfish bullies who wished to free themselves from royal control in order to oppress their weaker neighbours.

Most, however, were members of the new aristocracy of office, which Henry II had used to discipline the older nobility and fashion the administrative machine, which had now been turned into an instrument of irresponsible tyranny. They were strongest in the north, where authority had always been left to the man on the spot and where local magnates were used to defending themselves against Scottish raiders. It was these northerners who, goaded beyond endurance, in the summer of 1213 refused a royal demand for scutage. In this they were acting beyond their rights, for it was part of the feudal law that an overlord could tax his tenants-in-chief to support his wars. But they maintained that such a right could be denied if it was not used justly and within

the limits set by custom.

Others felt that their first duty was to the Crown, irrespective of its wearer. The King's majesty had become more important to them than the King himself. The tenure of their lands, their dignities and honours, the functioning of their local institutions and the administration of justice and order were all inextricably bound up with it. The nation was drifting into war, not only between its best elements and its worst, but between the best themselves. Men were appealing from the King to the King's law and taking their stand, in the name of the just laws of the King's father, against the King's government.

England Found What It Needed In Its Primate

The perils inherent in the situation were intense. To resolve it called not only for loyalty and selflessness, but for the most subtle, comprehending statesmanship. And in its primate, Stephen Langton, England found what it needed. Langton was a scholar trained in the close logic of the medieval Church, with a vision, which embraced all Christendom. His temper was essentially moderate, conciliatory and unassuming. He had the kind of good sense and quiet, rather whimsical, humour that takes the hysteria out of strained situations. He was always seeking to achieve what men of goodwill, after calmly hearing and debating all the arguments, considered both just and expedient. His aim was reasonableness even more than reason. In this he was most English. So was he in his respect for established custom and dislike of extremes.

Langton's wisdom and moderation failed to save England from the civil war he feared - one in which John, after ravaging his own country, met his death in October 1216 after a disastrous march through the flooded River Nene.

A Recital of Wrongs Suffered Under Tyrannical King

In all this the Charter, consisting of more than sixty clauses, was a recital of the wrongs suffered by subjects under a tyrannical King. And, as men of property - and, above all, landed property - were the only subjects with rights enforceable in the King's own courts, it confined itself in the main to setting out particulars of the redress granted them.

The Charter was NOT a Declaration of General Principles, let alone of Human Rights

Despite what the 'politically correct' now claim, the Charter was a charter of 'liberties', and to the medieval mind a liberty was a right to the enjoyment of a specific property. It was a freedom to do something with one's own without interference by the King or any other man.

Called Magna Carta because of its length, the Charter was not, therefore, a declaration of general principles, let alone of human rights. Medieval men thought of these only in connection with religion.

The Charter enunciated no theories; it was nothing if not specific and practical. Yet, though its chief beneficiaries were tenants-in-chief of the Crown, it was a national as well as feudal document. It made no distinction between Norman and English and guaranteed the liberties of small property-owners as well as large. Thirty-two of its sixty-one clauses dealt with the relations of the King and his subjects and not merely his tenants-in-chief. 'We grant,' it declared, 'to all the freemen of our realm, from us and our heirs forever, all the under-mentioned liberties to have and to hold for them as our heirs from us and our heirs.'

(Continued on page 4)

THE DRAGON SLAYERS data DVD

To our current subscribers of On Target or New Times Survey these SPECIAL OFFERS, \$25 for the Dragon Slayers data DVD or \$55 New Times Survey subscription renewal plus the Dragon Slayers data DVD or \$70 On Target subscription renewal plus the Dragon Slayers data DVD or \$90 On Target and New Times subscription renewals plus the Dragon Slayers data DVD ... a further \$10 saving.

\$110 On Target and New Times subscription renewals plus the Dragon Slayers data DVD ... plus 3 DVDs of the National Weekend 2014.

This offer expires on 30th June 2015

Secure your order now!

(Continued from page 3)

It Established Two Precedents of Immense Significance for the Future

One was that when an English king broke the feudal compact and gave his vassals the right - universally recognized by feudal law - to renounce their allegiance, it was not necessary to dissolve the bonds of political society and disintegrate the realm.

Magna Carta was a substitute for deposition: a legal expedient to enforce customary law, which left the King on the throne and the sword of civil war undrawn. Government in England, though exercised by the King, was to be rooted in justice and based on law, or it was not to be accepted as government at all.

Magna Carta was the first great political act in the history of the nation-state - itself an institution of which the English had been the pioneers.

The barons' unity in the face of John's injustice, and their decision to act within the law, had created a new phenomenon: a corporate estate of the realm to prevent the unjust exercise of power by the realm's ruler. The taxpayers had combined to control the tax-imposer. Magna Carta was the product, not of a rebellion as it seemed at the time to the King and his more bitter opponents.

Blue-Print for England's Future Constitutional Development

But before war broke out, on 15 June 1215 in a Thames-side meadow called Runnymede, the armed barons, with the archbishop's aid, forced the reluctant monarch to set his seal to a document which became a blue-print for England's future constitutional development.

Ostensibly a restatement of ancient law and custom: -

- It promised that the King should not without 'general counsel', that is without the consent of the Great Council,
- Demand any scutage or aid from his tenants-in-chief other than the three regular aids long recognized by feudal custom;
- That the heirs of earls and barons should be admitted to their inheritances on payment of the customary reliefs;
- That the estates of heirs-in-ward should not be wasted during their infancy, nor widows robbed of their dowries or forced against their will to marry royal nominees.
- It laid down that no free man should be imprisoned or dispossessed save by process of law and the just judgments of his equals;
- That he should not be taxed or fined unreasonably or to his ruin;
- That his means of livelihood, including the merchant's stock, the craftsman's tools and the peasant's wainage, should be free from amercement;
- That London and the chartered boroughs should enjoy their ancient liberties;
- That merchants should come and go safely in time of war;
- And that the foreign mercenaries should be dismissed.
- It provided for the regular administration of the judicial system;
- Ordered that the Common Pleas should be held at Westminster and not follow a perambulating court;
- That none should be made justices, bailiffs or constables who did not know the law of the land;
- That sheriffs should not sit in judgment in their own shires;
- That two justices with four knights of the shire should hold assizes in every county every quarter;
- That royal writs should not be sold at exorbitant prices or withheld from those entitled to them.
- 'To none,' the King was made to swear, 'will we sell, to none will we deny or delay right or justice.' ■

Source: "Set in a Silver Sea" by Sir Arthur Bryant.

MAGNA CARTA'S FREEDOMS NEVER PENETRATED THE EU by Torquil Dick-Erickson

Magna Carta crossed the oceans. In all the lands where English is spoken, its principles are known and recognised. But it never crossed the Channel.

Introduction by Rodney Atkinson

One of the most extraordinary facts about British politics is the abysmal ignorance of constitutional matters in general and the great and world famous Magna Carta in particular. While talking of a "constitutional crisis" with Scottish nationalism and changes to the House of Lords, the great elephant in the room - the removal of constitutional and parliamentary power from the British people by the European Union - is studiously ignored! Magna Carta defended the legal rights of individuals against arbitrary rule by the King and defended the State against foreign domination. As a result, neither King John nor the Pope were pleased! Here in this essay which appeared on the official Magna Carta website in this 800th anniversary year of the signing of the Charter at Runnymede on the Thames. Torquil Dick-Erikson who has practised law in Italy for several decades shows how fundamentally alien (and for British values) unjust and dangerous the principles of continental law are. That they are now part of the over-arching European Union "*corpus juris*" to which every British citizen is exposed, has been a matter of the gravest concern for many years.

MAGNA CARTA crossed the oceans. In all the lands where English is spoken, its principles are known and recognised. But it never crossed the Channel. In 1215, in England the Barons were confronting King John; in Rome Pope Innocent III was setting up the machinery of the Holy Inquisition.

A major purpose of Magna Carta was to limit the powers of the King - the central State authority.

In contrast, the Inquisition expanded and deepened the power of the authorities over the individual. Not only actions, and words, but even thoughts, were scrutinised and, if "culpable", punished. In ancient Rome, an accuser faced a defendant, and the case was decided by a judge, independent from both. Under the Empire, the Emperor's word became law. The dark ages saw more primitive forms of judgement (trial by ordeal, by combat...)

As analysed by the late, great, Italo Mereu, Professor of the History of Law at Ferrara University, in his painstakingly detailed history of the Inquisitorial system from the origins to the 1970s, "Sospettare e Punire" ("To suspect and to punish"), the Inquisition brought together the functions of prosecutor and investigator with that of the judge, in the new figure of the Inquisitor. The Inquisitor's job was to identify, seize, and interrogate a suspect, in order to arrive at the "truth". Or, it might be said, at the desired result.

The arbitrary powers of the inquisitor, and of his superiors, were clearly vast. The machinery of the Law became a tool for the ruler to ensure complete command and control over his subjects.

Clearly Magna Carta constituted a potent obstacle to such arbitrary exercise of power. In fact the Pope was furious when informed about what had happened at Runnymede, and wrote to the English bishops and abbots who had helped set it up telling them they had done something "abominable" and "illicit".

The specific constraints on the power of the State provided by Magna Carta include the famous and much celebrated clauses 39 "No free man shall be... punished... save by judgement of his peers and by the law of the land", and 40 "To no-one shall we deny, delay, or sell justice". Clause 39 in particular removed from rulers a crucial power of government, the power to decide who should be punished and who not. This power was placed in the hands of a jury of the defendant's peers, thus laying a foundation stone of democracy, and a bulwark against arbitrary punishments.

For eight hundred years since then, the English and the continental criminal procedures have gone off in different directions.

The Inquisition ravaged the nations of continental Europe for centuries, persecuting and prosecuting witches, heretics, and... scientists. Initially an ecclesiastical institution, its methods were adopted by secular rulers, as a means of suppressing opposition of any kind.

England alone escaped its grip. We fought off the Spanish Armada, which would have brought the Spanish Inquisition to our shores. Elisabeth I rejected the inquisitional method - "I will not make windows into men's souls". A sort of papal "fatwa" promised a fast track to heaven for any Catholic who murdered her. Yet she did not outlaw those who followed the old religion, though subjecting them to some constraints.

The power of Parliament grew and in the mid-seventeenth century prevailed over that of the king in the civil war. Parliamentary supremacy - representing ultimately the will of the people - was then firmly consolidated with the glorious - and bloodless - revolution of 1688-89.

Meanwhile across the channel absolutism held sway. The King of France famously proclaimed "I am the State".

The French Revolution swept away much of the old order. The "rights of man" were proclaimed. Then soon Napoleon took over the helm of France, and his armies set about invading most of Europe to export his notion of the "rights of man". His codes of law to this day underlie the legal systems used on the continent. Some of the original thinkers of the enlightenment, like Voltaire, whose ideas helped spark the French revolution, had drawn inspiration from the very different system of government they had seen in England. But Napoleon did not adopt Magna Carta, nor its principles, in criminal procedure. He adopted and adapted the basic elements of the inquisition, redirecting it to serve not the Church, but the State.

In the traditional English system, the powers of jurisdiction governing the different parts of criminal procedure are attributed to different bodies. Essentially, the police, divided into 43 independent local constabularies, investigate a case; the magistrates (mostly non-lawyers, unpaid volunteers working part-time) sign arrest warrants, and then decide bail and committal to trial in public hearings; a barrister is hired to conduct the prosecution in court, where he or she faces another barrister hired by the defence; the judge presides over the proceedings in court deciding procedural disputes between the parties, and handing down the sentence after a guilty verdict. And crucially, the verdict is entirely in the hands of a jury of 12 ordinary citizens, voters selected by lot from the electoral register, peers of the defendant, just as was established by Magna Carta so long ago.

The distribution of these powers into different hands provides essential checks and balances, not just between the legislative, executive and judicial functions, as famously prescribed by Montesquieu, but within the judicial function itself, on whose delicate balance depends the individual freedom of each and every citizen from arbitrary arrest and wrongful imprisonment. The use of legal violence on people's bodies, by arrest and imprisonment, is an exclusive prerogative of the sovereign State in any society. Its arbitrary use is a prime tool of tyranny. This is why effective legal safeguards against misuse are so necessary. Here lies the genius of Magna Carta, which 800 years ago in England provided the first legal safeguards against such arbitrary misuse.

Compare and contrast with today's Napoleonic-inquisitorial systems, where a career judiciary, whose members are State

(Continued on page 6)

employees, comprises prosecutors and judges, but excludes defenders. The prosecutor is nowadays no longer the selfsame person as the judge, but they are both servants of the State (though they may sometimes be institutionally independent from political control), and they are close colleagues, who can work in tandem together on case after case. The judges may have been prosecutors during the course of their careers, but normally they will never have been defenders.

Under the Napoleonic-inquisitorial dispensation used in continental Europe, all these powers are placed in the collective hands of one brotherhood - the career judiciary.

In Italy, for example, criminal investigations, prosecutions, assessments of evidence, decisions on arrest, bail or remand, the direction of courtroom proceedings, judgements of guilt or innocence and sentencing are all under the exclusive control of members of the career judiciary (“*magistratura*” - not to be confused with the idea of an English “magistrate” for which there is no equivalent).

After a law degree, young law graduates face three career alternatives: attorney, notary, or the judiciary (“*magistrato*”). To become a judge, they must pass a stiff State exam (set and marked by existing members of the judiciary), and then they are in. After one year’s “apprenticeship” (“*uditorato*”), they are assigned to a judicial office as a prosecutor/investigator or a judge, where they sit, pen in hand, empowered to order criminal investigations, arrests, bail, committals, etc. They are not trained in detective techniques, relying on their book knowledge of the law. But they direct the police (who may have such training) in the conduct of criminal investigations. It is said that this separation between competence and responsibility in criminal investigations explains why numbers of cases are not investigated as fruitfully as might be hoped.

Trial by Jury - that great heritage of Magna Carta - has no place in the Napoleonic-inquisitorial dispensation. Most cases are dealt with by professional judges alone. Very serious cases are heard by what might look like a jury of ordinary citizens chosen by lot. Actually, the verdict and the sentence are decided by a mixed panel of six lay “jury-people” and two professional career judges. They all go into the jury-room together, where the “judge’s summing-up” is delivered in secret. Although the six jury-people can outvote the two professionals, the latter obviously take a leading role in guiding the verdict. They also have other means of ensuring that what they consider a “perverse” verdict can be appealed against. There are no safeguards against double jeopardy – the prosecution are perfectly entitled to appeal against an acquittal, even if no fresh evidence has emerged.

Two other direct legacies of Magna Carta are clause 40 - “to no-one shall we delay justice”, and the not-so-often celebrated clause 38. The latter is worth quoting in the original: “*Nullus ballivus ponat de cetero aliquem ad legem simplici loquela sua, sine testibus fidelibus ad hoc aductis*” - “No judicial officer shall initiate legal proceedings against anyone on his own mere say-so, without reliable witnesses brought for that purpose”.

These provisions are ensured by Habeas Corpus. Under Habeas Corpus, a suspect if arrested must be brought into open court within hours (or at the very most, a few days), and there charged formally. And the charge must be based on enough hard evidence, already collected, to show that there is a *prima facie* case to answer.

It is perhaps taken for granted in English-speaking countries that any proceedings must be based on evidence. Not so however on the continent. In Italy, for example, a person may be arrested on the orders of two members of the judiciary (one acts as “prosecutor-cum-investigator” and the other as “judge of the preliminary investigations”), at the outset, on mere suspicion based on clues (“*indizi*”). Hence the title of Professor Mereu’s book. The

prisoner becomes a “person-under-investigation” (“*indagato*”), and can be kept in prison during the investigation, which can last months, before the authorities are ready to commit him. There is no right to any public hearing during this time. Within hours of arrest, the prisoner is interrogated by the two judges who ordered his arrest, in a secret hearing. He is assisted by his lawyer (or by a lawyer appointed by his interrogators if he cannot afford his own), and he can try to persuade them that they have got the wrong person, but he cannot see any evidence against him until much later.

All this directly violates clauses 38 and 40 of Magna Carta. Yet this is what happens to British subjects and others who are subjected to the European Arrest Warrant (EAW). Under the EAW no British court is allowed to ask to see any evidence of a *prima facie* case. Presumably the Parliamentarians who voted for this measure must have believed that the foreign judicial authority issuing the EAW would already have the necessary evidence, to be exhibited in a public hearing soon after extradition took place. Yet numbers of innocent Britons can testify that this is not the case. Famously, Andrew Symeou spent 11 months in a Greek prison before his first appearance in an open court hearing, where the case was dropped, owing to lack of any serious evidence.

It is thought that the European Convention of Human Rights offers adequate safeguards for the innocent. It does not. The ECHR makes no provision for Habeas Corpus, let alone Trial by Jury. Article 6 vouchsafes an appearance in a public hearing within a “reasonable” time after arrest, but does not specify what is “reasonable”. For us it is a matter of hours or at most days. In Europe it can be months or even longer.

Our forefathers, in their wisdom, laid down these safeguards for our freedom. Their words have rolled down eight centuries, to protect us. Yet today, we are abandoning them, for an illusion, based on wishful thinking.

This 800th year after Magna Carta is also the 200th anniversary of Waterloo. How ironic if Napoleon should have the last laugh after all. ■

OUR POLICY

- To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.
- To defend the free Society and its institutions — private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.
- To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.
- To oppose all forms of monopoly, either described as public or private.
- To encourage all electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.
- To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil and environment reflecting natural (God’s) laws, against policies of rape and waste.
- To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

THE SACRED SCEPTRE AND THE ROD (OR STAFF)

The earliest English coronation form of the 9th century mentions a sceptre (*sceptrum*), and a staff (*baculum*). In the so-called coronation form of Ethelred II a sceptre (*sceptrum*), and a rod (*virga*) appear, as they do also in the case of a coronation order of the 12th century. In a contemporary account of Richard I's coronation, the royal sceptre of gold with a gold cross (*sceptrum*), and the gold rod with a gold dove on the top (*virga*), enter the historical record for the first time.

About 1450 Sporley, a monk of Westminster, compiled a list of the relics there. These included the articles used at the coronation of St Edward the Confessor, and left by him for the coronations of his successors. A golden sceptre, a wooden rod gilt and an iron rod are named. These survived until the Commonwealth, and are minutely described in an inventory of the regalia drawn up in 1649, when everything was destroyed.

The Sceptre with the Dove, also known as the Rod with the Dove or the Rod of Equity and Mercy, is a sceptre of the British Crown Jewels. It was originally made for the coronation of King Charles II in 1661. Its design included a gold rod with bands of gemstones, surmounted by a sphere and an enamelled dove, representing the Holy Ghost.

The Sceptre with the Dove symbolises the spiritual authority of the Monarch under the Cross. The Sceptre with the Cross, another sceptre in the Crown Jewels, represents temporal or lay authority. During the coronation, the Monarch holds the Sceptre with the Dove in the left hand and the Sceptre with the Cross in the right while the Archbishop of Canterbury places St Edward's Crown on his or her head.

The Sceptre with the Dove, and the other Crown Jewels are on display at Jewel House in the Tower of London.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/>



Sceptre_with_the_Dove



The Sceptre: Dating from 1661, the Sovereign's sceptre with Cross signifies temporal power.

The pattern of Constitutional thought thus set out was to be reproduced in a thousand forms in the history of the English - and British nation. It is still enshrined, even after seven centuries, in the words of the national anthem:

*May he defend our laws
And ever give us cause
To sing with heart and voice,
God save the King!*

HAVE YOU HEARD OF OPERATION INDIGO SKYFOLD AND JADE HELM?

If you are following the stories, you may be like me and perceive a convergence of catastrophes.

The extreme weather event currently occurring across central United States may not be a natural occurrence but rather an orchestrated phenomenon created by Operation Indigo Skyfold (chemtrails) and HAARP (High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program) energy adjustments to the ionosphere.

Jade Helm, as a significant military operation that will take place in parts of seven states across the Southwest over two months, from July 15 to Sept. 15, and involve 1,200

<http://stateofthenation2012.com/?p=10890>

<http://stateofthenation2012.com/?p=5778>

<http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/may/30/texas-open-carry-law-passes-allowing-guns-in-holsters-on-the-street>

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/05/30/conceal-carry-gun-campus_n_7477274.html

<http://www.mintpressnews.com/texas-governor-deploys-state-guard-to-stave-off-obama-takeover/205278/>

Special Operations troops, is perceived to be the prelude to the imposition of Martial Law across the United States.

Texas Governor Greg Abbott and State of Texas Legislature and its people do not believe their Federal Government is acting in the Lone Star States' best interest and is ensuring each and every citizen is armed and ready to defend their freedoms.

Texas Gun Laws have recently been adjusted to allow citizens to openly carry weapons in public, and concealed weapons by 21-year-old students and older, on college grounds.

MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT IN BRITISH HISTORY – THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

Geoffrey Dobbs in 'Home' journal tells us: It was that great British historian Sir Arthur Bryant, quite openly a Christian and patriot, who, in "A History of Britain and the British People," insisted: "The most important element in our history has been the continuity of the Christian tradition." And though his trilogy deals with the politics and economics and social customs of the British peoples, its real theme is the continuity of the soul of man, as it has declared itself and developed in that island nation.

He commenced his story with the forming of the Island itself. Around 10,000 years ago, a flood of Atlantic salt water burst through the isthmus which connected it to the vast Euro-Asian land-mass, with distinctive and far-reaching consequences, not only for the independence of the Islanders, but for the history and liberty of mankind.

The Scene is Set For Us

But not an 'episodic' history does Sir Arthur write. He presented an account of the lives and the deeds of men as an expression of their character and long-term beliefs and policies. Not for him, the approach of modern writers who imagine themselves to be 'impartial' and 'scientific' – presenting history as a succession of events or occurrences and relationships determined by external forces, which just happen to have happened and of which mankind is the helpless puppet.

Sir Arthur continued: By the beginning of the thirteenth century a remarkable thing had begun to happen. The people of England – conquered a hundred and fifty years earlier by a foreign aristocracy who had seized their lands and despised their language – were becoming increasingly conscious of their unity and nationhood. And though their new kings and lords spoke French and boasted French descent, even they had begun to think of themselves as English and of their country as England.

And it was stimulated by the difficulty the conquerors - a few thousand warriors speaking a foreign tongue - experienced in ruling so stubborn a race. A hundred years after Hastings there were still Englishmen who persisted in going unshaved as a protest against the Conquest. Living in this misty land of rain and deep clay forests among an alien population, the Norman knights could

only exploit their conquest by meeting the natives half, and more than half, way. They needed English men and women to plough their fields, tend their homes, nurse their children and help them in battle. And the English did so - on terms: that their conquerors left them English and became in the end English themselves.

Since their numbers were so small, the conquerors soon became bilingual. They continued to think and converse among themselves in French, but spoke English with their subordinates. They learnt it from their nurses and servants, reeves and ploughmen, and, after the conquest was complete, from their men-at-arms.

Abbot Samson of Bury - head of the richest monastery in the land - preached to the common people in the dialect of Norfolk where he had been born and bred. And by the end of the twelfth century even Normans were coming to take a pride in the history and traditions of the island they had won and to treasure the legends of its saints and heroes.

The monkish historians, Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury, collected the ballads and tales of Britain, and Gerald de'Barry, a Marcher's son, loved to boast of his Welsh ancestry and the beauties and antiquities of his Pembrokeshire home.

It was a Norman - Geoffrey of Monmouth, Bishop of St Asaph - who wrote the romantic tale of King Arthur and his British court and made it almost as favourite a theme with the French-speaking ruling-class as the exploits of Charlemagne and the Song of Roland. It helped to make Britain's inhabitants - Normans, Welsh and English alike, and even southern Scots - believe they had a common history.

French and English place-names were blended on the map - English place and Norman owner grown English - Norton Fitzwarren, Pillerton Hersey, Sturminster Marshal, Berry Pomeroy. And the marriage of Church and State, spiritual and secular, was consummated, too, in this land where everything ultimately merged and became part of something else: Abbots Bromley and Temple Guiting, Toller Monachorum and Salford Priors, Whiteladies Aston Whitechurch Canonicorum. The great bishop, Richard le Poore who built Salisbury cathedral, left his heart to be buried in little Dorset village of Tarrant Crawford..." ■

SOUND PRINCIPLES OF ASSOCIATION

By Wallace Klinck, Canada

The Christian message is not advocacy for the vain repetition of prayers. That is the practice of the Pharisee. In its expansive sense, Life is a prayer and the way to Abundant Life is to give "flesh" to the Word. That is, to seek sound principles of association and to incarnate them actively in the immediate organic affairs of mankind. The Kingdom is within and not a remote and removed abstraction.

None of the obvious negative features of life have anything to do with the Christian ethic. They have everything to do with the philosophy, policy and practice of the Pharisee. They may be, and are, related to the actions of hypocritical individuals who seize upon the Christian label and misrepresent and distort it for their own selfish ends.

Unity is only desirable if voluntary and directed to desirable ends; it is extremely dangerous if it serves wrong ends. "Unity" is demanded by all totalitarian administrations in order to command conformance and obeisance. That is why Jesus said that he did not come to unite but to divide.

Life is a continuing quest for truth and the latter only can make us truly free. When forced unity is used as a pretext for asserting a specious truth you have tyranny. All humans have been given intelligence and the honest individual exercise of it is imperative in the quest for truth. Only individuals can think. A collective is a mere abstraction; it has no mind and cannot cognate. It can only function as a manipulated mindless mass - as an instrument of brute force. ■

Published by The Australian League of Rights, G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001.

A monthly journal — subscription \$30.00 p.a.

Editorial: Betty Luks, P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, S.A., 5159.

E-mail: elizabeth@alor.org Website: www.alor.org/

(The views expressed in articles in this journal do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher.)