

A Musing Michael

Originally published in early 2018

Now revised and re-issued.



NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2018 - I'm willing to bet next week's pension that I'm not the only person in town to be 'up to here' with radio and voyeur-vision daily news reports about our

national political parties. There is no getting away from it – party conference season is something of a trial for those of us who remain at home to do something more worthwhile with our time. For me, preaching to the choir never did seem to be a profitable experience.

The idea runs through my mind that most of us seem to have great difficulty in understanding that, doing the same thing over and over again **but expecting to obtain a different result**, is the height of self delusion. But we do it anyway. I was going to say "We must be nuts". That is unfair.

However, allow me to lay out my stall on page one. I believe that our parliamentary system as it is today is both contrary to common law and therefore unlawful and quite corrupt. My friend, **Martin Cruttwell**, will seek to reveal the extent to which we are deceived by a cleverly designed pretence. This notion of pretend will keep appearing.

Suffice it to say that when I spoke to our local Conservative party representative in parliament during the summer and asked him why I could never spot him in his place when I watched BBC Parliament channel, he replied that '**I am a minister and a member of the government. I answer questions, I don't ask them. But you will see me there after PMQs on a Wednesday.**'

It seems to me that anyone who is **first and foremost** a representative of his or her party and **then** accepts an offer to be a representative of the government is not best placed to be a representative of his constituency at the same time??? Without me wishing to be offensive, I invite you think whether a dog can truly obey two masters and which master has the most clout?? Martin has some similar thoughts.

HOW POLITICAL PARTIES CORRUPT THE CONSTITUTION

CONTENTS

1. **Pretend Constitutionality.** From **legal** democracy to **political** democracy
2. **The Party System** – the Revolution against the **legal** English Constitution
3. How the Party System overthrows the Monarchy
4. The Party System empowers politicians to ignore the Rule of Law
5. Fake Democracy. Political party manifestos – the “elective dictatorship” - a clever totalitarian trick to gain power.
6. The Party System is just that. A complete system. Why we feel helpless.
7. Goal of the Revolution. Elimination of Nations by a World Dictatorship
8. **On the road to dictatorship:** How Heath used the Party System to force us into the EC; forced the Queen to break Her Coronation Oath. The resulting Brexit mess.
9. **Immigration.** Principal revolutionary weapon against the English.
10. **The Consequences of allowing this abuse of Power:** debt, corruption, wars, mass migration and misery for millions. “world shaken to its foundations” ?
11. The bogus Oath of Allegiance. Why all party politicians (unknowingly?) commit Treason against the Crown, Constitution and the English people.
12. Legal democracy explained simply.
13. Simple solution: what you can do to stop it

Introduction “By retaining the forms, institutions and ceremonies of our Parliamentary heritage, though now rendered meaningless, the magnitude of the constitutional convulsion has been successfully disguised”.

Ben Greene. “The Party System and the Corruption of Parliament”.



There, we have only just started and “pretend” springs into view immediately. Phew!!

Explaining the changes. “*The English Parliamentary Constitution (previously) rested on one single principle that ALL authority was subject to the law of the land, derived solely from the consent of the people, which no ruler could change or disregard**, but which he was bound to administer. Based thus on the principle of the Rule of Law of the people the English Constitution stood as the greatest achievement in the art of strong free and stable government in the whole history of civilised mankind!*

*With a **legally constituted Parliament** (note 1) as the Supreme Authority, the English constitution established the practical mechanism of a **legal democracy** by means of which **the people, through the jury system, administered their own law, and by direct representation in the House of Commons controlled their own government**”.* Ben Greene.

NB. Not *choose* government – *control* it. That means the government did not reside inside Parliament, as now, but elsewhere. i.e. with the Crown.

By subtly moving the system of government away from a stable one such as described above, in which rulers and subjects alike were bound by the law, and towards a system of **political democracy**, the guiding power of the nation, the government, is no longer legally controlled and working for the national good but determined solely by the outcome of the deliberate division of the people into competing factions or PARTIES at election-time. This competition is based upon envy, fear, hate, greed and ambition and especially FOR power over the others. “when we come to power.....” . Despite the appearance of the ceremonial procession in the preceding pictures, we have a **lawless** form of government. Allow me to explain why this is so.

Ben Greene writes of a constitutional convulsion. This convulsion is caused by the political party system which, in my opinion, should also be regarded as the "revolution against the English legal constitution" in that this party system does not allow this liberty-protecting constitution and its laws (created over centuries of hard-won experience) to function as it should (with true separation of powers) and for that reason, without exception, even if the well-meaning participants fail to realise it, **ALL** political parties are revolutionary. Their **policies** can be placed somewhere along the **revolutionary spectrum**, hence the terms "right, left and centre". They all function in the same way and have the same effect on the Constitution.

How was this change to lawless government achieved so cleverly and a "fake democracy" maintained for so long?

According to Ben Greene, following the formation of disciplined political parties in the 1850s by Disraeli and Jo Chamberlain **by 1906** membership of the House of Commons was totally under party control and it was only necessary for Party Managers to inform the Monarch that no confidence will be shown in anyone not acceptable to the majority party and the personal and most significant Prerogative of the Crown – the appointment of public office – (and honours) passed to the party managers. (see quote by historian Sir Lewis Namier on my website www.camrecon.demon.co.uk . **Today** grant of office and honours, whilst nominally by the Monarch, is obviously exercised by Party Leaders, for example, the granting of peerages to loyal party cronies, as both Cameron and Corbyn demonstrated. (see also "The Party System" by H.Belloc 1911)(free download).

Why was it un-noticed? Because as **Bagehot the 19th century commentator** also said, the pomp and ceremony, the "dignified parts" would be retained to pretend to the masses that nothing had changed, **but "the appendages of the monarchy have been converted into the essence of a republic...it is needful to keep the ancient show".**(see booklet from www.candour.org.uk at end).

As we know the French had guillotined their Monarchy in 1789 and so no one could participate in government except revolutionaries. **This French Revolutionary idea of a Parliamentary Government has been adopted also by the British**, who have retained the office and ceremonies (pictures above) of Monarchy to pretend that no significant change had occurred.

It was during the same French Revolution that the Frenchman Talleyrand, an admirer of the English Constitution and fearing what was to come warned: **"If the English Constitution is destroyed the world will be shaken to its foundations"**. (see consequences later)

Was it just coincidence that this subtle over-throw of our monarchy by the English Party System started to be implemented just after the 1847 publication of Marx's Communist Manifesto in London? His manifesto included overthrow of all monarchy. When Marxist revolutionaries Rosa Luxemburg & Karl Liebknecht tried revolution in Europe in 1848 they failed but a much more violent version was planned for Russia by similar people in 1917 during WW1. ("war truly generalised terminates automatically in revolution", wrote Lenin).** In his Collected Works he wrote: "The World War (14-18) will see the establishment of Communism in Russia: *a second world war will extend its control over Europe...*". Both events happened, with help from the capitalist West, the second war preparing the ground for our present situation.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW NO OBSTACLE TO POLITICAL POWER

The political parties also realised that the **constitutional laws** which previously **bound the Monarchy** and so protected the people from **Kingly excess power** (as had happened) could be simply **disregarded** as not applying to them, even if those statutes remained on the Statute Books, (as former Speaker Betty Boothroyd confirmed with her Bill of Rights statement). **Political power had shifted** to them via the "democratic" process. Despite appearances of constitutional normality, to disregard the law is still lawless government. Instead of repealing these laws, which would cause attention, it was easier just to **disregard** them and to rely upon public ignorance.** see end note. But long before the revolution described above had arrived there was of course the so-called "Glorious Revolution" of 1688. This was a coup (excused by the activities of James) which pretended to be a popular revolt but in which the Estates represented by the aristocracy and landed gentry seized power for Parliament (see later) and emasculated the power of the King to protect the people in that a clause in the Bill of Rights forbade the King interfering with or blocking any law passed by Parliament without its consent.

As we will see later this clause rendered null and void the Monarch's Coronation Oath, a contract between the King and the people, to "govern

according to our laws and customs" (i.e Magna Carta etc) if, **as duty bound, he refused to assent to a law passed by Parliament which violated the people's laws and customs.**

In modern times the clever trick has been also to justify this lawlessness as expressing the "democratic will of the people", by a simple ruse, as you will see below.

This lawlessness is made obvious by government control of the Commons, the very body supposedly separate from and there to check government power. (as required by Act of Settlement 1701). As former Conservative Lord Chancellor Hailsham also stated, (see my website): *"It is the Parliamentary majority **which has the potential for tyranny.** The thing that Courts cannot protect you against is Parliament, **the traditional protector of our liberties.** But Parliament is constantly making mistakes and could in theory become the most oppressive instrument in the world".* Sunday Times 19th July 1970. (Not just in theory –see later) Why most oppressive? Because it has been authorised by popular vote!!*

What Hailsham should have said is that the Courts can't protect you against a GOVERNMENT placed in control of Parliament **by the party system,** but as a confessed party politician he could not.

Any semblance (**pretence**) of making the government accountable now depends entirely upon an Opposition Party making the government of thick-skinned politicians feel uncomfortable. This, while waiting for its turn "in power", even though it is numerically inferior and thus powerless. See those bear-garden scenes on TV involving shouting at PMQT which display the hypocrisy of the party system and disgust the onlooker in which any question put resolves nothing but continues the pretence at "democratic accountability".

Put simply, the "democratic" party system obliges the voter to participate in a game which entails transferring **personal and individual control** to a government via a 100-page manifesto with the dice heavily loaded against individual liberty to opt out of any policy, because the choice is so collectivised. See Professor Keeton quote later.

In what way is this done? At the beginning we saw Ben Greene explain that traditionally we were governed by **consent** in that the **laws** passed by a free Parliament were tested by Trial by Jury and accepted, or

rejected accordingly by Annulment, as deemed by 12 jurors. This was people power over rulers in that rejected laws were expunged from the Statute books!

In modern times to maintain this apparent continuation of **consent** (pretence) the **political parties** have to appear to offer voters a **political** choice, albeit a trick one, while in fact taking individual choice away. It is called a **manifesto** and comes in the form of a "**package**". The parties solicit votes by promoting heavily a few favoured policies and the voter (apparently unwittingly) **by voting for a party, consents** to/authorises the whole manifesto, often without a clue to its remaining contents!! As we know this is the only game in town and a bit like the lottery, you have to be "in" to win? Once in power and with a majority, **every party government** is like a heavy steam-roller and nearly impossible to stop. (as we found out with the EC in 1972). Once in power it can pass any law it likes even if not included in the manifesto!!

You may remember the late Bob McKenzie with his famous swingometer on TV at General Elections? In his book '**British Political Parties**' he writes, "*Lip service is still paid to the classical conception of democracy by many who are aware to the extent to which it has proved unworkable (and unstable Ed.)...the parallel development of the art of political propaganda has enabled political leaders to exploit the irrational element in human behaviour...some people are prepared to argue that the "popular will" (emphasis added) is the **manufactured** (emphasis added) PRODUCT (and not the motive power) of the political process" **BINGO!!** In other words, someone behind the scenes decides the manifesto content and the party MPs sell it to the public.*

The whole party system is a very cleverly disguised totalitarian trick. The political party "package manifesto" cleverly wraps everything neatly into a single bundle, which bundle is the only option allowed to the voter. ALL or nothing! No opt out. Who is behind each party? A tiny hidden clique...with secret links to...? ... a common powerful influence behind them all? After all, this is a "divide and rule" game where nothing must be left to chance? **By having the people busy attacking each other regarding POLICY, via the party system, instead of uniting to cleanse the system, our rulers are laughing all the way to the bank.** You even have candidates agreeing on one thing and disagreeing on another because it is party policy!!!!

Oh yes, by “**universal suffrage**” (see William Keyte at end)(note **7**) you have a vote and by that vote a free choice between the “packages” on offer by them but since **party political democracy** is *apparently* **the only game permitted in town** (because as explained the parties have overthrown our ancient **legal democracy**) the only choice for the unsuspecting voter is this revolutionary system of government. **All** parties, no matter what their policies, by combining the powers are part of the revolutionary system. As the similarities in main party’ **policies** show there is little respite even there for the disillusioned voter. Isn’t the vote for a **party** actually a transfer of control from you to them, by authorising the “package” and denying yourself the liberty to opt-out.

To repeat, in a really free society the **individual** is free to accept OR reject ONE policy (course of action) at a time and under a truly constitutional (legal and lawful) government, answerable to a **free** House of Commons, **each issue** arising would have to be properly examined on its merits, by unwhipped, free Members of Parliament, not as with preordained policy nodded through under the party system “package”. see David Owen, Julian Critchley quotes on my website

www.camrecon.demon.co.uk

It is not hard to see that a vote for any PARTY candidate **removes** from the **individual** much liberty and power to make his/her own **social** policy (which in concert with other like-minded people is REAL democracy) and places **control of social policy** (as part of the “package”) in the hands of whoever controls the winning party, **with devastating social effects****, as we shall see later. So, you’re trapped if you vote for a **Party** candidate. You’re trapped and helpless, if in disgust, you refuse to vote at all. The all-powerful government still gets in because other people continue to vote for PARTY. There **is** one other choice (see later).

As Professor CW Keeton stated in his “Elementary Principles of Jurisprudence” *“One of the chief differences between the modern Totalitarian State and Great Britain is that the latter provides for a change in the governing party, if the electorate so decide, whilst the system of the Totalitarian State does not. In BOTH (e.a.) cases the individual is left, face to face with the sovereign authority, with the balance heavily weighed against him”.*

What is that balance? The inability to say “NO” to a government policy and ACT upon that different course of action!!

We have already seen the warning from **Lord Hailsham**, but his book **"Dilemma of Democracy"** also confirmed what I had suspected - that the more that "universal suffrage" and the Reform Acts tried to compensate for the Rule of Law which was breaking down (partly due to pressures of the Industrial Revolution) the more people were forced into parties to protect themselves from "the others" and electing a **government** to do just that became the name of the game instead of getting power back under control. This breakdown of law was demonstrated by some landed gentry, who, with gambling debts, had their friends in Parliament pass Enclosure Acts in order to **legally but not lawfully** seize the land which the Yeomen of England had tilled for centuries, forcing them into the towns and cities to support families. Thus demonstrating all those years ago the heights of tyranny which **"Parliamentary Sovereignty"** can attain and is still doing so, to date.

Even Dicey, the constitutional expert and proponent of modern party government admitted that **"Parliamentary Sovereignty is an instrument well-adapted for the establishment of democratic despotism"**.

The notion, held by all sorts of otherwise intelligent people, that you can "kick them out" next time and get a different result means that the still-unaware voter, confronted with a system, suffers a **triple** whammy, given:

a) the extent of this lawless power available to any party government & how much damage can be done in just 5 years, b) that the alleged "alternatives" are empowered to **act** in exactly the same lawless way, c) their **policies** are so similar as to be *"not much difference 'tween 'em nowadays"* and therefore elections are a dangerous illusion.

What one party government has done is often not undone by the next because of a ratchet effect and because the main parties are not real alternatives, given there is this hidden agenda behind them all.(note 6)

No matter which party is in power, this is "top-down" management by the State pretending to be a "democracy" where the law and policy becomes that which the **government** (and its hidden backers) wishes!! (read Professor Keeton again and see W.Keyte later)(note 7)

May I repeat, so that you have no illusions about the party system, all of it? While we saw Ben Greene the former Hull Labour activist describing what has happened as a "constitutional convulsion", in my opinion, **the**

Party System should always be viewed also as the “revolution against the legal English constitution” in that the separation of powers and proper checks and balances and ancient constitutional laws are disregarded (consciously or otherwise) by ALL the participants of the party system **because the very existence of the party system alone** does the damage, let alone the disastrous policies which can ensue.

Lawless power reigns, thanks to the mechanisms or “conventions” which they have devised - to pretend that they are constitutional. The Cabinet has “collective irresponsibility” and so do MPs voting together along party lines. No one is held accountable individually of anything.

The publicly available “constitutional” chart (below) claims that the Queen is a Constitutional Monarch, but that depends on what you understand by “constitutional”, does it not? In my opinion constitutional in this context should mean legal and perhaps it does in that what She is still allowed to do is legal but what She is NOT allowed to do is to exercise those other legal powers which would thwart the party system. She is therefore just a figurehead or glorified social worker (She and Charles dutifully perform Honours ceremonies as seen on TV) giving the illusion of power, but preventing the people from having Her protection under the law, as we shall see.

Indeed, and this will be repeated later, apparently she never actually sees legislation. Someone called the “Queen’s cousin”, a parliamentary convention, in fact someone from the House of Lords, actually applies the Royal Seal!!!

But there is also a clause in the Bill of Rights 1689, a political coup by the big Estates against the role of the Monarch, which prohibits the Monarch interfering with legislation without the consent of Parliament. In other words they, those in high places, have stitched up the people up by removing their LEGAL protection under the Crown.

See below.




BRITISH INSTITUTIONS



THE QUEEN a constitutional monarch

THE QUEEN...
The United Kingdom is a **constitutional monarchy**, i.e. "the Queen reigns but does not rule"
Parliament is the most important authority in Britain



Let me explain how this disregard of the law, coupled to the party "manifesto trick", was put to work to betray the native people of Britain and their precious sovereignty and so create the present Brexit mess.



The Heath government was elected with a "majority" in 1970 on the typical Conservative type "law and order" (?) manifesto(but tacked on to that "package" of course was entry into the EC. Described as just a trading bloc we all now know (some of us did then) that was a blatant lie. In 1972 Heath and his party Whips **forced** (totalitarian) the Commons to pass legislation which then took us into the EC in January 1973. Enoch Powell recorded that dissident Tory MPs came out of the Whips office "ashen faced" they had been so threatened. The "elective dictatorship" came out into the open.

In his introduction to the 10th Edition of Dicey's "Law of the Constitution" (1960) Professor Wade explains this abuse of power:" ***It must not be forgotten that there can be no check upon the unscrupulous use of power by a government which finds itself in command of a majority in the House of Commons***".** This is the true implication of what ALL political parties

(including UKIP) call "Parliamentary Sovereignty" which the voter unwittingly endorses when voting for ANY party.

Labour was waiting in the wings in case the Tories failed to deliver. Indeed, in 1967 the Wilson government repealed the ancient Statute of Praemunire so that Heath could commit Treason. I believe Blair was facing Treason charges so he removed the appropriate statute to escape prosecution. As well as the reminder about two wars (fear factor!) the people were told that we had to join the EU as a "bulwark against communism".(fear factor again) (**6a**)but see later.

In 1975 Labour dealt with rising public concern about the EC by a rigged referendum. As a result the majority then voted to **remain** in the EC.

Using the power of his "democratic majority" in 1972 Heath was also able to **force** the Queen to break her solemn Coronation Oath made in 1953, **a solemn legal contract with the English people** under the Coronation Oath Act 1688 to "**govern according to our laws and customs**". Therefore, **though the Coronation Oath Act legally entitled Her to refuse** (one could say made Her "duty bound" to refuse) to the Treaty of Accession, (it was not lawful or customary to be governed by a foreign power) under Party System rules (and perhaps under the Bill of Rights clause about not suspending the laws of Parliament) if She had refused to Assent (or act on "advice" of Her Ministers) all hell would have broken loose from the media, party politicians and Republicans. The fact that She had been admonished by Queen Mary to protect the Monarchy may also have had something to do with it, even if inexcusable.

So, instead of the Queen saying, "**Mr Heath, the laws and customs of England prevent this and also I would be breaking my Solemn Oath to my people, therefore I will not sign**", She signed. The previous paragraph explains why. (but see later why we don't need an **elected** government anyway, in order to avoid this fraud).

The people, forced every 5-years by this fake "democracy" of "package deals" to elect one party or another, the **ensuing government** thereby claims to be the voice of the people and thus the supreme or **sovereign authority**, whom all must obey.(as we saw **Parliamentary Sovereignty** is the term they continually use).

By this ruse **even the true legal representative of the people**, since time immemorial, **the Royal Sovereign**, contracted to the English people

via Common Law and the solemn Coronation Oath, as described and seen on TV, is made subordinate!! Yes, subordinate to the party politicians!!

We have just seen that **no matter how treasonable a government's activity**, under party system rules these alleged representatives of the "will of the people" trump or negate all **legal** or **regal** safeguards. In my camrecon website I explain how under this "democratic" system we become our own executioners, as we unwittingly authorise this ongoing lawless horror story by continuing to vote for any party in the system.

If the nullification of the Coronation Oath contract by the party machines was not deadly enough, here are **another three examples** of how our ancient laws, bequeathed to us by our forefathers and designed to protect us, have been **disregarded** by the party politicians whom deceived voters put in power!

1) Using the **Bill of Rights**, our Right to petition the Monarch against something the government is doing, (it is also a Common Law right) "we the people" (those of us who had some idea of the threat) in all weathers and before the Internet, laboriously gathered ½ million signatures to stop Mr Heath. It was ignored because (as already shown) under **the Party System** the Monarch is supposed to act on the "advice" of Her Ministers. These people, who are no longer chosen by Her, thus preventing what is constitutionally correct, are "flotsam" provided by the party system, whom we see shuffled around like musical chairs to suit the Party Leader. This is the Bill of Rights which former Speaker Betty Boothroyd told the Commons is still the law. To no avail. (see end note)

2) Under the **Act of Settlement 1701** an MP was not allowed also be a Minister of the Crown, in order that the Commons may do its job of supervising the Government and keeping us free from interference by the Crown. (Remember Michael's response from his MP on page 1?). This Act is also ignored (except as a convenient device for MPs to quit Parliament by applying for the "Chiltern Hundreds", etc) **because party government control of the Commons is no longer deemed dangerous to our liberty(!!!)** and so you have party MPs also being Ministers, drawing two salaries and cancelling the separation of powers.

Nice work if you can get it and not very effective at supervising Government. **This sort of interference with the freedom of the Commons by a Monarch would have caused uproar in the old days!**

Today there is a Minister for every new ridiculous concept, the latest being for **Suicide Prevention** and **Loneliness**, which confirms that we have dangerously **consented** via the party system to the whole spectrum of human activity being subject to government control and mistakes!!. (Lord Hailsham) So complete is this control that every political party has to "shadow" every Ministerial post. Under Electoral Commission rules every Party has to have a set of rules to control its members and officers. Every party has a "package" for the voters. Apparently there is no escape from this all-pervading CONTROL?

3) By transferring the power to make laws over to the European Union the party politicians committed **Treason against the English people** because **European Law (Corpus Juris) does not recognise our ancient right to Trial by Jury and Magna Carta**, placing European bureaucrats and European Judges, not the English people and Jury trials, in control of all law-making. A vicious example is the European Arrest Warrant which does not permit Julian Assange or anyone else to have a Common Law hearing to test the evidence before extradition to an indefinite wait in a European jail.

*

*

*

Let's look again how the Party System works and keep us divided against each other? As briefly mentioned already; at election time by "**universal suffrage**" (deceitfully called democracy) you are offered several **collectivised** choices or "packages". You can choose "package" A, B, C, or D but you are **forced** (totalitarian) to **consent** to the whole package.

Forced, (totalitarian) in the sense that the political party game is the only game currently allowed and heavily promoted in town (by the media & the parties) - but see later - and totalitarian because there is no opting out of the bits you don't like and no **withdrawal of your consent** which might exercise some degree of control over government (which would be the real democracy)!! The parties use a few main policies as their bribes to the voters and once installed a party government is like a heavy steam-roller, almost impossible to stop, as the voter is deemed to have consented to all the other policies in the manifesto. This is **terrifying power** because then they can pass any law, or pursue any policy they like and do so, whipping their MPs to follow the government line. Now do you understand why you feel helpless. You have done it to yourself!!

Anyone who tries to opt out will be punished (**force**) and may even go to prison (**force**), as did the courageous lady who refused to pay her taxes after the Bush/Blair Iraq war. The modern version of that **force** is police who smash down your door, take you in handcuffs to the police station and contrary to Common Law, fingerprint you and DNA you before you have been convicted, , and then bail you for months while they trawl for evidence. So much for **consent** of the governed.

As Michael's introduction said, you expect different results, but as I have shown, **you get the revolution every time**. Have you noticed the current (shall we say latest) "Justice Minister" Gauke (Gove, Truss, Liddington in almost as many months?) see our Facebook video about here-today-gone-tomorrow "Justice" Ministers !!! The Brexit fiasco examples this unstable "revolving door" as Ministers resign and are replaced and the process starts all over again.

Force, of course, is a totalitarian concept, but **our minds**, apparently numbed by the sheer brazen effrontery of the "democratic" system and bombarded by endless TV images dutifully submit to this "democratic" force by obligingly continuing to play their party game. Don't the MS Media and political professors LOVE to explore daily (and make a perpetual living out of) the endless computations which the party system provides? Cabinet reshuffles? This keeps the people slavishly glued to the drama and their TV screens, blissfully unaware of that precious freedom which they have lost. (download for free "The Party System" by Belloc/Chesterton)

Having a vote is the ultimate expression of freedom, in 'it? "in our free **and** democratic country" intone the politicians, to keep us playing their game. Unaware, until now that is, that there is only one proper and safe **political** alternative, by which I mean **Independents**, voters continue to give one party or another party, or a combination, a majority.

It was Leopold Amery, Tory politician who said " ***The only candidates before him (the voter) worth taking seriously are either supporters of the team in office or of its rivals. It is within these narrow limits that his actual power is exercised***". In the light of that statement and given the power of the main parties to bribe the voters any other PARTY, including UKIP, is on a hiding to nothing. To continue to play the party game simply condones, aids and abets this ghastly system. The desperate creation of further minor parties splits the vote even further. Diabolically clever system.

Now that we begin to understand the deadly consequences of the party system,(e.g our forced entry into the EC and mass immigration) the hold of party over the voter can be broken?? See alternative later.

Dependent upon a) the desire of MPs to pursue a career for themselves and b) the strength of their party Whips, the party in government does just what it likes, which is why you get these "bear-garden" scenes in the



Commons which disgust everyone, as the Opposition pretends to be able to "hold the government to account". Thanks to you, the voter, the Government has its majority, the Opposition has no power and can only jeer, until

it is their turn for POWER. (see my website, esp. under "**Warnings Past and Present**").

As a result of the PARTY SYSTEM no other power **legal *or regal** can protect you against a government to which you have given a majority. **Political power out of control!!** This is "fake democracy".

Despite our huge petition the Queen could not help us under our ancient **Bill of Rights or through Her Coronation Oath**; there is no **law** which can stop a government with a majority (unless they happen to infringe a law which they themselves have passed) because we the people have ignorantly abandoned both our **legal and political protection** by voting for a political party.



The Cabinet, a picture of which you see here, is a lawless institution, because not only is there no law regarding their operations but they employ "collective responsibility" in order to escape personal responsibility for their crimes and with the 30-year secrecy rule they will be dead

before the files are released. Convenient for them?

With the party MP (your representative?) accepting the party line as a condition of "employment" in the Commons (but don't forget **YOU pay their wages** !!) perhaps now you realise why you feel so helpless when you complain to "your" MP (the PARTY representative) and get the party line in reply?

So out of control of the law (and arrogant) are some of these people that they not only gave our country away to a Soviet-style dictatorship in Brussels, (**note 5**) **contrary to English law**, but they have smashed up Iraq, (Bush/Blair) Libya (Cameron.Sarkozy), Afghanistan (Obama/Blair/Cameron) and Syria(Obama/Cameron), sent you the bill for the armaments used, killed or maimed many of our young soldiers, killed hundreds of thousands of innocent men women and children and caused a "terrorism" response from relatives of the victims which justifies in the government's eyes imposing **upon us** even more draconian laws! In addition we are expected to take in, at huge extra cost and inconvenience in schools, hospitals and housing all those refugees and economic migrants which "**they**" have displaced with their bombs because "**they**" are out of control and are working for their friends in the military/industrial complex and its World Government objective of total control of the world's people and resources.(note 6). Sufficient proof of the "world shaken to its foundations"? (Talleyrand).

What is the overall nature of the revolution shaking the world's foundations, as shown?

The destruction of the independent nation state and movement towards a world dictatorship *(of which the EU is but a stage) and for which world objective both British main parties have at some time declared support.(note 4) (*otherwise known as "globalisation").

"ELECTIVE DICTATORSHIP" TRANSFORMS INTO OPEN DICTATORSHIP

With regard to England, in preparation for all this, **the post-war revolution of 1945**** was directed to further replacing of Common Law principles of freedom & personal liberty (as foretold by Lord Chief Justice Hewart's book, "The New Despotism" in 1929). With a Fabian-inspired Statist or Socialist regime, or **concealed** "elective dictatorship" (Lord Hailsham), **alternating between the two main parties**, on Jan 1st 1973 it transferred to the **open** dictatorship or Napoleonic Law system of Brussels by the so-called "law and order" patriotic party, the

Conservatives. Indeed, after WW2 the Conservatives accepted that socialism was inevitable and that they would simply run it better than Labour. Part of the plan was to deliberately dismantle Britain's **traditional** industrial base. (note 3). As our heavy industry (and means of defence) was slowly dismantled, more and more people and businesses became dependent upon government for their survival, which suits the politicians, as everything can now be privatised.

While clearly the plan is to bring the whole of Europe under this centralist regime (**including the already conveniently Statist or "communist satellites created by WW2 (and run by dictators) merging when the time was ripe**)(note 5), if Britain or England were to refuse to join or if it joined and were then to leave (Brexit) and revert to its Common Law legal system then this World Dictatorship would fail. But, it is not hard to imagine that with so much time and money invested in this project the "powers that be" want to thwart any attempt by the British to leave. Presently the run down of British armed forces and a move towards a European Army both serve to render a British departure impotent. A nation that cannot defend itself ceases to be a nation. Of course, Russia must be kept as "the enemy" to provide the excuse for war if all else fails.

This revolution had to try to destroy any chance that the English Constitution might be restored, by destroying the homogeneity or cohesion of the people who created it, who for centuries lived in their blessed island fortress England (John of Gaunt) and controlled their borders and thus controlled who came in. The revolutionary "divide and rule" system, well established in a still peaceful homogenous nation, needed another more potent disruptive cocktail mix. **Immigration.**

This attack (deriving from the **1948 UN Charter** and its post-war anti-discrimination laws) directed at all European nations, but especially at England with its particular status as an independent nation state and **Common Law legal tradition**, has been two-fold. **First**, came mass immigration, which was started first, slowly as gradually, to prevent a huge reaction. Even so the early level of immigration caused alarm and those early objectors were also called "extremists" and physically attacked. **Secondly**, somewhat later, removal of the right to govern ourselves to Brussels (which as we know further removes the right to control our borders). Prominent in this attack was Peter Sutherland,

Goldman Sachs banker, one time EU Commissioner and former UN High Co-ordinator for Refugees (now dead) who said he wants to see European homogeneity destroyed.(source EU Times). It was Marx who said the English are too stupid to make their own revolution, a revolution would have to be imported.

Rarely mentioned in public (because that would be "racist"- a word designed to terrify us into silent submission) is the irreversible demographic change to the population in parts of England (including our capital city) where some parts are now unrecognisable as England! Hitler's bombs could not defeat them but as we saw on TV the proud Cockneys have been forced out of the East End by this totalitarian multi-culturalism. One MP exploiting this migrant vote is migrant Margaret Hodge who saw off BNP Griffin in Barking.

The real purpose of immigration, the destruction of English cohesion and identity by "divide and rule", now becomes clear**. Where there was no problem previously, post World War 2 one has been deliberately created, thanks to the subservience of the main political parties to this external UN/World Government pressure. *Revolutionary and Marxist.*

However innocent many immigrants must surely be, the **effect** on the native population is the same. Migrants are useful lobby fodder, especially for Labour, who, increasingly are awarded housing before the English, (larger families than the English), schools (special classes), not forgetting the incredibly expensive failure, "Prevent", territory and positions of influence in the media and government once belonging exclusively to the English. The main parties simply cite the needs of "the economy" for continuing immigration, ignoring the needs of the native English, **who were never asked in the first instance,** because the answer was obvious. So much for democracy. The immigrants, with no concern other than to better themselves, and with the system loaded in their favour, can devote all their energies to that purpose while the natives have had their hands tied behind their backs by party politicians.

Though many commentators confirmed that immigration featured large the 17 million pro-Brexit result, none of the main parties, **including UKIP,** will repeal the anti-discrimination laws which would free the English to discriminate and thereby assist in controlling immigration.

So important to the "revolution" has been immigration that all the main parties supported oppressive anti-discrimination legislation (contrary to English legal principles of freedom and justice) so as to punish those who objected or still object. This is that massive control of social policy forewarned earlier and shows that this external control of British elections makes them a farce.** Hailsham's potential for tyranny has arrived, having been given legal force and a fake democratic foundation!!

The English people watch helplessly as their culture is changing before their eyes as **they are slowly dispossessed and replaced in their own** country - thanks to terrified party politicians.

If this endless migration is cynical punishment for our having had an Empire it is impacting most on the poorest English who had no responsibility for Empire and who were not even alive when it existed!! Yet these alleged sins of the fathers are now to be visited on the "third and fourth generation" of the now deliberately workless-class,(see note 3) while this punishment is supported most enthusiastically of all the parties, by LABOUR - if hate-ridden Diane Abbott is to be believed.

Immigration is only part of the explosive austerity problem facing the English while the main cause is the bankers and their debt-ridden system which sucks millions of pounds out of the economy in interest charges which could be otherwise put to good social purposes.

It probably needs repeating, because the idea of a "democratic" party government is so engrained in our consciousness:

ALL political parties belong to the "revolutionary spectrum against our legal Constitution" because every party government (even a coalition party government) has the same effect on the **legal** Constitution by destroying the separation of powers. Thus our ancient constitution is disregarded!! It is political power over-ruling legal control and party supporters are clearly accomplices to the fact. *Those who play the party game, aid, abet, condone and lend respectability to the revolution, however unwittingly.*

In view of general public disgust with party politicians, surprisingly we find more and more people **starting new parties** or **continuing with old ones**; surely a form of insanity because it repeats the same mistakes yet expects a different result. Not realising that it is a

systematic problem which frustrates them, they remain in a hopeless cul-de-sac, having joined the system responsible for their plight!!

*The small parties, by playing the party game without any hope of power confirm that the ghastly mechanisms of the party system, bribery and blackmail and unbridled power go unchallenged and **uncorrected**!! You can't challenge the awfulness of it if you are part of it, can you?*

Inevitably those patriotic counter revolutionaries e.g. the English Democrats, the NF, the BNP, Britain First, **UKIP**, now Anne-Marie Waters (ex UKIP) For Britain Party etc who don't like the **policies** of the revolution nevertheless subscribe unwittingly to the **revolutionary system** by placing themselves into opposing camps ("oh, we're not as extreme as they are"!!) instead of uniting behind the constitution and our Common Law system of government, thus restoring individual freedom to choose and so returning that power to the people taken away by the diabolical party system.

They too do not seem to realise that they are part of the **system** and so give it credibility - rather than attack and expose it, as we have done in this leaflet.

Even worse, since political parties are always about a system of power centralisation, given the sudden arrival of big money they too could be taken over and used. Even Hitler came to power "democratically" on the backs of an enthusiastic German people to whom he promised everything having had huge financial backing from unexpected people!! In other words, don't be fooled by any label, once you have voted for any PARTY your power has gone!!!

IGNORANCE OR DELIBERATE TREASON?

When (new) PARTY MPs take their Oath of Loyalty to the Crown and its "heirs and successors" I wonder how many realise that as long as they are Party MPs and therefore automatically agents of the revolution against the Crown and Constitution, their Oath is as meaningless as the Opening-of-Parliament Ceremony which we saw at the beginning.

Not only is the **whole party system** the revolution against both our **legal** English constitution and the Crown but also against the sovereignty of the English people as a whole, whose sovereignty and possession of this island fortress since time immemorial is expressed through that

kingly power acting under Common Law, in defence of the nation. Overthrow of the Monarchy and its powers to protect us (however cleverly achieved) is Treason against us all. So much for their **political** “democracy” or **political suffrage**.

What does all this lead in simple practical terms? A solution?

In a moment we will come back to what Ben Greene called legal **democracy**, that which was mentioned at the start – a term probably unknown to you previously?

By refusing to play the party game at election time you will make a giant leap forward. Sitting comfortably in your arm chair at home, reading this, you can simply say “no more parties for me”! If there were a massive drop in votes for any party their “fake democracy” would look lame. If, at the same time, votes for known and trusted **Independents** soared then restoration of our constitution and our personal freedom to live (and make free social choices) is on its way back!! Now that you understand the trick which has been played on you and the dire consequences you won't be fooled again by party promises. The only wasted and dangerous vote is for a party, **any** party.

- Your vote stays in the safe custody of your known & locally trusted **Independent** to be used by him/her with judgement and regard to restoring the constitution and your **personal liberty**.

It means that in a freely elected House of Commons, no longer controlled by party, the legal separation of powers is brought back into operation and in censoring a government MPs would not be voting themselves out of office, (as they do now). A great incentive to do a proper job!!

- The appointment of Ministers must return to the Crown so that the best people of skill and integrity may be appointed by the reigning monarch as is our constitution (and then it will be “My Government” from the Throne in Parliament) not just the party flotsam thrown at Her by the party elections. MPs will **no longer** allowed to be Ministers, taking two salaries,(as required under the Act of Settlement 1701)

Those ancient laws (as listed) which the party politicians have **disregarded** because they were controlled by these laws, can be restored. Those laws with which the party machines have suppressed

our freedom to choose can be repealed by a free House of Commons or such laws can also be annulled by Trial by Jury. But observance of the full power of Trial by Jury under Magna Carta with **the annulment by a jury of any law passed by politicians is the fullest and most potent power of the people against tyranny by politicians and others.** That is "legal" democracy which is the safeguard if political democracy goes wrong. I merely repeat the term "legal" democracy as used by Ben Greene merely to refer to the decisions of the people which are made via a people's court of 12 good men and true under Common Law.

For a full explanation of democracy mentioned on page 1 **see New Chartist Movement website , heading "Articles" and then the excellent item "Democracy Is to be trusted after all" by William Keyte.** This is peaceful people's power, not the mob rule of revolution.

What the party politicians do not know is that they will be arraigned before the people's courts in accordance with Common Law and the Jury of 12 will decide not only whether guilty or innocent but if guilty the Jury will decide the sentence, which for Treason is severe!!!

- Prime Ministers like Blair and Cameron will no longer be able to make wars and send us the bills. These sort of people can be impeached by a free Commons.
- There will be no need for endless expensive and frankly pointless elections as the government will not need to change every five years. **Ultimately, a free Independent House of Commons will, through informed debate with government, decide each policy on its merits and the people, through Trial by Jury, will decide the laws of England, not the party hacks. Politicians will once again have to think very carefully before they pass any law, knowing it can be annulled by the people.**

You might reasonably ask "Is the Queen up to the job, having toed the party system line for so long"? We will see, once She is free of the party system, but previous Monarchs who let us down have come to a sticky end.

Next question? - **will you allow the next Coronation Oath uttered by Charles or William to be as meaningless as the last one?** Will you tell them what you want, as they do their social rounds? Will our next

Monarch be a real Monarch, obeying the Rule of Law, or just another glorified social worker, however splendid the Prince's Trust has been?

Obviously there are "good" people in all the political parties who just do not understand what the party system has done to our constitution.

Hopefully this explanation has helped. **Please tell your friends also.**

Please also visit my website www.camrecon.demon.co.uk and think hard. You might also care to visit @democracydestroyed on Facebook and watch our video "The Party System and the Destruction of England".

Finally, you may have often asked yourself **"why are our politicians doing this to us the English people"??** Is there some hidden force using threats, fear, fear of war, blackmail and bribery to keep them doing it to us? (note 6a)

Remember in the 1970s how they bleated "we have to be in the EC a) to avoid another war b) as a bulwark against communism", **only to later discover** that the EU is communism!! (in the sense of communism being a statist, non democratic system of government) and so, in effect, we have been taken over without a fight!!).(note 6). However, wars abound in which WE **are** involved, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria etc. as still "independent" nations are brought down by "regime change" by western governments acting for the New World Order!

Pretence again? You can have just as much of this corruption as you like, or you can say "enough is enough". Find out who was behind this mass immigration (in addition to the UN) and the anti-discrimination laws which have helped to flood England with aliens and you will know who is the 5th Column which is destroying your England and its freedom.

Clue. Wasn't it the "noble" and "Rt. Honourable" Lord Mandelson (Labour) who stated that we are now in a "post-democratic" stage? Their fake party democracy is over and now they are in open control? What we want does not count? Shall we tell them otherwise?

WHAT IS THE SIMPLE SOLUTION?

Our lawful constitution, Magna Carta gives us the means to resist the "divide and rule" PARTY system described above, in that through Trial by Jury **the people** govern through our decisions in the courts, rendering null and void any bad law passed by a corrupt party system. Through

Common Law we can prosecute those who have misgoverned us. See, no need for political parties? We have the power already if we would use it.

Since Parliament is not going to wither away, vote only for a trusted Independent whom you know supports our liberty loving constitution and to free Parliament (that is both Monarch and the Commons) from this ghastly party system. Then the described revolution must fail and Merrie England can once again lead by example, **saving Europe into the bargain!!(9)**

NOTES: 1) **What is a legally constituted Parliament?** A Parliament consisting of the three separate, independent institutions of Monarchy, Lords and Commons. each under the Rule of Law of the Common Law Constitution, so that none can have too much power and pass tyrannical laws. Contrast this with what we have today.

2) "In preparation for the World War the press of whole countries was brought financially under the control of London and Paris and the peoples belonging them reduced to an unqualified intellectual slavery". **Oswald Spengler. "Decline of the West" p 462**

3) A Conservative "Think Tank" chaired by Peter Thorneycroft "**Design for Europe**" (1947) stated: "No government dependent upon a democratic vote could possibly agree in advance to the sacrifices which any adequate plan must involve. ***The people must be led slowly and unconsciously into the abandonment of their traditional economic defences, NOT BEING ASKED IN ADVANCE....***" (emphasis added). This author received a copy of this booklet from Thorneycroft, so it is authentic.

4) **1957** Earl of Gosford (Macmillan Conservative Government) tells House of Lords, "Her Majesty's government are fully in agreement with World Government. We agree that this must be the goal and that every step that is humanly possible must be taken to reach that goal" Hansard (event also cited by Prof. Alan Sked LSE in Daily Telegraph article 27 Nov 2015)

5) Mr Gorbachev the former Secretary to the Soviet Communist Party (1985-1991) said: "**The most puzzling development in politics during the last decade is the apparent determination of Western European leaders to recreate the Soviet Union in Western Europe**".

Why should they do this? Remember how the Berlin Wall suddenly came down after years of the "Cold War" and the former Soviet satellite countries gradually were admitted into the EU. As Vladimir Bukovsky the Soviet dissident pointed out, the structure of the EU was deliberately created like the Soviet system so the two parts could be merged. He likened the European Parliament to the Supreme Soviet and the Commission to the Politburo in Russia. The EU is corrupt for the same reason Russia is corrupt – centralized power permits corruption. Stage towards World Government.

6) "We shall have World Government whether or not we like it. The only question is whether it will be by conquest or consent". **International Banker J Warburg to the US Senate 1950.** The EU is such a stage in this process, which is why it is not allowed to be democratic but is centralised control.

6a) "We have started from the position that only in war or the threat of war, will a British government embark on large-scale planning". PEP publication *Planning October 1938*

7) **Bill of Rights.** As the reader has read, originally I had deduced that it was the force of "democratic elections" which gave a government its authority to do as it pleased, but it has been suggested to me since that the so-called "Glorious Revolution" was not genuinely a people's revolution but a coup against Crown and people organised by the Estates which enthroned William and Mary, in that a clause in the **Bill of Rights 1689** forbade the monarch from taking part or interfering with the legislative process except with the consent of Parliament. This confirms that it was this treasonous power against the Monarch and also against the people thus acquired all those years ago which was the main authority which Heath used to take us into the EC. The fact that the Bill of Rights also contains an Oath forbidding transfer to a foreign power seems of no effect as McWhirter/Atkinson found out?

The Treason against the English people lies in the fact that accession to the EC **subordinated** the protection of **Magna Carta,(8)** Trial by Jury and Common Law principles of justice and equity to a Napoleonic legal system which places **all** the power in the hands of bureaucrats and judges in courts,(7a) not the people.(e.g. European Arrest Warrant) **This is the treason the Westminster politicians (unwittingly or otherwise) either voted for years ago or wish today as Remainers.** Unfortunately, Royal Assent is another fiction in that someone in the House of Lords, called a "Queen's Cousin" applies the Royal Seal and the Queen may never see the legislation, confirming our total impotence under the Party System, as described much earlier.

(7a) ***This is confirmed by Guy Verhofstad, Belgian Prime Minister as quoted in the Financial Times, 21 June 2004 "Europe's power is easy to miss. Like an "invisible hand" it operates through the shell of traditional political structures. The British House of Commons, British Law Courts and British Civil Servants are still here, but they have become agents of the European union, implementing European law. This is no accident. By creating common standards that are implemented through national institutions, Europe can take over countries without necessarily becoming a target for hostility".***

8) see William Keyte article on Democracy in New Chartist Movement website

9) "Let not England forget her precedence in teaching other nations how to live" English poet Milton.

"I look upon British rule as a safer guarantee of peace than the United Nations itself" and "it is necessary for the peace of the world that Britain recover her position and maintain herself as one of the super powers in the world" former Boer Field Marshall Jan Smuts.

*

*

*

*

With thanks to the A.K.Chesterton Trust (www.candour.org.uk) for permission to reproduce as necessary from "The Party System and the Corruption of Parliament". Order from Candour "The British Constitution and the Corruption of Parliament", new title for same booklet. © Martin Cruttwell e-mail: john.cruttwell@sfr.fr

Printed and freely distributed by mkcolumn@gmail.com