



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 55 No. 48

6<sup>th</sup> December 2019

## IN THIS ISSUE

Behind Extinction Rebellion By James Reed	1
Just Wow ... Westpac By Peter Ewer	2
VFT Rises Again By James Reed	3
The 1999 Republic Referendum	3

## THOUGHTS OF THE WEEK:

...Scientific method and the philosophy supporting it, admirable in their place, can create fanatics just as narrow as the Puritans, who in so many ways the scientists resemble. The scientific conscience would often let us all die rather than issue a warning about, say, a pesticide whose toxicity has not been proven by current scientific methods. Scientific pride in these matters is almost pathological and the scientific outlook as straight and narrow as the road to Paradise: indeed one suspects that many scientists believe that salvation has been sacrificed if an empirical fact is treated as a proven one. Scientists are loath to admit things which, though obvious to a layman, have not been scientifically proved. They are terrified of becoming involved in the vague interacting states of dynamic equilibrium which constitute that total state of dynamic equilibrium which we call nature. The complexity of life outside the experimental situation cannot be reduced to a condition in which there is only one variable and consequently nothing can be 'proved'. And yet this is reality and without a willingness to face these real problems scientists can never be ecologists... We shall have to realize there is more than one kind of proof....

The supreme biological law is diversity: without diversity neither nature nor society can survive. We have lived in an age of single-purpose men who have pursued monocultural, totalitarian objectives by purging their critics and opponents: and they have purged nature and the landscape too in pursuit of the single-purpose of economic efficiency. The men of power are predators who attempt to monopolise ideas so they can control action. This is justified on the pseudo scientific theory that it conforms to evolution — the survival of the fittest and so on. But (Sir George-ed) Stapledon pointed out that, if we model society on nature, then nature gives us as many examples of co-operation and harmony as of competition: and indeed competition itself has balance and harmony as its aim. Thus it reconciles conflicts that seem to man irreconcilable. The conflicts in nature are of great diversity: their object is not the victory of a few species over all the others —the nonsense of world domination that obsesses our nationalist politics —but the survival of all. Animals do not indulge in genocide: species do not prey on their own kind except when they are perverse. Species prey on other species, but the outcome is population control and a balance of forces.

*From Robert Waller's Introduction to Sir George Stapledon's Human Ecology (1971).*

## BEHIND EXTINCTION REBELLION By James Reed

The academic who formulated the Gaia theory of the earth as a self-regulating super-organism, has slammed Extinction Rebellion, as far as a 100-year old can slam anything:

<https://www.breitbart.com/europe/2019/10/20/james-gaia-lovelock-extinction-rebellion-are-silly-buggers/>

'James Lovelock, the world's most distinguished environmentalist, has come out against Extinction Rebellion (XR). They are a bunch of "silly buggers", the 100-year-old told me this week. Dr Lovelock —independent scientist; inventor of Gaia Theory; creator of the first device to measure the CFCs causing a hole in the ozone layer; environmental campaigner over many decades —told me that he has no sympathy with the Extinction Rebellion mob and their claims to be saving the planet. "No, I don't [support Extinction Rebellion], I think the silly buggers are going far over the top. It's all very well to mount a barrier, but make sure when you jump off you don't crash on the other side!" The eminent British scientist —who celebrated his 100th birthday earlier this year and is still going strong —was laughing at the expense of the Extinction Rebellion activists at Canning Town station in the East End of London, who climbed on to tube train carriages only to be dragged off by angry commuters.'

Earlier this year an Extinction Rebellion member Stuart Basden let loose with this revealing statement that ER is not just about the climate at all:

"And I'm here to say that XR isn't about the climate. You see, the climate's breakdown is a symptom of a toxic system of that has infected the ways we relate to each other as humans and to all life. *(continued next page)*

(continued from previous page) This was exacerbated when European ‘civilisation’ was spread around the globe through cruelty and violence (especially) over the last 600 years of colonialism, although the roots of the infections go much further back. As Europeans spread their toxicity around the world, they brought torture, genocide, carnage and suffering to the ends of the earth. Their cultural myths justified the horrors, such as the idea that indigenous people were animals (not humans), and therefore God had given us dominion over them. This was used to justify a multi-continent-wide genocide of tens of millions of people. The coming of the scientific era saw this intensify, as the world around us was increasingly seen as ‘dead’ matter — just sitting there waiting for us to exploit it and use it up. We’re now using it up faster than ever. Euro-Americans violently imposed and taught dangerous delusions that they used to justify the exploitation and reinforced our dominance, while silencing worldviews that differed or challenged them. The UK’s hand in this was enormous, as can be seen by the size of the former British empire, and the dominance of the English language around the world. There is stark evidence that everyday racial bias continues in Britain, now, today. It’s worth naming some of these constructed delusions that have been coded into societies and institutions around the world:

- The delusion of white-supremacy centres whiteness and the experience of white people, constructing and perpetuating the myth that white people and their lives are somehow inherently better and more valuable than people of colour.
  - The delusion of patriarchy centres the male experience, and excludes/hinders female assigned people from public life (reducing them to a possession or object for ownership or consumption). Patriarchy teaches dominating and competitive behaviours, and emphasises the idea that the world is a place of scarcity, separation and powerlessness.
  - The delusions of Eurocentrism include the notion that Europeans know what is best for the world.
  - The delusions of hetero-sexism/heteronormativity propagate the idea that heterosexuality is ‘normal’ and that other expressions of sexuality are deviant.
  - The delusions of class hierarchy uphold the theory that the rich elite are better/smarter/nobler than the rest of us, and make therefore better decisions.
- There are other delusions. These delusions have become ingrained in all of us, taught to us from a very young age.”

All of this, is in a word: communism, and all it ever entailed. \*\*\*

### JUST WOW ... WESTPAC By Peter Ewer

What more can be said. Here is one headline, that simply demands your attention: “Do as I say not as we do: How fallen Westpac boss Brian Hartzer ran a feel-good campaign to end slavery — as the bank ignored paedophiles sending cash to the Third World to exploit kids for sex.”

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7725843/Westpacs-lavish-human-trafficking-lunch-exposed-CEO-Brian-Hartzer-resigns.html?ico=pushly-notification-small>

‘Westpac revelled in a high-powered luncheon about ending slavery, and for years issued feel-good position papers signed by the CEO about its ‘zero tolerance’ approach to human trafficking. But these lofty social gestures have been slammed as ‘vacuous virtue signalling’ amid allegations the bank long allowed its services to be used for child trafficking and exploitation - with the backlash forcing CEO Brian Hartzer to fall on his sword on Tuesday. As heads rolled over the growing bank scandal, Daily Mail Australia can reveal the company hosted a lavish business lunch titled ‘The Truth About Human Trafficking’ in October 2016. Global expert Christine Dolan flew in to the bank’s Sydney headquarters to speak to an audience of about 100 guests, including author Tara Moss and Liberal party powerbroker Michael Photios. Executives should have been listening a little closer - with financial watchdog

Austrac three years later accusing the company of breaching anti-money laundering laws 23 million times. Among the alleged breaches are claims the company failed to monitor a dozen customers who have made transactions ‘consistent with child exploitation typologies’. The watchdog claims that includes a customer who made payments to a person in the Philippines, and was later arrested for child sex trafficking and livestreaming child abuse. In court documents, the watchdog claims more than 3,000 payments went undetected by the bank for years, even though six customers repeatedly travelled to child sex hotspots in the region. Home Affairs minister Peter Dutton has told Parliament the company must pay the price for giving a ‘free pass to paedophiles’. Meanwhile, leaked quotes from Mr Hartzer at an executive meeting that ‘this is not Enron’ led the CEO to resign on Tuesday morning. The revelations have left guests at Westpac’s 2016 talk reeling - one said: ‘I walked out of that talk feeling inspired, now I feel a bit dirty’. Every year since the lavish lunch, the company has produced an annual ‘Slavery and Human Trafficking’ statement, claiming it has a ‘zero tolerance’ approach and speaking about its ‘commitment’ to human rights. Each was signed by Mr Hartzer.’

Such is the wonderful world of globalised banking. \*\*\*

## VFT RISES AGAIN By James Reed

I remember back in the early 1990s there was a big move to make Australia part of Japan with the MFP Japanese city, and the Japanese financed Very Fast Train (VFT). Fast forward to colonialism today, I do not know the role that China money, the new rulers on the block will play, but we will soon see:

<https://www.smh.com.au/federal-election-2019/labor-to-spend-1b-on-bullet-train-route-from-melbourne-to-brisbane-via-sydney-20190509-p511qw.html>

‘Labor has promised to spend \$1 billion buying land between Melbourne, Canberra, Sydney and Brisbane to build a future high-speed rail link. The investment would stop land along a 1750-kilometre corridor identified for a proposed bullet rail line from being swallowed by suburban sprawl, potentially adding billions in acquisition costs to a project expected to cost up to \$114 billion. Australian governments have pursued visions of a high-speed east coast rail link since the 1980s. But the federal opposition’s \$1 billion pledge would be the biggest financial investment ever made towards the concept. Anthony Albanese, Labor’s infrastructure spokesman, said the pledge “would end nearly six years of Coalition inaction and finally deliver progress on a project that will revolutionise interstate travel and regional

development”. High-speed trains would travel at speeds of up to 350km/h and cut the journey time between Melbourne and Sydney, and Sydney and Brisbane, to as little as three hours, Labor said. Acquiring land along the corridor will require the help of state and territory governments, and Mr Albanese said a Shorten government would set up a high-speed rail authority to manage this. The authority would also work with the private sector, including overseas companies experienced in building and operating high speed rail, to make the vision a reality. Labor’s vision for high-speed rail adopts the findings of a \$20 million feasibility study commissioned by the former Gillard government in an agreement it made with the Greens in 2010. The 2013 study identified a 1748-kilometre route between Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane, with stops at more than a dozen regional cities along the way. Mr Albanese said it was important to start to buy the land now to protect it from developers.’

I recall that the 1990s VFT was debunked by an accountancy student who showed that plane travel was still cheaper. Maybe this same objection can be made to stick again, and save us billions, as well as compulsory land acquisitions. \*\*\*

## THE 1999 REPUBLIC REFERENDUM

*Ref: Newsletter from the Australian Monarchist League*

**Extract:** It was twenty years ago when disparate groups of campaigning amateurs gathered together to lobby for and against constitutional change to a republic. I say we were all amateurs because, even those who were members of the parliament and had party-political competence, had no expertise in prosecuting a case for and against constitutional change of the magnitude before the nation.

Many mistakes were made and confusing messages were sent out. The greatest mistake was a tendency to essentially divide the campaigns along Liberal-Labor lines. The results showed that roughly one third of Coalition voters, particularly in the big-city suburban seats voted for a republic with one third of Labor, particularly in the city outer-suburban seats voting for the monarchy. It is an error we cannot make when we next face a campaign for constitutional change.

It was the vote of traditional Labor that swung the pendulum against a republic. Traditional Labor have always been deeply conservative, in the traditional sense. Unlike so many trendy Liberals, they honour the Queen and respect our constitutional system of governance. In the 1990s, we knew this because a significant proportion of our supporters were – and still are - Labor voters.

Australia’s constitutional system is unlike most other countries, including the United Kingdom.

Firstly, we have a written constitution whereas the UK has several documents which form an un-codified constitution but one which can be updated and amended by simple acts of the British Parliament.

Secondly, our Constitution can only be amended by a vote of the people. We call this vote a referendum which again is unlike the sort of Brexit referendum we saw in the UK in 2016 which was more like our plebiscite. Our referendum is binding upon the parliament whereas the UK referendum is not. Furthermore, our referendum is based on a two-tiered vote requiring a nationwide majority of 50+1% or more plus a majority vote in a majority of states meaning that the vote in four of the six states must be 50+1% or more.

There have been 44 referendum proposals put to the Australian people in 19 polls with only 8 being passed. In describing the difficulty in getting any referendum passed, the then prime minister, Robert Menzies said in 1951, "The truth of the matter is that to get an affirmative vote from the Australian people on a referendum proposal is one of the labours of Hercules."

The nationwide vote in the 1999 referendum was 54.87% No (against the republic) which may not seem much but if a political party received that vote in a general election, it could well result in winning 72% of all electorates. It is rare that a political party receives over 50% of the total primary votes cast in any general election.

*(continued next page)*

(continued from previous page) In 1999 we submitted to the government that section 128 of the Australian Constitution (the process for constitutional change) was, in itself, not competent to be used to remove the Crown and that for this to be done all States had to vote to agree. This opinion was unofficially backed by leading jurists but was rejected by the government. We could not afford to go to the High Court and in any event were uncertain on how modern judges would view this.

Furthermore, we believe that there are a number of impediments written into the Australian Constitution and the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act of 1900. For instance, the preamble to the Constitution specifies that the States "...have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown..." If you remove the Crown, do you also remove the 'one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth'?

The Constitution also provides that "No alteration ... otherwise altering the limits of the State, or in any manner affecting the provisions of the Constitution in relation thereto, shall become law unless the majority of the electors voting in that State approve the proposed law."

Removing the Crown from the Australian Constitution, we submit, does affect each State which, although each has their own constitution under the Crown, all States form an integral part of the Commonwealth of Australia. Furthermore, had the referendum succeeded, each State would have had to remove the Crown within that State.

Accordingly, we believe that this means each State would need to agree because removing the Crown from the Federal Constitution would obviously affect provisions of the Constitution in relation each State.

Since 1999, republicans have continued to mount campaigns and we have continued to oppose them whilst, at the same time, promoting the benefits and security of our system of constitutional monarchy. However, we should always realise that they have a bevy of paid staff whereas we have only our worthy volunteers who give what time they can to the cause. More importantly, republicans have the media with them ready to boost them at a moment's notice whilst ignoring the work that we do. Such is life. This was the case in 1999 with polls showing a massive victory for the republicans, but they lost and we won and, with your support, when we next face them we will win again.

- Philip Benwell National Chair

#### RECOMMENDED CHRISTMASS READING-GIFT

*On Planning the Earth (circ. 1951)* - Geoffrey Dobbs

*The Local World (circ. 1990)* - Geoffrey Dobbs

*Ten Advantages to a Federal Constitution -*

*Geoffrey de Q. Walker*

*Human Ecology and Social Credit* - Michael Lane

*One-Man, One-Vote* - Geoffrey Dobbs

**Printed copies are available to order for \$50 including postage.**

## PERSONAL POSITION OF MONARCH

The Dissolution of the Australian Parliament:

11 November 1975

*Extract from **The Crown and The Constitution** by Professor Daniel Patrick O'Connell: Educated at University of Auckland, N.Z. and Trinity College, Cambridge, U.K. L.L.M. (N.Z.): Ph. D., LL.D (Cantab). Reader in Law, University of Adelaide 1953-62; Professor of International Law, Adelaide 1962-72; Chichele Professor of International Law, Oxford University since 1972. Author of a number of publications on International Law.*

...There remains one final point to be considered, and that is the personal position of the monarch.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, and also private citizens, wrote to the Queen seeking her intervention. The reply given by the Palace was that the matter was not in the Queen's hands so long as the Governor-General acted within the scope of his powers:

"The Australian Constitution (written by Australians, and which can only be changed by Australians) gives to the Governor-General (who is appointed by the Queen on the advice of her Australian Prime Minister) certain very specific constitutional functions and responsibilities. The written Constitution, and accepted constitutional conventions, precludes the Queen from intervening personally in those functions once the Governor-General has been appointed, or from interfering with His Excellency's tenure of office except upon advice from the Australian Prime Minister."

Two things are noteworthy about this: the first is that the Governor-General's actions are his responsibility and not the monarch's. Although there is a delegation of the royal prerogative in the Letters Patent constituting the office of Governor-General the provisions of the Constitution, quoted in this article, amply justify the position taken by the Palace. And the second is that the tenure of the Governor-General is a matter for the Queen acting upon the advice of the Prime Minister. The admission of this by the Palace underscores the difficulties of the Governor-General on 11 November 1975. \*\*\*

**Ref:** <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/OConnell%20DP%20-%20The%20Crown%20and%20The%20Constitution.pdf>

**Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.**

**NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.**

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**

**A/c Title** Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

**BSB** 105-044

**A/c No.** 188-040-840

or **cheques to:** 'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'

**Postal Address:** PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

**Telephone:** 08 8387 6574 **eMail:** [heritagebooks@alor.org](mailto:heritagebooks@alor.org)

**Online Bookstore :** <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>

<https://alor.org/> our main website and repository of the **Douglas Social Credit** and Freedom Movement 'Archives'.

**On Target is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy**

**13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.**