



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 59 No. 36

22<sup>nd</sup> September 2023

## IN THIS ISSUE

This Business of Altering Our Constitution Is Too Important to Leave To Politicians or The Media By Arnis Luks	1
Can We Have a Rational Debate? By Neville Archibald	2
Letters	3

**Thoughts for the Week:** “Constitutional reform is a serious matter. Unlike ordinary law reform whose effects are confined to specific areas, and which may be modified or repealed if it turns out to have been ill-advised, Constitutional reform impacts upon the entire system of law and government and is virtually irreversible. It follows that we have an obligation not only to ourselves but to our descendants to consider any proposals to change the Constitution of the Commonwealth or a State rationally, deliberately and with a complete understanding of the nature of that which is being changed and of what the consequences of the change will be.”

*Governors, Democracy and the Rule of Law* By His Excellency the Honourable Sir Guy S Green AC KBE Former Governor of Tasmania 29 October 1999 - Menzies Oration on Higher Education [https://about.unimelb.edu.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0023/20399/19991029-green.pdf](https://about.unimelb.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0023/20399/19991029-green.pdf)

**The Dialectical Two-step**

<https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/sep/17/mundine-calls-for-australia-day-date-change-and-backs-treaties-despite-opposing-voice>

Leading No vote spokesperson Warren Mundine has called for the date of Australia Day to be changed, and for multiple treaties with Australia’s First Nations, despite his own campaign raising these as potential “radical” consequences of voting for an Indigenous Voice to parliament. Mundine, who founded the *Recognise a Better Way* group opposing the Voice, also hinted on Sunday that fellow No vote advocate Gary Johns had been told to keep quiet, after a backlash over Johns’ comments suggesting blood tests for access to welfare, and that some people in Indigenous communities lived in a “stupor”...

<https://www.skynews.com.au/opinion/andrew-bolt/jacinta-prices-speech-could-mark-a-turning-point-in-australian-race-relations/video/>

Andrew Bolt commented with the throwaway line of 'changing Australia Day'.

<https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/nyunggai-warren-mundine-emerges-as-front-runner-for-liberal-senate-spot-20230904-p5e1tm.html>

“Prominent No campaigner and Indigenous leader Nyunggai Warren Mundine is shaping as the front runner to replace moderate Liberal Senator Marise Payne when she retires from politics, with powerbrokers hoping the former ALP president can unite the conservative wing of the Liberal Party.”

**The Uniparty – The Great Betrayal**

The Liberal Party of Australia is lining up to subvert all the good work done by Sen Jacinta Price. Firstly, Warren Mundine is a possible endorsement for the Liberal Senate spot to replace Senator Marise Payne. Mundine is an advocate of changing the date of Australia Day and for multiple treaties with Australia and the supposed first nation peoples. The Australian Monarchist League are also identifying Mundine as an advocate for a Republic, which is not surprising considering he was president of the Australian Labor Party for some years.

<https://www.sbs.com.au/news/article/from-labor-to-liberal-who-is-warren-mundine/znleh9vs2>

It's not just the wets (socialists) within the Liberal party to contend with. They are all uniting with the Labor Party as a Uniparty in all but name. The end objective hasn't changed, which is the deconstruction of the nation-state of Australia. While the Greens remain somewhat mute on the side-lines, the Labor and Liberal/National party, in their dialectical two-step are Sovietizing Australia, which happens to be Green policy. How surprising. \*\*\*

## **THIS BUSINESS OF ALTERING OUR CONSTITUTION IS TOO IMPORTANT TO LEAVE TO POLITICIANS OR THE MEDIA By Arnis Luks**

This past week I have been re-reading *The Head of State* by Sir David Smith. Sir David Iser Smith was an Australian public servant, and the Official Secretary to the Governor-General of Australia between 1973 and 1990, in which capacity he served Sir Paul Hasluck, Sir John Kerr, Sir Zelman Cowen, Sir Ninian Stephen and Bill Hayden.

*The Head of State* is an outstanding work on civics, specifically related to the Australian system of government; the reader being walked through the parliamentary and constitutional evolution that has continued to occur since before, during and after the 1901 Federation of Australia, and, Australia being one of the four oldest democracies in the world; England, USA, Switzerland and Australia stand apart from the rest, and each having not experienced a relatively recent breakdown of their political system - yet.

Although the USA went through independence and a civil war, as did England with the Dutch led invasion (the 1688 Glorious Revolution) and Switzerland also, Australia, up till now, has not had to experience the difficulties of civil war nor military conquest, but rather of the relatively peaceful colonisation and Constitutional evolution to become the limited constitutional monarchy of today.

We inherited this deep and vast legacy from the best of the best, to the point across 10 years of Constitutional Conventions during the 1890s, we essentially cherry picked the constituted 'referenda system from the Swiss', the constituted 'limiting powers of the central government' from the USA rather than the reverse from Canada, and the 'divisions and separation of powers' from the British, to form our own unique Limited Constitutional Monarchical system of government.

*The Head of State* book is becoming increasingly difficult to purchase for under \$100, however, working through your local library may provide access to this most important civic work to enhance a deeper understanding, and I might add, to disassemble the 'freeman of the lands' false arguments as to the status of our constituted nation. It may be that Sir David Smith saw this 'free man of the land' argument as a problem, (as I do), and took it upon himself to disassemble their arguments one falsity at a time.

It was not until 1953 with the 'Royal Powers' act, that most in Australia finally realised that our Governor General was not just the monarch's representative, but rather, all constituted Powers of the Monarch within our Constitution are vested in the Governor General. The 1953 'Royal Powers' act allowed the then new Queen visiting Australia, when personally present in Australia, any power under an Act exercisable by the Governor General, 'may' be exercised by the Queen.

The Governor General is not a rubber stamp, but rather a constituted entity, an integral part of the workings of our Constitution. The 212-letter dialogue between Sir John Kerr and the Palace prior to, during, and after the 1975 constitutional event, and the reply from the palace to Mr Gordon Scholes, former speaker of the House Of Representatives, each and all reinforce the independence of the Governor General in our Constitutional matters. It would be a sad day indeed should we choose to undo this balanced state of our Constitutional affairs with this injection of an 'experimental Voice' concept within our Westminster system of governmental powers.

<https://www.naa.gov.au/explore-collection/kerr-palace-letters>

Letter from Sir Martin Charteris to Mr Gordon Scholes, former Speaker of the House of Representatives dated 17 November 1975

*I am commanded by The Queen to acknowledge your letter of 12th November about the recent political events in Australia. You ask that The Queen should act*

*to restore Mr. Whitlam to office as Prime Minister. As we understand the situation here, the Australian Constitution firmly places the prerogative powers of the Crown in the hands of the Governor-General as the representative of The Queen of Australia. The only person competent to commission an Australian Prime Minister is the Governor-General, and The Queen has no part in the decisions which the Governor-General must take in accordance with the Constitution. Her Majesty, as Queen of Australia, is watching events in Canberra with close interest and attention, but it would not be proper for her to intervene in person in matters which are so clearly placed within the jurisdiction of the Governor-General by the Constitution Act.*

*I understand that you have been good enough to send a copy of your letter to the Governor-General so I am writing to His Excellency to say that the text of your letter has been received here in London and has been laid before The Queen.*

*I am sending a copy of this letter to the Governor-General.*

*Signed: M. Charteris*

### **Why is this consideration important to the Voice Proposal?**

Geoffrey Robertson AO KC is (already-ed) acknowledging that, should Australia reject the racist division of the Voice, the world will think we are racist anyway. <https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/if-the-no-wins-the-world-will-think-we-re-racist-anyway-20230913-p5e4ar.html>

Rob Harris also assures us that some countries have been experimenting with this concept of (shared governance-ed) for 27 years. <https://www.smh.com.au/world/europe/nothing-to-fear-the-country-that-has-had-a-voice-to-parliament-for-27-years-20230904-p5e1sg.html>

Lucy Cormack and Lia Timson eulogise first Nations peoples having already established a representative body alongside parliament. New Zealand is given pride of place with its shared, or, co-governmental-implementation. <https://www.smh.com.au/world/north-america/voices-around-the-world-indigenous-representation-in-other-countries-20230830-p5e0r4.html>

None of these writers take the reader to the originator of this concept, being the founder of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov. Lenin's Draft Thesis on *National and Colonial Questions* for The Second Congress of The Communist International – is available for download here: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1920/jun/05.htm>

Voice referendum: Lies fuel racism ahead of Australia's Indigenous vote <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-66470376>

'Racist' cartoon draws praise and criticism in Australia <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-36983146>

Stan Grant: Top Australian TV host steps down after enduring racist abuse

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-65642975>

## The Uniparty

This calibre of ideas, as Geoff McDonald reinforces in his book and video *Red Over Black*, has its roots in the Marxist revolutionary movement to deconstruct constituted nation-states such as Australia using the original peoples as political fodder. First published under *Lenin's Collected Works* in 1920, this pursuit of Marxist ideological objectives is not in abeyance, but alive and well through revolutionary movements such as our ABC, major political parties and the mainstream media. That the Australian Labor Party has placed this before the Australian people, is almost incidental to the fact that this referenda, should it fail, will be re-run by the Liberal Party of Australia should they achieve government. On this Pauline Hanson has got it right, by depicting Dutton with a very red background and red face.

We are all communists now.

Of equal import is that the 'New Disinformation Laws' originated from Liberal MP Paul Fletcher's office March 2022 under Morrison's Prime Ministership. There is significant difficulty in identifying any difference between the totalitarian policies of the Australian Labor Party and the totalitarian policies of the Liberal Party of Australia.

We are all totalitarians now.

<https://www.paulfletcher.com.au/media-releases/new-disinformation-laws>  
<https://www.spectator.com.au/2023/09/paul-fletcher-the-father-of-australian-censorship/>

That the Liberal Party under PM Morrison first offered a political spot to Mundine should come as no surprise, however, for Dutton to betray Senator Jacinta Price so readily and spontaneously is unforgivable given that she is the Vote NO spokesperson uniting Australians as one people. I see similarities with Senators Antic and Renick also being Liberal spokespersons who will also

be betrayed by their political party machine.

Australia, as an independent and self-reliant nation, is under revolutionary attack from within and without. A successful NO vote against the Voice will result in increased pressure to capitulate our national sovereignty, the UN being controlled by transnational corporations. Warnings against world government more than 100 years ago are now in full display. We are at a crossroads for our ancient rights and freedoms, and the major parties are significant contributors towards our Constitutional undoing.

A second book in regard to this subject is *Matters For Judgement* by Sir John Kerr, Governor General across the Whitlam and Fraser era. Sir John wrote of two other works that assisted him in coming to the profound Constitutional conclusions of 1975 - *The King and His Dominion Governors* by HV Evatt, and also

*The Royal Power of Dissolution of Parliament in the British Commonwealth* by Canadian Senator E A Forsey. Both these titles can be found in a combined title *Evatt and Forsey on the Reserve Powers*. I have searched across the internet to no avail to date, so shall have to take Sir John and Sir David's limited words for what Forsey had to say. <https://archive.org/details/royalpowerofdiss0000unse>

Those 'reserved powers' of the Crown, Constituted in our Governor General, are those that wish to be undone by the Voice - as an instrument of VETO for vested interests. Constitutional research is essential to counter this attempt to cram into a 6-week blitzkrieg - *an intense military campaign intended to bring about a swift victory* - led by the major political parties and mainstream media, to deconstruct our constituted system of government.

***There is No Doubt. Vote No for every good reason! \*\*\****

## CAN WE HAVE A RATIONAL DEBATE? By Neville Archibald

What has occurred within our society, such that in a few short years our relationship to one another has deteriorated to a point where it is almost impossible to have a rational conversation with someone.

Especially with people whom you previously expected to be capable of a spirited debate, with each side clearly thinking through each others arguments.

There will always be two sides to every story. Two teams in a game. The pro's and con's of every argument of every rational question. Yet here I am at 4.30 in the morning, unable to sleep, my mind ticking over, wondering, marvelling in some ways that people once thought capable of rational conversation are no longer able to sustain one.

I initially thought it was just from fear during the COVID threat. Many were so scared for their lives, or the lives of their loved ones, that they shut down any arguments about safety concerns or previously held beliefs (scientific or not) that included anything that questioned the government line on mandating the

vaccines.

The palpable fear and subsequent dismissal of things like, asymptomatic transmission and never vaccinating during a pandemic – two of the most questionable features of the government decision. These were not tolerated in any discussion, let alone any discussions around safety concerns.

Any parts contrary to the official narrative were indignantly pushed aside with little to no scrutiny. Fear prevailed!

Here we go again, this time it seems that some form of indignant righteousness has taken hold in another debate. "The Voice".

The minute you express a concern arising from any part of the proposal, you are automatically met with an incredulous stare and usually an inference that surely you must be joking.

If you are not immediately accused of being racist, you are slotted into the category of uninformed, duped, hoodwinked by racist propaganda.

It then becomes an uphill battle to convince the other party that, no, you are intelligent enough to have reasonable doubts. You are not 1) a racist 2) being misled by obvious misinformation or 3) uncaring to the plight of poor downtrodden people.

I can understand peoples indignation being a mindset if the question were only about, do inequalities exist between groups of people? Unfortunately, this goes so much further.

Here is a subject that has no real fear for life attached, a subject that has been at the forefront of debate many times, sadly without improved outcomes after each examination.

I believe I would be hard pushed to find anyone in my circle of acquaintances that wouldn't agree, our aboriginal population has some serious problems facing them, or that they should be helped.

Has the racist slur been used so often now that an enlightened society, such as we used to think we were, believes it? A society that struggled through the sixties to create a belief that "all men are equal".

In the words of Martin Luther King jr  
*"I have a dream, that my four little children can one day live in a world where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the calibre of their character."*

I thought we had largely accepted that!

Hollywood and TV would have us believe otherwise or they lose so much "good material" with which to entertain us. I had believed that we were mostly intelligent enough to see that these were only movies and not a real reflection of us.

The use of the race card in politics has always been a dubious one, the one played when an opposition has no real answers- an easy out – as it stops debate. Everyone then gets on their high horse, serious debate falters and important subjects get forgotten in a litany of parentage accusations! As for the acquaintance in the street?

I sit down with them, a subject is raised. Once that would be an interesting back and forth. Why do you think that? What are your reasons? How is it that you believe that? These would be the questions you would ask each other. That, appears to be gone!

Now the person sitting just across from you, gets a horrified look in their eyes, which if they know you, swiftly turns to pity – "oh, how could you be duped by such a racist belief?."

Often you haven't even mentioned race, just a distrust in government!

Then out comes all the diatribe, an incredulous questioning of why you would dare to question this, don't you know that these communities are in dire circumstances?

The one fact, that of disadvantage, becomes the over-riding issue. It trumps any other questions about the best way to overcome it or the fact that those in charge are

not fixing it now. Why not? Automatically it is assumed that the only way forward is this way, the way of the government. That the only reason we haven't fixed it before is because we are somehow racist ourselves, because it is our fault!

I'm sorry, but I don't feel guilty! I have tried to do the right thing all my life. I have sat on school council and argued for equality in education many times. I have protested to my political representatives about any number of issues where unfairness was in play. I have written letters to the press, expressing my concerns about our society, many times.

I have in my limited way, done these things. I don't hold the purse strings, nor do I live in an area where I have the ability to work at it first hand. I have spoken to people from all walks of life. I do not judge people by their colour.

Why is it, that so many people these days can not have a rational conversation when you mention the word "NO", even when they know you!

It is not fear this time, at least not fear of life. Is it Face?, fear of losing face? Or just straight virtue signaling, look at me, I'm doing the "right" thing! Has this addiction to being seen to be on the "right" side, been so successful that we would rather be seen to be right, Than actually be right!

The real correctness, the one that follows facts to real conclusion. One that has considered the variables, potential outcomes, dangers and intentions. Civilly, analytically – putting pure emotion aside, to make an unclouded judgement!

What path has society taken?

\*\*\*

## LETTERS

To whom it may concern,

How closely have you been following Albo's tricks? I believe WE should have as many people as possible scrutinizing when the Voice Referendum votes are counted. You can download the scrutineers handbook from the AEC website. Study the Handbook well!

For a referendum, scrutineers can be appointed by the Governor-General, the Governor of a state, the Chief Minister for the Australian Capital Territory, the Administrator of the Northern Territory, or the registered officer of a registered political party.

PM Albanese names the date as October 14<sup>th</sup>. I already had my form ready and so sent it to the Victorian Governor.

This responsibility towards electoral integrity should be easier than an election and over in a couple or few hours. WE Must be there! *Louis Cook.* \*\*\*

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

Telephone: **08 8322 8923** eMail: **heritagebooks@alor.org**

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

**On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks**  
**13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.**