



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.41, No.20

May 27th, 2005

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "No civilisation is tolerable which suppresses agitation from within its own borders against an existing condition, however mistaken that agitation may be. But no civilisation can survive which will permit members of an alien culture to settle within its borders in order to make exploitation of grievances real or fancied into a highly lucrative profession. It is remarkable that the British Dominions overseas are in the highest degree sensitive to any suggestion of interference from the *official* British Government in London, while tolerating barely concealed attempts to impose, *via* specially trained representatives of the London School of Economics working in conjunction with the Central Banks, a comprehensive tyranny entirely foreign in its origin and character."

– Clifford Hugh Douglas in "*The Brief for the Prosecution*", 1945

SECESSION, CONSTITUTIONALISM AND THE 'BREAKING OFF' FROM AUSTRALIA

by Ian Wilson, LL.B.

I have been given a great pile of papers by folk from within the Freedom Movement dealing with various legal subjects for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the contents.

First – On Secession.

It's Time Australia No.1 reports that the Central Queensland Free State was established on July 1st 2004: see website www.cqfreestate.com. These patriots sent their Declaration and Proclamation to the Queen, Governor-General, Prime Minister, Premier Beattie and Kofi Annan of the United Nations.

This is of course a very interesting topic: but is it legal and constitutional?

Lawyers have argued that an individual state can secede from the Commonwealth of Australia (Professor Craven has a book defending this). What about the break up of a State? My view is that as a matter of logic it is legal by the same arguments used to support the break up of a nation. But the real question is political – can the creators of the new state maintain and defend it?

I have also looked at another document doing the rounds in the Freedom Movement, "The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Australia". This document contains such gems as:

"Debates on the private and public activities of parties and members of both Houses is prohibited" – which will be interpreted as allowing rule without accountability.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *Secession, Constitutionalism And The 'Breaking Off' From Australia* • *David Mitchell For South Australia* • *The Seeds Of Albion* • *Solzhenitsyn's Warning To The West*

"Parliamentary salaries will relate more to the salary a candidate enjoyed before entering Parliament". This is allegedly to encourage a better class of politician. Naïve!! Most of this breed are lawyers and this paragraph will encourage the parasites of the system to flourish as never before.

"Parliamentary salaries are to be free of income tax": I rest my case.

The document unwisely, in vague drafting, attempts to sketch basic liberties and freedoms. Thus Section 54 says that: "Any two persons comprising a member of each sex, and who shall be eligible to vote, shall have the right to marry" - so incest is therefore constitutionally protected.

Worse, the document doesn't clearly outline Federalist principles. The document has many good ideas but it needs much work and redrafting if it is to be a realistic constitution – even apart from the validity of its propositions.

In my collection I have an essay attempting to show that in Australia "no government at any level, validly represents the sovereignty of the Commonwealth of Australia". The argument is that Australia did not become a nation at Federation but rather through King George V granting the necessary plenipotentiary documents to give full power to Australian delegates to sign the Treaty of Versailles, and thus be recognised as an independent sovereign nation.

But on that day of signing the British Colonial Law, An Act to Constitute the Commonwealth of Australia (UK) 1900 became *ultra vires* (beyond its authority).

One might as well argue that all common law and all law up to that point disappeared. The Constitution was legally binding before 1919 not only as a matter of Colonial Law, but dually because it was voted for at an Australian Referendum. It was law the way any society first gets law – by social agreement. The fallacy of this paper is lack of understanding of the evolutionary and conventionalist nature of law.

Finally, what about all those papers and seminars pushing the idea of the "common law" as a mechanism to obtain freedom and liberation. Could these good folk really be referring to the legal system, to judges and lawyers?

I note that these folk accept that the Bill of Rights of 1688 is part of the law of Australia, which contradicts the other freedom camp of "lawyers" mentioned in the last paragraph.

I agree that the claim and the opinion of the Attorney-General's Department of NSW in 1996 was that the Magna Carta is also part of our legal system, inherited from Britain. What these good folk do not understand is that you can't use these laws to show that Council rates, for example, are illegal. And even if some part of the Bill of Rights did do so, the later statute law would take precedent over the earlier law.

Those who work in the law are well aware of the extreme limits of the law for defending political freedoms. Yet I am amazed at how many members of the Freedom Movement think that if they had their day in court, they would move mountains.

This is not a balanced, realistic view. The world doesn't work the way of US legal dramas on TV.

DAVID MITCHELL FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA: Further to this matter the League of Rights has invited constitutional authority Dr. David Mitchell to Adelaide, South Australia (September 10th-11th, 2005) to conduct a two-day in depth School on Australia's constitutional foundation and development. Further details will be published as they come to hand.

This will be a very important School. What about making the effort to come from interstate for it? Join with those supporters from within the bounds of the (September) sunny state of South Australia.

THE SEEDS OF ALBION by James Reed: It is relatively easy to find Jewish writers celebrating Jewish genius. In my opinion there is nothing wrong with racial and ethnic pride as long as all groups are free to have it. Today, even among "White groups", the celebration of ethnic pride is encouraged. The Mediterraneans – Greeks, Italians, Arabs, etc. – do so. Among Nordic Whites, the Scots and Irish do so. Only the English people must feel eternally guilty about their race.

No ethnic group, apart from their Germanic cousins is vilified with such hostility. The Australian literature on multiculturalism is full of vilifications which if they were made against other super-sensitive ethnic groups, would land one before the Human Rights Commission and then Federal Court on a 'race hate' charge. But the English? No, they are fair game, especially by other White ethnic groups bearing historical grudges that should have been long forgotten.

It is therefore important for English people to be reminded of their greatness – and I mean English without the "Celt" attached.

We do not have books written by English people defending England's achievements and we should. I hope to eventually write such a book. In the meantime we have available an excellent book by Peter Ackroyd entitled *Albion: The Origins of the English Imagination* (Vintage London 2002). "Albion" means the "White Land" in Gaelic, suggesting purity. Pope Gregory sent Augustine to England to establish a Church in England after seeing blonde Angle slaves. When he asked who such people were and was told they were Angles, he said *non Angli sed angeli* – not Angles but angels. Today the angels in Britain are an endangered species, under threat by declining birth rates, miscegenation and mass coloured immigration. And to complain about it leaves one open to have the laws, created by our own people, used against one.

Never in history have a people been so eager to commit racial suicide.

Ackroyd's *Albion* tells us of the world of imagination that is under threat. Ackroyd himself embraces political correctness and tells us that there is no "pure Anglo-Saxon race", that "race" is obsolete; not so, there is a resurgence of research into the racial concepts. Secondly there is no "pure" anything in this world if purity demands "100% purity". But that is an absurd high redefinition. Some intermixture does not mean non-existence. Mud thrown into a flowing stream does not stain the waters forever.

Ackroyd, after getting the politically correct nonsense off his chest then takes us on a magic journey through the literature of, to name but a few, of the English geniuses:

Beowulf (the early sixth century Anglo-Saxon poem), Bede (672-735); Chaucer (1340-1400); Francis Bacon (1561-1626); Christopher Marlowe (1564-1593); William Shakespeare (1564-1616); John Donne (1572-1631); John Milton (1608-1674); Jonathan Swift (1667-1745); Alexander Pope (1688-1744); Samuel Johnson (1709-1784); Edward Gibbon (1737-1794); William Blake (1757-1827); William Wordsworth (1770-1850); Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834); Lord Byron (1788-1824); Perry Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822); John Keats (1795-1821); Alfred Tennyson (1809-1892); Thomas Hardy (1840-1928); Gerard Manly Hopkins (1844-1889); Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936); Ezra Pound (1885-1972); T.S. Eliot (1888-1965); J.R.R. Tolkien (1892-1973); and W.H. Auden (1907-1973) – to name but a few.

A scholar can spend a lifetime studying the works of any of these masters. Could the same be said about the so-called "greats" of today, such as Roth, Derrida and Foucault?

A book such as Ackroyd's could be written about English achievements in any number of fields: philosophy, mathematics, law and technology – even clothing and food! No other ethnic group as a matter of historical fact has matched the English – not the Irish, Scots, Jews or Chinese. It is therefore not surprising that such a talented people are under racial attack.

In Australia there is no specific group which defends English people. It must always be "British" or the "-Celtic" must be added in haste. Why aren't the English people allowed to exist?

Indeed there are even moves to eliminate England itself. The latest European map, although showing Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, no longer shows England as a country. England has become a collection of artificially constructed regions.

The regions are Yorkshire and Humberside, the North East and North West which the Blair government will give the opportunity to devolve from England by referendum. These devolved districts will in effect become a part of the EU. They will need to approach Brussels, not London for funds for major projects.

The original diabolical plan for the destruction of England was devised by the Tories, but Blair took the idea and ran with it.

Clearly English people across the world need their own ethnic defence group. No other group faces the prospect of being defined and deconstructed out of existence. Even if Hitler had invaded England and had won WWII, it is highly doubtful that England itself would have faced the prospect of political annihilation.

The globalists like to portray *Britain* as a successful multiracial society. The reality though is different. Leo McKinstry said in his article "The Multicultural Thought Police", *The Spectator*, 1/11/2003: "After decades of advancing multiculturalism, Britain is the most violent country in Europe, with the highest rate of gun crime, drug taking and street robbery".

According to J. Steele, "More Whites Become Victims of Racially Motivated Crime", *Telegraph* 12/10/2000, Asians and Blacks are four times more likely than Whites to commit racially motivated "hate crimes" – largely against Whites. This is a society which is falling apart at the seams.

SOLZHENITSYN'S WARNING TO THE WEST by James Reed: Recently Betty Luks celebrated the publication of a thoughtful article by National Action chairman Michael Brander in Quadrant, March 2005, entitled "Alexander Solzhenitsyn and the West". I was motivated to read this article as Brander's other writings did not impress me. I was very pleasantly surprised by Brander's deep understanding of Solzhenitsyn's warning to the West. Of course Solzhenitsyn's primary concern at the time he made a number of addresses to Western audiences, before he was regarded as "off limits" and "dangerous", was to warn about the Soviet menace. Few other writers have documented the tyrannical abuses of this most evil of regimes in such detail and clarity. How could Marxist "intellectuals" in Western universities not have seen this after reading Solzhenitsyn? Well, they didn't read him, and having no concern about the truth, would have dismissed him without serious argument or engagement if they did.

Solzhenitsyn's warning to the West as epitomized in his commencement address at Harvard University entitled "A World Split Apart" was that the West has absorbed some of the key philosophical tenets of Communism because there was a common philosophical root to Soviet Communism and Capitalist America. Both ideologies were based on the doctrine of humanism, that there is no higher law than that of man. Consequently their legal systems embraced legal positivism, that morality has nothing to do with law. Both systems ultimately had no real and lasting respect for human freedom; monopoly domination was the 'order of the day' for both. Both systems subordinate morality to economic ends. Globalism today combines the ideological baggage of communism (multiracialism, multiculturalism, "egalitarianism") with a merciless capitalism that plunders the world for profits, crushing traditional social institutions such as the family in its path.

Solzhenitsyn's pamphlets should be read by all of us concerned with the preservation of liberty. These pamphlets are available from the League's Book Services.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$40.00 p.a.