



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 55 No. 39

4th October 2019

## IN THIS ISSUE

|   |   |
|---|---|
| The British Supreme Court - A Power unto Itself By Philip Benwell | 1 |
| Making Babies, Hungarian Style By Richard Miller                  | 2 |
| Who Funds Greta Thunberg? By Bruce Bennett                        | 3 |
| British Westminster – A Sorry Tale By Philip Benwell              | 4 |

**THOUGHTS OF THE WEEK:** ‘The King is a suitor to you . . . that you will join with him in restoring the whole nation to its primitive temper and integrity, its old good manners, its old good humour and its old good nature; good nature a virtue so peculiar to you . . . that it can be translated into no other language, hardly practised by any other people.’ -- *Lord Chancellor Clarendon: Reconciliation Speech to Parliament, September 1660.*

### Severed Crown and Restoration 1625-1665

In 1625, nine years after Shakespeare’s death, Charles I succeeded his father whose academic belief in the Divine Right of Kings he shared with an almost mystical belief. During the first four years of his reign he became embroiled with three successive Parliaments, whose claims to control policy and criticize his ministers he regarded as treasonable, and whose reluctance to grant taxes he bitterly resented. After 1629 he governed the country for eleven years by proclamation without calling a Parliament. His intentions were benevolent — for he was essentially a good man — but, unlike the far more autocratic Tudors, he completely failed to appreciate Edward I’s dictum of three centuries before that, that which touches all should be approved by all, and that to govern England effectively there must be ‘counsel and consent’. By identifying the Crown with the exercise of untrammelled administrative authority — in that age frequently corrupt, occasionally unjust and nearly always inefficient — and with ideological and religious beliefs antipathetic to a vocal majority of his people, he undermined the instinctive love of the nation for its hereditary monarchy. Though a Protestant, his ecclesiastical leanings, unlike those of his increasingly puritan subjects, were those of the high Anglican Church of which by law he was the Head. His love of seemly ritual and ceremonial, as well as a devoted marriage to a French Roman Catholic princess, Henrietta Maria, made them suspect him, however wrongly, of Popery. Charles I was a thoroughly bad politician and a poor judge of character”

*A History of Britain and the British People, Volume 2 - Freedom's Own Island By Arthur Bryant, p.228.*

## ALOR NATIONAL WEEKEND 2019 in Adelaide, SA, 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> October; LAST CALL

### THE BRITISH SUPREME COURT - A POWER UNTO ITSELF By Philip Benwell

I must admit that there are things troubling me about the decision of the UK Supreme Court which held that the Queens proroguing of the British Parliament was void. In the first instance, how can ‘advice’ in itself be considered to be unlawful? Improper is one thing but unlawful is quite another particularly since it appears that the court was not aware of what that advice actually was or how it was worded. Secondly, how is it possible for any court to then say that an Order of the Queen was null and void? Surely, once the Queen has signed off on an Order in Council, that Order remains until and unless revoked by the Queen in Council. Whilst courts have previously examined the limits of the Royal Prerogative, they have done so only where such limits were uncertain. It was always recognised that the court could not ignore, set aside, quash or over-rule the Royal Prerogative. Presumably, the Supreme Court accepted that it was not empowered to set aside such an order but instead it determined that that Order simply did not happen, but as everyone is aware it obviously did.

The Supreme Court was established under the Constitutional Reform Act of 2005 and took over the appellate jurisdiction of the Law Lords as well as some powers of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Lord Neuberger of Abbotsbury, later President of the Supreme Court, expressed concerns that the new court could make itself more powerful than the House of Lords committee it succeeded, saying that there is a real risk of "judges arrogating to themselves greater power than they have at the moment". *(continued next page)*

(continued from previous page)

Of course, in Australia, we forget how indoctrinated the bureaucracy, the defence forces and the judiciary of the United Kingdom have become under the rule of the European Union. Influenced by European ideology their thinking is not like the thinking of days past. The Queen is coming under attack with calls by some leftist MPs for her abdication. In Australia republicans are accusing her of

complicity with Boris Johnson. This of the monarch who has dealt impartially and irreproachably with 14 British prime ministers during her long reign! Throughout this whole episode the Queen has behaved impeccably as she always behaves, adhering to procedure and protocol without interruption. \*\*\*

Philip Benwell is the National Chair of the *Australian Monarchist League*.

## MAKING BABIES, HUNGARIAN STYLE By Richard Miller

Focusing on most striking and critical trends: population decline and population ageing, the UN report considers replacement migration for eight low-fertility countries (France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom and United States) and two regions (Europe and the European Union).

Replacement migration refers to the international migration that a country would need to offset population decline and population ageing resulting from low fertility and mortality rates.

<https://russia-insider.com/en/politics/how-viktor-orban-saving-hungary-making-babies/ri27740>

‘The Hungarian government is offering married couples a 10 million-forint (around €30,590) loan, which they do not have to pay back if they have three children. The money is available via a scheme that kicked off at the start of July. What's more, the loan can be spent on anything the couple wants and is interest-free. Is there a catch? Like many other EU member states, the country is suffering from a labour shortage, with workers leaving the country in search of higher salaries. Prime Minister Viktor Orban and his right-wing Fidesz party want to encourage population growth via families rather than mass immigration.

“We do not need numbers, but Hungarian children,” he said in his State of the Nation address in February.

“The Hungarian people gave the Government a strong mandate to further expand the family protection system: 1,382,000 people filled out and returned a questionnaire,” the Hungarian government's International Communications Office told *Euronews*. “People would like Hungary to remain a Hungarian country, and be family-friendly,” it added.

While the EU average fertility rate is 1.59, Hungary's is lagging at 1.49 children per woman, according to Eurostat. The loan makes up part of Orban's Family Protection Action Plan, a seven-point policy announced during the address, which devotes 4.8% of GDP to programmes to support families and encourage childbirth. Other points in the plan include a loan programme to support home purchases, subsidies on cars for large families, and a lifetime exemption from personal income tax for women who have raised at least four children. Couples must meet specific criteria to get the loan payment in the first place:

- They must be married
  - One of the two on their first marriage
  - The wife must be aged 18 to 40
  - One of them must have paid social contributions in the last 3 years and at least 180 days in Hungary.
- For couples that have one child in a five-year time frame, the interest on their loan is suspended forever and monthly repayments are halted for three years. Adoption also counts. The birth of a second child allows them a further three-year pause on repayments, with any money they have contributed returned and the loan written off upon the birth of a third child. If the couple either fails to produce a child in five years or gets divorced, they must repay everything that they have borrowed plus interest in four months (120 days). They are exempt if they can provide a medical certificate as to why they have not had a child. Between its launch on July 1-July 15, 2,400 families asked for the loan, according to the Hungarian State Treasury, while 14,000 families have so far requested at least one element offered in the plan. “The first weeks after the Plan's introduction have proven expectations right,” they said.

### Criticism

Its critics say the Family Protection Action Plan is adapted to benefit middle-class Hungarians won't reach the poor, while the country's state secretary in charge of youth and family affairs, Katalin Novák, recently argued that a separate social safety net was available. The capacity of current childcare facilities to cope with more children has also been called into question. “By 2022 the number of crèche places will increase to 70,000 from the current level of around 50,000,” the government told *Euronews*. “This means that all parents will be able to find a place for their child in a crèche if they wish.” However, Novak said back in 2016 that the number of nursery places in the country would be increased to 60,000 by 2018, leaving a shortfall of 10,000 spaces that have not been provided. It remains to be seen if the new plan will remedy Hungary's ageing population — Orban and Fidesz are certainly banking on it over immigration.’

Hopefully, some part of the West will survive the great tsunami of chaos breaking on the shores of modernity.

\*\*\*

## WHO FUNDS GRETA THUNBERG? By Bruce Bennett

With the 'success' of the climate strike across the world, as a media attention grabber, the focus should be on the teenage leader of the movement, Greta Thunberg. Does she raise funds by selling tasty vegan food, made by elves? No, she is funded by George Soros et al.:

<https://www.quora.com/Is-Greta-Thunberg-sponsored-by-Soros>

"Her parents, Svante Thunberg and Malena (Sara) Ernman get the sponsoring from One Foundation PR-spinnet bakom Greta Thunberg-spinnet-bakom-greta-thunberg One Foundation is owned by George Soros. Also Bono and Bill Gates are contributing. Greta Thunberg's marketing campaign is managed by Ingmar Rentzhog and his PR company "We do not have time."

<https://freewestmedia.com/2019/04/24/george-soros-is-backing-greta-thunberg/>

"So, who is this young idealist? Greta Thunberg is now 16-years old and the daughter of famous opera singer and left-liberal activist Malena Ernman, who in the background has helped her daughter get started. Thunberg soon also got her own coach – a well-known climate activist from Germany by the name Luisa-Marie Neubauer. What is the likelihood of a young girl who starts a school strike outside the Swedish parliament, getting schoolchildren from all over the world to join her cause and fight against climate change? And how often do 16-year-olds have their own coaches? Luisa-Marie Neubauer, who has been captured on a numerous images and videos together with Greta when the two direct climate change strikes all over the world, belongs to the organisation called 'one foundation'. It has several well-known wealthy financiers, including Bono as well as Bill and Melissa Gates. An even more striking name is that of the multi-billionaire oligarch George Soros, notorious for his currency speculation and maybe even more prominent as the father of the global, radical, and left-liberal lobby and activist network 'Open Society', supporting thousands of NGOs."

The so-called youth revolt against climate change, may well be sincere, but behind this, as always are the globalists Pied Pipers of Hamelin, whose endgame is the deindustrialisation of the West, and the world dominance of China, that is untouched by the climate change issue, and as the world's greatest carbon polluter, is given a free road to world domination.

### LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To *The Australian* Perhaps we need to take more notice of Jacinta Nampijinpa Price ("I don't do Welcome to Country because it is a modern construct", Cut & Paste, 20/9). Like the "Aboriginal flag", this practice lacks authenticity and is being used to strengthen the forces of Aboriginal

As climate change and environmentalist guru Maurice Strong put it all, in these quotes from wiki:

- "Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class - involving high meat intake, the use of fossil fuels, electrical appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning, and suburban housing - are not sustainable.

-Maurice Strong, opening speech at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. But this quotation is not in the version posted on Mr. Strong's site.

<http://www.mauricestrong.net/index.php/opening-statement6>

- If we don't change, our species will not survive... Frankly, we may get to the point where the only way of saving the world will be for industrial civilization to collapse.

-Maurice Strong, September 1, 1997 edition of National Review magazine.

- What if a small group of world leaders were to conclude that the principal risk to the Earth comes from the actions of the rich countries? And if the world is to survive, those rich countries would have to sign an agreement reducing their impact on the environment. Will they do it? The group's conclusion is 'no'. The rich countries won't do it. They won't change. So, in order to save the planet, the group decides: Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring that about?

-Maurice Strong, Interview 1992, concerning the plot of a book he would like to write.

- It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation-states, however powerful. It is a principle which will yield only slowly and reluctantly to the imperatives of global environmental cooperation.

-Maurice Strong, 1992 essay entitled *Stockholm to Rio: A Journey Down a Generation*

- "Our concepts of ballot-box democracy may need to be modified to produce strong governments capable of making difficult decisions."

Strong's answer was, as usual, the creation of a world government through the UN.

\*\*\*

separatism. It's a pity, because there is poetry and some truth in it, notwithstanding.

A more inclusive statement of remembrance rather than one of spurious welcome would perhaps be a suitable replacement.

*Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic*

## BRITISH WESTMINSTER – A SORRY TALE By Philip Benwell

At no time in the modern history of the British Westminster parliament have we seen a government so pitted against its parliament and now the highest Court in the land. A very basic chronology is:

The Cameron Conservative government held a referendum in June 2016 with 51.89% of votes cast to leave the European Union. David Cameron then stepped down and was replaced by Theresa May as Prime Minister.

Ms May was unable to secure a successful vote in the British parliament on any deal agreed to by the European Union because a number of Conservative MPs voted with Labour against all the proposals she put forward. She resigned in June 2019 and was replaced by Boris Johnson the next month.

Unable to get backing from the parliament to leave the European Union without any deal, Boris Johnson then sought to prorogue the parliament for around five weeks until 14 October, two and a half weeks prior to the final exit date (from the EU) of 31 October.

Johnson then formally advised the Queen, by telephone, to prorogue parliament between the 9th to 12th September and to hold a Queen's Speech on 14th October. On 28th August, Mr Jacob Rees-Mogg, Leader of the House of Commons and Lord President of the Privy Council, Mr Mark Harper, chief whip, and Baroness Evans of Bowes Park, Leader of the House of Lords, attended a meeting of the Privy Council held by the Queen at Balmoral Castle resulting in an Order in Council proroguing the parliament between those dates. Throughout this entire process the Queen acted, as she is obliged to do, on the advice of the government and the Privy Council.

There were appeals brought by members of parliament before the Court of Session in Scotland, which ruled that prorogation was illegal. A Guyanese-British business owner and activist, Ms Gina Miller appealed to the High Court of England and Wales, which ruled that the matter was political and was therefore not justiciable.

Ms Miller then appealed to the Supreme Court, which is the highest court in the United Kingdom. The court looked only on whether the advice given by the Prime Minister to the Queen was lawful and the legal consequences if it was not and held that the decision to advise Her Majesty to prorogue parliament was unlawful because it had the effect of frustrating or preventing the ability of parliament to carry out its constitutional functions without reasonable justification.

The court held that the Order in Council to which the advice led was also "unlawful, void and of no effect and should be quashed" and therefore the prorogation was also void and of no effect and that parliament has not been prorogued.

It is difficult for people in Australia to understand all this, because our system has not been so politicised as that in the UK.

The problem that Boris Johnson faced was that a 2011 Act of parliament, brought in under the Cameron government, required fixed-term elections with a general election is scheduled for the first Thursday in May of the fifth year after the previous general election. The only way in which a general election could be otherwise held would be if there was a vote of no confidence in the government or a vote of two-thirds of the House of Commons. Not having a majority, Johnson was not able to muster a two-thirds vote and therefore resorted to the proroguing of the parliament.

On reflection, he should not have done this and even if he and his government considered that the advice tended to the Queen and the Privy Council was sound, he should have considered the implications of so doing, particularly since he did not control the parliament.

Of course, what should have happened a month or more ago is that the parliament should have held a vote of no confidence against the government. The Queen would then have asked the leader of the opposition, Jeremy Corbyn, and possibly others to try to form a government and when that failed, call a general election. However, elements within the parliament did not want an election but they continued to disrupt the proceedings of the government thereby making the parliament unworkable.

Therefore, the ultimate blame must lie with the parliament and the Speaker, John Bercow - who seems to be acting rather like a second John Pym, the Speaker who brought about the English Civil War of the 17th-century. All have been politicking at the expense of the people.

Philip Benwell is the National Chair of the *Australian Monarchist League*.

\*\*\*

**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

**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.**