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FEDERALISM: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME
By Arnis Luks

Taking stock of the various mainstream (propaganda) items across this week, the most glaring was in regard to the dual-purpose biological research facilities financed and developed by USA and the WHO located within Ukraine that have every likelihood of falling into Russian hands. In one broadcast these locations across Ukraine were shown, but also illustrated were the four dual-purpose biological research facilities located within Australia. https://www.ukcolumn.org/ukcolumn-news/uk-column-news-9th-march-2022

All biological research facilities are dual-purpose by their very nature for research/defence as well as military purposes. Such is the dis-information cloud of war and propaganda. Pondering the ramifications is not straightforward with only snapshots of information like this.

South Australia is one week out from the state election. I managed to finally speak with that illusive ‘independent’ who informed me that some of this elusiveness was self-inflicted. No more said.

I came across this immensely important website holding a collection of published writings by the former Clerk of the Senate Harry Evans. The double adjective ‘immensely important' does not do justice to these works. I immersed myself within his thinking for most of Friday and describe as profound his insight into political power, and the necessity for the many divisions of power across our governmental structures.

The Federal Structure

Harry Evans’ focus holds a understandable bias towards the Senate, however the divisions of power across our federalist structure are another full subject within themselves.

The 1983 High Court Franklin Dam decision and subsequent other High Court decisions have been the legislative mechanisms to centralise power to the detriment of States’ powers. The states could be kicking and screaming in the High Court to restore to right order this change to our federation-al constitutional arrangement however they sit on their hands and remain mute instead.

Evans argues that with party discipline including the party whip, parliaments have now become more akin to an ‘electoral college’ that simply endorses the vote-result and leaves all other matters to the Executive. Parliament holding the Executive to account becoming almost a thing of the past. The recent formation of a National Cabinet adjudicating only by leaders and bureaucrats over ‘unconstitutional matters of medical conscription’ is a further erosion of ‘divisions and balancing of powers’ and of our Westminster Parliamentary Representative processes.

Evans argues further that the Senate holds equal political and legislative power (except finance) to the lower house and could hold the government more to account within the legislative processes. The key to this division of power is to have independent and non-aligned Senators to counter the dominant political-party undemocratic oligarchies. For nearly 40 years after the High Court decisions, this centralising of political power continues. Each of these centralising steps could have been resisted by the States, the High Court and the Senate, but were not.
How we vote (differently) between the Upper and Lower Houses can be a step in the right direction of restoring the balancing of powers across our Federation.

**International Treaties**

Our federal government, due to the Franklin Dam and other High Court decisions, can make a treaty with any obscure, foreign power, and all structures of government are then obliged to legislate accordingly. The most current legislative realignment of power is originating with the World Health Organisation and the TPP transpacific partnership under a biological-security banner. Remember the Wuhan, China Laboratory narrative and also the Wuhan wet-market-bats narrative as sources of covid. Remember also the direct links between the WHO and Gates Foundation and Antony Fauci. Now consider the WHO/USA dual-purpose biological research facilities in Ukraine and Australia. Most, if not all of this has been shown to be various shades of propaganda with little truth in any narrative. [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4661789/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4661789/) [https://www.who.int/foodsafety/fs_management/No_01_Biosecurity_Mar10_en.pdf](https://www.who.int/foodsafety/fs_management/No_01_Biosecurity_Mar10_en.pdf) [https://www.bureaubiosecurity.nl/en/policy/International-treaties-and-guidelines](https://www.bureaubiosecurity.nl/en/policy/International-treaties-and-guidelines)

**The Netherlands**

The Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) prohibits the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons. The convention also regulates the destruction of these weapons. The BTWC was signed in 1972 by Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union and entered into force in 1975. The convention, which has been recognised and accepted by 173 countries, prohibits the possession and development of biological and toxin weapons. The BTWC was the first multilateral disarmament treaty banning the production and use of an entire category of weapons. The treaty is still one of the cornerstones of the multilateral framework of non-proliferation and disarmament.

**Significance for the Netherlands**

The Netherlands signed the BTWC convention on April 10, 1972. The convention was implemented in Dutch legislation on March 25, 1981 in the Biological Weapons Convention Implementation Act. In this Act, the BTWC has been implemented, whereby everyone (in the Netherlands) is prohibited from developing, producing, stockpiling, or in any other way acquiring or retaining biological agents.


This week it was reported that Australia has four (dual purpose) biological research facilities within our borders. [On 18 March 2020 in response to the COVID-19 outbreak in Australia, the Governor-General declared that a human biosecurity emergency exists.](https://www.who.int/foodsafety/fs_management/No_01_Biosecurity_Mar10_en.pdf)

The declaration gives the Minister for Health expansive powers to issue directions and set requirements in order to combat the outbreak. This is the first time these powers under the Biosecurity Act have been used. The Biosecurity (Human Biosecurity Emergency) (Human Coronavirus with Pandemic Potential) Declaration 2020 was made under section 475 of the Biosecurity Act 2015 (Cth).

Under this WHO biological-security Convention initially signed by USA, Britain and Russia, all our governments are obliged to legislatively implement the personal digital ID. This erosion and the subsequent loss of personal sovereignty was illustrated cinematographically with the infamous request for "papers please" from totalitarian regimes - the police state. This is what we are becoming as a consequence of the deliberate erosion of the balancing of powers across the Federalist structure by High Court decisions, international treaties, and undemocratic oligarchies within political parties, all under the banner of those two words within our Constitution “external affairs”.

This discussion about Federalism is complemented further by Harry Evans papers about the fortuitous arrangement we have with an equally powered Senate to the House of Representatives, and an Upper to Lower House for each state except Queensland (who chose to dissolve their Upper House with the Constitution Amendment Act 1921).

This two-year-old declaration of a pandemic is not going away readily as all governments are reluctant to forgo powers once seized. Changing undemocratic oligarchies within political parties this coming, or any other election will not achieve a change in policy direction as powers above government are directing traffic to the point of initiating a world war as necessary to bring about world government through the ‘great reset’.

**South Australia**

In the South Australian Parliament there are three branches of equal power. The House of Assembly being the lower house, the Legislative Council being the upper house, and the Queen's representative the Governor. The Governor is not mentioned within the South Australian Constitution as included within the South Australian Parliament, however by convention holds ‘reserved powers’ not necessarily revealed within the written Constitution Act.

South Australia Constitution Act 1934 Part 2—The legislature Division 1—General provisions 19B4—Constitution of the Parliament There shall be a Legislative Council and a House of Assembly which shall be called the Parliament of South Australia, and shall be constituted in the manner provided by this Act.

Protocol is such that all Legislative Acts must pass both houses and be given Royal assent in order to become law.
The South Australian Parliament also appears to be able to alter the Constitution Act ‘at will’ provided it is endorsed by an absolute majority within both houses. I understand Victoria’s Constitution is similar. I have not read the others.

23B8 — Power of Parliament to alter this Act
The Parliament may, from time to time, by any Act, repeal, alter, or vary all or any of the provisions of this Act, and substitute others in lieu thereof; Provided that—
(a) it shall not be lawful to present to the Governor, for His Majesty's assent, any Bill by which an alteration in the constitution of the Legislative Council or House of Assembly is made, unless the second and third readings of that Bill have been passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the Legislative Council and of the House of Assembly respectively;
(b) every such Bill which has been so passed shall be reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure thereon.

24B9 — Privileges of Parliament
The Parliament may, by any Act, define the privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Legislative Council and House of Assembly, and by the members thereof respectively; Provided that no such privileges, immunities, or powers shall exceed those held, enjoyed, and exercised on the twenty-fourth day of October, 1856, by the (British-ed) House of Commons, or the members thereof.

25B10 — Relative powers of Houses of Parliament
Except as provided in the sections of this Act relating to money Bills, the Legislative Council shall have equal power with the House of Assembly in respect of all Bills.

The Upper House - Legislative Council
Historically, Australians have voted differently in regard to ‘political parties’ - lower house to upper house. Also, Upper House in South Australia, being a quota voting system across the entire state, allows smaller franchised candidates to achieve a positive result, rather than domination shared-across the undemocratic majors. Victoria’s modernised Constitution, as does WA’s, has managed to somewhat circumvent the Upper House voting further by substituting the ‘entire state’ with ‘voting regions’ which requires more determination by the electors to return power back from the undemocratic oligarchies to the electorate. It can still be achieved, just harder with a vote-percentage regionalised rather than the entire state. In some ways this is an advantage for an active community determined to achieve effective representation in the Upper House. They do not have to cover the entire state, but can concentrate their efforts within their region to return power back to the people.

There is a battle for freedom between undemocratic oligarchs within political parties and the electorate
The complicity of the major parties working together is another challenge to be overcome by the electorate.

I reinforce this historical observation; that the undemocratic oligarchies within political parties will share preferences if they are concerned the result may go to another rather than either of them. This is happening right now plainly illustrating their collaboration. The political parties and individual candidates “How To Vote” cards are available from the Electoral Commission of South Australia website here: https://www.ecsa.sa.gov.au/elections/2022-state-election/how-to-vote-cards
Keep a copy of them and watch the results work through to conclusion based on their preferential conspiracy.

In my electorate of Davenport, SA, I noted that Greens preference Labor, then Liberal ahead of an inert Independent. I am surmising the Greens being totalitarian, read the same writing on the wall as I do, that the independent is closer to being representative than either the Labor or Liberal undemocratic oligarchs within, and so is placed last on their “How To Vote”. This Independent has his work cut out, that he must gain more votes than the existing incumbent to receive those preferences to achieve election. Otherwise, he holds little to no chance due to the preference intrigue.

The real point of this example is that to find political expression, the manipulated electorate must recognise the battle for representation is between themselves and the major political parties working together, so must do something entirely different than the past. Our area has a history of supporting independents. The incumbent is not as willing as Bob Such was to represent the electorate against lockstep/lockdown and mandatory jabs with job losses, even with the likes of Zoom or Skype at their disposal. There is a clear air-gap between these two differing models of representation.

Another important example of an effective Independent was that of Dorothy Pratt, electorate of Barambah, Queensland in 1988. Originally elected with the ‘One Nation’ wave, she continued to utilise amongst other methods, Dorothy’s Prattles as the printed mechanism to stay in touch and current with her electorate, even after leaving ‘One Nation’ in 1999 and the 2001 electoral boundary being abolished and replaced with Nanango, until her retirement in 2012. She actively engaged for 24 years with her electorate as did Bob Such for 25 years. Ted Mack, the ‘father of independents’, being such an effective representative, was elected and re-elected as an independent to local, state, and federal government.

The Nemesis of One World Government
The counter to centralised power is decentralised power – power being dispersed to the people as the fount of authority as to how we shall be governed - devolution. Unless sufficient individuals accept this counter to political party corruption, there will be no resolution to the challenge of our time. The real enemies of freedom are the undemocratic oligarchies within major political parties. An independent representative is the nemesis to political party corruption and world government tyranny.
How Could Devolution Take Shape?

For those that are prepared to accept natural law as changeless, power residing within the individual encourages choices and self-determination – choosing your own path to salvation if you like. Medical choices are a point in question. Should government have the authority to inject anything into your body, whether toxic poison or even distilled water, as they see fit regardless of age, weight, sex, pre-dispositions, historical contra-indications, co-morbidities? Making an informed choice can be a life-or-death decision. Media is not an authoritative source of information, but more readily representing vested-interest-propaganda.

Fact

Every pharmaceutical and industrial product carries a certified level of toxicity within their MSDS material safety data sheet, more recently referred to as SDS safety data sheet, including fluoride, chlorine and eventually mRNA injections. ‘RoundUp’ carries varying carcinogenic warnings depending on ‘who’ you source from, ‘where’ you source from and ‘when’ you have sourced that vital information.

“There’s Handbook of Toxic and Hazardous Chemicals and Carcinogens” 7th Edition is available in printed form and as an eBook.

Material Safety Data Sheets can be compared from the multiple sources here: http://www.ilpi.com/msds/

All of these official and actual sources of information can assist with making an informed choice if you are willing to search out the scientific literature. Some may willingly accept propaganda as authoritative and look no further. I make it my business to have an informed opinion.

Media Driven Propaganda As Medical Authority

Interestingly our local representative recommended getting the jab to continue employment. On what basis was this advice given? Is this advice still current after the Pfizer document fiasco that has now surfaced revealing massive adverse events? Is that representative responsible after having given this advice for any adverse events caused by the jab? What qualifications were held by the representative at the time of giving this advice? Can they all be sued for providing false or misleading information? Did they themselves receive the jab, or did they exercise their right to exemption? Can the producer of the jab be held to account, or are they legally indemnified against litigation and responsibility for adverse events caused by the jab?

Every informed choice should be able to receive answers to these pressing questions prior to the jab. Unfortunately, they are not, giving the individual further reason to place the sitting member last for having led us all into this covid lockstep/lockdown quagmire and remaining mute while this medical scandal of massive adverse events from the Pfizer jab surfaced.

Double Taxation

The main fuel tax in Australia is an excise tax, advised today to be 44.2 cents for every litre of fuel purchased. The final price of fuel at the pump includes this excise tax “plus industry costs” to which is added a further 10% Goods and Services Tax. A double taxation racket that goes onto all other products as part of their distribution costs. My maths shows about 1/3 at least being taxation of one sort or the other into the final price, if the information provided is accurate.


A 300% increase has occurred at the pump across the previous twenty-seven years showing the actual inflation rate and not the government issued CPI propaganda. Fuel, like electrical energy charges goes into all prices. A war setting without our own manufacturing base leaves us incapable of defending ourselves, being treachery or gross foolishness on the part of our historical politicians.

By all our major political parties allowing primary manufacturing industry to be sent to other nations as part of the Lima Declaration, we now enjoy the double whammy of exposure to other’s fuel whims in a possible war setting while our own hydrocarbon resources are sent overseas as a balance of payment issue. This is the same scenario Ireland found herself in during their potato famine. History is a subject of intense political interest if we are to learn from those lessons, or be bound to repeat their political and social injuries.

In Australia we are at war against the major political parties as ‘unrepresentative swill’ as PM Paul Keating once referred the Senate. By placing the sitting member last there is some chance of turning over politicians similar to soiled nappies, until we finally achieve a voice.

…They, major political parties, have become narrowly based, factionalised, undemocratic oligarchies, apt to be controlled by too few people, closed to public view but open to manipulation and outright corruption. Reforming them would make the institutions of government work better without changing those institutions, but without reforming them the institutions cannot work very much better than they do at present…
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