

AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND GOVERNMENTS ILLEGITIMATE - PART II

by [Kelvyn Alp](#) on Sunday, 03 April 2011 at 02:02

(Website Reference:

<http://www.relatingtolive.com/index.php?page=189&name=NZ%20Government%20is%20illegitimate>)



The follow up they tried to suppress!!

Originally written for BUT NOT published in the Solomon Islands due to interference, so you get to read it here anyway! - highly relevant here in New Zealand!

AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND GOVERNMENTS ILLEGITIMATE - PART II

The forerunner to this article has certainly stirred up a hornets' nest and some have asked that the material be presented in laymen's terms so everyone can better understand it. This article has been written and presented to allow just that.

Furthermore, this article, including its forerunner, serve as a public challenge to the so-called authority of the Australian and New Zealand Governments including, but not limited to, all of their subsidiary agencies, legislative branches, departments, officers and agents.

INTRODUCTION

In New Zealand and Australia there has been a significant shift in politics and in taxation. Political parties rarely listen to or act upon the peoples' concerns. Being a politician is now a cloistered profession. Only at election time do they venture out. Meanwhile lowly paid workers are being taxed at rates which used to be reserved for managers and professionals, whilst managers and professionals are being taxed at rates formerly reserved for the rich. The rich are hardly being taxed at all.

In both countries individual savings, either for normal family needs or for retirement, are being penalised at every turn. The result is that New Zealand and Australia have some of the lowest savings rates in the civilised world guaranteeing that there is a shortage of capital for development of ideas, businesses and infrastructure.

Businesses are penalised for employing. High taxation means much higher total wages are needed to provide even basic living standards for the average worker. The result is that many New Zealand and Australian companies now import their products rather than employing local workers to make them.

Large capital imports are needed to pay for capital works and those imported goods tend to be from countries which don't have punitive taxation systems. This forces the value of the New Zealand and Australian dollars down, diverts the returns from exports to overseas financiers (in the form of interest) and the interest charges together with devaluation forces up the cost of imported goods in relation to workers' incomes in both countries.

Today New Zealanders and Australians are measurably poorer than they were. Most discretionary incomes have shrunk, large numbers are unemployed and our living standards have slipped tremendously in relation to the rest of the OECD nations.

WHAT IS SOVEREIGNTY?

Sovereignty occurs when the other nations of the world recognise a country as independent. It means that as a people we are entitled to complete control over our own affairs - nationally and internationally. When the twentieth century began New Zealand and Australia were still colonies, legally under the control of the United Kingdom parliament. A decade ago we were recognised by every country in the world as independent sovereign nations. We are still recognised as such by the United Kingdom. But more and more nations now know and are exploiting the awful truth!

WHAT DOES IT REALLY MEAN AND WHEN DID THIS CHANGE FROM COLONY TO SOVEREIGN NATION TAKE PLACE?

New Zealand and Australia became independent nations at the moment their representatives lifted their pens from signing the Treaty of Versailles on 28th of June 1919. From that moment on the New Zealand and Australian people had the right to decide their own future. But more importantly, it meant **ONLY THE PEOPLE** of Australia and New Zealand could decide what legal and political systems they should live under.

BUT HAVEN'T NEW ZEALAND AND AUSTRALIA DONE THAT SINCE 1901?

No, they haven't! Neither Australia nor New Zealand has ever had either a system of law or a system of government to call their own. Both countries have remained firmly under British law but without any of the protections British citizens have. Australian and New Zealand courts have ruled that they are bound by British laws in the form of their colonial constitutions but both peoples are denied the legally enforceable rights which exist under other British laws.

Colonial constitutions don't contain enforceable human rights because the colonists subject to these constitutions could rely on the legally enforceable human rights of their masters. Today the British have constitutionally enforceable human rights and a Human Rights Act, 1998. Neither New Zealanders nor Australians do.

Simply put, the lawyers and the politicians have decided that both countries will keep the British laws which don't limit 'their' power but which existed as part of the colonial legal environment when these constitutions were written. This is why neither the New Zealand nor Australian constitutions contain any explicit form of human rights, other than the right to vote.

IF THE CONSTITUTIONS AREN'T BROKEN WHY FIX THEM?

Who says the constitutions aren't broken? The "splendid constitution" myth is perpetuated by the politicians and lawyers who are the only ones to benefit under it!

Effectively, the constitutions of Australia and New Zealand are documents for dictatorship! For instance, the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, 1900 (UK) allows a Governor-General (appointed by a foreign Queen) to govern without a parliament and with ministers solely appointed by him/her for as long as the Governor-General wishes. The only restriction is that the ministers can only serve for 90 days without being a Member of Parliament, but a nominal change of the portfolio - even a simple change of name for the ministry - can easily overcome this. If you don't believe this then read the 'Australian' Constitution from Section 61 onwards.

The proponents of the New Zealand and Australian constitutions try to escape this problem by saying that the "conventions" prevent these unpleasant situations from occurring. But in cold, hard fact the "conventions" have no legal force, they are simply the way things have been done in the past and recent experience clearly demonstrates today's politicians simply regard the past as a disposable nuisance.

More importantly, the International Law Commission of the United Nations has ruled that "the laws of one Member State cannot apply within the territory of another Member State except via a reciprocal treaty. Such treaty may not infringe the sovereignty of either Member State." See also: U.N. Resolutions 2131 [XX] 1965 and 2625 [XXV] 1970.

The Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act is a British law, passed by the Westminster Parliament in 1900 and with no reciprocal treaty between Australia and the UK to allow the continued use of that colonial Constitution. Therefore under two aspects of international law the continued use of the 'Australian' Constitution is illegal, both under the normal powers of sovereignty and under the requirements of major treaties and UN Resolutions, treaties and Resolutions to which both Australian and United Kingdom are signatories.

New Zealand is in an even worse state. New Zealand doesn't have a codified or completely entrenched constitution. The constitution of New Zealand consists of a dog's breakfast of statutes, treaties, Orders-in-Council, Letters Patent, court decisions and of course unwritten, unenforceable constitutional conventions!

WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THIS MAKE?

Every building depends on its foundations. If the foundations collapse so does the building. The constitutions of New Zealand and Australia are the foundations of their governments and their legal systems. Their collapse under international law means that both governments and legal systems also collapse. The only legal response under international law is new constitutions and new legal and political systems as chosen by the PEOPLE of New Zealand and Australia. No one else, including the existing de facto governments, has the power to create the new systems.

Various governments around the world are now aware of the monumental weaknesses of New Zealand's and Australia's constitutions - weaknesses that are being exploited. Anyone relying upon a passport from either of these countries had better hope that they don't get into trouble whilst overseas. Anyone claiming citizenship under the Citizenship Acts of either of these countries is deluding themselves! Colonies can't grant colonial citizenship!

WE ELECTED THE GOVERNMENT! DOESN'T THAT GIVE IT POWER AND AUTHORITY?

In law there is a concept known as "informed consent". It means that if you are to make an important decision, for instance on whether to allow a surgeon to undertake a very risky operation,

then you must be provided with all the information about the risks or else the surgeon has gained permission to carry out the operation by fraud. "Informed Consent" is a well known concept.

In political terms this means that the first government after independence (or indeed any later government) had to inform the people of New Zealand and Australia that British power, including that of the Queen, no longer applied in those countries and that a vote at the election under the provisions of their colonial constitutions handed all of that power, including the royal power, to the politicians.

The politicians have carefully avoided informing the Australian and New Zealand public since they know the public would demand that safeguards against the abuse of political power be built into their systems. Today there are no real safeguards. Without informed consent the politicians, their governments, their bureaucrats and their military have no legal authority but merely possess power since public servants will obey them and attempt to enforce their laws - no matter how unjust, absurd or invalid these laws are.

BUT DIDN'T THE AUSTRALIA ACTS AND THE NEW ZEALAND CONSTITUTION ACT (BOTH OF 1986) FIX ALL THIS?

The politicians and lawyers would love you to believe they did. In fact the concept on which these Acts were based is legally absurd. In Australia's case their Parliament legislated to stop a foreign parliament - the Westminster Parliament - from making laws whilst the Westminster Parliament passed laws in respect to a foreign country, Australia! Both the Australian and British parliaments were acting in contravention of Articles 2 and 4 of the Charter of the United Nations which they are sworn to uphold. Under international law the Australia Acts were a Monty Python exercise in illegality which fixed nothing.

New Zealand's Constitution Act, 1986 enforced the British Act of Settlement, 1701 as part of the New Zealand constitution - again falling foul of Articles 2 and 4 of the Charter of the United Nations. How bizarre is that - the law enshrines that the Sovereign of 'Free' and 'Independent' New Zealand is chosen by the Westminster parliament? No wonder the governments of China, Japan, America, Sri Lanka, Myanmar and who knows how many others are quietly laughing.

WHAT ABOUT THE STATUTE OF WESTMINSTER 1931?

Most Australian and New Zealand lawyers believe the Statute of Westminster 1931 (UK) is what gave Australia and New Zealand sovereignty. The same lawyers also believe that the Earth is flat.

Careful reading of the Statute of Westminster shows it is one side of an "international arrangement" which required legislation by the affected Dominions. Unfortunately for the lawyers, Article 18 of the League of Nations Covenant, by which Australia, New Zealand and the UK were bound, requires "international arrangements" to be registered and published by the League of Nations otherwise they are null and void and deemed not to exist. The Statute of Westminster was not registered and the Statute of Westminster Adoption Acts (1942 for Australia and 1947 for New Zealand) were not registered - in New Zealand's case because the League of Nations had ceased to exist - and therefore are not valid in international law! In any case, both Australia and New Zealand were independent long before the Statute of Westminster was produced in an attempt to hide the political chicanery of 1919-1920.

THEN WHO DOES HOLD SOVEREIGNTY OVER NEW ZEALAND AND AUSTRALIA?

In short, the people! - The People of New Zealand and Australia!

Despite the historical links, legal sovereignty passed from King George V to the Australian and New Zealand people on 28th of June 1919. But the legal and constitutional changes needed to accompany this transfer have never been made! Because of this, Elizabeth II has never been sovereign Queen over either New Zealand or Australia.

The UN certifies that both New Zealand and Australia were sovereign nations at least by 1945 when we joined the UN (sovereignty being a condition of joining) and Elizabeth II did not assume the throne of the United Kingdom until 1952. Since two sovereignties can't co-exist and the New Zealand and Australian people have never surrendered theirs, Elizabeth has never been sovereign Queen over either country.

The titles 'Queen of Australia' and 'Queen of New Zealand'(or words to that effect) given to Elizabeth II are purely honorary and carry no constitutional power whatsoever!

WHY SHOULD I BELIEVE WHAT I AM READING HERE?

Without checking you shouldn't! Blind faith is for fools and bureaucrats. But each of the historical facts discussed has existed long before these were uncovered and international law wasn't formulated for the benefit of this article. Use the internet [i.e. basicfraud.com] and you will find enough to convince yourself of the truth. After all, that's what this is all about - just the plain truth.

And the great thing about the truth is that eventually it exposes itself, because facts can't be kept secret forever.

Without any legitimate Australian or New Zealand Governments in place, the only real authority resides with the people of those lands.

In Australia the Aboriginals, like the rest of you, hold their own sovereign authority - while in New Zealand, the Maori have sovereign authority, with the added bonus of being internationally recognised via the Declaration of Independence 1835 - even if the 'New Zealand Government' wants to continually attempt to deny it.

Despite being factually wrong in their assumptions, the armchair critics prefer to take pot-shots on blogs and other internet forums targeting the messenger, instead of taking notice of the message. These same 'sheeple' are also happy to be mushrooms that are kept in the dark while fed a pile of crap!

Should a challenge be mounted by the people themselves, or those acting in their best interests, it remains a fact that under international law the Australian and New Zealand Governments have no legal authority to stand in their way. Not being nations, these governments have no standing (locus standi) - of course they will continue though, as they only maintain their existence by intimidation, fear and brute force!

Given what is happening around the world as God-given, age sanctified Freedoms and Rights of the people are constantly and brazenly being stripped away, some may suggest that this is one fight

from which no one can walk away! Your future and that of your descendants depend upon you doing your part to stop the long night of tyranny.

And truth be told, the twilight is already here!

[Covenant of the League of Nations](#)

[United Nations Resolution 2131 \[XX\] 1965](#)

[United Nations Resolution 2625 \[XXV\] 1970](#)

[Declaration of Independence 1835](#)

For more information see:

www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jsct/icc/subs/sub82.pdf

<http://www.basicfraud.com/>

<http://www.solomonstarnews.com/viewpoint/private-view/9538-australia-and-new-zealand-governments-illegitimate>

Footnote: Both articles include original notes and information by Ian Henke, a man that has been instrumental in helping to bring this information to the public arena.