

**Proposed review,  
replacement and/or repeal of  
the New South Wales  
Stewards' Foundation of  
Christian Brethren Act, 1989**

**A proposal opinion by Ray Carter supported  
by Lance J Christie**

We invite comments and questions and/or corrections on  
the [www.lancejchristie.com](http://www.lancejchristie.com) website or private communications with Lance  
via email [lancechristie7@gmail.com](mailto:lancechristie7@gmail.com)

## Contents

Introduction to the NSW Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act .....	3
Assembly Organisations and Trusts .....	3
Plymouth Brethren Christian Church and Open Brethren .....	3
No ‘Specific’ Provision for Ex-Members .....	4
Privacy Laws .....	4
Wealth Creation .....	4
Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Excommunication Policy .....	4
Legalities .....	5
Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Separation Policy .....	5
Questioning the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church .....	5
Chapels and Property .....	5
Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Interference in Marriages .....	6
The Act is Portable Internationally .....	6
Seals Beyond the Reach of Courts .....	6
Confusion in the NSW Parliament, 1989 .....	6
Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Strictures .....	7
Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Financial Planning .....	7
Coercive Control .....	7
Devastation of Ex-Members .....	7
The “Riddle of the Act” .....	8
Taxation .....	8
NSW Churches Legislation Policy .....	8
Ex-Members Become Irrelevant to the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church .....	8
Servitude .....	9
Tortious Interference in Marriages .....	9
Multiple Facet Tortious Interference in Lance’s Marriage .....	10
Infantile Behaviour .....	11
Suicides .....	11
Trust By-Laws .....	12
Man of God’s Control over Property .....	12
Cruelty of Cults .....	12
Background Information .....	12
Conclusion .....	13
Index .....	14

## **Introduction to the NSW Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act**

That the NSW Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act 1989 (the Act) was passed for the Open Brethren church and, given that it is used by the Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren church, that indicates that the two are one and the same in practice. To avoid confusion these two names are interchangeable for this discussion. There is no inference in this document that the Open Brethren or the Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren utilise the alleged spurious trust structure parts of the Act passed for them nor are we saying that they allow abnormal trusts, as such inference is said by a leader of the Open Brethren to be repugnant; however even the Open Brethren use should be open to question.

The following reasoning is an attempt to analyse and explain why the Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act NSW 1989 (the Act) should be reviewed, replaced or repealed. The claim here is that this Act is not available only to the church of the same name (the Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren) but is available also to the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church (PBCC) as an Assembly Organisation and indeed to any Assembly Organisation "styled" after the Open Brethren Foundation. There is no restriction at all despite claims by the aforesaid leader.

The question that can be reasonably asked is whether this claim is backed up.

To make this claim, what was said by The Honourable Fred Nile MLC as recorded in Hansard in the record of debate of the Second Reading must also be questioned. Fred said, when asked, that the Act was for the Open Brethren. Fred stated this after first being asked whether the Act was for the Plymouth Brethren. A proper reading of Hansard is both revealing and disturbing so it's essential, as for any dissertation, that the small print is studied properly.

## **Assembly Organisations and Trusts**

Again, the fact of the matter is that an Assembly Organisation (which the PBCC is) or any other, can use the Act, if it is "styled" after the Open Brethren Foundation created for the Open Brethren by the Act.

The Act allows for Trusts that are extraordinary in addition to the "normal trusts" that hold chapels in that they allow for merging and variation very differently to the normal Trust law of NSW. This is the probable reason why 3000 businesses from 19 countries have their accounts done by the PBCC UBT headquarters and possibly why the PBCC accounting division has been closed down (either by the ATO or maybe voluntarily by the PBCC as claimed).

Letters Ref IM21/28595, EAP21/13792 from the NSW Communities & Justice Law Reform and Legal Services on this website are responses to complaints made to Justice NSW and do not refute the concept that the Act is in itself a questionable thing. In fact they support us questioning it in that it acknowledges that the Act makes no provision for ex-members. The PBCC obviously use this provision yet the Open Brethren appear to eschew it.

## **Plymouth Brethren Christian Church and Open Brethren**

That the bill preceding the Act was presented as not being for the Plymouth Brethren when a proper reading of the Act as passed reveals that an Assembly Association such as the Plymouth Brethren can in fact use the Act, if "styled" after the Open Brethren's Foundation. This should be sufficient ground for the Act to be reviewed for possible replacement or repeal. Only if this occurs will the ATO, a Commonwealth agency, be fully equipped in its current investigation into PBCC affairs.

It is remarkable that the PBCC are wont to say that the gulf between them and the Open Brethren is "*the deepest ditch in Christendom*", when the above evidence indicates that the two are at one certain level or particularly close at least. A proper examination of the Hansard record of the

Second Reading and the Act itself reveals that the Act should never have been passed in the first place.

### **No 'Specific' Provision for Ex-Members**

As it stands, the passing of the Act through the NSW Parliament should be regarded as a shameful event, given that it does not measure up to the NSW Church Legislation Policy. The Act is totally inadequate and unfit for purpose given that the NSW Office of Justice and Law Reform has confirmed that the Act makes no "specific" provision for ex-members. This means that ex-PBCC members are entirely at the whim of the Committee of the Assembly Organisation, so can be "legally" held in a condition of servitude, servitude being the control of a person's person or property by another as exemplified in the case of the PBCC who enforce this with the continuous threat of shunning and excommunication in addition to their extremely potent mix of scripture and business. The Act could in fact be viewed as a business model, repugnant in nature.

The extraordinary discretionary provision or non-provision for ex-PBCC members means that some members may be chosen for one treatment and others for another. This potent power emanates from an outlandish interpretation of scriptures mixed with there being no specific provision for ex-members under the Act. When aligned with the threat of the same for members, this induces fear just as it would for anybody. Adding to the woes of many ex-PBCC members is the fact that they can be deemed to be ex-members just before their vested assets are sold and their proceeds distributed to the members remaining in the PBCC or anyone else as the Committee sees fit.

### **Privacy Laws**

The Act allows the PBCC (an Assembly Organisation and not a Company like the Open Brethren's Foundation) to sail under the Privacy Laws of Australia. This appears to be how the PBCC has been able to maintain an opaque façade despite requests for examination of their affairs by government agencies such as the ATO and Charities Commission. The affairs of the PBCC are a seemingly impenetrable secret which no media organisation, newspaper, blog or TV has been able to fully penetrate, so meticulously written is the legislation that they abide by.

### **Wealth Creation**

The Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act is a wealth creation device for the entities that choose to use the abnormal Trusts enabled by it, even enabling the creation of documents that cannot be required in a court of law by way of a special seal.

Australians should be concerned that there exists any such Act which appears to, by this extraordinary situation, underpin the wealth and lifestyles of PBCC members as observed by the ATO.

### **Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Excommunication Policy**

It is incongruous that the PBCC tout that their businessmen members face excommunication from the Church should they operate any taxation fraud when, from anecdotal evidence, this reportedly has never happened. In any case, what kind of business rule is that for a Christian church in the first place? Christian churches are supposed to be concerned with spiritual matters including impeccable charities that would never be tossing people out for worldly indictable offences if they want to comply with the community's idea of charity. More than likely the business of excommunication for these reasons is a veiled threat aimed at stopping members from stepping out of line so that the UBT can continue working its magical profitability with minimal publicity under the Act's malleable Trusts.

No Christian church member should be in fear of being excommunicated from their spiritual connection with God just because of a mortal tax fraud failure. Incongruously the PBCC throw this into the mix of a members punishment right in their hour of need. Excommunicating like this, if it is

to be taken seriously, puts a tax evader's soul at stake which is an unchristian overkill. All of this has more of the stench of a cynical subterfuge. More than likely, this would be lost on ordinary PBCC businessmen for want of knowledge on the issue and the accounting magic worked for them. In the PBCC, ignorance "of the world" is regarded as a virtue and strongly appears to be the purpose of the limited education available for church members and the prevention of their wider society interaction as dictated by the PBCC hierarchy. More than likely this furphy is waved about to defray anyone and everyone from questioning the PBCC concerning their tax affairs.

### **Legalities**

Although the ATO investigation has begun, it may not reveal much because the UBT indeed operates within the law, ironically a NSW law that substitutes for normal NSW Trust law. State law, even a questionable one like this, may not be within reach of the ATO, so a learned response would be welcome on this or any other aspect of this document because the concept of the Act is an instrument of evil when coupled with outlandish scriptural interpretation. Common sense might say that the ATO, a Commonwealth Authority, must have avenues of communication with the NSW Government. However legal strictures between the Commonwealth and States might prevail over common sense.

### **Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Separation Policy**

Despite the alleged but denied closeness of the Open Brethren and the Plymouth Brethren, they are clearly joined together in the Stewards' Foundation Act. Amazingly, the PBCC maintains that there is a great high wall of separation between PBCC and the Open Brethren. The height and thickness of this wall is of their own imagination entirely and the making and the size of it is exacerbated by their isolation policy that is based on the philosophy of separation and hatred of the world. This separation is also regulated by the requirement for Assembly member businessmen to "*fleece the Egyptians*" for the PBCC's maximum financial benefit. Clearly this is a distraction, given that no fleecing or tax fraud is necessary to undercut any competitor in any business endeavour, because they are already extremely profitable thanks to the magic worked by UBT on PBCC members' business books. The Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act ensures that normal Trust law is not applicable to PBCC businesses so it therefore follows that this can be extrapolated as a legitimised subversion of normal NSW Trust law. This would be a great business model if it were acceptable, but it clearly is not.

### **Questioning the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church**

The PBCC insist that questioning by anyone daring to challenge the Committee of the PBCC constitutes them "opposers" who are either "wicked", "corrupt" or "rival" and therefore unworthy of answers. This is clearly not for the protection of a spiritual gift. It is rather a diversion, childishly purposed to divert attention away from the real question which is why the Plymouth Brethren can live so luxuriously. As per media reports, this is the concerning matter that caught the attention of the ATO.

### **Chapels and Property**

It is informative that under the Act the PBCC chapels are held under "*normal*" NSW Trust law, so it follows that Trusts holding vested private property are abnormal Trusts. Altering, merging, creating and ending abnormal Trusts under the Act, can be done routinely and as frequently as the PBCC Committee chooses. Real benefit of ownership is separated and untraceable on the title deeds and all that can be seen is the name of the title holder on a piece of paper that can be waved about by the PBCC to indicate the independence of the title holding businessman. Vesting occurs voluntarily or when the PBCC businessmen borrow money, at which time documents are created enabling ownership benefit to anyone the Committee chooses. Such documents cannot be required by a court of law which means that these documents are thereby secret to the PBCC Committee. This renders a brethren property title holding either useful or useless to the title holder depending on

their naivety in because they're dependent on the whim of the Committee. The title holder is not necessarily (as per the Act's provisions) aware of this situation. The Act, by these means, can facilitate humungous international deals done by untraceable Trusts and any companies that the Trusts might own. All this can be done with minimal fuss or interference from Government Authorities, let alone the courts. This leaves journalists and investigators stumbling, some of whom no doubt simply back off because of rumours of rumours in the community or maybe or probably there exist friends of these people in high places. Hopefully the ATO and the NSW Parliament will delve into all of these matters because otherwise they, like the continuing stench suggested in the media, will not go away.

### **Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Interference in Marriages**

Similar in nature to this, though not born of the Stewards' Foundation Act, is the fact that the PBCC Committee make best use of its divine-like care for marrying couples to "facilitate" control of the wills of all members, dare we suggest, naïve assembly members conditioned to revere the main man as an infallible, an all-powerful thing, not worth the trouble of crossing.

### **The Act is Portable Internationally**

The PBCC Assembly Organisation Committee can, by virtue of the Act, have branches anywhere in the world, administering property held "*outside NSW*". To all intents the Act is internationally portable wherever acceptance can be arranged, a business model as valuable as anything a gang could conceive. Imagine what it means to have such influence alongside the benefits of being able to fly in and out of Canberra in a great big aeroplane, probably with a minor stretch of the imagination, as invisibly as a diplomat.

### **Seals Beyond the Reach of Courts**

The Act allows the Assembly Organisation Committee a seal which, when stamped on a document relating to who at their whim benefits from a property's title, renders that document beyond the reach of the courts. This is all but unbelievable as it creates a parallel universe. Remember also, as on the Hansard records, that all this is done for remarkable brethren businesspeople, debatably the Plymouths not the Open for whom the Act was passed. All this was done without consideration of the possibility that the users of the Act were becoming a cult. The confusion in Hansard therefore means that the Act appears to be inspired by Machiavelli's book *The Prince*, which is a preamble for the power-hungry to achieve power over others (servitude in other words). It is said that this book should only be read for learning how to nullify those bent on obtaining undue power over others. For good reason, Shakespeare, the sympathetic author of *Romeo and Juliet* and a man of the around the same time, when lamenting the children of forever-warring Princes in Italy, showed that this political disease can only be cured by the Christian virtue of mercy:

"And earthly power doth then show likest God's  
When mercy seasons justice." from *The Merchant of Venice*

### **Confusion in the NSW Parliament, 1989**

Anyone who reads the Hansard record simultaneously with the Act would on such reading be alerted to implications of a debate so brazen and an Act so vile. This may defy belief but should not be left at that! Debate of the bill preceding the passing of the Act was, interestingly, a very confused affair, especially when Hon Rev Fed Nile was not sure whether the worthy people/businessmen it was said to be for were of the Open Brethren or the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church persuasion. However, when prompted in the Chamber, Fred Nile got his thoughts together after his momentary confusion and settled on the Act being exclusive to the Open Brethren. It appears that those who were involved in constructing the Act purposed it to be so tightly wound that nobody would unravel it. This is not the case except for the lazy. The Act is indeed unravellable which may not please those who currently benefit from it.

The financial powers of the PBCC are derived from the Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act 1989 which is why the "Man of God" (an appointee of the Assembly Committee since 2002) has been able to state correctly that the PBCC pay tax and abide by the laws of Australia. The unusual financial dealings of this Act, unlawful for those not availed of its provisions, in 1989 exacerbated the already controversial biblical interpretations that the PBCC are widely known to abide by, ie that they leave the ex-communicated members bereft of everything financial, personal and spiritual. The Greens under Honourable Sue Higgsinon MLC in the NSW Parliament have recognised this which is why they are striving to have the Act repealed.

### **Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Strictures**

The increased strictures that the PBCC put on members after 1989 when the Act came into effect, must be seen for what they are; they are the bulwarking of the Act. The Act is the foundation of financial success way beyond the dreams of ordinary Australian businessmen. If the Act were indeed available to ordinary businesses, Australia's taxation situation would be a shambles.

### **Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Financial Planning**

The PBCC Committee and the UBT should be caused to explain the financial planning behind the Rhapsody it plans for themselves here on earth because NSW taxpayers are sick of facilitating the parallel universe that this law creates. The Act itself enables jurisdictions outside NSW to have branches that can avail themselves of the Act meaning that three thousand companies from nineteen countries around the world including Australia would not be having their books done in NSW without there being good financial benefit in NSW legislation to those 18 countries and 3000 businesses! This is the Act in action!

### **Coercive Control**

Coercive control of PBCC members must be a considerably time-consuming business of the PBCC Assembly Committee going by reports from disgruntled ex-PBCC Brethren. Ex-members who, on becoming aware of the Act, understand the potency of the PBCC use of the Act when combined with their outlandish biblical interpretations and how completely this controls every aspect of their lives, financially, family-wise and spiritually, while they are inside the Assembly. The Greens understand that ex-members must be assisted in their personal struggles in overcoming the damage done to them and their families, such release meaning that the supposed lawful source of that damage, the Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act, must be exposed for what it is.

### **Devastation of Ex-Members**

The Act is clearly milked for enormous financial advantage by the UBT without regard to its devastating effect on members' lives. Naively the PBCC congregation dismiss this because the UBT's boss, the "Man of God", is deemed very close to God, apparently only a heartbeat away. (This might be a pun because we are all that.) The MoG must be chuffed that followers attribute him a higher purpose being and naturally he rejects this and also the otherwise acceptable definition of a Cult. On the evidence, the MoG is an extraordinarily capable accountant able to garner best-advice-possible. He assuredly knows that the Act makes no "*specific*" provision for ex-Members as pointed out by Justice and Law Reform NSW. The MoG wields discretionary power with ever-increasing abandon over members and, as acknowledged in the record of the District Court Judge Turnbull case of Colin Betsha in the Downing Centre Court, Sydney, it follows ex-members for the rest of their lives. Whether an Assembly Member was involved in the crafted trust provisions of the Act's structuring will not be known unless there is a Commission of Enquiry set up by the NSW Government. The rules of tendency and coincidence though easily reveal there being too much tendency and too much coincidence to dismiss the concept that the Act has been devised as a questionable purpose Act. Michael Bachelard's book *Behind the Exclusive Brethren* should be read for a fuller understanding of the PBCC and whether they are worthy of the charity status afforded them by the Charities Commission and therefore the Australian Taxation Office.

## **The “Riddle of the Act”**

However the PBCC “punch through” bona fide criticism of their tax and charity status and wealth creation intrigues outsiders so must therefore be demystified. There needs to be a public deciphering of the “riddle of the Act” which is the purpose of this paper. The excesses allowed by the Act can never be justified by the financial successes enabled by it. Public perception is that the PBCC are more and more an out-of-control cult masquerading as a church rather than the unassuming benign Christian church image that it projects. Unravelling all this is a worthwhile pursuit that will do no harm to Christian values. Rather it will enhance them.

## **Taxation**

If the ATO believe that the Stewards’ Foundation of Christian Brethren Act is a “normal” law for taxation purposes, their investigation will not be complete. Significant pressure beyond what is happening now will need to be put on the NSW Government. There should be communication between the ATO and the NSW Government Agencies because we are part of a common-sense community that expects the best. However nothing in these matter should be assumed.

These issues could well be glossed over by the influence of those who enjoy the benefits of there being no specific provision for ex-members of the trusts of a “supposed” Christian church a term Judge Turnbull used it in the Betsha case. Imagine a Christian church rejoicing in the power that their discretionary power wields over the financial matters of members who have spent their lives working businesses and “owning” property only to find out that the vesting they naïvely allowed can at the discretion of the “church” leave them bereft way beyond normal financial expectations that, when mixed with the radical biblical interpretations they once accepted, leaves them impoverished, having lost just about everything at the discretion of the MoG.

## **NSW Churches Legislation Policy**

The NSW Churches Legislation Policy allows that a Church for which Trust law has been created needs 60% of its congregation to vote for review of their Church Trust legislation if they want it to be reviewed as per the Policy. This is unworkable because ex-members of the politically connected Plymouth Brethren Christian Church Assembly Organisation are a fraction of the total number of Plymouth Brethren members among the total congregation including the Open Brethren. A fraction of a fraction in other words which is made exponentially worse because first the PBCC deny that they use the Act and secondly the Open Brethren deny that the Plymouth Brethren do as well so how indeed can the average PBCC member be expected to fathom any of this out. Remember that they’re in a servitude-inducing mechanism purposefully controlling to minimise their knowledge base.

## **Ex-Members Become Irrelevant to the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church**

Ex-members can’t vote for change in any case because, perversely for that purpose, they are pre-shunned and excommunicated so quickly that they and their relationship with the church becomes irrelevant to the PBCC. The PBCC hierarchy assume discretionary power to succinctly sever relationships of members forever in the hope that creates a warning to remaining members to remain in their submission to servitude. This means discretionary power is used to sever members’ relationships with family and friends. These relationships are always in question under the PBCC unless they remain in the “church” and therefore are servitude inducing. These are the emotional plaything domains of the PBCC hierarchy and the realities of PBCC conduct under the Act that the Open Brethren management, instead of pretending it has authority over who uses the Act and therefore have never allowed the Plymouth Brethren to use it, should come to the reality that they have zero control over which Assembly Organisations “styled” after their Foundation, use the Act.

## Servitude

Unless there is significant publicity, PBCC members, by virtue of their servitude-inducing limited education and social interaction, will never put together in their minds where the control over their person and their property originates from, such is the complexity of the riddle of the Act. This complexity remains, whether their property is personal or is vested, or whether their membership is voluntary (or involuntary because they were born into the PBCC situation). These are strict controls that are the very essence of servitude! Servitude is unlawful in the first instance. Under the Act, Assembly Organisation Committees have (disgracefully) lawful discretionary powers under their seal to create any document they please relating to power over property benefits regardless of title. This therefore puts the beneficiaries of a title holding beyond the reach of the law, under the Act. These conditions are heart- and life-breaking in the truest sense! That it is ludicrous and ridiculous to contemplate that this actual legislation underpins these things in 2024 in Australia, means these matters must be dealt with urgently. Clearly the Act in the hands of the PBCC, a demonstrably unworthy organisation that by supposed lawful right combined with vile biblical interpretation has institutionalised the abuse of Human Rights, creates intergenerational servitude by stealth which is illegal under the Human Rights Commission Act and the UN Conventions that Australia is party to. The PBCC therefore should, in the fullest sense, be regarded as a cult for all purposes.

## Tortious Interference in Marriages

Many ex-Brethren report that they have been coerced by their intimate partners to stay in the Church. The new NSW Coercive Control Act would be more useful to church-going people (who are not inclined to challenge their spouses in court) if the Coercive Control Act allowed that any external antagonist, whether they be a cult or church leader with too much influence over one person in the intimate relationship, could be included in any action by the other, based on abuse of their Human Rights **effected by tortious interference**. The PBCC Committee including its branches, should be challenged on the **using of one spouse against the other** in a marriage. Marriage is supposedly held sacred in the church. However, in the PBCC rulings are imposed whereby the spouse that the Man of God (the power wielder) influences, becomes his proxy against the other spouse for nefarious purpose.

Where a cult's avarice is so deeply entrenched that it stoops to what is called "**tortious interference**" in a marriage contract, the "**broken heart rule**" should come back into legal acceptance. The broken heart rule means that an individual outside the marriage, a person who causes a marriage contract to end in divorce or even just estrangement, should be capable of being sued ie held accountable for influencing one spouse to **coercively control** the other for the purpose of cult dogma protection, getting rid of an irritant "opposer", interfering with the wellbeing of children and their parents and gaining more power, even total power, over PBCC married couples' businesses which extends tortious control into the **civil court action** arena.

Anyone in that invidious situation should check the following:

- Were you known to the person outside your marriage to be in a marriage contract?
- Do you believe that this person intentionally influenced your spouse to act in a way that alienated affection between you and your spouse though they were not in an adulterous relationship?
- Given your observance of the vows of your marriage between you and your spouse contract prior to the said third party influencer's influencing, do you regard the influence that this person had over your spouse to be in any way justifiable?

- Was the affectionate bond you had with your spouse up until your spouse was influenced by the person outside your marriage, **the tortious interferer**, the foundation of your own well-being, your family's wellbeing and the business you ran with your spouse and/or family members?
- Are you of a mind that the conduct of the person having influence over your spouse was both morally/spiritually wrong and/or unlawful?
- Do you believe that the person who influenced your spouse against you had motives which did not take your wellbeing of any nature into account, possibly for their or your spouse's financial advantage over yours?

If this is the case you can probably sue the person who wrongly influenced your spouse because in Australia, although no-fault divorce ended "alienation of affection" as a cause for divorce by an adulterous situation, this does not apply where the third party had other reasons also to cause the breakdown of your marriage, the relationship between you and your children or a business partnership between spouses.

### **Multiple Facet Tortious Interference in Lance's Marriage**

Multiple facet tortious interference by a third party is aimed at causing one spouse to coercively control the other for multiple purposes.

In the case of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church, "multi-tiered tortious interference" is a thing done not just to cause alienation of affection between a husband and wife by shunning, excommunication and other contrivances but is purposefully structured to commandeer, in most occasions, the male spouse's family and business as well. On most occasions the PBCC hierarchy targets the preferred female spouse for tortious-interference-causing-coercive-control, because mostly it is the woman, ie the mother of the spouses' children, who instinctively chooses the security of the "church" over an errant "opposer" husband.

In Lance Christie's case he had a family business with his wife like many others in the PBCC and the tortious interference visited on his marriage had that additional sting which was to gain control of the family business which suited the "church", in addition to the "luxury" of simultaneously getting rid of Lance the "opposer", himself. This luxury is courtesy of the NSW Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act which exacerbates the already abhorrent fear of shunning and excommunication by adding a financial aspect. The Honourable Sue Higginson MLC, member of the NSW Parliament, is working towards having the Act reviewed, repealed or replaced in accord with the new NSW Church Legislation Policy.

There are in practice multiple stings to multiple purpose tortious interference. At its most abhorrent, multiple purpose tortious interference is reliant on someone like a cult leader first making themselves ever-present in a marriage through vows that they, the leader themselves, encourage. By this ingratiating means, cult leaders of a certain calibre can gain coercive control where no control should exist. Such calibre of leaders believe that they have the right thereafter at will to interfere and cause alienation of affection between spouses for nefarious purpose.

It was multi purposed tortious interference that the Assembly Organisation PBCC Committee imposed on Lance. They at first caused a divorce and then alienated his children according to their outlandish interpretation of scripture. Then they began their coercive control by tortious interference aimed at his spouse-shared business, courtesy of the Stewards' Foundation Act. Then they simultaneously by these means dismissed the concept of Lance's self-esteem by the aforesaid shunning. Excommunication was the final move to pave the way for the commandeering of the largest portion of his assets. This was all accomplished as per the Act having no "**explicit provision**" for "ex-members", a community within which Lance unhappily became a member. Remember that

all of these consequences are the consequences of there being no lawful requirement for provision for Lance because any provision is at the PBCC Committee's discretion as per the Stewards' Foundation Act.

By these means Lance was left bereft of family and friends. Lance lost control of his business and demonstrable love of his family to the Assembly Organisation Committee. This, Lance says, makes it appear that all this suited his wife and family who chose the comforts and security of the well-heeled church ahead of him. All of this was because the tortious interference of the interferers in Lance's family who chose to embrace these interfering churchmen over and above Lance, the husband and father. They chose to cut loose the man who only wanted the best for his children but because he had questioned the tortious interferer's undue influence, they abandoned him entirely. In fact, they have sued him to protect the interferer known as the Man of God and in hindsight, as is now strongly debated in the NSW Parliament, the NSW Stewards' Foundation Act is seen more strongly to be a business plan for nefarious purposes rather than a proper church Act. All of the ordinary life pleasures, family and business which is the normal prerogative of a man in a democratic society have been taken over by the all-powerful PBCC committee and their appointed MoG which the Act enables. All of this, even in the eyes of the PBCC hierarchy, is a foreign Act so is an insult to UK law, considering it introduces to UK law the concept that a man can be lawfully deemed as not having a soul worth saving, so legitimising a situation whereby coercive control can be actioned.

A 'multipurpose tortious interference business model' thrives because of the Act and is more than the sum of its wicked components. It is an exponentially worse and more deceitfully vile instrument than its parts. Where such a mechanism is used by a supposed Christian Church, namely the PBCC's Assembly Organisation Committee, its appointed MoG and his enamoured followers, that constitutes reprehensible behaviour. An end must come to such behaviour before it spreads because it harms the very tenets of Christianity and therefore democratic values within a western rule-based culture.

Tortious interference of the type described appears to be an untested concept but the concept is hopefully open to be taken up in a court of law for best effect while the interference is ongoing, ie before it has achieved the Committee's desired outcome.

### **Infantile Behaviour**

When we "**grow up**", we are well advised to reason as an adult and put the childish version of life away. Bullying, a childish behaviour, only exists in a culture where it is allowed or encouraged by those who "**rule the roost**". It is such demeaning and shameful behaviour for all involved that even the perpetrators live hiding from "worldly" scrutiny, forever studying how to show themselves "**unshunnable**" to the cult leader. They to live in constant awareness of the dreaded consequences of falling out with the MoG or his appointed hierarchy.

It is weak and childish leadership indeed that resorts to influencing others to do the base dirty work that shunning involves in order for the leader to maintain power. Only long-term intergenerational servitude conditioning can induce others to act in such manner. Many get trapped in cults from birth so the tools of servitude used by the PBCC need to be cancelled. Repealing and/or replacing of the NSW Stewards' Foundation Act is a necessary start of this process.

### **Suicides**

Shunning is vile enough as a tool of insidious control let alone when used as an instrument to destroy and despoil a person's whole life to the extent that the PBCC pursue a person relentlessly as was observed by Judge Turnbull in the District Court of Sydney NSW at the recent Colin Betsha hearing. At times such torment culminates in ex-members contemplating suicide – the only coping option. By any measure these activities are the antithesis of Christ-like love. Luckily for Lance

Christie, he has become immune to the let-us-hope proverbial “*rat poison*” that the PBCC hierarchy want him to ingest daily while the MoG slogs on with his controlling rhetoric over the PBCC congregation.

### **Trust By-Laws**

At 24 of the Stewards’ Foundation of Christian Brethren Act, the Committee of the PBCC can make by-laws consistent with the abnormal Trusts’ provisions for business dealings.

The chapels are held under normal NSW Trust law.

At 9 the Committee must keep accurate minutes of every meeting held. However, the by-laws are available only to the PBCC Committee who passed them. This means that the by-laws deal with vested property whereas the beneficiaries of the title holding remain hidden.

At 19 of the Act they are in any case exonerated from all inquiry as to how they deal with property so only a NSW Parliamentary Enquiry or Commission of Enquiry will get to the bottom of these matters. This was probably the intention of those who drafted the Act.

### **Man of God’s Control over Property**

Though the MoG is not a Committee member or chairman of the Act, under 21 he also, as per 17 of the Act, is indemnified meaning that they may take money at will from the Trusts for any “*exercise of the function*” including whilst performing the open wide facility or manner of variation of trusts at 19, all secret to the Committee including at 19(4) disposing of the property in trust and “*otherwise*” to deal with it for the purposes of the Assembly. This is a terrible situation which a member who has just been excommunicated from of the Assembly has to deal with.

The Act is a tight wound “golf ball” type riddle, the glue of it being at 17- **Evidence under the seal.**

### **Cruelty of Cults**

In a cult like the PBCC, the threat of being “*withdrawn from*” is an ever-present servitude inducing cruelty, the likes of which is beyond an ordinary person’s imagination. The current reality is that there is a NSW Act that fosters it. The Act must be reviewed, replaced or repealed and the Greens for whom Human Rights protection is foremost, must be supported in this proper important undertaking.

### **Background Information**

**Avarice:** ‘Avarice is the root of all evils’ (1 Tim. 6 v 10). It makes the getting and keeping of money, possessions and the like, a purpose in itself to live for. Avarice refers to an insatiable desire to gain and hoard wealth. It’s similar to greed but goes even further, encompassing such things as selfishness, entitlement, materialism, consumerism and hoarding. Avarice is often looked upon as a sin, and it is mostly considered despicable and evil and should be considered even more so when it is woven into the fabric of a “Christian” church.

**The “broken heart” rule.** If your spouse cheated on you and it ends in divorce you can thrash it out in the courts. However, if the marriage breakdown is caused by a third-party person tortious interfeerer who had designs on the business you ran with your spouse, conspired with your business partner spouse and, as per the procedure, gained control or greater control of that business, this is a different matter altogether which is not simply a matter for the family courts but for the civil court system as well.

## **Conclusion**

The Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act without question needs repealing immediately to prevent continuation of all of these dreadful things as has been conveyed to the NSW Attorney General Michael Daley in December 2023 by the Right Honourable Sue Higginson MP MLC.

## **Index**

Australian Tax Office (ATO), 3-8  
Bachelard, Michael, 7  
Betsha, Colin, 7-8, 11  
Charities Commission, 4, 7  
Christie, Lance J, 10-11  
Coercive Control Act, NSW, 9  
Daley, Michael, 13  
Department of Communities and Justice, NSW, 3-4, 7  
Excommunication, 4, 8, 10, 12  
Ex-Members, provision for, 4, 7-8, 10-11  
Higginson, Sue, MLC, 10, 13  
Human Rights, 9, 12  
"Man of God", 7-9, 11-12  
Marriage, interference in, 6, 9-10, 12  
Nile, Fred, 3, 6  
Open Brethren, 3-6, 8  
Privacy laws, 4  
Separation, 5  
Shunning 4, 8, 10-11  
Tortious interference, 9-12  
Trust law, 3-6, 8, 10  
Turnbull, Judge, 7-8, 11