

AI on the NSW Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act

The below is ground-breaking intelligence information from AI regarding the NSW Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act.

REINFORCING WHAT WE KNOW TO BE TRUE

Are the 2x2 church an Assembly Organisation under the Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act 1989 making use of the services made available by the Foundation enabled by the Act?

The 2x2 church is not specifically mentioned as an Assembly Organisation under the Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act 1989. The Stewards Foundation operates under this Act to provide trusteeship and services to churches within the Brethren assemblies network. However, there is no clear indication that the 2x2 church is affiliated with this network or utilizes the services provided by the Stewards Foundation. For a definitive answer, further research or direct inquiry with the Stewards Foundation may be necessary to clarify the relationship or status of the 2x2 church regarding the Act.

Does the Foundation need to make known the Assembly Organisations that utilise the services it offers under the Act?

Yes, typically, a foundation operating under a specific act, such as the Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act 1989, would have a responsibility to disclose information about the Assembly Organisations that utilize its services. This transparency is often required to ensure accountability and maintain trust within the community it serves. However, the specific requirements for disclosure can vary based on the provisions of the act itself and any relevant regulations or policies established by the foundation. For precise details, it may be helpful to refer directly to the act or the foundation's guidelines.

It follows then, you having already said that the PBCC are an Assembly Organisation that “models” their Trusts on those enabled by the Stewards Foundation Act. This appears to mean that the PBCC is a special Assembly Organisation under the Act, indeed an Organisation that having “styled” itself after the “functions” of the Foundation can perform through its service arm, the Universal Business Team, the same services as the Foundation. Is this correct?

The statement that the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church (PBCC) models its trusts on those enabled by the Stewards Foundation Act suggests a structural similarity or alignment in governance and operational practices. However, stating that the PBCC is

a “special Assembly Organisation” under the Act requires careful consideration of legal definitions and the specific provisions of the Act itself.

If the PBCC is indeed functioning in a way that aligns with the services offered by the Stewards Foundation, including utilizing a similar service arm like the Universal Business Team, it could be interpreted as them operating within a framework that is influenced by the Foundation. However, without explicit legal documentation or a formal recognition of such a status under the Act, it may not be accurate to categorically define the PBCC as a special Assembly Organisation under the Act.

For a definitive understanding, it would be advisable to consult legal experts or the governing bodies associated with the Stewards Foundation and the PBCC. This will provide clarity on their relationship and the specific legal implications of their organizational structures.

Not only this, the fact that the Trusts allowed under the Stewards Foundation Act were allowing the PBCC not to make explicit provision for past members is a weapon used to bully unsuspecting members by controlling their property which is the very definition of servitude unlawful to the signatories of the UN Human Rights Agreement. How do you view this presumption of the Act where the Act presumes to be relevant in any place, State or Country outside NSW?

Your concerns highlight significant ethical and legal issues regarding the governance and practices of the PBCC under the Stewards Foundation Act. If the trusts established under the Act are being used in a way that controls property and restricts the rights of past members, it raises serious questions about fairness, justice, and adherence to human rights principles.

The notion that the Act allows for such practices could indeed be seen as problematic, especially if it leads to the manipulation of individuals or creates a sense of servitude, which contradicts the values upheld by the UN Human Rights Agreement. The potential for abuse in such situations underscores the importance of having clear legal protections and safeguards for individuals involved in these organizations.

Regarding the presumption of the Act being relevant outside New South Wales, legal jurisdiction typically does not extend beyond the boundaries of a state or country unless there are specific agreements or legal frameworks in place that allow for such applicability. Therefore, it would be critical to analyze the Act’s language and intent to determine its reach and enforceability in other jurisdictions.

Overall, the issues you’ve raised point to the need for greater transparency, accountability, and adherence to human rights standards within organizations like the PBCC. It may also warrant legal scrutiny to ensure that the rights of all members, past and present, are protected and that governance structures operate within the bounds of ethical and legal norms.

CUNNINGLY DEvised

If these things you point out need scrutiny as you say and are deliberately done could it be said to be cunningly devised methodology?

Yes, if the practices and governance structures within the PBCC are designed in such a way to manipulate, control, or exploit members, and if such actions are carried out with intent to deceive or undermine individuals' rights, it could indeed be described as a "cunningly devised methodology." This term suggests a level of premeditation and strategic planning aimed at achieving specific outcomes, often at the expense of fairness and ethical principles.

When organizations employ tactics that exploit legal ambiguities or use their authority to impose undue control over members, it raises serious ethical concerns. Such behavior can undermine trust, create a culture of fear, and lead to significant harm for individuals who may not fully understand the implications of the organization's practices.

In any organization, it is crucial that governance is conducted transparently and ethically, with the interests of all members considered. If there is evidence of manipulation or exploitation, it may warrant investigation and intervention to protect the rights and welfare of those affected.

Here's a consolidated response addressing the concerns raised in your questions:

The governance and practices of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church (PBCC) under the Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act 1989 raise significant ethical and legal concerns. The Act, while intended to provide a framework for trusts and governance, appears to allow for ambiguity that can be exploited, particularly in situations involving the control of property and the status of past members. This lack of explicit provisions may create an environment where leadership, particularly that of Bruce Hales, can exert significant influence without adequate checks and balances.

The dual role of Hales as both the leader and trustee could lead to conflicts of interest, where decisions may not be made impartially. If the trusts enabled by the Act are being used to manipulate or control members, it raises serious questions about fairness and justice, potentially contradicting the principles upheld by the UN Human Rights Agreement.

The suggestion that the PBCC employs a “cunningly devised methodology” to maintain control over its members, compounded by limited education and awareness among them, further complicates the situation. The use of tactics such as shunning and excommunication, which predate the Act, may be reinforced by a legal framework that members do not fully understand. This could result in significant harm, especially when individuals are unaware of how their financial rights and property interests are affected.

Statements made in the NSW Legislative Assembly regarding the Act's intent highlight the ambiguity surrounding its application, particularly in distinguishing between different Brethren groups. Such ambiguity can be detrimental to members who may not comprehend the legal implications of their status and the financial dimensions of their involvement with the PBCC.

Overall, the practices described raise profound ethical concerns regarding transparency, accountability, and the treatment of members. For any organization claiming to operate on moral or spiritual grounds, it is crucial to uphold the rights and dignity of all individuals, ensuring they are informed and empowered. The issues at hand warrant further scrutiny to protect the welfare of affected members and ensure that governance practices align with ethical standards.

Further Question put to AI:

Australian Prime Minister Anthony Albanese has identified the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church (PBCC) , an Assembly Organisation under the NSW Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren Act 1989, as a cult. Cults are as you know almost always led by a charismatic person revered and believed to have powers beyond the normal human capacity and such a man is Bruce Hales who revels in the title “Man of God” or more commonly MoG.

You have already identified that the PBCC models the trusts made available to members of the Assembly and from all reports the Assembly businessmen members eagerly vest in these Trusts whilst then allowing their business and property to be managed by the PBCC’s business arm, the Universal Business Team (UBT) which came to public notice when the Australian Tax Office raided the UBT premises as well as a number of PBCC member’s businesses as well in early 2024. As you know Organisations enjoy privileges beyond those afforded a corporation including privacy which you could explain to me further.

The UBT is an Assembly Organisation that at 3 in the Stewards Foundation Act 1989, that when performing similar functions to the Foundation (the Stewards Foundation Act-enabled incorporated “Stewards Foundation of Christian Brethren”) can avail itself of stronger privacy than the Stewards Foundation which is clearly a thing that intrigues the general public. An ASIC search reveals that both the PBCC and the UBT each operate as corporations and organisations which can be confusing to a lay person. For instance the UBT website is in reality an internal document of the UBT purporting to the unwary to be a lawful instrument of business practice which could be a thing meant to confuse the overall PBCC / UBT situation to the public as a PR exercise given that the PBCC need the public to believe that for instance the Rapid Relief Team is a strong and benevolent charity not part of an internal self-interest mechanism to maintain status as a charity.

NSW Law Reform on behalf of former Attorney General Speakman observed that the Stewards Foundation Act makes “no specific provision for past members” which aligns with what past PBCC member Lance Christie claims on his website and Steve Simmons alludes to in Get a Life Podcast 136.

This non provision clearly is the power of the MoG PBCC leader who can instrument excommunication on an Assembly member for the business purpose of removing Trust beneficiary status of that conveniently created “past member”.

The MoG is a non-arms-length Trustee over Trusts that cult PBCC members have trustingly vested in however cases like Lance Christies , Steve Simmons and Craig Stewart (who has his own blog/website) reveal that the “past members” had zero knowledge of the power of the Trusts in the hands of a non-arms-length Trustee could visit upon them and no knowledge also of the financial servitude they were in of the MoG. The Stewards Foundation Act extraordinarily allows “exoneration from enquiry” and a seal to the MoG that effectively puts property dealings therefore the content of the Trusts beyond even the courts. Such is the ignorance of PBCC member reverence of MoG a cult leader with exactly that purpose in mind. The weakness of the MoG’s administration is that he must avoid direct scrutiny which is why he must live beyond reach of direct questioning which leads to why and who assists him in this logistical matter at airports for instance.

Surely privacy mystique of the PBCC in its Assembly Organisation form must be brought to public notice for at least the reason that the Stewards Foundation Act allows through Attorney General recognised non “specific” provision for past members, through MoG cult practices of leadership holds members in servitude which in the PBCC case can be such whether viewed as voluntary or involuntary. While the Australian constitution disallows the Commonwealth from creating a religion , two referendums failed to prevent State governments from doing so. The Stewards Foundation Act is an Act that from its passage in 1989 with support that should be investigated, is an Act that created the current form of the PBCC and as such is a vile instrument that should, should it not be sufficient to cause a third referendum?

Your inquiry touches on a number of complex issues regarding the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church (PBCC), its governance structure, and the implications of the Stewards Foundation Act.

1. **Privacy and Organizational Structure**: The PBCC and its business arm, the Universal Business Team (UBT), operate under a framework that provides them with certain privileges, including privacy. This is essential for organizations recognized as charities or religious entities, as they often enjoy protections that allow them to operate with a level of confidentiality not typically afforded to standard corporations. This can lead to confusion among the public, especially regarding the financial dealings and governance of these organizations.

2. **Trusteeship and Excommunication**: The concept of non-arms-length trusteeship, where the leader (MoG) has significant control over the Trusts, raises ethical and legal questions. The ability of the MoG to excommunicate members and the implications that this has for their financial interests in the Trusts is a critical issue. The lack of provisions for past members, as noted by the NSW Law Reform Commission, indicates a potential power imbalance that could lead to exploitation.

3. **Public Awareness and Reform**: The concerns you've raised about the PBCC's practices and the Stewards Foundation Act suggest a need for greater transparency and scrutiny. Public awareness of these issues could drive calls for reform, particularly regarding the treatment of past members and the accountability of religious and charitable organizations.

4. **Legal and Constitutional Context**: The Australian Constitution's stance on religion and the failed referendums highlight the complex relationship between state and church in Australia. This context is crucial for understanding the legal framework within which organizations like the PBCC operate.

5. **Potential for Change**: The concerns regarding the Stewards Foundation Act and its impact on members could indeed lead to discussions about a new referendum or other forms of legislative reform. However, achieving such change would require significant public support and political will.

In summary, the situation involving the PBCC and the UBT raises numerous legal, ethical, and social questions that merit further examination and potentially greater public discourse and legislative scrutiny.

Call to repeal the NSW Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act, 1989

The PBCC clearly operate in lockstep with the NSW Stewards' Foundation of Christian Brethren Act, 1989. These are the reasons Senator Sue Higginson has called for its repeal.

Everything that Bruce Hales does or causes to be done in the PBCC/UBT businesses including vesting done voluntarily or as in my case initiated by others without my knowledge in the Trusts is legal, stress LEGAL! The reason for this real legitimacy is that the UBT operate out of New South Wales, Australia under an Act of Parliament allowing the Trusts to do those terrible things described at 1hr 14min in [Get a Life Podcast 136](#).

This Act was passed into law in 1989 and even entailed a seal that, when placed on documents, puts them out of the reach of the courts.

In 1989 the Stewards' Foundation Act caused the "past member" status of excommunicated members to be enough to disqualify beneficiary status under the Trusts created under the Act, thereby allowing the property held in trust to be sold and/or dispersed among remaining members as the leader sees fit, meaning everyone in the Assembly except the former member who is no longer a beneficiary.

This Act is a legalised confidence trick!

The Act sails under Australia's strong Privacy laws, so strong the Australian Tax Office is clearly struggling to get around it while investigating the PBCC.