

Has the 2020 bubble burst already? What was it all about anyway?

It would be easy to be cynical about what could be achieved by 1,000 'selected' people at a weekend talk fest, especially when the selection process was also clearly so political. Was I invited? No. Did I apply? No. Why? Because I accepted from the first day it was announced that I did not have a chance of being 'invited' or 'selected' even if I wanted to go - and I did not want to go!

It seems to have taken only a few days for the euphoria to wear off and the disgruntled voices to start harping at the PM and certain facilitators of various 2020 groups who appear to have had their own agendas.

That of course was never in question about this 2020 Summit – it was always going to be agenda driven and the main agenda driver, however much he tried to suggest otherwise, was Mr Rudd. There were, of course a myriad of other social liberals with their own self interests also willingly climbing on board.

It was stated that it would not include the usual 'activists' but ordinary Australians, yet we all knew who would indeed be lining up. It was therefore no surprise to see that the final list included a representative of the 'Scarlet Alliance', which represents thousands of Australian 'sex workers' (prostitutes and the like) and about 120 people associated with the left-wing Labor activated group Get Up, including its Executive Director.

Having stated, "No activists", even some of the facilitators were clearly activists. In fact the 'Families group' was co chaired by one of the country's biggest social activists, Tim Costello, who was duly watched over by pro homosexual social engineer/activist/MP Tanya Plibersek.

What's more, as Bill Muehlenberg said in his Culture Watch paper "Of the 80-plus people taking part in the 'Families' group, there is not one clear representative from the pro-family movement. Instead we have all the usual suspects: bureaucrats, feminists and special interest group lobbyists. Thus we have arch feminist and former Labor MP Joan Kirner, and Kathleen Swinbourne, head of the Sole Parent's Union lobby group, and spokesperson for the Women's Electoral Lobby. But not one of the many pro-family experts is included."

Another obvious activist was Dr. Wendell Rosevear who, in 1991 founded GLADS: Gay and Lesbian Alcohol and Drugs Support Group. He is an advocate for 'social inclusion' - presumably not just of homosexuals but drug addicts too, as he promotes "the legalisation of ALL drugs". According to him this will mean people can "experiment and learn, not experiment and die from overdoses".

Perhaps he forgot that if they don't take drugs they will not overdose. But, silly me, telling people that homosexuality is unnatural or that taking illegal drugs is wrong is not 'social inclusion' is it?

Should we be surprised, then that one of the Families group conclusions was, "Making social inclusion a national priority" and they, among others, also recommended a 'Charter of Rights'. With national advocate/activist for a 'Bill of Rights', George Williams, at the Summit, we might have expected that.

The initial Summit report states, "The plan to increase social inclusion and combat poverty should be developed in consultation with the community. **It should include evidence-based goals and measurable targets.**" Excuse me, what was that? Evidence-based? Since when have social liberals or left leaning governments done anything based on 'evidence' rather than philosophy? Sorry, I digress.

Other well-known activist names soon popped up, like David Marr (homosexual advocate/Journalist), Shelley Argent, of PFLAG who is an activist for homosexual 'causes', Prof Robert Manne and Philip Adams (two well-known lefties), and former Labor Premier of Victoria Steve Bracks. There was at least a cross section of activists in the Indigenous Australia section, because both Pat Dodson and Noel Pearson were there.

But were there any ordinary Australians? Possibly, but one would imagine a person had to have an axe to grind to even want to be there, so were they really all activists? It just seems to me, who would be

described as biased, that many of them came from a fairly narrow selection 'mould' – 'progressive' would probably sum it up and we know what new meaning (genre) that word has taken on in recent years.

Nobody was surprised to see the republic banner waved high but for Mr Rudd to claim it as one of the major 'ideas' of the summit is a joke. Even Kerry O'Brien, (ABC 7.30 Report, Monday night), hardly a right wing Monarchist, was very sceptical about this being a 'summit' decision; he suggested that, "The republic is hardly a new big idea. It's already Labor policy," and later stated, "I don't know how much of your selected thousand guests were actually monarchists, obviously not many of them."

That had to be the understatement of the Summit when it has been reported that in the Australian Governance stream, where the republic was discussed, only one person put their hand up to say they supported the Monarchy - and that was before the discussion even started!

Considering the referendum on the republic was soundly defeated less than a decade ago, it is hard to believe that a group of people with 99% support for a republic is representative of Australia-wide opinion on this issue.

But Mr Rudd was not going to be daunted by that fact because he stated, "What I found impressive about the sentiment of the Australia 2020 summit was people's desire overwhelmingly, I thought, for us to move to a republic and to become a republic."

Interestingly, when Kerrie O'Brien raised the issue of the National Anthem, Mr Rudd rejected any discussion of it by stating, "Look, the question of the Australian national anthem was settled quite a long time ago."

Yes it was, Mr Rudd, but so was the issue of a republic and yet that 'fact' does not stop you pushing that issue again. One can only ask, "Is this about what is best for the Nation, or has it more to do with Labor Party policy and/or the PM's own personal agenda?"

There is much more yet to be heard about the results of this exercise and some of it has already started to leak out from disgruntled 'Summiteers'.

On April 23 just 3 days after the Summit The Australian reported,

"Delegates to the productivity, indigenous, rural and community services sessions at the summit have told The Australian they felt railroaded into signing off on the agenda of those chairing and facilitating their streams.

They say the division of the streams into sub-groups was arbitrary and confusing, with the loudest voices often prevailing and too little time for discussion.

Even the Prime Minister's headline idea for the summit, announced last week - one-stop centres to support children's health, education and care - was never discussed, but simply appeared in the outcomes document released by Mr Rudd on Sunday afternoon."

(See attached for full report)

While celebrity issues like climate change and the republic seemed high on the agenda, more important ones for ordinary Australians, like Child abuse, apparently missed out. Father Chris Riley, from the community organisation 'Youth Off the Streets' is quoted in The Australian as saying, "he could not even get child abuse, included on any of the sheets of butchers' paper the facilitator used to list ideas". Child abuse expert Freda Briggs, from the University of South Australia, apparently agreed..."

So what do we have – a pre programmed talk fest largely made up of social progressive republicans giving the government a mandate to do what it was always going to do – only now they can blame others when it inevitably fails to deliver any real progress.

The proof of the pudding will be in the eating but it seems to me that many of us will be 'force fed' what we already know is poison.

Unless what we do is based on good sound 'evidence, the social engineering will continue. The playground of the social philosophers is always to manipulate people into thinking they themselves came up with the idea in the first place. This seems to have been the aim of the 2020 summit and, unless enough disgruntled voices are raised, it will achieve its goal.

Australia will, according to Mr Rudd, become a republic – apparently regardless of whether the people want it or not. He said so on the 7.30 Report when he said, “But the key thing is this the Australia of the 21st century **will a republic**”.

There was clearly no doubt in his mind, but excuse me Mr Rudd, the PEOPLE have to decide and that decision SHOULD be made based on the evidence. Evidence that shows us exactly why we will be better off as a republic than we are now. The problem is, it is hard to find such evidence.

The only ‘reason’ advancing this debate is that we “need an Australian head of state”. The fact that that will make no difference at all to ordinary Australians seems to go straight over the heads of the protagonists.

The disadvantages – the loss of the true independence of the Monarchy as an executive level of last resort, that we will inevitably lose the fact that we should be governed under the ‘guidance of Almighty God’ and the fact that we could end up like the US of A with the biggest bank balance deciding who wins the election for President, are just three overwhelming reasons to question the legitimacy of this, the major decision, coming from the 1,000, mostly unelected 2020 Summiteers.

In conclusion

A good Yahoo Pulse article suggested that,

“Some of the big ideas included fast-tracking an overhaul of Federation, a complete review of state and federal taxes, a national health preventative agency funded by a new tax on alcohol, cigarettes and junk food, carbon neutral new buildings by 2020, compulsory exercise for sedentary workers, artists linked to schools through mentoring programs as well as a revamped HECS scheme allowing students to pay off university debts with community service.”

And it concluded,

“The Summit delegates basked in the afterglow of the Rudd love-in though there were certainly detractors. Rudd ended the Summit with a pledge to fix the nation though many were left asking if anything will really be done or whether it was simply interesting rhetoric. History and Pulse will no doubt tell the tale.”

Like Pulse, we ask, “Was it all worth it, what will be the outcome?” Our conclusion – we will have to wait and see.

The big danger is that this Summit has given social acceptance to a lot of questionable ideas that were clearly already on the Labor Party/government agenda, but that now carry ‘the people’s’ stamp of approval.

Links

7.30 Report <http://www.abc.net.au/7.30/content/2007/s2223341.htm>

The Australian <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23584546-2702,00.html>

Yahoo <http://au.blogs.yahoo.com/pulse/294/2020-summitmore-than-a-gabfest>