It has come to my attention that Glenn Bowley is behaving like a chook trying to play chess again, so I thought I'd give myself a chance to reply publicly, despite the fact he, in comparison, rather cowardly hides his allegations from me.

There are many similar comments from him, but for example:

"I beat Rob Sudy using his own "legal" speak. He is easy enough to beat. And for the record, he conceded I was correct and all he could spout was "ratio decidendi" and "stare decisis" from the administrative entity trading in insolvency, then blocked me (and probably erased his post too, lol)..."

Jeez, I'm glad he spelled them correctly. Yes, "ratio decidendi" and "stare decisis", two most basic principles of the rule of law, that completely overrule his argument. He ought to have also added "orbiter" and "non-orbiter" as I also cited to him from Pomerleau v Canada (Revenue Agency), 2017 ABQB 123 (CanLII).

---

1 https://www.facebook.com/glenn.bowley
2https://www.facebook.com/VotenoToConstitutionalChange/photos/a.732629480140865.1073741826.350355421701608/1626237697446701/?type=3
The Justice explained: "I think it would be helpful to offer him an explanation of “obiter” or “obiter dicta”, and what that term actually means. Obiter are statements of law, principle or conclusions, that do not directly relate to the outcome of a court decision. For example, a judge might write a decision that says because of facts A I conclude B, and therefore do C, but if I the facts had been X, I would have concluded Y, and then I would have done Z. The X, Y and Z analysis is obiter. The court did not use that part of the decision to reach its actual conclusion. An obiter component of a judgment is not binding on other courts. It is, however, potentially influential.

Next I should clarify stare decisis. This principle dictates when a court has the discretion to address an issue, point of law, or a fact. Any legal system which has a judicial appeals process inherently creates a pecking order for the judiciary regarding where judicial decisions stand on the legal ladder. I am bound by decisions of Queen’s Bench judges, by decisions of the Alberta Court of Appeal and by decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada. Very simply, Masters in Chambers of a superior trial court occupy the bottom rung of the superior courts judicial ladder. I do not overrule decisions of a judge of this court. I cannot ignore any non-obiter findings and principles of law in that decision. Those have binding authority on the Masters of the Court of Queen’s Bench of Alberta.

He went on to emphasise: "If Gauthier thinks he can wave away Meads v Meads by a simple declaration that decision is just one judge’s opinion or because it is obiter, then he is wrong. What was one opinion is now a judicial chorus. Not one court has sung a dissenting note. Anyone who makes claims like the “Strawman” clause and then says Meads v Meads does not apply to them is going to face a very, very steep uphill battle in our Courts."

Glenn Bowley effectively just 'beat' himself simply by saying those two words. In short, his own obligations to denial of precedent does not alleviate a court's own obligation to uphold precedent.

I did concede that if one ignores the interpretations of the High Court, his contentions would be workable, but as I also pointed out, this is denial. Glenn Bowley thinks as long as he can maintain denial of his own denial, she'll be right mate chuckle haha lol.
Glenn Bowley blocked me, not the other way around. On multiple profiles actually. The real reason is rather obvious when you read what he wrote just afterwards:

**Glenn Bowley:** “Rob Sudy Works for the DPP. I know this because I had him threaten to sue me for naming a prosecutor in a case in Tasmania. Then earlier this week he took stills creating memes from one of my videos "the sale" where I blitz 2 cops and a council ranger over a council works zone out the front of my house. In that video there is a female Blonde Cop called Cst Poorly. Guess who slipped a Court Attendance Notice under my door yesterday for a made up charge stemming from Nov 2015? Little miss Poorly.”

So Glenn Bowley simply got paranoid and blocked me. I replied to his comments:

"It's easy to block me and then claim you won the argument, strutting around like a chook shitting on a chess board. You have provided absolutely no evidence to back your assertions in the last exchange but the strength of your own belief. Like most OPCA adherents, you ask questions the courts have already authoritatively answered, and then you pretend the answers don't exist when I cite them. Your whole argument therefore, is with these binding higher court decisions, NOT ME. You block ME simply because I cite the authorities the higher courts cite. The issue is, you can't accept the reality that they even exist, which is very delusional. You are fighting reality, and you think blocking me will help you. I can't help you with your denialism, or the painful cognitive dissonance you feel when I speak the truth, all I can do is cite the valid authorities, just as the courts are obliged to, regardless of how internally inconsistent reality is to the bubble you live in."
He is not alone really, this ridiculous paranoia pervades the whole movement.

The OPCA sphere is so conspiratorial, and the occupants so paranoid, that THERE IS SEVERAL ACTIVE CONSPIRACY THEORIES ABOUT ME. I've lost count of all the death threats I've had for "treason" and "slavery". Apparently they convened a "common law court" in Queensland to issue a warrant for my arrest for these "offences". No doubt, the "jury" consisted of OPCA cult members who couldn't raise a single argument to me, that I couldn't show had been authoritatively overruled in the courts. So they play pretend courts. Seriously?

Glenn's mates:

Deno Budimir: “One runs an anti freeman FB page, the other a paralegal FB page. Who are they really? Are they working for government? They've certainly got an agenda to confuse the people of their right to freedom.”

Jayden O'Connor: “They're police. Sudy pseudonym lol. The stuff they were coming out with is dpp material against the arguments and facts they're trying so desperately to stop getting out into the mainstream."

Martin St. John: “I've come across both of these maggotstrate's hand puppets before. Anybody who reads Sudy's comments, can tell he is either a shill, or an extremely indoctrinated Statist. He also gives info to the corrupt to the core QLD CCC.... Crime and Corruption Commission."

Romley Stover: "I have nothing to do with Rob Sudy... He has sworn an oath to the BAR... He is probably paid by the BAR to debunk the truth .."  

Darren Lee: “Rob "sudy" is a POLICE informant/nark. He also likes to forewarn maggotstrates of tactics discussed for forthcoming court cases so the maggotstrates are prepared for their arguments. He is a total piece of dogshit who needs a lead injection. Absolute fuckwit and devoted to the system."

Frankie Vazquez: "You're a dead cunt walking, I'm coming to your house and am going to kill your whole family. Publish everything, when you get knocked the fuck out from behind think of me, dead cunt x 1000, not long now."

Adam Thomas: "Understand this, I intend to inflict massive amounts of pain on you and make you cry. I'm coming for you, you will recieve several stitches from me I promise. You are now a wanted piece of shit that I intend on hurting and causing severe harm to."

Owen Torres: "Freeman propaganda, once I saw freeman, they have been trying to block us. They haven’t been able to rebut our legal argument since at least 2010. We base all on researched facts and documented evidence, which they cannot produce any evidence to rebut.

---

4 https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=1705651486
5 https://www.facebook.com/JustinianDeception
So when are you and the Judiciary going to tell the ordinary man/woman that they cannot use their legal name in court and that we have been lied to, as I never consented to their laws. You a Slave Trader along with the Fascist Oligarchy and your name will be added to our list for the Hague, when we win in the international courts."  

John Wilson: “Dear Rob, You show your true colors with your statements that, "common law" refers to unwritten, judge-made law. That is the lie that that the corrupt and treacherous legal profession implement. That is where you have blown your cover.”

Wayne Glew: "You have stated on here that i dont have the intellect or stamina to debate you... you want to know the facts on me being declared vexatious... the judges and judiciary in this state are sitting in fraud in contempt of the high court and the constitution......i think you should get your facts right..."

I have a far more extensive list, and screenshots, but you get the picture. Glenn Bowley continues in his comment:

"After that he created a bunch of fake profiles (he just admitted it) and became a pest."

Hahahaha... THAAT was when I "created a bunch of fake profiles" was it? And the beginning of my "becoming a pest" was it? Really lol?

I still have many of those profiles, but they are all four years old. I created 36 accounts in 2013, (Ask Ross Bradley) purely for an observation and study of all OPCA, sovereign and freeman groups in Australia, most of which still silently exist as members. I made no secret of it. I'd already been blocked on several of these profiles, so these were my "back door keys" to continue surveillance.

I continue to maintain these files on each of the groups and individuals, to document the evolution of the movement in Australia. I will be publishing many of the vital milestones, and their associated case studies, in my second book.

Now THIS was where I started "becoming a pest" simply because I started citing valid precedents and provisions, instead of just perpetuating the popular comforting delusion.

---

6 https://www.facebook.com/owen.torres.752
7 https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100006374838113
8 https://www.facebook.com/pseudolegal/posts/1712287162421085
In fact, that same year I’d become a competent enough "pest" to debunk Heather-Anne Tucci Jarraf from "One Peoples Public Trust". AbsoluteDataExchange ⁹ published an article on 23 July 2013 “Heathers Reply To Freeman Delusion” about "An opponent of the Freeman movement" who calls himself "Freeman Delusion" on Facebook." (Interestingly, Heather is now sitting in jail, and I’m roaming the countryside.) That year Mark McMurtrie from "Original Sovereign Tribal Federation" also had enough of my correcting his warped interpretations of Latin, retorting in comments ¹⁰ “Obviously Freeman Delusion is a governmental/Crown hack. There are always going to be those paid by the Crown/government/s who will try to disuade you from the truth.”

Santos Bonacci, who I had told would eventually be arrested for unpaid fines, got arrested for unpaid fines in 2014. He then jumped bail and pretended he was free. ¹¹ He wrote “This message is for the delusional fornicators that run this site! Too much time masturbating and wasting the chrism seed is what’s going on on, you have no chrism left in the organism. To all you fucktards with your hands on your dicks that follow this page... i suggest YOU get help for your mental health and general slave condition that you are wallowing in. Dumb-ass shills." He was then arrested in Queensland and jailed for contempt of court for threatening a judge.

Arthur Cristian from "Love For Life" ¹² published a dark conspiratorial warning on 11th June 2014 about me called "Another Delusion" where he emphasises "We are now going after Rob, Freeman Delusion... To us, Rob (Freeman Delusion) now re-presents an immense danger to a lot of innocent people and if he is not stopped, will cause phenomenal damage to many naive and gullible men and women who have been deceived/conned by this blatant liar... not provided with full-disclosure as to Rob's true ulterior motives, cul-de-sac intentions (massive red herring distractions) and who his real master is will be led down the yellow brick road and therefore remaining completely enslaved in "The System" with no way of ever getting out. It is serious to stop his nefarious work dead in its tracks because he now has an excellent "looking good" fabricated front to deceive others."

Earlier, he threatened in a comment: "We know at least 20 families in law, visited by Arthur and forced to process the curses of their own making, they were completely ruined, destroyed, some committing suicide. This man knows where you live, your real name, and a bit about your background. You are dealing with someone who backs everything he says. You are now processing the curse. This man has you in his sights."

So I've been a "pest" to the OPCA movement nearly as long as they've become a pest in our courts, and I've unashamedly had dozens of profiles, probably long before Glenn Bowley even came across OPCA theories online. Sadly, it isn't all about Glenn Bowley.

---

¹⁰https://www.facebook.com/mmcmutrie1
¹¹https://www.facebook.com/santos.bonacci
"Thats when I blocked all his profiles. He had no real comeback so was no longer worth the effort."

Ahh, so... he finally admits he DID block me hey. Funny how he just gave himself away. So did he block me initially because it was "no longer worth the effort" or because I blocked him? I generally don't block people unless their comments degenerate into violent threats, and even then it is rare. I get blocked constantly, for the exact reasons expressed in these "character references" above. The facts I present are too painful for these OPCA adherents to even consider. The only response therefore, is an ad hominem attack on my character, or personal traits, instead of engaging my argument.

Yes, he is completely right. There is no other "comeback". The precedents were cited, and the matter settled as far as the law is concerned. It might not be settled as far as Glenn Bowley is concerned, but that is quite irrelevant until he successfully challenges the precedents cited. Ultimately, he has provided no evidence of anything, except how strong his denial is.

"Rob Sudy hasn't got answers... Just opinions from invalid and self proclaimed "authority".

Yes, he is completely right again. I cite binding judgments from the higher courts, not answers based on confirmation bias. I don't cite opinions, regardless of his opinions. Supreme Court decisions are not "opinion" or orbiter, they are non-orbiter binding decisions, that apply to every lower court.

It is easy to draw up any number of theoretical abstracts in your own mind, of what could possibly be consistent with law, when your belief requires you completely ignore valid judicial responses like they don't exist. When the law is inconsistent with your belief, you simply ignore those parts, and overwrite it with how you think it should be. Ta-da, suddenly it all adds up, and you now know more about constitutional interpretation than the High Court itself.

This is called MORALISTIC FALLACY, or wishful thinking. It is an inversion of the naturalistic fallacy, and often synonymous with denial.

Glenn Bowley is not capable, for example, of trying to accurately describe things purely from the perspective of his opponent, the courts. He is not able, from an intellectual and academic perspective, to be appointed one side of any given debate, leave all personal opinions and prejudices aside, and just argue the particular side on it's own merits. This is because his COGNITIVE DISSONANCE prevents him from holding two such starkly opposing views simultaneously. He can only express, and consider, his own side of the story, his own opinions, and that of the OPCA cult. Not having any recognised judicial evidence, he relies purely on the strength of his belief, in what is effectively a faith-based moralistic ideal.

He holds an internally inconsistent worldview, so he actively seeks out confirmation of this separate, inconsistent reality, and assigns more weight to this perceived evidence, while intentionally ignoring or underweighting any evidence that could disconfirm his belief. This is called CONFIRMATION BIAS.
Essentially, we're looking at a cult here. It is an identified group, that has been influenced, no, digitally indoctrinated, to believe concepts that have no basis in law, and sometimes even fact. In a morally-outraged, charismatic, trance-like state, they "preach" these concepts, attempting to "save the world" with all the enthusiasm of a hellfire evangelist. They insist on their validity despite the courts having consistently and routinely rejected their notions for decades. They are, in essence, living in denial of reality, and actively using common psychological tactics to influence others into adopting their denial. Any ignorant person can write down their own one-sided opinions, it takes a very unignorant, open-minded person to take in both sides of a story. This can only occur when one's conclusions are not faith-based, but evidence-based.

I have made it my obligation for the last 4 years to purposefully seek out and identify the individuals and groups actively perpetuating these concepts, catalogue and record their belief, and provide the contrasting evidence. The only competent evidence, is the obligations of the court, to the particular binding authorities that reject the notions. I do this, not for the indoctrinated devotee, but for those who are following, and are consistently being fed only one side of the story online.

My 500 page, fully referenced, comprehensive analysis of these theories, explains each of the OPCA contentions in detail, from the perception of those who are so convinced, AS WELL as from the perceptions and judgments of the courts. Either side of the story are not even my own personal opinions, but accurately reflect, one, the perception expressed by the courts, psychiatry and law enforcement, and two, the perception expressed by adherents of the OPCA cult. As someone recently pointed out, in real life I am personally nothing like any of the opinions that are expressed in relation to the law. Quite markedly in contrast, I mostly live out bush, outside the law, as my own conscience dictates, and try to do no harm. My personal opinions of life, of politics and government, and my very alternative lifestyle, are completely foreign to anything considered mainstream. In fact, I hope this serves as some sort of evidence of the extremes I have gone to, in preventing my own biases, pre-conceived ethical notions or personal opinions, from interfering with my understanding, and interpretation, of the law.

"He really needs to stop avoiding the common seal issue and answer it definitively, not using opinion."

Glenn Bowley's contentions regarding the Great Seal of Australia have been answered repetitively by myself, directly from the higher courts. The problem lies in the fact he doesn't accept the answers, not that they haven't been given. As I stated earlier, I can't help him with his denial. Nevertheless, I will once again provide a referenced response to these notions.

But in conclusion to his allegations, he didn't "win" any argument, neither is he in any position to disclude binding decisions just because they aren't consistent with his delusion. Secondly, I didn't block him, he blocked me, because of his paranoia. But I have to admit, I was sort of upset when he blocked me, because out of most OPCA adherents online, he was actually fun and constructive to engage with. He said the same once, that I push him to find appropriate responses, and help the development of his own theories. As they say, every Locke needs a formidable Hobbes.
That's why he was cordially invited to join this closed-listed forum with all the other OPCA "gurus" he can summon, to organise a legitimate public relations initiative on ABC's Q&A, and much more. I'm calling you up on national television bloke, we better put aside this petty bullshit and work out a sensible script for the viewers, so the movement is portrayed in a better light than what presently exists.

OPCA adherents in Australia try to insert the U.S. Sovereign Citizen "two governments" contention into our constitutional framework in several ways.

The main basis of the Australian version, is that because of changes to the Royal Style and Titles in 1973, the original "Commonwealth of Australia" had been usurped, and replaced (just like its Sovereign Citizen "United States" counterpart) with a "corporation" that is headquartered in Washington DC. Consequentially, they claim this "Queen of Australia" has no lawful authority, and hence the laws created by parliament in the name of this "fictional Queen" are null and void.

The changes to Royal Titles and Style Act 1973 has been challenged on different grounds in the High Court, (Pochi v Macphee for example) but the main overruling precedent for this OPCA contention was set in Sue v Hill [1999] HCA 30 - 23 June 1999 - S179/1998 and B49/1998.  

Because the Oaths taken by members of the parliaments, the judiciary, police, and other officers are also to this "fictional Queen" they are likewise seen as invalid. This premise was rejected most recently in Balwyn Nominees Pty Ltd v Culleton [2016] FCA1578 \(^{14}\) where the court relied on Glew & Anor v Shire of Greenough [2006] WASCA 260. Wheeler JA (with whom Pullin and Buss JJA agreed) observed, at [17] and [18]

“There is no constitutional prohibition upon the alteration of the terminology which refers to the Crown or to her Majesty. Further, the changes of terminology contained within the Acts Amendment and Repeal (Courts and Legal Practice) Act 2003 are consistent with constitutional reality.”

(See also Shaw v Jim McGinty in his capacity as Attorney General & Anor [2006] WASCA 231 upholding Shaw v Attorney General for the State of Western Australia & Anor [2005] WASC 149; Glew v The Governor of Western Australia (2009) 222 FLR 416; [2009] WASC 14.)

And then, there is the change in Royal Seal, from the "Royal Arms of the United Kingdom" with the lion and unicorn, to the "Great Seal of Australia" with kangaroo and emu. To the adherent, this is a foreign seal, This premise was raised in Glenevan Pty Ltd [2015] NSWSC 201 \(^{15}\) in the NSW Supreme Court, and dismissed as without legal merit. David Fitzgibbon took the matter to the British High Court in 2004. \(^{16}\) The case was dismissed by High Court judge Justice Gavin Lightman, who noted that not only did he have no say over the case, but even if he did rule in favour of Mr Fitzgibbon the Australian Government, independent since 1901, could ignore him completely. \(^{17}\)

"It is for the Australian courts to apply Australian law to determine the capacity in which Her Majesty the Queen is acting, the appropriate seal and the consequences, if any, if the wrong seal is used. It is not for the UK courts to enter the field, proffering their view as to the proper interpretation of the Constitution." Calling Mr Fitzgibbon's action "quite purposeless", the Chancery Division's Master Bencher Bowman said: "Essentially it is a matter of procedure and not necessarily of substance - that the wrong seal was used. The claim should be struck out on the basis of hopelessness ... and, where appropriate, embarrassment."

But these cases don't really answer the question for the adherent, who doesn't see them as anything more than "opinion" and an attempt by the courts to hide the truth. They generally seek "the originating document" that authorised these changes, and contend there should of been a referendum, to allow the subsequent changes in interpretation to associated sections of the constitution.

On the latter point, the changes came from outside the constitution, and outside Australia, and therefore not anything that could even be decided by referendum. The British Empire collapsed, and so did our obligations to it, or reliance on it for sources of law. If I could draw a similar analogy, our parents disappeared, and we were on our own.

\(^{15}\) http://www.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/sinodisp/au/cases/nsw/NSWSC/2015/201.html
We had no obligation to our parent’s rules, or reliance on them as an authority over us, except what we chose to adopt for ourselves. This OPCA contention is akin to the denial of their disappearance, and an obviously delusional insistence, that we could somehow "decide" if we wanted that to occur.

Regardless of these outside occurrences, we just continued following our own rules, according to the same constitutional structure we designed by the referendums in each proposed state prior to Federation.

It was a gradual path to complete independence, the Balfour Agreement in 1926, and other agreements in following Imperial Conferences, and the Statute of Westminster 1931, that was adopted here in 1942 as a formal recognition of these agreements.

The matter has been succinctly addressed in Sue v Hill [1999] HCA 30 - 23 June 1999 - S179/1998 and B49/1998, where Justice Gaudron noted: "Once it is accepted that the divisibility of the Crown is implicit in the Constitution and that the Constitution acknowledges the possibility of change in the relationship between the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth, it is impossible to treat the United Kingdom as permanently excluded from the concept of "foreign power" in s 44(i) of the Constitution. That being so, the phrase is to be construed as having its natural and ordinary meaning."

In Volume 1 of the Final Report of the Constitutional Commission 1988 it was noted: "The development of Australian nationhood did not require any change to the Australian Constitution. It involved, in part, the abolition of limitations on constitutional power that were imposed from outside the Constitution, such as the Colonial Laws Validity Act 1865 (Imp) and restricting what otherwise would have been the proper interpretation of the Constitution, by virtue of Australia's status as part of the Empire. When the Empire ended and national status emerged, the external restrictions ceased, and constitutional powers could be given their full scope."

Sir Garfield Barwick has described the result, in relation to the Framers' purpose in drafting the Constitution as follows: "The Constitution was not devised for the immediate independence of a nation. It was conceived as the Constitution of an autonomous Dominion within the then British Empire. It s founders were not to know of the two world wars which would bring that Empire to an end. But they had national independence in mind. Quite apart from the possible disappearance of the Empire, they could confidently expect not only continuing autonomy but approaching independence. This came within 30 years. They devised a Constitution which would serve an independent nation. It has done so, and still does."

On the first point, "the originating document" would the Royal Warrants and Proclamations that enacted the Great Seal of Australia. The following was published in the Australian Government Gazette No. 152 Canberra, Friday, 19 October 1973 which show that the change to the Great Seal of Australia was indeed executed by Royal Warrant, and enacted by Proclamation from the Queen.

ROYAL WARRANT

Elizabeth R

TO Our Governor-General of Australia

WITH THIS you will receive a Great Seal prepared by Our Order for the use of Our Government of Australia.

OUR WILL AND PLEASURE IS, and We do hereby authorize and direct, that the said Great Seal be used in sealing all things whatsoever that shall pass the Great Seal of Australia.

OUR WILL AND PLEASURE FURTHER IS that you do cause the Great Seal that accompanied Our Royal Warrant given at Our Court at Government House, Canberra, on 16 February 1954 to be defaced by you in Our Executive Council of Australia.

AND FOR SO DOING this shall be your Warrant.

GIVEN at Our Court at Government House, Canberra, on 19 October 1973.

By Her Majesty's Command, E. G. WHITLAM Prime Minister

ROYAL WARRANT

Elizabeth R

TO all and singular to whom this Warrant shall come, GREETING:

WHEREAS by Our Warrant given this day at Our Court at Government House, Canberra, We authorized and directed that a Great Seal prepared by Our Order for the use of Our Government of Australia be used in sealing all things whatsoever that should pass the Great Seal of Australia:

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that the said Great Seal be used as a Royal Great Seal for certain purposes:

NOW THEREFORE Our Will and Pleasure is, and We do hereby authorize and direct, that the said Great Seal be used as a Royal Great Seal in sealing all things whatsoever (other than things that pass the said Great Seal) that bear Our Sign Manual and the counter-signature of one of Our Ministers of State for Australia.

GIVEN at Our Court at Government House, Canberra, on 19 October 1973.

By Her Majesty's Command, E. G. WHITLAM Prime Minister
PROCLAMATION By His Excellency the Governor-General of Australia

Paul Hasluck

WHEREAS a proposed law entitled "An Act relating to the Royal Style and Titles" has been passed by both Houses of the Parliament of Australia:

AND WHEREAS, upon the proposed law being on 14 September 1973 presented to me for the Royal Assent, I declared that I reserved the proposed law for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure:

AND WHEREAS the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure has been communicated to me:

NOW THEREFORE I, Sir Paul Meemaa Caedwalla Hasluck, the Governor General of Australia, do hereby proclaim and make known that Her Majesty has been pleased to assent to the proposed law.

GIVEN under my Hand and the Great Seal of Australia on 19 October 1973.

By His Excellency's Command, E. G. WHITLAM Prime Minister

ROYAL WARRANT

Elizabeth R

WHEREAS, by an Act of Our Australian Parliament entitled the Royal Style and Titles Act 1973, it is enacted that the assent of the said Parliament is given to the adoption by Us, for use in relation to Australia and its Territories, in lieu of the Style and Titles set forth in the Schedule to the Act of Our Australian Parliament entitled the Royal Style and Titles Act 1953, of the Style and Titles set forth in the Schedule to the first mentioned Act, and to the issue for that purpose by Us of Our Royal Proclamation under such Seal as We by Warrant appoint:

NOW THEREFORE We do, by this Our Warrant, appoint the Great Seal of Australia, being the Seal that We have this day delivered to Our Governor General of Australia, to be the Seal under which the said Royal Proclamation shall be issued.

GIVEN at Our Court at Government House, Canberra, on 19 October 1973. By Her Majesty's Command, E. G. WHITLAM Prime Minister
BY THE QUEEN A PROCLAMATION

Elizabeth R

WHEREAS, by an Act of the Parliament of Australia entitled the Royal Style and Titles Act 1973, it is enacted that the Assent of the said Parliament is given to the adoption by Us, for use in relation to Australia and its Territories, in lieu of the Style and Titles at present pertaining to the Crown, of the Style and Titles set forth in the Schedule to that Act, and to the issue for that purpose by Us of Our Royal Proclamation under such Seal as We by Warrant appoint:

AND WHEREAS We have this day, by Our Warrant, appointed the Great Seal of Australia to be the Seal under which the said Royal Proclamation shall be issued:

NOW THEREFORE We do hereby appoint and declare that henceforth, so far as conveniently may be, on all occasions and in all instruments wherein Our Style and Titles are used in relation to Australia and its Territories, the following Style and Titles shall be used, that is to say: Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God Queen of Australia and Her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth.

GIVEN under the Great Seal of Australia at Our Court at Government House, Canberra, on 19 October 1973.

By Her Majesty’s Command, E. G. WHITLAM Prime Minister

Link to the 6 page (274 KB) PDF here: (Published in the Australian Government Gazette No. 152 Canberra (Friday, 19 October 1973)

The amendment in 1973 by the Parliament of Australia had to exclude (in the case of Australia) the papal title given to King Henry VIII, "Defender of the Faith" because it was previously established that neither the Queen, the governor-general, or any state governor have any religious role in Australia. The Church of England lost its legal privileges in the Colony of New South Wales by the Church Act of 1836. Drafted by the reformist attorney-general John Plunkett, the act established legal equality for Anglicans, Catholics and Presbyterians and was later extended to Methodists. There never has been an established church in Australia, either before or since Federation in 1901. This amendment was reflective of one of the key differences from the Queen's role in England where she is the Supreme Governor of the Church of England.

It says on the top of the Statute of Westminster 1931:

"An Act to give effect to certain resolutions passed by Imperial Conferences held in the years 1926 and 1930."

The Imperial Conference in 1926 proposed a change to the Royal style and titles designated for King George V. That change was incorporated in the Statute of Westminster 1931.

In the second paragraph of the Statute of Westminster Adoption Act 1942 it states that: "...in accord with the established constitutional position of all the members of the Commonwealth in relation to one another that any alteration in the law touching the Succession to the Throne or the Royal Style and Titles shall hereafter require the assent as well of the Parliaments of all the Dominions as of the Parliament of the United Kingdom."

At the Imperial Conference of 1949 it was agreed that "it would not be necessary for each country to approve all the local variations of the title" and further in 1952 it was again agreed that each country should adopt "a form of Royal title suitable to its own circumstances" but "retain a substantial element which is common to all".

This element was retained in "Her other realms and Territories" and in "Head of the Commonwealth", and all Commonwealth Nations STILL retain this today. The amendment in 1973 did not alter this element, and was therefore within the powers of the particular parliament for this reason.

Extract from the Royal Titles Act 1953 (UK)

“And whereas it was agreed between representatives of Her Majesty's Governments in the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Pakistan and Ceylon assembled in London in the month of December, nineteen hundred and fifty-two, that there is need for an alteration thereof which, whilst permitting of the use in relation to each of those countries of a form suiting its particular circumstances, would retain a substantial element common to all."

These changes were agreed at the Imperial Conference of 1952 by "all the Dominions as of the Parliament of the United Kingdom." in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of the Statute of Westminster Adoption Act 1942, "...shall hereafter require the assent as well of the Parliaments of all the Dominions as of the Parliament of the United Kingdom."

"The "assent" of the parliament is normally given by legislation rather than a resolution, this is because the "parliament" is defined in section 1 of the Commonwealth Constitution as two Houses and the Queen. A resolution may be passed by each House, but only legislation is passed by both Houses and given assent by the third part of the parliament, being the Queen.” (The Chameleon Crown By Anne Twomey, page110)

Elizabeth II agreed in meetings in April 1973 that "Defender of the Faith" be dropped from her title, but insisted "By grace of God" remain. She also personally assented to, and made the proclamation regarding the legislation while in Australia on the 19th October 1973.

Both the 1953 and 1973 amendments to the Royal Titles and Styles Acts were reserved for her majesty's pleasure.  

The Royal Style and Titles Act 1953 was assented to on the April 3rd 1953 (Gazette No 21, 9 April 1953)

And the Royal Style and Titles Act 1973 was assented to on 19 October 1973 (Gazette No 152, 19 October 1973) the same time as the Seal above.

Extract from Nibbs v Devonport City Council [2015] TASSC 34:

"The Queen's title in the Commonwealth of Australia was changed, firstly by the Royal Style and Titles Act 1953 (Cth), and again by the Royal Style and Titles Act 1973 (Cth). Following those changes, Her Majesty's title was Elizabeth II, by the Grace of God Queen of Australia and her other Realms and Territories, Head of the Commonwealth. For some, that left room for argument about Her Majesty's title in the States, what power the British monarch could exercise in and in relation to those States, and whether the relationship of Australian States to the Crown was truly independent of the relationship of the Commonwealth to the Crown: see for instance Commonwealth v Queensland [1975] HCA 43; (1975) 134 CLR 298 (the 'Queen of Queensland Case') The Australia Act 1986 (UK) repealed the Imperial Colonial Laws Validity Act 1865. Thereafter there were no residual powers or responsibilities of the United Kingdom in relation to Australian States. Generally, the provisions of the Australia Act (UK) left a discrete Australian monarchy."

To read more about this interesting phenomena, download:  

FREEMAN DELUSION: The Organised Pseudolegal Commercial Argument in Australia, by Robert Sudy

https://www.legislation.gov.au/content/HistoricGazettes1953  
https://www.facebook.com/groups/506741482996786/