



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 55 No. 29

26<sup>th</sup> July 2019

## IN THIS ISSUE

Get Ready to Run to the Finish: The Indigenous Referendum By Ian Wilson LL. B	1
The Cure for Aboriginal Grievance Syndrome By Bill Martin	2
5G Newsletter from GreenMedInfo.com By Sayer Ji	4
Letter to The Editor	4

**THOUGHTS OF THE WEEK: “OUR SACRED LAND?”** My wife and I were both born in Australia, as were two children and four grandchildren. Our parents were born in Australia as were all of their parents. And some ancestors go back much further in this land. I feel rage every time I have to sit through another patronising “Welcome to country” charade, designed to make me feel an intruder in my own land. Indigenous history on this continent is the same as our family story – it just goes back a bit further. The first aboriginals probably walked here over a land bridge and Europeans came later in sailing clippers. All caused displacement of prior inhabitants. They brought dingos which are now “protected” – we brought cattle, sheep, horses and ploughs which are increasingly condemned. They mined ochre, quartzite and basalt, which are now heritage sites – but our coal mines are widely condemned. They brought spears and boomerangs – we brought guns and swords. Racial referenda, indigenous “Welcomes”, talk of Treaties and special land rights for some Australians just create and maintain division. How long before we are one people with the same rights and responsibilities? Two centuries is surely time enough?”

Letter to The Editor, from Viv Forbes, Qld, 17th July, 2019.

## GET READY TO RUN TO THE FINISH: THE INDIGENOUS REFERENDUM By Ian Wilson LL. B

It was only a matter of time, but even under the Libs the Aboriginal recognition referendum was certain to emerge. The details, straight from the horse’s mouths, so to speak are here:

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-07-10/indigenous-constitutional-recognition-to-go-to-referendum-wyatt/11294478>

‘Minister for Indigenous Australians Ken Wyatt will lead a historic push for a referendum in this term of parliament to recognise Aborigines in the Constitution, vowing to put forward a “pragmatic” model that will receive broad public support. Australia’s first indigenous cabinet minister yesterday declared he would “walk with people on all sides of politics” to find a consensus model that could achieve the required support of a majority of people in a majority of states for a successful referendum. In his speech to the National Press Club in Canberra yesterday, the West Australian MP, who was given the ministry by Scott Morrison after the May 18 election victory, also revealed the government would create an indigenous voice to parliament, which would advise government on Aboriginal issues. The body could be created by legislation without being part of the referendum process that would seek to recognise indigenous Australians in the nation’s founding document.

“The world is an oyster in terms of options that we have to seriously consider,” Mr Wyatt said. With Labor and indigenous leaders pushing for the voice body to be enshrined in the Constitution, Mr Wyatt warned he would cancel his referendum plans if the final model was too controversial. He said he would need to navigate the requests of indigenous activists and people who were sceptical of the need for constitutional recognition, including “reticent colleagues” in his own partyroom. “I’ve got to find common ground,” Mr Wyatt said. “And there are diverse views. It is about how do you bring the majority to common ground that is acceptable that we can win a referendum? That is the challenge. And I am up to that and I am prepared to walk with people on all sides of politics and all sides of the community to hear their view and reach a point which we can agree. “Sometimes we can aspire to an optimum outcome but we also have to accept there is a pragmatic element to constitutional referendums. I would rather us, in the psyche of this nation, have a win on a referendum than have a loss.”

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) Opposition spokeswoman for indigenous Australians Linda Burney said Labor wanted the indigenous voice enshrined in the Constitution, as recommended by indigenous leaders in the Uluru Statement from the Heart in 2017.

“Labor has been saying clearly that we would like a voice entrenched in the Australian Constitution, and I know that there are many people on the government benches that also believe that,” Ms Burney said.

“I think that is ultimately what we would want to see.” She acknowledged there would be “points of difference and we will have to work through those points of difference”. “Bipartisanship is not a race to the bottom,” she said.

While leaving the responsibility for treaties between indigenous people and governments with the states, Mr Wyatt said he would investigate the establishment of a “truth-telling” agency that would raise awareness of historical atrocities committed towards Aboriginal people. “History is generally written from a dominant society’s point of view and not that of the suppressed and therefore true history is brushed aside, masked, dismissed or destroyed,” he said. Mr Wyatt said he would undertake a period of “co-design” with indigenous communities and consult on the best form of constitutional recognition. He would also call on corporate Australia to get behind the recognition push. “Constitutional recognition is too important to get wrong, and too important to rush,” he said.

“I plan to establish a working group of parliamentary colleagues of all political persuasions to assist me in considering the role of engaging on many levels to bring forward a community model.”

Indigenous academic Prof. Marcia Langton, who has been a vocal supporter of a constitutionally enshrined voice, was among the Aboriginal figures who praised Mr Wyatt’s commitment to a referendum. “I think that Ken has achieved bipartisanship and nothing at all will be achieved without bipartisanship,” she said. Professor Langton would not say whether Mr Wyatt should put forward a constitutionally enshrined voice in the referendum.

“I don’t think we are at the stage where we can answer questions like that yet,” she said. “Everything hangs on this co-design process now. He has committed to that so that indicates to me that he is being utterly genuine and he has achieved more than any other politician because he understands the problems ahead of us.”

Ms Burney sounded a note of caution, declaring she was not sure a consensus was possible. Former prime minister Malcolm Turnbull rejected the voice proposal when it was presented to him by the Referendum Council in 2017. He said the body would become a “third chamber of parliament”, a phrase repeated by Mr Morrison early in his leadership. Mr Wyatt said if

the referendum failed, the issue would “gather dust” like the republic. “I don’t want to proceed if we don’t have the right question,” he said.

Indigenous academic Megan Davis, who was on the Referendum Council, said the voice was the “only constitutional model on the table”.

Mr Wyatt said he would listen to the concerns of people opposed to constitutional recognition, including One Nation leader Pauline Hanson, who claimed that she was indigenous because she was born in Australia.’

This is all so predictable given the history off the referendum proposal, and the fact that it attracted total support from the new class elites.

Basically, the idea is to get this one in to begin the big politically correct changes to the constitution, and maybe clean up with the republic referendum if necessary. What will be created is a separate Aboriginal parliament, that will examine all laws, but it will be the new class elites that will impact upon that. It is likely that something like a hyper-section 18 C will find its way into the constitution at some point, if not explicitly, then implicitly by judicial interpretation. I can see open borders being eventually pulled out of any change made to the black letters of the constitution, for there are no limits to what lawyers can do. Australia could eventually become far worse than the former Soviet Union.

The core argument against any change is that in the present culture, even if there were historical injustices, we cannot trust the fanatical politically correct new class elites, who have an agenda of their own to rewrite the constitution on their road to total power, and this is that will be done by even the change of one word:

<https://www.amazon.co.uk/Intellectuals-Road-Class-Power/dp/0151778604>

Intellectuals seek to obtain power by their monopoly over knowledge which they use as a political weapon; this is standard sociology from gurus such as Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu and Zygmunt Bauman. The sociology of knowledge tells us that intellectuals, such as the new class, seek to further the power of their own class, so, expect the referendum to reflect these power relations, and not truth and justice. That follows from left wing sociology itself.

Oppose it with all your strength, for this is truly the end. The same sex vote was a warm up to how the new class intends to roll over the deplorables, and we should not be deluded about how dumbed down Australians have now become, as uncomfortable as this truth may be to conservatives, who cannot bear too much reality. They trashed us on that last one, so it is time to get off our butts and do something. (subject continued next article) \*\*\*

## THE CURE FOR ABORIGINAL GRIEVANCE SYNDROME By Bill Martin

The original inhabitants of Australia were dispossessed of their land and way of life by British colonists. No fair-minded, intelligent Australian of whatever extraction would dispute that assertion, although attitudes concerning the morality of it, or the lack thereof, vary widely. Nevertheless, it is grossly dishonest to pass judgement according to current standards and values on events of two centuries ago. Had Captain Cook not claimed Australia for George III, then French, Dutch or other explorers would most certainly have claimed it for their own kings. That is indisputable by any reasonable standard. It must be noted here that the attitude and conduct of British authorities towards colonised peoples are widely acknowledged to have been far more benevolent than those of other colonising nations.

The preposterous condemnation of events of a bygone era according to prevailing criteria is exacerbated beyond all reason by assigning the hurt and blame to descendants of the original participants, now many generations removed. Not only is this attitude unforgivable due to the glaring injustice to those held culpable in perpetuity, it is also the principal reason why the majority of contemporary Aboriginals continue to suffer the effects of colonisation centuries after it occurred.

Australian society at large can not be accused by any measure of uncaring hardheartedness toward the conditions and circumstances of the descendants of the original inhabitants. Undeniably, the attitudes and actions of colonists, at both individual and government levels, were at times reprehensible, even cruel. Regrettable as those failings were, considering the frailty of human nature, they were all but unavoidable. Those early stains amount to naught compared with the abundance of goodwill towards Aboriginals right from the beginning, rising to ever greater heights over recent decades.

Program after program has been established to improve Aborigines' lot, costing many billions of dollars over the years. Some were, partly or wholly run by Aboriginals for Aboriginals. Some achieved some benefits, but most failed completely. The result to date is? Apart from assimilated Aborigines who live their lives much the same as most non-Aboriginals, the lot of the rest has steadfastly failed to improve. Why this complete and never-ending failure? The answer is staring us in the face: the key to the solution is in the hands of the activists, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal. What follows is addressed to them.

The foundation to eliminating the disadvantages plaguing contemporary Australian Aboriginals is the full and uncompromising acceptance that the continent was colonised – accepting it without extolling romantic myths and quixotic endeavours to reverse that long-ago,

unalterable occurrence. Rephrasing that in the colloquial: get over it. Failing to do so is irrational — indeed, it is insanity — and does great harm to those whom it supposed to help.

Relinquish the notion that it is the responsibility of present day non-Aboriginal Australians to remedy the adverse effects of British colonisation. Such remediation is an impossibility by any and all means due to the utter falsity of the premise on which it is based. It is in the realm of fantasy, together with the concept of a time machine, which would be the piece of essential equipment for its implementation.

Abandon the notion that Australian Aboriginals are entitled to exclusive and perpetual rights and privileges on account of their ancestors living here before white colonists' arrival. There is neither logical nor moral justification for that stance. Most importantly, it normalises the intolerable concept of there being different classes of Australians with different rights and privileges. That is a malignant cancer eating away at Australian society, rendering truly harmonious coexistence impossible so long as that mindset prevails.

Cease the glorification and incessant promotion of Aboriginal culture, much of it confected (mixed, compounded). It is obvious that the culture was perfectly suitable for the life of Aborigines up to the First Fleet sailing into Botany Bay, but what is presented today is a grotesque caricature which fuels a quiet resentment in many non-Aboriginal Australians. The ubiquitous “welcome to country” opening dialogues at almost all public events, usually delivered by professional spruikers for a set fee, are utterly meaningless for most audiences. Smoking ceremonies, performed for fees of up to \$8000, are redolent with irony. Is it not bizarre that self-proclaimed atheist social justice warriors, who routinely ridicule Christianity, attend with reverence these celebrations of animism? Worst of all, the relentless exaltation of Aboriginal culture fosters a disproportionate sense of social importance in Aboriginal Australians as distinct from other Australians, enhancing their feeling of entitlement to the benefits and privileges available to them. Their sense of righteous victimhood is also fostered by it. That is hardly the recipe for social harmony. It is also very likely that people with only a smidgen of Aboriginal blood are further motivated by it to flaunt their Aboriginality in order to enhance their eligibility for the advantages that come with the distinction.

Source: <https://quadrant.org.au/opinion/bennelong-papers/2019/07/the-cure-for-aboriginal-grievance-syndrome/>

All of these aspects of the cultural wars need to be pinned upon the referendum issue, because they provide a philosophical basis to it. Go to IT! \*\*\*

I created *GreenMedInfo.com* over 10 years ago to raise awareness about the most pressing health challenges of our times, and ways to solve them. Because of this advocacy, I've experienced both a lot of support and push back, especially on topics related to your basic human right to informed consent, with vaccination being the biggest powder keg, and your right to use natural alternatives to drug-based medicine a close second. But I'm here to tell you there is an even more ominous issue threatening to strip your health rights and compromise your bodily integrity, and which is being rolled out all around the world -- and even in space -- without your consent and with ZERO evidence proving it safe.

What is it? 5G. Don't believe the marketing hype. It's not just about faster connection and video streaming speeds. And is it not just a radiation risk to your health, as it can be used as a surveillance system and as a directed energy weapon. Sound like science fiction or 'conspiracy theory'? Sadly, it's not make believe, and if the powers that be have their way, it will soon be found on every block of every neighborhood in this country, with many more countries around the globe soon to follow. This is an alarming situation is why I teamed up

with my friend and colleague Josh Del Sol, the tireless activist and documentary filmmaker behind *Take Back Your Power*, to co-create the 5G Summit: Awareness and Accountability. In less than a month, Josh interviewed over three dozen of the world's experts on the topic - because time was of the essence, and we needed to get the information out NOW while we still have a chance. Together, we have produced an extremely empowering event, focusing not just on the harrowing magnitude of the problem, but what you and I can do to take concrete steps, both in our homes, and communities, to prevent this unprecedented roll out from moving forward unchallenged. We have also gathered the information you need to mitigate and/or neutralize the dangers and harms that are already present associated with all forms of EMF we are daily exposed to. Join us here to save your spot, and please share this with friends, family and colleagues, because it's only through grassroots, word-of-mouth activism, that together we can and will make a hugely positive impact! \*\*\*

**Register to watch the 5G documentary (free):**  
[https://the5gsummit.com/?idev\\_id=20024](https://the5gsummit.com/?idev_id=20024)

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To *The Age*, There are three insuperable arguments against any kind of amendment to the Constitution favouring our indigenous peoples. It is fundamentally inequitable to non-indigenous Australians (the great majority of us). Secondly, by eroding our national unity, it threatens our national security (think of the growing threats of expansionist China and aggressive Islamic fundamentalism in Indonesia). Thirdly, it will cause internal instability through divisiveness based on ethnic difference. All the genuine arguments supporting indigenous welfare can be met and satisfied without changing the Constitution. Nothing in the latest speech of Minister for Indigenous Australians Ken Wyatt successfully addresses these very serious objections.

*Nigel Jackson*, Belgrave, Vic \*\*\*

### **'THE BREAK-UP OF AUSTRALIA'** *The real agenda behind Aboriginal recognition'* **Book By Keith Windschuttle**

**The Hidden Agenda of Aboriginal Sovereignty**  
Australian voters are not being told the truth about the proposal for constitutional recognition of indigenous people. The goal of Aboriginal political activists today is to gain 'sovereignty' and create a black state, equivalent to the existing states. Its territory, comprising all land defined as native title, will soon amount to more than 60 per cent of the whole Australian continent. Constitutional recognition, if passed, would be its 'launching pad'. Recognition will not make our nation complete; it will divide us permanently.

**The Academic Assault on the Constitution**  
Univeristy-based lawyers are misleading the Australian people by claiming our Constitution was drafted to exclude Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples from the Australian nation. This is a myth. At Federation in 1901, our Constitution made Australia the most democratic country in the world. The great majority of Aboriginal people have always had the same political rights as other Australians, including the right to vote. Claims that the Constitution denied them full citizenship are political fabrications based on shoddy legal scholarship.

**Available from [Quadrant.org.au](http://Quadrant.org.au) \$44.95**

**Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.**

**NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.**

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

or by cheques directed to:

**'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'**

**Postal Address:** PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

**Telephone:** 08 8387 6574

**On Target is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy**  
**13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.**