



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 55 No. 30

2nd August 2019

IN THIS ISSUE

There's More to the 'Voice' than Gleeson says By Keith Windschuttle	1
Where Whites Responsible for This? By Chris Knight	2
Fear Our AI Overlords By Brian Simpson	3
Can Australia Become Even More Corrupt? By Pyjamas Reed	4

THOUGHTS OF THE WEEK: 'Speaking to Labour and Socialist audiences I have been struck with the hypnotism exercised by such phrases as "Public Ownership." It never seems to penetrate the minds of the large numbers of people who clamour for Public Ownership of this, that, or the other, that they already have public ownership of such things as the Army, Navy, Post Office and many other services.

I should like to see one of the public owners step upon a battleship of the Royal Navy with a view to removing his bit of property or making some use of it. The real fact is that the word "ownership" is quite meaningless when it is applied to the relations between any undertaking and a large number of what the law calls "tenants-in-common." It is quite impossible for a hundred people to own a piece of land, although there is a **legal fiction** to the effect that they can. Either they have to let it, and divide the rents, or each one of them can walk about on it, in which case there is no rent and nothing to divide. Even a Public Park is subject to regulations which the individuals using it are generally powerless to alter as individuals. It is a fact inherent in the nature of the case that **ownership must vest in an individual**, and any attempt to get away from this law of nature results as a practical consequence in the appointment of an administrator whose power increases as the number of his appointees increases.'

C.H. Douglas, *Warning Democracy*, 3rd ed. (London: Stanley Nott, 1935), 7-8.

THERE'S MORE TO THE 'VOICE' THAN GLEESON SAYS By Keith Windschuttle

Last Thursday night the former Chief Justice of the High Court, Murray Gleeson, gave a speech on the proposal to give Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples a "Voice" in the Australian political system. The speech was front-page news the following day and generated a number of op-ed pieces and editorials. It came in the midst of a public debate over constitutional recognition initiated by the Minister for Indigenous Australians, Ken Wyatt, who wants the issue settled in the current term of Parliament, and Prime Minister Scott Morrison, who has said his support would not extend to including a "First Nations Voice" in the Constitution. Gleeson was the most legally-distinguished member of the 14-person Referendum Council appointed by Malcolm Turnbull to advise his government on prospects for a referendum to change the Constitution on this issue. His speech last week was a reprise of several of the Referendum Council's proposals in June 2017. He argued that constitutional change was appropriate for indigenous recognition and claimed the representative body providing the Voice would not impinge on the supremacy of Parliament.

He also argued that the Voice would not offend against existing Australian values and laws about equality and race. Because the Constitution has allowed the Commonwealth to make laws specifically for Aboriginal people since the referendum of 1967, their special treatment was already well-embedded in political practice. "Since the Constitution now makes people the potential objects of special laws by reason of their Indigenous status," Gleeson said, "the Referendum Council considered that an appropriate form of recognition of such people would be to provide them with a Voice to Parliament". Given the context and timing of the speech, this is clearly an argument aimed at the position adopted by the Institute for Public Affairs, and its slogan "race has no place" in our Constitution. The judge has become a political advocate.

More significantly, Gleeson's speech studiously avoided any discussion of the three most contentious issues in the Referendum Council's report:

the Voice would lead to treaty-making between the Australian government and various Aboriginal groups that now regard themselves as nations;

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

the treaties it envisages would lead to indigenous autonomy and self-government, and

the Voice would represent Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples internationally.

Although he spoke just after NAIDOC Week (July 8–15), when the key slogan was “Voice. Treaty. Truth.”, which identified “the three key elements of the Uluru Statement from the Heart that represent the unified position of First Nations Australians”, neither Gleeson nor subsequent media commentary discussed Aboriginal treaties or the status of the First Nations the government is supposed to deal with. So let me show how committed Gleeson and the other authors of the Referendum Council report are to inserting these concepts into Australia’s political structure. The report puts forward several non-negotiable conditions:

Any Voice to Parliament should be designed so that it could support and promote a treaty-making process. Any body must have authority from, be representative of, and have legitimacy in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities across Australia. It must represent communities in remote, rural and urban areas, and not be comprised of handpicked leaders. The body must be structured in a way that respects culture. Any body must also be supported by a sufficient and guaranteed budget, with access to its own independent secretariat, experts and lawyers.

In other words, the real goal of the Voice was always more than simply allowing indigenous people representation to the Australian parliament — which they have had, anyway, almost continuously since 1967 through successive government advisory boards. The Referendum Council’s report emphasises that the demand for treaties was one of the priorities of the indigenous conventions leading up to the Uluru Statement:

The pursuit of treaty and treaties was strongly supported across the Dialogues. Treaty was seen as a pathway to recognition of sovereignty and for achieving future meaningful reform for Aboriginal and Torres Strait

WHERE WHITES RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS? By Chris Knight

First, at least the laws of arithmetic have not yet been rejected by the politically correct. Thus, Cortes and the conquistadors battled the Aztec empire from 1519-1521. However, the events to be described in South America happened in 1450. Columbus only reached the Americas in 1492, so there was no chance that white racism caused this, or is there???

<https://www.naturalnews.com/2019-07-20-mass-grave-discovered-in-peru-children-animal-sacrifice.html>

“The slaughter of hundreds of young children and llamas in 15th century Peru may have been in response to a huge *El Niño*. More than 140 boys and girls aged

Islander Peoples. Treaty would be the vehicle to achieve self-determination, autonomy and self-government.

So, rather than one “black state” as envisaged in 2001 by the disastrous former representative body, ATSIC, the latest proposal is for each individual clan to be recognised as a First Nation and for the Australian government to make a treaty with each one, as if it was a separate state. The states of Victoria and Queensland are now both in the process of writing their own treaties with such local groups. In the absence of any support from the Commonwealth, the political force of agreements of this kind will remain up in the air. But if Bill Shorten had won the last election, the legal machinery would already be cranked up, ready to start. As I record in *The Break-up of Australia*, this is a political outcome advocated not just by the far Left but by self-declared conservative activists such as Noel Pearson and Warren Mundine. They want self-government and an independent legal system for each self-identifying Aboriginal clan.

Although Gleeson is reluctant to mention it, in the Referendum Council’s report he and his colleagues even took seriously the demand from some Uluru delegations that the Voice’s goals of self-determination, autonomy and self-government should effectively give it international status:

It was also suggested that the body could represent Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples internationally. A number of Dialogues said the body’s representation could be drawn from an Assembly of First Nations, which could be established through a series of treaties among nations.

At this stage of the political process, the last proposal here is leftist wish-list material only. It nonetheless indicates clearly that, no matter how generous the terms and conditions of any agreement the Australian government makes now, it can never appease the insatiable demand by members of the Aboriginal political class for even more radical change in the future. No matter what the cost, what they call their “unfinished business” will never end. Article from *Quadrant* (magazine).***

between 5 and 14 were slaughtered in what is thought to be a mass sacrifice to appease the gods of a now extinct religion. Many of the children and juvenile animals had their hearts cut out during the grisly ritual. It is thought a huge *El Niño* caused major flooding and storms which triggered the bloody sacrifice. Analysis of the remains of more than 200 juvenile llamas and young humans dates it to approximately 1450, during the peak of the Chimu civilisation in northern coastal Peru. The Huanchaquito-Las Llamas burial site is a 7,500 square foot area located less than half a mile from the Chimu’s capital Chan Chan, a UNESCO World Heritage site.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) Its ancient empire controlled a 600-mile-long territory along the Pacific coast and interior valleys from the modern Peru-Ecuador border before the Incan empire took over. The study findings come after six years of excavation work at the site from 2011 to 2016. Study author John Verano, professor of anthropology at Tulane University, said: 'This site opens a new chapter on the practice of child sacrifice in the ancient world. 'This archaeological discovery was a surprise to all of us - we had not seen anything like this before, and there was no suggestion from ethnohistoric sources or historic accounts of child or camelid sacrifices being made on such a scale in northern coastal Peru. 'We were fortunate to be able to completely excavate the site and to have a multidisciplinary field and laboratory team to do the excavation and preliminary analysis of the material.' Anatomical and genetic tests,

published in the journal *PLOS One*, says cuts across the children and llamas' sterna suggested they had their chests cut open to remove their hearts. Professor Prieto said: 'Accessing the heart by transverse sectioning of the sternum is a technique familiar to modern thoracic surgeons, and is known by various names. 'The purpose of opening the chests of the children can only be hypothesised, but heart removal is a likely motivation.' Human and animal sacrifices are known from a variety of ancient cultures and are often performed as part of funerary, architectural, or spiritual rituals."

So, suppose that we had a fancy academic research grant, which always entails blaming Whites for everything bad; how do we incorporate the human sacrifice event into the White guilt history? Easy: just change the laws of physics, and causality! It is all just an average work day in deconstructive postmodernism! ***

FEAR OUR AI OVERLORDS By Brian Simpson

In an age of madness, this is to be expected; Elon Musk, the guy who has cars that sometimes ignite is working on a project to merge human brains with AI. Whooha, who gave him permission to do this? Why is this sort of research being permitted? Will the brains catch on fire too? Wait, it is science and technology, and thus part of the official religion of the West, or at least the insane capitalism-impregnated West, and thus beyond criticism:

https://www.shtfplan.com/headline-news/elon-musk-announcement-lets-merge-human-brains-to-achieve-a-symbiosis-with-ai_07172019

'Elon Musk finally admitted late Tuesday that NeuroLink's (Musk's brain-machine interface startup) official goal is to eventually merge human brains with artificial intelligence. The ultimate ending would be to "achieve a symbiosis with artificial intelligence."

Musk plans to begin human trials on an early version of NeuroLink intended to treat brain injuries next year, and he says that by "merging with AI," humans will be able to keep up with AI. "Ultimately we can do a full brain-machine interface," Musk said in an announcement that was widely live-streamed, according to a report by Vice. "This is going to sound pretty weird. Ultimately we can achieve a symbiosis with artificial intelligence. This is not a mandatory thing, this is something you can choose to have if you want. This is going to be really important at a civilization-level scale. Even in a benign AI scenario, we will be left behind. With a high-bandwidth brain-machine interface, we can go along for the ride and have the option of merging with AI."

Even though Musk claims it won't be "mandatory," things could always change. Laws could begin to mandate anyone who wants to participate in society to link their brain with AI. Especially considering NeuroLink has operated largely in secret since it was announced in 2017. Information about NeuroLink from public records documents obtained by Gizmodo show that it has been funding primate research studies at universities in California. Tuesday was the company's "coming out party." Musk stated that his goal with this presentation was to recruit engineers and scientists to NeuroLink's team.'

The great problem here is that there is no democratic control over these elites reshaping the entire nature of humanity. Because of money and profit, the system permits anything that generates a buck, and is thought to give more power to the super-capitalist elites. Yet, it all could come unstuck, since the AI monster could break its chains and become the new ruler. What use would an AI super-brain overlord have for the petty bs that our Dark Lords engage in? The super-elites are probably driven by notions of superiority and hatred, mixed with nihilism and world weariness from having too much wealth for too long. But, a displacing machine may not have desires as we know it, and may seek to eliminate the human pests that distract it some abstract mathematics, or some cognitive activity, we know not what.

Ed—Stepping in to at least partly defend Prof. Jordan B. Peterson, who has said that it is an illusion to be able to merge a human with a machine for the complexity of the human brain. ***

CAN AUSTRALIA BECOME EVEN MORE CORRUPT? By Pyjamas Reed

Wow, the joys of mental decline; typing my name now, I ended up with "Pyjamas," following Word's suggestions, but I like it and will stick with it for today. Now that leads me to the issue of the corruption of Australian society, and it seems that Oz is getting even more rotten:

"Australia is becoming more corrupt because successive federal governments have failed to create an effective national anti-corruption body similar to the NSW Independent Commission against Corruption, a leading jurist has argued. Writing in support of a national anti-corruption body, David Harper, a former Court of Appeals justice at the Supreme Court of Victoria, noted that in 2012 Australia ranked seventh in Transparency International's global corruption index, but that today we were ranked 13th. "The lack of a federal anti-corruption agency remains a reason why we have never come close to being corruption-free," he has written in an opinion piece for the *Herald*. Mr Harper writes that the lack of an effective federal anti-corruption watchdog had allowed corruption to flourish undetected and, in turn, allowed federal politicians to hide behind the myth that the federal sphere is free of corruption."

Yes, but the question could still be asked even if we had such a body; who watches the Watchmen: *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* ***

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To *The Australian* It is astonishing that in his almost full-page article John Ferguson does not examine the defects of current treaty-making projects with Aboriginal groups and the unprincipled campaign behind these assaults on our political order ("Treaty: new states of play", 22/7). Any treaty should be introduced only by the federal government and that only with the clear approval of the Australian people through a properly conducted referendum. Certain state governments have no mandate whatever for engaging in political folly which, it seems, might lead to scores of treaties across Australia. What a bureaucratic mess that will be! The actions of these governments constitute a disgraceful attempt to by-pass the will of Australians as a whole.

And with whom are these treaties to be made? The phrase "traditional owners" is thoroughly bogus. Australia, since its inauguration by federation, is owned by the Sovereign of the day - Her Majesty the Queen at present - who rules as protector of all Australians, no matter what their ethnic ancestry.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic

TARGET FOR THE WEEK

This target will be ongoing for months not just the week but now is the time to begin peppering the MP's and media with opposition to Aboriginal Recognition in the Constitution.

In case you thought the newly returned Morrison Government could be relied upon to resist the push from the ALP and Greens for Recognition; you need to think again. Quite a few Coalition MP's are leaning to the left on this issue too. It is official that the Government is promoting recognition because a Liberal MP wrote to his constituent as follows:

"The Australian Government is committed to the recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in the Australian Constitution. Recognition would acknowledge our shared history and the value we place on our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage."

Our **On Target** has already carried good information for you to use in opposing the plan. It may be best to not use several reasons in your letters, phone calls or visits to your MP's office; just stick to a couple like the division it will create as soon as one group is specifically mentioned in the Constitution. Instantly, there is a case of that group and the rest of us. Another point to raise is whether the MP believes his constituents really want such a plan. Is he aware that recognition is only the first step and will be followed by a Treaty and ultimately a separate State (remember it used to be called Apartheid).

More information will be in the journals soon, so keep it handy for a continuing effort.—ND

ONLINE ALOR RESOURCES

ALOR.ORG is our main website and repository of the Archives, sourced from our publications and historical documents of the Social Credit and Freedom Movements for the past 100 years.

AN EXCELLENT RESEARCH FACILITY

Main Internet Video Channel:

<https://www.brighteon.com/channel/douglassocialcredit>

Veritas Bookshop Online : <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>

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.