

"All that is necessary  
for the triumph of  
evil is that good  
men do nothing . . ."  
— EDMUND BURKE



# THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 16. No. 07

Registered Australia post — Publication PP343214 / 00016

July 2015

## CONTENTS

An Appeal to the Greek People by M. Oliver Heydorn	1
The Monetary System in Universal Use - Part II	2
Recognition Movement Disempowers Aborigines by Dr Anthony Dillon	2
The Salter Case and Beyond by Nigel Jackson	3
Newly Unearthed Writings from Isaac Newton Describe How Trees Defy Gravity by Jessica Orwig	6
Pentagon's '2015 Strategy' For Ruling The World by Mike Whitney	7

### AN APPEAL TO THE GREEK PEOPLE by M. Oliver Heydorn



Over the course of the last few years, the Greek people have had first-hand experience of the fact that the modern financial and economic systems do not work. They may not know, however, why they do not work and what can be done in order to fix them. The brute productive capacity (both actual and potential) of the modern, industrialized economy is so enormous that there is no good reason for poverty, for servility in its various forms (including the inane policy of full employment), for chronic and ever-increasing public, corporate, and consumer debts (that can never be paid off in the aggregate), for inflation, for economic waste and sabotage, or for increasing taxation and government intervention in the economy. In a word, there is no physical basis for economic struggle of any kind.

The great discrepancy between what a modern economy can do and what it actually does, as well as the correct solution to that particular paradox, have been known – not widely known – but known for many decades.

The Anglo-Scottish engineer, Major Clifford Hugh Douglas (1879-1952) correctly identified the core cause behind modern economic dysfunction and also devised apposite remedial measures. The resultant body of thought became known as Social Credit.

Greece suffers because the conventional financial system is not properly designed to begin with.

It is not designed to facilitate, to the greatest possible extent, the delivery of goods and services as, when, and where required, with the least amount of trouble to everyone.

Instead, the physical economy is hemmed in, restricted, and distorted by a financial system that does not adequately reflect reality. Hence, the economic struggle is completely artificial. If one were to sum up the problem in a single phrase that phrase would be: "chronic lack of consumer purchasing power." To make matters worse, recurring financial crises are bound to occur just so long as this underlying gap between prices and incomes is not adequately addressed.

The appropriate solution is for the financial system to be suitably modified so as to restore a real (i.e., self-liquidating) balance to the circular flow. A compensatory flow of 'debt-free' money must be created by a National Credit Office and issued directly (as a National Dividend) or indirectly (as a National Discount on retail prices) to the consumer. Once an endogenous financial homeostasis has been achieved, all the other symptoms of economic dysfunction will dissipate.

I would encourage all Greeks who have the best interests of their country at heart to take the time to familiarize themselves with the Social Credit analysis and remedial proposals.

Greece does not need inhuman austerity measures, nor does it require the intervention of the globalist troika (the IMF, the European Commission, and the European Central Bank). What Greece needs is a Social Credit monetary reform.

The Greeks gave the world the idea of 'democracy', the appropriation and proper application of the Social Credit ideas of a British engineer would allow them to finally enjoy the reality of both economic and political democracy. Without economic freedom and independence for each individual, a genuine political democracy cannot exist. The successful establishment of a Social Credit commonwealth in Greece would serve as an object-lesson for the whole world and be imitated everywhere.

## THE MONETARY SYSTEM IN UNIVERSAL USE - PART II

Source: The Alberta Post-War Reconstruction Committee Report of the Subcommittee on Finance (March 1945)

### 6. Velocity of Circulation

It is generally assumed that the purchasing power of money is increased or decreased by its "velocity of circulation". However, this theory will not bear examination in the light of the facts regarding the issue and withdrawal of money under the established system.

For purposes of analysis the following simple illustration of the velocity of circulation theory will suffice:

A wage-earner A. uses a \$10 bill of his income to buy two pairs of shoes from a shoe merchant B., who immediately goes into the adjoining store and spends the \$10 to purchase some shirts from C.; C in turn immediately goes across the street to grocer D. and buys some provisions costing \$10; grocer D. then takes the \$10 bill across to the local garage E., to buy some gasoline and oil.

The contention is that the \$10 bill provided purchasing power to the extent of \$40 during the day by virtue of its "velocity of circulation" in enabling \$40 worth of goods to be purchased by consumers. On the face of it this would appear to be the case, but on examination it will be found to be a complete fallacy.

Because all money issued creates a debt of the corresponding amount at its source of issue, for all practical purposes merchants B., C., D., and E. can be assumed to be operating on credit loans from their banks with some "savings" invested in their stock.

The proceeds of every sale they make can be divided into three parts:

- (1) repayment of a bank loan before a new line of credit can be obtained to replace stock,
- (2) payment of operating costs, and
- (3) net profit—i.e., personal income for services.

Suppose that in each case B., C., D., and E. work on a 15% net profit. From each purchase amounting to \$10 they would be obliged to set aside, say, \$8.50 repayment of their bank loans for replacement of stock and overhead costs, and only \$1.50 as personal income.

This is likewise true of C. and D. Therefore, by spending the \$10 both of them created a liability against their future purchasing power.

When A, obtained the \$10 in wages there was against it a corresponding cost in the prices of goods coming on the market. This liability must be kept in mind.

On buying the two pairs of shoes from B., A. surrendered his right to \$10 purchasing power and B. acquired the right to \$1.50 of this, the balance going for the repayment of his bank loan and cancellation of the money as shown previously. (If he was operating on his own capital it would make no difference, for the \$8.50 would have to go to the replacement of working capital with the same result.)

If B. does not repay his bank loan, but spends the whole \$10, he will have a liability of \$8.50 outstanding which will constitute a debt against future purchasing power. In other words he will have to sell over \$50 worth of goods without getting any portion of it for his own use in order to make good the deficit.

Thus while it is true that in the example quoted the \$10 bill resulted in \$40 worth of goods reaching consumers, there was created a trail of debts against their future purchasing power amounting to \$10 (the liability against the original issue of the money) plus \$8.50 (B.'s undischarged liability) plus \$8.50 (C.'s undischarged liability) plus \$8.50 (D.'s undischarged liability), making a total of \$35.50. Suppose E. now meets his obligations of \$8.50, he retains \$1.50 as his net profit—i.e., as purchasing power.

It will be evident that the effect is exactly the same as if A. bought gasoline, etc., from E., and B., C., and D. had obtained goods from each other "on time", pledging their future purchasing power.

The so-called "velocity of circulation" did not increase purchasing power at all. The fallacy of the theory lies in the incorrect assumption that money "circulates", whereas actually it is issued against production and withdrawn as purchasing power as the goods are bought for consumption. (emphasis added....ed)

=====

## RECOGNITION MOVEMENT DISEMPOWERS ABORIGINES

Academic Dr Anthony Dillon, identifies as part-Aboriginal... "I wish to see Aborigines move forward, not be held back by the myth that we are history's victims and powerless to change our own lives. The equally pernicious twin of this poisonous message about the past is that, until some (unspecified) form of recognition or acknowledgement or apology is given, Aboriginal people will be unable to move on. Yet, despite those who derive their sense of personal meaning and importance by playing the prophets of gloom, many have moved on in leaps and bounds...

People can move on, and many have, without receiving any such recognition. Offering forgiveness of wrongs committed is far more empowering than seeking some form of recognition or apology. I am not suggesting that people do not derive some short-term relief from an apology or other manifestations of recognition. But it is not the healing which comes from forgiving — and never forget that forgiveness can be an incredibly difficult thing to offer. That is why blaming others and demanding acknowledgement are more popular, so much more seductive. But the popular approach is also the disempowering approach. To blame others essentially communicates a message that hobbles those who utter it: "I am unable to do anything to help myself."

There is another serious problem with the belief that an acknowledgement of past wrongs by non-Aboriginal people is needed in order for Aboriginal people to feel good, engage productively with society and be able to attain the standard of living most Australians take for granted. To insist on some form of acknowledgement essentially implies that the happiness and well-being of Aboriginal people is under the direct control of those who are being requested to give the acknowledgement — the non-Aboriginal people. (continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

## Update

So is recognition going to do a single thing to fix this, or will it just entrench a disastrous you-owe-us defiance and victimhood?

Walgett will become the state's first school to have police stationed on the inside, as the government tries to hose down escalating violence at the northwest NSW school. Oops. Like so many such reports, this one doesn't mention the cultural and "racial" faultline here.

### But here's one earlier report which does:

Walgett's only public high school had become a breeding ground for "violence and criminal behaviour", with police attending almost daily, documents leaked to Fairfax Media reveal. The situation became critical in February when two female students attacked a long-standing female teacher and a deputy principal, who was unable to return to work for nearly a week.

The continuing violence and poor academic results have also prompted a complaint to the NSW deputy ombudsman with responsibility for Aboriginal affairs, Danny Lester.

"Today there have been two more assaults on staff in the high school and no action," said the complaint to the ombudsman. It detailed fights outside the school; described children jumping and damaging staff vehicles and properties; and breaches of the school's safety regulations. It claims that former principal Richard Rule, who "achieved so much in a short time and has years of experience", was forced out of the school by some in the Aboriginal community...

Deputy Opposition Leader Linda Burney said the situation at the school was "relegating another generation of mostly Aboriginal students to welfare and hopelessness". In recent weeks a quarter of the teachers have quit. As few as 21 of the more than 100 students turn up to school some days. Yet Aboriginal leaders are focussed on a stupid change of wording to the constitution as they bitch about the past.

The disempowering demands for recognition and apologies: Source: Andrew Bolt Blog, 6 July 2015

## THE SALTER CASE AND BEYOND

Aboriginal Constitutional Recognition (ACR) is being promoted to radically change the Australian nation against the interests of the majority.

*Nigel Jackson*

Anthropologist and ethnologist Frank Salter provided, in three parts in the prestigious literary magazine *Quadrant* – December 2013, January-February 2014 and March 2014, a profound and comprehensive rebuttal of the case made in favour of constitutional recognition of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (ACR) by the so-called Expert Panel (EP) appointed by the Gillard ALP government. There is reason to feel that this long essay should be made widely known. It is notable that advocates for ACR, such as our only national newspaper, *The Australian*, have been almost totally silent about Salter's thesis. For example, *The Australian* has published many news reports and opinion pieces in favour of ACR (by its own journalists such as Paul Kelly and Chris Kenny, but also by guest writers such as Frank Brennan, Damien Freeman, Noel Pearson and Gerard Henderson), none of which even mention Salter's name. My suggestion is that this is because Salter touched on too many 'politically incorrect' matters and did so with an analysis they cannot refute. (To be fair it must be noted that *The Australian* has published some articles and letters against ACR.)

This article sets out to offer a useful summary of Salter's case and will then examine any possible weaknesses in his position and discuss how the national debate has moved on since then. Salter argues, in effect, that the traditional nation of Australia, essentially British in its foundation and political structure, is in deadly danger. ACR is but part of a larger plan, the nature of which is not being adequately investigated and discussed by our major mass media. Indeed they appear to be in cahoots with the plan. Anyone who doubts this should study Salter's article in complete detail.

Salter's essential position on the changes recommended by the EP is that they are unacceptable, even if placed in the Constitution's preamble rather than the Constitution itself, 'because they fail to recognise the origins of the Australian nation' and would 'alienate the nation from its homeland.' ACR 'will not close the gap in indigenous health, criminality and employment.' Finally, 'the genuine ground for recognising indigenous peoples – that doing so would establish historical truth about the country's origins – also applies to British settlement and the original Anglo nation which gave Australia its name.'

Salter explains that our indigenous peoples 'deserve to be recognised as the country's first inhabitants' but that 'the first nation was established by the British Australians in the second half of the 19th Century and it was that emerging nation that brought mostly British technology, religion and political institutions and built the economy.' He could have added that they also brought our political order of constitutional monarchy, our traditional law and our culture in the various arts. 'White nationhood', Salter continues, 'emerged when Anglo-Celtic inhabitants began to identify with Australia as their homeland, not sacramentally but with affection, awe and pride.'

He points out that this has brought benefits to our indigenous peoples, despite their dispossession. 'Indigenous acquisition of a continent-wide identity has come through their participating in the Australian nation.' Salter criticises the EP for never once considering that Aboriginals 'are under a moral obligation to recognise the Anglo-Australian people as a nation that built their historic homeland through the blood, sweat and tears of their pioneering ancestors.' Thus 'indigenous ties have temporal precedence, while Anglo ties have national precedence.'

Salter makes an important distinction between nation and state.

(continued next page)

*(continued from previous page)*

'The Australian nation existed well before Federation and was a major impetus to the constitutional movement', so that Federation brought into existence not that nation but a state which would henceforth be its political order. He quoted Alfred Deakin, later a prime minister, at the Federation Debate in 1890: 'We are people one in blood, race, religion and aspirations.' At the same meeting Sir John Hall referred to 'that feeling of kinship among Australians' and their 'community of race and language.'

## II

It is in that context that Salter is able to establish the appalling and disgraceful ethnic bias of the EP. Its 'gross ethnic imbalance undermines its claim to representativeness and fairness.' Yet this group made recommendations 'that an ethnically blind constitution be changed into one that names two relatively small ethnic groups so as to honour and privilege them in perpetuity while omitting recognition of Australia's national origins.' True, there were several Anglo members, but 'they appear to have been chosen for their commitment to the Aboriginal cause, not as ethnic representatives'; and 'Anglo or White loyalists were absent from the EP, a body that dispensed the vital interests of White Australians who make up the majority of the population and the core of the nation.' Anglo Australia was also excluded from the EP's leadership, one chairman being Aboriginal and the other Jewish.

Salter adds that the report's 'use of sources was also skewed' since 'little use was made of independent analysts in the social sciences and business. No critics of the Aboriginal industry are cited.' Moreover, the report 'favoured submissions by indigenous advocates to a degree that did not accord with impartiality or representativeness.' Hostility towards Anglo Australia 'cast shadows within the EP', as shown in remarks by Noel Pearson and Marcia Langton; while, as for Mark Leibler, the Jewish chairman, it was 'regrettable' that he should have gone on record with criticism, apparently motivated 'by a traumatic reaction to Nazism', of 'a nation-building constitution that helped defeat that tyranny.' Summing up, Salter states that 'the ethnic bias of the EP should raise the gravest suspicion about its report.' Sardonicly, he adds that 'somehow Labor's racial politics escaped the attention of the professoriate and the media, despite their forensic hunt for Anglo "racism".'

## III

Salter makes a close examination of the actual EP proposals. For example, he points out that the proposed new Section 51A's acknowledgment of the 'continuing' relationship of our indigenous peoples' relationship with their traditional lands and waters, and their 'continuing' cultures, languages and heritage, would 'likely widen and extend claims to native title.' The acknowledgment of 'the need to secure the advancement' of these peoples (with no sunset clause for a time when advancement has been completed) is also dangerous.

'Thus attempts to revive, institutionalise and perpetuate native identity, law and customs are not as innocent as they first appear. They favour the movement to carve an Aboriginal nation out of the Australian nation.' Salter opposes the suggestion that the current Section 51(xxvi) should be removed, since it provides 'a necessary legislative power of any society that wishes to retain essential instruments for managing ethnic affairs..... the ramifications [of removal] take the form of legal traps that would impede responsible government' in areas such as immigration, internal security, national emergencies and war. The proposed new Section 116A 'would prevent governments from regulating ethno-cultural diversity.'

The question of indigenous disability, its causes and how it should be addressed, is considered at length. Salter shows that the EP gave insufficient attention to important causes of this disability, especially the relatively low IQs by international standards of the Aboriginal people as a whole. Other causes overlooked include welfarism, rural location, inadequate schooling, English being a second language, communal decision-making and the poor nourishment of children. Alcoholism and drug dependency could have been added as well. He concludes that 'the real causes of disability are... fatal to utopian visions of racial equality advanced by both sides of politics..... By setting unattainable goals – in contrast to obtainable and sizeable improvements – academics have helped lock White Australians into the purgatory of self-doubt and nervous spending. The goal of equal outcomes is unfair to Aboriginals, because it raises expectations that, while achievable for many individuals, are impossible for the population overall for the foreseeable future.' Salter also observes that 'reconciliation is an ever-receding mirage' and 'is often used as a code word for White guilt and apology and endless retreat.'

## IV

Salter's essay establishes the reliance of the EP on the United Nations Organisation and the largely unsatisfactory nature of that entity's pronouncements and activities. The ACR campaign is plainly part of a worldwide strategy in the interests of hidden parties. The United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), signed by Australia in 2009, is 'a master document to the EP report, just as the United Nations International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (UNCERD) was the master document to Australia's Racial Discrimination Act of 1975.' Salter bemoans the EP's 'slavish devotion' to 'an organisation compromised by cultural Marxism from its early days.' He asserts that the thrust of UNDRIP is 'to build indigenous sovereignty and undermine national sovereignty.' It does not require genius to grasp that this is the age-old strategy of 'divide and conquer' all over again. Any parties seeking to control the peoples of the planet through a UN morphed into a world government or 'New World Order' will naturally seek to weaken and divide currently existing nations.

*(continued next page)*

**"NewTimes Survey"** is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.

Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9600 0677

Subscription \$30.00 p.a.

*(continued from previous page)*

The revolutionary nature of the UN is clearly exposed by Salter. He notes that, like Australian proposals, UNDRIP ‘does not limit indigenous rights by time or culture. No mention is made of accepted international laws of possession in past centuries.’ Neither UNCERD nor UNDRIP, he adds, ‘is in the Western political tradition of consistency of principle and natural justice. Neither do they accord with Anglo-Saxon tradition of civil liberties, in which freedom to discriminate is an unstated presumption.’ He thus concludes that ‘social control of Western majorities is a prime goal of the anti-discrimination infrastructure’ and that, as a result, ‘in many Western societies liberties won through centuries of political evolution are being rapidly constrained as diversity rises.’ This leads him to ask the sixty-four dollar question: ‘It would be interesting to know how Australia came to sign a Declaration as subversive of national interests and common sense as UNDRIP..... the Howard government refused to sign. How did the Rudd Labor government come to approve it in 2009? What led Jenny Macklin MP, the relevant minister, to state that the Declaration set principles nations should aspire to? Did anyone think to strike a balance by proposing a declaration for the rights of nations or majorities?’

**V**

Salter adopts a politically incorrect position on the question of race and ethnicity, as well as on its application in this controversy. He dismisses the racial equality theories of Franz Boas and Ashley Montagu as unscientific and tainted by political agendas. He points out that ‘continental populations of contrasting appearance show multiple biological differences on a scale greater than that seen between races in many other species.’ It is certain that races ‘differed greatly in cultural achievements over the last two millennia.’ Moreover, ‘contemporary populations show differences in intelligence. Populations evolved in Eurasia have made most cultural advances and have the highest IQs.’ Salter’s honesty is shown by his recognition that his own group are not the star performers: ‘Populations derived from North-east Asia generally have higher IQs than those derived from Europe.’ Salter adds that the evidence supporting the hereditarian side (nature rather than nurture) of the debate on the causes of group differences ‘is strong and growing’.

Applying this perspective to the ACR campaign, Salter writes that ‘ethnic groups are large pools of kinship.’ Thus, ‘each Aboriginal is a stakeholder in the continuity and welfare of his people. The racial component of ethnic identity is another reason to respect their fellow feeling.’ However, he goes on to argue that this does not validate Noel Pearson’s claim ‘that race is never a legitimate criterion on which to base legislation.’ Rather, Salter says, ‘not only can “race” practically remain in the Constitution, it should, because the term... has broad meaning’ and ‘is a valid biological and taxonomical concept and is often an important ethnic marker.’ Courage will be needed in affirming this, because ‘the taboo on attributing cultural differences to biology is still policed.’ Despite that, ‘the evidence for substantial race difference in intelligence is strong.’ A very good question which Salter does not consider here is why and how this taboo has been established. A taboo involves the stimulus of fear, often intense fear amounting to terror. It contains something other than logical argumentation.

It is difficult not to conclude that at its base lies something mysteriously demonic.

**VI**

Despite his clear awareness of the enormous amount of chicanery that lies behind ACR, Salter nevertheless avers that ‘both the indigenous and Anglo roles in the nation’s origins can and should be recognised’ in the Constitution. I disagree. I advocate that there be absolutely no truckling whatever to this nefarious campaign.

Salter states that ‘recognition should be limited to recognising the past.’ His position is that ‘indigenous peoples deserve to be recognised as the country’s first inhabitants. But the first nation was established by British Australians in the second half of the 19th Century’ and that deserves recognition too. He believes that such a possibility can be realised; I do not. He correctly states that ‘the Australian population is diverse but the nation is still largely Anglo, including all those who have assimilated into that identity group’. However, he also notes some ominous facts. ‘At this point, not one member of the national Parliament has faulted the EP report for omitting the nation.’ And ‘Anglo ethnic organisations are few.’ He could have mentioned the Australian League of Rights and the Australian Monarchists League, but does not. He names only the British Australian Community in Melbourne and refers favourably to Alan James’ book, ‘New Britannia. The Rise and Decline of Anglo-Australia’, published in 2013. And he adds that ‘the present political class considers it unthinkable that the policy process should include Anglo Australians who feel about their people the way Aboriginal and multicultural leaders feel about theirs.’

The chance of any new committee being formed to allow fair play to Anglo Australia seems to me to be very remote. Those of us who care, as Salter does, for our British heritage need to be very clear-sighted about what has happened to our people and very practical about what can be done about it.

Everyone is aware that our indigenous people, as a people, are still traumatised by the dispossession of this continent which their ancestors experienced in the 19th Century. That is where the main reservoir of sympathy for them has its origins; and it needs to be respected, as Salter clearly states. It is a very powerful driver of ACR. However, there has been almost no public discussion of the traumatising suffered by the British people in their various lands around the world. The Aboriginals lost a continent; we have lost an empire. Add to that the terrible losses of some of our best young men in the two world wars. No wonder we have been so easily pushed about by semi-secret political forces obviously using their financial superiority to twist political orders to suit their ends and not ours. Our dismal position is made even worse by the steady collapsing of our sacred tradition, Christianity. Here I comment in the spirit of that famous saying from both the Old and the New Testaments: ‘Make straight the paths of the Lord!’ It has to be done again and again. In very simple terms, our sacred tradition stands in immediate need of a profound reformation, one greater and more in alignment with truth than that of Luther, Calvin and others in the 15th and 16th centuries. The truth is that orthodoxy, whether Orthodox, Catholic or Protestant, is not really orthodox: it is not true teaching of sacred reality in an unimpaired form. *(continued next page)*



*(continued from previous page)*

What has happened is that research into Christian origins and into comparative religion during the past two centuries, together with the ‘coming together of nations into a global village’ so that other sacred traditions cannot be ignored or simplistically rejected, has invalidated key understandings of what I will call received Christianity. Without reform, based on the works of the Perennialists (or Traditionalists) and others, I see little hope for a British renaissance of any kind.

My position on ACR is that it must be rejected in any form, since even the most minimalist change to the Constitution can be built on later, say when an ALP government is in power again. Secondly, we must ally ourselves with Australians of all ethnicities and sacred traditions and persuade them that saving the British nature of Australia is in the interests of us all. It will be impossible to do that on the basis of an exclusivist, foolish and superannuated theology – or on an attempt to privilege Anglo Australia in the Constitution.

## VII

Much has happened in the public debate since Salter’s article appeared. ACR advocates have engaged in much high-sounding rhetoric which is usually dressed up statements of the obvious or vague and sentimental verbiage. There has been enormous discussion, both in indigenous circles and in national forums, about how a referendum question involving ACR should be articulated. Two Jewish commentators have been widely touted as bringing ‘the conservatives’ into line behind ACR – a misleading claim to say the least. Reaching agreement is proving agonisingly difficult for campaigners. However, no one has convincingly explained why recognition (a good in itself, within reasonable bounds) has to occur in the Constitution. The various different proposals canvassed by a range of enthusiasts have totally failed to dissipate the very reasonable apprehension that many others feel about the whole business.

Noel Pearson made one useful contribution along the way. He correctly said that there are three strands of the nation that merit recognition: the indigenous, the British and the multicultural contributed by non-British immigrants. In itself that is true; but there is no need to place such recognition in the Constitution. Salter rightly expresses concern about the implications of the currently popular ‘recognition of traditional owners’ ceremonies at public events.

That concern could be easily met if such ceremonies were adapted to include all three strands of the nation. However, if all three were placed in the Constitution, government sponsored politically biased programmes in the future might simply ignore one or two and focus exclusively on Aboriginal ‘traditional owners’.

Another matter of great concern is the series of references by ACR advocates, both indigenous and non-indigenous, to the possibility of obtaining a ‘treaty’ after ACR has been achieved. Such people obviously are not taken in by the Prime Minister’s silly mantra about ‘completing’ the Constitution. Salter discusses the effects of such a treaty. He points out that no treaty could be made with Aboriginals upon British settlement, because there was no Aboriginal nation to negotiate with.

As for New Zealand’s 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, often cited as an example for us to follow, Salter points out that the bloody New Zealand Wars occurred sometime afterwards; and its existence is now being used, as might be expected, by Maori activists seeking benefits and perhaps sovereignty for their people. Support for a treaty can only be espoused by people who openly or secretly are working towards or at least favouring political division of the continent at a later date.

The same is true of the display of the ‘Aboriginal flag’ (to say nothing of the ‘Eureka flag’). Australians who value national unity should be encouraged to speak out against these flags and, where possible, to boycott institutions or events displaying them.

National unity is the theme around which our resistance should be predicated, not fair treatment of Anglos. Of course, another problem for us is the sentimental tendency in religions like Christianity and Islam to make light of the importance of kinship groupings. We need, in that context, to point out that, while sacred traditions may offer salvation to all human beings, they do not advise dropping the family as an institution. Kinship groupings are ‘family writ large’ and deserve similar respect and protection. The importance of Anglo kinship ties to Australia as a whole needs to form part of our advocacy of national unity. For, as Salter says, ‘to remain stable and moderate, societies should nurture their core ethnic groups, for the nation formed around them and they provide the strongest glue in the form of common culture, political traditions, and attachment to homeland.’

Salter has performed a signal task for Australia in labouring to provide his long and minutely documented thesis. Let us hope it plays its part in averting the doom hanging over Australia’s head at the present time.



### **NEWLY UNEARTHED WRITINGS FROM ISAAC NEWTON DESCRIBE HOW TREES DEFY GRAVITY** by Jessica Orwig

Isaac Newton is best known for “discovering” gravity and co-inventing calculus. But newly unearthed writings from Newton’s college days show he was equally adept at unlocking the mysteries of plants.

During his days as an undergraduate student in the 1660s at Trinity College, Newton kept a notebook for some of his philosophical thoughts. One researcher who analyzed Newton’s writings has uncovered a single passage titled “Vegetables” buried deep inside. In the passage, Newton offered an early explanation for how water and nutrients in plants — especially trees — seemingly defy gravity when they move from the roots to the leaves.

According to David Beerling, a professor of palaeoclimatology at the University of Sheffield in England and author of a paper describing the passage, Newton’s description is remarkably accurate.

*(continued next page)*

(continued from previous page)

### **A longstanding mystery**

From a lifetime of experience, people in the 17th Century knew that objects moved down — like water flowing downstream or rocks tumbling downhill. Yet, somehow, trees were miraculously moving nutrients and fluid tens and hundreds of feet in the opposite direction: up to the tips of their high-hanging branches.

How trees did this was a mystery that stumped botanists until 1895 — more than 200 years after Newton wrote his “Vegetables” passage at Trinity College. Unfortunately, the notebook wasn’t publicly available until 1872, when it was donated to the Cambridge University Library, otherwise botanists might have solved the mystery much sooner.

In his notebook, Newton theorized that plants have fluid-filled pores in their leaves, Beerling writes in his Feb. 2 paper in the journal *Nature Plants*. Newton thought that when light shines on these pores, the light particles push water particles away from the plant, which then lets the tree move water and other nutrients up through its trunk to replace the lost water particles.

Newton’s explanation is surprisingly similar to the evaporation process botanists first proposed in 1895 and is still the leading theory today. Below is a journal entry, which is transcribed:

#### **More questions than answers**

Today, botanists know that trees harbour long columns of nutrient-rich water. Like a chain, each column is a series of connected water molecules that are strongly bound together through a chemical process called hydrogen bonding. These chains run from the high-hanging leaves to the underground roots.

The trick to understanding trees lies within the leaves’ stomata — small pores that plants use as breathing holes, opening them to release oxygen and closing them after inhaling carbon dioxide. When a stoma opens, heat from sunlight can enter and make the leaf give up some of its water in the form of evaporation.

As the water leaves the tree leaf, it tugs on the molecules nearby, which tug on their nearby molecules, and so on, all the way down the tree into the roots, which then extracts water from the soil.

Newton suggested a very similar process in his own 17th Century words (where “particle b” is a droplet of water and “Globule c” is light):

“Suppose a b the pore of a Vegetable filled with fluid mater & that the Globule c doth hitt away the particle b, then the rest of subtile matter in the pores riseth from a towards b & by this meanes juices continually arise up from the roots of trees upward leaving dreggs in the pores & then wanting passage stretch the pores to make them as wide as before they were clogged. which makes the plant bigger untill the pores are too narrow for the juice to arise through the pores & then the plant ceaseth to grow any more.”

Like many discoveries, Beerling’s fascinating find raises more questions than answers.

“Frustratingly, the context of Newton’s notes on plant juices is unknown,” Beerling wrote. “We have no idea how long Newton spent thinking about the working of plants of what prompted these thoughts. No other pages in the notebook report comments on plants,” Beerling wrote in his paper. But one thing is likely certain: Newton didn’t steal the idea Beerling writes: “Reclusive and secretive, it’s doubtful he gained botanical inspiration from conversations with others at Cambridge University interested in plants.”

---

---

---

### **PENTAGON’S ‘2015 STRATEGY’ FOR RULING THE WORLD by Mike Whitney, Global Research**

The Pentagon has released its 2015 National Military Strategy, a 24-page blueprint for ruling the world through military force. While the language in the report is subtler and less incendiary than similar documents in the past, the determination to unilaterally pursue US interests through extreme violence remains the cornerstone of the new strategy.

Readers will not find even a hint of remorse in the NMS for the vast destruction and loss of life the US caused in countries that posed not the slightest threat to US national security. Instead, the report reflects the steely resolve of its authors and elite constituents to continue the carnage and bloodletting until all potential rivals have been killed or eliminated and until such time that Washington feels confident that its control over the levers of global power cannot be challenged.

As one would expect, the NMS conceals its hostile intentions behind the deceptive language of “national security”. The US does not initiate wars of aggression against blameless states that possess large quantities of natural resources.

No. The US merely addresses “security challenges” to “protect the homeland” and to “advance our national interests.” How could anyone find fault with that, after all, wasn’t the US just trying to bring peace and democracy to Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and now Syria?

In the Chairman’s Forward, Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey attempts to prepare the American people for a future of endless war:

Future conflicts will come more rapidly, last longer, and take place on a much more technically challenging battlefield. ... We must be able to rapidly adapt to new threats while maintaining comparative advantage over traditional ones ... the application of the military instrument of power against state threats is very different than the application of military power against non state threats. We are more likely to face prolonged campaigns than conflicts that are resolved quickly ... that control of escalation is becoming more difficult and more important. (Document: 2015 U.S. National Military Strategy, USNI News)

War, war and more war. This is the Pentagon’s vision of the future. Unlike Russia or China which have a plan for an integrated EU-Asia free trade zone (Silk Road) that will increase employment, improve vital infrastructure, and raise living standards, the US sees only death and destruction ahead. Washington has no strategy for the future, no vision of a better world. There is only war; asymmetrical war, technological war, pre-emptive war. The entire political class and their elite paymasters unanimously support global rule through force of arms. That is the unavoidable meaning of this document.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

The United States intends to maintain its tenuous grip on global power by maximizing the use of its greatest asset; its military. And who is in the military's gunsights? Check out this excerpt from an article in Defense News:

The strategy specifically calls out Iran, Russia and North Korea as aggressive threats to global peace. It also mentions China, but notably starts that paragraph by saying the Obama administration wants to "support China's rise and encourage it to become a partner for greater international security," continuing to thread the line between China the economic ally and China the regional competitor.

"None of these nations are believed to be seeking direct military conflict with the United States or our allies," the strategy reads. "Nonetheless, they each pose serious security concerns which the international community is working to collectively address by way of common policies, shared messages, and coordinated action. (Pentagon Releases National Military Strategy, Defense News)

Did you catch that last part? "None of these nations are believed to be seeking direct military conflict with the United States or our allies. Nevertheless, they each pose serious security concerns."

In other words, none of these countries wants to fight the United States, but the United States wants to fight them. And the US feels it's justified in launching a war against these countries because, well, because they either control vast resources, have huge industrial capacity, occupy an area of the world that interests the US geopolitically, or because they simply want to maintain their own sovereign independence which, of course, is a crime."

**Source:** <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-pentagons-2015-strategy-for-ruling-the-world/5460404>

### **Canadian Wallace Klinck observed:**

The (Americans) are ruled by an occupying anti-Christian Cabal whose narcissistic assumed superior "intelligence" regards acquisition of power as the only meaningful motivation for human action, with might and force being fully justified as the purely logical means of pursuing this malevolent policy.

Above all, they want to protect the all-powerful and pervasive exploitative financial system which they have established as the ultimate instrument of control for pursuing their destructive activities. Pure evil—which will lead to the eventual destruction of the nation—possibly of civilization as we conceive it - if allowed to continue dominating its foreign policy.

It is a sick view of human purpose where might trumps love and makes life not worth living except for the ruling elites who control the levers of policy enforcement, at least for as long as they can escape the consequences of their own perverse actions.

### **OUR POLICY**

**To** promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

**To** defend the free Society and its institutions — private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.

**To** promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

**To** oppose all forms of monopoly, either described as public or private.

**To** encourage all electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

**To** support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil and environment reflecting natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

**To** oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

**VERITAS BOOKS IS HAVING AN EoFY+ SALE  
until July 31st 2015**

**40% discount on all stock items @ [veritasbooks.com.au](http://veritasbooks.com.au)**

**LEAGUE'S WEBSITE ADDRESS: [alor.org/](http://alor.org/)**

**THE LEAGUE'S BOOK SERVICES: —**

When ordering journals, '*On Target*' and '*New Times Survey*'

— Please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to—

**'ALOR Journals'** .

For educational books, videos and DVDs, etc. please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to —

**'Heritage Bookshop Services'**

For donations to the League please make payments to

**'Australian League of Rights' or 'ALOR'**

Books are available at meetings, at our Melbourne bookshop or by mail order from the following addresses:

**Victoria, Tasmania:** Heritage Bookshop,

2nd Floor, 145 Russell Street,

Melbourne, 3000

(G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001).

Phone: (03) 9600 0677

**South Australia**

Heritage Book Mailing Service,

P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, 5159.

Phone: (08) 7123 7131;

**All Other States:** To either Victorian or South Australian addresses.

**VERITASBOOKS ONLINE: <http://veritasbooks.com.au/>**

**<http://alor.org/avLibrary/index.php>**