ABORIGINAL LAND RIGHTS AND AUSTRALIA’S SOVEREIGNTY


The following information was published by the Australian League of Rights in the May 1984 edition of the Intelligence Survey, in an effort to warn the Australian people what, and who, were behind the push for ‘land rights’ for the Aboriginal folk. Australians continued about their everyday affairs not recognising the dangers to our national sovereignty. Twenty six years later it is a different situation, the Aboriginal folk are now realising they were used for a far different agenda.

The screws are being tightened as we are forced tighter and tighter in the New World Order vice.....

The Commonwealth Government, under the zealous hand of Aboriginal Affairs Minister Clyde Holding, has embarked on a policy for “Aboriginal Land-Rights” which will not only take it into a constitutional minefield, but will, if taken as far as possible, threaten the Australian continent with a type of balkanisation into racial “ghettos”, and also compromise Australia’s Federal system, its communications, its defence and its relative lack of racial disharmony.

To achieve this package of disasters the Government will rely not so much on the considered constitutional will of the Australian people - a process amply provided for in the Constitution itself - as on a series of premises derived by the United Nations Organisation and its agencies. These premises, or, as High Court Justice Wilson described them in 1982, “international arrangements”, will be imposed on all Australians, including the Aboriginals, by a radical mis-use of Section 51(29) of the Constitution, which gives the Commonwealth Government power over “external affairs”.

If this policy is consummated, the ultimate decision on what happens inside Australia will be determined not by elected parliaments within constitutional limits, interpreted where necessary by a High Court which uses the expressed will of the Australian people as its criterion. It will be determined by the International Court of Justice, which sits in the Peace Palace in the Hague, which is owned by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

The World Almanac, 1983, described the International Court in these words:

“The International Court of Justice is the principal judicial-organ of the United Nations. All members are ipso facto parties to the statute of the Court, as are three non-members - Liechtenstein, San Marino and Switzerland. Other states may become parties to the Court’s Statute. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises cases which the parties submit to it and matters especially provided for in the Charter or in treaties.

The Court gives advisory opinions and renders judgements. Its decisions are only binding between the parties concerned and in respect to a particular dispute. If any party to a case fails to heed a judgment, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council. The 15 judges are elected for nine-year terms by the General Assembly and the Security Council. Retiring judges are eligible for re-election.

The Court remains permanently in session, except during vacations. All questions are decided by majority. The Court sits in The Hague, Netherlands.
ABORIGINAL GENES SUGGEST INDIAN MIGRATION

by Alice McRae

Northern Australian Aboriginals may have had contact with Indian migrants 4000 years ago, says study.

AUSTRALIA MIGHT NOT have been as isolated for the 40,000 years prior to European colonisation as once thought, according to a new study which has found evidence of substantial gene flow between Indian populations and Australia about 4000 years ago.

The research also suggests the dingo might have arrived on Australian shores about that time – along with tool technology and food processing – though other experts are sceptical.

“This is very exciting work and may well resolve a major scientific conundrum,” says Associate Professor Darren Curnoe at the University of New South Wales in Sydney, who adds that scientists have speculated about this possible ancient connection for 200 years.

Australian Aboriginals had early contact

The study, published today in the journal PNAS, says it was commonly assumed that Australia remained largely isolated following initial colonisation some 40,000 years ago, though the genetic history of Aboriginal people has not been explored in detail.

Dr Irina Pugach and Dr Mark Stoneking, of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology in Germany, joined colleagues in analysing large-scale genotyping data from Aboriginal Australians, New Guineans, Island Southeast Asians and Indians that suggest a new possibility.

The authors found a common origin for populations in Australia, New Guinea and the Mamanwa (a Negrito group from the Philippines) and estimated these groups split from each other about 36,000 years ago.

The researchers say this supports the view that these groups represent the descendants of an ancient southwards migration out of Africa. They also found a substantial gene flow from India to Australia 141 generations ago, or 4230 years ago, assuming a generation span of 30 years.

Gene flow from India to Australia

“This is also approximately when changes in tool technology, food processing, and the dingo appear in the Australian archaeological record, suggesting that these may be related to the migration from India,” the authors write, though they add that the Indian genes might not have come directly from India.

These genes could not have arrived during the initial migration to Australia 40,000 years ago because they are absent from the New Guinean and Mamanwa genomes. Also, they are too uniformly spread across northern Aboriginal genomes to have come from European colonists.

Associate Professor Joe Dortch of the University of Western Australia in Perth says the findings are significant, and questions whether there was some kind of migration or simply occasional contact. “It’s not possible to say how the connection to India arose,” he told Australian Geographic.

“But expansion of trading or exploration activity by a culture or group of cultures called the Austronesians may be a factor... [as] the ancestors of northern Australians, like those who were involved in the study, had more contact with Asian peoples than other Australians.”

Associate Professor Jeremy Austin from the University of Adelaide says that the study highlights the fine-scale knowledge that can be obtained from genome data, but adds that the results need to be interpreted carefully.

“The authors do not estimate the number of migrants involved that could have carried this genetic signature from India, “he says. “In theory, this could have been a very small number of people. Thus, any lay-interpretation of the results that boatloads of Indian fishermen arrived on the coast of Australia, bringing new technologies, may not be accurate.”

Could dingoes have arrived with Indian migration?

Jeremy is sceptical about the claims related to the arrival of dingoes in Australia.

“Genetic data for dingoes suggests they came from Island Southeast Asia, not India. So linking the human genetic evidence to the idea that they also imported a range of new technologies and dingoes is something that needs further investigation,” he says.

“The important result of this paper is that it supports previous ideas about trade and movement of people between Australia and Asia over a long period of time.”

The Australian samples came from a broad area of the Northern Territory, and as a result may not be representative of the indigenous populations across the rest of the continent.

========================================
Genome-wide data substantiate Holocene Gene flow from India to Australia
Irina Pugacha, Frederick Delfina, Ellen Gunnarsdóttira, Manfred Kayserd, and Mark Stonekinga
Edited by James O’Connell, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, and approved November 27, 2012 (received for review July 21, 2012)
- - http://www.pnas.org/content/110/5/1803.full
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SOCIAL CREDIT AND MASS MIGRATION by M. Oliver Heydorn

We live now in an age of mass migrations and of rumours of mass migrations. With the term ‘mass migration’ we are referring, of course, to the movement, not merely of large numbers of people, but of whole groups of people, who constitute various racial-cultural gestalts, en masse from one nation or region to another. When it comes to explaining why this mass migration has been occurring, why it is, on the whole, a negative phenomenon, and what can be done to reduce migratory flows to saner proportions and saner forms, Social Credit theory has much to contribute to the public discourse.

The Economic Cause Behind Mass Migration

It has been commonplace to explain the existence of mass migration in the modern era in terms of technological advancements and particularly in terms of revolutions in communication and transport facilities, as though it were all a largely natural development. This overlooks the fact that a great deal of the more recent waves of mass migration, those with which we are most familiar, has actually been an effect of an international economic policy. Technology is what makes the mass migration possible, to be sure, but it really does not explain why it is happening. To this question of why, Social Credit provides an original and cogent answer.

The Social Credit analysis of cost reveals that the standard financial system is inherently unbalanced. It does not automatically provide the consumer with sufficient money in the form of income to offset the costs of production. This chronic lack or deficiency of consumer buying power means that the economy is also fundamentally unstable because it is, to a greater or lesser degree, structurally insolvent. In order to restore stability, the present economic model attempts to achieve an approximation of equilibrium by: a) borrowing into existence additional producer credit from the private banks in order to finance business expansion (especially for additional capital and export goods) or new government production, or else by: b) borrowing into existence additional consumer credit directly in the form of consumer loans. In both cases, the economy is committing itself to a programme of perpetual economic growth in order to keep itself afloat. Growth is mandated as the condition of the possibility of economic survival.

Countries that have been more or less successful in filling the price-income gap thus have a powerful incentive to steadily increase the populations within their borders so that their economies can continue to expand. If the native citizenry are not having a sufficient number of children to support the required level of growth, large numbers of additional producer-consumer units, otherwise known as human beings, must be ‘imported’ from the outside in order to maintain the economic momentum. At the same time, economically stagnant countries that have been less successful in bridging the gap, or even in just producing goods and services in the first place, are also provided with an incentive to export people for whom they cannot furnish an adequate livelihood. This releases some of the economic, social, and political pressure which those unemployed or under-employed citizens place upon their respective nations, and especially on whatever social services they may possess.

The Negative Character of Mass Migration

Respect for the organic, i.e., that which arises spontaneously from within, is a hallmark of Social Credit philosophy and policy. Social Credit’s great objection to mass migration and to the type of multicultural societies which mass migration produces is the thoroughly inorganic character of both. People do not fall prey to a spontaneous desire to permanently uproot themselves by journeying thousands of miles away from home, often inter-continentally, because they have an overwhelming wish to enrich someone else’s culture or for the love of travel. They do it because the reigning financial system (amongst other possible factors) makes it difficult, if not extremely difficult, for many people to achieve a decent standard of living in their own countries of origin. The more well-to-do nations are all too eager to welcome these immigrants, who may be likened to ‘refugees’ fleeing financial oppression, as potential economic adjuncts. Provided that the money is forthcoming, these people will produce and above all consume, thus helping to satisfy the need for continual economic growth.
This forced movement of people creates a number of problems, however. In the first place, it leads to the dilemma of integration. Throughout the world, and especially the Western world, different sorts of people are being forced to live in the same geographical space because of circumstances which have been imposed on all of them by external forces. At the same time, societies must, by necessity, enjoy a certain degree of social cohesion in order to function. [1] But how do you successfully bind disparate people together who have no real common interests beyond the economic, which, under the existing system, is to say ‘money’? The two great models that have been developed to address the challenge of integration are the melting pot, typified by the United States, and the multicultural mosaic model, which some might say is typified by Canada. The first policy attempts to dissolve individual cultural differences in the name of a common identity, while the second dissolves the common identity in the name of preserving individual cultural differences. Both policies are bound to fail; the first by denying or at least downplaying the incommunicability of organically derived cultures and the second by failing to meet the functional necessity of a society for a substantive common identity and bond. Both policies are policies of forced integration and forcing disparate groups of people to live together is utopian, i.e., out of step with reality:

Without carrying the German conception of Blut und Boden to the absurd lengths characteristic of its protagonists, only the type of mind which has absorbed the abstractions of Bloomsbury would dispute the large element of truth which it embodies. A nation is amongst other factors a culture, and while a culture probably contains many components which do not derive from the soil, it is certain that no culture which is not rooted in the soil and racially related to it has the character of permanence. [2]

It is of the essence of Social Credit ideas that there is an organic connection between peoples, races, and individuals, and the soils of particular portions of the earth’s surface which are individualistic.[3]

The second major problem with mass migration is the problem posed to the survival of the host culture. Just as there is a right not to be displaced, there is also a right not to be invaded. Any and all people who share a historically-derived cultural unity have a natural right to protect, preserve, and promote their own common identity, way of life, and heritage, as well as to be free to determine their own common destiny (by establishing a government that genuinely represents their own interests), provided that in doing so they always act in keeping with the moral law. Speaking within a British context, Douglas thought that a sensible level of immigration would involve small numbers of culturally compatible individuals (as opposed to large groups). The price of violating this policy-proposal would be the loss of continuity with the past and the eventual destruction of British culture:

It is not difficult to apprehend that naturalisation laws have a vital bearing on this matter, and that naturalisation laws are affected not merely quantitatively but essentially by the relation of the culture of the immigrant to that of the country of his choice. Apart from a few points of the seaboard, for instance, the culture of the North American Continent in the seventeenth century was that of the North American Indian.

Immigration has wiped out that culture, not wholly or even principally through frontier massacre, but by the sheer incompatibility of the indigenous culture with that of the immigrant. The immigrant himself was in the main a variant of the general European culture although of differing national stocks, and a culture with recognisable European features was characteristic of the United States until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, as it is in Canada to-day. A consideration of the history of American expansion leads a grimly humorous aspect to the solicitude for India now so prevalent in the United States.

The immigration and the culture which is being forced upon Great Britain by every device of propaganda and covert political, social, and economic pressure is not fundamentally European, is not accompanied by immigration of European stock, and is as incompatible with the native culture as was European culture with that of the North American Indian. It is just arguable, and it is very loudly argued, that a small influx of foreign strains can be absorbed without great disadvantage. But it must be small, and it is essential that it should be absorbed. Our alien population is not small (its dimensions are systematically falsified), it is increasing, and it is not being absorbed.[4]

The prophylactic for cultural conflict is to recognize and respect the fact that individuals belong naturally to different groups, and that all of these groups have genuine interests that should be protected and promoted, but not any single one at the illegitimate expense of any other group. Social Credit is therefore incompatible with any sort of supremacism according to which one group of people has a natural right to dominate, control, or otherwise impose themselves on others. In place of one group imposing itself, there should be mutual respect amongst all. As part of this mutual respect, however, the right of each nation to restrict migratory flows in its own best interests must be granted.

There is a final point that must be made in addressing this matter:
One must never lose sight of the fact that the sort of demographic and cultural changes that the Western world is currently experiencing, changes that are likely to intensify in the future, are not merely economic phenomena. They also serve the political objectives of those who would wish to centralize power, economic, political, and cultural, in the hands of an international plutocratic oligarchy. Multicultural nations lose their raison d’être for being nations in the first place. Make no mistake about it, mass migration and its cultural fallout is NWO policy:

In this, the gravest crisis of the world’s history, it is essential to realize that the stakes which are being played for are so high that the players on one side, at least, care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow. [5]

Let us not, under the influence of cultural Marxism and its untenable (but apparently beguiling) concept of ‘equality’ support a policy that only promises to contribute further to the undoing of all of us.

The Social Credit Solution to Mass Migration

The Social Credit solution to the phenomenon of mass migration is as straightforward as its diagnosis. Restore, through a suitable reform of the monetary system, a distributive, self-liquidating balance to the circular flow: http://www.socred.org/index.php/blogs/view/a-summary-of-the-social-credit-monetary-reform, and there will no longer be any need for compensatory public, business, and consumer debts.

[1] Social cohesion is indeed a functional necessity, i.e., the greater and more organic the cultural cohesion of a society, the easier it should be to get things done in association. Such societies benefit from “... the immense stability underlying race homogeneity.” C.H. Douglas, The Brief for the Prosecution (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1945), 78. On the other hand, only a certain level of social cohesion is strictly necessary for the political and economic systems of a country to function tolerably well. The benefits which could be derived from increased levels of social cohesion cannot be legislated because one cannot legislate the organic. For this reason, while it is certainly acceptable to use the coercive force of the state in order to preserve the organic, one cannot use it to force complete cultural compliance from immigrants once they have been permitted entry. France, for example, was fully within her rights to refuse to permit Muslim immigration, whether from North Africa or elsewhere, in order to preserve her own identity. Once admitted, however, there can be no justification for forcing Muslims to comply with French cultural norms when there is no question of health, safety, or common decency. The current prohibitions on the wearing of the Hijab in public buildings, or the wearing of the Burka anywhere in public, go far beyond the structural functional necessities of a political association. They are unjustifiable impositions and are bound to result in resentment and increased dissatisfaction rather than the ostensibly desired end of increased integration. More broadly, those functional necessities which are not systemic or structural (by which I mean functional necessities that are inherent to the proper functioning of economic and political systems, etc.) ought never to be mandated by force of law. These non-structural functional necessities have more to do with the spirit or ethos which a people bring to an association. A community of kind, patient, and compassionate people, for example, would be far more successful in achieving common ends than one in which people were irritable, impatient, and indifferent, but one cannot force people to develop the sort of virtues or other qualities which would make life in association more successful by passing a law. Forced virtue or charm is no virtue or charm at all.

Eliminate the need for ever-increasing indebtedness and you eliminate the artificial pressure currently exerted in favour of constant economic growth. Eliminate continuous growth as a requirement for economic survival and neither those countries who have managed to meet the demand for growth by importing more people, nor those countries who have given up on meeting any such demand and have consequently exported some of their own citizens, would have any need of being either net importers nor net exporters of human beings. The inherent insolvency of the existing financial order, which has hitherto served as the dynamo or engine driving migratory flows, will have been appropriately neutralized and the phenomenon of mass migration will recede into the past.

Balancing the financial system along Social Credit lines would stabilize the economy and an inherently or endogenously stable economy, an economy that does not have to look or go outside of itself in order to secure (or salvage) its own functionality, would provide the material basis for a stable and organic culture. Indeed, a plurality of Social Credit nations would lay a sound financial foundation for mutual respect and harmony on the international stage. The Social Crediter anticipates a world in which the words of the prophet Micah might eventually be paraphrased as follows:

‘But they shall sit every people under their own vine and under their own fig tree; and none shall make them afraid.’

NOTES

[1] Social cohesion is indeed a functional necessity, i.e., the greater and more organic the cultural cohesion of a society, the easier it should be to get things done in association. Such societies benefit from “... the immense stability underlying race homogeneity.” C.H. Douglas, The Brief for the Prosecution (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1945), 78. On the other hand, only a certain level of social cohesion is strictly necessary for the political and economic systems of a country to function tolerably well. The benefits which could be derived from increased levels of social cohesion cannot be legislated because one cannot legislate the organic. For this reason, while it is certainly acceptable to use the coercive force of the state in order to preserve the organic, one cannot use it to force complete cultural compliance from immigrants once they have been permitted entry. France, for example, was fully within her rights to refuse to permit Muslim immigration, whether from North Africa or elsewhere, in order to preserve her own identity. Once admitted, however, there can be no justification for forcing Muslims to comply with French cultural norms when there is no question of health, safety,
The freedom of individuals to act in ways which conflict with the non-structural functional necessities of an association must therefore be respected, even if they choose to undercut these sorts of functional necessities by acting at cross-purposes. Only thus can the individual and organic dimensions of personality have an opportunity to blossom.


Japan has maintained a very restrictive immigration policy, and I, as a non-Japanese, have no objection whatsoever to the fact that they value and wish to maintain their own organically derived identity. On the contrary, I am fully supportive of their policy even if it means that I could never immigrate there. The loss of the Japanese culture and people through a multicultural disintegration would be a great loss to the entire world. The same type of observation could be made mutatis mutandis with respect to every other racial and ethnic group.


***

FAREWELL TO BILL MOLLISON

“The only ethical decision is to take responsibility for our own existence and that of our children.”… Bill Mollison

EDUCATOR, author and co-founder of the global permaculture movement Bill Mollison has died in Hobart at the age of 88. 24th September 2016

Mr Mollison’s passing on Saturday was announced on the website of the Permaculture Research Institute, which he founded.

“A massive tree in the forest of humanity has fallen,” the Institute said in a statement.

“With deep sorrow, we wish to inform family and friends that Bruce Charles ‘Bill’ Mollison, the ‘Father of Permaculture’, has passed away. “He gifted so much to the world: a vision and framework for a positive future, a special concern for developing countries, and above all, hope.”

Mr Mollison and David Holmgren developed the system of permaculture as an integrated and sustainable form of agriculture — designed to create a symbiotic relationship between man and the world — which they spelled out in their 1977 book Permaculture One. The system adopts environmentally friendly techniques including forgoing the use of chemicals, thoughtful garden design, mimicking natural ecosystems and incorporates recycling and the use of waste.

Mr Holmgren said Mr Mollison was one of Australia’s ecological pioneers. “Bill’s brilliance was in gathering together the ecological insights, principles, strategies and techniques that could be applied to create the world we do want rather than fighting against the world we reject,” he wrote. “His legacy lives on in all those who were transformed by his teaching.”

In a tribute posted on the website of Permaculture Magazine, author Graham Bell said Mr Mollison was a visionary in his field. “A few people are born who are world-class heroes to those who know them and unknown to the great majority, until one day their inescapable influence floats to the surface and is generally recognised for the cream it is. In hindsight such leaders go on to become household names.”

Born at Stanley, Mr Mollison was a former University of Tasmania lecturer who spent decades travelling the world spreading the word about permaculture. His work was recognised with numerous awards and international recognition including the Right Livelihood Award and the USSR Academy of Sciences’s Vavilov Medal.
THE GENOCIDE OF A LAND by Paul Craig Roberts

In our days of darkness, spreading ignorance, and absence of serious debate in public forums, we can take hope from the fact that some scholars still produce serious and informative books on the most critical issues of our time. If in the future policymakers again seek the guidance of truth, they will have the information at hand. One such book of truth is Jeremy R. Hammond’s just published Obstacle to Peace, a closely reasoned, heavily documented (68 pages of footnotes), fully indexed, readable book with a Foreword by Richard Falk, an Introduction by Gene Epstein, and an endorsement by Noam Chomsky.

The obstacle to peace is the United States government, which has consistently opposed the entire world’s decades long effort to stop the Zionist genocide of a land called Palestine.

Palestine is a stolen and oppressed land. Israel’s greatest leaders themselves acknowledge the fact. Thomas Are quotes David Ben-Gurion:

“If I were an Arab leader, I would never make terms with Israel. That is natural, we have taken their country. Sure God promised it to us, but what does that matter to them? Our God is not theirs. We came from Israel, it’s true, but that was two thousand years ago, and what is that to them? There has been anti-Semitism, the Nazis, Auschwitz, but was that their fault? They only see one thing: we have come and stolen their country. Why should they accept that?”

http://thomas-l-are.blogspot.com

What once was a country consists today of a few small isolated Palestinian ghettos in the West Bank surrounded by Israeli settlements and an open air prison known as Gaza. Periodically Israel launches military assaults on the civilian population of Gaza, destroying the lives of the people and the infrastructure of the prison camp.

Israel then prevents outside efforts from sending supplies to the suffering people in Gaza. “Freedom flotillas” crewed by Nobel Laurates, present and former members of US and European legislative bodies, and even members of the Israeli Knesset set sail with supplies for Gaza and are pirated and captured in international waters by the Israeli Navy, which, as a warning to others, kills some of the delegation in “self-defense.”

The United States steadfastly defends Israel’s criminal behavior with its UN veto and other governments, though disapproving, are unwilling to confront Washington and force a change.

Washington’s 21st century wars in the Middle East were initiated by neoconservative regimes whose principal policymakers are tightly allied with Israel. The wars focused on Arab nations—Iraq, Libya, and Syria—that were supportive of the Palestinians and had foreign policies independent of Washington. Washington succeeded in destroying two of the countries and has not given up on destroying Syria despite the risk of confrontation with Russia.

The risks that Washington is imposing on Americans and Europeans in order to advance Israeli expansion in the Middle East are horrific. Zionists claim a “greater Israel” from the Nile to the Euphrates. Washington’s wars in the Middle East are designed to remove obstacles to “greater Israel”. For example, on past occasions Israel has attempted to seize southern Lebanon for the water resources, but were driven out by Hezbollah, a militia supplied by Syria and Iran. This is one reason Syria and Iran are on Washington’s target list.

To achieve ‘its’ or ‘Israel’s’ goals, Washington uses jihadists. Russia sees the jihadists as threats that could spread to the Muslim areas of the Russian Federation, and Russia acts to protect itself. China also has realized that its province bordering Kazakhstan is subject to jihadist destabilization and appears to be aligning with Russia, Iran, and Syria against Washington’s effort to overthrow the Syrian government and install in its place chaos as Washington has done in Iraq and Libya, thus removing another constraint on Israel’s expansion and the restraint of a secular Syrian government on jihadism.

To get all of this from Hammond, you might have to connect some dots. But what you will get is a massive amount of verbatim dialogue that documents beyond all doubt the conspiracy between Israel, Washington, and the US presstitutes to get rid of “the Palestinian problem” by getting rid of Palestinians.

What does emerge strongly from Hammond’s book is that justice is not a thriving characteristic of the Israeli government, US foreign policy, or the media. The United Nations has produced report after report documenting the extermination of a people, but is powerless to act because of Washington’s veto.

What has happened to Palestinians is a replay of what happened to the native inhabitants of North America and Australia. Palestinians have been dispossessed and murdered. For this crime, the United States shares responsibility with Israel.
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