



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 59 No. 35

15th September 2023

IN THIS ISSUE

<u>The Head</u> : Who controls the Soul of Politics? By Neville Archibald	1
<u>The Heart & Soul</u> : 'We The People, Humbly Relying On The Blessings Of Almighty God'	2
<u>The Body</u> : Psychopolitical Warfare : Awaiting Sentence Before The Trial By Arnis Luks	2

THE HEAD: WHO CONTROLS THE SOUL OF POLITICS? By Neville Archibald

In reviewing the 1930's, when we were in a similar position, politically, I came across an article by Major Douglas. Written in 1935, it was of his travels in Alberta Canada, entitled "Wanted - Political Consciousness" (*Social Credit Journal* July 26 1935.)

Has our position changed since then? Are we still battling the same problems in the same way? What of our Political Consciousness?

On his train trip to the province, Major Douglas makes some observations of his fellow travellers, as we all do at times, I guess. It led him to muse about whether the institution of government has got a soul? I'd probably include some of our politicians in this question as well.

He speaks of his contact with "the upper ranks of politicians, they have generally been composed of men who were trying to do a difficult job and who in their private lives were honest and respectable citizens." That they are somehow in control or striving to be in control of an organisation of vested interests! Such is the administration.

He gives credit to the difficulties they face. He then goes on to mention, a body without a soul. "Just so long as you have the machinery of government without a dynamic will in control, you have a body without a soul."

This soullessness can be found in many institutions of today's western society, probably more so than in 1935. We have increasingly thrown out religious influences, the void they left has been replaced by Humanist or Marxist doctrine.

The machinery of the would-be world dominators has taken root in that void. The likes of the WEF young leaders' program has churned out large numbers of replacements, taught to believe in some sort of benign dictatorship being better than the free will of the individual. Those who have entrusted their future (and ours) in this limited belief of a benevolent elite, will find themselves sadly mistaken in the future. The results of history would tell us so over and over again.

The opposite of this soullessness taking over control of our institutions is our own taking back control. Our not accepting this usurping of power.

This power, he explains is not something that will be given up willingly. A few entrenched usurpers, wield the might of the bureaucracy, the ability to wear down even the most persistent of us.

If you've ever had to deal with the ubiquitous government department – moved hand to hand through an ever-increasing number of people 'til you are back where you started and none the wiser. You will know what I mean.

He then talks of a "Great responsibility" and I know I have dealt with this before, but it truly is the only answer. Ours and ours alone. We have the numbers.

The indignation of many during the arguments for the Yes or No side of the Voice to parliament, would suggest to me that there are enough people out there with a desire for good, to effect a change. The trouble lies in getting them reconciled with each other on the change that is actually required to achieve a better society.

Like Douglas' comments on the upper ranks of politicians, I too believe that the individuals that make up a majority of the desire to change, and are also looking for the best outcome, are being denied a vision of it by those vested interests.

These interests use the smokescreen of division, encouraged by name calling and deflection of purpose. They rely on the superficial, the immediate pavlovic response of "I feel good, I endorsed a noble thought", although upon closer examination, this very thought is linked to an incorrect doctrine. One that will not lead to unity, but division. One that changes nothing of consequence for the affected parties, but pretends that it will.

As Douglas admits in his article, we cannot rush off and expect to fix a problem in days. So too we cannot expect a single vote on the 14th to fix a problem that has lingered for decades in advance.

The actions required to to fix any issue starts with those on the ground / at the coalface, actually doing the job they are supposed to do.

If they do not make a start, those higher up the chain are then responsible for ensuring that they do, until someone is employed who will do the job required of them. And so on up the chain of command. This chain stops at US!

We elect the people who are to represent these ideals to the body of government, be it parliament or the lingering bureaucracy. They are our voice and they must be made to speak for us. To voice our concerns and effect our desires for a better outcome for us all!

I once believed that the trivial desires of the masses would be their undoing. The interest in the plight of the indigenous communities, (not the activists or the

THE HEART & SOUL : ‘We The People, Humbly Relying On The Blessings Of Almighty God’

THE BODY: PSYCHOPOLITICAL WARFARE:

AWAITING SENTENCE BEFORE THE TRIAL By Arnis Luks

Deciphering today's propaganda requires a combination of many and varying political perspectives, essentially a ‘salting’ of differing points of view.

New Lies For Old by Anatoly Golitsyn, and *Mind Space - Influencing Behaviour Through Public Policy* by the Institute for Government, Cabinet Office UK, is the necessary background-minimum to decipher somewhat-truth from outright-fabrication.
<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Golitsyn%20A-NewLiesForOld-TheCommunistStrategyOfDeceptionAndDisinformation1984.pdf>
<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/MindSpace.pdf>

Golitsyn writes in an, at times half-truth, eulogising democratic government, without acknowledging that we are all, East and West, under some form of psychopolitical tyranny. Propaganda is of such a pervasive nature, that what was once acknowledged work-practice for totalitarian regimes, is now standard fare across the once-free world - a 'spook' subbranch devoted to manipulating the narrative (usually from a dialectical perspective) for political objectives.

The Hegelian dialectic is a difficult concept to recognise in action. I always visualise the two wrestlers performing a spectacle against each other for public amusement with an already predetermined outcome, at times correctly called entertainment - WWE. So it is with our political parties. However, the ramifications of the possible outcomes we must treat with all seriousness.

Also, the Marxist tactic of two steps forward and one step back, is always apparent. Push hard with the half-truth of 'mandated' jabs, and then deny with a straight face that they were ever 'forced' onto the people.
<https://www.news.com.au/lifestyle/health/health-problems/people-made-their-own-choices-nz-pm-insists-there-was-no-compulsory-vaccination/news-story/a1d355dca5063c5436a4ca6517bb3b7d>

The high uptake of jabs demonstrated the actual policy-objective of compromising the immune system and causing permanent physical damage that plays right into the hands of big Pharma. Corporatised-fascism on a world-scale could not have provided a better example.

ON TARGET

politically enabled protagonists, or the hangers on to the gravy train of indigenous affairs that have not done their jobs), but the every day, doing it tough communities. Their plight has touched a chord. Seen by the words in all the letters written and the comments made, regardless of Yes or No.

That is the potential we need to tap. Here is the dynamic will required to control the body!

As Douglas finished his speech:

If you do not express your will”... then “the corporate body becomes an insane body...” so indeed it does. The Chain stops at US. ***

It Is Always About The Money, or The Power, or Both

The Voice proposal suggests experimentation of this fragile thing we call representative and responsible government. Having formed around the Westminster-Trinitarian-model, ours being a Limited Constitutional Monarchy, with the Monarch's representative, (our Governor General and State Governors) holding significant ‘reserved powers’ not all found within the written law, but rather, in past precedent and also convention, as another possible check on an unrestrained Executive, is their main area of experimentation.

The Voice proposal establishes a third chamber of the Parliament, giving it for all intents and purposes a VETO-power to all legislation (which, by the way has not been exercised by our Monarch for hundreds of years), but is similar to the US Presidential powers. Don't think that if the Voice speaks against a proposal, and government ignories that Voice, that all will be well. The 'international community' emanating from the communist inspired/established and transnational-corporate-financed UN, will not remain silent on any issue that effects ‘their interests’ that our government chooses to ignore. Think of Rhodesia and South Africa, especially, with separate development (Apartheid). We will be subject to significant international pressure (an instant VETO) spearheaded by a compliant mainstream media MSM against any attempt to exercise our own sovereignty for our own self interests.

The vested interests within this Voice, like the lobbyists who already busy our politicians far too much with the ever-ready assistance from the mainstream media, will place inordinate political pressure onto our elites to comply. This is a play by big money and big industry, in all essentials corporatized-fascism, to dominate over governmental structure – to hold VETO power over how we shall be governed. The remote Aboriginals count for nothing in this play for control over Australia - read *Red Over Black* by G. McDonald.
<https://veritasbooks.com.au/politics/red-over-black-behind-the-aboriginal-land-rights-g-mcdonald>

The Constitution is No Place for a Lobby Group

By Janet Albrechtsen

An Indigenous voice to parliament would be more like the Pharmacy Guild on political steroids if it is entrenched. <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/on-the-voice-referendum-the-constitution-is-no-place-for-a-lobby-group/> The Australian's Legal Affairs Contributor Chris Merritt says he would describe the Voice to Parliament as a "publicly funded lobby group".

<https://www.msn.com/en-au/news/other/voice-to-parliament-could-be-described-as-a-publicly-funded-lobby-group/ar-AA17F3YK>

While Janet Albrechtsen refers to this "Lobby Group", and Chris Merritt a "publicly funded lobby group", it is important to recognise the potential VETO power of the Voice, not being deeply examined. A select group of individuals holding power over our Parliaments. And our parliaments can enhance that VETO power at any time with a simple majority vote. The referenda system of Constitutional Alteration will thus also become defunct. This Referendum will be used by the corporates to destroy the Constitutional Alteration provision, similar to existing state 'Constitutions', alterable by Parliaments. Thus, 'We The People' will lose our own voice in preference to another entity controlled by corporate interests.

Already On Display

State governments have moved out of the starting gates with a state-based Voice, but SA smartly curtailed the implementation to avoid the embarrassment of an actual demonstration prior to the Commonwealth referendum. But we can certainly take a look at its shape of dual governance by looking across the Tasman or even Canada, if interested, to see the Constitutional carnage.

IPA - The New Zealand Māori Voice To Parliament And What We Can Expect From Australia

<https://ipa.org.au/ipa-today/the-new-zealand-maori-voice-to-parliament-and-what-we-can-expect-from-australia>

VETO as an Experiment

Within our federal system of State and Commonwealth parliaments is the opportunity to perform a valid experimentation of the legitimacy of the VETO mechanism, whether it be by a group of selected individuals as with the Voice proposal, or more importantly, opening the opportunity for "We The People" with our own VETO - to endorse or reject specific legislation, and/or endorse or reject specific individuals within the bureaucracy, or even the adventurous work practices of our High Court Justices.

Governments' tendency is always to accumulate more political power, likewise, an active citizenry must constantly be engaged in curtailing that pursuit of further political power. VETO is such a constitutional mechanism to curtail the tendency of all governments and the bureaucracy to accumulate more political power. The political party system was invented/created to promote vested interest above the will of the people. This Voice proposal is a similar manifestation of the same vested interest proposal to circumvent the will of the people.

An Invalid Claim For More Power

Those (20%, of the 100%, of the 3%) who claim some semblance of Aboriginal ancestry still living in remote communities won't achieve a suitable improvement in their outcomes, nor will any of their existing issues be resolved, unless they themselves choose to do something about it. Power must reside locally – devolution.

We will only ever hear further cries to increase the powers of the Voice. It will become a never-ending merry-go-round of which a resilient people must overcome, and in their own way nullify, by uniting under one philosophy, one system of governance, proven and demonstrable across millennia since men first wrote down a system of Common-Law from which all could agree to form a nation - Alfred the Great 886 - 889 AD.

If anyone should hold VETO power over our government and the bureaucracy it must be:

We The People,

Humbly Relying On The Blessings Of Almighty God'

The Royal VETO

1689 heralded the Bill of Rights in England, which specifically curtailed the power of the Monarch and infused the superiority of Parliament - the Parliament could do no wrong. I found this subject of significant import to this debate for the Voice, even the ambiguity of the *Guardian* article below, essentially making a story out of nothing.

The Last Royal Veto By William Everett, Dec 1903-Issue
<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1903/12/the-last-royal-veto/637560/>

The Queen's Consent and Legislative Veto Powers Explained

<https://royalcentral.co.uk/uk/queen/the-queens-consent-and-legislative-veto-powers-explained-155588/>

Buckingham Palace Denies Claims that

The Queen Blocked Legislation

<https://royalcentral.co.uk/uk/queen/buckingham-palace-denies-claims-that-the-queen-blocked-the-passing-of-a-new-law-155585/>

Royals vetted more than 1,000 laws via Queen's consent: secretive procedure used to review laws ranging from

Brexit trade deal to inheritance and land policy

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/feb/08/royals-vetted-more-than-1000-laws-via-queens-consent>

From Bagehot to Brexit: The Monarch's Rights to be Consulted, to Encourage and to Warn By Anne Twomey
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00358533.2018.1494687>

ABSTRACT - Bagehot to Brexit

Walter Bagehot famously attributed three rights to the sovereign – to be consulted, to encourage and to warn. These rights apply not only in the United Kingdom but also with respect to the powers of the Governor-General (and our State-Governors- ed) in Realms such as Australia, Canada and New Zealand. This article considers how accurate Bagehot's assessment was in its day, the intention behind it, and its transformation from radicalism to orthodoxy. It analyses how those rights are exercised by vice-regal officers. It discusses the tension between the conventional obligation to act on final ministerial advice and the assessment of when that advice is 'final' or can still be delayed, stymied

or altered. It also addresses the suggestion that the rights Bagehot identified have transformed from mere encouragement and warning into a right, or even a duty, to advise and advocate policy change.

It concludes with a discussion of the limits on the power and influence of the sovereign and her vice-regal representatives and how Bagehot's rights can mask the exercise of soft power while averting the need to exercise the Crown's reserve powers.

[Extract]... A Duty to Counsel, Encourage, Warn, and Advocate Policy Positions? The Queen's private secretary wrote to *The Times* in 1986 declaring that the 'Queen has the right – indeed the duty – to counsel, encourage and warn her government'. He added that she is entitled to express her opinions on government policy to her chief minister, but they are to be treated as entirely confidential communications between the Queen and her prime minister... [End of Extract]

Parliament Act 1911

Up to the passing of the Parliament Act 1911, the House of Lords held 'VETO power' to bills passed by the Commons. The 1911 Act saw this power significantly curtailed to only the 'delaying power' the Lords hold today— this was one of the most radical reforms to the House of Lords in its history. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/explainers/what-does-house-lords-do>

Had Whitlam's government been successful in 1975 to curtail the power of the Senate to withhold supply, our lower house the House of Representatives would also have been superior to the Senate and thrown our own Constitution into the same majority-vote tyranny as is Britain and New Zealand today.

What has occurred these past 50 years or more, is that the political-party system has achieved a similar purpose, by dominating both houses of our parliament from within the political-party-room, by voting as-one in the parliament, rather than as representatives across both Houses. Party discipline does away with *demos*, representative government. Under ever-dominating party-discipline we have already entered the phase of single chamber majority-vote government, essentially bypassing our many Commonwealth and State Parliaments.

Jack Lang wrote a paper titled *Communism In Australia* in PDF here: https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lang_JT-Communism_In_Australia_1944.pdf
or Geoff McDonald's *Red Over Black*, in book form here: <https://veritasbooks.com.au/politics/red-over-black-behind-the-aboriginal-land-rights-g-mcdonald>
Or in PDF here: https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/McDonald_G-Red_Over_Black.pdf

Both these books pertain to a communist inspired world government operating through the UN and its subsidiaries – WEF and WHO and transnational trade agreements such as the Comprehensive and Progressive Trans Pacific Partnership CPTPP. Trans National Corporations are, through the Voice proposal,

consolidating their power above national governments.

The Voice proposal provides this chamber of 'selected' individuals to dominate over our Parliament, for all practical purposes holding a VETO over all our parliamentary governments, State and Commonwealth.

Obviously, those selected individuals for the Voice will be loyal to another entity other than the Australian people as a whole, not just race based either. An example of bureaucratic governance is the European Parliament as a non-functioning forum with no political teeth. The bureaucrats working behind the scenes control everything that comes out of that entity. Who appoints the bureaucracy is the ONLY question to ask for the EU. Who appoints the Voice is also the ONLY question to ask.

The United Nations operates in a similar vein, of vested-interests controlling everything that emanates from their own bureaucratic maze. Even a cursory study of the history of the establishment of the UN demonstrates the Hegelian dialectic of communism and capitalism working collaboratively to circumvent representative government. So, it will be with our parliaments and the Voice.

The 97% of people voting for representation in Australia will be stunted with NO-voice to this third chamber that supposedly represents only the '20% of the final 3%' of who claim Aboriginality - being those who reside in remote communities, the 80% of that 3% having already moved into mainstream society. \$30 billion per annum plus over-representation already within our existing parliaments, is apparently insufficient to provide an existing Voice, how much more will ever be sufficient? Is it a Voice, or is it an 'invoice'?

Some election votes carry more weight than others. Some (the 3%) will get to vote a third time instead of the 97% who get to vote only twice. No noise from the left whatsoever about this disparity. We are all equal, unless we are not. What Humbug!

There is already significant noise coming in regard to the states' house, the Senate with disproportionate representation coming from the smaller states of Tasmania and South Australia compared to the more populous states of New South Wales and Victoria. If you think about it, it is apparent that the left will never be satisfied regardless of the revolutionising progress for Australia. At some point Australia's peoples must stand and defend our institutions and our nation-state based upon our rich cultural heritage that has served us well. The time of indifferent abandonment of our proven institutions is not now, especially with political and constitutional understanding at such a low ebb. ***

***What Awaits Us If/When The Vote Fails
Is Another Question Entirely!***

On Target is printed and authorised by A. J. Luks
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.
Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org