

From: noreply@ntepa.nt.gov.au
To: [eia_consult](#)
Subject: NTEPA Consultation - Phase 2 Expansion of the Arnhem Space Centre
Date: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 10:11:46 PM
Attachments: [AEROSPACE-POLLUTANTS-OVER-ARNHEM.docx](#)
[Americas-51st-State-North-Australia.docx](#)
[ARNHEM-ROCKET-RANGE-MILITARY-NOT-CIVILIAN.docx](#)

Your details

First and last names: Tony Ryan

Post code of where you live: 0880


Email: tonyryan43@gmail.com

Are you making this submission on behalf of an organisation:

If yes, please enter the name of the organisation:

Submission contents

Submission details:


Ongoing research revealed that such a site had been permanently banned by a Commonwealth 1987 study which reluctantly ruled such ventures as too dangerous for the surrounding population. Access to this original research illuminated the global danger of rocket exhausts, threatening not just local populations but, following ongoing research, a threat to life on this planet. Moreover, it became clear that dry season rocket/missile launches would spread chlorine gas across Arnhem Land's Gove Peninsula at a high altitude, damaging the ozone layer. Wet season lift-offs would toxify southern regions. But this presumed the previously posted four or five launchings per year. Now it seems, South Korea, the US and other nations also will be launching their rockets in Gulkula. With some rockets or missiles being military, these automatically become a target for Chinese reprisal or pre-emptive missiles; a likelihood considering the 2015 Rand Report recommending imminent US attack against that nation. In conclusion, the launch site threatens north Australia's ozone layer, human populations immediately downwind, has serious implications for land rights and homelands; and if attacked by missiles, in the dry season would result in the deaths of 4000 civilians residing on the Gove Peninsula, killed by the vast cloud of chlorine gas resulting from missile-vaporising of stored solid fuel; and several thousand more deaths if the wind swung more from the north, which is common in the Wet Season. Environmentally, this is the least of our worries. There is not one agency on earth regulating what many scientists regard as a threat to all life on this planet. Launch projections will deliver sufficient toxic gases to make earth life extinct. DEAL, ELA, and

the NT Government, represented by [REDACTED] denied any military involvement and accused me of being a conspiracy theorist. [REDACTED] also denied there was any risk to civilians, even though I asked him about this at a public forum in the Garma Festival. Initially, the only Australians who examined the evidence and took the Gulkula risk to the community seriously were my Yolngu Nations Assembly Corporation boss, Shannon Voss, and NT Govt Aboriginal interpreter [REDACTED]. Gradually local traders and residents are expressing nervousness about the entire situation. Increasing US belligerence does not help. Also attached is a condensation of papers on rocket-missile fuel toxicity, and of my later contextualising of the entire Gulkula launch pad, including geopolitical realities. Tony Ryan 21 November 2023

Submission files

- 1: AEROSPACE-POLLUTANTS-OVER-ARNHEM.docx, type application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document, 24.6 KB
- 2: Americas-51st-State-North-Australia.docx, type application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document, 28.3 KB
- 3: ARNHEM-ROCKET-RANGE-MILITARY-NOT-CIVILIAN.docx, type application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document, 50.5 KB
- 4: No file uploaded
- 5: No file uploaded

In 1987, the Australian Commonwealth Government permanently banned rocket launching in the NT as too dangerous to the human population.

Rocket pollution is now found to be many times more dangerous than was then realised: to the ozone layer and to all life forms. All life in the eastern Top End is now threatened by the Arnhem Land Aerospace Programme.

The facility is also a US military missile site, inviting reprisal nuclear strikes in response to the planned American war with China. (Read 2015 Rand report). US solid rocket fuels spew life and ozone-destroying chlorine.

What was, in 1987, regarded as an existential threat to Territorians and wildlife is now found to be part of a planetary life extinction threat.*

**Modified from the original article title: "Rockets destroy ozone; cause climate change; Aerospace's deadly impacts to the Earth". By Nina Beety; GlobalResearch.com Jan 24 2022*

The ozone layer continues to deteriorate despite international action such as the ban on CFCs.

The Antarctic ozone hole is becoming permanent, and the soothing green and blue on NASA's maps actually signifies low ozone levels. The aerospace industry is a major factor in this problem. Ozone depletion is one of the largest environmental concerns surrounding rocket launches from Earth."

Why?

Rockets' radical emissions cause immediate, almost total, ozone destruction for hundreds of square miles and which lasts days. Rockets' exhaust and pollutants introduced into the stratosphere persist there and destroy ozone over the long term.

The sun creates the ozone layer by changing oxygen into ozone in the stratosphere, but rockets expel pollutants as exhaust: chlorine, water vapor, black carbon, and fuel components such as alumina, into the stratosphere, blocking the sun's rays. This reduces the sun's creation of ozone, reducing ozone layer repair and replenishment. The long-duration exhausts persist in the stratosphere for 3-5 years and accumulate with every rocket launch, cumulatively decreasing ozone regeneration.

The shockwave of de-orbiting debris, satellites, and rockets creates nitric oxide which also destroys ozone.

There is no environmental oversight. No agency on Planet Earth is regulating rocket exhausts.

Researchers including Martin Ross, Darin Toohey, and James Vedda have repeatedly warned the industry. Ignoring this, the industry and governments are

escalating space funding and programs. This is a competition in which the prize is death, but winning is what matters.

Prior to 2021, some two thousand satellites were in orbit around the Earth. Since then, two thousand eight hundred satellites have been launched — more than doubling the total in just one year. Moreover, the FCC has approved 17,270 low-earth-orbit (LEO) satellites.

65,912 more LEO applications are pending. Governments and private companies plan an additional 30,947.

Meanwhile, Rwanda has applied to the ITU for a staggering 327,320 satellites. These numbers don't include systems fewer than five satellites, geostationary, or medium earth orbit (MEO) satellites, or other-function rockets.

These programs will acceleratingly destroy the ozone layer which is essential to protect the Earth and life.

NASA discovered in 2007 that UV-C and UV-B were already reaching the Earth, but failed to respond. UV radiation is having lethal effects on species as we speak.

LEO satellites are very short-lived, lasting 5-7 years and the U.S. military plans 3-year duration satellites. These LEOs need frequent replacement via rocket launch.

Aleksandr Dunayev of the Russian Space Agency said in 1991: *“About 300 launches of the [space] shuttle each year would be a catastrophe, and the ozone layer would be completely destroyed.”*

Science author Arthur Firstenberg says: “In 2021, there were 146 orbital rocket launches to put 1,800 satellites into space. At that rate, to maintain and continually replace 100,000 low-earth-orbit satellites, which have a lifespan of five years, would require more than 1,600 rocket launches per year, or more than four every day, forever into the future.” That's more than five times the amount required to destroy the entire ozone layer.

The long-lived rocket pollution in the stratosphere also traps Earth's natural heat under a rapidly thickening blanket, preventing the heat from venting into space. This will increasingly raise Earth's temperature. This has nothing to do with carbon or methane. However, the increased heat will release methane stored in permafrost and formerly ice-covered regions, and this methane will poison Earth.

These satellite systems are largely intended for 4G/5G global Wi-Fi, military warfighting, and the Internet of Things. They exponentially increase RF-EMF radiation levels in the atmosphere and on Earth.

This radiation damages neurology, DNA, cell membranes, the brain, cognition, learning, memory, immunity, reproduction and fertility, blood, mitochondria, dysregulates hormones, the blood-brain barrier, sleep cycles, and causes cancer, stroke, heart attacks, and oxidative stress.

It disrupts wildlife's ability to navigate and orient by Earth's natural EMF fields. Bees, insects, and birds are particularly vulnerable. The U.S. Department of Interior warned in 2014 about the devastating impacts to birds from this radiation.

In 2020, a 5G military/SpaceX "live fire" drill killed up to millions of birds in the Southwest (of the US).

Western governments and the FCC ignore the substantial research showing devastating impacts.

Another problem: dead spacecraft and debris are rapidly accumulating in the sky, creating collision hazards for other rockets, satellites, and the space stations. Every collision creates more debris, leading to more collisions. Unstoppable chain-reaction collisions... Kessler Syndrome... are inevitable. It is increasingly difficult to navigate through these debris fields.

High rates of satellite failure leave dead, unmaneuverable satellites in orbit. The new large constellations will dramatically worsen this problem.

All of this debris, computers, electronic and chemical waste, radioactive elements, weapons, dead satellites, rocket parts, and dust come down. Aerospace officials and agencies, including the FCC, talk nonsense about "disposal" via "safe" de-orbiting and vaporization, as if the waste simply disappears.

The reality is that de-orbiting and vaporization create new problems, exploding burning debris, aerosolizing toxins, metals, paints, fuels, and other chemicals. They fall into the lower atmosphere to pollute the soil, ocean, waters, and air we breathe. "Vaporized" means it explodes into tiny particles and dust.

With these large constellations of short lifespan, increasing failures, and launch rocket debris, a barrage of debris and fall-out and increasing atmospheric dust are just the beginning.

All of this debris burns at very hot temperatures as it re-enters the atmosphere, with big and little chunks landing everywhere. Exponential increases in fall-out increases the risk for fires, injuries, deaths, and property damage. A large chunk of space debris fell into a Michigan family's yard and just missed hitting anyone. Hot debris fell in Chile last year causing fires. A Russian satellite that was supposed to stay in orbit for ten thousand years fell out of orbit this month and possibly landed in the Pacific Ocean.

In 2020, the FCC proposed an "acceptable" casualty rate of 1 in 10,000 from falling satellites and rockets. The FCC also discussed liability and indemnity. However, any liability depends on debris being attributable to a company or government. Otherwise, injured parties would likely have limited or no recourse.

Direct land, air, and ocean pollution from dumping, rocket lift-offs, launch pad runoff and accidents, is another terrible problem.

No one is discussing this.

The US also wants to put nuclear power into space... reactors in the sky... and awarded a major contract to a team that includes GE, the company which engineered the flawed Fukushima reactors.

Rockets can explode at launch, malfunction after launch, or fail to reach orbit. This last happened with SNAP 9-A in 1964.

As a result, 2.1 pounds of plutonium-238 “vaporized in the atmosphere and spread worldwide. Dr. John Goffman concluded that the dispersed deadly plutonium-238 was a leading cause of the increase in cancers around the world today.” There have been other space nuclear accidents. Officials don’t seem to care.

The militarization of the atmosphere, space, and the moon risk World War III.

5G in space will control weapons systems on Earth and in the ocean, including military sonar already responsible for killing hundreds of thousands of dolphins, whales, and other marine animals. Elon Musk/SpaceX in partnership with the US government has endangered Chinese astronauts by getting too close to their space station. Musk is the same man who advocates nuking Mars and saying the U.S. can coup whatever country it wants for rare earth minerals such as lithium.

The military and its contractors are not guided by responsible, calm leaders. The worst is already happening.

Add to that accelerating plans to exploit, extract, militarize, and privatize the sovereign moon which stabilizes Earth’s rotation and climates, creates the tides, and is essential to all life. Who’s protecting the moon and the Earth?

Military conquest, profiteering through extraction, mining, tourism, and exploitation are the main goals driving the expenditure of public monies and private investment, not pretty space pictures or neutral, scientific “exploration”.

It’s time to strip back the curtain and reveal the protected astronauts, aerospace moguls, and rocket scientists. They are not heroes. They are destroying our planet Earth.

If you want your children to be blind and dying of skin cancer caused by aerospace pollutants, just do nothing.

Written by Nina Beety. Edited by Tony Ryan.

Also by Tony Ryan, ... The probability of up to 10,000 deaths in Australia’s Arnhem Land, in the very likely Chinese reprisal strikes against US military installations.

“America’s 51st state of North Australia.”

America's 51st state of North Australia

By Tony Ryan

The celebrated Arnhem Land aerospace project, rather than being dedicatedly civilian as the government has led us to believe, will eventually emerge as a major US military installation, evidently as a strategic component of the Rand Corporation-projected war against China (2015 Rand Report).

Despite massive PR investment and the refusal of Australian politicians to confirm or deny, the US military expansion role was admitted quietly in NT budget estimates committee hearings (28 November 2017, P49).

Initial research revealed that the project evolved from initial discussions four years previously, between military missile makers Raytheon and Lockheed Martin, and the Australian Department of Defense. Of significance, following our discovery, this article was immediately withdrawn from the Internet.

What are the implications for Australian security?

A US military missile base in Arnhem Land will become one of China's automatic first missile strikes. In fact, since it became clear that the White House is pushing Israel to nuke Iran, we may presume that China and Russia have divvied up the 780 foreign military facilities; and American software manufacturing and military bases within its borders, along with administration. Other initial strike probabilities are Darwin airport; the US Echelon and Five Eyes spy satellite bases in rural Darwin; Tindal air base; the submarine base, and Pine Gap.

Chillingly, this is the very WWII scenario former PM Malcolm Fraser warned us against on at least seven occasions before he died... clearly intended as his legacy to the people of Australia. He elaborated on this potential for Australian apocalypse in his book "Dangerous Allies"..

Even more alarming was top US Navy Admiral Johnathan Greenert's assertion that America wants to install a navy base in the Top End. The context of this is the forced closure of US bases in Okinawa and Guam and the reality that only one suitable NT harbour exists, Melville Bay, currently leased to Rio Tinto for Gove bauxite export, which is scheduled for closure in three years (2026). Significantly, Melville Bay is a mere 40 Ks from the missile and rocket launching site. It is understood that the NT Government will seal a highway through Arnhem Land to facilitate these developments, even though the NT Government refuses to repair roads to Aboriginal homelands, some cut off since Cyclone Lam, nine years ago..

What does this mean to the people of the NT?

Potentially, given the hawkish aggression of Antony Blinken, Jake Sullivan, Victoria Nuland, Mike Pompeo, and Lindsay Graham, and the escalating China/US race to

command global lithium deposits (Australia is a supplier), war appears to be a certainty and the NT will inevitably attract seven preemptive, or reprisal missile strikes (possibly 12). There will be immediate loss of life, particularly in Darwin when it is leveled by the incidental explosion of the giant Inpex gas tank; and on the Gove Peninsular.

Even if this worst-case scenario does not eventuate, US military bases on Melville Bay will necessitate security exclusion zones, which will extend to the Aboriginal communities of Wallaby Beach and Gunyangara (Ski Beach), and may even include Yirrkala. Without doubt, Ski Beach and Wallaby Beach will be bulldozed to make room for US personnel housing. Most houses are already gone. The Gulkula missile base is situated on a site important to all clans in East Arnhem Land. Inexplicably, the Northern Land Council has identified Gulkula as Gumatj land and this clan is receiving a mere \$50,000 annual site rental. **Consultation with other language groups was hopelessly inadequate and local clans are oblivious to the development (It was the survey by the author, commissioned by ██████████ ██████████ to gauge the adequacy of consultation that precipitated the discovery of the military function).**

Nor was there warning about the serious risks incurred by rocket launching. **A 1987 government study ruled out such bases as too dangerous for surrounding residents.** Since then it has emerged that US rockets use solid fuels which spread toxic chlorine gas and heavy metals through the atmosphere, and this also damages the ozone layer. The NLC claims an expert was consulted, however, this man was either appallingly ignorant or was paid to sugar-coat the project. The project organiser, ██████████, CEO of Gumatj Corporation, at first denied the military application, then claimed toxins would fall harmlessly into the sea, ignoring the powerful South-Easterly winds that blow landward all Dry Season and much of the Wet Season.

The proposed bases will compromise critical local passenger air services, the only access to the outside world during the wet season; and past experience with US bases suggests toxification of our water resources. Tindal air base has already poisoned Top End water, polluting the Katherine River. This was entirely predictable.

Can the town of Nhulunbuy be permitted to survive? Probably not. Rio Tinto's bauxite mine will soon close and the only other functions of the town are as a servicing hub for local Aboriginal communities and as a staging post for tourism. Obviously, both roles will be seriously impeded. Nevertheless, as part of a massive dual-public relations and smoke screen exercise, a large committee is pretending Nhulunbuy has a future. Ten thousand Yolngu are represented by one man, the Chairman of Gumatj Corporation, ██████████. This is a complete abrogation of Yolngu consensus protocols.

How will this affect Nhulunbuy's population?

There will be no compensation. The White House will enforce its own lucrative corruption of the US Law of *Eminent Domain*, which was originally intended to pay market value for real estate acquired for public utility. The cunning Catch 22 now applied is that once word is out about the security exclusion zones, the value of

Nhulunbuy real estate will plummet and all properties will be unsaleable. Australian government valuations will follow the inevitable pattern of descent, following in the footsteps of the tragic US experiences in New York and New Orleans.

Commercial interests in the town, especially real estate, have been promised the romantic illusion of Aboriginal culture, magnificent wildlife, and swaying coconut palms, against a stunning sunset backdrop of rockets ascending into the heavens.

Incredibly, they actually buy this. Evidently, there are no inhibitions on greed.

And the Indigenous population? Without access to important Songline sites, morale will collapse and Arnhem Aboriginal culture will go into terminal decline. What is unknown are the implications for Aboriginal land rights. These have already been jettisoned for the Gove peninsula and for the whole of Arnhem Land, *vis a vis* the shires. All of these developments are incompatible with the terms of the Gove bauxite lease, which should be returned intact to traditional owners in 2006, and of the NT Land Rights Act (1976).

Effectively, this will overturn Lands Rights in Australia.

All of this has been known since 2016 but a media blackout has been imposed, including by the ABC. The NT ALP needs an injection of US capital to fund the next reelection campaign if it is to have any hope of winning the next NT elections. This desperate need for election finance motivated the 2016 ALP to betray the 90% of Territorians who opposed fracking.

No doubt, considering the US loyalties of the powerful media monopoly, in conjunction with the university and think tank influences of Rupert Murdoch and Frank Lowy, commercial media have also been successfully silenced.

If it appears that I am implying the pre-existence of a conspiracy, the evidence says exactly this: Government established a phony organisation titled Develop East Arnhem Land (DEAL) with a managing Board with no endemic regional skills or useful knowledge whatsoever, but with useful links to Murdoch media, mining and military. The dominant inaugural personality was Ian Smith, a globalist and refugee advocate who is married to elitist former democrat senator Natasha Stott-Despoja; and his *Bespoke* agency partner Andrew Butler is a spokesman for Rupert Murdoch and NewsCorp; served PR for Telstra, and whose wife is American journalist Sara James, a former aid of Aus/US diplomat Downer, a Liberal Party hawk.

Similarly, ***Equatorial Launch Australia***, the supposed civilian aerospace organisation is led by Scott Wallis, whose background includes air force military space research; he was Australian desk for the US/NATO Five Eyes electronic spy network, US Leadfoot II weapons effects analysis, and defense suborbital rockets in WA. The unmistakable focus is American war interests. Laughingly, Wallis claims ELA focuses on “community engagement”, which it most certainly does not. In fact, ELA staff refuse to discuss any of the salient issues during public forums. The board membership itself has strong links to military, and this applies especially to Wallis, Stuart Briese, Tiffany Manning, and Danny O’Toole.

The two organisations work in tangent as an all-powerful public relations operation, seamlessly supported by government and the American Murdoch media. Neither organisation has anything by way of relevant knowledge or skills to offer the people of the Top End. They are also assisted by Rio Tinto's pretend local government entity the Nhulunbuy Corporation, which is a respectability cover for the "Nhulunbuy Mafia", a ruthless alliance of property investors, rogue government bureaucrats, and blatantly conflict-of-interest-ridden local traders.

Ironically, none of these organisations include an indigenous component, even though the population is overwhelmingly Aboriginal.

Finally, all of this prompts questions about the state of Australia's Defense Policies. ***What kind of defense policy actually attracts missile, and possibly nuclear, strikes on its civilian population?***

Clearly, we have no coherent defense policy as such; merely American impositions.

But it gets worse. Many military personnel claim our equipment is inadequate for protecting the Australian people and landmass, and within a few days of imminent conflict there would be no fuel to conduct a war anyway. Singapore, our sole national supplier, is China's closest foreign ally and will cancel contracts at the first whiff of hostility. Australian fuel reserves are tenuous at best: *"Australia only holds 23 days of aviation fuel, 22 days of diesel and 19 days of automotive gas."* US Studies centre, University of Sydney, 19 August 2019. Reliable rumour has it that, under the current and unbelievably incompetent Albanese Government, the national fuel reserve is down to four days.

This threatens the ability of the Australian military to function, to say nothing of national resiliency as a whole. Manifestly, government does not take defence of Australians seriously. Soldiers claim that accommodation of transexual and alphabetical minority groups occupy a much higher priority for the Australian Government. Morale is at rock bottom. Veterans are currently petitioning to have the ADF leadership replaced, Angus Campbell, they say, having proved to be worse than incompetent and devoid of patriotism or loyalty.

Moreover, it is now public knowledge that Australia has relinquished national sovereignty and that the White House makes all our military decisions.

As Malcolm Fraser noted, "America cannot be trusted". Fraser noted that the US had betrayed Australia to Indonesia twice, including over the planned invasion of Australia in 1975. Moreover, he pointed out, the ANZAS Treaty does not require the US to protect Australia... as is the cherished albeit mistaken belief of so many Australians. The evidence demonstrates convincingly that it will not. Foolishly, sixty percent of Australians believe we must pay any price to keep the US as our ally.

Fraser had a historic insight into geopolitics. The US intends confrontation with China and Russia, he said, which will mean WWIII and several (possibly nuclear) strikes on Australia. If the Melville Bay navy and missile base plans go ahead, we will certainly experience several severe missile strikes throughout the Northern Territory

and wherever there are US installations elsewhere in Australia. According to geopolitical pundits, the projected commencement of WWIII is New Year 2024, although many declare it commenced with the NATO/Kiev Minsk betrayal of 2014. We will leave that debate for the survivors; should there be any.

As they say, if you want to lose everything, just do nothing.

Kato Rivera
Darwin, NT

katorivera@gmail.com

Kato Rivera is a geopolitical analyst and writer.

Independent 2018 Report on "Adequacy of Consultation: pertaining to Waramirri, Wangurri, Galpu, and Lamamirr language Groups acceptance of the proposed rocket base in North East Arnhem Land".

Civilian aerospace in Arnhem Land... or something very different

Easy money for Gumatj clan? Or a development that should alarm, not only Arnhem Land people, but all Australians.

Synopsis



Wangurri language group claim the rocket base lease lies within their ambit of songline care but, as an outcome of routine analysis of circumstances surrounding the rocket base proposal, items of evidence emerged which reveal that the base is part of a much wider American military expansion into Arnhem Land.

The disturbing national context of this is current US military activities in the Top End of the Northern Territory amid dangerously rising tensions between China and the US, the most likely outcome of which will be attracting Chinese pre-emptive and retaliatory nuclear missile strikes on Australian soil, including Arnhem Land.

Additional details about the evidently broader military function of the rocket base will never be accessible until it is too late to alter the course of events.

If our suspicions prove correct, we are trilaterally confronted by:

- The threat to survival of East Arnhem Aboriginal culture;
- The possible elimination of our only Arnhem Land town; and
- The nationally pivotal issue of Australian defence sovereignty, which it appears, is now the subject of capitulation to the US.

Like the citizens of any other country, we cannot accept foreign military occupation as *fait accompli* merely because Federal politicians want to retain US corporate election funding for the current favourite party. Responsible Australians must look at the available evidence now and identify probable Pentagon objectives and then challenge government to confirm or deny. Traditionally, for this we would have relied on the media but both the ABC and commercial public media have refused to cover this story, despite incontrovertible evidence, which suggests an all-pervasive ban. Only the independent online news sites have published this story.

Of concomitant concern: if Australia is truly a democracy, this kind of situation should never have evolved in the first place. The already exposed covert military

incursion runs parallel with the US-led fracking campaign, with government caving in, disregarding overwhelming electoral opposition. This attack on Australian democracy, also must be resolved in the very near future.

The evidence thus far

When national discussions about an Australian civilian rocket base began quietly seven years ago, the parties identified on the internet were:

- Australian Department of Defence
- Lockheed-Martin
- Raytheon

As plans progressed, Raytheon and the Department of Defence dropped out of media publicity and a couple of new organisations emerged: *DEAL* (Develop East Arnhem Land) and *Equatorial Launch Australia*. The word **civilian** has been stressed, again and again and again. The repetition is far from subtle and has triggered wide-ranging speculation.

Initial public dialogue suggested unambiguous intent; however...

- As we all know, the Department of Defence deals in wars;
- Lockheed-Martin makes aircraft (ie the new F-35 Stealth Fighter);
- Raytheon makes only war machines, particularly rockets and missiles. Its best-known is the Patriot Missile (the guidance system has been replaced twice and still does not work).

So far, it has become obvious that whoever initiated this project wants the words **weapons** and **defence** eliminated from the public narrative. And, curiously, the article outlining the Raytheon/Dept of Defence discussions has been suddenly withdrawn from the internet.

Again, we wonder why?

So... what other factors might expand the parameters of, or further illuminate, the circumstances of rockets and defence and leases on Aboriginal land near the NT's Gove Peninsula?

Geopolitical context: The search for clues

The people of Guam and Okinawa, where there are giant Northern and Mid-Pacific American military bases, are sick of their women being raped and assaulted by US servicemen; of having sleep interrupted around the clock; and they do not want any more poisons from military bases contaminating their water supplies and seas.

They also fear their land will be nuclear bombed by China or North Korea in the event of war with the USA. With the White House repeatedly undermining conciliation opportunities between the North and South Korea, and engaging in calculated military provocations, the long-suffering civilians of Guam and Okinawa

want America out... now! Both North and South Korea appear to have launched exclusive bilateral initiatives towards their own reconciliation, shouldering aside US meddling.

The writing is on the wall. The US needs a new site for another and much bigger military base and this must be in a China-confronting Indian Ocean deep-water harbour. There are new bases in the Philippines but evidently, these are not enough. We have long been aware of rumours that the Pentagon wants to move its Naval fleet to Melville Bay on the Gove Peninsula. America's top naval Admiral. Jonathan Greenert, has recently visited and the NT Chief Minister has recently hinted at a US occupation of Melville Bay.

If Australians knew the truth about the 780 American bases around the world, they would probably deliver a loud **NO** to such a base here.

With a little imagination, reinforced by the patterns of geopolitical history, we can guess the likely progression of events:

1. First, a tiny civilian rocket base will be established, with maximum publicity blurbs about *Australia finally joining the exciting Space Exploration Frontier*. Indeed, this was the exact line adopted by Alan Duffy, ABC TV's celebrity astronomer... not conspiratorially, I hasten to add, but demonstrating the kind of scientific naiveté that governments have learned to rely upon to establish credibility and believability.
2. In the second stage of the PR campaign, two or three satellite relay installations will be established on neighbouring clan leases, to track the rockets and satellites. Then, entirely disparately of course, will follow a few minor reconstructions to Rio Tinto's bauxite plant in Inverell Bay to enable "civilian" ships to call in with "civilian" communication technology, installations and equipment. At some stage, there will be a projection of hundreds of jobs for Aborigines and former mine workers.
3. Then, as the US creates more tension in the Asia Pacific, there will be the Australian Government's inevitable 'speculation' that our national security might well be served if the civilian installations also provide minor assistance to the Depart of Defence. No doubt, the term "cost-effectiveness" will be injected into media releases, as will the political party forecast for passenger ship visitation and a lucrative explosion of tourism.

The eyes of shop keepers and traders in Nhulunbuy will glitter at this prospect, even though anyone with market research capability would roll their eyes and refocus on real-world prospects.

Meanwhile, additional evidence draws into focus:

The NT Government has already budgeted for \$50,000 and \$75,000 for consultation and negotiation; to help out, among other things..."**increasing the American Defence Presence**"...

Ref: Estimates transcript - Day 1 – 28 November 2017 page 49.

URL: Parliament.nt.gov.au/committees/estimates2017/annual-reports

This was a quote from Luke Bowen, who at that time was General Manager of the NT Government's *Northern Australian Development Office*, and who is in charge of *major projects and strategic infrastructure*.

Bowen's position is both curious and telling. He was formerly Executive Director and CEO of the NT Cattlemen's Association; General Manager of Northern Territory Cattlemen's Trading Pty Ltd; Member of the Agricultural Industry Advisory Council (Chaired by the Federal Minister for Agriculture); and on the Prime Minister's Centenary of ANZAC Advisory Board; and gained nationwide notoriety as the conspicuous promoter of the nationally-unpopular *Live Cattle Export* campaign, which was roundly condemned for:

- Destroying Australia's good reputation for humane animal handling;
- The elimination of 150 abattoirs;
- The destruction of 240,000 regional Australian jobs (directly and from feeder industries); and
- The decimation of entire regional populations in NSW, Queensland, and Victoria.

It would seem that archetypal pragmatist Luke Bowen is a useful person to front enterprises which can be expected to attract national and even global condemnation.

One might well say: *right man; right place; right time*.

Adding to the above evidence, there has also been the recent NT Chief Minister's belated reference to use of Melville Bay by the US.

What more evidence does the media need before it confronts government?

Meanwhile, the Federal Government has still not admitted that the lauded **civilian** rocket base has a military genesis. This is not a situation in which the perception of agenda **overlap** is an interpretive option. Once the military are involved the term *civilian* is automatically disqualified. To claim otherwise is like being half pregnant.

Meanwhile, the current number of US Marines in Darwin is around 2000 and Defence Housing Australia has announced provision of 329 new houses in the new Breeze/Muirhead suburb. Northern military expansion is clearly on the horizon.

Given the obvious extent of current and predicted US occupation of the NT it seems reasonable to conclude that the Northern Territory's future status will be as an

American military asset, with all other activities rendered subordinate to Pentagon priorities.

In other words, the NT is about to become an unwilling colony of America... the unofficial 51st state. Permanent Territorians may have something to say about that.

America, in its additional PR contribution, makes daily references to North Korea's ability to drop nuclear bombs on Australia; which is absurd as North Korea does not have the prerequisite guidance systems, nor miniature war heads. This is US jingoism to justify its regional belligerence.

Conveniently, the entire media circus surrounding the North Korea "crisis" ignores the contextual nature of the original American attack on North Korea; the criminal fire-bombing of entire cities of civilians (an estimated burning to death of one third of all men, women and children, in horrific contravention of the Geneva Agreement); then the ongoing trade sanctions which starved to death thousands of women and children; and the fly-overs by nuclear bomb capacity planes; and cruise-bys by American warships and aircraft carriers. Seventy years of intimidation has most certainly created an entirely justified paranoid attitude in North Korea's government, and nuclear defence was clearly their only way to end this.

Moreover, in spite of the hype of remarkably ignorant politicians (ie American Senators Lindsay Graham and Mike Pence), the US has never attempted diplomacy (until Trump, years later). Transparently, the 'North Korean Crisis' is a manufactured false flag exercise, intended to intimidate America's client states, of which Australia is one.

It would appear that the South Korean Government now realises it is about to become a sacrificial lamb and has hastened to extricate itself by establishing bilateral dialogue of a depth and quality not seen in 70 years... to the White House's acute dismay.

For those readers who are sceptical of my presentation of the 'North Korea Crisis', I refer you to Justice Michael Pembroke, a NSW Supreme Court judge and author, who has studied the recent history of Korea in depth and who described the current situation to the ABC TV's The Drum, in much the same language. He was scathing of the media's failure to report the US's gross distortions of events.

Impact on NT tourism

An aspect of all this that does not appear to have been factored in, is tourism in the Top End. International awareness of nuclear missile-attracting installations might well, during periods of international tension, harm NT tourism visitation. One reason for Australia's tourism success has always been our excellent personal security status. A US military presence could very well drive tourists away. Nuclear war targets are not renowned as tourism icons.

Environmental pollution

Western nation rockets use solid fuel, which produce chlorine gas, which interacts with oxygen to form chlorine oxides, and **these damage the ozone layer**.

Presumably, a rocket base in Arnhem Land could possibly create an ozone void.

If we list all relevant military developments in the Top End, and fill in the gaps with the most likely projections, a credible albeit disturbing picture emerges.

What we already know:

- A US Airforce Base in Tindal is gaining in military significance (and is already poisoning the region's soils, ground water, and the Katherine River);
- A US Marines Base in Darwin is destined for rapid expansion;
- The Australia-epi-centred hemisphere spy and navigation satellite relay bases in Shoal Bay and Middle Point (which have been active for decades and are off-limits to all Australians, and which serve only American interests), will gain in regional military first-strike target significance for China;
- The ongoing militarisation of Darwin International Airport for nuclear-armed B52 staging (which has happened in the past and made Darwin a double nuclear target during the Cold War).
- There is now, apparently, a US Nuclear armed submarine base in Darwin harbour, which we always thought was built for Australian Collins submarines.

Only two more elements of the prospective South Pacific US war machine have yet to be installed:

- A major navy base; and
- An Intercontinental missile-launching platform.

Melville Bay is the perfect deep-water harbour for a naval base, and the nearby "civilian" rocket installation completes all elements of the Pentagon's Military Acquisition Strategy... as contextually speculated.

By the time the South Pacific naval base strategy becomes public knowledge, Australians will be inured to the US military presence and, anyway, 60% of Australians believe we must put up with bully Americans because we need the superpower to defend us from China or Indonesia.

Are they right?

According to former Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, the answer is NO! and NO!

Before he passed away a couple of years ago, Malcolm Fraser several times **warned Australians to cut the military alliance with America** because, he said, the US cannot be trusted.

Fraser pointed out that when Indonesia planned invasion of North Australia in 1975, **America took Indonesia's side against Australia**. And according to our own military intelligence, the information produced from the joint survey of Timor and Arafura oceanic sea floors, was shared exclusively between the US and Indonesia. **Australia was left out in the cold**. We paid our way and Indonesia did not.

Since 1946, the US has militarily and aggressively invaded 56 sovereign nations (61 as of November 2023) and confiscated their resources. Arnhem Land is one of the richest resource zones in the world and we know America wants to own this too. That taking over the Top End will also create a vast new complex of American military bases, is simply a magnificent bonus.

Does Australia need a super-power ally?

No.

It has long been recognised in military circles that Australia is simply too expensive to invade conventionally. This is the reason for the old reference "The Brisbane Line", which means that, by the time an invader has brought ammunition, transport, fuel, food, water, personnel, and equipment to the Australian coast, the costs would already be prohibitive; and for every 100 Ks inland penetration the costs would magnify exponentially.

For even the most powerful of nations, their economy would be destroyed by the time they had ventured 1000ks inland. To progress therein towards the nation's capitals would be economically impossible.

Obviously, the invasion would need to be on the rugged East Coast, with its Great Barrier Reef and surf coasts to the south; and Great Dividing Range guarding the hinterland; the logistics would be just as exorbitant as in the north. Because the continent is so vast and the terrain so inhospitable, this would make viable occupation by an enemy quite impossible (as Indonesia finally realised in 1975). Tiny forces of Australian guerrillas could have an invading force running in catastrophic circles.

Conclusion: in terms of military economic practicality, the Australian continent is invasion-proof.

This is why the global investment banker consortium which has been behind all major wars since the Battle of Waterloo, gave up the idea of invading our country and instead simply destroyed our manufacturing sector and domestic food production, and flooded our labour pool with refugees and immigrants. We have already experienced the new-age-style invasion, backed by an American military whose flag proclaims them as our allies.

How will an American Base in Gove affect the people in Arnhem Land?

Based on the kind of security exclusion zones imposed on other US Bases (ie Okinawa, Guam, and in Latin America), we can guess that the Wessel Islands and mainland almost as far south and west as Gurrumuru will be off-limits to Yolngu and other Australians.

- If events follow the usual American pattern, Yirrkala, Ski Beach, Wallaby Beach, and all nearby Homelands will be bulldozed and the residents relocated to a new and no doubt flimsy town to be located on country somewhere just north-east of Gurrumuru. Nhulunbuy will be militarised; *that is*, only people with appropriate security classification will be permitted to visit or reside there, and no civilians whatsoever.
- The kinds of toxic substances used in military bases, will inevitably poison the local coast, creeks, and groundwater.
- Americans typically treat local indigenous people with contempt, and so any interaction with US personnel will not be a positive experience. Abuse and rapes will become commonplace. With Rio Tinto already *in situ*, this ruthless mining corporation may follow its South American tradition of assisting the eliminating Aborigines with introduced diseases before expediting more extensive Arnhem Land resource exploitation. Handily, even its traditional agent for distributing disease-infected clothes, *The Summer Institute of Linguistics*, (a bible-interpreting service) is also already in position in the Top End. (War hero, explorer, journalist, and historian Frank Alcorta accurately narrated this sad episode of history in the NT News three decades ago).
- If the US provokes war with Iran, Turkey, China, Russia, or North Korea (which is what is going on at this moment), this is likely to develop into World War Three. If this happens there will certainly be Chinese missiles visited on:
 - Melville Bay,
 - The new missile/rocket launching site,
 - Darwin Airport,
 - The satellite relay signal installations at Middle Point and Shoal Bay,
 - Tindal airport,
 - Pine Gap.

If this goes nuclear, as some have suggested, those Australians not killed in the immediate blasts, will die from the nuclear fall-out; some quickly, others in the years that follow. When bombed, the three giant *Inpex* gas tanks will also explode, with a reported devastation radius well beyond Darwin.

This scenario mirrors the warnings issued by ultra-insider, Malcolm Fraser.

As former Prime Minister, and with ongoing privileged access to classified information, he was in possession of the disturbing facts. We would be prudent to heed Fraser's warning, **which he clearly intended as his legacy to the Australian People**. I am sure many Australians will conclude that to ignore his warning would be to court national suicide, in the most literal sense.

Even if an American military presence was not on the table, there is still the matter of public safety surrounding even a civilian rocket base.

Indeed, a comprehensive 1987 government study found that there was no place in the north of Australia where it would be safe to install a rocket launching platform, let alone the initially envisaged Gunn Point location.

Quote from report: *"As all of the common trajectories for geostationary, polar and space shuttle orbits traverse populated areas, and most of impact zones occur in inhabited localities including cities, towns and communities, the Working Party has reluctantly drawn the inevitable conclusion that none of the studied sites is suitable for a commercial spaceport"...* (1987 Cabinet Papers, NTRS 2575/P1, Decision 5266; Northern Territory Archives Service).

The question is now posed: why is a rocket base now suddenly classified as safe, especially considering that the relevant resident population is much denser now than it was in 1987? And why has internet reference to the results of that study, and the Raytheon/Lockheed Martin link, suddenly disappeared?

Another question: Why has the *Native Title Act* been breached.? Traditional consensus protocols, these forming the Indigenous decision-making process, have been ignored. Instead, a purely western process was applied and completed in 13 days, inclusive of weekends.

Tony Ryan
PO Box 129
Nhulunbuy NT 0881
2018-2020

REPORT: *Muthamul: Wangurri-Waramirri; Adequacy of Consultation Study,* [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; *undertaken by researcher, Tony Ryan.* (Fields: Geopolitics, Aboriginal Law; Aboriginal health, land management; fire management; buffalo industry; consensus democracy. Etc)

Estimates transcript - Day 1 – 28 November 2017

Parliament.nt.gov.au/committees/estimates2017/annual-reports

Question on Notice No 1.6

(ESTIMATES COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS – Tuesday 28 November 2017, P49)

Madam CHAIR: Member for Nhulunbuy, can you repeat your question, please?

Mr GUYULA: Indigenous workforce initiatives supported 477 Aboriginal Territorians to achieve jobs, where were these jobs based? How many were in remote community centres and outlying homelands?

Madam CHAIR: Chief Minister, are you happy to accept the question on notice?

Mr GUNNER: Yes. Madam CHAIR: The question asked by the Member for Nhulunbuy of the Chief Minister has been allocated the number 1.6.

Madam CHAIR: Are there any further questions?

Mr GUYULA: In relation to the business unit and its future priorities, exactly how many jobs do you anticipate may be created in the area of aerospace development, and how many of these jobs will be for local people?

Mr GUNNER: I believe Luke has put his hand up to take that question. Mr BOWEN: The Equatorial Launch project, which is in your electorate—just today there was an announcement in Canberra, at Mount Stromlo, in relation to the finalisation of a sublease agreement. The head lease for the land there, which the Gumatj have negotiated with Equatorial Launch, has been agreed by the Northern Land Council and approved by the federal minister. The estimates and the sublease to Equatorial Launch, which enables them to go about securing finance for the launch facilities—that project is projected to employ about 35 people in the construction phase. In the ongoing operational phase it is about 32 people. The objective is to maximise the local involvement in that project for obvious reasons. This is about transitioning a mining-focused service town for the region in order to maximise local input. It also feeds in well with the overall work that is going on in the Defence area, not only in space but in Air Force, Navy and Army activities, increasing American Defence presence and other allies. It feeds in well with some of the skills and requirements for servicing what is an increasingly sophisticated Defence sector, and it complements some of those initiatives. It is about growing the space industry. The projections are based on current knowledge of what the demands of the equatorial launch facility would look like. They are making a very steady step-by-step approach to scaling their operations, basing initially on some primary arrangements with NASA, which hopefully will be operational by the end of 2019, with some low orbit satellites and rockets that go up and come back down.

Madam CHAIR: Are there any further questions?

Mr GUYULA: Yes. The department has given a grant of \$50 000 to Equatorial Launch Australia. Was this given to ELA before it was given a lease? What was the purpose of the grant?

Mr BOWEN: The grant was to kick-start the project. An enormous amount of work was involved in the consultation process, which required working with Northern Land Council and traditional owners in the region to gain support for the project and get an agreement to the headlease that has now been approved by the Northern Land Council—the full council—and the federal minister. There is a lot of preparatory work, and that is not just in relation to the consultation process; there is technical work involved. The processes for gaining approval beyond traditional owners' approval are extensive. In some cases this is new territory for the Northern Territory. We have not had a space industry before. There is also federal legislation that needs to catch up with some of the new areas in this new frontier. There is a lot of work that had to go into the approval processes and environmental approval processes as well. The Northern Territory Government saw it as a very strategic investment to assist with that process of engagement and going through the approval process.

Mr GUYULA: The department has given a grant for \$75 000 to "*Developing East Arnhem limited*" under the category of Defence industry. What was the purpose of this grant and what area in East Arnhem Land did it relate to?

Mr BOWEN: If I understand that question, it is also connected to the equatorial launch, the activities to get the approval process in place. There was a Heads of Agreement signed between the Gumatj and East Arnhem Limited, which is a body that has been established to help with the economic development of the region and all the town. This has been part of the facilitation of this exciting new project in Nhulunbuy.

Mr GUYULA: When the government gives grant money for projects on Aboriginal country, do they get permission of the leaders for the country? Mr GUNNER: I think that is slightly complicated; it depends on the project that is occurring. In this instance, Equatorial Launch Australia with the Gumatj are the ones handling those conversations. We were merely providing support. There are other mechanisms around that. Do you want to talk further to that, Michael?

Mr TENNANT: I thank the member for the question. It is certainly something we ask when we receive interest from people seeking grants about whether—and they are looking at doing something on Aboriginal land or land *subject to native title*. We ask questions in relation to, are and have they engaged with local traditional owners and local communities? Are they consulting with those communities? Do they have the agreement or consent of those communities? Equatorial Launch Australia, I am advised; before they received any funding was in conversations with and working through Gumatj in relation to their proposed project. It was something we had looked for from ELA, the company. They were engaging locally and working with local people around what they were proposing to do on traditional owners' land. Madam CHAIR: Thank you for that response. I interject because I am mindful that we have two minutes remaining and I know the Member for Blain has a question, so I will go to him as a committee member.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS – Tuesday 28 November 2017 50

Optional:

Explanatory notes pertaining to inadequate consultation with (Aborigines) Yolngu:

The [REDACTED], has expressed reservations about the extent and quality of consultation and securing of relevant permissions, in respect of the proposed aerospace development.

The NLC claims consultation adhered to traditional decision-making processes, however, there is absolutely no evidence of this. Moreover, the entire consultation period took a mere 12 working days (27 July to 9 August) to consult with Wanggurri, Waramirri, and Lamamirr language groups. This has the benchmarks of a rush job. Why?

And why were Yolngu not advised about the ozone damaging gases (Cl) produced by the solid rocket fuels used, or about the 1987 decision which ruled a north Australia rocket launch platform as too dangerous. Population dispersion around Gunn Point is not substantially different to the community and homeland proliferation of East Arnhem.

Acting on the request of [REDACTED] office's researchers, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], I soon discovered evidence of other glaring omissions. These notwithstanding, covered as they are in the main text; I share the MLA's reservations, which reflect the bland and uncomprehending attitude of government as evidenced in the above *estimates review* dialogue.

For the benefit of readers not familiar with the gulf between Aboriginal culture and western culture, some brief explanation is provided.

Essentially, it needs to be understood that the prime determinant of Aboriginal culture is, dually, **Conflict Avoidance/Establishment of Harmony**, whereas western culture centres primarily on a single value: **Acquisition**.

Clearly, the two are irreconcilable. A cross-cultural buffer zone is required.

For this, and reasons of entirely disparate millennial culture-evolving environments, few experiences were identical, resulting in Aboriginal languages in which no words possess exact equivalents to their supposed counterparts in English. This means that language interpretations have been an exercise in compromise and riddled with ambiguity.

As the anthropologist Elkin pointed out eighty years ago, the use of pidgin and interpreters are exercises in futility and miscomprehension. **He was unequivocal in stating that Government officers responsible for communication and consultation must learn Aboriginal languages, or accept that failure of developmental programmes will be widespread and inevitable.**

To this day, government has clung to the colonial policy of not recognising Aboriginal languages as standard mediums for communication, which has resulted in almost no traditional Aborigines comprehending government policies, or politics, or geopolitics. Instead, they have been forced to negotiate their survival in a foreign language... English; invariably a fourth or even seventh language.

It gets worse. There are two distinct sides to the interpreter coin. Few, if any, of the interpreters used by **government fully understand western culture or English language**. This is because they are invariably Aboriginal themselves and the meanings they apply in English are in fact the Aboriginal-interpreted meanings, **which are never the same**.

To reiterate, language is a direct expression of culture. Thus, if one's culture is Aboriginal but the language spoken is English, the meanings will reflect Aboriginal culture. It has yet to occur to governments that special training must be given to Aboriginal interpreters to ensure both parties are communicating the same ideas and concepts.

If government officers were Swiss this would not be a problem as most Swiss people understand two, three or even four languages. But almost all proficient Australian English-speakers are monolingual, which means they are oblivious to this invisible cross-cultural gulf. Most damaging of all, they are blind to their own culture; most being unaware they possess one at all. Anthropologists included, they actually presume their prime values are universal.

Significantly, for example, the western fondness for lauding **leadership**, which actually implies unilateral behaviour to the exclusion of other viewpoints, in Aboriginal understanding means more **the initiator of consensus**; which is the diametric opposite in terms of process and objectives.

Aboriginal decision-making is by *total consensus* whereas the Western method is hierarchical imposition (with the handful of historical exceptions, these being the eight successful Australian national referenda).

In 230 years, the Australian Government has remained oblivious to this fundamental incongruity, which is the primary reason why NT Aboriginal health, education and employment have gone backwards.

Influential but hostile global entities most certainly understood this culturally-camouflaged conflict, which works entirely to western convenience and to the extreme detriment of Aborigines. The Murdoch-controlled media has further distracted potential critics by promoting southern urban Aboriginal media celebrities, who divert public attention towards tokenistic campaigns such as *Reconciliation*, *Close the Gap*, and so on; talk-fests which cannot deliver outcomes of substance or consequence.

Meanwhile, endemic language-speaking NT Aborigines who want language and homelands recognised as priorities cannot be seen or heard, drowned at as they are by the southern and urban uproar.

Both the Commonwealth and NT Governments have had this explained to them in detail but both remain deaf and blind to such inconvenient realities. The outcome is genocide, pure and simple. The weapons used do not go dramatically *bang*, but are lethal just the same.

Governmental alibis also take the form of anthropologists, who also do not learn Aboriginal languages and who are expert on a parallel but entirely mythical "Aboriginal Culture". This *blind leading the wilfully blind* gave birth to the Land Rights Act (NT) 1976, and the NLC; institutional aberrations which were compounded in the Native Titles Act and its subsequent amendments.

The *Native Title Act* has been amended to delete the requirement to consult with and secure permission of the entire Language Group who belongs to a said portion of land (a development which I now, with the benefit of hindsight, interpret **as the entire judicial intent from the outset**).

Essentially, a representative cadre can now agree on behalf of everyone (if my interpretation of the most recent amendment is correct). Moreover, in Aboriginal culture *Traditional Owners* is an alien concept, one fabricated by the Northern Land Council and Law Reform Commission. The word **owner** has an entirely different meaning in Aboriginal culture, coming closer to **owned (by the land)**.

To reiterate, **the western concept of leadership... by definition, a situation in which one person can act unilaterally, overriding all other expressions of opinion or interpretation of convention or law... does not exist in Aboriginal culture**, nor in Kung or Inuit for that matter. Leadership as a decision-making mechanism is far from historically international and it is an arrogant expression of western colonialism to presume Aborigines must have *leaders* simply because we do. Yet this has been the benchmark approach to Aboriginal development and consultation for fifty years; facilitating, not the informed will of the Australian people as a source of purported guidance to Australia's surviving first residents, but manipulation by ruthless foreign corporations.

So imbedded is the western conditioned belief in leadership as the only realistic method of societal decision-making, that I believe it is necessary to draw attention to those in our own tri-millennial history who so volubly and lyrically disagreed with the hierarchical concept:

In point of philosophical fact, as was clearly determined by some of the greatest political philosophers in human history, unilateral behaviour is an undesirable choice and has invariably proved to be a disaster for the people. These thinkers saw **the obvious advantages of accessing the knowledge, wisdom and good-will of all, rather than restricting input to the select and invariably corrupted or sycophantic few:**

Thucydides of ancient Greece “We are government by the many, not by the few”;

The Irish Monks (one third of whom were women) who recorded genuine democracies in Finland and elsewhere, noting their superiority of performance compared to unilateralist governments;

Thomas Paine “All authority resides in The People” – *The Rights of Man*.

Abraham Lincoln “*Government of The People, by The People and for The People*”; *Gettysburg Address*; and

Lord Acton “To elect a person to do our thinking for us *is transferring our power to determine our own future, to another*. This accumulation of power always corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely”.

Notwithstanding the observable reality that there are no genuine democracies surviving today, Aboriginal decision-making was *democracy* in its purist form. As was carefully explained to me in 1975 by the foremost Songmen on Elcho Island: Yolngu recognised and installed clear consensus protocols which ensured that every man, woman, and child was able to express their wishes on any issue under discussion. (A record of the traditional *Yolngu consensus protocols* is available on request).

That the NLC and Law Reform Commission have imposed their own fractured cultural behaviour on Yolngu and other Aborigines is an outrageous act of colonialism and cultural oppression. Government has just spent \$20 million on a boarding school in Nhulunbuy to “inculcate leadership roles in young Yolngu minds”. The propaganda is unrelenting.

What is also incorrect is the presumption that any one language group can decide on issues of multi-clan significance. Gumatj, being Yirritja, must also consider the views of their closely related (inter-marrying) Dhuwa clans; and also how their activities might impact on Songlines and surrounding country, especially creeks, rivers and coastal waters. **This has certainly not happened in respect of the rocket base proposal.**

Finally, if the Arnhem Land proposal has defence significance, especially involving the activities of an aggressive and hegemonic foreign power, this is the business of every single Australian citizen before the event, not after.

Then there is the matter of the citizens of Nhulunbuy. If experience elsewhere is any guide, installation of a US military presence will have security-exclusionist impacts on everyone; probably resulting in the replacement of the entire population to one of appropriate security status; a euphemism for *colonisation by American military and security personnel*.

By definition, this is invasion. As former PM Malcolm Fraser repeatedly pointed out:

- The US is an unreliable ally,
- Has betrayed Australia at least twice before,
- Has never honoured a treaty,
- Is actually under no obligation to defend Australia, and
- Would force the People’s Republic of China military to target reprisal or defensive nuclear targets in...

- Pine Gap,
- Middle Point, and
- Shoal Bay spy and navigation satellite relay installations,
- Darwin Airport,
- Tindal Airport,
- The rocket base,
- (Reportedly) two other bases in WA; and
- If our speculation based on previous US behaviour and objectives proves accurate, Melville Bay deep water harbour, long coveted by the US Navy.

...which is a total of nine automatic nuclear targets following the first strike / panic button alert.

URLs for Fraser Papers and those of other defence experts in similar vein:

<http://www.defence.gov.au/WhitePaper/docs/071-MarrickvillePeaceGroup.pdf>
<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-04-29/fraser-australia-must-strive-for-strategic-independence/5417712>
<https://www.policyforum.net/australias-role-in-the-pacific/>
http://cecaust.com.au/releases/2017_12_14_Fraser_Dastyari.html

Making oneself a multiple nuclear target is a questionable, if not self-defeating, national defence policy.

FOOTNOTE

Half of Australian defence personnel, and 40% of the national population, believe Australia should abandon foreign adventures, chained as we have been to America's well-proved lies and fabrications to support military invasions of sovereign nations; and instead defend our own continent with missiles and conventional defence.

Rockets with 7000 K ranges and 4000 KPH speeds are available on the global market. Australia does have viable options to nuclear obliteration of the North.

Not incidentally, this geopolitical independence would also almost entirely eliminate Australia as a target for international terrorism.

Clearly, the time has come for a Rethink. Evidently, we are not alone in our conclusions. Some Australians have dubbed their preference 'Armed Neutrality'.

Tony Ryan
 PO Box 129 Nhulunbuy NT 0881