



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.39, No.1

January 17th, 2003

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"There is, in a certain type of metaphysics, a theory, or rather statement, that animals have a 'Group' soul, and that the real test of difference between the animal kingdom and the human race is the individuality of the human soul. That is to say, the first 'duty' of the human being is to dominate his relationship with the group soul. This means, if it means anything, that the supreme aim of evolution is differentiation, and that the determined effort to present human beings, and to treat human beings, as a collectivity, is the Sin against the Holy Ghost, for which there is no forgiveness... An organisation which is expressly designed to make use of individuals without allowing them to understand the true object for which they are being used is inherently Evil... A quarrel between two individuals proceeds from something inside them. A modern war is a collective prize fight, promoted by outsiders for the benefit of themselves and the destruction of the contestants."*

– C.H. Douglas "The Big Idea" 1942

TRAGEDY AND HOPE by Jeremy Lee:

Welcome to 2003, and a Happy New Year to all our readers!

On Target exists to summarize a massive amount of news each week into a concise format that serves those without time to traverse the world's media and internet. If it has a bias it is towards freedom and peace between nations and individuals.

It would be nice to report that peace and freedom are expanding across the world. Unfortunately, they are under attack as never before. The complexity of the technology at the disposal of tyrants increases their potency. In material terms the future for mankind looks bleak. However, there is no technology that can eliminate hope and the individual initiative which is sharpened when threatened.

Towards the end of 2002 a landmark case in the Australian High Court opened a Pandora's Box. Mining magnate Joseph Gutnick sued Dow Jones for an article published in the United States in October 2000. The article appeared in the financial magazine *Barrons*, which has five subscribers in Victoria. The article also appeared on the Internet, and about 100 Australians are believed to have downloaded it.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought for the Week* • *Tragedy and Hope* • *The Slaving Dogs of War* • *Burning the Camps* • *Be Alarmed – and Alert* • *Financial Furore* • *The Cherie on Tony's Cake* • *Petrol and Biofuels*

The Court ruled that any material appearing on the Internet is liable to prosecution in the country and under that country's jurisdiction, where it is read. Mark Day, commenting on the case in *The Australian* (11/12/02), said: "...The decision means publishers must take responsibility for their words in every one of the 300-odd legal jurisdictions around the world. Any defamations in the published material occur where the material is downloaded and read, not where it is uploaded onto an internal server"

The Hong Kong-based *Asia Times* commented: "Australia's highest court has paved the way for China and other oppressive governments to apply their home-grown standards to anything published anywhere in the world. That ruling will help the world's autocrats sleep better, while keeping media companies and reporters awake and their lawyers busy ..."

Suggestions have already been made that a new international treaty is required to cover the situation.

THE SLAVERING DOGS OF WAR: All through 2002 the pressure for war against Iraq, relentlessly pursued by Israel's Likud and the club of Zionist-oriented hawks within the US State Department was increased month by month. Looking back, several "D-Days" were canvassed by the media, and people were supposed to accept the inevitability of war. Speed was essential to a successful outcome. But one hitch after another kept postponing an invasion, which allowed time for two things: firstly, more and more information, largely from the Internet, reached the public through the chinks and cracks in "official" news coverage; and secondly, in country after country an ever-growing resistance to war began to emerge with, in some cases, huge anti-war demonstrations. Prime Minister Blair in Britain found the support for his war rhetoric ebbing drastically. President Schroeder in Germany managed to bolster his slipping popularity in the polls by a strong anti-war campaign.

Grudgingly, the US was forced to accept a United Nations role and the return of weapons inspectors. But it made it obvious that the outcome would make no difference to its war intentions. So far a very big team of inspectors with the best technology money can buy has found no sign of "weapons of mass destruction".

Presumably, it was briefed, before going to Iraq, on any and all evidence in the files of western powers as to details and locations of suspected weapons.

As 2003 opens, President Bush's finger – or the unseen powers that are holding his hand – is on the biggest arms build-up and troop deployment the world has ever seen. There is enough fire-power to blow the Middle East to pieces. The United Nations has warned of an expected 900,000 refugees from any Iraq war, to add to the millions already dislocating borders and facilities round the world.

Ordinary people are also taking note of the seemingly-different reactions to different countries. Why no threat of a pre-emptive strike against North Korea, whose nuclear programme is far in advance of Iraq's (if the latter exists at all)? North Korea is supplying arms to such countries as Afghanistan and Yemen. Yet George Bush is conciliatory against a country with the potential to retaliate. Only the powerless are legitimate military targets it seems. Israel, Pakistan and India, and obviously China, are all capable of nuclear aggression. Yet no gun is currently pointed in their direction.

It is the 'reconstruction' of the Middle East, both in regard to oil and the festering sore of the occupied Palestinian territories, that is really on the drawing board of global war.

BURNING THE CAMPS: The Christmas period in Australia saw a co-ordinated spate of arson in Australia's refugee camps. High quality facilities were torched one after the other, causing millions of dollars damage. There seems little doubt that there was outside assistance in the organization behind this sabotage. The aim is to allow any and all refugees, whether illegal or not, immediate facilities in Australian communities.

The Weekend Australian (14-15/12/02) told us that 14,000 illegals, whose claim for refugee status had been denied, had gone underground in Australia: "Almost 14,000 failed asylum-seekers are on the run in Australia after having their refugee claims rejected, immigration authorities say.

"An investigation by *The Weekend Australian* suggests that many absconders are being supported by an increasingly sophisticated underground network providing accommodation, medical care and financial support"

If that is the situation now, imagine what would happen if a further 900,000 Iraqis fled from an imminent war in their country; and Afghanistan bogged down, as seems to be the case, into a resumption of civil war with a resurrected Taliban and Al Qu'ida.

BE ALARMED – AND ALERT: \$15 million dollars will be spent on the advertisement campaign which has started with Steve Liebman telling us to report suspicious incidents and to "be alert but not alarmed".

Like many others, I have wondered what's behind it. It looks suspiciously like a tax-funded electioneering advertisement.

There's no doubt, war, terrorism and the refugee crisis between them are, if played deftly, election winners. The Coalition may well have the pretext for a double dissolution in the next six months. The Senate has rejected Darryl Williams' ASIO Bill. There is no doubt it will be put forward again. A second rejection could provide the trigger Howard wants for such a move. Any war moves in Iraq, any terrorist incident such as Bali, plus the anger over the torching of the refugee detention centres would provide the very psychology for another Howard victory. Crean and his cronies would be annihilated.

Flushed with a third straight victory, Howard would probably leave office within a year, leaving a bloated Coalition to the tender mercies of Peter Costello.

This is, of course, sheer speculation. But what are these expensive advertisements *really* all about?

Former NSW Auditor-General, Tony Harris, writing in *The Australian Financial Review* (7/1/03) said: ".... One of the explicit values the advertisements promote – that we should be alert – is incapable of sensible action. How many Australians will ever be in the position to notice the preparations made by terrorists? When the Commonwealth government asks its people to participate as anti-terrorism vigilantes, one has to be suspicious of its motives, because the untrained looking for the unlikely will consume considerable resources for nothing of value...."

FINANCIAL FURORE: The front page of *The Australian Financial Review* (2/1/03), as the world's stock markets opened for the first time in 2003, summed up the current outlook for the world's financial system: "Global financial markets open trading today dogged by fears about the health of the American economy and the possibility of war with Iraq, after Wall Street ended 2002 suffering from its third year of consecutive losses and its worst annual performance since the mid-1970s....."

"A total of about \$US2.8 trillion was wiped from the value of America's listed companies in a year marred by accounting scandals, terrorism fears, escalating conflict with Iraq and a US economy that weakened in its second half.

"Other key global sharemarkets also notched up sharp losses. The UK's FTSE100 was down 24.5 per cent for 2002, its worst annual loss so far, while Japan's Nikkei 225 Index fell 18.5 per cent. Australia's S&P/ASX200 fell 12.1 per cent"

A lot of commentators are pretending it's going to get better. Wishful thinking.

THE CHERIE ON TONY'S CAKE: *The Chronicle* (Toowoomba, 2/1/03) gave us this little gem:

"LONDON: Cherie Blair yesterday topped a poll of Britons who should be deported after people were prevented from voting for her husband Tony. The Prime Minister was removed from the survey early on because so many people wanted to pick him."

Various exiles have found hidey-holes in odd places in times past. Trotsky hid in South America where he was eventually assassinated with an ice-pick. Idi Amin continues to get a sun tan in Saudi Arabia. Mugabe will probably end up in Timbuktu, or a guest of Gaddafi in Libya.

But where on earth would Tony and Cherie end up? Who, we may ask, would have them? Patagonia? Pitcairn Island? Every country, in the end, has to draw the line somewhere!

The Ides of March for 2003 do not look good. But more people are waking up than ever before. The inevitable ain't necessarily so!

PETROL AND BIOFUELS by Antonio Feitz:

Yesterday I asked a mechanic whether ethanol is harmful to car engines. In reply he told me that he's been swearing at the TV over the current ethanol scare. He thinks the government is trying to demonise biofuels when according to him, methyl alcohol – not ethanol – is the best fuel for cars. It's non-polluting, kinder on engines, gives better performance, works at lower temperatures – his list went on and on.

I asked, if in fact, the internal combustion engine runs better on methyl alcohol than petrol, why the hell aren't we growing our own fuel? Why aren't we designing engines that run efficiently on biofuels – methyl alcohol and vegetable oils – that we can grow?

Imagine the benefit to regional Australia – or Canada, or Africa or wherever – if nations became self-sufficient in fuel. Farms, not city-based oil refineries, would power nations. Nations wouldn't have to rely on imported expensive oil.

In reply, the mechanic said that there's no way any government in the world really wants self sufficiency. There's no way any government really wants sustainability either, he added. When I looked blank he said, just consider the tax revenue from petrol: governments can't AFFORD to go green! He's right. That's why there are so many carrots such as 3-year warranties for people to keep on trading in their cars every few years.

There are sticks too to 'encourage' people to consume oil. As he said, it's getting harder and harder to register older cars – for 'safety' reasons of course. But there's a catch to upgrading, and it's more than the sinful waste of energy and natural resources to produce a 'throwaway' product. According to the mechanic, older cars can "with very little modification" be converted to run on biofuels. Newer cars with their computer fuel injected systems can't. So once you're hooked into ever-trading up you're a 'gonner' as far as biofuels go.

He also told me that years ago somebody invented a ceramic engine block. Unlike today's engines, it would never wear out. It never saw the light of day because our economy is based on waste and inefficiency.

Instead of weeping at the felling of renewable trees isn't it time the greens established some cred with regional Australia? A campaign to introduce home grown, non-polluting biofuels in Australia would surely be a winner.