



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.40, No.44

November 12th, 2004

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "In accordance with the principles of Christian philosophy and theology, England will be a free community. It will be an association of families of free men and women living in the fellowship of a free community."

Saint Augustine warned his generation: "God did not make man to lord it over his fellows, but only to master irrational creatures; and that the desire to rule over our equals is an intolerable lust of the soul."

– Richard O'Sullivan QC in "*Christian Philosophy in the Common Law*", 1947

IT'S A BATTLE FOR COMMON LAW RIGHTS by Betty Luks:

Australia and America now have 'conservative right-wing' governments. But what does that mean in today's *doublespeak*? And why am I so cynical when it comes to all the hype and hoopla of politicians? I ask myself, what is really motivating them and what are the undisclosed agendas behind their latest moves?

A 'conservative' was once someone who held a political orientation towards the preservation of the best in their society and they were opposed to *radical* changes (*radical*: arising from or going to the *root* cause). In other words, there were basic principles which the conservatives believed essential for the continuity and sustainability of their society.

The Australian League of Rights (ALoR) has been a Christian 'conservative' movement throughout its 58 years of existence; it has convened *Conservative Speakers' Clubs* in the different States of the Commonwealth for well over thirty continuous years. So, what are the differences between the League's policies and the newly elected so-called 'conservative' parties' in Australia and America?

Where can we 'spot the difference' in at least one aspect between the League as a Christian-based conservative movement and both 'conservative' parties whose leading members parade their own brand of 'Christianity' when it gives them a political advantage.

A Christian civilisation: The ALoR starts from the position it was the light of *Christian Truth* which showed the way forward for men to build what was the finest civilisation man had yet produced.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *It's A Battle For Common Law Rights* • *From The 'Bowels' Of Washington* • *Trial Reveals US Gave UK 5-Months Advance Date For Iraq War* • *'Institutional Liars' Savaged Over EU Constitution* • *And Now For The 'Health' Police*

"ON TARGET"

November 12th, 2004

Page 1 (173)

We stand positively for the Individual: The protection and extension of Individual freedom is essential. The Individual is ultimately held responsible and accountable for his attitudes and actions throughout his life, therefore, to be 'responsible' he must be in a position to be able to freely choose.

What 'the State' gives today – it can take away tomorrow! For over fifty years Eric Butler warned his fellow Australians against the idea of an Australian Bill of Rights: If you fall for the idea that the State can grant you your rights, you had better remember that what the State gives you today it can take away tomorrow!

The *pedigree* of the modern idea of a Bill of Rights can be traced back to the French Revolution's "Declaration of Rights" and Englishman Roger Scruton has reminded his readers that when the Bastille was stormed in 1789, seven inmates were discovered and released amid general rejoicing (*The Spectator*, 16/10/04). Yet only four years later, the prisons of France contained 400,000 people! And in conditions that ensured the deaths of many of them.

French revolutionary 'justice' was administered by Revolutionary Tribunals which denied the accused the right to counsel, and which punished people for offences defined in the same philosophical language that had inspired the original Declaration, and which could therefore be interpreted to mean anything that the prosecutor desired.

"**The State can't set you free,**" admonished Roger Scruton when warning of the 'Human Rights' threats to the ancient liberties of the British peoples.

"The Human Rights Act has seemed to many to be an innocent adaptation of principles already contained within our common law, and indeed affirmed by Statute once before, in the Bill of Rights of 1689. Seen in this way, the Act is no more than an affirmation of an ancient principle of our jurisdiction, which is that the law exists to protect the individual from oppression, whether that oppression be exerted by criminals, by neighbours or by those in authority."

Mr. Scruton continues: "But this vision of the matter overlooks a profound distinction between common law and civilian jurisdictions, and between the *English* presumption that you are free until the law forbids you and the *Continental* presumption that you are free *only if the law explicitly says so*." (And you may only speak out on 'politically incorrect' issues if the State's human rights thought police approve!...*ed*)

The British idea of freedom "did not originate in the courts", writes Mr. Scruton, "it stepped down there from the exalted realm of philosophy, but only by first putting a foot on to the throne of politics. It arose out of mediaeval speculations about natural justice - the justice that reigns supreme in Heaven and which stands in judgement over human laws..."

Out of the French Revolution grew the revolutionary idea that our freedoms came from some point other than God, and, just like Topsy the idea grew. It could be the Party, the State, the Parliament, even the Cabinet and the Human Rights Commissions.

Scruton counsels us to think deeper: "Rights are not secured by declaring them," he says, "they are secured by the procedures that protect them."

Ernst Zundel is leading the way for us: That is why Ingrid Rimland, wife of Ernst Zundel a *political* prisoner in Canada courageously fighting for his right to freedom of thought and speech, and now his personal freedom, could write:

"When I asked what this latest Supreme Court defeat meant, not just for Ernst, but for Canadians, he said calmly – and here I have to paraphrase as I remember it:

"It has always been a feature of Anglo-Saxon law that there were review mechanisms every step of the way built into the system – where one could challenge bad decisions and get someone to take another look. A precedent has now been set, and Canada will have to live with it. A pity."

FROM THE 'BOWELS' OF WASHINGTON: "The most credible American journalist of yesteryear, Walter Cronkite, made a rather startling comment when asked about bin Laden's video speech to the

Americans (during the last days of the presidential election campaign). Cronkite said he is inclined to think that Karl Rove, the political manager at the White House, who is a very clever man, he probably set up bin Laden to this thing." – *from* www.MiddleEastRealities website:

Martin Walker of United Press International was interviewed last Thursday evening (4/11/04) by Kerry O'Brien on the 7.30 Report. Asked by Kerry what he thought we could expect now that Bush had been re-elected, Walker replied he thought that within a matter of months Israel would attack Iran with the support of America.

TRIAL REVEALS US GAVE UK 5-MONTHS ADVANCE DATE FOR IRAQ WAR: It has been revealed through a court martial case now before a court in Britain that secret plans for the war in Iraq were passed to British Army chiefs by US defence planners five months before the invasion was launched.

The revelation strengthened suspicions that Tony Blair gave his agreement to President George Bush to go to war while the diplomatic efforts to force Saddam Hussein to comply with UN resolutions were continuing.

Alan Simpson, the leader of "Labour Against the War", said the documents were 'dynamite', if genuine, and showed that Clare Short was right to assert in her book, serialised in *The Independent*, that Mr. Blair had "knowingly misled" Parliament.

The plans were revealed during the court martial of L/Cpl. Ian Blaymire, 23, from Leeds, who is charged with the manslaughter of a comrade while serving in Iraq. Sgt. John Nightingale, 32, a reservist from Guiseley, West Yorkshire, died after being shot in the chest on September 23rd last year.

The court, at Catterick Garrison, North Yorkshire, heard that contingency plans were drawn up by Lt. Col. Christopher Warren, staff officer at Land Command, Salisbury, Wiltshire, who was responsible for operational training.

Lt. Col. Warren said US planners had passed on dates for which the invasion was planned. The hearing was told Army chiefs wanted the training for the Army to start at the beginning of December 2002. However, due to "sensitivities" the training was delayed.

The court heard the training for the TA began two months late and for the regular Army one month late. Lt. Col. Warren was asked what the sensitivities were. He replied: "Because in December there was a world interest. If the UK had mobilised while all this was going on that would have shown an intent before the political process had been allowed to run its course."

The hearing has been adjourned.

INSTITUTIONAL LIARS' SAVAGED OVER EU CONSTITUTION: Lord Stoddart of Swindon, the independent Labour peer who chairs the cross-party "Campaign for an Independent Britain" (CIB) has severely criticised the Prime Minister for signing up to the EU Constitution against the wishes of the British people. He described Tony Blair and his Government as "institutional liars" and called the signing of the Treaty a "betrayal of Britain and its independence".

Lord Stoddart said: "This Government has been shown over and over again to be institutional liars. They have told us nothing but lies about the Constitution. We were supposed to believe that it was only a 'tidying up' exercise, when in reality it is a polar shift in our relationship with the EU. It marks the formal transition of the EU to a legal personality in its own right. Today, it becomes a country called Europe and gives itself massive new powers over the member states.

"People need to understand that the Prime Minister is signing away nothing less than Britain's right to self-government. A thousand years of history goes down the drain at the stroke of a pen. Our democratic heritage is being given away lock, stock and barrel.

The 'Third Way' – the real direction: "Opinion poll after opinion poll has shown that the British people want nothing to do with the EU Constitution and yet we have a Prime Minister who swept to power calling his Government 'the people's Government', who is riding roughshod over their wishes by signing up to this dreadful document in Rome today. How times have changed".

The Campaign for an Independent Britain opposes Britain's membership of the European Union. Its campaigning activities are based on accurate and informed analysis of the very real cost of Britain's continued membership. It believes that the EU is undermining British democracy and endangering the nation's economic future.

Editor's note: Fortunately there will be a referendum in a number of EU countries, including the UK, so the new EU Constitution is not yet a certainty.

UK readers: For further information on "Campaign for an Independent Britain" contact Stuart Gulleford on 07734-457390 or 01277-231837.

AND NOW FOR THE 'HEALTH' POLICE: We have received a disturbing report of a 'Discussion Paper' which was quietly released by the NSW Health Department who want to "reform the Mental Health Act" in that state.

According to our report, Section 11 of the 1990 Mental Health Act protects every citizen in NSW from having their religious convictions or practice, personal philosophy or practice, political beliefs/actions, sexual history or orientation or anti-social behaviour being a factor in an assessment of mental illness, but some folk are concerned this law is to be changed.

For those who want to view the discussion paper for themselves it is available at the following web address: <http://www.health.nsw.gov.au/pubs/2004/menthealrev.html>

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$40.00 p.a.