



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.41, No.8

March 4th, 2005

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "If any would be greatest among you let him be your servant," was not sentimentalism, but a brilliant maxim of social and political organisation."

– C.H. Douglas in *"The Fig Tree"*, June, 1938

WATCH MY LIPS – ANOTHER 'CORE' PROMISE by Betty Luks:

The joke goes like this: "How do you know when a politician is lying?" The answer being: "When you see his lips moving." And so John Winston Howard has broken his word yet again. He insisted he would not send more Australian servicemen to Iraq; in fact Senator Hill was previously 'making noises' about bringing the troops home in 'eighteen months or thereabouts'.

Decision to commit our troops to war: When did the parliamentary responsibility to commit our troops to war shift to 'cabinet'? Did this shift originate as another party-political convention, just as did the promotion of the status of 'prime minister'? There is no constitutional provision for a prime minister. It is purely a party-political construct. The so-called position of 'prime minister' is decided by a political party back-room vote. The people of Australia choose their own political representatives. Just as did the electorate of Bennelong choose John Howard to represent *them*.

Should a party-political appointed 'prime minister' be able to commit Australian troops to an overseas war without a full debate and vote in Parliament?

THE LAW AND THE WAR: It is not only Australians who have grave misgivings about the war of aggression in Iraq and where Howard's deceitful 'all the way with Dubya-a' policies are leading us. United Kingdom elections are looming and the Blair Labour government is more than anxious to 'move on' from the divisions of the war in Iraq, reports *The Guardian*, February 23rd, 2005.

"Yet, try as it may, the Blair government cannot get the arguments about Iraq to disappear. A new book by the international lawyer Philippe Sands QC,...shows some reasons why. Mr. Sands makes fresh claims and poses new questions about one of the most controversial aspects of the decision to go to war – the attorney general's advice to ministers and service chiefs that the attack on Iraq was legal.

If Mr. Sands is right, the advice was even more finely balanced than has previously been acknowledged and the use to which it was put more dubious.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *Watch My Lips – Another 'Core' Promise* • *The Law And The War* • *The Great Neo 'Con'* • *Now That's Gratitude For You* • *Cargo Cult Mentality* • *Food Vouchers For The Unemployed*

The attorney's legal advice was pivotal in the decision to make war: Its key assertion was that Iraq had failed to comply fully with UN resolution 1441 and was thus in material breach of its international obligations following the Gulf war. In Lord Goldsmith's opinion, Iraq's continuing failure to eliminate its weapons of mass destruction created the legal basis for war.

A summary of his views was put before the cabinet on two sides of A4 and was then published as a parliamentary written answer.

The following day, its claim that Iraq's material breach had "revived" the authority to use force was a crucial link in the formal war resolution on which MPs voted. (Notice the UK politicians at least had a vote!...ed)

During his speech, the prime minister could not have been clearer: "I have never put the justification for action as regime change," he said. "We have to act within the terms set out in resolution 1441 – that is our legal base."

In other words, if the attorney general had said that the use of force was legally dubious, Britain could not have attacked Iraq.

But, according to Mr. Sands, this is precisely what the attorney general did say: In his full 13-page advice to the prime minister, dated March 7 – a document that has never been published and which was not shown to the cabinet either – Lord Goldsmith apparently said that **the use of force on the basis of resolution 1441 "could be found to be illegal"**.

It would therefore be much safer to get a second UN resolution to authorise force, he advised.

So concerned was the government that it put together a legal team to defend itself against international litigation. So concerned were the service chiefs that they demanded a less ambiguous statement, so that soldiers would not risk being "put through the mill", as the chief of the defence staff Lord Boyce put it.

"I spent a good deal of time recently in the Balkans making sure that Milosevic was put behind bars," the head of the army Sir Michael Jackson is alleged to have said. "I have no intention of ending up in the next cell to him in the Hague."

The service chiefs got what they wanted – a summary that was also given to ministers and MPs. But this summary, though issued in Lord Goldsmith's name, was the work of other hands – names in the frame include Lord Falconer, then a home office minister, and Baroness Morgan, Mr. Blair's senior political adviser.

These are very serious claims about a piece of advice which caused the foreign office's deputy legal adviser to resign on the grounds that it sanctioned an unlawful use of force amounting to a "crime of aggression". They cannot be allowed to go unanswered.

Three things should therefore be done:

- First, the government should end the speculation by publishing all drafts of Lord Goldsmith's advice.
- Second, the public administration select committee should call an inquiry into the advice and the use to which its various forms were put.
- Third, all those involved should answer for their roles in the story.

It is one thing to move on. It is quite another to do so without a full public accounting for one of the murkiest and most dubious decisions ever taken by a modern British government." (emphasis added ... ed)

THE GREAT NEO 'CON' by James Reed:

There is a nasty rumour going around some circles in America that George Bush "stole the election". *Audit the Vote* and *Help America Recount* (see www.auditthevote.org) has documented evidence of statistical anomalies, voting machine malfunction and outright fraud in the 2004 Presidential election. Eighty per cent of all votes cast nationally were counted by two corporations, Diebald and ES&S. The head of Diebald said in a 2003 fundraising letter: "I am committed to helping Ohio deliver its electoral votes to the President." Machine malfunctions occurred in many states. In New Mexico official canvass reports show 2,087 "phantom votes" – the number of votes recorded exceeding the number of cast ballots. Bush won New Mexico by less than 6,000 votes.

The monitoring agency *Election Protection Coalition* received over 200,000 phone calls reporting electoral irregularities on November 2nd, 2004, and an additional 200,000 calls were made to a hotline run by *Common Cause*. Machine malfunctions were common and the optical scanning machines were subject to computer errors. Some of the errors were detected but civil libertarians have doubts that all were.

And so it goes on. One wonders, after pondering upon such material what the situation in Australia is really like? What is the extent of electoral corruption in our land?

NOW THAT'S GRATITUDE FOR YOU by James Reed:

It is well known that 'Australia' is bending over backwards to increase the number of Asians in this country. This is done, not only by a racially discriminatory immigration policy – which, under Australia's greatest Asianising Prime Minister, John Howard – but also increasingly through the guest worker/'temporary' migrant scheme. Students and guest workers become permanent stayers.

It is therefore interesting to observe the front-page story of the Indian doctor, Dr. Gursharan Sing in the Adelaide *Advertiser*, 19/2/05. Dr. Singh laments, from the luxury of India where he has returned, that the workload from being on-call at Wudinna on the Eyre Peninsula of South Australia was "exploitation", and indeed, a human rights violation.

Dr. Singh stayed at Wudinna only six days and 23 hours before returning to India. He was to be paid \$100,000 a year, but said that on an hourly basis this was less than a waiter would get. A public sector job in India would pay better.

Dr. Singh has returned to India. With that attitude India is welcome to him. It is time to solve our economic problems without the use of the cargo cult ideology of importing migrants. Let us train more local doctors who have agreed and contracted to do country service.

Editor's comment: We do hope the farmers on the west coast of SA are taking note of Dr. Singh's protest of the "exploitation of his human rights" as they continue to struggle to survive on a daily basis, let alone get ahead, amidst all the financial burdens, red tape and restrictions imposed upon them by the three-tiers of government – never mind the soulless financial system. And what about the last four years of drought many have suffered, and bush fires, and loss of life and homes, etc., etc., and whatever else mother nature chooses to throw at them?

CARGO-CULT MENTALITY: We know it is time to solve our economic problems without the use of the cargo cult ideology of importing migrants – but the question is HOW?

Clifford Hugh Douglas warned the western world eighty years ago. There is a double problem to solve.

- The industrialised world had to find an effective means of distributing the products, the results, of the machine. Machines have taken the place of human labour and therefore less wages,

- salaries and dividends are distributed – as purchasing power – through the production system.
- And at the same time there is the need to restore personal initiative (to the individual), as well as retain the benefits of mechanisation for productive purposes.

Douglas' warning was: A faulty philosophy lies at the core of the problem confronting Western civilisation.

Douglas grasped that with the advent of the machine, industry became essentially co-operative, and policy became a matter of public concern.

That is why we seek to encourage our readers to grasp the importance of their *potential* social dynamic, which could be used constructively and for the good of us all. Instead of which, our financial and political masters continually seek to divide us and thereby rule over us. **AND NO ONE IS SATISFIED WITH THE PRESENT SYSTEM!**

FOOD VOUCHERS FOR THE UNEMPLOYED by Ken Grundy:

One of our readers sent the following letter in response to James Reed's article on the Liberals' proposal to issue food vouchers in place of welfare payments in money.

"The suggestion by some elements within the Liberal party, that welfare recipients be given vouchers or stamps to access basic living requirements, has received a mixed reaction.

Some publicity suggests the level of welfare will be reduced and the stay-at-home-mums will be thrust back into the workforce. But need that occur if the level of welfare is maintained? In any case, society is prepared to acknowledge the contribution of mothers who stay at home and is willing to support them. Similarly with the aged and disabled, whose welfare is not questioned.

Australia has a vast pool of unemployed people, many of whom are young and fit. Australia also has many manual labour jobs, for which few people apply. Many of these are in the primary industry scene with fruit picking being the most noteworthy.

Is it more desirable to get "fly-in fly-out" workers from overseas to pick the fruit or to get Aussies to do the work?

The question does not deserve an answer.

But how will we motivate our own people to work? Is the dole too generous? Would vouchers or stamps rather than cash, assist?

For those of us who cherish freedom, the vouchers would deny the recipient some freedom of choice. The welfare could only be spent as directed (e.g. food) rather than luxuries. Does this clash with our philosophy?

Does anyone have total freedom of choice? The employed have to abide by the firm's rules; the soldier has to accept orders; the prisoner has even fewer choices. Is it too much to ask the unemployed to accept welfare with restrictions?

Welfare is different from a social dividend which would be applicable to every citizen. The dividend is a reward which the dole should never be.

Imagine how welfare would be distributed if we did not have a money system. It would be similar to circumstances after a bushfire - the needy would be given clothes, food and shelter, not cash. In our modern society we have found it more convenient to pay cash. The system has been abused by some and many would claim it has destroyed for many, the incentive to work.

How will we get the fruit picked?"

"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.