



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.46, No.19

May 21st, 2010

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Reflections on May 6th: The Conservatives or Labour have governed this country on a "two party" system for 88 years. On 6th of May 2010, the British electorate decided that they want this situation to continue (presumably indefinitely), despite the fact that it has brought upon us, *massive* social, economic, and constitutional problems, and impending bankruptcy.

In Bromsgrove, a total of 33,808 voters indicated that they want to perpetuate the two party charade. This includes 11,250 Labour voters, hell bent on ensuring that Gordon Brown's national fiscal ruination programme runs for another five years. When the count was complete, 22,558 Tory voters had indicated that they were also happy to see the 'two party pantomime' continue its disastrous run, but with just the star comedians changed. Every vote for the LIB-CON double act will, sadly, ensure Britain's continued descent into bankruptcy, international obscurity, and social unrest.

Whichever pantomime dame gets the keys to No.10, none of our problems will be solved, until the EU's catastrophic drain on our finances and morale, coupled with our destruction as a sovereign state (via the Lisbon Treaty) is acknowledged and addressed.

We in UKIP have reached the point where the BBC's iron grip on the political process, via Paxman, Dimbleby, Andrew Neil, *et al* (aided and abetted by our far from unbiased national press) has rendered further UKIP progress impossible. Many voters thought, that only Brown, Clegg and Cameron were on offer to the electorate, as the '1984 style' election campaign was rammed home like a prime time gameshow.

Where to now? Democracy is destroyed and there is no way into the elite, EU prescribed, two-party club, from which they allow us to choose our government. The Lib Dems are only there to give it some, pseudo air of diversity.

Once, I would have said: we fight on! but discretion tells me we have reached decision time and we need to think hard and long about our options. We could simply say: OK, WE TRIED, (now) PUT UP WITH WHAT YOU'VE ELECTED!

– Peter McHugh Sec., UKIP (U.K Independence Party) Bromsgrove, 7th May, 2010.

BARNABY JOYCE'S LATEST MEDIA RELEASE by Betty Luks: I'm sorry Senator Joyce, but your media releases are causing me no end of irritation. You publicly make one or two timely and sensible statements and people who are desperately seeking genuine leadership from among their 'political representatives' have their hopes raised for a short time only to have them dashed once again.

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *Barnaby Joyce's Latest Media Release* • *The Tail That Refuses To Wag* • *What The Public Needs To Know: The Gross Negligence Of BP*

In your media release: 'Vegetation Inquiry Critical of Governments Approach', you refer to the fact that "It should be remembered that each Australian farmer feeds 150 Australians and 650 people overseas".

Have you never asked yourself if there isn't something wrong with a system that makes the Australian farmer feed 650 people worldwide in order to feed 150 Australians and himself and family? Do you really believe the rest of the world is so unproductive that Australian farmers have to feed so many of them?

You recognise "These people just don't need to be saddled by the extra burden of having to bear what the Senate committee identified as economic, personal and family costs".

I presume you are referring to *financial* and *physical* and *lack of rest and recreation COSTS*. In other words, the farmers have to work longer and longer hours and continue to rape and deplete the soils for less and less financial returns. Sounds more like serfdom or financial-slavery to me. The owners of the land are really working for the banks and governments. You say, "They still have to maintain the land and try to be productive and yet they are not being allowed to utilise the land profitably."

Good heavens Mr. Joyce, are you now saying these people – even with one and a half hands tied behind their backs through banks, governments and bureaucrats parasitically living off of them – are NOT PRODUCTIVE ENOUGH? You can't have it both ways.

And tell me, why has the Senate Inquiry Committee come to the conclusion that "COAG should re-examine the native vegetation laws with a view to establishing a balance between managing environmental objectives and maximising agricultural production"?

COAG = Coalition of Australian Governments: Why COAG? When did the people of the Commonwealth of Australia give this unconstitutional body the authority to make such decisions on their behalf?

I feel sure, having been an accountant in a former life, you would be well aware of the terrible financial burdens these people have to bear. Don't you ever ask yourself the question: Why is it that such productive farmers – as are Australian farmers – always struggling with such debt burdens? Have you ever in all your life thought that there should be such a thing as a **Just Price**? Just as Labor and the unions once promoted the idea of a Just Wage, don't you think that the other side of the coin should be a Just Price for free enterprise?

The financial system would then simply reflect the physical facts. ***If that is not the true purpose of a financial system, then maybe you can tell us what is?***

As for your statement: "It is interesting to note that even though the Senate has recommended a review of the laws which have created a huge amount of stress and financial hardship to farmers, the NSW government is reportedly starting a new round of clearing compliance measures which include sending satellite photos of alleged infringements to landowners. Surely the N.S.W. government should be taking note of the inquiry findings before adding more stress and uncertainty to farmers."

Why aren't you 'up in arms' that ANY government within Australia should spy on its people by satellite? And what about that most important principle of freedom? You know the one Senator Joyce, the principle farmer Peter Spencer is fighting for – under the Rule of Law his (property) right to determine what he does with his own land – without such 'big-brother' 'busy-body' government and bureaucratic intrusion, interference and parasitism. Surely Mr. Spencer knew better than anybody else what he needed to do to ensure sustainable farming on his own land? **Not good enough Senator Joyce... simply not good enough!**

THE TAIL THAT REFUSES TO WAG by Jeremy Lee, *On Target*, Vol.35 No.17: Let me remind readers of what Jeremy Lee (another Queenslander) wrote over ten years ago about the direction taken by the National Party – towards globalisation and the new world order.

Jeremy wrote: One might have thought that the National Party would have woken long ago to the need for a major push to revive the bush. Even the blind can see that rural Australia is at the tail end of a long period of decline, which started at the end of the sixties. Spaced over the quarter of a century since then has been a refugee crisis which in terms of numbers must be reaching the half-million – obviously led by the 250,000 or so farmers who have walked off the land. All this while the National Party sat on its hands – or washed them, Pilate-like, while the protracted disaster unfolded.

The National Party is now, in reality, two parties: the State-oriented section, of which the Queensland National Party is most obvious; and the "Fed-Nats", best represented by leader Tim Fischer, *which has decided that its best chance of harvesting the choicest plums of politics is to tread in the footsteps of the Liberals*. It was all fine until One Nation brought into public view what all but the most obtuse of politicians must have known – a seething anger and resentment in rural Australia that had finally tired of being the "bunny" for complacent party hacks who never took a stand on anything. Aware now that, whatever long-term fate befalls One Nation, the disaffected in rural Australia will continue to seek political weapons that can turn the tide, the Nationals are looking for a few alternatives to retrieve their fortunes.

Most Federal Nationals are only in office now with the barest of margins. *The Australian Financial Review* (30/4/99), in an intriguing full-page report, described a Sydney meeting between Kerry Packer and a number of top corporate leaders, and the "elite" of the National Party. "Kerry Packer delivered some passionate views in favour of greater government intervention to solve the woes of the bush, views that took the National Party leadership by surprise. His timing could not have come at a more critical moment as the National Party stands at the crossroads, facing fundamental decisions about its policy direction and leadership, with Fischer tipped to resign this year. "And Packer – with broad agreement from many of the senior business people at the lunch – was championing a far more radical position than the Federal Nationals dared even suggest.

"The Nationals at the meeting – Federal leader Tim Fischer, his deputy John Anderson and Party president Don MacDonald – were not surprised to hear Packer's assessment that rural Australia was falling disastrously and irrevocably behind the cities. He could have been reading from a National Party script. But what did surprise them was the extent to which Packer, with dissent from only a minority in the room, thought the Government should move to remedy the situation.

The last time the Nationals were bluntly confronted with the truth was in the mid-eighties, when Ian MacLachlan, as leader of the fledgling National Farmers' Association, gave them a tongue-lashing widely reported in the media. But MacLachlan became a party-politician, and the NFF became a "puppy-dog" establishment body, and the Nationals went back to their old ways of doing nothing – until One Nation mauled them in the Queensland State election.

The article, by Lenore Taylor, described it thus: "... Fischer has committed his nine-year leadership of the Party to helping the bush face the reality of globalisation, rather than hide from it. Anderson has been part of that push and would continue it. "But the economic and social pain caused by globalisation falling commodity prices, cuts to government services in the bush and the flight of population to the cities has translated directly into political pain for the National Party. And that political pain is translating directly into support for leadership contenders who would take a more interventionist stance on policy and be more prepared to rock the Coalition boat..."

Is it possible for a party to cleanse and reinvigorate itself? The very nature of the back stabbing

ambition fostered in party politics mitigates against such a possibility. It is more likely that the best elements are forced to break away – which may yet eventuate. It is clear that the philosophy espoused by Tim Fischer and John Anderson will alienate rural Australia – or what's left of it – even further..."

WHAT THE PUBLIC NEEDS TO KNOW: THE GROSS NEGLIGENCE OF BP: "The Gross Negligence of BP – Oil Giant's Trying to Slick Its Way Out of Controversy".

Source: <http://www.alternet.org/story/146771/>. Greg Palast's article is well worth a read.

He writes: "I've seen this movie before. In 1989, I was a fraud investigator hired to dig into the cause of the Exxon Valdez disaster. Despite Exxon's name on that boat, I found the party most to blame for the destruction was ... British Petroleum. That's important to know, because the way BP caused devastation in Alaska is exactly the way BP is now sliming the entire Gulf Coast.

Tankers run aground, wells blow out, pipes burst. It shouldn't happen but it does. And when it does, the name of the game is containment. Both in Alaska, when the Exxon Valdez grounded, and in the Gulf over a week ago, when the Deepwater Horizon platform blew, it was British Petroleum that was charged with carrying out the Oil Spill Response Plans ("OSRP") which the company itself drafted and filed with the government.

What's so insane, when I look over that sickening slick moving toward the Delta, is that containing spilled oil is really quite simple and easy. And from my investigation, BP has figured out a very low cost way to prepare for this task: BP lies. BP prevaricates, BP fabricates and BP obfuscates. That's because responding to a spill may be easy and simple, but not at all cheap. And BP is cheap. Deadly cheap. (But it is not a 'spill' Greg, it is a 'gush'!)

To contain a spill, the main thing you need is a lot of rubber, long skirts of it called "boom." Quickly surround a spill or leak or burst, then pump it out into skimmers or disperse it, sink it or burn it. Simple. But there's one thing about the rubber skirts: you've got to have lots of it at the ready, with crews on standby in helicopters and on containment barges ready to roll. They have to be in place round the clock, all the time, just like a fire department; even when all is operating A-OK. Because rapid response is the key. In Alaska, that was BP's job, as principal owner of the pipeline consortium Alyeska. It is, as well, BP's job in the Gulf, as principal lessee of the deepwater oil concession.

Before the Exxon Valdez grounding, BP's Alyeska group claimed it had these full-time oil spill response crews. Alyeska had hired Alaskan Natives, trained them to drop from helicopters into the freezing water and set boom in case of emergency. Alyeska also certified in writing that a containment barge with equipment was within five hours sailing of any point in the Prince William Sound. Alyeska also told the state and federal government it had plenty of boom and equipment cached on Bligh Island. But it was all a lie.

On that March night in 1989 when the Exxon Valdez hit Bligh Reef in the Prince William Sound, the BP group had, in fact, not a lick of boom there. And Alyeska had fired the Natives who had manned the full-time response teams, replacing them with phantom crews, lists of untrained employees with no idea how to control a spill. And that containment barge at the ready was, in fact, laid up in a drydock in Cordova, locked under ice, 12 hours away. As a result, the oil from the Exxon Valdez, which could have and should have been contained around the ship, spread out in a sludge tide that wrecked 1,200 miles of shoreline.

Continued in The Bulletin

"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 \$45.00 p.a.