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SOLD

Barr & Carr Realty

Public Lands for Private Profit

Interested High Profile ALP Donors are cordially invited to apply for a partnership with Landcom in these exciting developments

Manly Hospital soon closing without objection from the State Member, although our Federal Member has signed a petition to retain and upgrade Manly Hospital. Seven headland hectares of tasteful terraced townhouses with ocean views and sea breezes, ideal for retirees enjoying excellent physical and mental health & young couples NOT anticipating children (vas certificates required). Handy to former Quarantine Station and former School of Artillery. Less than an hour to the nearest hospital and less than two hours to the nearest mental health facility.

Seaforth Just Listed Disused TAFE College closed by NSW Govt. Great potential for ✓ Drive through fast food ✓ Carwash ✓ Distillery ✓ Correctional facility ✓ Industrial incinerator ✓ Martial arts academy ✓ Chemical waste storage ✓ Urban warfare training

Mona Vale Hospital listed for closure. Ideal for top-drawer country club featuring popular international sports including golf, polo, hang gliding, camel-gallopings, skeet shooting, free-fall parachuting, bull-fighting, skirmishing, bear-baiting, mud-wrestling and dirt-track racing.

Dee Why “Colossus” Carpark approved for 611 units in eight storeys in a quiet corner of Dee Why. The site was acquired from St Kevin’s Church on the promise that it would always be an open, free, public access carpark.

Dee Why “Snake Gully” Major development opportunity on site of the former Warringah Council. Guaranteed pre-approval of any Development Application involving maximisation of traffic chaos for the whole peninsula.

Nolan & Passmore Reserves Year-round multi-use public-access grassed sports and recreation area easily converted to a single-use, hard surface, four-months-a-year sporting monolith requiring 400 parking spaces!

Beacon Hill High School closed by NSW Labor. Best offer

WANTED

Eager overseas and local investors urgently seek your educational, health, sporting, religious, aged & disability facilities.

NO PROJECT TOO BIZARRE FOR BARR & CARR

Please contribute your influence to Community Expressions. Please phone 0413 348 843
Manly Council and Section 94 Contributions

The Manly-based citizens' group Community Expressions has come out strongly against the decision by Manly Council to impose an astonishing increase in Section 94 contributions.

Under Section 94 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (as amended) Councils in New South Wales are permitted to place a levy upon property developers – including owner builders – to provide necessary public services and amenities to meet the demand of new development. Section 94 enables councils to levy contributions for public services and amenities made necessary by a new development or to facilitate that development. The power to levy a contribution is valid only where there is a clear link (or nexus) between a specific development in respect of which the levy is imposed and the need for the public amenity or service for which the contribution is required.

On 11 April 2005 the Manly Council resolved to increase very substantially the size of levies under Section 94. One experienced real estate agent has calculated that construction of a three-bedroom house in the Manly Municipality will henceforth incur a Section 94 levy of $33,900, five times the levy which would formerly have applied. This is an outrageous imposition, a cruel and vicious tax on homebuilders, homebuyers and renters.

Community Expressions has received many complaints about this money-grabbing move by Manly Council, and there is a growing demand among local residents for the Council to rescind its ill-considered resolution of 11 April.

One homeless person in Manly is one too many. Every bureaucratic imposition upon the builders of dwellings ultimately pushes people out of the most humble accommodation. Let the Council Members stroll across the park from their Council Chambers any Saturday evening and speak with the many homeless who enjoy a hot meal each week provided by Street Mission (Alan and Hui Clarke 0425 272 648) in front of the Uniting Church in West Promenade, Manly.

There is no fun in being homeless. Perhaps Councillors feel secure in the belief that the homeless have difficulty getting onto the electoral roll and therefore lack the opportunity to vote against those who would reduce their prospects of finding somewhere warm to sleep.
Fake Citizens’ Group in Dangerous Demo

The Manly Daily of 10 June 05 (page 3) carries Lisa Muxworthy’s report, titled “Keep quiet, nurses tell campaigners”.

The Report begins: “MANLY Hospital staff stopped work yesterday to tell the Save Mona Vale Hospital committee to ‘sit down and shut up’ so the State Government could plan a new peninsula hospital. Lyn Hopper, Manly nurse and chairperson for BEACHES (Better Equitable Access to Community and Hospital Services), said workers were frustrated the Mona Vale committee had monopolised the hospital debate.”

Residents of Manly and the Peninsula deserve to know these facts:

- There was no general stoppage of work as readers might infer from the article, and the demonstrators included persons who were neither staff nor patients.
- “BEACHES” was exposed during the NSW Legislative Council Inquiry as representing the interests of the arm of NSW Labor, now known as Northern Sydney Central Coast Health.
- Lyn Hopper gave surprising evidence to the NSW Legislative Council Inquiry, of a rally which was not witnessed by anybody else. Here is an extract from a speech by Rev Dr the Hon Gordon Moyes MLC, recorded in Hansard page 14674 of 22 March 2005:
  
  While walking back to my office after the hearing I saw Miss Hopper and a staff person who works for David Barr, member of Parliament, walking towards me in the Fountain Court. As we came toward each other I said, "Miss Hopper, excuse me, Miss Hopper, but can you confirm you told the committee that BEACHES organised a rally at Manly where more than a thousand people were present to support the Dee Why site?" Miss Hopper replied, "Yes." I said, "Thank you", and continued on my way.

- Lyn Hopper, who has failed to admit that there was never a rally of 1,000 supporting the Dee Why site, is an ally of David Barr MLA in calling for the closure of Manly Hospital.
The demonstration of 9 June was attended by Dr Grahame Robards, a member of BEACHES who has no status at Manly Hospital. Mrs Robards, well known for her strident expression of a minority viewpoint at public meetings, was also demonstrating.

The demonstrators took new-born babies from the hospital to use as propaganda. This is dangerous conduct, and especially wrong if the mothers did not consent. According to eye-witnesses, babies used as propaganda, including one baby held for a time by Dr Robards, were carried back to the Obstetrics Block by two nurses.

Newborn babies must never be exposed to glare, and babies were presented for photographs in the midday sunshine with no apparent attempt being made to cover their delicate eyes and skin.

The demonstrators prevented an ambulance and other vehicles from leaving the hospital, and stopped a senior medical practitioner from driving into the hospital to see a patient. The medical practitioner was obliged to park outside the hospital and enter on foot, whereupon the demonstrators booed the medical practitioner.

Manly Hospital and Mona Vale Hospital have two of the best hospital sites in the whole world. Patients and staff deserve beautiful views and sea breezes.

By closing Prince Henry Hospital and selling off Little Bay through Landcom, the NSW Government has revealed its motives for wanting to close Manly and Mona Vale Hospitals.

Any shortcomings of Manly and Mona Vale Hospitals are directly attributable to the State Government policy of running down these two fine hospitals in order to justify the plan to close them in direct opposition to the views of the community.

SEAFORTH TAFE

Another issue of great concern to Community Expressions is the scandal of the moribund TAFE College at Seaforth. For five years the purpose-built Seaforth TAFE has remained empty, after the precipitate closure decision forced 1,800 students to look elsewhere or abandon their studies. Landcom has been briefed to handle the disposal of the site. The replacement building cost of forty classrooms with workshops and laboratories is estimated at $50m. The unsatisfied demand for TAFE places should count for more than the money-grabbing ambitions of the State Government. **RE-OPEN SEAFORTH TAFE!!!**
Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen,

Each year, the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian communities all over the world commemorate a truly tragic day in their national modern history. On the evening of June 13th 1941, innocent men, women and children were herded from their homes, placed on goods trains and expelled from their countries of birth. Many did not return.

The perpetrator of this crime was a brutal occupying power planning to eliminate the loudest voices of resistance and any nationalistic elements. It was also to take advantage of the use of slave labor to feed its war machine. In 1940, puppet regimes had already been imposed on these previously independent nations by the perpetrating dictatorship. In this time, perceived political opponents and former members of the armed forces had been rounded up, imprisoned and executed.

Members of the audience here today may be surprised that I have mentioned these events to acquaintances of mine from differing ethnic backgrounds without mentioning the perpetrator. When asked who they thought had committed the atrocities, a common response is that these crimes had been committed by Hitler’s Third Reich.

No, Hitler’s terror was still to come.
Surely not an allied nation, the Soviet Union?

Here is part of the problem the Baltic nations have faced in making the world at large seriously understand the extent of repression that Stalin’s Soviet Union imposed on smaller nations. To the victors go the spoils of war, and for many decades this has included their ‘spin’ on history.

However, I believe current developments give grounds for optimism that the perceptions of the past are being more seriously and objectively appraised by the Western World. We have recently witnessed renewed global political interest on the contents of the illegal, treacherous agreement that secretly divided the territories of Eastern Europe signed by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union on August 23rd 1939.

The Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, named after the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, consigned Estonia, Latvia and eventually Lithuania to the Soviet sphere of influence. This agreement allowed Hitler to attack Poland on September 1st 1939. For Soviet Russia, the agreement bought time and future control of countries it had thirsted to regain since the accumulation of power by Stalin in the 1920s.

Having had their futures already condemned, the Baltic nations were given ultimatums to sign mutual assistance pacts with the Soviet Union, allowing Soviet troops to be stationed in key points on Baltic soil under the pretence of ‘protection’. To this day, it is astounding how methodical and well-prepared the Soviet annexation of these nations really was. Historical records have uncovered an order (No. 001223) signed by the leader of the Soviet secret police, the ‘Cheka’, General Serov – the order specifically instructed the deportation of the Baltic peoples to Siberia. A process of ethnic cleansing was about to take place. The order was dated 11th October 1939, just a month and a half following the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. The use of deportation as a tool to break nationalistic tendencies or political challenges to authority was not new, as it had already been employed in Tsarist Russia. Much of the infrastructure and management techniques to look after such an influx of deportees were thus in place well before the Baltic peoples arrived in Siberia.
By June 1940, the Soviet Union provided the ultimate untenable demands for Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The countries had to forcibly submit all of their territory to be occupied by Soviet troops and without delay to install puppet governments directly sympathetic to Soviet Russia and its communist party. In modern politics, the tone and harshness of such demands would be just unthinkable and outrageous. The Soviet Union was not even at war at that stage. The annexation of the Baltic nations was committed at a time when the European allies in particular, were focused on fighting Hitler’s Reich. Stalin had the perfect smoke-screen and correctly gambled that the rest of the world may indeed protest but not care enough to prevent the occupation from taking place. The United States was also at that time keeping aloof of the war with Germany.

So began the events in a year of occupation that Latvians refer to as *baigais gads* or dreadful year. Without doubt, our Estonian and Lithuanian neighbours have similar terms or phrases to describe the first Soviet occupation. As this is the 64th commemoration of the deportations, the scope, horror and cruelty of these acts seems almost surreal to those generations of us that have been born in the freedom and comfort of the modern Western world. Those of us from Baltic descent, however, do know from the experiences recounted by our parents and grandparents. Many families have relatives who were deported not only in 1940-41 but also in the subsequent Soviet occupation from 1945.

In many cases, their only crime was that they belonged to economically successful and educated groupings of people from a once independent nation.

*Soviet brutality: Books on the Deportations*

“Seeds on the Wind – a family’s journey to freedom during WWII” by Inara Kalnins, and

Doctors, solicitors, teachers, independent contractors, supervisors were all fair game as were their immediate and extended families. The Soviet jargon described these men, women and children as ‘harmful elements’ representing a ‘social danger’. In Latvia alone, approximately 18,600 were arrested and deported on the 13th and 14th June 1941. A total of 33,000 or 1.7% of the Latvian population had been executed, deported or forced to flee in the year to June 1941. Similar estimated losses were experienced in Estonia whilst some 45,000 Lithuanians suffered this fate.

As a university student in the Cold War’s later years, I treasured a book about a 14 year old Latvian girl’s plight as she was deported with her younger sisters, mother and grandmother in the June 14th 1941 mass deportations. Fearing reprisals against family members and friends, the surname of the girl was kept anonymous as the manuscript was secretly brought out of Soviet Latvia after her death in 1967 by family friends. The book reads not as a literary piece but rather a diarised account of her family’s deportation to Siberia. It represents a wasted youth and a destroyed life – the girl’s mother and grandmother died within two years of exile in inhuman and intolerable conditions, the two youngest sisters were placed in a state children’s home while the eldest was forced to work with other adults and adolescents in the Siberian pine forests. It was only after 8 years of living at the edge of human existence that the three sisters returned to Soviet occupied Latvia. In a way they were lucky to survive, in another sense they were to be victimised yet again in another deportation in 1951, this time with their father. Tellingly, this young girl struggled with her health after the first deportation. In what should have been her best years, she battled tuberculosis and died after her second return to Latvia in 1957. She was only 31 years old. To this day, her account titled ‘Dear God, I Wanted to Live’ remains as a representative reminder to later generations of the sheer horror and dreadful conditions deportees had to face.

Many families have similar sobering accounts of their experiences. Soviet Russia used deportation as a multi-faceted tool to provide cheap labour and break the will of the Baltic people. It is not surprising that those few that survived both waves of repression were broken souls, living their final years of existence in fear and experiencing nightmares of what they had been through. Plagued by ill
health, they would have been content enough just having basic food, water and
shelter.

It is the memory of these lost people that we honour here today. Baltic people
know that theirs is a story that represents only a chapter of terror, persecution
and suffering in World War II. Stalin’s reign of terror claimed the lives of tens of
millions of people in the Soviet Union and occupied territories. July 1941 brought
the co-conspirator of the infamous 1939 pact to the Baltic countries. Nazi
Germany’s occupation to 1944-45 brought more misery, arrests and persecutions
to yet other segments of the Baltic communities. Drafting available men into the
German army as cannon fodder for the Russian front, the Nazis masked their
apparent liberation of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia with their own malice and hate.
Had Hitler prevailed over the Soviet Union, documentary evidence suggests that
many Baltic peoples may have been re-colonised into parts of conquered Russia
to make way for German settlers. Not surprising really, given Nazi Germany’s
equally treacherous role in the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. Geographically located
between two evil superpowers, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia were treated as
mere pawns on a chessboard.

The difficult political situation of the times is reflected in the memoirs of the then
Latvian military attaché to Berlin, Aleksandrs Plensners. Already in the summer of
1939, the Latvian embassy in Berlin had advised the Latvian government that it
was illusory to assume that there would not be a major war. It was their strong
opinion that Germany would be the one to commence the war and in that event,
Latvia’s neutrality would be inconsequential, leading to inevitable occupation by
either Germany or the Soviet Union.

By that time, there was little the Baltic nations could do. Their destinies were
being shaped elsewhere.

Having not lived through these harsh times, I highly commend to all younger
generations of Baltic descendants and indeed to the world at large to make an
odyssey to visit the various history and occupation museums in the Baltic nations
and indeed the deeply moving Hill of Crosses near Siauliai. During the Soviet
occupation planting a cross to commemorate a Lithuanian victim of Soviet
repression was an arrestable offence. The hill was bulldozed three times and in
1961 the Red Army destroyed the crosses. But at night time more crosses
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So it is that today that the newly independent Baltic nations seek the outright renunciation and apology for the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact by its heirs and successors in Germany and the Soviet Union’s successor, the Russian Federation. It is no coincidence that on the 50th anniversary of the pact, some two million people from the then occupied Baltic republics bravely formed a human chain stretching from Tallinn to Vilnius calling for secession. The pact was the primary agreement that covertly sold the liberty of the once proud independent nations. Which modern government could possibly hold out today and not renounce such an agreement?

The Government of Germany has already renounced its participation in the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and publicly apologised for the destruction and terror Nazi Germany unleashed on the world. Sadly the leader of the successor state to the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, has been defiant in his public statements regarding Soviet actions from 1941-1945. He has defended the behaviour of Red Army members during this period and reconfirmed the 1939 pact as “necessary to ensure the Soviet Union’s interests and its security on its western borders.” Mr. Putin insists the Red Army was a liberator, not an oppressor, of Eastern Europe. A Red Army whose members committed customary rapes, lootings and wanton killings in a systematic manner throughout the territories it occupied. Responding to calls by the three Baltic presidents as well as a concurrent resolution by the United States Congress to admit and condemn the illegal occupation and annexation by the Soviet Union of the Baltic countries, Mr. Putin most recently offered the following retort: “Our people not only defended their homeland, they liberated eleven European countries.” Note the ‘spin’ of the word ‘liberate’. Its audacious use in this context is both laughable and offensive. The Russian president went on to accuse the Baltic nations of covering up Nazi collaboration.

Well Mr. Putin needs to ‘get with the times’ and do away with the now defunct, subjective communist slogans. The history books have been well and truly open in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania since they regained their independence. There are monuments, museums, cemeteries and historical investigations addressing all
forms of occupation from 1940 onward available for all to see who visit these nations. They address both Soviet and Nazi oppression. The Russian president still sees only one side of the coin. By acknowledging the facts, the Russian Federation would not only improve relations with the Baltic countries but admit its past mistakes for the benefit of its own society to give Russia a hope of building a successful future.

Until 1990, history on the Soviet side of the Iron Curtain paid scant regard for the truth. The exercise had simply been to glorify communism. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, some light has been cast on cold war shadows – but the shadows have not been dispelled.

Russia is outraged that its Great Patriotic War fought at heavy cost, could be seen by its neighbours as slavery and subjugation. The Soviet Union's victory over Nazi Germany does not remove Moscow's responsibility for its renewed occupation and subsequent repression of these countries after 1945. It is interesting to observe that Nazism was judged at Nuremberg, whereas the crimes of communism have never been brought to an international tribunal. This void has left Russia space to entrench itself in slogans of old, proclaim its achievements, and indignantly reject the pain its victory inflicted.

Calls for atonement for past wrongdoings have come at an inconvenient time for the Russian president, hosting the 60th anniversary of Victory in Europe Day on May 9th.

Mr. Putin had planned for an unfettered, massive celebration of Russian military might in Red Square. Instead, things became a bit tricky as some of the dirty laundry of Communism was hung out in the sun for the world to see.

The U.S. President's announcement of a snap visit to Latvia shortly before the celebration raised the Russian Government's ire. The Latvian president, Vaira Vike-Freiberga, had already announced in January of this year that she had decided to accept the invitation to attend the V.E. day celebrations. It was a difficult decision. One can very well understand the position adopted by Estonian president Arnold Rüutel and Lithuanian president Valdas Adamkus not to attend. After all, the celebration was being hosted by a country deliberately avoiding
any signs of contrition toward territories it had illegally occupied. A highly impressive letter by 71 eminent signatories including, among others, Lithuania's former president, Vytautas Landsbergis, and former Czech president Vaclav Havel, criticised the choice of Moscow as the venue for the VE day celebrations. In part it read: “While the anniversary itself is without question a worthy occasion for celebrating one of the greatest victories of mankind over tyranny, we believe the venue and hosting of this event are altogether unsuited to the fundamental principles for which that historic victory ... was achieved.”

In light of such a sound argument, why then did the Latvian president take the unexpected option to attend?

The US president, George W. Bush, made a landmark speech in Riga on May 7th, 2005, shortly following Latvia’s celebration of their 15th year of modern independence and just before the V.E. celebrations in Moscow. Tellingly, President Bush denounced the Soviet rule of Eastern Europe during the Cold War as one of the “greatest wrongs of history.” He echoed the Baltic nations’ position and said that the end of the war brought liberty from fascism but meant the “iron rule of another empire” for the Baltic countries and nations from Poland to Romania. Equally significant was the President’s focus on the Yalta agreement of 1945 that effectively agreed that the Soviet Union be allowed to continue to control most of Eastern Europe. To quote President Bush: “Once again, when powerful governments negotiated, the freedom of small nations was somehow expendable.”

In front of the three Baltic presidents attending in Riga, the U.S. president apologised for America’s role at Yalta, acknowledging it “followed the unjust tradition of Munich and the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact.” Little wonder then that Mr. Bush, who may be unpopular in sections of the West, invokes a healthy respect by the nations of Eastern Europe subjugated to the rule of communist regimes during lengthy parts of the 20th century. From the standpoint of the Baltic and other Eastern European countries, the scourge of the legacy of communism is much more palpable and realistic than it is in London, Paris or Brussels.

By bringing this truth to light in Riga, the U.S. president caused worldwide media attention and headlines just before Mr. Putin’s celebration in Moscow. There
would be no one-sided coverage of Russia’s Great Patriotic War. The Russian
government had already objected to Mr. Bush’s trip to Latvia as a ‘slap in the face’.
According to the White House, however, Mr. Bush was going with a vision and a
set of principles that would provide the framework by which various issues can
be resolved. While stopping short of supporting pleas from the Baltic nations for
an apology from Russia, Mr. Bush’s Riga speech is amongst the most strident and
unambiguous declarations of support for the new Baltic democracies yet seen
from a President of the United States.

The Baltic nations now must move forward as the spotlight fades after several
politically eventful months. As new members of the European Union, the recent
French and Dutch elections regarding the EU constitution will be analysed for
their ramifications. Economic challenges of the day, once again regain their
newsworthiness.

Diplomatic relations with Russia will initially be cordial at best. Having had a
lukewarm global appraisal of its victory parade, the prestige of the Russian
regime has undoubtedly suffered a setback with renewed questions of justice and
responsibility arising from the Communist years. I have no doubt that Estonia,
Latvia and Lithuania will feel the displeasure from Moscow over the next year.
There is nothing new in this. Until the Russian government changes its assessment
of its past occupation of sovereign nations, the attitude will always be – ”You have
no right to criticise us, only praise us for your liberation”.

In spite of this, the Baltic nations should not play into the Kremlin’s tactic of bluff
and bluster. Whether one likes it or not, the reality is that Mr. Putin is likely to be
President of Russia for quite some time yet. The Baltic nations cannot change the
fact that they have a giant neighbour on their doorstep. Part of the Baltic
economic success is driven by investors needing to have a trading ‘bridge’ to
Russia and beyond. The policy should be one of engagement with Russia not
disengagement.

It will take many years, perhaps decades, to obtain the necessary atonement from
Russia for past repression. Already, Russia along with communist China, remain
out of step with other large nations to tackle the shadows of the past. But it does
not mean that contrition will never occur. The Baltic nations owe it to their lost
souls; the deported, the executed, the displaced, to continue to place the demands of justice before the Russian government. With some luck, the United States and other significant nations will continue their pressure as well.

There is a responsibility incumbent on all nations to ensure that the pain and suffering inflicted during World War II is never to be repeated. War means cruelty that can never be refined. The difficult history of the Baltic nations has taught us that we need to accept the modern political art of give and take – to choose the path of discussion and negotiation over confrontation. The modern world has developed a new, inclusive European Union. I sincerely believe that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania will become worthy members of the new Europe; guided by their experience of hardship and their true appreciation of the concepts of freedom and independence.

Contact Aris Berzins: arisb[at]bigpond.com*
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN and children of the High Country:

I write this to encourage you and urge you to continue your struggle.

The 23 May 2005 announcement by the Victorian Government of its decision not to renew grazing permits in the Victorian Alps is significant. Significant for different reasons!

The green fundamentalists will see it as significant because they will once again be celebrating their capacity to hoodwink our political leaders with the balderdash that has riddled our Nation’s policy decisions for the last 30 years.

Others in the broader High Country in particular and rural Australia generally will also see this wrong decision as significant as it will indeed draw at last a line in the sand.

The move from knowledge-based policy assessment to academic theory has been a fundamental component of the very structure of change that has taken

National Parks constitute massive cancers across the landscape. . . . Staff spend more time in offices and on the road than in the field. Animals are out of control. Feral and native animals multiply unchecked with no real provision for their movement, habitat or nutritional requirements.

High Country Pride – our Homeland

Peter Spencer

Saarahnlee, Shannons Flat, 24 May 2005
over Australian policy conceptualisation drafting and implementation with outcomes that are proving the nonsense of this practice.

Australia has had 30 years of being a theoretical environmental testing ground which through its impact on the fabric of predominantly rural Australia has amounted to nothing but debilitating social engineering. Furthermore this approach to policy making has forced many rural Australians traumatised by its impact into almost total social disengagement.

This assault directed at the families with very real cultural attachment to the Victorian High Country is a shocking example of the blatant bigotry of the Government.

The Aboriginal people are well aware of their struggle in having their cultural attachment recognised. They will identify with the desperate need of high country families to have their homeland and traditions restored to them and permanently protected as should be the case right across the entire Australian Alps.

Under the guise of National Parks the destruction of the Australian Alps in Victoria, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory is a national disgrace. The authorities have removed the families that lived and loved the land for generations. These families raised their children, bred their stock, cut their timber, built their homes, fought fires, suffered droughts and floods and drove their animals and product to market and buried their dead - all here in the mountains.

The Deputy Prime Minister having quoted Dr. David Suzuki in his address to the 2005 ABARE Outlook Conference I will use the same quote “when you have an environmental problem, you’ll always get to the answer, the most durable economical and effective answer, fastest and most effectively, if you begin by consulting and listening to the people who live with the problem and are committed to live in the area.”

So what is the first directive of the “declare it a park” initiative? NOT an environmental impact study! NOT an application for a Development Authority! No! FIRST remove any person who has a genuine attachment - who has real knowledge and experience - and get them all out of the way!
National Parks constitute massive cancers across the landscape. The land in other high country regions since the high country folk have been removed is relatively unknown; more to the point what little is known is misunderstood. Any decision is only made after numerous meetings and repeated multiple deliberations. Most staff have no field experience hence they have difficulty in comprehending possible outcomes. Staff spend more time in offices and on the road than in the field. Animals are out of control. Feral and native animals multiply unchecked with no real provision for their movement, habitat or nutritional requirements. Weeds flourish and the very flora structure is changing out of control. Erosion and fire fuel loads are not only unprecedented but also gravely underestimated mainly through lack of experience. The real fire damage is unparalleled and this data is being suppressed.

Because of the Parks mismanagement, most of the land adjoining the Parks has been de-stocked and either abandoned or left vacant. The cancer has now flowed over the edges of the Parks impacting on every neighbour. Now even neighbours once removed are being impacted as the buffer zone has been eliminated by the de-stocking of adjoining properties. Huge numbers of kangaroos eat our pasture, destroying our infrastructure. The prolific numbers of wild dogs prey on our stock. These wholly adverse effects of National Parks have taken their toll in terms of stress on families who suffer significant devaluation of their land to the level of their properties becoming unviable. An obvious weak link in this bureaucratic process of declaring yet another National Park is replacing the valuable human resource of those who know the land, and who eat and sleep and breathe it, with a staff member who spends a few hours a week in the field and the rest of the week in an office. These people do not have even a thread of attachment. Their involvement is an emotional, academic and ideological presence for which they are paid. The payment also is totally unrelated to the outcome of the work place involvement. This is entirely the opposite of the families who opened up these homestead grazing lands. The high country families did not eat if they did not relate very intimately to the environment around them and this made them very sensitive to every aspect of these mountains - breathing the very air meant understanding the mood of the wind rain and snow. This was their life and their inspiration.
Australians recognise these cultural values as worthy of Heritage Trust recognition. Moreover, the High Country families collectively represent one of the finest examples of Australia’s rich cultural tradition.

It is timely that Australians not only pay respect to Aboriginal cultural significance but also realise the need for respect and permanent recognition wherever any deep cultural positive tradition is identified. This is a cultural imperative for the sake of those involved and for the fundamental structural integrity of our national heritage and Australian identity.

So I ask all the families belonging to the Victorian Alps not to view as a crushing blow this attempt by the Victorian Government to take away your birthright. Instead, see this assault on your freedoms as a rallying cry across the Nation for your rights, for your identity and for recognition of the cultural rights of all Australians across the land. I stress again - the culture of all Australians!

The purely academic alternatives to productive family occupation of the high country have proven to be comprehensive failures.

By fighting this fight and refusing to budge come what may, the families of the Victorian Alps will earn the support of countless Australians of goodwill in protecting their homeland and their traditional way of life. You and your allies will also be defending best practice management for the sensitive environment of the Alps. For this, all Australia will be grateful.

For far too long the recognition and political acknowledgement of one’s culture has been seen as something belonging only to the indigenous and to more recent ethnic arrivals in Australia. Those representing many generations of high country farmers and many other productive groups throughout Australia are entitled to the recognition of their cultural rights. Denying that entitlement is hostile to individual rights and contrary to the national interest.

Our so-called multicultural society will be exposed as a sham if heartless bureaucrats are allowed to promote a policy of selective cultural extinction.

Contact Peter Spencer: ozpond[at]optusnet.com.au*

* In publishing email addresses, represent @ as [at] to defeat spammers’ harvesting robots.
I BEGIN with a confession, a story of failure on my part.

On 30 April 1992 I passed a career milestone: I ceased to be a salaryman. The last position I had held was as Head of what was then the Department of Economics and Statistics at the OECD, in Paris. In that capacity, I had two principal sets of clients and taskmasters. First were officials from the central economic departments of state of OECD member countries - treasuries, ministries of finance or economics, and in the US, the Council of Economic Advisers. Second were representatives of those countries' central banks. Officials of both kinds came together twice a year, as they still do, to meet in the OECD's Economic Policy Committee (EPC).

The last EPC meeting that I attended took place in April 1992, just before my time as an official expired; and as is usual on such occasions, some kindly farewell words were spoken at the end. The Chairman took three minutes or so to say how
much the Committee had benefited from my services; and in response, I took three minutes to speak appreciatively of the Committee, my staff, and the work of the Organisation. Such official exchanges, however sincere the words that are spoken, bear a routine stamp. They are soon forgotten.

It took me five years to wake up to the fact that, on that occasion in April 1992, I had failed to grasp an opportunity. Out of my 3-minute address to a captive audience of senior finance ministry officials, I should have spent no more than 90 seconds in rendering thanks, however genuine, and in paying tributes, however well deserved. I should have spent the remaining 90 seconds in telling these officials, using direct though civil language, that they were currently failing in their duty. That would have made the occasion less forgettable: it might even have made some impact. But I failed to perceive the opportunity.

What ought I to have said to those finance ministry persons, in a highly irregular accusatory 90-second Part II? What were the grounds for bringing a charge of dereliction of duty against them? The charge, a just one, would have been that they had paid and were paying no attention to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development which was about to be held in Rio de Janeiro. I should have told them that the so-called Rio Earth Summit was an important and worrying event; that it and the developments it gave rise to could well bring serious economic consequences; and that they ought accordingly to inform themselves, to monitor developments, and to take a continuing interest in the issues and processes that were involved.

Such a warning would have been justified by events. The Rio Earth Summit of June 1992 marked a major victory for what I call global salvationism. This outcome passed unnoticed by my former official clients; and as I have said, it took me longer than it ought to have done to realize just what had been happening in the world, both at Rio and subsequently.

Since the Earth Summit, the ground won there by global salvationism has been consolidated and extended. The trends and ways of thinking that I should have warned of in Paris in April '92 are more worrying in May '05. Alas, even now such worries are not shared by my former clients: they have still not cottoned on. Had I been offered the chance of a 13th-anniversary 3-minute presentation to the EPC meeting that took place in Paris last month, I would have accepted with alacrity; I would have taken as my theme the need for these officials to inform themselves.
more fully, better late than never, about what has been going on in the world around them, and to consider what they might do about it; and I would have commended to them my already-published proposal\(^1\) for prompt specific action on their part within the framework of the OECD itself. However, I would also have referred to issues and concerns that go well beyond those that I failed to raise in 1992. These relate to the broader domain of what I have termed “new millennium collectivism.” I shall touch on them at the end of my remarks.

**Global salvationism**

First, what do I mean by global salvationism? Here I give a brief summary: a fuller concise treatment is to be found in Chapter 4 of a recent book of mine, *The Role of Business in the Modern World: Progress, Pressures, and Prospects for the Market Economy*, published in 2004, in London by the Institute of Economic Affairs and in Washington D.C. by the Competitive Enterprise Institute\(^2\).

The salvationist doctrine has two main strands, which originally were separate but have long since come together to form an influential worldwide consensus. The first strand is developmental salvationism, and relates to the economic fortunes of poor countries. The second strand is environmental salvationism.

In both strands, two elements are combined. One is a relentlessly dark - not to say alarmist - picture of recent trends, the present state of the world (or ‘the planet’), and prospects for the future unless prompt and far-reaching changes are made in official policies. The second is a conviction that known effective remedies exist for the various ills and threats thus identified, remedies which require action on the part of governments and ‘the international community’. ‘Solutions’ are at hand, given wise collective resolves and actions. Global salvationism thus combines alarmist visions and diagnoses with confidently radical collectivist prescriptions for the world.

---

\(^1\) My proposal is that the EPC should now concern itself with economic issues relating to climate change, and with the way in which those issues are handled by the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change and its sponsoring departments and agencies. The reasons for this will appear below.

\(^2\) The latter edition has a different foreword, Americanised spelling, a much fuller executive summary, and an index.
The first coming together of the two strands, developmental and environmental, can be traced back to the early 1970s. Since then what has evolved into a combined salvationist consensus has set the tone and content of a continuing series of international meetings, reports and resolutions: an early landmark was the establishment in 1972 of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), following the Stockholm Conference on the Environment which was the first of its kind. The essence of the consensus diagnosis can be illustrated by a quotation from a mid-1970s Club of Rome study:

> "Two gaps, steadily widening, appear to be at the heart of mankind's present crises: the gap between man and nature, and the gap between "North" and "South", rich and poor. Both gaps must be narrowed if world-shattering catastrophes are to be avoided..."

During the 1980s, the salvationist consensus found expression in two widely read and influential reports, each produced by a specially convened international group of eminent persons. The first of these was the Brandt report of 1980, and the second the Brundtland report of 1987. The Brundtland Report led on to the Dec 1989 resolution of the UN General Assembly that authorized the Rio Summit.

Before commenting on the Earth Summit and its sequel, let me put before you eight summary propositions relating to economic progress.

**Material progress and its sources**

- Over the past half-century or more the world economy, and most though by no means all of the economies within it, have grown at rates that were substantially higher than in the past, and much higher than anyone foresaw. All the countries that counted as developed in 1950 have shared in this greatly increased prosperity. But the record of economic progress goes beyond these already advanced countries, in ways that no one foresaw or even imagined, and which mark a decisive break with the past. In the course of these past five to six decades, an increasing number of previously poor countries achieved sustained rates of growth in GDP per head, which were either rare or wholly unprecedented anywhere in earlier history.

---

• The advances in GDP per head have gone together with striking improvements in life expectation, in health, in educational standards, in leisure, and, in important respects, in the quality of the environment.

• Contrary to many alarmist assertions and predictions, these remarkable and widely diffused gains in material welfare have not been achieved at the cost of putting the future at serious risk through pressure on natural or non-renewable resources.

• Generally speaking, the extraordinary progress that has been made by many countries that were previously poor has owed little to foreign assistance. It was not the outcome of official aid programmes, of public-spirited conduct by large international firms, or of charitable actions on the part of ‘the international community’. It was not brought about by ‘empowerment’.

• These developments have further confirmed, what earlier economic history already indicated clearly, that everywhere, the material progress of people, rich and poor alike, depends primarily on the dynamism of the economies in which they live and work.

• The success stories also confirm that, in economies where a number of background conditions are broadly established and maintained, material progress, including improvements in the quality of life and in the environment, is likely to go ahead at rates which half a century ago would have been viewed as unthinkable.

• The background conditions are that there is reasonably stable government, with no serious internal disorders, that governments do not act irresponsibly in matters of public finance and the control of the money supply, that property rights are well established and maintained, that economic decision-making rests largely with private individuals and enterprises, and that the economy is substantially open to transactions with the rest of the world. These are the main conditions, political as well as economic, which make it possible for a market economy to operate effectively.

• Everywhere, the advancement of ordinary people largely depends, as it always has, on the access to opportunities, and the ability to make choices, which economic freedom provides both for them and for others.
Salvationist dissent

I would argue that these eight propositions are well founded; and I think that all of you here, even if you might not be willing to join in signing a letter to The Times in their support, would at any rate agree that a case can be made out for all of them. You may wonder why I have spent my strictly limited time this evening in putting before you already familiar arguments.

The reason why I have done so is simple. In the domain of global salvationism, and the constant stream of writings and statements in which it continues to find expression, all these propositions are played down, glossed over, disregarded, or denied.

Let me quote you a recent instance, chosen from among a wide range of candidates because of its source: the source is UNEP. UNEP has an ambitious flagship publication entitled Global Environment Outlook. Here are two short excerpts from the Synthesis chapter of the third and latest in the series, a 446-page volume.4

‘Poverty and excessive consumption - the twin evils of humankind - continue to put enormous pressure on the environment ... the state of the global environment ... continues to deteriorate’.

‘The world is continually plagued by increasing poverty and continually widening divisions between the haves and have-nots’.

In the salvationist picture of the world, the record, sources and lessons of economic progress go unrecognized. Poor countries, whose relative poverty is typically much overstated, are portrayed as victims whose progress chiefly depends on empowerment and deliverance from above, while environmental issues are treated almost exclusively with reference to problems, threats, and potential or even imminent disasters. Insofar as such beliefs and assumptions form the basis for economic policies, there are grounds for concern.

Salvationist alliances

Who are the global salvationists? There are three main parties that make up a working triple alliance on the international scene.

First, virtually every UN agency embraces and gives expression to salvationist assumptions and ideas. On the economic side, we have in particular the UN Secretariat, the regional economic commissions, UNDP, UNCTAD, UNIDO, the ILO and UNEP. The World Bank under its present leadership should also be counted in.

Second, there are the non-governmental organizations. Here there are two main categories. One comprises what are officially known as 'the social partners’ - i.e., business and trade-union organisations. Both partners largely accept salvationist assumptions and arguments - big business now more than ever, as I have amply documented both in the book I mentioned and in a predecessor study. The second category is the so-called 'public interest' non-governmental organisations, usually referred to as NGOs. These are often given the title, in a worrying misuse of language, of 'civil society'. A feature of the Rio Summit was an enlarged scope for participation of the NGOs. Almost without exception, the NGOs are hostile to, or highly critical of, free trade, globalisation, capitalism, multinational enterprises, and the idea of a market economy; and the great majority are preoccupied with what they see as dire threats to the planet. Since 1992 their status and influence have grown.

However, the most important members of the salvationist alliance are governments. It is they that fund and give instructions to UN agencies, and it is

---

5 The predecessor is Misguided Virtue: False Notions of Corporate Social Responsibility, published in 2001 in London by the Institute of Economic Affairs and in Wellington, New Zealand, by the New Zealand Business Roundtable.
they that decide how far, and in what ways, non-governmental organisations of both kinds, social partners and NGOs alike, are able to participate in national and international affairs. What happened at the Earth Summit and after largely reflects the perceptions, wishes and intentions of governments, as formulated and given expression by the responsible departments of state. In the context of Rio and similar occasions, these latter are chiefly environment departments, labour departments, development agencies, and foreign offices.

**The significance of the Rio Summit**

Now global salvationism was flourishing and widely accepted long before the Rio Summit of 1992. It is flourishing and widely accepted today. You may therefore ask what was special about the Rio Summit, and what makes me still rue my failure at the time to draw the attention of my clients to it. The answer comes under three headings.

First was the level of participation. For the first time, an international conference of this kind was attended by heads of state and heads of government: over 120 of these actually came to Rio. The various proceedings and outcomes were thus given an extra standing and authority: governments as a whole, as well as particular departments of state, appeared as committed.

A second distinctive feature of Rio was that an important international agreement, still very much in force, emerged from it. The vast majority of the world’s governments signed then, and later ratified, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which later gave birth to the Kyoto Protocol. It was at the Rio Summit that governments formally agreed to recognise, and to take action to deal with, what was now officially identified as a serious problem posed by global warming arising from economic activity.

These two special features of the Earth Summit are linked: the reason why so many heads of state and heads of government came to Rio, and put their governments’ names to resolutions and agreements there, was that they were persuaded that the threat of global warming was real: the decisive new element was the issue of climate change.

That issue had been reviewed at length in the First Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC, which had been established in 1988. This Report, which was published in 1990, laid the basis for...
the Framework Convention. Since then the IPCC has brought out two further massive Assessment Reports, and it is now engaged in preparing the fourth in the series, which is due to emerge in 2007.

**The IPCC and the salvationist connection**

Now when people think of the IPCC and its work, what they visualise, I think, is an objective and thoroughly professional scientific inquiry which has a status of its own, independently of other influences and proceedings, and which is weighed and reviewed as such by governments. It is taken to be an independent, non-ideological, self-contained exercise. Let me give you two reasons for questioning this perception.

First, go back to 1992. Climate change issues formed only part of the Earth Summit agenda. They were incorporated, as an additional reinforcing element, into the familiar UN-style dark salvationist message. In the Rio documents and resolutions, that familiar message was neither qualified nor watered down. Chief among the many documents prepared for the Summit was a 600-page proposed action programme called Agenda 21, which the conference actually adopted in an amended form. The preamble to this document opens as follows:

'Humanity stands at a defining moment in history. We are confronted with a perpetuation of disparities within and between nations, a worsening of poverty,
hunger, ill health and illiteracy, and the continued deterioration of the ecosystems on which we depend for our well-being'.

Those opening sentences were not amended. They were accepted by participating governments, including that of John Major, and went into the final text.

The proposed remedies for the stark situation thus depicted in Agenda 21 were to be given effect through 'a new global partnership for sustainable development'.

This brings me to a third notable feature of the Earth Summit. It marked the general acceptance by governments, many of them at the highest political level, of the principle of 'sustainable development' as a basis for policy. Since then this dubious formula has acquired an even more assured official status: it has been accepted uncritically almost everywhere, including by successive British governments of both parties and the European Commission[6].

Such was the salvationist diagnosis and prescription which all the participating governments at Rio proved ready to endorse, many of them at the highest political level. The IPCC's contribution entered into the Summit proceedings, not as a separate stand-alone exercise, but rather as a powerful new chapter in the already existing widely accepted global salvationist story.

History aside, consider the formal status of the IPCC. One may ask why the work of the Panel should have been, as it still is, so closely linked with already established and highly questionable salvationist proceedings and ways of thinking: why is the IPCC process not a fully independent undertaking? The answer is simple. Through the decision of member governments, the IPCC is the creation of, and reports to, two parent agencies. One of these is the World Meteorological Organisation, which one might expect - though increasingly, I wonder about this - to have no particular leanings either towards or away from global salvationism.

[6] In this context, I would like to commend to you Sir Alan Peacock's 2003 Presidential Address to the David Hume Institute in Edinburgh, entitled 'The Political Economy of Sustainable Development', published by the Institute.
The other parent, which along with its sponsoring ministries and participating NGOs is fully committed to global salvationism, is UNEP.

The IPCC and economics

Since the IPCC’s terms of reference extend to economic issues, it is worth asking whether and how far its treatment of those issues measures up to what we would see as professional standards, and meets the requirement laid down for the Panel that its work should be ‘comprehensive, objective, open and transparent’. I am pleased to say that this question, among others, is now being considered by the House of Lords Select Committee on Economic Affairs.

Over the past two and a half years I and an Australian co-author - Ian Castles, formerly Head of the Australian Bureau of Statistics - have published, jointly and severally, a number of pieces in which we set out a critique of the IPCC’s handling of economic issues, together with proposals for improving it. Again, I will be happy to provide references or papers on request. However, the main single reference that I would bring to your attention is a special press release which the IPCC issued in December 2003, and which is specifically and exclusively devoted to answering - and dismissing - our critique. The text is now carried, in a somewhat less impolite form than the original, on the Panel’s website.

This high-level official document is truly remarkable for both tone and substance. The opening para of the release says of the IPCC that ‘It mobilises the best experts from all over the world, who work diligently on bringing out the various reports...

The Third Assessment Review ... was released in 2001 through the collective efforts of around 2,000 experts from a diverse range of countries and disciplines. All of IPCC’s reports go through a careful two stage review process by governments and experts and acceptance by the member governments composing the Panel’.

I believe that in relation to economic aspects, there is good reason to question the claims to authority and representative status that the IPCC thus makes. Those of us who are sceptics do not question the numbers of those involved, their diligence, or the existence and observance of formal review processes. But we think that when it comes to the treatment of leading economic issues, the IPCC milieu is neither fully competent nor adequately representative. We also hold - and this does not apply only to economic aspects - that building in peer review is
no safeguard against dubious assumptions, arguments and conclusions if the peers are all drawn from the same restricted professional milieu.

In its recent evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee, the responsible Whitehall department, the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, expressed the view that 'there are very many distinguished economists working alongside ...[IPCC] scientists...’ Those of you who are curious about this aspect may care to go to the IPCC website and trawl the list of around 400 persons who are expected to act as authors, contributors and reviewers for Working Groups II and III of the Panel.

**Failure at the centre**

I believe that the treatment of economic issues within the IPCC process can be made more professionally representative and watertight only if new participants are brought into it, and this can be achieved only if and in so far as member governments act to make it happen: the IPCC milieu appears impervious to unofficial criticism. In this context, it is the central economic departments of state - my former clients - that have a potentially key role if they choose, not before time, to play it. Up to now, and despite the large amounts that are at stake, they have been content to leave these matters to the departments and agencies directly concerned to handle as they think best. The questionable treatment of economic issues by the IPCC and its sponsoring organisations, which Castles and I have drawn attention to as independent outsiders, has apparently not been queried, or even noticed, by a single official in a single finance or economics ministry in a single OECD country.

In my opinion this is only one instance of a continuing lack of imagination and resourcefulness on the part of these ministries. In my fantasy 3-minute EPC presentation in Paris last month, I would have moved on from global salvationism to the broader theme of new millennium collectivism. I would have suggested to these officials, not only that they should focus at long last on IPCC-related issues, but also that they have failed, among other things, to wake up to, and try do something about, the growing influence of anti-business and anti-market NGOs, the interventionist and anti-market line taken by most international agencies, the uncritical endorsement by their own governments of questionable notions such as 'sustainable development', 'social exclusion', and 'Corporate Social Responsibility',
and - in particular - the substantial and continuing erosion of freedom of contract through intrusive laws and regulations.

On these and other fronts, they have surrendered large areas of ground to collectivist ideas and pressures, with serious implications both for economic performance and for individual liberty, without effective resistance, and indeed without fully realising what has been going on around them. They have allowed anti-liberal7 influences and trends to prevail.

**Economists in government**

Behind this sombre performance report lies an element of personal frustration and disappointment. In the Oxford long vacation of 1960 I wrote an article, published in early 1961, which drew attention to the fact that in almost all British government departments outside the Treasury economic policy was viewed and decided without the involvement of economists8. I noted, with telling examples, that in these situations economic ideas entered into the policy process, often decisively; but that these were intuitive beliefs and assumptions, arrived at without benefit of an economic training. I made the point, which I later developed in my 1988 Beith Lectures, that these notions ‘[might ] well be inadequate or over-simplified if not quite literally fantastic’. I argued that economists as such should be introduced into departments, and I may have been the first to suggest the establishment of what four years later became the Government Economic Service.

I think my article reads well today, and when it comes to practical proposals there is only one sentence I would want to amend. But I find myself wondering, rather disconsolately, why and how the kind of reform I was advocating has not produced the results that I had hoped for. The Government Economic Service today has around 800 professionals. Given the worrying situations and developments that I have pointed to this evening, the question arises: What are these people doing?

7 I use the term ‘liberal’ in its continental European rather than its American sense. Hence a liberal is taken to be one who emphasises the value of individual freedom, and who accordingly judges arrangements and policies, whether economic or political, primarily with reference to their effects on freedom.

8 ‘The Use of Economists in British Administration’, Oxford Economic Papers, Volume 13 Number 1, February 1961
Concluding thoughts

In the final chapter of the recent book I mentioned earlier, I consider the question of how far today’s widespread and influential anti-liberal pressures, tendencies and ways of thinking represent a serious threat to the market economy and to economic freedom. In that context, I offer now a final rather gloomy reflection. It is based on the closing paragraph of a recent review article of mine, where I place Martin Wolf’s fine book on globalisation alongside two other publications on the same subject which I was not impressed by.

Classical liberals are few and far between, while most of today’s social democrats and democratic conservatives, while not to be counted among the anti-market activists, are well disposed towards, or ready to acquiesce in, much of the thinking that enters into new millennium collectivism. Not many of them would wish to question the status of such plausible and generally accepted notions as sustainable development, positive human rights, corporate social responsibility, socially responsible investment, anti-discrimination, equal opportunity, diversity, social justice, social exclusion, global social governance, the precautionary principle, or participatory democracy. As currently interpreted, however, all these guiding principles find expression in anti-liberal measures and programmes. A continuing threat to economic freedom thus arises, not just from anti-capitalist groups and movements on the periphery, but also, and principally, from representative opinion of various kinds in conjunction with a wide range of interest group pressures old and new.

---

## LINKS WORTH VISITING

Content of linked sites changes at random, so the Darby Report issues no permanent endorsements of linked sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.liberal.org.au">www.liberal.org.au</a></td>
<td>Liberal Party of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.patersononline.com/bobbaldwin/gallery-archive.html">www.patersononline.com/bobbaldwin/gallery-archive.html</a></td>
<td>Bob Baldwin MP, Member for Paterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://seaton.acenet.com.au">http://seaton.acenet.com.au</a></td>
<td>Peta Seaton MP, NSW Shadow Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.donbrash.com/">http://www.donbrash.com/</a></td>
<td>NZ Opposition Leader Dr Don Brash MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://kerrycollision.net/">http://kerrycollision.net/</a></td>
<td>Kerry B. Collision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.prodos.org/">http://www.prodos.org/</a></td>
<td>Prodos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.michaelyon.blogspot.com/">www.michaelyon.blogspot.com/</a></td>
<td>Michael Yon: Iraq and the Yezidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/">http://littlegreenfootballs.com/weblog/</a></td>
<td>Charles and Michael Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://dissectleft.blogspot.com/">http://dissectleft.blogspot.com/</a></td>
<td>Dr J J Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.flagsoociety.org.au/">http://www.flagsoociety.org.au/</a></td>
<td>Australian Flag Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://fizarrescience.blogspot.com/">http://fizarrescience.blogspot.com/</a></td>
<td>Dr Aaron Oakley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://timblair.net/">http://timblair.net/</a></td>
<td>Tim Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://slattnews.blogspot.com/">http://slattnews.blogspot.com/</a></td>
<td>Bernard Slattery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.rightwingnews.com/">http://www.rightwingnews.com/</a></td>
<td>John Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.savemanshospital.org">www.savemanshospital.org</a></td>
<td>Community Expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.cleanenergy.da.ru">www.cleanenergy.da.ru</a></td>
<td>Australians for Clean Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://discoverludwigvonmises.com/">http://discoverludwigvonmises.com/</a></td>
<td>Discover Ludwig Von Mises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.defenddemocracy.org/">http://www.defenddemocracy.org/</a></td>
<td>Clifford D May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.truthmaster.com/">http://www.truthmaster.com/</a></td>
<td>Bruce W Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.frum.org/Winnerisms/index.asp">http://www.frum.org/Winnerisms/index.asp</a></td>
<td>Michael Winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.americasvoices.org/">http://www.americasvoices.org/</a></td>
<td>Dr Michael R Bowen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.nationalreview.com/europress/europress-archive.asp">http://www.nationalreview.com/europress/europress-archive.asp</a></td>
<td>Denis Boyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://mdarby.blogspot.com/">http://mdarby.blogspot.com/</a></td>
<td>Michael Darby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://no-pasaran.blogspot.com/">http://no-pasaran.blogspot.com/</a></td>
<td>¡No Pasaran! (formerly Merde in France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.acsh.org/index.html">www.acsh.org/index.html</a></td>
<td>American Council on Science and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://rgi2.und.com/">http://rgi2.und.com/</a></td>
<td>Joseph Farah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Alternative-Fuel Nonsense

Forcing the U.S. to import less oil would only hurt Americans.
Alan Reynolds

PROPOSALS FOR EXTRA BILLIONS of dollars in federal subsidies invariably attract impressive bipartisan support. If someone proposed big subsidies to replace fuel-guzzling airplanes with hot-air balloons, organizations would instantly spring up and eminent Beltway bandits would scramble for a piece of the action. Groups with names like “Americans for Everything Wonderful” would suddenly flood the talk shows with representatives arguing that we could easily reduce dependence on imported oil by simply elevating our balloons with imported liquefied natural gas. Lobbyists inconspicuously tied to the coal or corn industries might provide additional hot air about methanol or ethanol. If the White House and Congress were dominated by Democrats, the sales pitch would be about cooling the planet. If Republicans held the purse strings, balloon subsidies would become a national-security emergency.

The current debate about U.S. oil policy is equally enlightened. It is dominated by a special-interest lobby whose primary interest is to enrich automakers and alternative-fuel producers, and by journalists whose enthusiasm for the green agenda has clouded their understanding of basic economics.

In 2004, the Apollo Alliance was patched together as an election-year opportunity to promote $300 billion in federal subsidies and tax breaks, largely for ethanol and methanol to (as the Kerry campaign put it) “help farmers and coal miners.” This year, it has again endorsed a $12-billion subsidy plan.

Meanwhile, Set America Free, a group associated with the Apollo Alliance, has made a highly publicized claim that the government could painlessly bribe or compel Detroit (but not BMW or Infiniti) to make cars that get 500 miles per gallon. This bizarre number starts with the Toyota Prius, which gets about 44 mpg. What they don’t tell you is that the figure would fall to 32 mpg if the Prius ran on...
the group’s proposed mix of 88 percent ethanol. They claim such a car’s mileage per gallon could be doubled by adding heavy batteries to be plugged in for short trips on electricity (i.e., 67 horsepower and no air conditioning) alone.

Even if drivers were willing to do this, it would be bad for the environment. As the Sierra Club’s Dan Becker notes, “coal is more polluting than gasoline, and nearly 60 percent of U.S. electricity is generated by burning coal.” Yet the plug-in supposedly gets us up to 100 mpg, which magically rises to 500 by assuming one out of every five or six gallons consists of gasoline and the rest is ethanol or methanol (and pretending those fuels can be produced without energy). They mean gallons of petroleum, not fuel. But it takes a lot of petroleum to farm corn (fertilizer, pesticides, and farm-equipment fuel), convert it to ethanol, and get it to market. By the same logic by which the IAGS came up with that 500 mpg figure, an all-electric car or a methanol-powered giant truck could be said to get infinite miles per gallon.

A closer look at some of Set America Free’s supporters sheds a little light on the group’s political objectives. Aside from their association with the Apollo Alliance — whose raison d’être is to promote ethanol and methanol subsidies — the group is significant in that one-third of their masthead consists of directors and advisors to the Institute for Analysis of Global Security (IAGS), although just two are identified as such. Other individuals not directly affiliated with IAGS or Apollo include a few prominent names identified only by their past government jobs, even though some now have conflicting interests in energy companies and electric utilities. IAGS’s directors and advisors include an executive director of the International LNG Alliance, the vice chairman of the International Committee on Coal Research, an executive director of the Gas Technology Institute, a founder of DCH Technology Inc. (a fuel-cell company), a founder of Global Energy Investors LLC, and a principal of Energy and Communications Solutions LLC.

What such disinterested advisors have in common is that they want to send $4 billion to U.S. automotive manufacturers to build the hybrids Japan already sells, $4 billion to “demonstration plants” to produce methanol or ethanol and provide the related pumps, $2 billion to those who will “continue work on commercializing fuel cell technology,” and $2 billion to the incentive bin in the
form of tax breaks for those rich enough to afford a $48,535 Lexus 400h or the larger new hybrids coming from GM and Ford (many of which promise only 10 to 15 percent better mileage than gas-powered equivalents).

The IAGS is a “global security” advocacy group, interested in energy economics only as a roundabout means to their global (not national) foreign-policy objective. They want to impose stern conservation on U.S. (not foreign) motorists. Putting possible special-interest conflicts aside, the ideological rationale of IAGS is to use austerity in driving as unilateral economic warfare against two identifiable Middle Eastern oil producers.

Their argument begins by feigning alarm that “22 percent of the world’s oil is in the hands of state sponsors of terrorism.” But only three of the seven countries on the State Department’s list of terrorism sponsors are oil exporters, and one of those is now occupied by U.S. forces. That leaves Iran and Libya, who account for merely 7 percent of world production. Reserves are irrelevant. Governments are paid for what they produce, not for what remains in the ground. A full 93 percent of the proposed austerity in U.S. oil demand would be aimed at oil-producing countries who are not state sponsors of terrorism, notably Canada, Mexico, and the U.S. itself.

The IAGS nonetheless theorizes, “Reducing demand for Middle East oil would force the petroleum-rich regimes to invest their funds domestically, seek ways to diversify their economies and rethink their support for America’s enemies.” This echoes the “geo-green” theme of New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman, who wrote in January that “if we put all our focus on reducing the price of oil — by conservation, by developing renewable and alternative energies and by expanding nuclear power — we will force more reform [of Middle Eastern political] than by any other strategy.” He promised $18 a barrel would guarantee “political and economic reform from Algeria to Iran.”

But the process of replacing older vehicles with ethanol-fueled plug-in hybrids would move with glacial slowness, and would not shrink global oil demand enough to collapse oil prices. That is why Friedman proposes to further decrease demand by raising U.S. taxes high enough to keep gasoline above $4 a gallon.
regardless of the price of crude. In practice, this would simply mean that we would pay much more for gasoline so other nations could pay less.

Even if world oil did fall back to $18 a barrel, as Friedman would like, there would be no incentive for Asia or Europe to economize on oil use at all, nor for anyone to supply or demand expensive alternatives. Besides, the price of oil was below $18 nearly all the time from February 1986 to June 1999 — falling as low as $11 at the end of 1998 and remaining below $20 through the end of 2001. Yet cheap oil did nothing to promote economic or political liberty in Algeria, Iran, or anywhere else. This theory has been tested — and it failed completely.

Serious economic warfare has to be multinational to stand any chance of doing any damage to anyone except the consuming countries who are inflicting artificial scarcity on themselves. Forcing the U.S. alone to import less oil just leaves more oil available to other countries at a lower price. And even a broadly supported multinational embargo that really did curb Iraq’s oil sales did nothing to dislodge Saddam Hussein; it just hurt the Iraqi people, pushed oil prices higher (helping Iran and others), and enriched Saddam and some other thieves. A prolonged unilateral embargo against Fidel Castro did not dislodge him either.

Given this history, it’s hard not to conclude that the 500-mpg claim and its geo-green “global security” rationale are simply excuses for wasting even more taxpayer dollars on subsidies and special tax breaks.

— Alan Reynolds is a senior fellow with the Cato Institute.
Bulawayo, 20 May 2005

The Crisis Deepens

"If the UN simply responds to this deepening crisis in the normal way - they will simply make our position worse and entrench a delinquent, criminal regime in power"

The Gono circus has come and gone - or as one commentator said to me - Gono has preached his latest sermon from the mount. It lasted 2 and a half hours and to be frank I was less than impressed. A lot of right sounding rhetoric without substance or form.

He devalued the Zimbabwe dollar by a third - to 9,000 to 1 against the US dollar, raised commercial interest rates and promised more concessionary lending - some at 5 per cent per annum interest rates, to key sectors. He also threatened everyone who dare to trade outside the system and took a swipe at private foreign currency accounts - people who have such accounts must now apply to the Reserve Bank for permission to use them!

On the same day the rates in the real foreign exchange market collapsed to new lows - the Rand traded at over 4,000 to 1, the USD at 28,000 to 1 or more, signalling frantic activity and a total loss of confidence. In an effort to offset the negative effects of the exchange rate on key industries he handed out the promise of soft loans and gave the tobacco producers a Z$350 billion dollar "subsidy". He also jacked up the so called "support price" for gold to give producers a return approaching the value of gold at current prices computed back at a parallel market exchange rate.
Outside the gilded hall where he made his statement the situation is bleak - today workers are walking home - there are few buses running. Fuel stocks are virtually zero in all centres - food stocks are also completely exhausted. Water shortages plague most towns and cities and electricity cuts are widespread. Just as worrying are the growing list of basic consumer items that simply cannot be found on our shelves - soap, salt, sugar, matches, cigarettes, cooking oil; the list grows longer every day as factory after factory closes its doors.

In the face of this calamitous situation Mugabe has conceded that we need help but he is defiantly saying that any food aid should not come with conditions. He must be crazy to think that anyone would allow food aid into the country under these conditions without demanding that the regime put its house in order. This is not a natural disaster - this is a made in Mugabe disaster, and it must be treated as such.

I understand that the Secretary General of the United Nations has personally spoken to Mugabe - sent an emissary in the form of the former President of Mozambique to see him and that together they have "persuaded" the old man that he needs help. He has now said he will meet with the head of the World Food Programme - Morris, when he is in the region next week. To be frank I had hoped that the UN intervention might embrace the real causes of this crisis, but it seems as if they are going to deal with the consequences and not the cause.

This is very dangerous. We have a humanitarian disaster on our hands - we need nearly a billion US dollars worth of food imports to meet our needs over the next 12 months. We have half our population on the verge of starvation. Mugabe, sensing the extent of the problem, has now rejected the NGO Act, which would have closed down hundreds of organisations vital to any relief effort. Just this week I saw a letter from the World Food Programme closing its Beitbridge operations - a vital link in any food relief exercise.

But is anyone thinking about the longer-term consequences of a massive humanitarian relief effort? Let us imagine that when Morris gets here, a new appeal is launched for food aid. Donors come forward and they buy US$500
million dollars worth of food in the next year; bring it into Zimbabwe and give it away to needy people.

Such an operation will totally undermine any possibility of a recovery in our own indigenous food system - peasants who receive food free will make little or no effort to grow food. Government will just love such a development as they will make sure such free food hand outs are attributed to State intervention and this will ensure the continued “support” of rural peasants for the “ruling Party”. No matter how much the donor community may try, they will never get the hands of Zanu PF off the food aid business.

Foreign aid coming into Zimbabwe will also create a new flow of foreign exchange which will go through “official channels” giving the patronage system a whole new range of opportunities as the Reserve Bank obtains inflows of hard currencies at a third of its value. This will further entrench the political patronage system which has allowed crazy policies to prevail in this lunatic asylum they call Zimbabwe.

Of course the UN loves food aid - it’s a safe, no hassles activity that allows officials on high hard currency salaries to justify their existence.

NGO’s love food aid - it means new 4 x 4 vehicles and hard currency allowances and many other perks. Someone said to me once that you could tell how much trouble a country is in by the numbers of vehicles carrying the UN flag. It’s worse than that - such countries become incurable basket cases and permanent holes for so called “food aid”.

So what should the international response be? First it should be tough and demand that the country address all the governance issues that are on the table - democracy, the rule of law, human and political rights. Secondly they should demand that priority should be given to funding commercial imports of food in the form of raw materials to local industry so that we can protect jobs and supply food to all without political interference. The objective being to bring these basic needs into free supply. Thirdly, these supplies should be priced into the market at real exchange rates and the counterpart funds thus created used imaginatively by the donor community (not the UN) to help needy people and communities.
Forcing people to buy food at real prices will require people living outside the country to send money home to fund these purchases. It will also protect local producers and create incentives for local farmers. Then maybe, just maybe, we will grow something ourselves this coming season.

But if the UN simply responds to this deepening crisis in the normal way - they will simply make our position worse and entrench a delinquent, criminal regime in power.

***
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**The Destruction of the Informal Sector**

IN THE PAST WEEK the government of Zimbabwe has taken steps to destroy much of what has become known throughout Africa as the informal sector. This consists of about 3 million small-scale business enterprises - none of whom are registered or pay direct taxes but which play a major part in the nation's economy.

There are 800,000 small scale peasant farmers and their families, but it is in the cities where this kind of economic activity has thrived as the formal sector has crashed. The activities take on many forms - cross border traders who take orders from urban business and then find the foreign exchange and go to South Africa or Botswana to source the products required. I estimated once that about 5,000 traders crossed the borders every day doing anything up to 20 per cent of all imports.

Vegetable and fruit sellers are found almost everywhere - a vendor selling just a few tomatoes every day can make as much as a worker in industry.

Small scale industry goes on where ever there is a vacant lot and takes on all sorts of tasks and produce products such as wire netting, door frames, windows, furniture. The motor industry and public transport is another area of informal
sector business - hundreds of small vans operate in urban areas and provide a very efficient form of local transport, which is used by millions every day.

In the housing sector the role of the informal economy is just as ubiquitous - with a backlog in housing running to over 1 million units on official lists and only 1.4 million housing units actually on the ground, over 40 per cent of the urban population is thought to be technically homeless - they live in crowded tenements and as lodgers - often living as a whole family in a single room. Desperate for any sort of privacy and family life many take to constructing shacks in other peoples yards or on vacant ground in peri urban and township areas.

This means that somewhere about 2.5 million people live in makeshift urban accommodation without adequate sanitation or clean water. They include hundreds of thousands of children, many brought to the towns because the education and health services are so much better than they are in the rural areas, or their parents have died from Aids or a related illness and they are living with the extended family.

So we have a massive structure of informal sector activities - almost eclipsing the formal sector that was so dominant in 1980. I estimate that informal business may generate as much as half our GDP, handle as much as 40 per cent of all foreign exchange and 20 per cent of our exports and imports.

They support 3.4 million urban people and 4 million rural people. They provide transport for the great majority and meet the basic housing requirements of at least 8 million people. They pay taxes through the indirect systems of taxation that exist (VAT and others) and provide a huge market for the formal sector as well as income support for the majority.

Despite the complete failure of the Zanu regime to maintain the formal sector - with GDP declining nearly 50 per cent in 7 years, exports down by half and employment by over 40 per cent - the State has now decided to decimate the one thing that is working - the informal sector.

If I had not seen it myself I could not have believed that so stupid and heartless a thing could be carried out. On Thursday last week I watched armed police destroy the markets in Beitbridge - the border town with South Africa. I saw them burn food, steal groceries and smash furniture.
Afterwards one street kid said to me as I walked past - "this is cyclone Gono!" referring to the governor of the Reserve Bank who seemed to have triggered this exercise in an effort to gain control of informal money markets. Others just sat stunned - not quite appreciating that the State had just robbed them of virtually everything they owned.

We saw evidence of the cyclone all the way to Harare and then over the weekend we saw the Capital City go up in flames. The markets at Magaba, Mbare all destroyed and billions of dollars worth of goods taken or destroyed. My daughter witnessed a team on the street cutting a vendors hot dog stand loose and then loading it onto a truck - she remonstrated with them and they threatened to arrest her. Some Z$2 billion in cash stolen from vendors by the Police.

All over the City homes were destroyed, goods stolen or destroyed and people threatened with loaded weapons and live ammunition. They were also threatened with tear gas supplied by Israel that stuns its victims. Officers in charge of this mindless destruction said that they had orders to shoot anyone resisting. In one area I visited the majority of the squatters had voted Zanu PF in the recent election, believing that in doing so they were protecting themselves from eviction because the land they occupied was not theirs - they sat stunned by events surrounded by burnt out wrecks of their homes and crying children who had spent the night out in the cold.

The question is why are they doing this - punishment is one reason given by police to those they were hurting, punishment for voting MDC in the cities.

But I think there is another reason and this is that Mugabe - now in the final stages of his rule, has decided - like Stalin in the 30's and Pol Pot in the 60's and the Afrikaner administration in South Africa, that it is time to move some people out of the cities and back to the rural areas. This is a mass eviction of unwanted urban poor being forced to go "back to their rural homes" and "grow food!"

In the cities they are a threat - restless, independent and proving a powerful support base for opposition politics. In the rural areas they can be controlled and perhaps forced to grow food where none is being grown at present. Will they get away with it - probably, just like Stalin and Pol Pot and the apartheid regime. But only for a while, eventually the tide will turn and when it does, those who were the oppressors will themselves become the victims of their own evil acts.
To back up this thesis that strange new Ministry called the Ministry of Rural Housing and Social Amenities with Munangagawa in charge has been given a massive budget from nowhere to operate with. This suggests that they really are trying to force a relocation of population. In the past 5 years, rural populations have been declining - the maths suggest by as much as 10 per cent per annum. This coupled with the impact of Aids has meant that these areas can no longer even feed themselves. Mugabe is trying to reverse this situation.

When you go to bed tonight - just think of those tens of thousands of poor, hungry, destitute people and their children who will sleep in the open in near zero temperatures, without hope or a future. Mugabe is goading the population to revolt - then he can declare a state of emergency and remove what is left of our civil liberties and rights.

***
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All History is Linear

In the Bible, God says of Himself "I am the alpha and the omega!" This simple statement carries with it such profound implications that we could spend a lifetime working through them. But in it God is saying - I was at the beginning of life and I will be at the end of life. History is linear; it has a beginning and an end. This means that the world and the universe as we know it had a beginning and its life is finite - there will be an end to its existence. The same principle applies to our own lives - we are born and we die, no exceptions.

* In publishing email addresses, represent @ as [at] to defeat spammers' harvesting robots.
Governments rise up and they fade away, nothing lasts forever.

We do not choose the circumstances or the period on the line into which we are born and raised but we have to manage the consequences. Some are fortunate and go through life with little to disturb their equilibrium.

Others go through the holocaust. Such things do not seem to have any reason or purpose, they just happen and what makes the difference is how we handle the situations we each find ourselves in.

Jesus said “In the world you will have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.” This is a clear statement that life for all of us is not going to be a bed of roses. On the contrary, we will all face real problems throughout our lives and must accept these as part of life.

It means we have a certain life to live and our choices make a difference - to us as individuals and to those around us and in our community. We are faced with circumstances and also influence those same circumstances. We may not be able to choose when or where we must live out our lives, but we can all choose how we live while we are on our own historical line through time.

I was born in a time in my own country where we saw the end of white settler control over government and the start of majority, democratic rule. It was not a good time to be white and in Africa. We had not behaved well when in power; we had discriminated against the black majority and suppressed freedoms that were taken as universal rights in the rest of the world. Then we faced a period of discrimination designed to redress the imbalances we had created. We were not accepted as citizens with full rights, we even found ourselves being deprived of what we had built up over the previous half century.

At the same time we had been in Africa for over a century, we had no other home and knew no other life. We loved our country and were at home among its peoples. When we travelled abroad it only confirmed what we already suspected - we were not Europeans, we were Africans!

But we are on our life line - we had no choice as to where that life line started, but we could shape the life that we lived when on the line. We chose - both my wife and I and our two children, to stay in Zimbabwe and to help put this new nation on a track to success and to make a life for us as a family here.
It has not been easy - there have been highs and lows and right now we face the most difficult period that any of us can remember. More difficult than in the civil war, more difficult than when UN sanctions were imposed, more unsettled for everyone, but especially for those who have no alternative places to live. It is not going to get any easier and we must again make choices, to stay; to flee; to fight, to coexist.

For those of us who choose the hard road, we can draw comfort that there will come an end to this evil regime that has made such a mess of things.

That is the way of life, of history - life is linear. For those responsible for this awful mess, life must be a nightmare - like being tied to a stinking corpse and unable to let go or get rid of this terrible burden. For those responsible for killings and murder and even worse, they must live with the ghosts of their past, unable to leave them behind; they will follow them to their own graves and deny them peace.

But what of those of us who stay with the tough road we are on? How do we survive, live our lives to the fullness of what is on offer? I have found that in every thing that happens to me there is a path of hope and faith, which constantly surprises. In the darkest times there is light and that light banishes the darkness, in fact the darkness flees from this light. In times of need, something always happens to ensure we find that all our needs are satisfied.

But more than that - life does not consist of what we eat or we wear, or in what sort of house we live. It is much more based on what we do with our lives and the contribution we make to the lives of those who live with us.

We live rich, interesting lives that face daily challenges to our initiative and ingenuity. We are surrounded by life - relationships that keep on growing. The acceptance and recognition of others and the fantastic experience of life in such a country with its beauty and variety.

The night skies alive with stars, the warm yellow autumn moon, the cool mornings heavy with dew and birdsong. The blazing evening skies and the vast spaces of bush in every color and shape. The great rivers and lakes, the splash of tiger and bream and the sullen stare of a lion in the shade.
The fight for basic human and political rights, which others take for granted, and which are now denied to us as a people. The struggle for freedoms that others in developed countries no longer even think about and take for granted. The constant battle to keep our businesses afloat and to somehow stay on top of rising costs and falling currency values. Our lives are so rich it's sinful and I feel sorry for those who do not have these challenges to meet every day.

Life is linear but that does not mean we are not called to live life out in all its fullness and potential. Only in struggle do we write great music and recognize beauty. I am sorry for Mugabe and his collection of goons because they have missed all this and worse - they now have to live with the consequences of their actions. Am I doubtful about the final outcome?

Never - I have read the Book - in the end we win!

---

**Action**

Please note that the stay away on Thursday and Friday is official - it has the support of all major civic bodies in the country. They are calling for a solid two-day stay away from work to protest in a manner that will not expose people to the violence and intimidation of the Police and the Army.

Just stay at home - do your buying on Wednesday and then take a 4-day break.

Do not go out if you can avoid it as there may be trouble and the safest place for you is at home.

Please note that this is not the only action being taken - there are several initiatives being run at the same time. Further action is planned for next week and you will be informed of this as decisions are taken and the relevant information can be released to the public.

We are not prepared to take this nonsense anymore. The country is collapsing and with it our companies and jobs are in serious jeopardy. The Police and the...
Army are just as fed up but they want to see what you feel about this situation. The Stay Away is your first shot at this. Let's act together as we did before.

* * *
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Aid and Trade are Not Enough

This past week and the weeks ahead are likely to be dominated by discussion on the future of Africa and the role that aid, debt relief and trade reform can play in alleviating the devastating poverty in much of Africa. But I am afraid that this debate will miss the main obstacle to growth and development in Africa, which is weak and corrupt leadership.

In 1983 I travelled to Ghana to collect a debt. That alone caused much amusement in Ghana itself - they thought it was a joke that I would travel up over half the continent to try and collect a debt that could never be paid. The reason - Ghana had imploded, the International Airport had small trees growing in the runway and the hotel I stayed in had no water or electricity. Passengers getting off the aircraft with me looked like refugees carrying water and other "essentials". The famous local university looked as if it had been bombed, buildings vandalized and roofs stolen.

What had happened - nothing much. Aid had poured in; they had a wonderful start at independence with good foreign exchange reserves, a well-educated administration and rich resources. They had not fought a war for liberation; there were no internal conflicts, only rotten, corrupt, self-serving leadership. Ghana was a failed State - it scared me and I wondered, could this happen at home in Zimbabwe?

It could and it has. Zimbabwe was given every chance to succeed - open access to global markets on a preferential basis, massive foreign aid from all quarters, technical assistance in whatever field was requested. We started out with an educated elite - many of whom had lived abroad for a number of years. We had a diverse economy based on mining, agriculture, industry and commerce. We were virtually debt free. The world was at our feet but we blew it.
Today Zimbabwe is a basket case - we cannot feed our people, we have destroyed over half the formal sector jobs in the economy, our industry is in tatters, all other sectors of the economy either shrinking or stagnant.

Our social services are a mess and life expectancy has halved. We are poorer than we were 30 years ago and there is no sign of an end to the decline and all-pervading despair.

No amount of aid or debt relief or trade concessions are going to help this country get out of the hole it is in - only a radical change of direction and leadership will do that and I am afraid that this same analysis applies to many countries on the continent.

People talk of a “Marshal Plan” for Africa, failing to recognize that countries like Zimbabwe have been the recipients of more aid per capita than was applied to Europe in 1945. People talk about debt relief - we are not servicing our debt at all at present, the US$7 billion in debt that we owe is virtually free money anyway. Its not even trade - African countries have had access to European markets on an extremely preferential basis for 25 years and yet only a tiny minority have taken up the opportunities available.

Our collapse is self inflicted, its home grown, and until this sort of nonsense is addressed by the global and the African community, there is no hope for countries like Zimbabwe, the Congo, Sudan, Somalia and so on. We are our own worst enemies and we must fix what is wrong here at home in Africa, before we can make effective use of the generosity of the developed world and the new global village that offers such marvellous opportunities and freedom.

The question is how to effect such changes without running the risk of being accused of neo-colonialism? How to ensure that when leadership fails a country, the people can change them without violence and mayhem? We have tried here in Zimbabwe for the past 8 years - we have insisted on no violence, no guns, we have worked to secure a democratic, legal transfer of power to new, popular leadership and we have not succeeded - why? It has been simply because African leaders pay lip service to the fundamentals of the rule of law and democracy.

When it comes to the wholesale theft of national resources and the subversion of the rule of law and democracy, our leaders are in a league all by themselves. We have become adept at manipulating the media and foreign governments and the
multinational agencies such as the World Bank and the UN. To this long list we perhaps should now add the G8 leadership and Bob Geldof. We allow African leaders to strut across the platforms of the world stage as if they were acting in the real interests of their people and not acting simply as self-serving tyrants.

Quite frankly until African leaders themselves put their own houses in order there should be no talk of assistance of any kind.

It is ridiculous that Ethiopia with its rich agricultural resources has been supported by massive food aid for over 20 years. Just take a look at Nigeria - one of the oil giants of the world yet threatened with instability and rising poverty that belies its wealth and status.

Development and poverty alleviation take discipline, honesty, openness and democracy in national political life. It takes hard work and commitment and the strict observance of the rule of law and the guarantee of investor rights and business contracts. If African leaders applied these principles to their own and their public lives they would bring prosperity and freedom to their countries.

It's got nothing to do with race, or discrimination, or unfair trading practices or a shortage of resources - human and financial. Ours is a home-grown crisis and it can only be resolved by home-grown solutions. And do not think that economic collapse and human suffering will by themselves bring change - just look at North Korea and Myanmar for example.

The global community needs to completely isolate tyrannical regimes like

---

**BARTERCARD IS RIGHT HERE**

Bartercard is the largest and fastest growing barter network in the world. It is focused mainly on the small and medium sized business (SME) market, which is the largest sector of business and economic turnover in every economy worldwide.

Some of the reasons businesses join Bartercard are –
1. reduce cash expenses
2. increase cash flow
3. guaranteed new business
4. a competitive advantage
5. access to over 60,000 Barter Members worldwide
6. an interest-free line of credit

If you could handle some extra business, benefit from increased cashflow or would welcome an interest-free line of credit call Steve Dare of Bartercard on 9972 4322.
the above and the Mugabe regime in Zimbabwe and then demand that they affect real reforms before they are allowed back into the world community. If we fail to address the issue of leadership in these countries then we condemn both those countries and their millions of people to hardship and poverty and human deprivation that can only be overcome by flight to another country which will offer a better life. Human migration on this basis simply makes things worse in both the affected States.

Aid and trade are not enough.

** * * *
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**A Peoples Government?**

I have just come in from visiting the squatter camps at Klarney outside Bulawayo. They have been there since independence in 1980 and are home to a transient population of homeless people who live in makeshift shelters. You can see how long they have been there by the trees and shrubs that have been planted.

Today there were just smoking ruins of what had been homes. The people were sitting with what they had left - a few blankets and pots and sticks, perhaps an item of furniture or two. We saw armed Police still at work with smoke billowing up behind them in the valley below us. A local Pastor said to us that they had threatened him when they found him talking to the people in one settlement.

There are three separate camps - all told I am informed, about 2,000 men, women and children. The site is on a barren hillside facing south and tonight we will have sub zero temperatures and a southeast wind blowing all the way from the Arctic across South Africa.

Three days ago they were warned - move or else. Many started to dismantle their meagre homes, many simply ignored the threat. Today several Chinese made military vehicles arrived with a number of armed police onboard and these then went from settlement to settlement burning homes and ordering the people to move by tomorrow (Sunday) or face the destruction of their personal belongings.
This community of the poorest people in the country will spend tonight out in the open. Local Pastors said they would go in after the Police left the area to assess needs and to ask the people what they wanted to do. 90 per cent have nowhere to go at all.

Last week I saw a similar exercise in Dulibadzimu - a township in the Border town of Beitbridge. My estimate then was that in that exercise at least a third of the total population of the town would be rendered homeless. I personally put 5 families into my workshop until they can find an alternative. A widow I know, Mrs. Siphali, came to me and said they have destroyed my home and I have three children in local schools - one about to write O levels. “What can you do” she asked?

What makes this pogrom against the absolute poor so evil is that it is at the worst time of the year - mid winter. There has been little warning and no preparation of any alternative accommodation and the exercise is being carried out nationwide - millions of people are involved. If this were not stopped I would estimate that at least 2 million people - many of them children - will be rendered homeless and destitute, without access to social amenities, water and sanitation.

Many will take the only route to safety - across the Limpopo - and South Africa will have to brace itself for another influx of economic refugees from Zimbabwe. This time however they will be desperate and will be prepared to do anything to make a bit of money and I mean anything.

* * *

**Eddie Cross Diary, Bulawayo, 16th June 2005**

**The Zimbabwean Economy in 2005**

After a brief attempt at real reform of the monetary and fiscal situation in 2003, the Ministry of Finance and the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe have reverted to the old formula that has failed in the past. As a consequence all indicators in the Zimbabwe economy are again strongly negative.

Inflation has started to accelerate and most commentators expect this trend to continue for some time. The GDP has shrunk in the first quarter of the year and I expect negative growth in the order of about 5 per cent this year. The main
reasons for this being continued stagnation in the tourism, service and mining sectors and a sharp reduction in manufacturing output as well as agriculture. The main immediate crisis is being brought about by a severe shortage of foreign exchange. The authorities are attempting to correct this by forcing all available resources into the Reserve Bank and to this end severe penalties are being imposed on any who violate strict Reserve Bank controls on foreign exchange inflows. This is unlikely to be successful but has had the effect of curbing the rapid decline in the value of the currency on parallel markets. Most traders expect the decline to continue once traders have arranged how to avoid the new restrictions imposed by the recent monetary statement.

The foreign exchange crisis has been exacerbated by considerable expenditure on military hardware in recent months. The full extent of this is not known because the transactions are shrouded in secrecy, but arms already delivered have a face value of at least US$400 million. There is talk of further orders with East European manufacturers and the Chinese arms industry but this is not confirmed.

In an environment where we expect formal sector exports to decline to US$1.1 billion, down from US$1.36 billion in 2004, this expenditure on weapons has made an already serious foreign exchange crisis unmanageable - as a result fuel and food supplies are at an all time low.

Almost all indicators point to a disastrous agricultural season - tobacco sales are expected to reach a maximum of 65,000 tonnes (down from 85,000 tonnes in 2004), maize output has fallen to one third of national demand, oilseed crops are down very substantially and other major agricultural sectors are all showing a downturn in output - fruit, sugar, tea, coffee, horticulture, meat products and milk are all in very short supply. With the likelihood that winter cropping will be also very disappointing it is likely that imports of food and other products will take up at least US$800 million in the next 12 months. This is simply not available and a real food crisis is now almost inevitable.

In the liquid fuels sector, even though demand has declined from about 5.5 million litres a day to about 3 million litres a day, the State is simply unable to meet demand or even a small proportion of demand. Transporters are now finding their fleets grounded for lack of fuel and exports are building up without transport to move them to their markets. Public transport is almost non-existent.
and if this situation continues for any length of time it will have devastating consequences in the wider economy.

On the more technical front, we have seen the largest expansion of public debt in the history of the country in the past 5 months. The domestic borrowing of central government has risen from Z$2 trillion at the end of 2004 to over Z$10 trillion today. Even in hard currency terms this is an astonishing figure. National debt now exceeds annual GDP by a wide margin and there is no sign of Government curbing its appetite for borrowing.

It is impossible to estimate the current account deficit in government expenditure. Some economists put it at over 30 per cent. Whatever the real figure it is completely out of control and carries with it the very real threat of a collapse of state finances. The parastatals sector is also reporting massive losses that are not being accounted for by the authorities.

The Railways total revenue is now insufficient to cover the wage bill and the management is calling on the State (often the Reserve Bank) to fund salaries. Hwange Colliery is unable to meet demand and there is a serious shortage of coal throughout industry and mining. This is now being compounded by the fuel shortage.

The Grain Marketing Board is still selling maize at Z$600,000 a tonne when the actual cost of imported maize is over R1000 per tonne (Z$1,500,000 per tonne) and local maize prices to farmers are over Z$2,500,000 per tonne.

With GMB sales running at about 1,500 tonnes a day this implies direct subsidies to the Board of billions of dollars. The same applies to wheat and to other products such as rice being handled by the Board.

Fuel from the State sector is being sold at 16 per cent of its real cost and this partly explains its scarcity - long haul transporters buy as much fuel as they can in Zimbabwe where the official pump price is below Z$3,500 a litre (US38 cents at official exchange rates, 16 cents at a realistic exchange rate). This compares to over US$1.00 per litre in most other countries in the region. The recent actions of the Reserve Bank have closed the door on private sector initiatives to fund the supply of fuel and to secure deliveries from South Africa and this is the main reason for the present crisis.
The major energy supplier called ZESA is also in deep crisis. Despite major adjustments to local tariffs the organisation continues to accumulate debt and is unable to properly maintain its infrastructure. Shortages of foreign exchange are compounding these problems and there is an increasing deficit in domestic electrical energy supplies.

All of these difficulties will be made much worse by the recent decision of central government to destroy much of the informal sector. This sector supports over 3 million families and makes a very substantial contribution to the national economy. Its destruction will impact on human welfare across the country, damaging food supplies and markets and plunging millions into increased poverty and deprivation.

PETA Workers Arrested for Alleged Cruelty
from www.newsday.com

By Associated Press, June 17, 2005, 2:15 PM EDT

AHOSKIE, N.C. -- Two employees of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals were charged with animal cruelty for allegedly picking up dogs and cats from shelters and dumping their dead bodies in the garbage.

Police said they found 18 dead animals in the bin and 13 more in a van registered to the activist group, all from shelters in the state's northeastern corner.

Investigators arrested the two workers after staking out a garbage bin where animals had previously been dumped, police said Thursday.

PETA President Ingrid Newkirk said the workers were picking up animals to be brought to PETA headquarters for euthanization. Veterinarians and animal control
officers said the PETA workers had promised to find homes for the animals rather than euthanize them, according to police. Neither police nor PETA offered any theory on why the animals might have been dumped.

PETA spokeswoman Colleen O’Brien said the organization euthanizes animals by lethal injection, which it considers more humane than gassing animals in groups, as some counties do.

The group scheduled a news conference Friday in Norfolk, Va., where the group is based.

Police charged Andrew Benjamin Cook, 24, of Virginia Beach, Va., and Adria Joy Hinkle, 27, of Norfolk, Va., each with 31 felony counts of animal cruelty and eight misdemeanor counts of illegal disposal of dead animals. They were released on bond.

**Guantanamo Bay**

“Gitmo” Cocktail

Ralph Peters
16 June 2005

June 16, 2005 – THE demands to shut down our Guantanamo lock-up for terrorists have nothing to do with human rights. They’re about punishing America for our power and success.

From our ailing domestic left to overseas America haters, no one really cares about the fate of Mustapha the Murderer or Ahmed the Assassin. The lies told about Gitmo are meant to undercut U.S. foreign policy and embarrass America.

The Gitmo controversy is about many things, from jealousy of the United States and outrage that we refuse to fail, to residual anger that we won the Cold War and exploded the left’s great fantasy of a dictatorship of the intellectuals.
But the one thing the protests aren’t about is human rights. Except, of course, as a means to slam the United States.

Torture? Who and when? Koran abuse? I’d rather be a Koran in Gitmo than a Bible in Saudi Arabia. Illegal detentions? Suggest a better way to handle hardcore terrorists. Maltreatment? Spare me. The food the prisoners receive is better than what I had to eat in the Army.

Another thing: Would it be more humane to incarcerate the declared enemies of civilization in northern Alaska, rather than on a Caribbean beach?

Has the Bush administration made mistakes regarding Guantanamo? You bet. The biggest one was attempting to placate the critics. By launching a new investigation every time a terrorist had a toothache, our government played into the hands of its enemies.

The truth is that the terrorists and their defenders have something in common. It’s not courage, which is one quality violent fanatics don’t lack. It’s that neither can be appeased.

Any concession only increases their appetites. The Clinton administration’s reluctance to respond to terrorist strikes encouraged al Qaeda. If the Bush administration closed the Guantanamo facility, any alternative holding center would be attacked just as rabidly and dishonestly.

If we put our captives up at the Four Seasons, we’d be condemned because somebody smelled bacon at breakfast.

You can’t negotiate with terrorists. And you cannot reason with ideologues - whether they’re Islamist fanatics or pathetic old lefties fishing for a cause to give meaning to squandered lives.
Terrorists, French and German neo-Stalinists, and our own democracy-hating intelligentsia aren’t interested in facts. It’s all about the comfort of belief.

Let’s get this straight: Nothing we could do would appease those who feel a need for our country to fail. We must stop trying to satisfy them.

There’s a military maxim that applies to all the nonsense about Gitmo: Don’t let the entire battalion get bogged down by a sniper. By attempting to respond to the wild charges leveled by those who offer no solutions themselves - who have no interest in solutions - we’ve allowed anti-American basket cases from Harvard Yard to the German parliament to create an issue from nothing.

Oh, and thanks to the “mainstream” media for assuming that our country’s always wrong.

There’s a culture of torture in the world. Blessedly, America isn’t part of it. When a few of our troops make mistakes, they’re punished. Given the magnitude of our task and the unprecedented conditions we face, it’s remarkable our errors have been so few.

What should enrage every decent citizen is that the real torturers - from Zimbabwe to China, from Syria to North Korea - get a pass from the political left. If terrorists behead defenceless captives on videotape, it’s simply an expression of their culture. But if a handful of U.S. troops play an ugly round of Candid Camera, that’s a new gulag.

As someone who takes human rights seriously, I’m appalled by the lack of sympathy the left feels toward the victims of any regime other than the Bush administration. Let’s shout it to prisoners everywhere: If you’re not harmed by an American, your suffering doesn’t count.

The left’s hypocrisy is immeasurable. The grandchildren of those who defended Stalin are mortified that Saddam Hussein will stand trial. By taking such irresponsible voices seriously, we grant our critics a strength they otherwise lack and simply help them keep their lies alive.

No matter what our country does, we will never please a global intelligentsia outraged that all their theories came to nothing. We can’t satisfy al Qaeda, and we can’t please those discontented souls who need to blame the United States for their personal inadequacies. It’s time we stopped trying.
What should our nation’s leaders say about Guantanamo and our treatment of captured terrorists? A lot less.

When comments are unavoidable, try this: “We’re human. We make mistakes. We fix those mistakes. And we move on. Nothing will divert us from our mission of defeating terror and keeping our country safe.”


NEW YORK POST is a registered trademark of NYP Holdings, Inc. Copyright 2005 NYP Holdings, Inc. All rights reserved.
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**Action Business Brokers**
Visit our web page
www.actionbb.com.au
Action is what you want – Action is Business.

For a confidential discussion on your selling requirements, contact Michael Kios direct.
Mobile 0419 277 511 Phone. (02) 8221 8888 Fax. (02) 8221 8822

**Beyond The Razor Wire**
The true story of a detention officer's experiences at Woomera and Curtin illegal immigrants’ camps, and in a maximum security prison. Bizarre, shocking, horrifying, and hilarious incidents from the diary of someone who has seen life from within the razor wire. Did rioters really throw babies at the shields of guards marching in to disperse them? Did parents really sew their children’s lips up?
“A must for every Australian who is interested in the future of our country... or just curious about what our detention centres are really like”

“Beyond The Razor Wire” by Sandy Thorne.
$19.80 plus $5 postage from PO Box 1011, Lightning Ridge 2834.
Bob Geldof now listed on the Ukqwitt Register

TO BECOME LISTED in the Ukqwitt Register, being very wrong – for example by advocating the convoluted policies of the Australian Labor Party – is not enough. One must in addition be demonstrably stupid and obsessively self-focused.

For those – including new subscribers – who missed earlier Darby Reports, the Ukqwitt Register was instigated by a Sydney northside businessman (“the Registrar”) who is a keen student of public affairs, in recognition of Ferdinand Ukqwitt (1780-1828).

Ferdinand Ukqwitt (sometimes rendered “Ukqvitt”) died as he lived, stupidly. He met his end, duelling pistol in his hand, shortly after dawn on 10 November 1828 in Berlin, not far from the site of the present zoo. Ukqwitt had repeatedly challenged a Prussian army officer to a duel over some misunderstanding regarding the affections of a lady. The officer reluctantly accepted the challenge from an obviously incompetent civilian, and arrived at the rendezvous in time to witness Ukqwitt accidentally shoot the right ear off his own second. The second, unsurprisingly, was not impressed and hurled a paving stone at Ukqwitt. Attempting to dodge the missile, Ukqwitt slipped and fell, impaling himself painfully – and fatally – on an iron fence.

In the course of his useless life Ukqwitt had incurred the contempt of the well-informed public of several nations through his obsessive pamphleteering and speechmaking in support of his ill-conceived plan for the incorporation of Switzerland into the Kingdom of Sardinia.

Prussian senior delegate to the Vienna Conferences Prince Karl August von Hardenberg described Ukqwitt as “the fool of the century”.

The then British representative in Vienna, Lord Castlereagh, wrote in a private letter to Prime Minister Robert Jenkinson (the Second Earl of Liverpool): “The whole logic of European relations is threatened by Ukqwittism”.
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The rules of the Ukqwitt Register are simple:

- Any subscriber to the Darby Report may nominate a name to be inscribed in the Ukqwitt Register, with the right of veto being held by the Registrar.
- Persons with their names inscribed in the register instantly receive the cognomen "Ukqwitt" to be used immediately before the surname.
- From time to time the Darby Report will list a new addition to the Ukqwitt Register.

There was no contest for the entry at the top of the Ukqwitt Register, Senator Bob Ukqwitt Brown, who almost daily consolidates his position with a renewed burst of Ukqwittism. Number two in the Ukqwitt Register, Phillip Ukqwitt Adams, received his place for his moronic, bigoted and demonstrably false assertion (The Weekend Australian Magazine, 15-16 November 2003) "... the conservatives have absolutely no sense of humour or irony. . . . satire is lost on them."

Number three in the Ukqwitt Register is animal liberationist Ralph Ukqwitt Hahneuser, the saboteur and enemy of Australian rural industry, who in mid-November 2003 conducted a raid against the Kobo Feedlot in Portland, Victoria, where he contaminated sheep feed by the addition of shredded ham.

Number four in the Ukqwitt Register is Andrew Ukqwitt Bartlett, somehow leader of a party which holds itself out as upholding the rights of women. Bartlett’s supreme unconcern – indeed contempt – for the rights of women has been evidenced by his 5 December 2003 assault upon fellow Senator Jeannie Ferris, in the Senate Chamber.

Number five is now Mark Ukqwitt Latham MP. As evidenced by his photo on page 2 of The Weekend Australian of 13-14 December 2003, the then Leader of the Federal Opposition organized a photo opportunity for himself, purportedly engaging in the popular sport of lawn bowls. At New Farm Bowls Club in Brisbane, Mark Latham sent down a bowl for the photographer, Nathan Richter. Latham was not wearing a hat, an omission which most bowlers in Queensland would classify as stupid. Latham was wearing his suit jacket and tie, unthinkable on a bowling green, especially in Queensland. Latham was wearing his street...
shoes with raised leather heels, illegal on every bowling green in the civilized
world. Since then, Mark (“Supermouth”) Ukqwitt Latham has consolidated his
position on the Register by various means including inventing stories about the
content of briefings he received from senior public servants, in a failed and futile
attempt to justify his ill-considered forays into foreign policy. His crashing fall
from public favour and comprehensive electoral defeat is a tribute to the wisdom
of the public.

Greg Ukqwitt Barnes earned his position at number six by challenging a
journalist who was trying to interview Prince Frederik of Denmark, then visiting
Hobart, the home of his fiancee, Mary Donaldson. Barnes gave the journalist the
benefit of his opinion, an opinion so bizarre it would astound many if not most of
his fellow republicans: “All monarchies are evil!”

Holding number seven position is
former Lord Mayor of Sydney Frank
Ukqwitt Sartor who for years
masqueraded as an independent
before becoming a Labor Party
Minister. On Thursday 5 February
2004 in a telephone conversation
with (then) Lord Mayor Lucy
Turnbull and two senior public
servants, Sartor repeatedly made
reference to the Labor Government
“destroying” Ms Turnbull and the
Council. Sartor then uttered the
phrase for which he will always be
remembered: “You are local
government pissants”.

Number eight on the Ukqwitt Register is a Vice-Regal appointment, former
Governor of Tasmania H.E. (as he then was) Richard Ukqwitt Butler. Former
Governor-General Bill Hayden in the course of his honourable vice-regal service
did a great deal to disprove the axiom “Once a political hack, always a political
hack”.
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All that good work has been undone by Richard Butler, who in addition to descending to tawdry levels of political nastiness, set the seal on his inclusion in the Register by asking (according to press reports) Mark Latham to make him Governor-General.

Entertainer Bob Geldof has beaten off strong international competition to win the ninth spot on the Ukqwit Register.

Bob Geldof is a talented performer with a strong humanitarian streak who sadly lacks any idea about what causes poverty. His Make Poverty History Campaign is supported of course by political-organisation-masquerading-as-charity Oxfam. Another of the groups aligned with Geldhof is Conscience, the Peace Tax Campaign which wants “the legal right for those with a conscientious objection to war to have the military part of their taxes spent on peacebuilding activities”. Then we have Unite Against Racism, which campaigns “to end France’s ban on the hijab” and which ran a “Unite Against Fascism Day of Action” on 11 June 2005 (which must have been great news for the poor of Africa). Another listed group, One World Action, describes itself as part of the Trade Justice Movement which organised an anti-free-trade demonstration outside 10 Downing Street in April 2005. Some of the groups aligned with Geldhof do little or no harm, and some of them do some good. None seem fussy about the company they keep.

The vital issue is that poverty and misery in Africa are not caused by exploitative western governments nor by the legacy of colonialism. Poverty and misery in Africa are caused by those rotten African Governments which institutionalise corruption, brutality, crime, female subservience and even genocide and slavery. Read what Eddie Cross has to say in this issue of the Darby Report.

When Bob Geldof’s mates all unite to drive Robert Mugabe from office they’ll have some credibility. In the meantime, lets encourage and assist the minority of African Governments which support individual liberty and which are making a genuine effort to lift the living standards of their people. The Republic of Ghana is a rare but very welcome example.

No kind person objects to Bob Geldof organising concerts to raise money by voluntary contributions from attendees or even through the sale of television rights. But Geldof goes far beyond the bounds of legitimacy by demanding that
governments steal even more tax money from their citizens to bestow upon undeserving dictators. At the same time, he gives comfort and encouragement to those who seek to impede trade and investment, the most likely sources of genuine prosperity for the poor and oppressed. Hence Bob Ukqwitt Geldof.

Further nominations for the Ukqwitt Register are welcome. Let’s also have subscriber input on whether places on the Register should be maintained in chronological order of appointment, or whether the order should vary according to perceived degrees of Ukqwittism.

HELP THE WORK OF THE SALESIANS IN EAST TIMOR AND IN TSUNAMI-DEVASTATED AREAS.
PLEASE SEND YOUR GENEROUS DONATION TO
Salesians of Don Bosco (att Bro Michael Lynch)
P O Box 264 Ascot Vale Victoria 3032
Tel 03 9377 6060 salmiss[at]ozemail.com.au

Michael Darby’s regular poetry gigs:
- Harry’s Fish Café, at the Spit Bridge between Manly and Mosman, each Thursday night from 7.30. Join the Poet’s table if you wish for wonderful seafood, wine and good fellowship (share cost, up to $50 per person). Poetry performance usually around 8.45pm. Phone 0413 348 843 to book.
- Wood and Stone Italian Restaurant of Manly Cove, opposite Manly Wharf, each Monday night from 8pm, with poetry usually around 8.15pm. Superb gourmet pizzas, many family groups attend.
- West Promenade, Manly, near Gilbert Street, across the park from the Manly Police Station, each Saturday night from 7.00pm, entertainment in the course of regular hot meal provided for the homeless of Manly district, by Alan and Hui Clarke of Street Mission (donations welcome 0425 272 648).
Dear Editor,

A NATIONAL DISGRACE is an understatement to describe Henry Palaszczuk, Minister for Primary Industries and Fisheries, for his failure to secure the financial viability of Emerald’s citrus growers and for his blatant contempt for the Central Queensland City of Emerald.

Palaszczuk has known about the illegally imported exotic citrus canker disease for over four (4) years, but chose to stick his head in the ground citing the much-touted ‘scientific evidence’ rhetoric until the first outbreak occurred in June 2004.

Aided and abetted by ministerial buffoons, including a senior policy advisor, Palaszczuk has weaved a web of deceit to conceal his incompetence to resolve a potentially disastrous situation for Australia’s exports of citrus fruits estimated at $650 million annually.

On Tuesday 24 May 2005, just hours before affected Emerald growers were to meet with the Prime Minister’s Chief of Staff in Canberra, another citrus canker outbreak was located on an Emerald citrus orchard.

The National Management Group has now announced the total destruction of all commercial and domestic citrus trees in the Emerald Quarantine Pest Area, without any financial consideration to citrus farming families who will, as a consequence, be forced into bankruptcy.

With the announced State budget surplus of $2,720 million, Palaszczuk’s excuse of insufficient State funds is untenable as the reason for not providing financial reimburse to growers for the loss of their 2005 crop, in addition to the realisation of financial losses for the ensuing seven (7) years to enable the re-establishment of Emerald’s citrus orchards.
Over eight hundred local jobs are now lost with a similar number of itinerant seasonal fruit pickers and flow-on jobs also gone as a result of bureaucratic bungling, which was through no fault of the growers, the workers, or the Emerald community.

Selwyn Johnston
Independent Candidate

The Flying Doctors are always there

You’re travelling through the Outback, you’ve been bitten by a snake and the closest town with a doctor is miles away. Who do you call?

For thousands of people living, working or travelling in the Outback, the only reliable medical help they can depend on is the Royal Flying Doctor Service (RFDS).

The Service is a not-for-profit, charitable organisation. RFDS receives operational funding from governments but relies on community generosity to buy replacement aircraft and vital medical equipment.

To help the Flying Doctors continue saving lives please call 1800 444 788 or visit www.flyingdoctors.org