

## Vote Labour!

None of us has ever voted Labour before. Until very recently, we would have considered our doing so at the forthcoming election to be as unlikely as that we might endorse spoon-bending, or claim to have been abducted by extraterrestrials. Moreover, we remain desperately opposed to core Labour themes such as greater European integration, higher taxes, the destruction of valuable traditions (most recently, the abolition of the double-jeopardy rule), and ever-increasing bureaucratic intervention in every aspect of British life.

Yet despite all that, we want to do everything we can to return Tony Blair to office at the forthcoming election. In most constituencies, this will entail voting Labour, so that is what we urge our British readers to do.

The reason is, of course, the war. Faced with that challenge, Tony Blair spectacularly found his moral compass. Michael Howard shamefully lost his – and the Conservative Party stands willingly behind him. And of course the Liberal Democrats' stance was, and remains, utterly despicable.

There might be an argument for protest-voting for a fringe party, such as perhaps the UK Independence Party. But such a protest would be meaningless under the present circumstances, where there are overwhelmingly important foreign-policy and defence issues. One small comfort is that we shall get a separate chance to vote against Blair on the issues of the Euro and the European Constitution.

So, more precisely, our advice is: *vote for Blair's foreign and defence policies*. If your local Labour candidate is a Blair loyalist, the choice is easy: vote for him or her. (You can easily discover such information on the web.) If the Labour candidate is a Saddam supporter and the Conservative candidate approves of Blair's handling of the war, the choice is more complicated: you might then want to vote Conservative, because you would not want to have voted for an MP who, when Blair retires, will support an idiotarian socialist for Prime Minister. Also, where applicable, it is important to vote tactically to keep the Liberal Democrats from making any gains: more than anything else, large gains by them

will be interpreted as a vote for the legitimacy of Saddam's regime

and the world's remaining fear regimes.

Sat, 04/09/2005 - 13:42 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

## Once again...

the editors of "**The World**" sacrifice all of their values to the god of war.

by a reader on Sun, 04/10/2005 - 00:40 | [reply](#)

## Re: Once again...

We shall sing our answer:

(Tune [here](#).)

When this lousy war is over  
We'll go back to normalcy:  
No more voting for New Labour,  
Oh how happy we shall be!  
Every nation will start learning  
How to trade instead of kill;  
We won't tell your guilty secret:  
They were freed against your will.

When this lousy war is over  
We will blog of cows and trees.  
No more threats to chop our heads off,  
No more fear societies.  
You'll be welcome then to join us,  
But you'll hang your head in shame:  
All the world was freed from tyrants  
But it wasn't in your name.

-----  
(Original lyrics [here](#).)

by [Editor](#) on Sun, 04/10/2005 - 14:45 | [reply](#)

## Should be:

As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free;

While God is marching on.

Glory! Glory! Hallelujah! Glory! Glory! Hallelujah!

Glory! Glory! Hallelujah! While God is marching on.

by a reader on Sun, 04/10/2005 - 21:07 | [reply](#)

## Kickass song, Editor. - El

Kickass song, Editor.

- Elliot

## **misalignment of truth compass**

Quoting the 'permalink'

"The reason is, of course, the war. Faced with that challenge, Tony Blair spectacularly found his moral compass. Michael Howard shamefully lost his.."

The coalition invaded Iraq in March 2003. Michael Howard became leader of the Conservative party in November 2003- a full seven months after the invasion. In March 2003, of course, Iain Duncan Smith was the head of the Conservative Party. Mr Duncan Smith, a former army Major, was fully behind Blair's proposed invasion of Iraq. This is a quote from his 2002 response to Blair's statement on Iraq;

'The only question remaining is whether he has the motive to strike against Britain - I believe it is fair to assume he would.' -Iain Duncan Smith.

Therefore, in response to the above claim of Howard losing his 'moral compass' when faced with 'that challenge' I refute it on two grounds: 1) Howard was not leader of the opposition then and 2) Duncan Smith, who was, did not oppose the invasion.

For the above stated reason, among others, the permalink statement is rhetorical nonsense.

Kieren.

## **Re: misalignment of truth compass**

The moral challenge was not faced only by party leaders. Nor did it end with the invasion of Iraq. Nor has Michael Howard's loss of moral compass ever manifested itself (as the Liberal Democrats' has throughout) as explicit opposition to the liberation of Iraq: on the contrary, he continues to support the liberation and British military involvement in Iraq. (Britain can be proud that it is the only democracy in the world in which both the government and the main opposition party are in favour of such actions – though not *too* proud, since most of the population are opposed.)

We have described some of the forms it has taken [here](#) and [here](#). Howard has lost no opportunity to jump onto the populist and conspiracy-theoretic **Blair lied** bandwagon, in order to gain credit with the anti-liberation constituency who want to believe anything that will undermine the liberation policy. Howard was once a prominent member of the Atlanticist faction of the Conservative Party. He has now gone so far in the opposite direction as to have become the first Conservative leader for many decades (since

Eden?) to be persona non grata at the White House. It is not

because of any policy differences that Bush's people have decided that they can't be bothered with Howard any more. It is his cynical, bombastic posturing about the war, which is the external sign that despite his powerful intellect and enormous knowledge and experience, there is no one at home there, morally.

by **Editor** on Tue, 04/12/2005 - 20:33 | [reply](#)

---

Copyright © 2007 Setting The World To Rights