The kryptonite to us superhero dole-bludgers is that the Social Security Administration Act (1999) is impregnable.

It is impregnable for one simple reason: it does not require (the Government) to prove that somebody (it) targets for income-management has a demonstrable history of income MISmanagement.

This means that somebody's personal circumstances are irrelevant.

In the appeal process, which is a sham in itself,* personal circumstances are useless.

If you 'fit the criteria', it's game over.

Aspiring appellants will always come a cropper, from whatever solid ground they may perceive themselves to be on, and however unshifting that ground might be in reality as well as *philosophically*.

For the people (lawyers?) who drew up the SSAA to preclude personal circumstances from Part 3b, the relevant part of the Act, suggests they had in mind a broader picture than just the quarantining of indigenous Australians' incomes.

It suggests that they were thinking punishment as well.

What else can it possibly be for the likes of me and my friend, who are already being IMd, plus the thousands of other people without a history of (drunken violence etc) who will be forcibly IMd in 2012?

That's the only conclusion I personally can draw. Blanket IM and its spawn, the BasicsCard, is the punishment meted out to the long-term unemployed.

There are good reasons why we have been jobless for so long, or can't work the requisite hours. But of course, they involve personal circumstances and as mentioned, they are invalidated by the legislation.

Under Part 3b, they are taboo. The Government is not interested in them, regardless of what a person might be contributing to the community, or how he or she might be busily adding to its cohesiveness through selfless unpaid labour.

In a historical context, I, Rob Inder-Smith, shouldn't be surprised about the advent of IM, given Australian bureaucracy's will to punish with one hand and screw up with the other.

IM/the BasicsCard is just the latest in a long line of austerity packages and Government brainwaves, to wit: asbestos, cane toads, white Australia policy, deforrestation, forced assimilation, privatisation, bank deregulation etc ad nauseum, not to mention a policy of genocide against our indigenous population that has made this country world famous.

Our mismanagement of significant (white) affairs, let alone those under the rubric of 'Aboriginal affairs', is at once laughable and deplorable.

As an addendum and snapshot in the life of the forcibly IMd:

Today (Tuesday, December 27, 2011) I needed petrol in my car.

I'm almost certain there is/was about $70 in my BasicsCard account. But it's that slight doubt that sent me to the machine at Casuarina Shopping Centre to check my balance.

I arrived to find the machine not working. The screen was dead. So I couldn't confirm my balance. It's not the first time this lone Darwin machine has been off the air (that's right – it's the only machine in Darwin).

What I would like to know is, why is not Centrelink, which makes such a big deal about 'mutual obligation', not honouring *its* obligation to ensure that its (technology) is functional?

We might be jobless, but, at risk of sounding naive, what gives it the right to treat us with such contempt?

I ended up taking a punt and putting just $10 of petrol in my car. But I had drive around to do it and of course, the service stations can't print out account balances, so I am still only presuming that I have about $60 remaining in my account.

How would I be if I had children to support and petrol wasn't the only thing I needed? (I sarcastically tell the console operators, 'I have lived and worked and held down a job in four

capital cities in this country, but I don't know how to manage my income').

In the big picture of BasicsCard inconveniences, that little tale hardly rates. The people with the *nightmares* to contend with, at this point at least, are the indigenous who have been on the thing since 2007.

But the time is fast approaching when white honkies start arcing up. Centrelink security guards in Bankstown, Logan, Rockhampton, Playford and Shepparton can expect to see a little more action in the new year.

I expect certain street crime to increase, as well.

Regarding my personal anti-IM submissions, see: www.banthebasiccard.webs.com

* The first stage of appeal against being IMd is Centrelink's own 'authorised review officer' (ARO). After he or she upholds the decision (to forcibly IM you) you then appeal to the Social Security Administrative Tribunal. After that, it's off to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. The whole process is a waste of tax-payer money. But if enough people exploited the system, it would clog it up nicely and might even cure the mainstream media's blind spot on IM and matters unemployment in general.

Rob Inder-Smith