



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Registered for posting as a Publication —
Category "B"

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance—

Vol. 18 No. 23

June 19th., 1981

Thought for the Week: "Man will either be governed by God, or ruled by tyrants."

— William Penn.

TOWARDS A MARXIST SOCIETY: Mr. Eric Butler has often told the story of the meeting organised many years ago by a Liberal Party branch. He wrote Karl Marx's ten steps for Communising a State, from Marx's text-book, "The Communist Manifesto", on a blackboard without any indication of the source of what he had written. During the course of the meeting he invited members of the audience to express an opinion on what he had written. All felt there was a "catch" somewhere, and sat tight. But eventually one young man said he would "have a go". He felt that what was written sounded like much of the Liberal Party's programme. There was consternation when Mr. Butler thanked him for observing that Karl Marx's ten steps for Communising a State were being implemented by the Liberal Party! One of those steps was the imposition of heavy, graduated income tax.

In a press advertisement promoting the "Small Business Letter", publisher and editor Phil Ward makes it clear that "anti-Communist" Malcolm Fraser is leading the march towards the Marxist society, also drawing attention to Karl Marx's "Communist Manifesto". Mr. Ward also refers to a letter by Marx to his famous collaborator, the wealthy businessman Engels, claiming that once taxation reached 40 per cent., a collapse into Communism would be inevitable. With company tax currently running at 40 per cent., the future for genuine free enterprise is bleak. It is helping to foster "monopoly capitalism", which Marx and his followers believe leads to State capitalism - Socialism. Mr. Ward comments: "So either knowingly or unwittingly tax increases by all major political parties help create a Marxist State."

But the Frasers of the Western world also contribute to the advance towards the Marxist-type State by aiding and abetting the

Communist regimes. Australian exports to the Communist bloc pour out with little coming back - except propaganda and subversion. It is all justified under the doctrine of the "favourable balance of trade". Marx's famous supporter, Lenin, also had something to say on this, claiming that the "decadent capitalists" would provide the rope with which the Marxists would hang them. The Labor Party is correctly described as a "Labor-Socialist" party. The Liberal Party should be described as the "Liberal-Socialist" party.

TELECOMMENTARY: "Largely because of Mr. Sinclair's inept handling of the Telecom issue, the Government faces the collapse of its policy of containing inflation caused by a torrent of wage rises."

Neil O'Reilly, in The Sun-Herald (Sydney) June 14. Mr. O'Reilly further observes, and quite rightly: "After loftily lecturing private employers to stand firm against unions (remember the scrap between Malcolm Fraser and the managing director of I.C.I.A.N.Z.?...On Target) and to resist any sweetheart deals, the Government has been forced to accept a classic case of getting into bed with the unions."

In a slick piece of foot-work, Mr. Sinclair attempted to slide the responsibility from the Government on to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission by implying (National Press Club address very recently) that the Government would accept wage hikes if endorsed by the Commission. Sir John Moore, President of the Commission, correctly rejected this "swifty" - a sweetheart deal outside the wage indexation guidelines laid down by the Commission, which the Government, itself, held should be observed by all parties in any dispute. Having been backed into a corner, the Government was forced to accept the deal.

Now the Telecom Board of Commissioners is in for the wrath of the Cabinet: its managing director has already "resigned" prematurely. It was guilty of not informing the Government in advance of the wage hike offer. All above is now history. At the time of going to press the Telecom dispute appears settled. But will the "phones be out" in another 3-4 years? Probably. The Telecom strike should bring home to all and sundry the increasing fragility of the modern industrial/technological society. As technology advances, more and more of the vital functions of our society come to depend upon the skills of fewer and fewer highly-trained people. We must therefore expect that the subversives will "target" these areas, if they can. We do not suggest that this has been the case with highly-trained air-pilots, air navigation controllers, and the like. But disputes in these areas highlight the point we make about the fragility of the modern industrial/technological society.

THE HEALTH BOMB: "A Federal Labor Government would re-introduce universal health insurance as an 'effective, fair, and equitable system', which people could understand and afford, the Opposition Leader, Mr. Hayden, said yesterday."

- The Age (Melbourne), June 15th.

Mr. Hayden stated, and we are more than inclined to agree with him, that the issue of Health, above all others, would ensure the Federal Labor Party of victory in the next election.

C.H. Douglas observed that in the two party system of government, when one of those parties turns socialist and implements socialistic policies, then all future elections would be a contest in bribery of the electorate with "free" this and that (socialism) resulting in a steady and continual shift, politically, to the Left. This has happened in Western nations, and will continue apace. Of course, the "free" services which socialism promises are nothing of the kind: they are paid for by escalating taxation (now generally disguised by emphasis on indirect levies) to pay for the swelling bureaucracies which socialist policies ensure, and by inflation.

Malcolm Fraser's Razor Gang attempts to "trim off the fat" from a bloated bureaucracy, and this isn't difficult to do - but, when Malcolm Fraser attempts to disband an essential service (Health), then this is a horse of a different colour; the harsh fact of socialistic life is that the man and woman in the street are kept so light on purchasing power because of high taxation, and inflation, that they are not able to provide adequately for such an essential as Health Insurance. Figures have not been published for the percentage of people opting out of health insurance and "taking the risk", however, we know it has been increasing.

So Mr. Hayden will have increasing electoral support for his battle over the next two years or so before the next federal election, and he will score heavily here. He will have learned much from the failings and dangers built into Medibank 1; this time Medibank 2 will avoid some of these. His future battle with the doctors will be easier, as Michelle Grattan of the Melbourne Age points out, because of the falling image of the medical profession in the eyes of the public, as it (the medical profession) has shown itself (or perhaps more accurately, been forced to show itself) as just as much a student of the dollar as any other section of the community. The old image of the gentle, aloof, medical practitioner, with his strict code of ethics, and his professional disinterest in matters of mere money has been rudely dissipated by a harsh economic climate, along with other matters. Every second day some doctor, somewhere in Australia, is up on a charge of defrauding the Commonwealth Department of Health through false claims. Every second month some doctor, somewhere, is in trouble for abusing his role by irresponsibly over-prescribing drugs for gain. One doctor, who was in practice in St.

Kilda a few years back, was known to the young drug sub-culture as "The Candyman". All very bad the image. Incidentally, whilst still on the subject of health, the (Vic.) State Labor Conference in Melb. very recently voted to continue support for the policy of fluoridation of water supplies.

The Melbourne Conservative Speakers' Club was informed by its last Guest Speaker, a bio-chemist with an international reputation, that fluoridated water destroys Vitamin C in babies' feeding formulas in a comparatively short time.

BRIEF COMMENTS: There is a smart new word now available to us. It is "buzz". In the absence of other information, credit must be given to Senator Gareth Evans (A.L.P. - Vic.) who used the word at the (Vic.) State Labor Conference, referred to above. He stated that it is as important for a political party to have a clear philosophy as clear policies. The Liberal Party, he said, has its "individualism", "incentives", and the Australian Democrats had been using "buzz" phrases like "personal freedom" and humanitarianism, to explain what they stood for. Senator Evans admonished Labor for poor articulation of its policies.

We understood that Mr. Hayden had put this matter quite clearly: the objective of Labor was "democratic socialism"! Why cannot we accept "democratic socialism" as a "buzz" phrase? It buzzes well; the trouble is it doesn't make any sense; as we remarked in a recent issue of On Target. Now Mr. Bill Hartley, of the Victorian Socialist Left, has gone one better, albeit not with respect to clarity of thought. His "pearl" was - "You don't have to say we're democratic socialists, because socialism it inherently democratic". We hope there is no necessity for us now to take this apart. Mr. Hartley no doubt believes this himself, although this confusion of mind makes our mind boggle.

* * * *

Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs, well-known to many Australian supporters, in a recent article which we hope to bring into publication shortly - "The Left and the Right And the Truth" - writes of "anti-language" and the "anti-linguist". He writes of a "realistic analysis, relating actual policy as expressed in deeds with the use made of words in relation to it". He says that the (realistic analysis) "is commonly rejected by those who have swallowed the anti-language at face value, as cynical, but though these people (e.g. the average patriotic Conservative voter) think of themselves as 'sincere', they lack integrity in so far as they refuse to face the 'deeds'. If they did so, all the parties would have been forced to fit their policies to their words long ago, or else would have been left high and dry with a mere handful of supporters."