



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

PER

320.56

ON 1



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.46, No.12

April 1st, 2010

The Blessings of Holy Week to All our Readers

The Law of Love: "You, MY FRIENDS, were called to be free men; only do not turn your freedom into licence for your lower nature, but be servants to one another in love. For the whole law can be summed up in a single commandment: 'Love your neighbour as yourself.' But if you go on fighting one another, tooth and nail, all you can expect is mutual destruction.

I mean this: if you are guided by the Spirit you will not fulfil the desires of your lower nature. That nature sets its desires against the Spirit, while the Spirit fights against it. They are in conflict with one another so that what you will to do you cannot do. But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under law.

Anyone can see the kind of behaviour that belongs to the lower nature: fornication, impurity, and indecency; idolatry and sorcery; quarrels, a contentious temper, envy, fits of rage, selfish ambitions, dissensions, party intrigues, and jealousies; drinking bouts, orgies, and the like. I warn you, as I warned you before, that those who behave in such ways will never inherit the kingdom of God.

But the *harvest* of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, fidelity, gentleness, and self-control. There is no law dealing with such things as these. And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the lower nature with its passions and desires. If the Spirit is the source of our life, let the Spirit also direct our course."

– St. Paul's letter to the Galatians 5:13-25

SERFDOM VIA THE SOCIAL SERVICE STATE: Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, wants to take the control of Australia's Medicare System away from the States and centralise it in the hands of the Commonwealth Government. So? What's new?

We are indebted to Louis Cook who reminded us of the legacy of Eric D. Butler. In an essay written in 1949, "The Labour-Socialist Road to Serfdom", Eric explained the real intention behind the 1944 Referendums brought forward by the then Labor Government. One of the objectives was the nationalisation of the health systems of the various states. It was a blatant grab for Power in the drive for a Socialist State of Australia.

Lou extracted two sections from the essay and they are reproduced on the League's website in the Political Democracy section under "Nationalising Australia's Medicare". Study it carefully gentle reader and ask yourself if this is still not the intention of the Labor-Socialists.

In this issue: • *Serfdom Via The Social Service State* • *It Is About Only One Thing* – Ginormous Government • *Women, The Law And Feminist Dogmas* • *Some Reasons For Being Glad (Still)* ...

"ON TARGET"

April 1st, 2010

Page 1 (45)

As an economic productive system, socialism has proved itself a dismal failure. They don't seem to get anything right so why should they be allowed to interfere in the important sphere of personal health?

The drive to socialise Australia was never more apparent than under the Rudd Government.

"The exploitation of the Social Service idea to sap the independence of the individual and to help bring him under centralised control has always been a major aspect of 'Socialist' technique. The Labour-Socialists are at present stressing the importance of their National Health and "Free" Medicine Schemes..."

– Eric D. Butler, 1949.

IT IS ABOUT ONLY ONE THING – GINORMOUS GOVERNMENT: Journalist Mark Steyn should be congratulated for his clear thinking. It's a pity the 'conservative' journalists in this country don't have the same ability. Or is it because, for all their 'blah', the Australian versions fit his description of an American 'republican' 'conservative' and even 'democrat' equivalents. Where are the warning bells for this country? Our own Prime Minister is busy on the campaign trail selling his brand of Collectivist Health Care – and barely a peep from the so-called freedom-loving 'conservatives' whether in journalism or politics!

Labor's WWII 14 Powers Referendum: How many Australians are aware this is not the first attempt by Socialist-Labor forces to centralise Australia's Health Care System? We have placed on our website [www.alor.org/ at >politicaldemocracy/nationalising-australia-s-medicare<](http://www.alor.org/at>politicaldemocracy/nationalising-australia-s-medicare<) a portion of a paper written by Eric D. Butler in 1949 on the push to centralise the health system during the war years under the then Labor government. There really is nothing new!

Now on to Mike Steyn: *The Dakota Beacon*, March 5, 2010. "So there was President Obama giving his bazillionth speech on health care, droning yet again that "now is the hour when we must seize the moment", the same moment he's been seizing every day of the week for the past year, only this time his genius photo-op guys thought it would look good to have him surrounded by men in white coats.

Why is he doing this? Why let "health" "care" "reform" stagger on like the rotting husk in a low-grade creature feature who refuses to stay dead no matter how many stakes you pound through his chest? Because it's worth it. Big time. I've been saying in this space for two years that the governmentalization of health care is the fastest way to a permanent left-of-centre political culture. **It redefines the relationship between the citizen and the state in fundamental ways that make limited government all but impossible.**

In most of the rest of the western world, there are still nominally "conservative" parties, and they even win elections occasionally, but not to any great effect (Let's not forget that Jacques Chirac was, in French terms, a "conservative"). The result is a kind of two-party one-party state: Right-of-centre parties will once in a while be in office, but never in power, merely presiding over vast left-wing bureaucracies that cruise on regardless.

Republicans seem to have difficulty grasping this basic dynamic. Less than three months ago, they were stunned at the way the Democrats managed to get 60 senators to vote for the health bill. Then Scott Brown took them back down to 59, and Republicans were again stunned to find the Dems talking about ramming this thing into law through the parliamentary device of "reconciliation". And, when polls showed an ever larger number of Americans ever more opposed to Obamacare (by margins approaching three-to-one), Republicans were further stunned to discover that, in order to advance "reconciliation", Democrat reconsiglieries [CORRECT] had apparently been offering (illegally) various cosy Big Government sinecures to swing-state congressmen in order to induce them to climb into the

cockpit for the kamikaze raid to push the bill through. The Democrats understand that politics is not just about Tuesday evenings every other November, but about everything else, too.

A year or two back, when the Canadian Islamic Congress attempted to criminalize my writing north of the border by taking me to the Canadian "Human Rights" Commission, a number of outraged American readers wrote to me saying, "You need to start kicking up a fuss about this, Steyn, and then maybe Canadians will get mad and elect a conservative government that will end this nonsense."

Makes perfect sense. Except that Canada already has a Conservative government under a Conservative Prime Minister, and the very head of the "human rights" commission investigating me was herself the Conservative appointee of a Conservative Minister of Justice. Makes no difference. Once the state swells to a certain size, the people available to fill the ever expanding number of government jobs will be statist – sometimes hardcore Marxist statist, sometimes social-engineering multiculti statist, sometimes fluffily "compassionate" statist, but always statist.

The short history of the post-war welfare state is that you don't need a president-for-life if you've got a bureaucracy-for-life: The people can elect "conservatives", as the Germans have done and the British are about to do, and the left is mostly relaxed about it because, in all but exceptional cases (Thatcher), they fulfill the same function in the system as the first-year boys at wintry English boarding schools who for tuppence-ha'penny or some such would agree to go and warm the seat in the unheated lavatories until the prefects strolled in and took their rightful place.

Republicans (Liberals/Nationals ?) are good at keeping the seat warm: A bigtime GOP (Grand Old Party) consultant was on TV crowing that Republicans wanted the Dems to pass Obamacare because it's so unpopular it will guarantee a GOP sweep in November. Okay, then what? You'll roll it back – like you've rolled back all those other unsustainable entitlements premised on cobwebbed actuarial tables from 80 years ago? Like you've undone the Federal Department of Education and of Energy and all the other nickel'n'dime novelties of even a universally reviled one-term loser like Jimmy Carter?

Andrew McCarthy concluded a shrewd analysis of the political realities thus: "Health care is a loser for the Left only if the Right has the steel to undo it. The Left is banking on an absence of steel. Why is that a bad bet?"

Indeed. Look at it from the Dems' point of view. You pass Obamacare. You lose the 2010 election, which gives the GOP co-ownership of an awkward couple of years. And you come back in 2012 to find your health care apparatus is still in place, a fetid behemoth of toxic pustules oozing all over the basement, and, simply through the natural processes of government, already bigger and more expensive and more bureaucratic than it was when you passed it two years earlier. That's a huge prize, and well worth a mid-term timeout.

I've been bandying comparisons with Britain and France but that hardly begins to convey the scale of it. Obamacare represents the government annexation of "one-sixth of the U.S. economy" – i.e., the equivalent of the entire British or French economy, or the entire Indian economy twice over. Nobody has ever attempted this level of centralized planning for an advanced society of 300 million people. Even the control-freaks of the European Union have never tried to impose a unitary "comprehensive" health care system from Galway to Greece. The Soviet Union did, of course, and we know how that worked out.

This "reform" is not about health care, and certainly not about "controlling costs". (As with Medicare), it "controls" costs by declining to acknowledge them, or pay them. Dr William Schreiber of North Syracuse, New York, told CNN that he sees 120 patients per week – about 30% on Medicare, 65% on private insurance plans whose payments take into account the Medicare reimbursement

rates, and about 5% who do it the old-fashioned way and write a cheque. He calculates that, under Obamacare, for every \$5 he now makes, he'll get \$2 in the future. Which suggests now would be a good time to retrain as a realtor or accountant, or the night clerk at the convenience store. Yet Congresswoman Louise Slaughter (Democrat, New York) justifies her support for Obamacare this way: "I even had one constituent – you will not believe this, and I know you won't, but it's true – her sister died. This poor woman had no dentures. She wore her dead sister's teeth."

Is the problem of second-hand teeth a particular problem in this corner of New York? I haven't noticed an epidemic of ill-fitting dentures on recent visits to the Empire State. George Washington had wooden teeth, but presumably these days the Sierra Club would object to the clear-cutting. Yet, even granting Congresswoman Slaughter the benefit of the doubt, is annexing the equivalent of a G7 economy the solution to what would seem to be the statistically unrepresentative problem of her constituent's ill-fitting choppers?

Is it worth reducing the next generation of Americans to indentured servitude to pay for this poor New Yorker's dentured servitude? **Yes. *Because government health care is not about health care, it's about government. Once you look at it that way, what the Dems are doing makes perfect sense. For them.***

WOMEN, THE LAW AND FEMINIST DOGMAS by Ian Wilson LL.B: **Against the Lawyers series:** Michael Black retires as Federal Court Chief Justice after 18 years on March 19, 2010. According to the article "Courts are Still to Do Full Justice to Women" (*The Australian*, 22/1/2010, p.29) "Michael Black recently boarded a flight that was full of men at the pointy end of the plane. He felt the same way he does when entering a room full of males: 'It's just unnatural. It's absurd. I am glad it's no longer the case in the court.' Even though 'great progress' has been made in getting women into law, there is more to be done to 'do full justice to women' the title article says. The problem is that 'brilliant young women' want to have families and men just don't want the traditional maternal role. Maybe a female prime minister is needed? ('You didn't hear me say that').

However, the available evidence indicates that women are happier in marriages with traditional division of labour rather than this sort of politically correct egalitarian (or even matriarchal) arrangement. Research by Bradford Wilcox and Steven Nock, two University of Virginia sociologists, involved a sample of 5000 couples drawn from the second wave (1992-1994) of the U.S. National Survey of Families and Households. It was found that the more traditional the woman and the more traditional the marriage, the happier the woman was. Women were happier for their husbands to be breadwinners. So maybe the Australian lawyers are just reacting to the same forces?

Writers such as our own James Reed who sees some sort of conspiracy of feminists bringing down Western civilisation, should follow up this research (W. Bradford Wilcox and S.L. Nock, "What's Love Got To Do With It? Equality, Equity, Commitment and Women's Marital Equality", *Social Forces*, vol. 84, March 2006).

SOME REASONS FOR BEING GLAD (STILL)... by Peter Ewer: Yes, things are grim here in Australia – in a relative sense. Yes, the forces of darkness are closing in. But I just had a good walk in the Autumn sun and with loads of natural vitamin D in my system, I consider: In Saudi Arabia a woman filed harassment claims without being accompanied by a male relative. According to the group Human Rights Watch, she has been sentenced to 300 lashes and 18 months in gaol! Over in Iran a protestant clergyman has been gaoled for "converting Muslims" – he has been tortured and threatened with execution. In Pakistan a Christian couple received 75 years in gaol for allegedly touching the Qur'an with "dirty hands". This is said to be an offence of blasphemy. Stories like this, reported daily at www.jihadwatch.com make me glad to be in Australia.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$45.00 p.a.