

0.1. Still don't believe Conspiracy Theory?

0.1.1. So in this chapter I am including J Doe in with bloke, as the "screwees". **Here** is another abuse [against **old** blokes, not in the Smirk Future Fund] under the steerage of Captain Smirk, as ABC AM presenter Tony Eastley explained in an interview on 10 October 2007 with yet another quango/firewall called CEDA, per:

*PETER RYAN: So what you're saying is in line, pretty much, with what the Treasurer Peter Costello is saying - that the current **aged pension** and also superannuation planning is **not really sustainable** as it stands?*

But let's go back to the start of the discussion, per:

TONY EASTLEY: For many working people, retirement and the aged pension, can't come soon enough. But one of Australia's top economic think-tanks would like Australians to wait longer by extending the pension qualification age from 65 to 67. The Committee for Economic Development of Australia, or CEDA, wants to introduce the higher age by 2015, citing an ageing population. And in a report to be released today, CEDA, is urging both the Government and Opposition to link the pension age to life expectancy. CEDA's chief executive, David Byers, has been speaking with our business editor, Peter Ryan.

*DAVID BYERS: Back at the time that the pension was introduced 100 years ago, one of the **few people** who actually made it to 65, could expect to live for something like about 11.5 years. By 2001, that figure was up to around about 20, and as medical science continues and as the trends continue, we can look, by the middle of the century, to people having life expectancies who reach 65 to **still have another 30 years** of life in front of them.*

0.1.2. So what we have here is the exact same attitude used against me via Ms Patterson the **former** Minister for Families [until I truncated her rule - see blokesline.com], via her army of HLLs at Centrelink, aided by the subcontracted Catholic NGO CentreCare. It was said to me that it was **all my fault** that I had "survived" Vietnam conscription and threatened to become an imposition on Smirk. The woman told me [at age 61] "you will never get the pension, we can't afford it". The Royal plural of "we" was explained as being "Smirk and us femmos".

0.1.3. I should mention that I was very suspicious of the fact, as a Patterson personally selected **extreme** HLL Inquisitor/Terminator, she had removed her nameplate from her breastplate. For sure she was under "Terminate with Extreme Prejudice" orders, but happily it was Howard that had to terminate Patterson when all this "political terrorism" went pear shaped.

0.1.4. I told her that if I was a woman, I would **already** be on the pension. Well not quite correct [see table below] but the nameless one was also unsure and blurted out a Freudian Slip of "how did you know that?" In short the aim of this Smirk plan is to "help" people to stay employed so they don't "dither away" their final years on things like enjoyment. But there's more help folks, with "something in the air", per:

PETER RYAN: We're on the brink of a federal election - is this decision something that has to be made in the next term of the federal government, whoever is the winner?

*DAVID BYERS: I don't believe so. I think [sic] it's **something**, though, you know, as we **look out** sort of against a **backdrop** of **something** which, you know, this is **something** that we're **putting forth** an idea into the public domain on **something** which is really **gotta be debated** over a period of time [sic -*

going forward?]. [Editor: a perfect candidate for Weasel Word Award of the Year]

*We're not looking at any sort of changes to the current framework **until 2015**, that's eight years away. But I think it's a discussion that we need to start to have now so that we can ensure that we sort of think through exactly what this means, give ourselves time to adjust, but at the same time we do that against the reality of people living longer and **wanting to live more productive working lives**.*

0.1.5. So one might ask would a person of 65 years "life experience" not be able to make up their **own** mind about retirement? Also, no matter your intelligence level, I don't need to tell you that this whole argument is **self defeating** as women live much longer than men, suggesting [to me] men stay at 65 and women bunny hop to 70, with about \$20 billion saving. But I am getting ahead of myself, so to move on, going backwards and then going forward to the Smirk matters, we have:

PETER RYAN: So what sort of saving or additional money would this push into the overall economy?

DAVID BYERS: It would save the Federal Government around about \$800-million a year in pension payments.

0.1.6. So the reason I knew of this Secret Wimmens Business of Unequal Opportunity, is simply because it is on the Centrelink website, per:

You may get Age Pension if you:

- *are aged 65 years and over if you are a man, or*
- *are above certain qualifying ages for women (see the ages chart below)*

*Depending on their date of birth, women qualify for Age Pension at different ages. **By 2014**, the minimum qualifying age for women will be 65 years, making it the **same for everyone**.*

<i>Date of Birth</i>	<i>Qualification Age</i>
<i>1 July 1935 to 31 December 1936</i>	<i>60.5</i>
<i>1 January 1937 to 30 June 1938</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>1 July 1938 to 31 December 1939</i>	<i>61.5</i>
<i>1 January 1940 to 30 June 1941</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>1 July 1941 to 31 December 1942</i>	<i>62.5</i>
<i>1 January 1943 to 30 June 1944</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>1 July 1944 to 31 December 1945</i>	<i>63.5</i>
<i>1 January 1946 to 30 June 1947</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>1 July 1947 to 31 December 1948</i>	<i>64.5</i>
<i>1 January 1949 and later</i>	<i>65</i>

0.1.7. So back in Keating time, before Pru Goward came to power, it was realised that it was "unfair" that women get the pension at 60 and men at 65, so a 20 year ramp up was introduced in 1995. You will note the mention by "Biased Byers" of the year 2014, but no mention of the bias **already** in the system. And of course the ABC's business editor, Peter Ryan was not about to tell J Doe either, as he dutifully trod the Howard Congoline of Firewalls.

0.1.8. So it is rather ironic that the soft option by Keating to ramp up [rather than just do a full 5 year bunny hop as per CEDA], in order to "give equality without upsetting the female vote", did not work for him. My own ethical solution would have been to meet in the middle at 62.5 years, and ramp or bunny hop **if** required/desired [tick the box] from that point of equality.

0.1.9. So using CEDA's figures [albeit ABS says about three times their figure], the ramp up saves the gummt \$4 billion over the 20 years, whereas a bunny hop in 1995 would have got \$8 billion. So I suppose both sides of gummt can say that "delayed

equality" **did** save J Doe \$4 billion, but the numbers are peanuts compared to the overall Centrelink pensions, allowances, benefits and payments available to Buttercup once she goes for her DIP.

0.1.10. What is more, they are also tiny compared to the **assured** "pension" for Captain Smirk himself [and all those unfunded gummt employees] obtained by selling off the Telstra farm and putting the proceeds into Smirk's Future Fund.

0.1.11. So once again we have the same lies, lies and statistics used by gummts [on an easy audience] and nobody ever says anything. Well in fact, as well as busting Patterson, I also busted Telstra for a \$100 million overcharging fraud [see flyingfairy.net], so maybe in a few months when, but for an accident in gender, I too **would** be on the pension at age 63.5, I might challenge this whole farce in the courts, irrespective of Smirk steering the ship or counting his Super from the Future Fund.

0.1.12. So to answer conspiracy theory, whether using Smirkonomics or Parkinson/Byers Ethics, clearly this is not about money, and because of the total **ban** [for boffins and media alike] on mentioning the present [20 year long] Secret Wimmins Business racial discrimination, I would say with 99% assurance that it is purely a red herring to get old blokes "screaming their tits off" about a "something" that will never happen, but diverting any putative vision away from what should have been as obvious as the noses on their faces.

0.1.13. So the only difference in the [Hitler aided] Howard strategy here is that bloke is **older** than "bokus familus lawus" to whom the bulk of this book is directed. And yes, the "ethics" change too from Parkinson's father hating ones to Mr Something's work till you drop ones, but Howard has never been backward in using "boffins with ethics".

0.1.14. But as added proof [if needed] of conspiracy theory being correct related to this **new** [to me at least] Howard firewall, I sent them a letter ["for want of something better", per Clancy of the Overflow]. Or in fact, being post Clancy times, it was an email. I requested a password at CEDA so I could see the **full** report to see if **it** had any mention of the present discrimination. The reply was:

"I am unable to provide you with a password as you are not a member of CEDA."

The email also said:

CEDA brings together leaders in business, government, academia and the broader community to chart Australia's economic future.

0.1.15. Well now, firstly why is penny pinching from putative old age pensioner men top of the agenda for CEDA's vision/chart of economic future? Secondly, if that is so, then would it not be democratic to allow such old blokes [obviously not included in the Howardian "broader community"] to at least **see** the plan to starve them to death, so they might at least have a say in such economic future? Of course there was no reply to my email asking those questions. So I hope you understand by now the great number of Howard quangos/Gummt funded NGOs/firewalls, and secondly, how devious they are in their "toxic methodology".

0.1.16. And, as I say, this is all the more offensive given that Captain Smirk has assured his **own** "pension" [at about 20 times the Old Age Pension rate] by selling off the Telstra Farm [that the putative Old Age Pensioners actually **paid for** with 50 years of taxation] into Smirk's Future Fund. Could one possibly get more pig troughy/common swilly/porky barrelling than that?