A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 61 No. 36 **12th September 2025**

IN THIS ISSUE

Political Swear Words (How They Sway You) By Neville Archibald 49

Political Swear Words (How They Sway You) By Neville Archibald

There is probably little that is as effective as language when it comes to silencing someone. Guilt by association, just a possible connection or even just mentioning some words in the same sentence as someone, can work wonders on the minds of those who follow the media blindly. The terms used, don't even need to make sense if they are used in negative terms often enough.

We have witnessed the birth of a new one recently, in the use of the two words, 'Sovereign Citizen'. In itself it is, if not an oxymoron, a contradicting couple of words. Sovereign meaning: supreme & exempt from external control (of princes and the like usually); and Citizen: freeman of a city; civilian or inhabitant of a state. To use the two together is uncalled for and not a normal occurrence. Besides which, by being a citizen, you are claiming to be a part of a state as such, and therefore subject to it's limitations.

That aside; however, the correct usage of words needs not be a part of how they can be used, many such words used to smear people or demonise them, have little to do with who they really are. In the case of 'Sovereign Citizen', we are now seeing an attempt to associate these two words with police shooter, deranged thinker, someone who expects to be outside of our political system yet retain all the privileges of being a part of it. The essence of media and political intent, would seem to be to develop it as a pair of easily recognisable words that are almost like a marketing tool in reverse. To brand someone as being unstable, or worse, likely to engage in totally unacceptable behaviour, any claims they then may make would then be written off as the thoughts of a madman (not worth considering).

I have met a number of people who would now fit the media's definition, if not their own version of it. None to date have been violent criminals intending to hurt

everyone around them. Their main gripe has been over-government! If I were to sum them up (in my opinion only, and I hope they are comfortable with this) they mostly believe, like many of us I am sure, that our current governments no longer represent us as we would like them to. Continual raising of taxes, enacting of new laws (restrictions on what we can and can't do) and basic mismanagement of our systems, are all seen as a reason to opt out, they've had enough. The over the top and totalitarian enforcements of the Covid era, only reinforced this belief. Opting out of a system is always easier said than done. Yet despite this, many have tried.

We have seen Principalities emerge in the past, where someone has seceded from a state to create their own version a smaller yet seemingly independent state.
(The Principality of Hutt River, often referred to by its former name, the Hutt River Province, was a micro nation in Australia, proclaimed on 21 April 1970)

If you were to listen to the ABC you would find them saying, among other things:
"Australia has been home to more than a dozen different micronations, among the most in the world, including the Sovereign State of Aeterna Lucina and the Province of Bumbunga.
Ranging from well-meaning to absurd, they are not legally recognised by the Federal Government and seldom register in the national consciousness, beyond the occasional headline."

The Australian Government has not officially recognised any of them to date and taxes still had to be paid so it appears that the ABC would be right. Hutt River rejoined our nation in 2020.

Those attempts show that people have tried to escape the system before, the Sovereign Citizen movement is just a different take on the same thing, a desire to 'Stop the world I want to get off!'

So now we have a new tool for media to use to demonise ordinary people, whether they are part of this movement or not. No connection to group, has never stopped that practice in the past.

Another example is the word Racist. Used until it has lost all real meaning, it is trotted out as a classic stand-by. There does not even have to be any apparent racism present. If we have seen anything recently it has been this word overused to the hilt to describe those who believe immigration has surged out of control. Basic indicators like infrastructure not able to cope with the numbers of people using it and housing so much at a premium that many live on the streets; yet a request for a sane discussion is met with cries of this word at every turn. Race or make up of immigrants does not even need to be mentioned. Yet this word used; silences many, who are scared to be called names.

Antisemitism has also had a fair flogging too. The Israel/Palestine conflict has been a thorn in the side of world politics ever since the nation state of Israel was created. No matter which side you think you are on, you cannot deny it has destabilised the area and the tendrils of this dispute has reached into many nations worldwide, causing division in populations far, far removed from any part of the conflict.

In my opinion, I am Australian, it has nothing to do with me. I have no desire to fund either side in their complaints. Is that charitable of me? I really don't care anymore, once I may have, but the use to which I now see this conflict put, only makes me believe more, that it is continued only as a distraction from other more pressing internal battles going on in our own nations. It seems to escalate at very opportune times is all I will say.

Lets look at the actual word though, for it is interesting. As a swear word it seems to have no equal, all seem to quail before it.

Anti of course is opposite or against

Semetic is a bit more interesting (and I know no matter what I say about this word, someone will accuse me of being racist or anti Jewish or any other word they might deign to use – let them, to me they are only words not realities. All I am doing is talking about word origins here and the use and abuse of them. As a journalist it should be a sacred duty to keep these things accurate. The sad reflection of journalism in present times shows it is not so sacred anymore)

Who are the Semites that people are accused of being against? My dictionary and my bible both tell me they are the descendants of Shem, one of the sons of Noah. He gave rise to the Hebrew, Phoenician, Arabian and Assyrian peoples, the descendants whose speech is from the Semitic family of languages. History is an interesting mistress, it makes you question words at times. I know that language changes as we journey through generations, some listings for semitism now only include Jewish ideas and influence. This 'family' of tribes thus represented, need to sort themselves out. For one to claim to be more Semitic than the others, always amuses me. If you wish to say anti Jewish, why the heck don't they just say that.

When it comes to being opposed to some ideas (or policies – the way we intend to carry out those ideas) of course we all have some we support and others we don't. The intricate policies that are thrown up by parties in nations across the west have supporters and detractors – and we argue points in those before elections. Do they lock up or demonise one side or the other for opposing policy? Do they bay for blood or push to make it illegal?

Yet they do this with the far more important policies by which we base our laws and lifestyles. They slander with these swear words, the good intent of many who have a point of view to make known, especially if it contradicts prevailing political policy. Do we wish to cut off the hand of the thief? Or pluck out the eye of the lustful? No, we have transcended these crude retributions and as the New Testament, and Christ, has shown us; there are better ways. We give a chance for the sinner to repent and change, hoping that they do. In many other ways we have seen the barbaric practices of the old testament, of the Talmud, of the myriad other barbaric controls, removed from our justice system. This has not been by accident, nor has it been a bad development on the whole. Where mistakes can be forgiven, the clash of cultures can be minimised, can be worked through rationally. The sad situation in the Israel/Palestine continuous war is a result of lack of forgiveness on both sides.

This tooth for a tooth mentality, has seen this festering sore on the map continue almost unabated for almost eighty years. It has spilled over onto the world stage in so many ways and has caused unrest and violence across the globe. Christ himself would be horrified at the actions taken in the name of god, any god!

So for me to be anti eye-for-an-eye policy, do I get automatically lumped into the antisemitic label? Why is this sort of narrow mindedness so prevalent on the political sphere? I disagree on policy that causes disruption to a stable society, not the people of a race or culture.

Those who would settle and accept our values as a nation are welcomed, as they have been for most of my life. Those who would drive division are not. It really is that simple folks. Those that stand up and yell fire in a crowded theatre, so as to see a panic, are not welcome in the theatre. Their placing of our lives in the area of fun, or their right to see us squirm or to rip us off have no place in our legal systems, let alone our lives. We developed a justice system with laws to keep us within the bounds of what we have determined is decent. If someone steps outside of these they should be asked to be accountable for their actions.

Hiding behind swear words of Racism, or antisemitism, or any other accusation and not looking at the policy to be upheld, is a simple minded approach that will never solve anything, only create more division as one policy for some, gets allowed over another policy for others.

There are far more intricate subtleties in politics than just words and meanings as we get to see them. You can be anti-policy, if that policy is bad or corrupt, and still be friends with the people of a nation – especially when the governing body is at odds with its basic population's desires. We saw the rise of Hitler to the world stage and fought his policies: as we did Mussolini. Yet afterwards the many Germans and Italians who were forced to go along with them, eventually became a part of our world, and of our western culture. We are seeing bad policy in Australia now, by opposing it are we to be the enemy?

Take the other swear words continually trotted out by 'left' and 'right' equally.
Right wing, extreme right wing, far right, Nazi etc.
The left get called communists, Marxists, woke and more.
What do these thing really mean? To most they are just words associated with something bad and therefore, what is being described must be bad. Look away, keep away, shut down discussion, or in most cases just yell obscenities back and forth, don't look closely at what is being said. Logic and debate when it comes to this demonisation of a foe is no where to be seen.

The two most basic slurs revolve around left wing/right wing. Communist and Nazi, shall we break these down to see what the fuss is?

The Left, commonly called Communism or socialism, is rule by the state. As seen in the USSR (union of Soviet Socialist Republics) - note the word socialist! Commonly envisaged as ruled by a Stalin like figure. The politburo and all things cold war connected. A regime ruled over viscously by a party elite, where the masses

are downtrodden and poor. It is called left wing. Leftists believe it can be done properly so that all will partake in the wealth of the state equally. This has, of course, not been seen, the party corrupts and it becomes, as George Orwell depicted in Animal Farm, "all animals are equal but some are more equal than others"?
Thus you have a downtrodden people ruled over by an elite – a totalitarian government!

Now we go to the right, called variously Nazis, Fascists, far right, Hitler lovers etc. Nationalist, as if wishing to be a nation is a bad thing. But lets continue.

These swear words rely largely on the second world war and the demonisation of the Germans under Hitler. Who knows what Nazi stands for? Wiki's description is as good as any: "a member of the far-right National Socialist German Workers' Party." - note again, the use of the word Socialist. Wiki also says of Nazism: "Nazism is a form of fascism, with disdain for liberal democracy and the parliamentary system. Its beliefs include support for dictatorship, fervent antisemitism …"

So all far right or even right leaning people are tarred with this when being argued against or labelled. The connotation being that the atrocities of WW2 are fully in our minds.

My reading of this shows a rule by dictatorship! Again, a party with Hitler at the head. Reality: a totalitarian rule of a people by the few, who again consider themselves elites.
How do these terms left and right truly differ, both taken to extreme are

DICTATORSHIP BY AN ELITE.

Following both left and right policies to the end, will net the same result, thus the 'tweedledum' and 'tweedledee' of politics. The 'uni-party' descriptor which we have also seen rise as a political swear word, it has a definite basis in fact even if it has not been clearly explained. We have seen the results of both left (labor) and right (liberal) turning out to be the same thing – a progression towards rule over people, a party system dictatorship, rather than an elected re presentation, giving voice to the people.

So please let's be clear here, left and right are simply words used to separate us, to have us at each others throats. The loonies on both sides play to it; because, for many, it provides an outlet to be seen and heard. Others who wish to 'belong' also find some comfort in 'like family'.

Real Australians are neither, in practice! None, that I know, would be pushing for any form of totalitarian government, in fact most are reacting against it. The real situation we face is not left and right, but complete anarchy on one side and totalitarian rule on the other. We egalitarian Aussies, are somewhere in the middle. Just enough rule to keep us together peacefully and not too much to be overbearing and suppressive.

The word egalitarian means; "believing in or based on the principle that all people are equal and deserve equal rights and opportunities." wiki.

The poetry of Patterson and Lawson use that word to describe us Aussies, along with laconic, which could also describe our political beliefs as well as our speech, the

less used, the better.

When it comes to labels and political swear words, just remember the "sticks and stones" quotation of childhood. The "your mother wears army boots" slurs of youth. Long before we developed our reasoning skills, that was what we resorted to, to make someone feel isolated, to abuse them for no good reason. The sad fact of today is that those who still use these political swear words are much the same as they were before they grew up, they are still comparatively infantile, if they lack the ability to reason out and debate you intelligently on policy, then they bring out the words to silence you.

Your mother doesn't wear army boots, we may have to endure a few sticks and stones, but we should all stand tall, knowing we are the adults in these arguments!

==========

Charlie Kirk

After the writing of this article we have now seen the assassination of a prominent figure in the political arena in America, Charlie Kirk. It has left me aghast: appalled. Having watched many of his real life interactions with American youth, where he challenges them to step up and debate him; to stand up and question the arguments they are making for what they believe is a good cause. I can only imagine how anyone could hate him so vehemently that they would wish him dead. This silencing of a reasoned voice, a polite voice, a never raised in anger voice, one only interested in making the youth of America start to ask basic questions: is an outcome from the divisiveness being promoted as political interaction these days. The very words I have mentioned above, issued with an ignorance of what they truly mean or represent, is the very cause of this unthinking war between ideologies.

Where genuine people, with a genuine view, are silenced to further an elitist agenda, it can be described as nothing else. This is, sadly, the other way of silencing opposition. One that should never be resorted to in a sane and progressive society. One that wants to pride itself on inclusion and tolerance, has just shown how much of this very belief they have inside themselves. If at the core of their being there is a person wanting change for the betterment of mankind, this act has to make people question their actions, their motivation for spreading this hate of others who hold differing opinions to the point of taking the life of a passionate Christian who only wanted the world to be a better place.

As a debater and an educator, encouraging people to look deeply at what and why they believe, I don't know that he had an equal. On the world stage he was making a difference. A truly sad loss for decency and values everywhere.

R.I.P. Charlie Kirk.

League Objectives

(a) To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, to the Crown, and to the Country.

(b) To advocate genuine competitive individual enterprise and personal initiative.

(c) To defend private ownership and advocate its extension in order that individual freedom with security shall be available to all.

(d) To attack and expose government-by regulation and bureaucratic interference with economic and social activities.

(e) To take steps designed to secure to the individual very definite rights which no government can take away, and especially steps which defend the written constitution.

(f) To defend the Rule of law which makes all equal before the Law.

(g) To stress the value of our system of Common Law, originally built up in Great Britain, to protect the rights of the individual; and to that end, to expose corruption and partiality in all their forms.

(h) To expose the manner in which the safe guards of individual rights and liberties are being destroyed.

(I) To emphasise the value of the Senate and of Legislative Councils.

(j) To expose and oppose all anti-British propaganda and actions, irrespective of their origin.

(h) To take such other actions as may be deemed desirable to promote the policy of the League.

Social Credit is a name given to a certain movement of the human mind and spirit (not an organisation) which stems originally from the mind and writings of a man of great insight and genius, the late Clifford Hugh Douglas. Its aim is to 'bind back to reality' or 'express in practical terms' in the current world, especially the world of politics and economics, those beliefs about the nature of God and man and the Universe which constitute the Christian Faith, as delivered to us from our forefathers, and NOT as altered and perverted to suit current politics or economics, which stem from a non-Christian source. - G Dobbs

God is a trinity, a relational structure. Every work of the devil is to divide us into warring camps - East vs West, Ukraine vs Russia, Israel vs Palestine, Sport team A vs Sport team B, Liberal vs Labor, Democrat vs Republican, Husband vs Wife, Young vs Old. Resolution is to be found in upholding this relational structure, of the natural law, community, of discussion, love if you like.

The Australian League of Rights
National Seminar

Adelaide 11-12 October 2025

The Will To Power
The Will To Freedom

========

The Traditional Church -
Speaking to Power
delivered by Solicitor R Balzola

Uncovering The Douglas Social Credit Archives of Sir Walter Murdoch
delivered by Daniel L. Criddle

The Douglas Social Credit Solutions
delivered by Neville Archibald

Bookings via email to :: heritagebooks@alor.org or Mobile 0415527121

The Cross-Roads - Wednesday Morning Streaming

Our usual Broadcast / Podcast for Wednesday morning each week will now include streaming through Zoom technology. Should you wish to join us, simply click on the front page link in alor.org - just below the main menu items and before the videos.

While we won't be able to bring you 'live' into the show at the moment, the questions and statements from the chat box can be passed around the team to consider your thoughts.

We look forward to catching up and fielding your interaction across the panelists. This is a new initiative for ALOR, and you are most welcome.

Every Wednesday mornings at 1000 hrs ACST - (UTC + 9.30) via Zoom.

See you all there!

Annual Subscription to *'On Target'* $75.00 pa which includes an Insert, the On Target and the NewTimes Survey journals - printed and posted monthly.
Donations & Subscriptions can both be performed by Direct Bank Transfer to:
A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)
BSB 105-044
A/c No. 188-040-840
Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.
Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org
Online Bookstore : https://veritasbooks.com.au/
Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the Freedom Movement "Archives" :: https://alor.org/
On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks 13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.