A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 41 **23rd October 2026**

IN THIS ISSUE

Ideology, Lowering Our Standards, Rather Than Raising Us! By Neville Archibald 1

Ideology, Lowering Our Standards, Rather Than Raising Us!
Neville Archibald

History alone does nothing towards solving the problems of our interaction with other nations. I guess it will not do so either, until we do it! What it does provide; however, is the evidence we need to interpret the outcomes of policy. The continued election of one party or another will not change anything, unless the basic policy changes. When it does not, how can we expect to see an improvement!

We have confronted the inequalities of trade many times, yet the final word seems to be that a "favourable balance of trade", pushed by all the major parties, is one where we give away more than we get! How that is favourable is anyone's guess.

Add to that, the decline we are experiencing in quality of life and the restrictions on individual freedoms we are experiencing, and you must question how it is that this problem is never truly addressed?

The concept of trading 'like-for-like,' or bargaining for advantage, has been usurped by our "debt" fixated money system, where the best thing we can achieve is a fictional surplus of accounting entries. The ability of some nations to produce, in quantity, items for export, often denies the fact that their populations are starving or suffer from a poor quality of life! Living standards in poorer countries are 'normalised' and countries/corporations justify the use of this 'cheap labour' as though, "it is the third world, what do you expect?"

When I examine those last statements, I wonder why this is still so? The object of selling our industry offshore (the LIMA declaration), was to raise those third world standards. We see instead, a lowering of our standards by

almost every metric that keeps our social cohesion strong. Instead of helping these poorer countries to raise themselves, we have ended up enriching corporations and lowering our standards.

Like for like, has always been the outcome of bartering. Getting an advantage is eventually weighed up to include man hours, scarcity, desirability or prestige. In short, individual acceptance by individuals who come to agreement.

Now that our "world money crafters" (the international banking fraternity) are involved, the individual side of trading has largely disappeared. We might make individual decisions on import or export trade items; but the rate of exchange and the mechanics of any interaction are all channelled through financial services that are outside of our control. Limitations via government (both this country and the reciprocal one) apply. Instead of our money representing our work, and the issuing of it relating to our capability as a nation, this outside source lends the concept of our ability to us and expects repayment in real wealth. Lending us a concept and gaining real wealth from it, is just as easily done by our Government (therefore keeping this wealth in the nations hands). Why the Bruce-Paige government, in 1924, emasculated our Commonwealth bank (who were doing this well) and transferred this power to the international banks is a question very close to treason as far as I am concerned. Since then our debt has only increased, despite our productive ability rising many-fold.

As we have advanced, and I use that word cautiously, the ideological pressure from feel good agreements like the oft mentioned LIMA declaration, have shaped our interactions. As I said, the raising of the third world has not really eventuated, but the lowering of ours has!

Why, as we have advanced, has there been a need to 'balance out' this difference? Surely any advance could be shared to bring all up to the same level. Just because one group has an improved four wheel cart and the other none, should not mean we halve the difference and each make do with a two wheeler, or even further shared out - and use wheel barrows. This makes no sense at all (except to those fixated solely on finance). As I see it, the object of advancement is improvement, both in terms of human satisfaction and it's continuance (that it can be sustained). We are building not for the short term, but into the future, with all that that entails.

How we have gone about this in the political sphere, can be seen by looking at history. As Eric Butler was always fond of saying, "history is simply crystallised politics". In the study of history we can see the decisions that have started trends and those that have continued them. The forces behind these policies are harder to see, but they are there! History is not

made in a vacuum. The best informed and those who can see clearest are those that take the time to read that history, it is there for anyone with the available time. ***https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Amos%20DJ%20-%20Commonwealth%20Bank.pdf***

Manipulation of culture.

Along with policy, cultural or public opinion must be manipulated too, to make any change less evident. Things that may have seemed like common sense once-upon-a-time, have needed alteration to allow for this change. Our perceptions have been clouded by the dialectic argument in many cases, or most recently, by fear!

Barriers have been placed in our path towards improvement, both in the third world and here. The biggest of these is financial restriction. As I said before, the balancing out between countries that are 'rich' and 'poor' was never required. Technology and ability to implement it, has always been something that can be done at any time, in any place. All it requires is the will of the people, and the leaders they have, to do it. If they can feed themselves, provide the education and the skills upgrades to make that change, then it can be done. The only limiting factor has been the medium of exchange to allow it to happen – Money! An abstract barrier between potential and reality.

Political reasons exist for this so called 'barrier.' It takes on many forms and has been in place often posing as ideological compromises. The turn of the century (1900s) saw Protectionist and Free Traders arguing in our parliament. Many who wished to advance the production and self sufficiency of this newly formed federation, pushed for Protection from the unscrupulous who would take advantage, and to allow fledgling businesses to build enough resilience to cope on the world stage. In later years this was changed to reflect anti dumping laws, 1947 and again in the 90s. No matter who looked at these trades, the ear of government was often found captured by self interested parties, whose only concern was the profit of the company, not the effect on the country or it's inhabitants. Each time these concerns have been revisited, we see the same outcomes, from the same policies. No lessons of history are taken into account.

The concept of Free-trade has been linked to efficiency of production and the limiting of subsidising, (or the use of public money – taxes - to prop up industries that should be capable of surviving on their own). The use of public money in this manner is almost always portrayed as 'milking the system,' whereas that part of the problem is easily enough controlled with correct oversight. Enabling the independence of the country, in all spheres,

should be of prime concern. That we must be able to stand on our own for all the necessaries of life, should be self evident. Now more than ever, with the disruption of war in the middle east, this should be apparent. Sadly this self interest has been portrayed as somehow evil! The idea that we should look after our own first, so that we are then able to help others, has been corrupted to look like we are acting superior. That this is merely 'white privilege,' where looking after our own first is a bad thing.

Structuring our taxation and trade policies, to reflect a bias towards the third world to help them, has been at the cost of our own industries. Our own people have borne the brunt of these 'equalising' policies. Our acceptance of these attitudes has been largely due to the 'spin' promoting it. Spin pushed by those who have gained from it.

With tariffs and trade in the public eye again now, I thought I might reprint an article from the turn of that century and ask if it is really any different now? if not, why not? Surely we have moved forward since then!

"WHAT'S IN A NAME?
TO THE EDITOR OF THE FREE PRESS - 1901.

Sir, - I heard a gentleman say a few days ago, " So far as the Commonwealth is concerned Free-Trade and Protection are both dead." Doubtless, what he implied was that neither policy would be put into force but that a compromise tariff would be carried which, whilst giving some slight protection, would yet not be considered a protectionist tariff; and, similarly, Free Traders could not claim a victory for their policy. That is Mr Barton's policy. Is there any need, however, to compromise between Free-Trade and Protection?

I wish, Sir, in this letter to show there is no such need. Accepting the term "Protection" as meaning a tariff which will check imports and enable manufacturers to charge higher prices for their productions; and accepting "Free-Trade" at a tariff fixed so low as not to check importations, I will use these definitions as a basis. (I am aware that neither definition will satisfy the ultras, but at present I am addressing the moderates.)

Both Mr Barton and Mr Reid stand pledged to a tariff which will yield a revenue sufficient for Federal purposes, and to return to the States a sum equivalent to their Customs and excise duties for the past year. Mr Barton, however, backed by a large number of weak-kneed Free-Traders, intends to give incidental protection to some industries; whilst Mr Reid would have no duties so high as to divert money! into his own pocket which should go into the national treasury. The difference between the two tariffs of these respective

leaders may be infinitesimal in regard to the amount of duties fixed, but immense issues hang upon that difference. If the tariff is called "Free-Trade," it will be possible to always keep it at such a level as to bring to the treasury all the revenue required: but if it gives the smallest amount of protection, and the name "Protective tariff" attaches to it, the seed is sown which will eventually grow into the upas tree of prohibition. (upas tree is a term used to describe any harmful, toxic, or deadly influence or institution. From the poison dart tree of Java. Ed).

When protection was established in Victoria 30 years ago, 10 per cent, to 15 per cent, was the utmost protection asked for, "Just to put the infant industries on their feet," and in a few years, it was promised, they would be able to stand alone. The infant grew, however, only in lung power, which used to cry "more" and yet "more," until the 15 per cents had grown to be 45 per cents, and the infants (so they said) were still unable to stand alone. (Let me point out in parenthesis that they can not only stand alone in other States, but also fight their own battles - to wit, starch, candles & binder-twine.)

Now what has been the experience in Victoria will also be the experience in the Commonwealth. Once you admit the principle of protection, and the primary industries of the country - farming, dairying, mining, fruit growing, &c. - will be delivered over, bound hand and foot, to the secondary or manufactory industries. The Reid policy is to place both classes of industries on the same footing, both meeting the world in open competition.

The Barton policy will give some shelter to the secondary industries (which may be relied upon to increase that shelter as rapidly as opportunity offers), whilst the primary industries are left to face the open competition of the world, and provide the shelter for the manufacturers. In conclusion, Sir, I would strongly advise your readers, during the interval before the Federal elections, to put on their thinking caps and think hard where the "incidental protection" will come from which Mr Barton promises the manufacturers. - Tours, &c.,

COMMONWEAL.

Kyabram,

Kyabram Free Press Jan 28th 1901.

Since this letter was published we have seen many changes, but few have kept our independence forefront. The primary Industry mentioned, has become subservient to secondary (in most cases large corporations) and are now price takers. The 'fair price' for production has not eventuated, bias

towards big business has resulted in primary production becoming bigger business as well, to the detriment of both social and ecological outcomes. Ideological changes start like this, the questioning of a fundamental assumption. There is often no real basis behind the change (other than financial), and somehow a moral or guilt invoking premise is inserted. It ends up levelling the world downward, before we can realise the abundance and the promise that true use of technology can lead us to! One hundred and twenty-five years later, we are still arguing like the outcomes are not known. Does no one read history in parliament?

The demonising of CO^2 (once a known growth enhancer and promoted for use in hothouses), is a classic example. Misleading information, predictions based on computational guesswork, and profiteering by those who have the 'solutions', and the use of both fear and guilt combined, stifles true debate. Meanwhile we further dismantle our industries and lives, while other countries forge ahead using old technology and no one says boo! The extravagances of those crying wolf the loudest, should be the first indicator that something does not gel.

If this were an isolated example I would be less concerned; but the corruption of our advancement in all spheres is evident, if only we look. Cultural as well as technological advancement is stifled by profiteering and the consolidation of power. A program of reducing our social cohesion is in full swing, as groups among us continue to divide us so that we offer less informed resistance, the political parties in particular. Then they have the audacity to call out those who complain of this disruption, as if they are the ones creating it.

Over time we are supposed to become smarter, we are supposed to learn from history. That we are still debating Tariffs and Free trade convinces me of only one thing – someone is pulling the strings for power and profit – and it is not for our common benefit. Our job is to wake up to these methods of control. We do not have to understand all the technical details of an argument, we just need to look where it will eventually lead us. If that end point, is more power taken from us, then we must examine carefully the motives of those promoting it and take the time to follow the money – that is usually the biggest indicator.

In a Nutshell:

We give away more than we get in return (our 'favourable' balance of trade), we make more than we can consume (thus the reason we fight for exports), yet with all this excess we can not buy enough of it ourselves. Many in our communities go hungry, or face homelessness.

I'm sure you all know of some local factory or producer who could ramp up their production and prosper, if only the public would buy more! If only they could 'find' a market!

These difficulties are common the world over, and export wars or tariff introductions or subsidies are the attempt to 'fix' the problems. No one looks at the money system and says, "it is simply an accountancy problem!" No one but we Douglas Social Crediters that is.

In a world where the problem of production has been solved, we are failing to recognise that the real problem is how to distribute it. Tying income to work, in a labour saved economy, is not admitting we have inherited gains from our industrial advances. If it takes only a portion of our workforce to do what it used to take most of us, then some of must miss out on the 'work' aspect!

What we should not miss out on, is a share of that production! It is our inherited wealth, a natural dividend or consequence of our advancement!

We are foolish to insist that we all must find new work to earn income, when we already have all we need being produced by fewer people. Ideally we should either work less hours for the same pay, or a National dividend is paid to us to allow us to access this production. The days of income (spending money) only being obtained through work hours, is over. Modern day slavery (the use of machines) should see us all far better off than we are. Something is wrong in a system that cannot or will not see this problem for what it is. Once you realise that, any solution promised must address the connection between income and work, otherwise it is just another band-aid! Something to keep in mind when questioning your potential candidates at election time. If they have no answer for this, or they cannot see how this effects the economy, then perhaps they need to learn or else go down the list in favour of someone who does understand it MUST be addressed. ***

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.