



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 10

20th March 2026

IN THIS ISSUE

Free Speech is Dead? But Only for Some? By Neville Archibald

1

Free Speech is Dead? But Only for Some? By Neville Archibald

Arrests for six words, said or printed on a singlet! This is Queensland's state of affairs. The Palestinian protest rallies might get up your nose, or they might be just be your cup of tea, either way the right to say something is paramount if we are to have and keep free speech. Equating slogans or statements with weapons of terror or incitement is a fine line to walk. Truth then becomes subject to political power.

Ironically since 1977, the founding charter of Netanyahu's Likud Party says:

'between the [Mediterranean] Sea and the Jordan [River] there will only be Israeli sovereignty'.

'Last year, Netanyahu affirmed that Israel must have 'security control over the entire territory west of the Jordan River'. He added, 'That collides with the idea of [Palestinian] sovereignty. What can we do?

In addition, Israel has made extraterritorial gains in both Lebanon and Syria after degrading Hezbollah and striking both southern Syria and Iran. He has said the IDF's footprint in both countries will not be pulled back any time soon.

Arab and Muslim leaders have strongly condemned Netanyahu's references to a 'Greater Israel'. The US also has not publicly endorsed it, though the US ambassador to Israel, Mike Huckabee, has been a supporter of the idea.'

<https://www.uwa.edu.au/news/article/2025/september/is-netanyahu-on-a-mission-to-realise-a-greater-israel>

Contrast this comment with the desire of a free Palestinian people, who want their place in what is/was their own country up until they were forced to share it with a fledgling Israel. The continued loss of land that they face, shows no sign of being stopped, despite the many UN resolutions condemning it:

'Based on the language used by the Israeli leader and his extremist ministers, the creation of 'Greater Israel' appears to be a priority.

In recent weeks, Netanyahu has publicly alluded to this, saying he was 'very' connected to the idea.

The 'Greater Israel' phrase was used after the Six-Day War in 1967 to refer to the lands Israel had conquered: the West Bank, East Jerusalem, Gaza, the Golan Heights and the Sinai peninsula (which has since been returned to Egypt).

This concept was enshrined in 1977 in the founding charter of Netanyahu's Likud Party, which said 'between the [Mediterranean] Sea and the Jordan [River] there will only be Israeli sovereignty'.

Last year, Netanyahu affirmed that Israel must have 'security control over the entire territory west of the Jordan River'. He added, 'That collides with the idea of [Palestinian] sovereignty. What can we do?'

In addition, Israel has made extraterritorial gains in both Lebanon and Syria after degrading Hezbollah and striking both southern Syria and Iran. He has said the IDF's footprint in both countries will not be pulled back any time soon.'
<https://theconversation.com/is-benjamin-netanyahu-on-a-mission-to-realise-a-greater-israel-265662>

If the above two quotes are not to your liking, consider that the *Times of Israel*, has presented the same thing:

'The term Greater Israel was used after the Six Day War of June 1967 to refer to Israel and the areas it had just conquered — East Jerusalem, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Sinai Peninsula and the Golan Heights.

The phrase was also used by some early Zionists, including Zé'ev Jabotinsky, forerunner of Netanyahu's Likud party, to refer to present-day Israel, Gaza and the West Bank, and present-day Jordan.

Gal's question about his connection to the 'vision' of the Promised Land and Greater Israel comes after he asks the premier if he feels he is on a mission on behalf of the Jewish people. Netanyahu answers that he is 'on a mission of generations — there are generations of Jews that dreamt of coming here and generations of Jews who will come after us.'

'So if you're asking if I have a sense of mission, historically and spiritually, the answer is yes,' he says.'

https://www.timesofisrael.com/liveblog_entry/netanyahu-says-hes-on-a-historic-and-spiritual-mission-endorses-vision-of-greater-israel/

So here we have a series of admissions that the intention for a 'Greater Israel' includes all the land between the sea and the river. If this is not the same as the now banned saying, even though the words are reversed (expressing a desire to take land that was not originally granted them), then what truth is being denied

here and to whom. It can be hard to find a mention of the Zionist political desire in mainstream newspapers, and very few televised discussions on this subject are ever mentioned. Only in more recent times, as atrocities continue to mount and can no longer be ignored like before (largely due to citizen reporting via the web) has this intention really surfaced for the average punter. It has gone on for years in silence, to the frustration of many who could see.

Now that it can be seen, the control of who actually is allowed to say it (those six words) is to be taken out of the hands of those who might just point out an inconvenient truth. This is the power wielded by political control of speech! This shows a very real and dangerous precedent can be set, which ultimately paves the way for political restrictions far greater than many can imagine.

If a slogan is weaponized and used to incite, there are laws in place to deal with this incitement. If a rallying cry is used in leading a riot, then again, there are laws in place to deal with the actions thus caused. I believe that these powers have always been capable of use when needed, not to silence dissent; but to stop actions, which are the real problem. Do we stop the building of skyscrapers just because someone may suggest they are a good place to jump from? Is the architect or the builder held liable? Is the truth that a fall from a high place will kill you – incitement?

Truth in war-time is the first casualty. Declaring some truths to be more equal when said by one side in an argument is the very definition of a bias. There are always two sides to a story and open debate is the only way to reach some sort of conclusion, some form of justice between warring parties.

If we look at the 'Greater Israel Project' we see which desires need to be fulfilled to achieve it. If these come at a cost that is too much for a region, or for the surrounding countries, to take; then it can only lead to further conflict – even as this one is progressing. We need to be careful of which 'allowed' truth we then follow!

More on Free speech in social media?

John Ruddick MLC – Libertarian party, brings up the question of New South Wales now having, '... laws to unleash the police to door knock over social media posts.' In his post (taken from a speech in the NSW parliament recently), he says:

'On the 25th of February this year, Premier Minns announced a new Armed Response command. This has 250 police officers plus 28 admin staff. Not 25, 250. It's a rapid response unit to protect against hate related threats. The headline is that these 250 officers will police public protests.'

and, 'Premier Minns has described it as a 24/7 intelligence led unit, which is code for they'll be looking at social media all day. And when someone has met some threshold, some vague threshold under the new laws, then the rapid

response team will go door knocking.'

This is followed by a comment about a delegation of New South Wales police being sent to both Britain and Germany to learn best practice in anti hate policing! He rightly asks what this would look like. He also hopes he is wrong about the government's intentions, as do I; but the pictures coming from those examples overseas are not encouraging.

Anyone following the reactions in both of those countries would be able to see the huge number of arrests and prosecutions of ordinary people for speaking their mind: the death of the right to free speech is happening there! Are we to follow this? Given the New South Wales example above and the arrests during COVID, I think we have seen what will soon become a normal practice. How far will we allow this to go? Surely the push for information control and what I see as truth manipulation, with mis, dis and mal – information laws, shows us what might be possible! Do we sit quiet, or do we support the likes of John Ruddick MLC, Senator Ralph Babet, George Christensen, various One Nation members and others who show some opposition to this madness. We must!

These restrictive laws are being implemented in all states as well as federally. We must push back against them and ensure we can be heard. Both major parties want some form of control over this, they just vary the degree of control. The leading two party political past must become just that, the past! We must look to a future where each member is a supporter of OUR rights, over the right of government to legislate us into subservience. We still have the power at the ballot box. We still have the right to campaign for freedom and the right to select who represents us. We must ensure it becomes more important to us than next weeks footy game, and treat it as such!

A shorter working week!

In reaction to war-time shortages of fuel, Sri Lanka has announced a four day week!

Every Wednesday is now to be a holiday, some are being encouraged to work from home during the remaining week-days or where possible, and the country will continue to operate despite this. We saw something similar during COVID lock-downs, where whole populations were denied work unless they were deemed 'essential workers'. Many worked from home and many also received monetary compensation while being sidelined. Is this a reflection of actual work needed to keep a country going? Many of us are not really needed in the workforce? Is that to be a reality going forward? If Sri Lanka finds that despite war restrictions their population still survives, and does so on less hours worked, will they make the startling discovery that the truth is - we do not all need to work for so long!

The term, 'labour-saving' attached to devices, production upgrades and new technology developments: what part of the labour saved, is given to the community?

Who is it saved for? What happens to the wages no longer available due to labour not toiled over? If the production has increased and the money paid to workers lessened, who then affords to buy the material produced? Less wages in the system must equal less ability to buy! More production must mean more available to buy! Where does or how does the money needed to consume that production, come into existence if not in wages paid out? Is it borrowed? At interest? As a debt to be paid back? This must eventually result in the removal of even more money from the consumer spending side of the equation!

This imbalance is clearly set out in C.H. Douglas' A+B theorem.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20A-B-and-the-Bankers-CH-Douglas-New-Age-1925.pdf>

and also in an animation:

https://rumble.com/v5recmz-episode-31-the-a-b-theorem.html?e9s=src_v1_ucp_a

Is it any wonder that things are getting tighter as the economy grapples with this lack. One side of the production/consumption equation is out of balance! Economic gurus will find some answer to give. It will be explained or justified in their usual language, but the results will still be clear in the real world.

The average wage earner will fail to have enough to buy all that is produced. The excess product will be sold overseas or production will slow, but still the population will not have enough available money to buy it. Enter an injection of funds in some form, that occur without any productive work being done!

No readily saleable items will be produced by this work. Sadly much of it will be government work or make do jobs paid from taxes which takes further money out of consumer hands. The only other alternative is government borrowing, as we saw in lock-down. Countries around the world, found international debt piling up, as governments of all kinds paid out subsistence level incomes in lieu of a real wage. Debts climbed and we all still went on doing our thing. Some found it hard, while others (the wealthy) actually got wealthier:

'About \$42 trillion in new wealth was created in the first two years of the pandemic. Two-thirds of that has gone to the richest 1% of the world's people, according to a [report out Monday from the nonprofit organization Oxfam](#). In the United States, billionaires are a third richer now than they were before the pandemic.'

<https://www.marketplace.org/story/2023/01/16/how-the-worlds-richest-people-became-much-richer-during-the-pandemic>

So in effect, with many people doing nothing and being supported by government handouts, we all still survived. This is the reality of our modern production system. With the implementation of Labour saving processes, we don't need the labour component of everyone, at least not for a forty hour week, or a 35 hour week, or even a ten hour week. Back in the 1920s it was estimated that the British people only needed to work for 5 hours a week to produce all they needed. The problem was, the distribution of the wealth in terms of money available to all to buy that production.

This whole argument is the basis of our dilemma, one that C.H. Douglas spent his life trying to tell the world about. Strong opposition by those 'wealthiest' who gained control over the production system was the main reason for the dismissal of his ideas. The other reasons are the same those we face today, an unwillingness to look at the problem and a collective spell cast over us by our education system and financial chicanery. There is also the idea that only really smart people make money – are you not smart? So we don't look too closely.

If Sri Lanka makes this work (as we did over COVID) then the writing must surely be on the wall for recognising this truth. That is if war doesn't get in the way!

A Rude Awakening.

Not long after Pauline Hanson was criticised for talking about Islamic radicalisation in Lakemba, <https://www.facebook.com/reel/1623340392027162> our Prime Minister and his off-sider Mr Burke attended a Mosque in that very area. While I am not entirely sure of the motive they had in mind, the outcome saw a hasty exit with worried faces, surrounded by security. Many angry shouts and gestures represented either just a basic general hatred of our Prime Minister, some form of resentment at non-believers being allowed in at such a time (the end of Ramadan) or even just our government's 'support' for Israel. Little respect for the office of Prime Minister, or our government in general, was shown by those disrupting.

The people who advise our 'leaders', would do well to revisit the intention, or expected outcome required, and whether or not their presence was such a good idea!

If it was to put to rest, Pauline's concerns or to 'show her up', I believe it backfired badly.

Pauline was roundly criticised for what she said in the above ABC interview and the one previous to that, on Sky. If you listen to what Pauline did say, the reaction she received seems to have been focused on what they would like you to believe she said, rather than what she actually did say. The usual misinterpretations were applied and Pauline once again demonised. The real risks

we face from radical Islam is the subject she was raising, but this was not adequately addressed. (Even ASIO, with 18,000 on the terrorism watch-list admits we are at risk). This risk is a real one and it is important to both our security and to the continuation of our culture that we address these concerns. I cannot understand why other cultures can keep and celebrate theirs, while we must suppress and apologise for ours! This is the essence of what I believe Pauline is trying to put forward. People like the two beating the above hasty exit, would have us believe we must change our society to suit those coming here for a better life. No wonder really, that there are many who have little that is nice to say about them.

I must admit, many people I know, (myself included) would not be particularly welcoming to either of them at any function we might hold either. Not that we'd issue threats or the like, but very few would see it as a highlight! ***

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 propoganda and actions, irrespective of their origin.
- (h) To take such other actions as may be deemed desirable to promote the policy of the League.

Annual Subscription to 'On Target' \$75.00 pa which includes an Insert, the On Target and the NewTimes Survey journals - **printed and posted monthly.**

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.