A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 61 No. 44 **7th November 2025**

IN THIS ISSUE

What is an Opposition? By Neville Archibald

Forgive me for asking this question, but the word derives from opposite, or an opposing view. If we have Labor government, then the opposition would be another party, but different. If the left of politics is socialist, and claims the other side is right (and No, I don't mean correct!) then it should be defined by fascism – or right wing beliefs! You would expect the centre to be the point to aim for – a careful balance between the two.

What if I was to tell you that both are left wing, or socialist! Would you believe me or would you just ignore me as a ranting idiot who obviously doesn't know a thing about politics? What if I were to say they were both fascist? How could that be so, you are obviously delusional, Mr writer!

All I I know, is what I see! The pair of parties that run, and have run, this country into the ground over the past decades, have been steadily socialising this country and putting us firmly under their control via ever increasing restrictive legislation. Labelled Left or Right changes the level of control not one iota. Sometimes a particularly bad piece is defeated and one party will crow about it being their doing, yet in the next breath they are pushing another restrictive piece on us. The overall direction still has that 'left' lean to it (or is it a 'right' lean?). Before you wonder 'where has the 'right' gone, or you say we would be worse off under the right, let me describe a useful tool these labels are!

We swap one party for another, almost religiously every few elections. We don't so much as vote one IN, as vote one OUT. The charade of left and right has us believing we are acting safely, treading that safe centre position! The truth comes out when you examine the nature of man's governmental constructions. When you have too much government, it is suffocating. It is restrictive of every thing you wish to do. Whether it is a single overbearing

ruler, the fictitious Big Brother of 1984, or the reality of Hitler, Stalin, or another leader of a tin pot dictatorial regime. All those leaders have a group behind them, for they are essentially just a figure head for a larger group. They can be recognised by their outcomes, the control over their respective populations, and usually, their corruptions (they seem to go hand in hand).

If you disagree or protest, you are shut down, cut off, or worse, eliminated. When we have too little government, the population runs amok, and behaves as the whims of our upbringing enables us to do. We have Anarchy, no control! Disagreement reigns, survival of the brutalist, the strongest, most callous, they have the advantage, for they have no limits. At that point we must struggle again to reassert calm, form some collective group, or group of groups, to uphold some gradually defined concept of law and order!

Don't get me wrong, but I thought that was what we were trying for in creating representative government in the first place? We now seem content to sit back and allow special interest groups take all that we have struggled for, away from us. Maybe it is because the struggle, the fight was not ours and we are too far removed from the sacrifices our forebears made, we have forgotten and shamefully now hang our heads and say, 'but what can I do?'

Where we have two parties vying for control, and ever increasing restrictive laws, I say we do not have a balance between control (total government) and anarchy (no government at all) we have a biased scale, always tipped to the control side. Paint it whatever colour you like, call it whatever label you wish, but recognise it as what it is, biased! We have allowed the true beam of our scales to be weighted at one end, or perhaps the fulcrum has been shifted from under us. Do we have an opposition? Does this exist in the Coalition?

With a rising population clamouring for less migration, due to several factors, each as relevant to them as the other. The need to address this problem could be said to be important enough to take a stand on. The housing crisis, breakdown of the hospital system and it's ability to cope (even without a pandemic), and joblessness or unemployment figures being in reality far higher than admitted, are just a few of the flow on effects from our rapid population increase. These are some of the reasons people are taking to the streets, almost regularly now, and in large numbers. You are seeing it taking place, even in the controlled media, who do not report all that truthfully at times. It is hard to miss.

Why then, when senior members of this so called opposition, the coalition, make comments or ask questions about policy concerns (particularly on immigration numbers), are they sidelined, removed from the front bench or allowed to resign without properly addressing their concerns?

Recent manoeuvrings within the Coalition has seen a new Home Affairs

spokesman in Jonno Duniam. A recent article in the *Sydney Morning Herald,* entitled, 'With temperatures running high on immigration, the coalition's new shadow minister wants to lower the heat', questions the reaction to this rising problem. An interesting read. ***https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/with-temperatures-running-high-on-immigration-the-coalition-s-new-shadow-minister-wants-to-lower-the-heat-20251029-p5n6ac.html***

As I see it, the disconnect of politics with what Australians really want, is at the core of their problems! The coalition wants to be seen as putting forward a professional tone and united message. They want the same from the labor government also, so that they both play a part in lowering what is seen as community tension. The reasons for this high immigration and it's part in the plan for population growth, just needs to be better explained, by both parties!

Duriam is concerned, he says, 'I think my role, along with the minister, is to try and de-escalate some of these issues and just be business-like about it.'

The article then goes on to talk about, 'no magic number', and the issues within the party that were, 'the byproduct of a policy that has not been working well'. The debate over immigration and within the party seems to be going the way it is because, 'This lack of information results in a void, and what fills a void? Concern, sometimes conspiracy,'
and then, 'But I honestly think that you could take the temperature down quite a few degrees if you were open and transparent about it É I intend to try and, from our side, provide leadership in that direction.'

To be fair, he talks of them (labor) as trying to lure us into a trap about people with 'particular characteristics', (the old racist card of course, because, that is used to shut everyone up).

To my mind, the whole article and a couple more (one by Natassia Chrysanthos, SMH about Tony Burke's 'no magic number', say interesting things about our general direction. ***https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/burke-says-there-s-not-a-magic-number-in-immigration-debate-20251015-p5n2qe.html***

Both parties are content with immigration, only the levels need to be 'explained' better. The numbers are not so much the problem, as the way they can be shown to be propping up our economy. The whole, <u>it's just business</u> routine, is reflective of nearly all presented policies, on both sides. I have many people who keep telling me that all parties are now registered companies, something I should look deeper into I suppose, but since they act like they are, and the important issues they push look like a corporation trying to sell something distasteful to their consumers, I don't know that I need to. By their fruits ...

So in all, there is no real promise to do anything concrete, other than try to sell <u>it</u> better, whatever the 'it' ends up being. I see it mostly as damage control as Ley and others try to limit their slow disintegration. The trials of immigration are only one battlefield.

Net Zero the promise of a greener future! A concept that now seems to have run it's race in other countries and lost (and in some cases, China, never started at all; unless you count the large scale building of 'green energy solutions' to flog off to the rest of the delusional world). Yes, net zero, meaning a 'carbon balance'. A set of scales to measure CO2 input and output worldwide, because it is a 'dangerous and scary gas', to help us to restore a balance that we, as humans, have drastically and almost un**control**lably altered. Please note the bold word in there, control. For that is what this whole article, nay, our whole struggle is about! Control of populations to suit a small ruling elite, whether called WEF, IMF, UN or any other group that is trying to assert dominance over us (heaven forbid we should call it a conspiracy).

These groups push world views, of which 'net zero' is one. Never mind that CO2 is plant food, or that, of all the modelling done by computer, none really predicts correct out-comes, if you change their starting points. This 'solution' must be enacted! As a control mechanism, it could be said to be almost as good as the control of money, but that is another story.

Modelling needs a better examination, for I know many out there that truly believe we are damaging the world, and must do something. To them I say, I agree, we are! To be more explicit, I would say the way we allow, in the main, big business, to operate, is our fault. We have let them damage our environment in many ways, none so bad as built in obsolescence, or product for profit alone, that then has to be 'Sold' to us, rather than being asked for. The food that has been farmed, modified or transformed for profit despite the obvious damage it may be doing. (there are so many ways we wreck things around us, purely looking at them from a, profit motive is paramount, point of view). These are things we know and can see, and potentially do something about. Climate guesswork, we are still trying to understand!

To speak of modelling and understand where we are with this scientific endeavour, we must first realise our limitations, something that many zealous adherents don't seem to want to recognise. Data is data after all, and selling a good story, especially one tied to control, does not need to be perfect!
If you go to research data, such as that done by many different, true scientists, they will talk of their difficulties of prediction.
https://futurumcareers.com/how-past-climate-clues-can-help-predict-the-future

They recognise limitations and try to account for them. This area of study is relatively new in comparative terms, and has a long way to go. Making bold assertions from incomplete or inexact data sets can have enormous implications. The best you can say is, that they are trying. '*To predict the future, we need to know the past,*' says Liu. '*Climate models used to project future impacts need to be tested against past climate records.*' Professor Zhengyu Liu, of Ohio State

University.

I like this and other articles like it, for they will tell you of the uncertainties. '*Studying past climates provides a natural 'laboratory' to fully understand the Earth system beyond what people have measured directly in the last couple of centuries,' says Bette. 'The Earth's climate has fluctuated a lot in the past – it has gone through periods of much warmer and colder climates, and rapid transitions between the two.*'

Dr Bette Otto-Bliesner, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado.

The sources of information used to make these models and to assess them, are things like oxygen isotopes and CO2 in ice cores, dust, pollen and knowledge of plant life from sediment cores and may other paleodata sources. The things we have relied on for much of our historical guesswork over centuries of study. More power to them!

They say again, '*Neither of these methods give us a perfectly accurate window into the past, but by comparing results with each other and with other sources of paleodata, we can build a good picture. Being able to compare these deductions with computer models such as the CESM means there is even more room for taking a critical look and fine-tuning our knowledge of our planet's history ever further.*'

It is an ongoing research that is occurring. They admit that they find things that cannot be explained at this point, and hope to be able to relate other data to it to help them.

'*Scientists found an explanation for why this might have happened for those areas north of the equator: the Earth's orbit had a 'wobble' at the time, due to its gravitational interactions with other celestial bodies such as Jupiter and Saturn. This meant that the northern hemisphere was closer to the Sun in summer, leading to stronger summer temperatures that strengthened monsoon winds and led to more rainfall.*

However, large swathes of Africa south of the equator also experienced more rain, which cannot be explained by this wobble, since the southern hemisphere would be further from the Sun during its summer.'

Please don't get me wrong, I am not criticising these scientists for their work, I am pointing out just how much we still have to learn and fine tune our guesswork, our modelling. When we are talking complete changes to our lives, restrictions that will have dire consequences on our freedoms, and all over a small temperature rise prediction, one that they say they are still fine tuning, then what basis is this political control method made on?

So much more beneficial an impact could be made to our world by limiting the excesses of greed in the corporate world. By challenging the money power first, to stop the pursuit of profit over harms done in so many ways. By recognising

that world solutions rely on local actions; but, not as the WEF would have us believe, by giving them all the power, but by taking back this power locally. Where we can control it, where we can see the results directly. Not some abstract other world problem somewhere else. Local control is the only real effect we can both make and see. Some amorphous 'Net Zero', that relies on complicated scientific explanation (that is still being worked out) and the curtailment of basic freedoms (for some), will never be a solution which allows us to grow into a better place to live.

I stared out by talking of net zero, and the Lab/Lib adherence to some form of it. I will end with this also. Two parties pushing for the same outcomes, is not a choice! To bodies of thought, who differ only on petty things, still drive us into a state of total control over our lives. Energy is a means of control now, we are so reliant on it in everything we do. The imposition of a way to monitor and control it's use, justified vaguely by an incomplete theory, is another shackle to wear. Like money, the control of it will be a dangerous thing to give those whose actions show us what they are aiming for. The final nail, of course, is how to control those who don't accept these limitations. And here we have surveillance.

Digital ID. How are we to be scrutinised in our use of money, of energy, of any of the plethora of government restrictions. How can anyone keep tabs on what we do?

Enter the digital age! Computers are used everywhere, more smart devices are creeping into our lives everyday. Many ask if it is possible to have such control over us as individuals. The depiction of this overbearing suppression has been looked at as the subject of far fetched movies, or games, but it is now becoming reality, faster than we can keep up with.

The pending Age restriction ID being brought in in December, is not simply effecting under 16s and their access. To take part at all, one must prove they are over 16. A digital ID by default, for all users. Not only this 'new legislation,' but a continuance of the ongoing methods they are already using will result in all our ID being held by government. Including that of fingerprint, facial recognition and anything else that you have shared with them. Got your blood type on your hospital records?, is this tied in with medicare? Your phones now have fingerprint and facial recognition features, so the information is there for the harvesting, isn't it? COVID brought in tracing features, to enable where you had been, to be logged and checked. If you think any of this has been fully given up, you do not think like me! Our respective governments have shown, time after time, that they cannot be fully trusted, even if it is just the accidental 'privacy or data leaks'. This is your information they have and may be collating.

The next step is carbon credit linking. Do you really think they won't go there? They have accessed and stopped bank accounts of people in the past, so

it is possible in the future too. Just what justification they will use, will be up to who actually implements it. Whose power they use to make the call, will depend on the crisis being used to justify it! We have already been told it just a matter of time before the next pandemic happens! What then? We have allowed them to back the adoption of the WHO Pandemic Agreement, in May '25, all that remains is the signing in mid '26. After that, regulation and even potentially enforcement will be in the hands of this unelected body. One whose actions during the past 'pandemic' I see as questionable at best. Do we want more of this?

Signing up for any form of Digital ID will make you transparent in your thoughts, movements and purchases. All that needs to happen for it to become a monitoring system, is the right emergency! We are seeing civil unrest in many western countries, as governments refuse to listen to what the populations are asking for. Continued high immigration, of non compatible peoples, are causing friction in many places. Laws for some and not for others, continue to build this friction. All sorts of divisive policies are being pushed and creating conflict in communities. From gigantic wind farms and power lines, to allowing young repeat offenders out on bail, time after time. Here in Victoria it is becoming a very big issue, machete attacks across Melbourne being carried out almost nightly. The call on government to fix these immediate problems would seem to be of less interest than the pursuance of other agendas.

We have just had a treaty signed in Victoria, with people I should call 'first Nations'. But it has got that way, that I don't know what to call them, as some complain no matter what term we use. The Victorian Government is now under pressure from some aboriginal groups outside of Melbourne for the use of the term 'Gellung Warl'.

https://ipa.org.au/read/aboriginal-treaty-to-demolish-democracy-and-fairness-in-victoria-forever

Comments in many different articles, suggest that all is not rosy among First Nations tribes. The acceptance of both the words and the treaty itself, to represent all groups is not as widespread as the government would have us believe.

'There was no consent given, but they are doing it anyway, and they are just being very disrespectful.'

Aunty Cheryl objected to the creation of the Gellung Warl and added Kurnai elders do not support the treaty.'

This from the Daily mail. Other people commenting include ministers, whose constituents have already approached them.

We have already spent considerable time and money on Albanese's Voice, with a resounding NO across Australia. What right does the Victorian government think it has to just overlook this decision? Consultation and engagement appears to be limited and going by previous turnouts at 'Treaty elections' not that many

took part. To say it is an elected group that will represent them, is far from our Constitutional idea of a normal election.

This AI overview: ***Voter turnout in previous "treaty elections":*** *A related, but different, "treaty election" in 2019 had a very low turnout, with only about 2,000 ballots cast from a potential pool of 30,000 Victorian Aboriginal people.*

I was looking for actual detail on the efforts surrounding this bill, but either I am not capable of finding it, or it is submerged in other areas. With this bill is to going forward, can we now look forward to other countries treating us like they did South Africa, for it's apartheid policies? for that is the effective take on what we now have as far as I am concerned.

https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-15184199/Jacinta-Allan-Victoria-treaty-Kurnai.html

Difficulties within our communities, should be dealt with, with an even hand. There should only be one set of laws for everyone in this country. No ifs, buts, or maybes. We are supposed to be One Nation!

In another area, we see a juggling of wait times in a major Victorian hospital, according to, wait for it, race. ***https://www.facebook.com/JasonWood.updates/photos/labors-woke-hospital-agenda-provides-care-based-on-skin-colour-rather-than-need-/1384151253081804/***

The complaint was made that People of aboriginal background were not being seen in the ED department, quickly enough. This could be said for many people in our over-burdened systems. But now they seem to be making policy to address, what I see as potentially a triage complaint. When you present at the hospital ED, you are seen and categorised without bias. Purely on a needs basis. You are then to wait until more severe cases are dealt with. If this is failing, the problem, surely, is one of poor triage. I am not blaming the Drs or Nurses in this instance so much as the system. Proper triage takes time and is a critical call on expertise, the ED departments do a wonderful job as far as I have seen.

The biggest problem they all face, is overwork, or to put it another way, underfunding! In a situation like now, where we have just come out of a pandemic, and had money thrown into the system, left, right and centre, would we not expect, in these quieter times, to be blessed with an abundance?

Where is our system at? Who is responsible for it? Ultimately it is Government! Mr Andrews 4000 new beds? The constant revamping, Ambulance concerns and ramping problems? Were these even recognised by our government? And if so, what was done to solve them?

That we are pursuing a policy like this, of selective triage because of skin colour, in some hospital, is an admission of failure to respond to the difficulties ALL people face when in the hospital system. All these issues will only be resolved, when enough people continually contact and ask their local representatives to do something. No reaction from this contact, then leads to replacement at the next election. Replacement by someone who will be opposing current problems in policy, not just pretending to be in opposition to it. ***

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