



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 05

13th February 2026

IN THIS ISSUE

Does Democracy Need a Warning? By Neville Archibald

1

Does Democracy Need a Warning? By Neville Archibald

In the preface of *Warning Democracy* C.H.Douglas. It starts:

In 'Warning Democracy' Major Douglas speaks colloquially of political events and prospects in the light of his famous Social Credit proposals. The titles of his nineteen chapters are indicative of the enormous range of topics covered. For the reader who has already concluded that something must be rotten in the state where poverty stalks the land in spite of a hundred and fifty years of invention to increase the output of goods, Major Douglas's lucid and non-technical essays constitute an initiation into fundamental causes and remedies.

The words of this series of addresses might have been written between 1920 and 1931, but the reason for them is still the same today. Douglas was often fond of repeating that: "*Systems were made for man, and not man for systems, and the interest of man which is self-development, is above all systems, whether theological, political or economic*" (The philosophy is espoused further in his book: *Economic Democracy*.) It is this very problem that we face today, more than ever!

Every time a problem arises between yourself and your government, ask yourself why? The answer usually comes down to, 'that's just the way the system works!' or in your case, doesn't work!

Disenfranchisement with government departments and bureaucratic process, has been steadily increasing since Douglas first wrote those words. Our usually tolerant nature has allowed more and more of this disengagement of individual outcomes, until it has become the more structured, 'what part of the system do you fit into'. It may not sound like a

big difference initially, but it is at the core of our very problem. Continued law making and amending, sees an ever increasing reliance on knowing the 'law' in regard to personal outcomes, than it does allowing for common sense; backed by a generalised brief to instruct intent. The reliance on these laws and the dependence on the written clauses, means that 'common sense' cannot prevail and what we then find is that, what is not exercised is lost. We all wonder why there is a shortage of it these days (common sense), I contend that it has been programmed into us to look for what the books say, and now, what the internet says. From 'how to' videos to legal advice or accounting advice, our everyday life is subject to a plethora of rules and regulations to be followed. From waiting for a red light or turn arrow at midnight, when there is no traffic (the camera might get you!), to the newly instituted 'hate speech laws', where you are told what you can and cannot say!

Each of these system requirements means you must fit in, no matter what the circumstances and it is set up to punish us if we do not.

Governments and bureaucracy both, love to exercise control and have become experts at using these systems to further limit the possibility of someone having an alternate opinion.

Take increased gun laws, if no guns are available (goes the concept) , no one can be shot. The same could be said of anything we have around us. No cars so no road fatalities, no knives, so no stabbings, even down to no ropes, so no one can hang themselves. Where do we stop?

We stop at common sense! The very thing being limited.

Why this rambling? It does serve a purpose and does relate to Douglas' original quote and the words: *'For the reader who has already concluded that something must be rotten in the state where poverty stalks the land in spite of a hundred and fifty years of invention to increase the output of goods, ...'*

Common sense would suggest that since both output and ability have increased far more than necessary to achieve a life of plenty, why are so many now almost destitute? Farmers grow far more than we need (witness the waste and inability to find markets), factories can turn out far more product, of all kinds, than they can sell! Most actually scale down ability, so as not to 'oversupply the market'. What is that all about?

Somewhere in there, the 'system' is faulty! And yet we do not seem to be able to see this. The entire financial system, based on a faulty premise, only ever results in increased debt. The solutions 'sold' to us are not real solutions, but just different ways to sink the boat. One part of the uni-party urges us to battle inflation, for the other the battle is more about interest rates. What we don't seem to connect with, is the fact that both decrease our real wealth. Alternating

between which of the holes in the boat we cover, doesn't stop it from sinking. The biggest reason I can find for this is, the ability of others to 'sell' their views on the subject at hand as though they were the only solution there is. In some cases only two solutions are offered, neither of which is a real solution. We are then urged to fight for the one we believe is 'best sold'. We are arranged into opposing teams, no matter what the issue, to play a game whose very rules are fixed. There can be no winner. We are given false visions, or we are distracted by what I term, crises acting.

Let's take a look at what we are seeing presently.

The leadership challenge within the Liberal party, does it really matter? We have seen the actions of the party when it comes to the crunch, time after time. They follow on in the same direction as before, with just a small tweaking of personalities and perhaps if we are lucky, a slower rate of change. Is it ever the change we want? Or does it still end up being just a show to convince us they might be more reasonable this time. That the brand now has a better face.

In case you are wondering, the new leader, Angus Taylor, was absent from the vote on the hate speech laws. In fact for some reason he was absent from the vote on 32 out of 72 bills voted on in 2024 (As listed in the, 'they vote for you' website).

https://theyvoteforyou.org.au/people/representatives/hume/angus_taylor/friends

We also find that he and the former leader voted 99.5% the same in the cases where they both attended. So will he make a difference? According to that same website, he never rebels, that would mean that he always follows the party line. The statistics of voting may vary and being marked as absentee may well be a legitimate thing, but I would like to think this shows something. That the smoke and mirrors of the challenge, is more akin to a deflection of policy scrutiny. Watch the show, don't ask the hard questions!

With the hype around gun laws, resulting from the Bondi terror attack waning, it seems not enough news is demonising gun owners presently. So to boost the scare factor, several media outlets ran with the worry about the 71% 'increase in new firearm licence applications'. Pushed as if these were all new gun purchases or new gun owners, they missed the mark completely. Gun laws changed the categories into which many firearms fell. If your currently owned gun changed category, of course you needed to re apply for a new permit. If the number of guns you had was more than 4, then someone else in your family perhaps applied. The statistics are once again chosen for their fear factor to influence the general public who do not look so deeply at things they know little about. Couple this with the relatively small numbers we are talking, and any increase becomes statistically significant.

Focusing on things like the increase in people looking to be firearm collectors

(7000% increase) sounds impressive, yet for those who already had more than 4 firearms it became just another way to keep those they already had. There is a lot more statistical 'scaremongering' that would truly fit the category of misinformation, if it were not for the fact that this fits the narrative they are trying to pursue. System changes that alter perception of what is going on, seems to have reached an all-time high! Nothing we are being told about this subject seems to be in any way relevant to the fact that a terrorist attack was carried out, despite adequate laws being in place. The failure to respond prior is something that should be headlining the news. Instead, legitimate gun owners have become the target.

The Israel and Palestine subject, a continual source of protest and violence on our streets is also being used to stir us into taking a side. Both are a long way away, both involve people who are not a part of our country. Yet the division we are being constantly bombarded by takes up a large portion of our news every night.

We have no real say in the outcome, for they are both other countries, but we find a large portion of our political time is taken up with it. Imagine for a moment that we are looking globally. Sudan, Myanmar, Syria, Yemen, the democratic republic of Congo and Burkina Faso; are all still at war. Who has even heard of the last one?

Of these countries, Sudan, Yemen, Myanmar and Syria; are persecuting Christians en-masse, yet we hear little to nothing of it!

<https://www.vaticannews.va/en/church/news/2026-01/open-doors-world-watch-list-2026-report-christians-persecuted.html>

<https://www.opendoors.org.au/world-watch-list/>

The reason it is being 'promoted' for want of a better word – to keep us from concentrating on the other stories that show our political leaders for what they are.

We live in an increasingly violent world, many struggling to stay alive in dire circumstances, including civil wars (struggle for political control) and ideological conflicts. Much of this is exacerbated by poverty. In this abundant world we have the ability to ensure this 'poverty' could be removed. Still we cling to the false financial beliefs that despite every advance we have made, we are now poorer than ever and cannot even help ourselves.

The first step to seeing these ridiculous reasons for our own poverty, is understanding. Understanding that it need not be so. The study of Social Credit, as Douglas saw it, is a way of looking anew at the issues we face. Looking at the world as it is, with a knowledge that the improvements we can make are huge, given just the will to do it.

In his *Approach to Reality*, Douglas takes you through our associations and their relationship to individuals, as well as a look at the purpose of the employment system, as both he and Keynes see it. He then takes us through some of the reasons we are being 'governed by money' and not enabled by it. An easy 12 page read.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Approach%20to%20Reality.pdf>

In *Dictatorship by Taxation*, he shows the difference between money and wealth, who really should own it, a proposal to the New Zealand government in 1934 to help fix monetary problems and then how we are being punished by the tax system, rather than the alternative – benefited by public works. Also a short read of 18 pages.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Dictatorship%20by%20Taxation.pdf>

More Snouts in the trough!

There has been talk of bringing the numbers of senators in the two territories, from two to four and possibly even six.

<https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/aug/06/labor-national-conference-northern-territory-nt-act-senators-referendums-territorians>

While it started in 2023 as a parliamentary inquiry to improve representation, it was again revisited in April 2025 as a consideration by Labor, if elected. Murmurings have continued since.

Our Australian Constitution allows for further numbers of political representatives to be added, with a formula for the numbers and population statistics considered. In the past there have been two increases, one in 1949 and again in 1984. In 1975, two Senators each were added for the ACT and the Northern Territory.

While I have no qualms about increasing the ability to 'represent' a given population, I am cynic enough to see potential reasons for doing so.

In the case of the ACT, we would see a bias towards the political party system as the residents, in greater proportion, rely on government for their jobs. It allows for the two party system to keep its advantage. I am not saying that these people should not have a say in the running of the country, but we must also realise that as with city centred population bases, this lopsidedness distorts the ability of rural populations to have any real say over what happens to them. This divide is already quite wide, and many look on with despair at it growing further.

So much so that there have already been ideas floated to form a separate Riverina State.

Poor decisions and a growing frustration at lack of any input into government policy, has seen the formation of a group called REXITAU. <https://rexit.au/riverina.php>

Made up of land in NSW and Victoria adjoining the Murray river, the idea was first floated by a Senator Charles Hardy in 1931. It has gained popularity recently through a desire for the regional centres to get their voices not only heard, but taken notice of. There is no doubt that many rural people see the State and Federal Governments as city centred. Victoria stops just outside Melbourne for many, as does NSW stop once you are over the dividing range. This disenfranchisement we spoke of earlier, is the very thing pushing it. To have more politicians in city areas, as many would see the extra Senators, would be another reason to push for succession into a new state.

Once again, our Constitution allows for the creation of new states, but it is up to the parliament to do it. The push for what they currently appear to want, would further their hold on power as far as I can see. To divest this power to a 'Rural State' would be an anathema to them.

This scene is being played out elsewhere as people in western countries try to come to grips with their loss of control over the political elite. In the UK, in Scotland, in the US there have been attempts; and now in Alberta Canada moves are afoot for the western states to separate from Quebec and the eastern states. *'Organizers of the Alberta independence movement are collecting signatures in order to trigger a referendum in that province. The pro-independence campaign has been travelling across the province as organizers try to collect nearly 178,000 signatures over the next few months.'* <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/eby-alberta-separatism-9.7066320>

If this shows anything, it is that political systems the world over are 'on the nose'. True public representation is being seen as absent from everyday processes. The push for some form of world homogenised government is becoming clearer by the day. Governments are finding ways to help them keep control in this changing environment, one way which does not seem to occur to them is actually representing the people.

To ensure you have some knowledge of what these attempts are about, you could consider the reasons behind federation in this country and in looking at federalism more broadly. The concept of federalism – as a safeguard for the independence of the individual, has been shown to work well. It is just that we do not own it anymore! We have sold it off to Parties, to decide what is best for us. We vote once every three years and go back to sleep. To take back our independence we need to understand our processes and the reasons we chose them in the first place.

I have been reading: *Ten Advantages of a Federal Constitution and How to Make the Most of Them*, by Geoffrey de Q. Walker. 2001
[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Walker%20G%20de%20Q%20-%20Ten Advantages of a Federal Constitution.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Walker%20G%20de%20Q%20-%20Ten%20Advantages%20of%20a%20Federal%20Constitution.pdf)

Barrister-at-law, 1965-. University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Queensland.,

Australia, professor of law and head of department, 1985-96, dean of faculty of law, 1988-96.

Walker has authored a number of well researched books, including this one. To come to understand what something means, you do need to know some of it's history. Once you realise why it was developed, it becomes easier to see why we still need it and how it should be implemented. It is hard to stress just how much our own knowledge and participation is needed to fix the issues we face. Just knowing that most of the systems we operate under were originally designed to benefit us, should help us to understand that it is we who must once again take an active part in keeping them honest.

The executive summary from this book follows, may it tempt you to read further:

Executive Summary

Worldwide interest in federalism is greater than ever before and more countries are moving to adopt it. It has proved its worth and is especially well adapted to today's world, but in Australia it is still being attacked and undermined. The debate concentrates on, and exaggerates, the minor inconveniences of federalism and makes no mention of its great advantages. These include:

1. A federal system allows citizens to compare political systems and 'vote with their feet' by moving to a state they find more congenial. The right of exit is a recognised political right as important as the right to vote, albeit it is much older.
2. Federalism allows and encourages experimentation in political, social and economic matters. It is more conducive to rational progress because it enables the results of different approaches to be compared easily.
3. Federalism permits economic and cultural differences to be accommodated, thus strengthening national unity. At the same time, federations work better if regional differences are not too marked, so Australia has an advantage here. The sheer size of Australia makes some kind of federal structure inevitable in any event.
4. A federation is more democratic than a unitary system because there are more levels for public opinion to affect. A federal structure helps to offset governmental elitism.
5. The federal division of powers hampers the rise of despotic central government and thus protects liberty. This was exemplified when the states led the struggle against the political broadcasts ban in 1991.
6. Federal decentralisation makes governments easier for the people to supervise and results in better decision making. State governments have fewer programs and employees, and their smaller scale cuts monitoring costs.

As the states cannot create money, the scope for abuse of power is reduced.

7. Federations produce more stable government than unitary systems, and stability is a cardinal virtue in government.

8. The competition between governments in a properly working federation reduces waste and promotes the best mix of taxation and services.

The duplication issue is misunderstood—Australia spends proportionally less on government than the unitary United Kingdom or New Zealand.

9. Competitive federalism facilitates the discovery of the rules and devices that will enhance the competitive position of Australia in world markets.

Australia's problem with railway gauges long predates Federation; its persistence may be a result of government monopoly ownership.

At the dawn of the Commonwealth's second century, changes are in progress that may help revitalise Australian federalism and make the most of its potential. The goods and services tax in practice provides the secure revenue base the states have long needed, and is a step towards more balanced Commonwealth-State fiscal relations. The lack of a formal national bill of rights denies the federal judiciary the de facto veto power over state (or provincial) legislation that they enjoy in the United

States and Canada. The general intellectual climate is becoming more favourable to constitutionalism, checks and balances, aided by the decline of the old British theory of absolute parliamentary power.

Many of the world's other federations tap the benefits of federalism better than Australia does. There are a number of simple and inexpensive steps that would improve Australia's performance in that regard. They include reviving the Senate's role as the states' house by establishing a standing committee on federal-state relations, formalising present intergovernmental bodies by requiring, for example, regular meetings and public hearings, and recognising that the usual drive towards national conformism should be balanced by an appreciation of the benefits of diversity. The High Court should be invited to emulate the United States Supreme Court and revisit some of the centralist decisions that have undermined the Constitution. Some purely symbolic measures would help to reawaken the spirit of independence, self-reliance and community solidarity.

Our national future is not determined by our past. There is no reason why past conditions, mistakes and prejudices should be allowed to lock the nation into unhelpful patterns. Australia is a young, vigorous and successful country. Within its own borders it can be anything it wants to be. ***

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.