

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 19

22nd May 2026

IN THIS ISSUE

Just Whose Expectations are Governments Fulfilling? By Neville Archibald

1

Just Whose Expectations are Governments Fulfilling? By Neville Archibald

During the Trump campaign for president, many promises were made. America needs to be remade great again! Trump promised just that with his MAGA policies (Make America Great Again). He promised to "drain the swamp". He promised to release the Epstein files, the JFK files, he promised to stop being the global policeman, to bring the soldiers home! All these things have been of limited success - if at all. The appointments made to fix that swamp, look remarkably like all previous appointments. The Epstein files have been suppressed yet again. America is not only involved in another war at present, it also acted like a policeman (with dubious authority) in Venezuela. The broken MAGA promises have left a bad taste in many mouths. His approval rating has dropped to around 34%. Yet he gets off a plane (from Israel I believe) and boasts about what exactly?

"I'm right now at 99% in Israel. I could run for Prime Minister. So maybe after I do this, I'll go to Israel, run for the Prime Minister. I had a poll this morning. I'm 99% So that's good." He says.

(May 20th 2026.) Tucker Carlson podcast: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IgjThZM8Z8U>

What sort of comment is that to make? An American President boasting about being so popular in a foreign country is one thing, to say it when a large proportion of his country is dubious about their involvement in this current war, Israel vs Iran, seems to be provoking the anti war brigade. I know that Trump's style does not exclude these sort of outbursts, but what are his minders thinking? The connection between the Israel lobby groups and the republican party would appear to be stronger than ever, possibly stronger

than the connection the party has to the people of America it would seem. In mentioning this I may well be seen to be anti Israel to some, but the big question here really is, just who has the most say in policy – the American influence, or the Israel lobby? Surely America comes first in the ‘Make America Great Again’ intent of his original election fight.

The decline of support being felt for Trump is really not surprising, the decline of support for the ruling parties in all western countries is very similar. All seem to be heading full tilt in directions that their voting public do not wish to go – the same playbook is in use everywhere!

What makes this question of support by the Israel lobby such a stand out feature, is the blatant abuse of power it depicts. This brings us to a Kentucky election campaign and one Thomas Massie!

Who is Thomas Massie?

Thomas Massie is well known in American Politics for being straightforward and saying what he thinks. A republican, he has held his seat in Kentucky since 2012. He locked horns with the Republican leadership over the Great Big Beautiful Bill act and more specifically the suppression of the Epstein files. Looking over his CV he appears to have voted in most instances for what was best for the American people, even if it fell foul of republican expectations. His biggest crimes; however, seem to be his wish to keep to Trumps original promises and his stance on Israel. The only one out of 217 republican representatives who refused to take money from the Israel lobby. His ‘America first’ beliefs seem to preclude this, he says so himself on Tuckers podcast. (See above)

Recently up for re-election, his primary selection for Kentucky (his home State) was contested by a lobby willing to spend millions in political donations to go against him.

At 31.30 of the podcast– Tucker asks,

“why is Trump so mad at him? Why is Miriam Adelson so mad?”

“And of course the answer is because Thomas Massie was willing to say out loud that there is an Israel Lobby! There is a foreign country whose supporters in the United States in positions of prominence are making campaign contributions purely on the basis of what’s good for a foreign country.”

The sad part, is that the needs of Israel, a foreign country, would appear to be more important to Trump than the promises he made to the American people. The quote, “he who pays the piper, picks the tune” comes to mind here.

And it is not just Tucker is saying this, Haaretz, the traditionally liberal paper in Israel, which publishes an english edition had this headline:

“The Most Consequential Republican Primary for Israel is happening in Kentucky.”
<https://www.haaretz.com/us-news/2026-05-19/ty-article/.premium/the-most-consequential-republican-primary-for-israel-is-happening-in-kentucky/0000019e-4056-d394-addf-fb7e8fdc0000>

Why? you may you ask, is it so important to Israel, just who gets elected in Kentucky? It is not like it is a State with a high Jewish/Israeli population. Is it because the general public is not to see the amount of support Israel needs from America to even exist? The US taxpayers are funding it's very survival – one lone voice is a strange thing to push against. 1 out of 217, are they afraid of this recognition? Are they afraid of something else?

Just what is the reason that they feel the need to spend so big against him? So the short of this would seem to be that not accepting the Israel lobby's donations, along with any criticism of Israel, is being seen as antisemitic, enough to bring in the big guns to elections even. In a primary like this, in Kentucky, you would expect to see some \$500,000 to \$2 million spent on a campaign. Massie surely must be a problem, considering this election saw nearly \$32 million spent to ensure his removal, at least that is how it seems. What next? Needless to say, Massie lost his seat and the Republican movement now moves further away from the ideals it espoused before being elected.

Just how many donations are made like this, that shape elections? And not just in the US. This use of funding to alter elections in favour of a foreign country and it's desires, begs the question of what else can it do? Where else will we see it? We think of the contrary decisions made by our governments, especially when so many of them occur, must we then question, just who is paying the bill for them? What real power lies behind the scenes? With massive upset between the governments of the west and their people becoming commonplace, who are our governments more concerned for?

In this case, it is a big reveal, the curtain has been drawn back and we can see the puppet master pulling the strings. We should now be wondering just how much truth there is in a global conspiracy to create this one world government we seem to be staring into the face of. For too long we have allowed ourselves to believe in bad decisions with no intent behind them. This shows that intention is indeed a primary motivator. It is now coming to light. What other foreign powers are massaging election outcomes, and for what purpose?

A Dividend for Samsung employees in South Korea.

Samsung employees in Seoul have just made a deal, possibly ending a five month long labour dispute. It seems that paychecks are not going very far over there too. A push to increase wages is nearly always in response to inflation of some sort. The prices you must pay to keep a certain living standard or even to just survive, keep on rising. Government keeps on raising taxes and everywhere

fees and charges only go up. Contrast this with our ability to make more product with less labour input and we see a shortage of earned spending money.

Samsung, Korea, is offering dividends to its staff based on output:

“Samsung Electronics’ memory-chip employees could receive close to 600 million won (\$398,900) each in combined incentives this year, while colleagues in loss-making chip units may receive less than a third of that amount.

The gap is built into the bonus formula at the center of Samsung’s tentative labor deal, which creates a floor for all semiconductor employees but lets memory business staff earn far more because the biggest portion of a workers’ bonus is tied to the performance of the business unit they work for.”

so says the Korean Herald. <https://www.koreaherald.com/article/10742921>

If recognition of a bonus income for producing more can be made in this way, to settle labour disputes, why then can we not ask if this is possible in all other areas of human endeavour.

When we improve on our ability to produce, when less labour is needed to make the same amount of product (or more in fact), should we all not all receive some form of dividend like this? As society improves itself, we are all gaining something from it, are we not? Excess production must result; but excess wages to buy this production? - these would seem to be lacking. The workforce is made smaller by efficiency drives, less money finds its way into spending hands, and product must therefore remain on the shelf – unless someone can find money from somewhere else (usually as a debt to be repaid). This improvement, this bonus, belongs to us all, not in some collective or socialist manner, but due to what could be rightly called an ‘inherited’ dividend. Just for being a part of that big company called Australia.

The association of a dividend with production improvements is not a new concept. If all of the production improvements we have made since we first started ‘Australia unlimited’, are tallied up, doesn’t it make some sense that we all should be sharing a part of this ‘real wealth increase’? Just like the Samsung employees?

If we fail to improve, we get less obviously; but in this country we have seen huge improvements in our abilities to provide. Most recently the debt and our standard of living have been almost inversely proportional, and it makes a mockery of our improved production capacity. Why?

C.H.Douglas suggested that we were all entitled to some form of dividend, just for being a part of a nation. He expressed this in many of his books. Along with other suggestions and possibilities, the dividend could be used to great advantage, to allow us all to partake in our success at reducing actual labour.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Use%20of%20Social%20Credit.pdf>

"The phrase of "Poverty amidst plenty" has become enshrined amongst the cliches of the English language. Social Credit, in consequence, is primarily concerned with the distribution, and not with the administration or technique of production.

Its problem is poverty, not plenty, and poverty consists of lack of money the essence of money being credit--the belief that money will do what it is supposed to do. Economic production is interlocked with the distribution of money through the agency of wages, salary and dividends. The existing financial system stands or falls by the perfectly simple proposition that the production of every article distributes enough money to the general public to buy that article. The orthodox economist says it does, the Social Engineer says it does not. The Socialist complaint against so-called capitalism is that money has been distributed inequitably, that is to say, that some people, the "Capitalists," get too much and some, the "Workers," get too little. Hence the Socialist is permanently committed to a policy of "soak the Rich."

It is a primary tenet of Social Credit theory that though this unequitable distribution may exist, it is a secondary consideration to the fact that not enough money is distributed to buy the goods that are for sale, and that in consequence redistribution is not an economic remedy, whilst being a political irritant of a high order."

The main point out of his conclusion, is that money available to buy production, is never truly met under the orthodox system of monetary control – there must always be a lack of purchasing power, which is only ever met by increasing borrowing (or Debt). Exactly what we are seeing worldwide.

He talks of two main ways to combat this, one being price discounts (which operated here in Australia during the war years as a 'combating inflation policy') and the provision of a dividend, not entirely unlike what Samsung is offering with increased levels for increased production: a recognition of improved productivity. This is not to be confused with a Universal Basic Income (UBI) that is also being proposed. One is linked to actual production figures and would alter with the success or not of real world outcomes – the other is a small part of a bigger plan to keep you quiet while you own nothing and ... you know the drill!

"While a scientific regulation of the price level so that goods can be taken off the market by the available purchasing power as fast as they are produced is an essential component of a scientific money system, it does not deal with the second aspect of the problem, which fundamentally is related to the change over from manual production to power production.

Probably over 80 percent of the total number of issues of purchasing power distributed in our existing financial system, is distributed through the agency of

wages and salaries and it is obvious that this assumes that 80 percent, at least, of the population will be maintained on a wage or salary basis.

But there is no ground for the common assumption that such a percentage can, or will be maintained in normal times, and every ground for assuming that it will decrease continuously.

On the other hand, the dividend system is independent of employment, and depends fundamentally, only on production. If we can arrange that while the wage and salary payroll becomes continually less, the dividend payroll becomes continually greater and more widely distributed, we have dealt with the second half of the problem.”

Once again, the system of financial control we currently operate under, can only lead to further impoverishment, despite increased production capabilities; therefore, we must look at alternatives and ensure that they enhance the ability of individuals to advance themselves and not just provide a drip feed allowing us to just survive at the whim of those pulling the strings of finance.

Stepping around the fringes of the party politic.

In the course of reading the two Douglas’ articles mentioned in this *On Target*, a direction to proceed in is made, one that is well worth considering. If we are to obtain lasting change in political circles we need to be able to cast a wide net. The usual protests about single individuals and the ineffective role they have to play, is also true for minor parties. Until such time as a party (within the party ruled system) has a majority, it would seem to be merely a tool for raising awareness at best. As a voting block, they struggle to find the numbers with any desire to make effective and lasting changes; and only then if deals are struck, often with compromises made.

We must look outside the party system to find a way to bring sensible debate and workable solutions to each individual member of parliament (regardless of political persuasion). Within each party structure, only a few insistent individuals create policy direction and possible solutions. A great many of the party members just ride along with them. Amongst those riding along are a number, who, if approached in the right way, could see a sensible correction when it is pointed out. They may also be agreeable while on their own, it is once they take it to the party room that good intentions are undone. If they are not convinced by the ‘better’ argument of the party whip, then often they are questioned about their desire to run for the next pre-selection. In this way some form of hold is kept over them by the party machine.

Individual politicians who will take the time to listen, and possibly be interested, need to know they have a backing behind them, at least as strong as the party itself, before they dare question party policy on any great

level. Knowing that someone, or some group in the electorate they call home, is going to support them, will go a long way to making them feel capable of opposing the party machine.

Over the years we have seen defections and the crossing of the floor at voting time in parliament, some still do it on less important matters and are allowed some freedom in this regard. More would be likely to so, if it were seen as more acceptable or if they had support in the greater numbers of politicians who might join them in this regard.

A clear change within a number of electorates as to the support and backing each member receives, could be made to happen. It is something that each electorate could initiate. Instead of attempting to elect strictly independent members alone to make the change, targeted individuals within parties could be made to feel free enough to follow what they see as right for Australia, rather than just following the party line. We currently have a number of Senators and Representatives who follow a different path, who are speaking out against what they see as wrong – even against their parties during debate. They may not always cross the floor and vote against them in parliament, but I'm sure given encouragement, those who hesitate to follow their first inclination, would do so given that extra support.

In Douglas' article, [Wanted, Political Consciousness:](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Wanted-Political-Consciousness.pdf)
<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Wanted-Political-Consciousness.pdf>

He makes that very suggestion; that a movement for change may be made more effective if it is made to transcend party politics. It would then necessarily pull in those whose loyalty to party is less than loyalty to Australian benefit. Some may not believe there are many who fit this bill, but I think we might be pleasantly surprised at the 'jumping on the bandwagon' we may see, if at first, some make a start. The Coalition is currently endeavouring to make us believe that certain One Nation policies are theirs as well now. The path to the next election can take strange detours, if it is possible in that instance, then given the necessary support, more could be made of it.

This is a question we would need to discuss from various viewpoints within each electorate grouping. Is it achievable for one, and the snowball effect this may create if we are successful. The biggest hurdle may end up being which policy change to focus on. If the aim to begin with is too high, if it is not in the public eye, or it is simply too far fetched, then the action may end up demoralising us rather than empowering us.

All in all, our ability to make these changes has to be fostered to grow. Those of us with the knowledge and desire to see this change must act. We must bring on board those who can see some of what we see, and encourage some sort of

groundswell movement. Many have been alienated by successive Uni-party actions, a better time to begin has not been seen for some time. Douglas saw it between the wars (WW1 and WW2) in the actions of parliament and community then, and commented on it. The tired population of the time, did not achieve any lasting change then. Our chance is now! We need unity of purpose and a small number of problems to solve in the correct way. Once we have made that start, bigger things can follow. As Eric Butler always used to say, it must start with the grass roots, that means you! ***

From the Archives: C.H. Douglas - Use of Social Credit (1935)

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Use%20of%20Social%20Credit.pdf>

The monopoly of credit at present held by financial interests, that is to say, banking institutions and their affiliations, is obviously so valuable that it would be too optimistic to suppose that it will be relinquished without a struggle.

The primary weapon used in this war is misrepresentation. The socialisation of credit, so far from being an attack upon private property, is probably the only method by which private property can once again become reasonably secure.

It is the alternative to ever-increasing taxation. It is a method by which everyone may become richer without anyone becoming poorer. It is, so far as I am aware, the only method by which the pernicious doctrine of "a favourable balance of trade" can be exploded. In consequence, it is the primary requisite to the removal of the fundamental causes of war.

You are, however, unlikely to arrive at any_ conclusions of this character by reading criticisms of the theory which originate from orthodox financial circles.

In spite of the difficulty of obtaining a wide public presentation of the theory, however, the progress which has been made by it, more particularly in the past two or three years, is remarkable.

There is no portion of the English speaking world in which it is not discussed, or in which, spontaneously, bodies for its propagation and realisation have not been formed. So far as anything is certain in this world, banking dominance of credit, commerce and industry, is certainly doomed together with poverty amidst plenty. ***

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

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.