A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 42 **30th October 2026**

IN THIS ISSUE

Entrenched Policy Doesn't Always Change when the Government Does! By Neville Archibald 1

Entrenched Policy Doesn't Always Change when the Government Does! By Neville Archibald

A recent letter from the Australian libertarian website, brings up an important subject – the entrenched bureaucracy. A subject that I have heard discussed by many people who have had the chance to elect a 'better' candidate. These newly elected members are all fired up when they venture forth to parliament, but are then somehow dragged into the system and find themselves at a loss - or worse, ineffective. Some have ended up joining a party or otherwise seemingly disappointing those who helped them get there!

This then leads to the cry: "Independents can't form a government" or, "don't vote Independent, it is a wasted vote!"

I know many who have started out expressing high ideals, but the drag of the bureaucracy and the 'Club' mentality of the Party is a hard thing to work around.

The public perception of this attitude is not altogether wrong. It would seem a sad state of affairs that our political system has devolved so far; but it is understandable.

The Party system has reinforced it's ability to be re-elected. The power craving aspect of the <u>will to govern</u>, rather than r<u>epresent</u>, has organised things so that it is easier to remain in power. This gives advantage to the group (or Party) vote. Once elected, the sheer volume of paperwork that must be handled and the inability of one person (even with a couple of helpers), to read it all, let alone understand it, is daunting. This too, I'm sure, is a product of attempts to remain in power. Couple this with the entrenched bureaucratic systems everything goes through, and you have a recipe for the failure or true

representation. (Keeping the "Party" in power, means only a few policies ever need to change between tweedle dum and tweedle dee.)

As a nation wanting change (real change), we must address both of these concerns before we can truly solve the problem. Which I see as primarily government by preset ideals, rather than representation. We must overcome our fear of electing someone other than the parties who have put us in this position.

While I do not endorse all that the libertarians put forth, in this instance they are bringing up some important items for consideration. We've all seen 'Yes , Minister', the BBC TV series (and if you haven't, you should!). The role that senior bureaucrats play in political life is considerable, and the acted out version is uncannily more and more like real life (or is that the other way around?). Many programs within parliamentary walls run on, despite party change after elections. If we are to believe the claims made by the WEF (World Economic Forum), many senior positions within both Parliament and the bureaucracy, include people trained and educated in the 'global ideals' they express. They boast of it! The entrenched "Global objective", is real!

When we elect a new government (if we do), we should be well within our rights to expect that the bureaucratic policy will change too, we elect on the basis of policy difference don't we? How do we ensure that that a pseudo government doesn't just continue on. With entire careers and sometimes almost empires, created around policy, a change within the bureaucracy might not be so straightforward as we like to think. It definitely needs discussion!

When we watch members questioning senior bureaucrats in the various commission enquiries, you see the problems we face.

Alex Antic was recently questioning the CSIRO on the changing of excess deaths calculations. Since the 'pandemic', excess deaths world-wide (at least where the 'vaccines were rolled out) have remained high. The resulting calculations and modelling around the new figures have now been changed. If the vaccines have caused any excess mortality risks, this will now likely be 'hidden from view' by these recalculations. In trying to discover the criterion used to make these calculations and ask the hard questions, he appeared to be thwarted by explanations around normalisation attempts. See the conversation here: ***https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-iMM4GVtVpE***

Then there is the interaction between Malcolm Roberts and the CSIRO in senate estimates, regarding power generation costs. Relevant questions were put as to why coal fired generation is listed as high cost, when the life span of

a plant is artificially shortened, and wind and solar are calculated at the extreme end of their life span. Also not listed is the need to use battery back up and the costs therein which should be added to wind and solar price per k/w but are not. An antagonistic exchange results, without really addressing these concerns.

If we manage to make a change in government, will they also face a hostile bureaucracy if change is desired?
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jA1kUtGJob8

Also to be viewed is the clash between Senator Leah Blyth and Dr Anna Cody of the Australian Human Rights Commission on the subject of male breastfeeding!
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nE8DK6NjQC8

It is hard to watch these exchanges and not wonder where we are headed. The refusal of many, to look at the real world with real eyes is becoming almost common-place. The damage that is being inflicted on us as a society by these strange beliefs, is manyfold. It is getting harder than ever to tell whether some of these ideologies are serious or intentional in their ability to disrupt us. I find it hard to believe we are still seeking truth.

These three examples serve to show just how difficult entrenched ideals can be in the public service. Many aspirants are career focused and will continue up the ranks as the departments grow. Changing policy at the top, will not necessarily be reflected by the people under it without some push-back. Many similar issues can also be found. The attitude may well be described as, waiting out the current (newly elected) government until another change puts the old ones back in again – referred to I believe, as, 'playing the long game.'

If we can defeat the concept of Net Zero, which I hope we can, what becomes of those in the system dedicated to bringing it about? Many have built their livelihood around it and will be less than willing to give it up. While they are entitled to this opinion personally, once the policy finishes, the implementation should stop. Will it? We see replies given in estimates committees, or you do if you watch them, where answers are deliberately obscuring or so full of jargon that no real sense can be made of the answer. Many times I have wondered how these people keep their jobs, it also makes me wonder who it is they are working for. Elected ministers and parliamentarians ask questions that they have every right to ask. I admit, many times some form of point scoring (the scourge of the Party system mentality) is behind it, but just as often recently, they are serious questions. Who holds these employees to account?

I am not about to label all public servants in the bureaucracy as a problem, we need them to do the work given to them and many do it well. But it must proceed in the direction that the people have indicated through the election process, regardless of personal opinion.

Inefficiencies in government departments and the building of mini-empires is not unknown, is often commented on, and even leads to privatisation when it goes too far. The State Electricity Commission of Victoria (SEC) was one example, as are those parts of government that each side of politics, end up contracting out. I do not believe that this 'selling off' of government assets (the people's assets) is a good thing, nor is allowing it to remain inefficient. The same goes for government departments (NDIS) where the objective has become background noise to a virtually self sustaining growth cycle. The SEC may have been bloated and costly; but selling it to private buyers has meant prices rising fast and profits going overseas. If the SEC had been subject to better oversight and perhaps limited empire building, we might now be seeing profits staying in this country and prices lower. The same can be said of other departments, they become so big, the concept they were created for so buried in layers, that change needs several election cycles to complete. The new broom, as it were, cannot effectively sweep clean as might have been promised. If we do get a change, we must be prepared to support them!

The concept of limiting bureaucratic terms along with parliamentary terms is something to consider. In the event that we do get a real change at election time, for a new party (new government) to start in office battling employees with entrenched visions, is a difficulty they (and we) don't need. Not all employees fit this category, not many will agree with it; but if we are to reverse some of the vital policies that need reversing, this idea must be examined closely.

In his article, Steve Holland makes the case for Bureaucrat Term Limits:

"Unelected public officials can spend decades occupying the corridors of power, accumulating influence, cultivating relationships and mastering the machinery of government. While politicians operate on electoral cycles, senior bureaucrats can play the long game – why fight a reform you dislike when you can simply outlast the politician proposing it?
This is one of democracy's great contradictions. We demand accountability from elected politicians while allowing enormous concentrations of administrative power to develop among officials who never face the voters."

This is one of the hurdles aptly portrayed by 'Yes, Minister', and as Steve

points out:

"The problem isn't that public servants are inherently malicious or incompetent, many are dedicated professionals. The problem is that bureaucracies, like every institution, develop interests of their own. Departments seek larger budgets, additional staff, expanded responsibilities and greater influence. When was the last time a government department recommend abolishing itself?"

and

"Australia is not immune. Our departmental secretaries were once permanent appointments. Today they're generally appointed for terms of up to five years. Yet re-appointment and movement between senior positions still allows influential officials to accumulate decades within the executive establishment. The principle is straightforward: nobody exercising substantial coercive government authority should enjoy an indefinite claim to power."
(extracts from a longer article)
https://www.libertyitch.com/p/the-libertarian-case-for-bureaucrat?

…….

The entrenched bureaucracy could well be one of the bigger hurdles we face when pushing for change. I find the common ground with all those who fail to see the significance of our argument, is the abstract nature of their connection to the real world. I am not being nasty or dismissive with this comment, rather trying to point out that while we all might understand the theory of a shovel, when it comes to digging with it, those who have used it all their life, will know how to do so without serious aches and pains afterward. They will also know when not to use it.

A little bit obscure? An understanding of how regulations impact real life events, will never be fully realised unless there is a close connection to the people they limit.

A ban on the thinning of trees in National parks, might sound progressive and green, but with the rise of a thick growth of saplings after a flood, where all are far too close together to ever survive long term, only creates more material to burn when they die out in the dry. Thinning actually allows some to reach maturity and begin the process of regeneration of the natural undergrowth beneath them. If the forest is to be 'managed' these things can only be understood by observing first hand those issues, not just by a blanket ban.

The classic example of this first hand knowledge in recent times is the "belt fed shotgun" debacle (after the Bondi shootings). While such a

prototype may exist somewhere, they are not a 'thing' at all out there in the real world of shooters. The same may be said of limits to gun ownership. Tools exist for many reasons, each with their own purpose. Imagine telling a mechanic he can only have one socket set with a limited number of sizes! How would he cope?

This is the reason I believe our hope of turning this around, comes with a closer connection to each other, rather than separation and isolation. When we had family in the country that we could holiday with, or when the rural part of the family interacted with their city counterparts, we had a closer connection. Kids knew that milk came from cows, or wool from sheep. Dads knew that the rifle was for shooting wild dogs or foxes, and the shotgun for a meal of duck, in season.

We need to make that connection stronger!

Prepare for what?

Many social media posts and even some governments are telling their citizens to prepare themselves for something. Insisting that each should have a supply of food, waster and some form of power to last from days to weeks, depending on the region. In Europe it is not so surprising. With the riots and disruptions causing major damage to infrastructure it would definitely be a wise move. Elsewhere it is not a bad suggestion to have some sort of insurance against outages or disruption.

Are we being prepared for war? Is there a coming financial meltdown or a cyber-attack? Listening the latest Bill Gates predictions, he virtually promises there will be cyber-attacks. What does he know and how? Just like his 'Pandemic predictions' prior to COVID, and the 'fast tracked' roll out of a new technology inject-able, does this presage the future?

I have no faith in Bill or his cohorts, "by their fruits ye shall know them", and we now know them! I do not doubt, that if he can make a dollar somehow he will. But with the number of countries around the world asking their citizens to be prepared something is in the wings.

The Debt clock is still rising and the bubble it represents could well burst, throwing all into chaos. If bank accounts are closed and assets frozen, what will we do? The international banks, to whom we supposedly owe this money, will have a solution waiting, an international basic income – or something like it. It will be digital, dependant on being good little digits, and diabolical. If you resist or opt out you will no longer have access to the world around you. We will truly be in our cages where we will own nothing and we will have no option but to be happy – if you are anything else, you will be frozen out of society. The trial run happened during COVID, where those

without the digital passport of compliance, could no longer take part in everyday life.

The push back against this must be many times greater if we are to stop it. The understanding of what is in store must spread widely and quickly. There may be a few steps to enacting this final outcome, each will seem appropriate at the time or will be suggested as 'temporary measures'. Unfortunately, like the mRNA technology, which has still not had proper testing done on it, it will become 'normal and expected', a *fiat-accompli*. We will have opportunities ahead of us to make changes, each election will be one of those. It is more important than ever to take part in spreading the word and pointing out the dangers we face.

The concept of Douglas Social Credit, as a solution, where we realise that the money of a nation belongs to the people, not the banks, will remove the guilt of 'owing' this fictitious amount, especially if the long con of all money coming into existence as debt is realised. Read, repeat and reinvigorate yourselves to pass on this message, it is our only way out.

What the world might look like if the theory of Douglas is enacted, is yet to be seen. We have witnessed what it looks like without this theory in place, and there are too many failures to count. We have increased our material capability, we have harnessed the power of the machine and we have no reason for going without; yet we work harder than ever to make ends meet and scarce have time to draw breath. Not the vision mankind had when he used to look to the future. We imagined flying cars and time saving devices of all kinds doing our work while we played golf or otherwise relaxed!

Reality has not kept pace with that potential, so something is wrong! While we point it out and encourage others to listen, those in power cling tightly to their levers of control. The financial system ties us to ever increasing debt and longer hours at work, despite being surrounded by labour saving devices of all kinds.

I for one, would like access to my inheritance of the modern age. My fathers before me recognised, designed and invented, endless means of achieving a life more abundant, one that I feel excluded from now. I have less time than my father, or his, to pursue individual achievement. I produce far more in a given hour, yet cannot afford to consume it. Two incomes now fail to buy what one single breadwinner did in their time. Something is not right.

We need the courage to dare dream of something different, a system that works to our advantage. Then we need to speak up and colour-in the

differences that it could provide in our everyday lives, and in the lives of those around us. Make it visible to the multitudes. The potential is huge, let's make it happen.

Meet the Candidates for the up coming Victorian elections is on right now.

Various venues around the State will be holding these events. Make sure you go along and ask what sort of representation they will be providing. A good suggestion would be to ask them what legislation they will be appealing in their first one hundred days in office (if they get in). Don't get bogged down in the nitty gritty of each policy, just be sure to find out if the direction it takes is towards more freedom for the individual and less government intervention.

It is important that we are out there pushing for answers to these questions, allowing others to see the type of candidate they are looking at. Being antagonistic or argumentative will not win you friends, but asking obvious questions like, where do you stand on allowing taxpayer funded abortion on demand; or will you repeal the 4th tier of government, since we all said no to the voice!

Pick a subject you are confident will allow others to see who it is they are potentially electing. Something relevant to your area. Here in the Northern regions, water buybacks are a good example. The destruction of established farmland by the removal of water from the district, in favour of the industrial farms up north is a good start. Your candidate must promise to look after the region first, the party 2nd if at all.

Getting our government back starts with your participation. ***

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.