A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

**Vol. 62 No. 11** **27th March 2026**

**IN THIS ISSUE**

The Dangers of Spreading Hate! By Neville Archibald 1
From the Archives: Making the Court Accountable 8

## The Dangers of Spreading Hate! By Neville Archibald

With all that is going on around us in this ever increasing world of chaos, it would be surprising if we were not, in some way, affected. The sins visited upon us are sometimes overwhelming, be they personal, systemic or cultural. A backlash against any of these can turn ugly at any time. As young men and women, we are taught to temper our anger and work through the issues that have created it. We have been taught that differences do occur and we must cut others some slack and attempt to work things out. Most of these lessons, as I can see, have been in the personal area – man to man - so to speak. We are not brawling in the street every Saturday night (I hope), and we have been able to exist alongside others who are different. Despite all the ongoing reports to the contrary, we are a very tolerant society.

If I were to say 'more tolerant than we should be', I might easily be thought of as pushing for intolerance, or inciting! This is where the question of self determination comes in and the degree of tolerance we accept must be discussed in a reasonable way. The growth of our laws and culture, has all been ongoing over centuries. We have had a long time to decide just how much difference we can accept before we find we no longer can tolerate it as a society. The point at which it creates division or upset to our day to day interaction, to societal cohesion, is the point we draw that line. This is the point where we make a law and embed our 'intolerance' in our culture.

The usual argument for why we have laws can be brought out here. Why we drive on one side of the road! I often get sick of hearing people (especially politicians) using this as an example of why we need some 'new' legislation; but, it fits here, more than there, in most cases. As a benign example it should bring no anger with it, no indignant upset. I mean how can

you 'take a side' so to speak. We drive on the left so there is no confusion as to where we should be when approaching another vehicle! Common sense surely. The upset seems to come when the accepted norms of different peoples clash. What is okay in one group and not in another has to be worked out. Something as simple as spitting on the street, okay in India and commonplace, not so socially acceptable here! Unlikely to lead to fisticuffs, but a niggling in the back of mind nonetheless – a perception created!

When you examine this (and I hope you do) do you think of why the revulsion has come about? The black plague? Sanitation in general? The spread of disease? In times past we dealt with the why of it, it became a cultural expectation. It was a sanitary response that we all generally accepted. Maybe there is a law on it, I doubt it is ever enforced, but it has – to us – become common sense – a cultural norm.

We could list many other things that fit in this category of cultural acceptance, that we probably do not realise we even do. My point is, we have developed these and other ways of coping with what is and what is not allowed in society, our society. We should stand up for these, maybe examine them a bit more closely before deciding that we will water down our values to help the integration of others' values.

Before you leap to conclusions of 'intolerance', remember the reasons and the outcomes of not having a line in the sand to draw. Time has shaped our society for the better, at some point we lost that ability to see this, we now self abuse and denigrate our own past far more than we should. It has become trendy to find fault, to imagine slights and second guess our cultural developments, in preference for the largely unquestioned practices of others. Does our heritage mean so little to us?

We drew these lines to show the limits of what is acceptable and to know where we stood. Small concessions to make for peaceful co-existence. The tolerance/intolerance balance is an important one.

When talking of systemic tolerance, the second one mentioned, we all rely on systems for our everyday interaction. These are the systems of government, of our workplace, of our buying and selling. There may be others you can find, that I have not mentioned. They are the written and unwritten interactions of associations mostly. Ideals that developed due to constant use and as a way to align ourselves with others, to keep it fair! This fairness (and what is and is not fair), is another part of our progressive development. We embodied it in our governing systems, in chambers of commerce, in clubs and societies: in fact man, for all his achievements, has been a creator of associations for all manner of reasons. Mostly because they work! Man in association with each other can

achieve the impossible!
(see *Social Dynamics,* by E.D.Butler. ***https://alor.org*** ).

The systems we use for these purposes are only useful if they keep to their intended purpose. Once they take a different tack, they become upsetting, not just emotionally, but the upset becomes a wedge of instability within the social structure they are purporting to be concerned with.

Our tolerance of systemic corruption, which is what this becomes, is far too great. We see it daily in News reports as government and industry corruption, but also in the daily interactions with bodies supposedly working for us. We have become so immune to it's mention, that we no longer do more than make just a half hearted complaint. Perhaps it is not so much unnoticed as now just background noise. Apathy, which is what our tolerance has become, has grown out of not just inability to effect change in our systems, but also from the constant programming rammed down our throats by a compliant media. The very purpose of tolerance and it's flip side, has been pacified into meaninglessness. We have been conditioned to automatically step back, to appease, rather than question why we should. If we question, we are labelled and denigrated as intolerant, as though that is a bad thing. Like discrimination before it, intolerance, has become seen as a bad thing to have. Politicians can get away with zero tolerance comments, when it refers to protests against their ambitions, or disagreement with proposed new laws; but we, the public, are not to have zero tolerance when it concerns the changing of our rights to live as we used to.

**When does tolerance lead to conflict?**

If there are two sides to a conflict, and both feel they are in the right, can middle ground be reached? Can the conflict be resolved successfully for both parties?

I guess in a perfect world, the compromise is to accept the difference and co-exist. This is not always possible. For the reasons stated above, each party has figured out what works for them. If a difference is too great, the best alternative is (as the world shows) separate countries/nations.

When it comes to the Middle East, and the war currently being pursued, this conflict will not be resolved in such a simple manner. There are decades of conditioning to be considered, where each side only sees the other as terrorist or invader. Atrocities committed by both sides have created a 1984-like divide. Constantly at war, each might be forgiven for thinking that the other is evil personified.

A number of interviews on the streets of both Israel and Palestine, asking people about their views on a solution, would indicate that neither can see a time when they will co-exist. Hate for each other is now generational and almost

a part of life. This is seen reflected in the extremes each will go to, justified by whatever their cultural/religious leaders have been telling them.

Is culture important here! Are all cultures the same? Can all cultures co-exist in harmony?

The answers to these questions are at the core of the problem.

One side sees all outsiders as 'goyim'. Not a part of them and subject to different considerations to their own people. This is not just a debatable concept, it is fundamental in their religious and cultural upbringing. While not all adhere strictly to these rules of life, enough do to make it a trait within their communities. In a place like Israel, where extremes are reinforced by continual conflict, the 'hard liners' will necessarily find more acceptance for this 'separation'. Conversely the other side sees those who are not like them as infidels or non-believers. They also find justification in hard line interpretations of their religion. Strong leaders of faith use their influence to 'harden' the lines of acceptance. Anyone outside of that, is not 'of the faith' and thus a lesser being in the eyes of scripture.

Now I might also point out, in the interests of fairness, many Christian faiths also see those who have not accepted Christ as their personal saviour, as forever doomed to eternal damnation or something similar. So all faiths have ideas of what is right. The difference being, that while the soul is condemned, the place you continue to have in society is accepted with the hope that as an individual you will eventually come to Jesus. You are not expressly excluded or discriminated against in societal terms – thus the reason we accepted multiculturalism as an idea when most other faiths have not.

These fundamental differences can easily lead to conflict if allowed or pushed. Friction occurs when unlike groups are forced to share a country or a system that is not designed for both. As much as we would like to believe it is possible, reality shows us otherwise. Our multicultural experiment is beginning to break down our society, as segments within now wish to change what we have for something we have already decided we didn't want. Social rules are just as much a real force as gravity, and with similar consequences.

In this conflict, as in the Middle East, our taking of sides is dividing our nation. The concept that one side is evil and the other is just, plays the same tune for both sides. The reality, as I indicated above, is something we can see, if we take the time to look and open our minds enough to do so without prejudice. We get any amount of media coverage of the nastiness of Hezbollah, or Iran and Jordan and the terrorist activity therein. We are supposed to see Israel as the defensive one, striking a blow for their own safety. The two sides are different in culture, both radicalised enough by constant war to be in that frame of mind

where 'others' are not us! There can be no sharing for either side.

I have recently read a few articles that show this, and the nature and degree to which this cultural divide has been embedded.

*'Extremist Jewish settlers have carried out a spate of attacks on Palestinian villages in the occupied West Bank, setting fire to homes, vehicles and agricultural fields.'*
*'More than 20 settler attacks were reported overnight, according to a defence official cited by Israeli media.'*
*'Yesh Din, an Israeli civil rights group that works to protect the rights of Palestinians, described the attacks as "a night of pogroms".*
*"Despite prior knowledge of the planned attacks, forces once again failed to prepare accordingly," the group said in a statement posted on X on Sunday evening. "No preventive measures were put in place to stop the pogroms."'*
*'Israel has built about 160 settlements housing 700,000 Jews since it occupied the West Bank and East Jerusalem - land Palestinians want, along with Gaza, for a hoped-for future state - during the 1967 Middle East war. An estimated 3.3 million Palestinians live alongside them.*
*The settlements are illegal under international law.'*
***https:/https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cew719w80g7o /***

This is one of many internal conflicts that rarely get coverage. Much of the anger being let out is this now generational hate that has developed, and been allowed to develop and fester in order to suit the desires of international interests. Both sides in this conflict are now suffering under the same prejudices.

Big oil (read energy supply), and the manipulation of world energy prices, is intrinsically linked to control of the now dependent populations of the world. Dependant because each nation has seen a selling out of their ability to be energy self sufficient. If we thought foreign debt and it's control of financial policy was bad enough, the overall situation regarding energy supply in all western nations is now in a similar situation. We are reliant on a few small areas in the world and a few large corporations. Once you can see this, the interference in Middle East affairs over previous decades make a lot more sense.

We are now seeing future hot spots being set up as Israel, with the blessing (and help) of many western powers, destroys and invades neighbouring countries on the basis of future security.

*'The Israeli military says plans for the expansion of ground and air attacks against the Lebanese armed group Hezbollah have been approved, amid fears in Lebanon that Israel is preparing a large-scale ground invasion of the country.'*
*'Since then, more than 1,000 people have been killed in Lebanon, according to the Lebanese health ministry, including at least 118 children and 40 health workers.'*

*'More than a million people have been displaced, which could lead to a major humanitarian crisis.'*
*'Israeli forces had been ordered to demolish homes in Lebanese villages along the border to neutralise threats to Israeli communities.'*
***https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c30rl05evd8o***

These extracts from a BBC article show what is happening in Lebanon, what the situation is in Syria and other adjacent countries is little mentioned. Israel's excuse, it is creating a buffer zone, a safety zone for themselves. This is now occupied territory, much as Gaza, the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights (in Syria) are. Under international law, these annexed territories have certain rights. The UN has issued many warnings to Israel since their first occupation after the six day war in 1967. The fact that most of these have been ignored has led to the situation we now see before us. A brief overview of expected behaviour of an occupying force is listed below.
From the International Humanitarian law Centre (IHL).

*'A fundamental concept in IHL is that occupation is a temporary situation at the end of which control of the territory will return to the original sovereign. During this limited period, the occupant administers the territory on behalf of the sovereign. The status of the Occupying Power can therefore be compared to that of a trustee that is supposed to introduce as few changes (demographical, geographical, political) as possible, to preserve the status quo that existed at the beginning of the occupation.'*
*'In addition to these general rules there are other specific obligations and prohibitions, namely:*

- *the obligation to provide for the basic needs of protected population;*
- *the obligation to facilitate humanitarian aid by third actors;*
- *the strict prohibition on transferring the own population into the occupied territory;*
- *the strict prohibition on forcible transfer of the protected population, while allowing for temporary evacuation for military operations;*
- *the obligation to respect private property;*
- *the destruction of property is prohibited except where rendered absolutely necessary for military operations'*

***www.diakonia.se/ihl/resources/international-humanitarian-law/ihl-law-occupation/***

Read these expectations and ask yourself just who you think is at fault here. The rights of Nations to decide their own fates should be paramount.
Our interference without fully understanding why these things have come about, is hypocritical at best. We would do far better by the world's population, to rein

in the causes that work behind the scenes, international finance and it's fingers of control – international corporations.

**Do we really need a law to enforce our legal system?**

Two political figures have introduced a piece of 'firestorm' legislation. Dubbed the Sharia Freedom Act, the **Australian Courts Act 2026** was proposed by both Bob Katter and Barnaby Joyce. You can imagine the slanging matches and the rhetoric, not to mention the name calling that will rise to this occasion. It is essentially a bill that stipulates that no foreign law, including religious law such as Sharia, will have any jurisdiction in Australian federal courts.

My question with this bill, is why do we think we need it?

In any country, the law of the land is embedded in it's structure.
The constitution, the inherited culture and legal system all provide what is expected of us. A foreign law is just that – foreign! (The definition being the law of a country other than your own.)

I would have expected our judicial system to work according to our laws alone. The respect we may owe to foreign laws, stops at our borders!, In this country the are not acted upon! They are not law! We have our developed laws - and they are it. To change them requires an act of parliament and a judicial adoption, both of which would be contrary to our vision of our country as it stands.

Those who claim it will effect the rights of immigrants, or destroy our ideals of multiculturalism, seem to have lost view of the fact that we have our stability and freedoms based entirely upon our developed systems; of law, of government, of expected social order. To keep these things we must retain what we have and not introduce foreign concepts that are not compatible.

I find it strange that an existing system should need qualification or justification to allow it to continue. Especially since it requires active participation to change it.
For these foreign laws to be accepted, the parliamentary process to begin it, must occur. We must actually adopt them! I cannot see that happening.

The wariness I feel about this bill, is more to do with the basic soviet advances at the beginning of the rise of communism in eastern Europe. The rights that a government gives you, are the rights they can also modify or take away.
Our rights are inherent in both our system and our culture. They are God given – inalienable! They are not for the prevailing government to codify and 'allow us to have' or not to have. Otherwise we will see a steady erosion by stealth, when legislation is amended or altered at the whim of whatever woke policy becomes the flavour of the month.

More power to the sentiments expressed by Messrs Katter and Joyce, but our rights need to remain inalienable, not state controlled! Beware of politicians bearing gifts! ***

**From the Archives: *On Target* Vol. 33 No. 07. (28th Feb 1997)**

***https://alor.org/Storage/OnTarget/Volume33/Vol33No7.htm***

## Making the Court Accountable

The magnitude of the decisions reached by the High Court, and the far-reaching consequences of those decisions, raise the question of the accountability of the High Court. To whom does the Court answer if they make a mistake? The answer to this question seems to be "their consciences". There is no longer any appeal to a higher court, unless the International Court in the Hague is regarded as a legitimate Court of Appeal for Australia. It has no heritage of common law, and is based more on the Roman legal system than the British.

As a question of historical fact, there can be no denying that since Federation, the High Court has assisted in the centralisation of power in Australia. Cases like the Koowarta, Franklin Dam, Mabo and Wik are modern examples of a century long trend. As this trend now moves from the national centralisation of power to the international centralisation of power, Australians are entirely justified in asking for further accountability from the High Court.

Professor Geoffrey Walker, Dean of the Queensland University Law Faculty, was trenchant in his criticism of the High Court in 1993, when he described the Court as the main agent in the subversion of Australian federalism. Referring to the Franklin River Dam case, Walker charged that the Court had defied all recognised principles of constitutional interpretation. "This judicial coup d'etat gave Canberra the tools with which to over-ride the federal distribution of powers whenever it chooses," Walker said.

He added that the Mabo case was the most divisive and disruptive in the Court's history, in which it had again abandoned its constitutional role.

There is no doubt that the Commonwealth has ruthlessly exploited the High Court's interpretation of the "external affairs" power of the Constitution, in order to strip the States of many of their legitimate powers. Will Mr. Howard move towards correcting this "trend"? Or will he shut his eyes, hang on tight, and hope for the best?

Professor Walker made a suggestion in 1993, which Howard might examine. He suggested that the High Court comprise judges from, the Supreme Courts of the States to hear all matters concerning constitutional divisions of power, or the powers of the States. In between such cases, Supreme Court judges could resume their normal State duties, thus minimising the centrist bias that is so blatantly obvious. ***

**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.**