A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 61 No. 45 **14th November 2025**

IN THIS ISSUE

Have a Proper Gander at This! By Neville Archibald

The News is always ongoing and plentiful. How we read it is important. There are reasons to be careful when taking things at face value, and critical thinking caps are a crucial part of any reading activity. It used to be sitting with your smoking jacket on, pipe in hand, whisky or other vice by your side in a comfy armchair. Perusing the days papers at leisure.

Now we hastily cram in a few digital posts or condensed articles, many never going beyond headlines and introductory blurb. The real reading of news is a thing of the past.

Don't get me wrong, I emphasise with time poor people, with the 'there's nothing new' and even the, 'It's all bullshit' brigades. It can be and is a frustrating task to find the truth in reporting these days. Bias and under-reporting, over-reporting and not reporting at all, seem to be more normal now than accurate reporting. Maybe I am wrong in my view of this, but each day I see conflicting reports, or reports that conveniently neglect to mention items that I see as crucial.

A recent condemnation of a climate report, as being in some way connected to 'Fossil Fuel money', appeared in a paper just recently. One footnote of many, was a report done, on a similar problem, by such a think tank (fossil fuel lobby). It was mentioned amongst the footnotes purely as it found a similar result. It was not a part of this detailed research. The interviewer doing the critical article had phoned and spoken with the lead author, who told them exactly that. All research and conclusions were independent of any sort of sponsorship and that the inclusion was only used to highlight that someone else had come to the same conclusion using different methods.

The Article still went ahead as a condemnation piece, linking the two when there was no link. An apology was made only after the media responsible was contacted, with a small recanting note put in the media responsible. This trick, for that is how I see it, is done quite often. The first big publication or pronouncement smears, the retraction, that comes (often much later) is a small one that gets little notice. The deed is done. Oops a mistake was made, but not before critical material has had a wash put over it. In this way, much of our current media, (not all of them mind you) operates. An existing bias is strengthened by misuse of facts or 'slips' in accuracy. If it was just ignorance or deadline pressure, one could possibly feel for the writer/presenter. But most have a huge team backing them in everything they do.

This story sort of highlights for me the impact propaganda has also. During wartime, news was censored and government 'stories' went out to help in the war effort. If you were on the winning side, it was 'encouraging a population', if you were on the other side it was 'propaganda', aimed to spread untruth and despair, or to trick!

Both sides told untruths, there is no way to sugar coat it. Both sides used this weapon of war in an attempt to win. We may not be at war now, at least not in a physical sense as many would define it, but we are in a spiritual war, a business war, a war for control of populations by another name. We are at war with global compliance, from every side.

Take January 6th 2021, the supposed White house insurrection, in Washington DC. Trump was giving a speech, a protest was happening at the capital, other events also were going on. We saw a flood of people enter the White-house in protest to what they saw as a governing system out of their control. Frustrations, questions of fairness, voting anomalies, were all part of the reason for them being there. What happened after that is history. Both sides claimed to be misrepresented and the court of public opinion was the battle ground. Who was right, was the President inflaming the crowds? Were they let in purposefully to create a scene. One woman was shot, dead!, lost her life in this debacle. Do those vying for power truly not care for life?

I know it is old news and should not affect us here in Australia, but recent findings in the UK have had important repercussions within this questioning. As I said, I believe we are at war with a spiritual dimension leading the way. TRUTH, does not get a fair hearing, and those who defile it, seem to get away with it in this world. I only hope they are judged for their indiscretions in the afterlife.

Donald Trump faced a lot of criticism over Jan 6th, his election prospects and all that that entails became food for conjecture. A leading article of the time, a

piece in the BBC program 'Panorama' edited two pieces of the presidents speech together, despite them being almost 50 minutes apart.

> 'The BBC doctored a Donald Trump speech by making him appear to encourage the Capitol Hill riot, according to an internal whistle-blowing memo seen by *The Telegraph*'
>
> ***https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2025/11/03/bbc-report-reveals-bias-donald-trump/***

It would appear that the BBC piece gave the impression that the president was encouraging the riot. This style of reporting is done more often than you may think. We all realise that media 'spins' stories from time to time, but do we ever seriously consider the real and longer term impacts they have; enough?

Heads are rolling at the BBC, with the Director General (of 5 years, before that a 20 year career, I believe) and the Head of News, now stepping down from their positions. I don't believe the repercussions of this has been fully felt yet, what else may follow, given the BBC is supposed to be like our ABC, public funded and impartial. Questions are raised and the Telegraph pointed out the 'leaked memo' also included accusations of systemic bias of various kinds, and failure to deal with issues when raised.

> 'The leaked memo was written by Michael Prescott, a former independent external adviser to the broadcaster's editorial standards committee, who left the role in June.'
> 'His leaked memo said he had felt "despair" at the lack of action by BBC management "when issues come to light"'.'
>
> ***https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c3vn25d5dq7o***

One of my favourite lines in this article is, 'Davie, who has worked for the corporation for 20 years, stressed that "our journalism and quality content continues to be admired as a gold standard" and that the organisation was "overwhelmingly kind, tolerant and curious"'.'

Shades of our Victorian Premier Daniel Andrews and his Gold Standard comments during the plandemic. What is not to trust?

So reading the news of the day, while it is important, it is even more important to get a complete view and to read the fine print when it is available. Or in the words of a favourite Uncle, 'Don't believe all you hear!'

Reporting again raises it's head with the plight of Naomi Seibt. A political activist aligned with the far right, if you believe wikipedia. A relatively young 25, she is being linked with Germany's AfD, or Alternative for Germany (despite her saying she is not). The AfD, founded by 'Gauland, Bernd Lucke, and former members of the Christian Democratic Union of Germany (CDU) to oppose the policies of the eurozone as a right-wing and moderately Eurosceptic alternative to

the centre-right but pro-European CDU.' Wikipedia.
It became the party opposed to Angela Merkel's direction for Germany. And a vocal one against increasing immigration and destruction of long held German values.

With Germany's heightened fear of anything Nationalist, the opposition to it, seems to focus on this, and comes down hard.

> ''I made a post during the European elections in June 2024, where I said, "My name is Naomi Seibt, and I'm voting for the AfD."
>
> '"It is illegal to damage the reputation of a politician in Germany. This law was extended under Angela Merkel article 188 and now people are being arrested. And their houses are being raided for just social media posts. As soon as I come back to Germany, I feel that they will try to arrest me," she explained.'
> ***https://www.foxnews.com/world/anti-greta-activist-flees-europe-antifa-death-threats-elon-musk-backs-asylum-claim***

The fact that she is being seen as the 'Anti Greta' of climate, and a supporter of the AfD, has put her in the spotlight. Germany is now known for it's position on anything Nationalist, and that excuse is being used to smear or identify as 'nasty' anyone who opposes the current German political machine. An effective gag. Reports of arrests of those opposing the direction Germany is taking, and death threats to those same groups, are numerous. There is also a question being raised about the 'untimely' deaths of a number of the political opposition. Statistically the number is far in excess of what would be considered normal for the general population, even taking into consideration the older age of many.

> 'Four candidates and two reserves from the right-wing AfD political party in Germany have dropped dead within 13 days of each other — just before elections, according to reports.'
> 'Officials said no foul play is currently suspected in any of their deaths, the BBC reported.'
> ***https://nypost.com/2025/09/02/world-news/six-candidates-from-germanys-rightwing-afd-party-die-days-apart-in-lead-up-to-local-elections-reports/***
>
> 'Alternative for Deutschland co-leader Alice Weidel amplified speculation when she reposted economist Stefan Homburg's comment that the number of candidate deaths was 'statistically impossible,' the BBC reported.'
> German police stated they were investigating the deaths and details have been withheld for reasons of family privacy, according to reports.'

Dr John Campbell looked at this in a podcast, due to it's statistical improbability, it is worth viewing.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZmXjgXw0XKE

Naomi herself, raised this in a podcast with Redacted presenters, Clayton and Natali Morris. ***https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=99Cd23GLZaI***

Now you could probably say the asylum seeking was for publicity reasons, you might also believe that these news items are just a part of politics these days, and the depths that some will sink to to get attention is now seriously perverted. I would like to think that it is all just fiction, but when death is involved and political intrigue looks an awful lot like the 1930s machinations all over again, one becomes suspicious. Didn't Hitler remove many of his opposition in that way? If they (German Government) are so concerned about the rise of a 'New Right', would they not be concerned by this? What is the truth? Will it be found out after the elections and enough time has passed to dampen down indignity within the public's imagination? If enough time passes before truth is admitted (or even looked at seriously) then it provides time to spin new narratives to replace the old. In this way does our mind become a plaything for those in power, especially when some form of propaganda is prevalent. If it took the BBC so long to deal with an item from 2021, what hope do we have?

In more recent news, it now appears President Trump may be suing the BBC over this. I cannot stress enough, the implications that poor reporting, inaccurate reporting and biased reporting, has on public opinion. It is a huge factor in creating a false narrative, whether done purposely or not. It can create huge division within communities and lead to problems that then need a solution; one that a willing globalist mindset is happy to provide. Be careful of Greeks bearing gifts, was the old proverb, in reference to a Trojan Horse!

In Victoria we now have a treaty in place with Aboriginal people. In ABC news they say:

> 'Australia has seen its first ever treaty with Aboriginal people signed and formalised as law today.
> It follows nearly a decade of consultation and negotiation between the Victorian government and Indigenous leaders.
> The treaty has been applauded internationally by the United Nations.'
> ***https://www.abc.net.au/news/2025-11-13/australia-first-treaty-agreement-signed-law-victoria/106002730***

What does this mean exactly? We now have another tier of government it would appear, with all the problems associated with it. A divided community by colour or race. But that is only my opinion.

Aintree Group Legal say this on their web page:

> 'The Act establishes Gellung Warl – a Gunaikurnai phrase meaning 'tip of the spear' – a new statutory corporation that permanently enshrines the First Peoples' Assembly of Victoria in law.
> Gellung Warl will be the vehicle for statewide treaty processes and will consist

of three arms:
the Assembly (representative body);
a truth-telling body, Nyerna Yoorrook Telkuna; and
an accountability and monitoring body, Nginma Ngainga Wara.
This structure ensures that Aboriginal voices are formally recognised in decision-making and that treaty processes have transparent oversight.'
https://aintreelegal.com.au/insights/victoria-passes-australias-first-statewide-treaty-legislation/

While I am concerned about the poor outcomes in some 'first nations' groups, I am no more concerned than any other poor outcome in other groups in our communities. After all, we are all supposed to be equal! We only just had a formal federal referendum which decided we did not want to divide our country in this way, yet our state governments seem to believe they are not beholden to this clearly made decision. In the blurb associated with the website below, are these words:

'The Australian Labor Party (ALP) took a statewide Treaty commitment to the last Victorian state election, and with that electoral mandate, the Government has now acted to deliver on this policy promise. This gives the Bill both political legitimacy and a strong foundation for debate in Parliament.'
https://aintreelegal.com.au/insights/victorias-historic-treaty-bill/

I'm sorry, but I am at pains to figure how that actually works. We have a party that campaigns on so many policies, of which 'treaty' is only one. A nationwide (which includes Victoria) referendum, on one subject, which says NO, is swept aside by one policy amongst the 82 that they announced for the 2022 election. 'Victorian Labor announced 82 policies and the Liberals and Nationals announced 112.' ***https://pbo.vic.gov.au/response/5693***

My mind boggles at this ability to justify what 'they' want, over what the people actually want. This is the reason why electing parties, with their groups of policies to be enacted, can never truly reflect public opinion or desire. One controversial topic can swing an election result! Every other policy could be opposed by a majority of people, but that 'one' makes the difference.

Or vice-versa, one set of reasonable policies can hide the kicker that tightens the totalitarian noose. Maybe I am being dramatic!

The UN has weighed in, praising this decision as a great step for Human Rights. We need to be careful of these 'Human Rights' we are looking for. It is probably forgotten, but even the Soviet Union had 'Rights', the right to vote (as long as it was for the only party), right to free speech (as long as it was correct 'free speech') and numerous others. Remember, what the state gives you, the state owns and can take away! I see the globalist nature of the UN and its affiliates in this way too. Many are authoritarian in nature and do not have God as the giver of these rights. It is a careful road to tread when discussing this concept, as I do

not wish to confer intent upon those currently in positions of trust; but, we must all remember that these positions do change and leadership groups alter, not always for the better. Power given to one group, can easily be abused by the next. We have witnessed this through history, which is a good reason to be familiar with it.

Net Zero moves, ahead.

The Coalition votes soon to accept or reject this concept. Moves are afoot to resolve this dis-chord within the opposition. Why? I think people are beginning to see more clearly, that much of the action involved in achieving this aim, revolves around big business and global entities getting access to a never ending milk cow, the Australian public.

NSW has in it's build, a battery! A 'shock absorber' for the renewables supply variations. This is a $1 billion investment, $500 million from Blackrock, also investment by NGS super and $100 million from federal government via it's clean energy finance corporation. The Waratah project, which is due to supply power late this year, has suffered a major setback. It now looks to be fully online later in 2026. ***https://www.afr.com/companies/energy/catastrophic-failure-delays-massive-1b-waratah-super-battery-20251110-p5n90f***

The part that I contest here, is the limited access to the financial details of this build and the ongoing supply payments. Just who benefits and how much of our money is now going overseas. Both Blackrock (who effectively owns the battery) and Transgrid who deliver the power are not fully Australian owned. There are many mentions of Investors, but nothing is clear cut. Some are superannuation entities and whatever that entails. Renew Economy wrote in Dec 2023:

> 'A project to build Australia's biggest 'shock absorber' battery and its associated infrastructure will cost more than $700 million over six years. The figure was released late on Friday by the Australian Energy Regulator as it completed a complex series of determinations. But it raises more questions than it answers because so much of the project remains confidential, including the payments to the battery owner itself, and even the identity of other partners.'
>
> ***https://reneweconomy.com.au/filling-eraring-gap-giant-waratah-super-battery-project-to-receive-more-than-700m/***

The 'Commercial in confidence' nature of the build in 2023, is not inspiring to the likes of myself, who remembers the SEC (State Electricity Commission) and profits (or losses) being ours (the State's). Now we have the situation where the outgoing profits, possibly subsidies and who knows what else, may well be just going offshore. We have coal, we had generators and they were ours, any small loss due to government inability to manage our electrical grid properly would still have been peanuts compared to the losses we will now see in ongoing payments

to foreign entities. If this 'offshoring' of utilities continues, under whatever pretext they can whip up, then we will end up being tenants in our own country. We will owe our living costs to big corporations who have no National loyalty and no real reason to spend their profits here. It becomes a distinct net loss for us all.

While I see no problem building good infrastructure, it needs to be both well thought out and properly funded. Funded by the likes of our own Bank. I know the Commonwealth bank is no longer the original Commonwealth bank – owned by Australia and operating under it's original charter - but it could be!

It was done once before when Sir Dennison Miller was at it's head, and it did some remarkable development in this nation. This is not a fairy tale or wishful thinking, it is FACT. It could be done again, given the political will to do so.

I suggest you buy a copy of, The Story of the Commonwealth Bank by D.J.Amos, and present it to your local member. Ask, if it was done before, why can't it be done again? There are also other articles related to the correct use of monetary policy that would back this up. We need to understand that we are being hamstrung by a flawed system and it suits those controlling it to keep it that way. Speaking up is the only solution, doing so until our voices can no longer be ignored. ***

Purchase a copy here:
https://veritasbooks.com.au/products/the-story-of-the-commonwealth-bank-d-j-amos

Or download your own copy from:
https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Amos%20DJ%20-%20Commonwealth%20Bank.pdf

Who Are We? By Neville Archibald

The very first policy of the League of Rights, is:

> "To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations."

To many people, these things may seem old fashioned, to some even downright out of date. After all, are we not multicultural?; are we not better off being rid of royalty?; isn't the 'Commonwealth' a series of colonial 'has-beens', no longer answerable to a dying British ideal?

Each of these concepts, may be sneered at by the 'progressive', or the 'science and man are king' set. The woke brigade, who see themselves as beyond all that old horse and buggy stuff. We can split atoms, make artificial intelligences almost equal to us! We are able to do so many brilliant things that our poor dear ancestors could not even comprehend!

In believing we know it all, modern man has often overlooked the older methods of doing things, and in doing so, has lost sight of what it really means

to have already developed a system of getting on together. In the race to identify just how advanced we think we are, we clearly miss some of the important factors that have held us together as a nation, as a civilized group of nations, with a common wealth. There is no doubt as to why those words were chosen to represent us, for we do share a wealth of things in common. Things that have allowed us to progressively find ourselves as individuals, increasingly free. Free from poverty, free from restrictions, free to follow our passions and so many of the other freedoms that we take for granted.

Over a long history of development we have tried and failed, tried and succeeded, and endeavoured to keep those successes and improve on our failures. We no longer have to use slaves, we no longer face down brutal enemies by ourselves, we have some form of protection from a legal system that makes it hard to cause mental, physical or social harm to others. We are protected from the worst of the wrong doers who would splinter our society for their own benefit.

These are the things our historical connection with the teachings of God and Jesus have given us. The creation of kings came from this unity under a Christian ideal. We transformed a method of rule from antiquity, into a method of keeping our historical connections to Christian fairness by having in the King, a virtual umpire who rules on parliamentary laws or impositions, according to the rights and customs of the populace. He is the protector of the realm, defender of the faith, and as such is above the petty squabbles of fallible men, whose desire to rule often sees them push the very limits of what is acceptable to the very people they are supposed to represent. The oath taken at Coronation ties the monarch to that history, to just rule under God, under the Bill of Rights 1866, and under Magna Carta. In the push for a republic and removal of the Monarch, there is much that would be thrown out with the bath water, so to speak. If this were to be done from the grass roots population, with educated discussion being the push, we may successfully see a change. The calibre of those pushing for change now is such that any change would only reflect the constant loss of freedoms we are currently experiencing. I contend that we would be far worse off, no matter what carrots are dangled.

So what has happened to cause this damage within our Nation?

I suggest that if you wanted to break down a successfully independent Nation and change the rule, the power structure, then the correctly functioning systems would need to be slandered or sneered at. These systems would need to be 'broken' in some way and then shown as being bad or badly run, then of course push for them to be replaced (with something that suits better control of the populace). These actions would be the actions of a 5th column inside a country, one that wanted to adjust our governing processes to better control the population. All for the sole purpose of power and what that can bring. Is this

what we've seen?

Is it happening now? Has it happened before? What can we do about it? The answer lies in the study of history and the matching of those historical happenings to the goings on in today's world.

If they are not to be seen, then we can rest happily in that knowledge. If there is a sniff of something rotten, then we must wake up to it and make changes in our lives to actually deal with it. The responsibility for keeping ourselves free, is ours alone. ***

League Objectives

(a) To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, to the Crown, and to the Country.

(b) To advocate genuine competitive individual enterprise and personal initiative.

(c) To defend private ownership and advocate its extension in order that individual freedom with security shall be available to all.

(d) To attack and expose government-by regulation and bureaucratic interference with economic and social activities.

(e) To take steps designed to secure to the individual very definite rights which no government can take away, and especially steps which defend the written constitution.

(f) To defend the Rule of law which makes all equal before the Law.

(g) To stress the value of our system of Common Law, originally built up in Great Britain, to protect the rights of the individual; and to that end, to expose corruption and partiality in all their forms.

(h) To expose the manner in which the safe guards of individual rights and liberties are being destroyed.

(I) To emphasise the value of the Senate and of Legislative Councils.

(j) To expose and oppose all anti-British propaganda and actions, irrespective of their origin.

(h) To take such other actions as may be deemed desirable to promote the policy of the League.

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.