A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 28 24th July 2026

IN THIS ISSUE

Money, Simple or Complicated? By Neville Archibald

The money system we operate under reminds me of another system that I had problems with recently.

The parallel problem was one of understanding rather than complexity. Sometimes it seems we focus on that complex association rather than the simple mechanical application it should be.

With internet connections being disrupted or downgraded in my area on several occasions, the decision to try star-link as an alternative was made. A simple plug and play star-link mini, with its own router is an easy tool to use (so I'm told).

I had my star-link gear ready to go, but had yet to test it out, still relying on Telstra mobile or land line as my main 'podcast' connection. Both alternatives on the morning in question, would not give me enough upload speed to connect, despite trying several times. With start-time looming, I set up Star-link and plugged it in. I had the green light from my mentor (at a remote location) who was monitoring this installation, but despite that, my computer would not 'shake hands' as the terminology goes.

This led to several hasty attempts to solve the problem, but eventually I had to bow out of the session. I contacted my IT bloke, and we proceeded to run test after test of software and setting configurations. That the physical attachment was made, was not in question (although I disconnected and reconnected to check).

After considerable mental effort and much time, we made the decision to pull the pin (literally) and use another connection to a separate router in another location (just in case my laptop input was faulty). I had another cable and gear to do so organised, so I disconnected from my 'docking station' (as I use multiple screens) and was about to remove the star-link cable, when I noticed flashing lights – behold, connection established!

It seems the 'dock' over-rides the laptop computer's own Ethernet connection, and I should have been plugged into the dock not the laptop! Once free of the dock – of course it worked. We had occupied our time looking for complicated, when the answer was basic reality, we just needed to know where to look. (my IT mate had not realised I was on a dock, or he probably would have said to check that).

The same parallel can be drawn about our financial system! We spend a lot of time following experts with theories and experts with solutions but rarely stop to ask the basic questions. We allow continuous tinkering and the raising of taxes or reduction in spending to attempt to sort out our issues, yet all the while the problem continues.

In that same way, we are always looking for a complicated solution, in fact we are asked to vote for various solutions which are based on the premise that the complicated formulas are wrong and need changing. Money must come from somewhere to pay for expenses or debt, it is presented as just a matter of who you take it from. We even go so far sometimes to 'blame' others for having too much, while we have too little.

The tax take must be adjusted, and we fight each other to make sure it isn't us who pays.

When the bickering dies down, we still find, at the end of the political term for the group we selected, we are still facing the same old problems. Each party just plays to a different audience. Different music for different dances, but each sees us shuffling in circles around the problem, never getting closer to its centre.

Now, if we all stood back and let those competing bands go quiet, we might be able to hear something else! The composer in the background is perhaps writing his own melody, regardless of the dance style that the audience wants!

If we decided to direct the composer to write for us, things would be different. It is not so much about the battle of the bands, as it is why we are playing music in the first place.

Money is there to enable society to operate! It is a basic tool, one that should help us to use our skills, our inherited knowledge and the resources at our disposal as a nation, to improve our lives. If it is physically possible, if we have all those things, then the only impediment we face is the permission to do it – this permission takes the form of money!

Who owns that money? Who is it doing the physical work, who is it doing the mental arithmetic and the supplying of the resources? In each case it is the people of the nation and the resources they own in common (i.e. Australia itself). The issue of the slips of permission (physical form of money) is strictly an accounting procedure. The people tasked with giving this permission to proceed, need only ask if it is possible. If all pieces are in place, then the go ahead, in the form of money, is given.

The idea that 'money' is in short supply, when the physical reality tells us otherwise, is a conscious denial of what is possible. We are being constrained for no good reason.

It is often portrayed, that issuing money without limit will make things worse, inflation will rise and we will all lose out. Funny money, printing money or other derogatory terms are used to disguise the fact that there is a lack of these permissions in circulation. We are overspending! or we have too much! is a common complaint. Taxes or interest rates must rise to cool us down! What rot!

The answer to our constrained financial position, is not contained in playing with the equations of some theory or other, it is simply in the questions, is it possible in real terms, is it desired by the nation? If so, it is financially possible with the confidence of the nation behind it and the ownership of the end result is the nation itself. Along the way, the people involved earn and exchange the necessary permissions (money) to achieve the end result!

We need no outside force 'lending' us their permission and then claiming ownership, to do any of these things, just something created for nothing (a mere bookkeepers fee), stands between us and whatever it is we decide to do.

We look for the complicated solution, when the reality is simple. If it is physically possible, it is financially possible!

How else does our finance system take from us?

Thomas Peterffy, a Hungarian born American billionaire, pioneered the making of money via knowledge of market movements in advance of everyone else! (Note: making money, not wealth!)

Sometimes known as insider trading, where inside knowledge of coming market sales, advances in technology or political decisions can see fortunes made or lost, there are degrees to which it is made illegal and times when it is overlooked. Not saying of course, that Mr Peterffy was doing anything illegal in pioneering this method, astute players of the stock market do this all the time. Buying stock on the way up, then selling it again just before it reaches the top. Even if it makes only cents in the dollar, the difference, with enough money invested and the timing right, means fortunes are to be had.

(As the gambling ads go: you win some, you lose more! In this case it generally ends up being the public that foots the ultimate bill.)

President Trump, with his promise to 'drain the swamp' has just, as I see it, added a few more sharks or leeches to the water. His decision (or that of his minders) to monetise access to his tweets, gives me cause to question his intentions. Government policy is also a driver of markets and early knowledge of coming shifts in policy could easily be considered insider trading (and has been).

What Mr Trump is suggesting is charging large sums of money (subscriptions) for the earliest receipt of his tweets. Milliseconds before anyone else, perhaps even minutes, as some wait for servers to catch up with the sending out to the 111 million followers he has on X.

What will this do?

For those entities who play the market and play it big, their computing power, their AI programs and algorithms, make the difference on the trading markets in milliseconds. That ability to buy and sell before anyone else, can be leveraged to make 'better informed' decisions and beat the market lag enough to ensure a profit. People in the know, get the jump!

So is Trump, effectively front-running customers who pay, with an advantage? It would seem possible. This service comes in on August 1st. Let's see what happens.

All this vying for financial advantage, is at the core of our moral problem. The very idea of buying and selling someone else's livelihoods to make a monetary profit (with no real beneficial interaction), I see as greed or gluttony! Making these fortunes from 'gambling' on the achievements of others, does no favour to society as a whole. I only see this as a parasitic draw on our potential. It only comes about because of our endeavour to 'play' the system as it is structured now. Companies that enter this 'market', only do so because they are convinced it is the only way to achieve their goals. The incantations and promises of the economists who persist in selling the theories that abound, are the only ones effectively promoted. We have been sold a complicated ecosystem, when all we wanted was to potter about in the garden.

Many proposed solutions try to convince us that the market will solve the issues if only we can get money back on the gold standard, or some other fictional form of wealth. Bitcoin, bonds or band-aids would be as good, if we believe in them enough. None of those items is a true representation of what money should be, and that is the main issue. Thinking that the gold standard and the market will bring us back does not go far enough.

I can see no solution where 'the market' can be used to solve the issues we face, either as an indicator or a moderator. It will remain faulty as long as it can be biased by the ultra-rich or ultra powerful. Using it as a tool will be like using a faulty spirit level, every floor you lay, will be a slope down which we will slide back into the depth's financial disparity.

To hope for a system that keeps us level is not a desire to 'regulate' by government as much as it is to regulate to stop the corruption of a few over the general population of a country. The only true way a population can ever hope to achieve this fairness for all, is some form of democratic association that enables Joe Blow to be on the same footing and under the same laws as those who are trying to rob him. Regulation in this sense is not the dirty word they would have you believe, it is the culmination of the implementation of laws which we all agree will keep us safe from predatory actions. Like murder is unacceptable and regulated against, so too should our use of money represent how we interact fairly. Without this we are at the mercy of the unscrupulous. When unfair advantage is enacted in the distribution of money, it robs the average punter of his/her real wealth – the wealth of the nation.

The implementation of Douglas Social Credit principles, would see the ownership of wealth, put back into the hands of those creating it, and all of us being able to share in the inheritance of past discoveries. The true wealth of a nation resides in its people and their abilities, this should be reflected in our financial system. Money itself is just that reflection in accounting terms.

A lesson from the past

In a recent podcast released on you tube is entitled: *'How the World's Richest City Went Completely Broke!'* **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=llAT7ZxQ1wE**

In line with the above theme, this short presentation shows how market manipulation can cause extreme loss for some, while the perpetrators get off virtually scot free.

Melbourne in the late 1800s became a boom town. The richest alluvial gold field in the world was found in Victoria and the economy thus created, saw marvellous construction and development proceed. The confidence in this rise, saw banks, land banks and other lending institutions capitalising on this and investments in Melbourne came from afar. British money in particular.

There were, however, what today we would call speculators, who invested in land in this growing city. It seemed there would be no end to the bubble. Inflated values and incessant lending took prices on an unachievable journey and eventually caused a London bank to nearly collapse in 1890, then finally in 1893 the commercial bank in Victoria, locked its doors. What followed initiated the government to close all banks in Victoria for 5 days (calling it a banking holiday) while the population settled. Within 6 weeks, 13 out of 22 banks had suspended accounts. Millions of pounds were frozen. Some of those who initiated the 'boom' as well as those whose ordinary accounts were in those banks, lost out. Hardly anyone responsible was taken to task. The unconstrained greed and the inclusion of political persons in that bubble saw no regulation occur. Banks, lending institutions and politicians, all failed the people of the colony. Despite such a huge contribution of wealth from gold, overinflated confidence and greed combined to bring Melbourne to its knees.

Then came a ten-year period of unemployment, hardship and depression. (again, the result of the denial of the true credit of the colony – the building and expansion that was going so well before, stopped, because of limited permissions from the financial industries controlling it).

We think these things cannot happen today, that we are above those conditions; yet house prices and in Victoria at least, unfettered building without cost constraints are going gangbusters. The ability of people to afford a house has never been so far out of reach, the ability of government to overspend also outgrowing their income from taxes. The bubble here in Victoria must burst at some point, indebtedness cannot climb forever without something coming to a head. This use of money without properly determining who really owns the wealth being created, is leaving us open to claims by lenders, for something concrete in return for their permission slips. The charade of the money lenders needs a light shone on it, so we can see the truth of who should really own our wealth – us! The presentation shows just what has happened before, the inflated expectations of speculators create a boom that does not just affect them, it drags us all down.

Nothing says saving the planet like a $1200 a night room!

Energy and Climate Change minister, Chris Bowen, the very same $275 electricity bill reduction proponent, is once again showing us his concern. $4.2 million is the budget for the upcoming COP conference in Fiji (note that this is a pre-conference conference). We are to believe that some of this will be paid back to us by participating nations, but last time, in Blenheim, we had to foot the bill for 490 odd Australians in his entourage. Assuming at least the same this time (although as the self-confessed leader of negotiations I'd guess he might need more), will these be at this room cost too?

Besides the exorbitant room costs, the cost of him being president for this meeting is added to our bill:

> '*Australia will spend nearly $150 million on Climate Change Minister Chris Bowen's side role as president of negotiations at the United Nations' next climate conference, as well as on supporting Pacific nations to participate in the global event.*' ***Sydney Morning Herald, May 25th.***

So here we have a man seemingly concerned about climate and trying hard to reduce electricity costs (cough, cough), spending our money like it's nothing. A zoom meeting while sitting in his already paid for office in Parliament house is surely not off the cards, is it? it would certainly save on all that nasty CO^2

pollution created by extravagance.

And this is just the pre-meeting, meeting! Shades of *'The Office'*, which episode was that?

Never mind, the government can't run out of our money, can it?

Trumps 50% tariff on Canadian goods

Last week's short peek at the history of social credit in Canada, reminds us that history is supposed to be something we learn from: as the saying goes, if we don't learn the lessons of history, we are doomed to repeat it!

Methods of taxation, to provide for government spending and use in the growth of nations has had many variations. Income tax, for example, is a fairly recent tax. We forget so quickly what means of raising taxes have been employed and why.

Great Britain introduced it in 1799 to temporarily fund the Napoleonic wars and then repealed it in 1816. It was not until 1842 that it was reinstated.

The early US relied almost entirely on Tariffs and excise duties. To fund the American civil war, they implemented the revenue act of 1861, this introduced the nation's first individual income tax. 3% on incomes of $800 or above. This was then repealed in 1872.

The very war of independence was fought over 'no taxation without representation'.

Taxes were meant to be fair and representative of the people's desires.
The Boston Tea Party and what occurred after was a result of this.

In Australia throughout the 1800s, the six separate colonies survived on customs and excise duties alone. Income tax only appeared in 1884 in South Australia and the 1890s for Victoria and NSW.

Prior to this, the idea of taxation by tariff-like-means, meant struggling local industry and manufacturing was allowed to flourish without outside competition interfering. The big players in other countries, could not obtain unfair advantage and the newly established colonies could 'find their feet' as it were. There was little complaint about trying to build a nation this way, especially from the people who were trying to make it. Big companies, like the East India company and other colonial powers of the time, often found themselves restricted as the nation grew. Political ideals of the time had to be shaped by those whose interests were independence.

Time and again we have seen wars conducted to obtain this sort of independence. It is in the nature of man to seek this freedom.

While many economists wail and vent about tariffs, the end result will be advantage for the internal structure of the nation enacting them. What is it that is wrong with this concept? Every nation should be independent and capable of standing alone. Security of food, energy and the means of making life the best it can be, relies on this ability. To be entirely reliant on global trade, not only wastes energy in transport, but also subjects some counties to the will of others. Increasingly, this control is less in the hands of nations and more in the palm of global finance and a small number of so called 'elites'.

Before condemning Trumps Tariffs, consider the objective he is aiming for. If other countries are so reliant on exports for 'income' to pay their debts, what part of the system is at fault? What forces countries to give away their production in exchange for pieces of paper or blips on a screen, that represents what exactly?

Every time we shop, we see the result of global trade imbalances. Things that were made here have now been replaced by products from other countries, many of which suffer lower standards of living or cheaper cost of ingredients (also reflecting what is paid to other suppliers). The only real winners here are the multinational companies who benefit from struggling economies. If you believe someone is better off for this shuffling of manufacture between low-income countries, then you have fallen for the economic equivalent of a magician's trick. The population of the country you live in, no longer shares in the production cycle and all the other flow on industry that might go with it. We are being pauperised across the board every time we lose yet another industry, cheaper price goods can never make up for that. Once we have lost it for good, those cheaper prices seem to magically rise, like a fish, growing to fit the size of his bowl.

It only takes a minor disruption in one part of the distribution chain, to have us all begging for a solution. To this end does the UN and the WEF provide answers, more control over individual lives, more rationing out of goods and attempts at changing the world to suit themselves – not us. They have told us to eat crickets, reduce meat consumption, travel less and much, much, more. None of this would be possible if we remained virtually self-sufficient as a nation. Control of money, most of all, is the mechanism everyone succumbs to, tariffs are simply a method that was once used to reduce the impact of global monopoly. They could be again, but that would go against the narrative being driven.
It will be interesting to see how the Canadian experience pans out and whether Trump does this to strengthen the nation or help his mates in big business.
Time will tell.

What will the solution be?

With all of the above points being made, it should be beginning to come clear. We are being deliberately manipulated by the financial system and those who run it.

"Give me control of a nation's money supply, and I care not who makes its laws." is a comment that has been made and is attributed to Mayer Amschel Rothschild. Founder of the Rothschild banking dynasty.

> ***'Whoever controls the volume of money in our country is absolute master of all industry and commerce...when you realize that the entire system is very easily controlled, one way or another, by a few powerful men at the top, you will not have to be told how periods of inflation and depression originate.'***
>
> ***James A. Garfield 20th President of the United States.***

These two quotes alone should be enough to tie past and present problems to that control. The intention is deliberate and has an end in mind. I am sure if it was spelt out in the terms that truly explain it, it would be rejected outright. Instead, it has been foisted upon us little by little, with excuses and camouflage attached.

The collapse of banks, of property prices, mortgage scandals and investment firms, nearly always sees the little bloke carry the brunt of the loss. Governments who are also now a part of the problem, bail out these institutions with our money and they continue on. Each time, further controls are implemented, over personal freedoms and over property, whether individual or in common. Whether it is 1890, 1930, 1990 or even now, it will continue to do so, until the system they long for is in place. This will be Central banking controlled from the top, limiting what you can do, make, buy and say. Data (surveillance) centres are a huge part of that coming infrastructure.

Or, as they say, 'You will own nothing and be happy', though I suggest the happy part is more likely to be dumbed down to the point of mentally comatose.

To illustrate this a little more clearly, watch the recent speech by President Trump about the Ratepayer Protection Pledge.

See it here: ***https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ebICSW2yVww***

> *'We are here today to continue the incredible progress we're making in communities nationwide to ensure that as new data centers go up, and they're going up all over, electricity bills for American families will actually come down. You know, you're going to be building your own data centers and you're going to build -- building your own electric plants. You're essentially becoming a utility like Con Edison in New York, but maybe at a level that nobody's ever seen before, because we've seen some of the plants that they're building are absolutely incredible.'*
>
> *'... we're leading China by a lot. And using our old grid would not have worked.'*
>
> *'They're going to have a lot of electricity left over and they'll put that into the grid, so we'll actually end up with more electricity, the rates are going to go*

down. As president, I've always said that America's goal must be to dominate the future and that includes being the number one superpower in artificial intelligence -- so important.' **(All quotes extracted from the transcript of the above link.)**

In this speech he announces his intention to make AI data centres build their own electricity generation provisions. He suggests but does not say outright, that this progress will be American; but, in reality it will be big corporations or finance, not the people! He links the failing grid and the promise to fix it to a challenge to 'beat' the world competition for AI technology and data processing ability. We have to win!, is the rallying cry, make America Great!

Now I would like to point out some of the things left unsaid (and this also applies to Australia in it's push for Net Zero). The 'Grid' cannot cope with the demand expected, nor is it in good enough health to do so. Years of political policy demonising coal and gas has seen reduced expenditure on maintaining and upgrading existing power generation. The push for wind and solar has seen decommissioning and refusals of new builds, instead pressing on with the intermittent sources (most of these foreign owned). Now that big business and international finance wish to push surveillance (data) centre builds and the public is crying about electricity consumption, the solution is already primed for acceptance. Make these centres also producers of grid electricity, little matter that most, if not all, of these will use fossil fuels to do so. Where is Net Zero concern then?

Fear of grid failure (virtually engineered), hesitancy around data centre builds and a sweetener linked (to be first in a competitive market), and all the worries about freedoms are overwhelmed. Your mates in the global cabal are enabled even further!

Government (us by proxy) has no say, as these are private entities. Our once essential service (power generation) is now even further out of our control. Our privacy is washed down the toilet along with the excessive water use. Water use that will see less real food grown to feed the population. Prices will rise and only the big multinationals will be able to afford to grow the crap they already provide us with.

It's a bleak picture, I know, but it is where we are headed if we do not insist on taking back control of both Government and finance. As James A Garfield and others have pointed out, finance drives all of this, it is the most crucial of all points made. We must control it.

None of this is simply, 'whoops', it is all engineered with design in mind. Let that sink in!

***

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.