



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 29

31st July 2026

IN THIS ISSUE

Labor Pays the Press? By Neville Archibald

1

Labor Pays the Press? By Neville Archibald

A recent article by George Christensen examines the payments by government to the national press. Instead of being involved in the funding of the ABC or SBS, it would appear that there is a lot more of our money being used to prop up other, supposedly independent media. Does this then mean that these institutions must act favourably towards government? The Answer is probably no, but one does wonder if perhaps each storyteller then has this at the back of mind when investigating. Cause and effect can be subtle, which is why this sort of thing is usually not done!

“This is not some roundabout subsidy buried in the tax system. It is not a government advertising campaign or a grant to repair an old printing press in a country town. The Commonwealth is contributing directly towards the wages of journalists employed by private media companies.”

“Taken together, the Fairfax and Nine entities received more than \$16 million. Seven-related businesses received millions more. These are companies with national television networks, major newspapers, large political bureaus, wealthy shareholders, and direct access to the most powerful people in Canberra.

They are also the organisations that regularly lecture everyone else about conflicts of interest.”

“The practical effect remains obvious. Left-leaning media outlets such as Nine, Crikey, The Conversation, Mamamia, and The Saturday Paper could receive government money. Sky News, The Australian, The Herald Sun, The Daily Telegraph, and several newer conservative outlets could not.

"That does not look much like media diversity."

George Christensen.

The above extract (from George Christensen's post: <http://confidentiaaldaily.com/>) is one to take note of. If you ever wondered why the media seems so biased towards Labor, or indeed the government in general instead of unbiased factual reporting, perhaps this could be one of the reasons.

Political favouritism is not unheard of and sometimes an editorial piece might be excused as just the opinion of the editor, but when basic reporting becomes slanted towards an end, or omits or 'forgets' to ask the important questions, then we no longer have a news service 'without fear or favour'.

What we do have, if this sort of reporting continues, is propaganda! A selective reporting or a form of argument that can be directed, especially if the funding is in some way seen as conditional.

Now I am not accusing Labor of this directly, but in previous times the papers and news purveyors survived as businesses by themselves (with the exception of the ABC). Any attempt at coercion went against long held and fiercely defended journalistic ethics. Are the bosses of these concerns now less interested in this integrity than they are in income? Are the political organisations now so dependent on creating a public attitude towards them, that they need to 'colour' everything before releasing it? Do they feel a need to 'sweeten the pot' of reporting? Is their policy base so out of favour with electorates that help is needed with the selling of it?

Is it any wonder that these questions must be asked at this point. In times past, this sort of possibility was only seen in the communist states. Where dictatorships clung to power by making truth subject to political approval - the first action was to control the press.

Any legislation to deny free speech (something an independent media once defended unconditionally), or any attempt to influence reporting must be viewed with alarm.

We have seen 'hate speech' legislation introduced under the cover of terrorist reaction, we saw mis, dis and mal information headline and overthrow both discussion and reporting during COVID and beyond. Both of these continue to put ordinary Aussies in the firing line for disagreement with political policy. Public reaction to excessive immigration is being relabelled as racism or hate in various forms, refusal to cede bodily autonomy is called names and labelled as harmful, regardless of facts. Research done by competent scientists is being sidelined or demonised when it does not fit that same political agenda.

We must be alert to the possibility of someone seeking to take advantage of our systems, the very things we rely on to keep us informed. If we do not have

truth in reporting, or at least a balance, then poor public decisions are the only outcome we will see. Are we being manipulated yet again?

Political parties have long avoided doing anything that might appear to be blatantly in their self interest. Funding in particular was always a major concern. Nothing smells quite like corruption than a pay off. Both sides of politics avoided all possibilities of this, it was electoral suicide to be caught. What has changed? I know that favouritism happens, I know that deals are done, I am not naive to this. I must ask though, as a voter and one who values truth in all its forms, how gullible are we to believe all this ... whatever it is ... , is just co-incidental or happenstance.

Nothing in the political world ever happens without intent.

The Australian Labour party and our Superannuation

Leveraging our superannuation. When a socialist government (or any government really) runs out of money, it is in effect running out of your money. The only wealth a country has, is in it's people and their belief in themselves. Labor is eyeing off our superannuation funds as capital to use for investment. These are private savings managed by and for retirement. They were made compulsory savings in 1992 after the government's indication that the old age pension (which we have already all paid into all our working lives) may not be available when we retire. There was no real alternative to this imposition, for many it was taken straight out of wages before payment. The rate has steadily increased, from a minimum of 3% or 4% (depending on amount) to reach 12% in 2025. Since then we have also seen attempts at altering it's set up to make private management of your own fund, even more difficult or in some way penalised, thus pushing more people into managed funds by big investment groups. This has resulted in an asset that is now being used to invest in big projects, many of them with substantial risk involved. While you can opt to take a low risk approach in your fund, there always remains some. As a retirement nest egg, and with the inferred absence of future government pensions, I cannot see this as acceptable.

Now government is eyeing it off as though they can claim leverage from it. Not just content with 'debt for equity' swaps (where our national parks, resources or land in general are used as collateral for loans) we are looking at a government that wishes to build policy as though this asset was theirs.

This from Scott Donald, UNSW. <https://www.unsw.edu.au/newsroom/news/2026/07/government-tap-4-trillion-superannuation-address-australias-challenges-risky-strategy>

"At the Superannuation Lending Round-table last week, an annual event hosted by The Australian Financial Review, Prime Minister Anthony Albanese said there was a "real potential" to see superannuation funds as:

a national asset that can be used more appropriately and get better returns as well, not just for individuals and for retirees, but for the nation.

Albanese reportedly urged attendees – including the chief executives of several major super funds and banks – to invest more of their members' funds in Australia, in particular business lending to fuel growth."

Naturally there was a push back by current fund managers, but the aim of an increasingly cash strapped government is easy to see.

Under current debt financing, this search for an ever decreasing amount of available money will continue. It will continue until everything we own is hocked, and we literally "own nothing ... but we're not happy". A solution of some sort will be proposed, and every effort will be made to convince us that there is no other option. We will be asked to trust a government that has continually put us in that position. A bail-out or alternative will be offered that make our current 'wage slavery' seem like a walk in the park. **It will be sold to us as the solution.** Before this happens we must educate ourselves and others to make sure we do not fall for this. **It will not be a solution that gives us freedom.**

For further education we must read and understand what history has shown us and what a potential solution really could look like. A demonising of 'Social Credit' by its use in China (as a controlling or surveillance network and universal basic incomes), means we must look at and reassert '**Douglas' Social Credit principles** at every opportunity. That China has used the words, social credit, I do not believe is co-incidental. In the west, this 'word association' will not help our cause.

However, the fact that it is part of the Chinese dictatorial system is our biggest advantage if this is the system proposed. We are seeing all the infrastructure of that very Chinese system being built around us: data (surveillance) centres, increased restrictions in every field of endeavour, and limits to all conversations, are being put in place. Emphasis on the Christian principles undergirding the Douglas proposed Social Credit, will carry far more weight when we have it's polar opposite next to it!

Douglas, must precede all Social Credit references and the word Christian should also be in there. The foundation of our free society rests on the teachings of Christ, any solution that does not include this, is fraught with danger. Jeremy Lee wrote, Mending a Mortgaged World in 2009. A better overview of how we got here and what we are facing is hard to find. The potential solution in the form of Douglas Social Credit is also summarised. We will need this knowledge to be wide-spread!

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Lee%20J%20-%20Mending%20a%20Mortgaged%20World.html>

A political problem is a Social problem!

I raise questions about political decisions every issue. We discuss the intentions and actions of various groups and people. What we ignore far too much, is our role.

The definition of politics; the purpose of the political system, is to create and continue the social well-being of the nation. Under a democratic system this must coincide with the desires of the Nation. It must Re – Present the will of the populace, to the government of the day, and be acted upon according to those wishes.

We often separate social and political ideals, putting politics aside, in a basket on it's own because it divides us, or otherwise it makes us merely shut down and not engage! We fail to think of politics in terms of reality, and the overall desire of the population is being effected by political manoeuvrings we are absent from. The object, the desire to get along in a large group – a nation – means we must be on the same basic page about our societal conventions. It is vitally important that these agreements, these standardised acceptances are recognised as what they are, CULTURE!

When we are being told we have a toxic culture, or we have no real culture, what the political establishment is telling us, is that they are going to create one for us! They are ignoring what we have and replacing it with something else. The push for gender recognition in schools, where children are being taught there are many genders. The push to limit speech in case someone, somewhere is offended. The push to demonise our past and label what is left of our culture as abhorrent because of those past occurrences, fails to address the real advances and achievements we have made.

By focusing entirely on the negative in life, we have been captured and made to believe we must accept the changes being foisted upon us.

‘Playing politics’ is simply organising groups into opposing teams, to argue about often non existent problems, or problems we are well on the way to solving already. It can also be used to distract us from the real issues we should be facing. Running effective government is not about this ‘playing’ of politics, it is about finding out what people want and endeavouring to organise it to happen in the best possible way. **The ideals and aims of the people are supposed to be the guiding factor in politics, this will not happen if we do not participate.**

The distaste for politics has been engendered to create this disengagement, I am sure. We have allowed ourselves to be put off by it, to step away from the conflict it creates, an intentional one. The people still ultimately hold the power, but do not realise it. We still have a culture, no matter how many times we are told we do not. It is still worth protecting from unbridled change. We have seen

change, it has been ongoing since the beginning of this nation and it has been for the better overall. All the hype and grievance politics being played ignores this point, instead focusing on controlling what we think and pushing for a radical departure from our existing culture.

So politics is the key to social harmony and social growth – it must be played as a participant, not viewed as a spectator! Get out there!

Katoomba stopped a data centre

The most needed part of a surveillance state is the ability to process collected data. A population that resists ‘spying’ on others (as Australians do not ‘dob in a mate’), finds government at a disadvantage when it comes to both collection and the sorting of what is collected. The sole purpose of data centres is this processing ability. It will enable selection of data to suit the purpose desired. All other issues pale beneath this possibility.

Katoomba, in the blue mountains just outside of Sydney, has at this point defeated an attempt to build a data centre in their area.

“The application for the \$4.8 million data centre was withdrawn after the intense local backlash including almost 1000 signatures on petitions opposing the build, as well as a flood of community action involving flyers, online action groups and political campaigning from the Greens.

Spry said the P and C voted unanimously to add their voice to the chorus of community members fighting the proposed development

No Data Centres in Katoomba (NDCIK) campaign organiser Jackie Manners said she first learnt about the proposed development in her local paper, discovering it was only a block away from where she lived.

“It was quite alarming,” she said.”

<https://7news.com.au/news/plans-for-data-centre-at-heart-of-world-heritage-listed-national-park-scrapped-after-community-outcry-c-22525588>

Katoomba has an active community spirit and other things going for it. Being closely connected to a world heritage site, they have a foot in the door for resisting change already. This should not discourage those of us who don’t, it should inspire us to act as well, growing from their experience. The NSW Parliamentary Inquiry into data centres may have finished with submissions in March, but the issue still remains a significant issue confronting individual members in their own electorates. Parties remain wary of public backlash. If 1000 signatures and active council participation can stop things there, then it is possible everywhere else too.

“While the David and Goliath battle is far from over — with no confirmation the North Katoomba data centre application would not be resubmitted in future

— locals are using the momentum to caution other towns, as well as plans to fight for the Blue Mountains to remain exempted from future proposed data centre builds.

“I think everyone needs to be very mindful of these developments coming up in their areas, because it was very quietly done,” Spry said.

“If people in our area weren’t civic-minded and kept aware of what was going on in the local community with developments, it would have very quietly gone through. Once they’re in, they’re not going to be turned off. And once one is in the area, more will follow.”

We must remain vigilant in our own areas and help out in others where we can. This issue will not stop on its own. If we do not want to live in a controlled society, where politicians decide what our lives look like, we must be active in politics, local State and Federal. Contact your local members regularly.

The rise of ‘bird flu’

We are witnessing an increased hysteria in the media about dying sea birds on our shores. I noted a short time ago that the South Australian Government has increased testing ability. Has this increased the number found?

“Hawk-eyed citizen scientists will be trained in bird flu detection in South Australia to bolster frontline defences against the virus.

SA has so far recorded five confirmed cases of H5 bird flu — four in migratory giant petrels, and one last week in a greater crested tern, which is native to Australia.

There have been 13 confirmed cases across the country, including seven in WA and one in New South Wales.”

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2026-07-14/bird-flu-detection-training-to-be-rolled-out-in-sa/106912236>

There are important points that need to be noted when considering the figures being touted as a danger to us all. The first being what are we comparing these figures to?

What history of detection over the past decade or more is there? A number of 13 might sound impressive or not, but what does it relate to? In the past how many were detected? Is it cyclical? Does it follow bad seasons where food is scarce or when some other stress has been observed?

On their own, 13 identified birds mean very little. During the last big bird kill on our shores, were they tested for bird flu? Was it the same method used? Are we comparing apples with apples?

Like the PCR tests during COVID, what sort of testing is being used, is it accurate? Then we have the rate of testing! If we started out with one or two sick

birds testing positive, how many more tests had to be done to achieve the number thirteen?

The more tests, the more potential positives. Again, what history are we comparing it to, is it just a normal level, or don't we really know!

I am wary of any statistics presented without clarification of what they mean compared to past observations. Science relies on attention to detail and consistent methods to make comparisons. If these are not present, then the results are just conjecture! My trust in these reports has decreased considerably since COVID and with the attempts at controlling our lives becoming evermore frequent, I see no change in my position at this point.

Bird flu has been a part of the environment since they first learned to fly, nature continues on as it always has – unless gain of function experiments or profit driven overcrowding causes something different!

I see this hype just as another means of restricting food self sufficiency. Removal of backyard chooks or limiting our ability to otherwise help ourselves, makes us reliant on government and big corporations. All the signs of this possibility are there! Lab grown meat, rather than 'dirty polluting animals'; water restrictions via price increase and competition from huge agribusiness continues to remove the small diversified farmer. Mono-cropping and growing for export rather than our own needs is taking precedence over a healthy, self sustaining food supply. Greater and greater reliance on imports in our supermarkets also means potential supply chain issues in a crisis.

Couple this 'disease outbreak' with CO2 restrictions and rising fuel costs and we will be so preoccupied with survival that we will not have the where-with-all to resist the final push to global governance and the great reset that the WEF is so fond of talking about. ***

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

Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

Online Bookstore : <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>

Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the Freedom Movement "Archives" :: <https://alor.org/>

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.