A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 34 **4th September 2026**

IN THIS ISSUE

The Good the Bad and the Absurd By Neville Archibald

Imagine for a moment,that there was some sort of breakdown in society and a large factory or warehouse is full of materials: food, chemicals, electric forklifts coupled to a solar charger.

In fact several factories, full of everything that Society needs to continue.

All are thrown out of the work they used to do and these finance driven industries have stopped. We can ask at this point, why it is they stopped? Perhaps a financial breakdown, perhaps receivership due to a stock-market crash and the liabilities include this factory. How long would this sit there if the breakdown was world wide?

The surviving population can go there now and loot that and make their lives a little bit better for a while. Or they could go there and, in an orderly fashion get parts of that factory running to keep their local community going.

The items in that factory or warehouse can be used by the people, they exist in real time. Money is not needed to use or consume them (except for some sort of 'legal system' sense). What the community decides to do, is for them to decide. If they have a strong leader, or a strong sense of community, they could very well begin a rebuilding of some sort – enough to weather the storm, the disruption.

Now imagine the same scenario in the form of a recession or depression. Banks no longer allow borrowing or withdrawals, certainly not enough to buy all that can be produced. Like in 1930s America, depicted in *The Grapes of Wrath,* by John Steinbeck. The fruit on trees is left to fall on the ground and rot, because finance is not available for picking or processing. Growers are asked not to give it away or it will disrupt what is left of the economy, prices will fall and all will become worthless! This is your financial system at work!

We have factories full of potential, we have farmers full of potential we have workers full of potential, yet the produce cannot be bought by locals – perhaps it can be exported?

Is this not Absurd?

The need to consume is there, the money, the permission is not, finance is tight!

The simple act of banks removing their permission to borrow is enough to let people suffer needlessly. To stop producers producing, despite their ability to do so.

In a breakdown situation, the people could just take it and use it. It is real. They could simply carry on as usual if allowed. Parts of the economy would shut down, petrol, diesel and perhaps gas would stop being delivered. Electricity the same, unless the populations in those areas of creation also decided just to keep working. The extent of this breakdown would depend entirely on just how much independence we have lost. On just how tied into the global grid we are. Coal fired power plants might stop without diesel to mine and cart the coal, unless some form of emergency plan enabled what locally produced fuel being made was made solely available for the electricity generation.

All these decisions would need to be made by each community involved, some form of government would need to still operate. Could we do it? Yes, entirely possible given the desire. Could it be done without money? Yes, absolutely! We would just need the confidence in our communities to look after each other. So there is no real restriction to doing things, except that which we have given over to the concept of money!

Sharing ability, product and knowledge already happens in our local communities and we rarely think of it. We support local Kindergartens with working bees, we raise money for footy games, we contribute locally to many things. We share garden produce with neighbours and family. All this without money changing hands.

In a breakdown situation, we could still do most things as long as we realised it. The things we could not do due to exotic or outside dependence, we would find a way around – (no pineapple on our pizza unless we lived in a tropical area). We are ingenious in that way!

Why is it, do you think, that we cannot be ingenious now and solve our distribution issues?

We have factories capable of producing or packing all we need. We have fruit growers and farmers going out of business because prices are too low or overhead costs are too high! Yet we have people that still need to eat, who cannot buy the produce we could make. A shortage of the means of exchange – money!
That fictional representation of real wealth, the wealth that Douglas said was

actually the things that money can 'buy' for you. These are the things made by someone, somewhere. Created by knowledge, materials and labour. Whose knowledge? Whose materials? Whose labour? In each case it is the person doing that job. They might go to a bank to get a 'loan', money to use to facilitate this process, but all of the wealth input is theirs! The bank only provides a token of exchange to allow people to swap these materials (both physical and intellectual). They provide no 'real wealth' yet they expect full repayment for the tokens lent. Much like a printer of train tickets, requiring the full value of the actual fare – the face value – as payment for enabling the service to be used. The train operator would laugh, and rightly so!, the cost to the printer is simply ink, paper and labour; they have no right to demand face value. Yet, this is the claim the banking system makes of us! This is the reason debt continues to climb, why the world at large owes more than it can repay. It is a fictional debt. A book-keeping debt that has confused a service charge for accountancy, with ownership, and we are too confused by financial jargon to see it clearly!

So back to our fictional breakdown, society could still operate in a real world sense as long as we had the confidence in each other to do so. We could pull together as separate groups all over the country and swap our resulting manufacture. How is this any different from today when those materials sit and exist in warehouses, or in the potential of the population to produce.
If we only had the ability to exchange these real wealth items, no one need go without!

Oh! that's right, we do! It's called the Australian Dollar, yet somehow some foreign bank owns it, not us! They can lend it to us and expect to be repaid in full with interest. The government can borrow it from them, and place our potential up as collateral for repayment. The collateral that sees us doing the work we have already done in the first instance to create the items that we borrowed to make in the first place. (confused yet?).

In short, we have the work, they have the ability to give us permission to do it. Somehow it's not available to the government (our collective permission giver) who should be issuing this permission on our behalf. Is this not absurd?

All of the potential abundance we are capable of, may as well be sitting in a warehouse awaiting distribution. Why is it that we are incapable of actually distributing in the community where it is needed. Even though we are the ones who produced it, we cannot access it, because of the current financial system, we cannot, without incurring a debt to the banks to do so.

This is the very thing that needs our most attention! It is the very thing that our representatives to parliament need to have at the top of their list. We are capable, we should be allowed to do what is needed and they should be the ones enabling it, not some foreign banking fraternity, who should just be the mere accountants keeping our books.

What is real wealth according to Douglas (from, *Money and the Price System*)
https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Money%20and%20the%20Price%20System.pdf

How Money is Made

"Now the first thing I think that we have to recognise—a thing which is quite incontestable—is that there are only three classes of people in the world who make money, in any literal sense of the word. In Great Britain, for example, there is the Master of His Majesty's Mint, who makes metal coinage, and, after a long and honourable career, he generally gets a little bit of red ribbon—a Knight Commandership of the Bath—and a good salary. There is the gentleman who sets up a little plant of his own and either makes counterfeit coins or writes very delicately executed signatures on pieces of special paper. He "makes" money, but he gets as a reward fifteen years imprisonment. There is the third who, in regard to this matter, is much less advertised and much more retiring, and that is the banker, and it is he, in the literal sense of the word, who makes over 90 per cent. of the actual money that we use. When I say "makes it" I mean exactly what I am saying; he makes it in exactly the same sense that the brick maker makes bricks, and not in the sense that Mr. Jones makes money; Mr. Jones only gets it from somebody else, but the banker makes it."

"The method by which the banker makes money is ingenious, and consists very largely of bookkeeping. There is not, I think, in well-informed circles really any discussion in regard to the matter itself. Chairmen of some of the big English banks still deny that bankers make money in the sense that I mean, but I don't think anybody pays much attention to them. The "Encyclopaedia Britannica" which most people accept as a fairly sound and reputable authority, states that "bankers create the means of payment out of nothing". The Chairman of the Midland Bank, the Right Honourable Reginald McKenna, put the matter as shortly as I think it can be put when he said that every bank loan creates a deposit, the repayment of every bank loan destroys a deposit; the purchase of a security by a bank creates a deposit and the sale of a security by a bank destroys a deposit."

"There you have, in as short a compass as possible, a quite undeniable statement of where money comes from. All but 0.7 of one per cent. (or over 99 per cent.), in Great Britain at any rate, of the money transactions—without which under modern conditions none of us could exist—are in the form of "bank credit," which is actually manufactured by the banking system and is claimed by the banking system as its own property. That is undeniably because the banking

system lends this money (it does not give it), a condition of affairs which will be accepted by anybody as sufficient proof of a claim to ownership.”

“Over against that, you have the manufacturer of real wealth, by which I mean things which money will buy, clothes, houses, motor cars, the things that go to raise the physical standard of living, and embroider our civilisation. We realise, I suppose, without having it emphasised too much, that the possession of money is a claim upon real wealth: some of us who have not gone into these matters for any length of time are still hypnotised into thinking that money is real wealth. I am sure, in an audience of this calibre, it is not necessary to emphasise this: money is not real wealth. It is a claim upon real wealth. Now classical economics is based unquestionably, in my opinion, on "barter" economics, and this is where the classical economics parts with what we are beginning to call the new and, in my opinion, the real economics.”

Money now as a Means of Distribution

“The classical economics works on the assumption that the nature of money is that it is a medium of exchange. That idea proceeds from a state of affairs which was, at any rate broadly speaking, true perhaps 200 years ago. It was the assumption that in some sense or other, from the highest to the lowest, everybody worked, and that they exchanged or bartered the fruits of their work with each other through the medium of money, so far as it was used. The idea was that you had a constant exchange of goods and services between, let us say, A, B and C; and the whole of the classical economics is really based upon that idea, that we are all of us producers and consumers in the economic sense, and that the function of money is to exchange between ourselves the goods and services which each of us produces.”

“Whatever may at one time have been the truth of this, it is, of course, patently not true now. The modern economic production system is not a system of individual production and exchange of production between individuals. It is more and more the synthetic assembly, in a central pool, of wealth consisting of goods and services which are preponderantly due to the use of power, to modern scientific processes and all sorts of organisations and other constituent contributions of each one of us which will occur to you.”

“The problem is not to exchange the constituent contributions of each one of us to that central pool, because in fact our contribution to that central pool, in the ordinary sense of tangible economic things, is becoming smaller and smaller.”

“The correct picture—the incontestably exact picture of the modern production system—is, to my mind, based upon a kind of typewriter with a decreasing number of operators who are tapping the keys, and, by tapping these keys, fewer

and fewer operators can produce all that we require. Through the power of the sun (oil power, steam power and so forth consist of what is generalised as solar energy) the so-called curse of Adam is being transferred from the backs of men to machines, so that a small number of persons operating on this machine of industrial "production", can produce all that is required for the use of the population; and the problem is not to exchange between the number of the population, who are less and less required to push these keys, but it is to draw from this central pool of wealth by means of what can be visualised as a ticket system. And the modern money system is in fact losing almost daily its aspect, however much it may at one time have been true, of a medium of exchange, and becoming more and more a ticket system by which people, who are not exchanging their production, can draw from that central pool of wealth. That I believe at bottom to be the fundamental cleavage between, let us say, my own view and those who think with me, and the school of classical economics." ***

"They Want to Shut Down Your Free Speech": British Australian Community President Warns By Harry Richardson

https://harryrichardson.substack.com/p/they-want-to-shut-down-your-free?

Harry Richardson, President of the British Australian Community, speaking at the Sydney Free Speech Rally on 30 August 2026:

First, an acknowledgement. The BAC would like to acknowledge the Anglo explorers, the pioneers and their descendants who planted the British flag and Christian faith on this continent, creating the Australian nation. We acknowledge the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who have lived here since the Dreamtime.

And we acknowledge the Federal Commonwealth of Australia, created by the nation, under the Crown, to guard the nation and the liberty of all citizens. Today, in 2026, there are few countries that have free speech. The ones that do are mostly European or European-derived.

Yet in England, Sir Edward Coke insisted that freedom of speech was an ancient custom of Parliament. That was in the 1590s, more than 400 years ago. I grew up in England in the 60s and 70s and played out in the street every night.

And once in a while, some kid would come running into his mum and say, Mum, Johnny called me an idiot. And the answer every kid got from his mum was the same. Go and tell Johnny, sticks and stones can break my bones, but names will never hurt me.

In other words, grow up and take it on the chin. Hurty words won't damage you. People have a right to insult you. Deal with it.

This was the ancient culture of free speech that we were marinated in as we grew up. But whilst in the atmosphere and parts of Western Europe, free speech was a foundational part of our culture, in the rest of the world, it mostly wasn't.

Saying the wrong things could have you punished or even killed. Our leaders used to tell us that we were an anomaly, because we were a European country in Asia. Now they tell us that we're not a European country at all and never were.

They say that the only defining feature of Australians is their values. They say that anyone could come here and adopt our values and instantly be as Australian as anyone else. But in order to bring in people from such diverse backgrounds, one of the first things they had to do was to shut down our free speech, which is one of our most precious values.

In 1975, just three years after Whitlam decided to abolish discriminatory immigration, our elites introduced the Racial Discrimination Act, which began the process of cramping down on free speech in order to facilitate a diverse society.

But that wasn't enough, of course, so later they added the hated 18C. Then when Tony Abbott promised to repeal 18C, a coalition of diverse minorities got together and made damn sure that he would do no such thing, even though it was a foundational value of the Anglo-Celts who settled and built this nation.

Now even that isn't enough, so they bring in the anti-Semitism and hate speech laws, which are even worse. And this isn't the end of it. You mark my words.

The destruction of free speech has been intertwined with the project to force multiculturalism onto Australia. If you don't believe me, Chris Minns, the New South Wales Premier, spelled it out for you. He said, and I quote:

"We don't have the same freedom of speech laws that they have in the United States, and the reason for that is that we want to hold together a multicultural community."

So there you have it. We can't have free speech anymore because now we're multicultural. We all need to understand that.

When we choose migrants, most of us want people with the same value systems as we have. But how do we make sure that people share our values before we give them a passport to one of the richest countries in the world?

Well, our founders wrestled with this idea and came up with a simple solution. It wasn't perfect, of course, but it was the best they could manage. They decided to restrict entry mostly to people from the British Isles and to a lesser extent Western and Northern Europe. Some people called this the White Australia Policy.

Why did they think that people from Britain would share their values and loyalties? Well, probably because our founders were of British descent, and they were very explicit about that.

Henry Parkes, the father of Federation, talked about the crimson thread of kinship. His views were hugely popular. So they ran this policy for the first 70 years or more after Federation, and not surprisingly, most of the migrants shared the same values as other Australians.

They believed in freedom of speech, the rule of law, Christian morality, and the Protestant work ethic, and so on. During this time, the policy was wildly popular with the citizens of the nation, and the nation flourished. Australia had a high standard of living, low levels of crime and corruption, and all the benefits of a high-trust society.

Importantly, we had a deep cultural affinity for free speech, which we understood was the bedrock of the kind of free and stable society to which we were accustomed to. But our elites decided to introduce non-discriminatory immigration, which benefited minorities. They told us that this wouldn't matter, because the new migrants would have our values.

But when people found that many new migrants had different values, the government crushed dissent by clamping down on free speech. The problem is that once the government gets the right to ban speech they don't like, it never stops, because they love to ban criticism of their own policies. And the policy that most people wanted to criticise was mass indiscriminate immigration.

So multiculturalism and immigration have been protected by constantly undermining our ancient free speech rights and values. In Britain today, thousands of people are arrested every year for expressing opinions, and most of those opinions are in opposition to mass indiscriminate immigration. Free speech is effectively dead in that country, and Australia is catching up fast.

You can't import people en masse from countries with different value systems, and expect them all to adopt our loyalties and value systems the moment they arrive here. It isn't easy to defend free speech, even amongst educated Westerners. How can we expect people who've grown up in cultures which hate free speech to suddenly embrace it? It was never going to work.

Just ask Salman Rushdie. Under our current immigration system, only about 3-5% of migrants come from the British Isles, and 90-95% of our new migrants come from outside Europe. These new people come from countries with different values, and for the most part, free speech is not one of them.

Values exist in the minds of people, not in the magic soil or floating in the air. Different people have different values. If we allow the government to turn us into a hated minority in this land, then don't expect our values to hang around.

So this is the game. They want to shut down your free speech so that they can bring in more people who don't believe in free speech. We have to fight these laws and preserve our free speech, or as George Washington said, it may be taken away, and dumb and silent we may be led like sheep to the slaughter. ***

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