A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 38 **2nd October 2026**

IN THIS ISSUE

Is the Lack of Money just a Problem of Fair Distribution? 1
By Neville Archibald

Is the Lack of Money just a Problem of Fair Distribution?
By Neville Archibald

There are those that focus on redistribution of wealth as the solution to our problems. They blame the rich for the poor. Our Governments are no different, increasing taxation on those they lose the least votes from, and then often framing shortfalls in funding to poor distribution by the previous government. Others point out the super rich individuals and companies who are either not paying their fair share in tax or are making obscene profits.

The latest to blame the rich, is a book by Linda Mc Quaig, called, *Cancelling Billionaires before they Cancel Us.*

While the book appears to be built around the 'questionable') activities (read philanthropic funding) of some of our most visible Billionaires.
The cancelling of these outrageous ideas, like Bill Gates' lab grown meat or his spraying the skies to block the sun re: global cooling, is still a good idea, but each of these Pie in the sky concepts should be evaluated on their merits, regardless of who proposes them. Anyone proposing sweeping changes to our planet or our society without allowing for individual choice, is dictating to us. Anyone who plays god with our planet, also plays god over our lives. No man should have that power!

The book also carries the idea of the redistribution of wealth, an idea common to many others who present solutions. This idea is straight out of the Soviet playbook. Communism, redistributing all wealth so that all are equally poor – except those in the 'party' at the top. Recognition that some Billionaires have used the financial markets to manipulate the efforts of others, and have obtained wealth this way, is different from blaming them for holding on to all the money. Anyone prepared to do what is legally possible, even

though it is morally repugnant, shows a fault in both the person and the system that allows it. If our system was set up correctly, monopolisation or cheating, as a moral concept, would be far harder.

Then if we look at the amount of money that could be taken from the rich and given to the poor, it still falls far, far short of what is actually needed. It would not solve the underlying problem anymore than our Treasurers idea that inter-generational wealth (specifically the baby boomers who own their own homes and have saved for a comfortable retirement) is the reason Australia is lacking money for investment in our future – "those nasty boomers are hogging it all!"

(This is reflected in the recent tax reforms and the quiet attempts to access private superannuation funds as collateral for loans or projects the government desires to do. Each time a demographic is targeted like this, you can bet it was picked only after voting potentials were analysed.)

But back to redistribution, punishing the 'billionaires', once done, then lowers the bar so that the state can come after the next level down, the millionaires, and the next etc. at some point we all become that target. Few will lose sleep over this targeting and many will rationalise that it is 'only fair', I suggest they are being sidetracked from the issue that really matters, lack of consumer buying power no matter how much the available money is levelled out. As Douglas shows in his famous A+B theorem.
https://www.socred.org/s-c-action/social-credit-views/the-a-b-theorem

When analysed, the amount of money available to purchase production (wages, dividends, etc), falls short of money expended to produce. Since the total money (cost) of production also calls for loan repayments, the interest component and other overheads which do not go back into the community as spending money, the price of the product – reflecting all costs – must be higher than ability to purchase these produced items. A+B the cost of production can never equal A - the money available to purchase.

It is worth noting that currently this shortfall is made up for by ever expanding production and the issuance of loans as interest bearing debt. This can be seen in the pressure to export more than we import (that laughable 'favourable balance of trade'), and rising world debt. This debt now stands at $73, 748, 000, 000, 000.
https://worlddebtclocks.com/

A number that is not very comprehensible in real terms, but:

It is 922,380,952,381 Big Macs in Australian cost, or enough to give everyone in the world 111 of them!

Squash them down a bit to fit them in the box, then stack them up one on top of the other and the pile reaches – to somewhere just past Mars!

Not keen on Maccas, lets try an Xbox Series X 25th-Anniversary Edition:

The special-edition console released with a translucent green shell! Once again enough to buy everyone in the world one! I shudder to think of it! How would we power them all up – not all at once I hope!

I am being facetious here, but this 'World Debt'? What is it really? Who owns it? Can we even produce that many Big Macs?

The biggest question to me would be what collateral was this enormous figure backed up by? Where is that cumulative real world collateral now? If we buy a $500,000 house and pay it off, we have a $500,000 house as an asset! What asset are the owners of the debt claiming backs up their money? This question should raise even more questions for you! If it has no backing – is it even real? If it is not, then we have been subjected to (and still are) one of the greatest swindles of all time! Imagine this money put back into the economies of the world – redistribution like that would certainly change the course of history! However, discovering the fault in the issuing of money and fixing that, as Douglas found and proposed, would enable the full potential of mankind to be reached for, but only if we decide to do something about it.

When Removing a Surcharge is Really just Palming it off to Someone Else

A promise to remove the credit card surcharge on items for sale sounded good. As a soundbite it seemed that at last the greedy banks might be forced to forego one of their forever increasing fees and charges. A government might actually step in and say - enough!

Alas, the hopeful still wait in vain for this small reduction in the cost of using their own money via card. It seems that the business who accepts the card for payment must still pay the fees, but must now either wear the cost themselves or build it into their end price for goods.

A cup of coffee might have been $5 with a 20cent surcharge tacked on, it is now, in many cases, a flat $5.50.

If a business was paying for it before, by passing it on, then to expect them to absorb it now is for them to take a pay cut. In the aforementioned coffee example, if they serve 200 cups a day, that is an extra $40 they need to find out of their net profit. Operating already on a slim margin, (average net profit margins are between 2 – 6%) many will find this difficult. Meanwhile banks are still raking in billions in profits each year and paying their directors extremely well. Who misses out here? Once again, is the average bloke on the street. Thanks Albo!

Diesel Prices

The cost of living can only rise while diesel prices remain high. We are already seeing this in increased costs at the supermarkets. What are our politicians doing about it? It would seem that going cap in hand and begging for more, like Oliver Twist is one solution. Negotiating for preferential deliveries from Singapore and

elsewhere works short term, but fails the long term test. If this shortage tells us anything, it is how fragile our economy is without our own ability to produce. This is no small error of our past, the deliberate winding down of Australian industry started with the Lima Declaration in 1975. While the declaration might not have had binding powers (as we are continuously told by some), the intent and the subsequent actions of successive governments has seen its promises play out. Read Senator Anning's 2018 speech which is relevant here:
https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Hansard/Hansard_Display?bid=chamber/hansards/d7fb77b1-0930-425d-ad2a-6fd86946e453/&sid=0042

One of these declaration promises is reflected in the lack of refineries now in Australia. With only two left (out of the 12 we had in 1975) and these not refining our own oil, I would like to think that resurrecting our own refineries is top of the list.

This is not the case. We abhor anything as pedestrian as fossil fuel, but still rely heavily on it and have no other real plans to change that.

We export all our crude and import the crude for the refineries still operating here. According to google: *"Most crude oil produced in Australia is classified as* ***light, sweet crude,*** *which has low sulfur levels and is among the easiest types of oil to refine into fuels like diesel and jet fuel."*

Given this ideal and easy crude is ours to begin with, why are we adding transport costs and the pollution associated with it to our diesel supply chain. Does it not make sense to be rebuilding our own industry with this on our doorstep. At least our existing refineries should be operating with our crude. Building more refineries should also be of the highest priority, the cost of living could be kept down and future disruptions overseas would not hobble us further. Dr Hunter Laidlaw presented this paper to parliament in December 2020:
https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_departments/Parliamentary_Library/Research/FlagPost/2020/December/Oil_refineries_and_fuel_security

In it he discusses the very situation we now face with the Iran war. He notes that *"Domestic oil production is not currently sufficient to meet Australia's total demand for fuel, even if all of it was refined domestically." He also notes that: " other analysts continue to question how the Government will keep the country and the Australian Defence Force operating 'in the event of a foreign interruption to fuel supplies coming from foreign owned refineries on foreign owned ships'."*

It would appear that we export all our own crude at a rate slightly under our usage rate. Given this situation, we would need extra, but in the event of a disruption, we would still be far better off. Security and stability are important for all countries, the fact that both of these things have been sold out increasingly since at least 1975, makes the question of who our successive governments have

truly been working for a good question to ask.

Until there is a suitable alternative to diesel and it has been shown to work, ignoring the perils of running out is no excuse.

This should be the top of the talking list for politicians of all persuasions, immediate action is needed. Contact your representatives and let them know how you feel.

Climate Change – on the nose?

Climate Change would seem to be taking a back seat in many countries now. Many are moving away from the 'so called science' and it's catastrophic warnings. Other countries are moving forward from what is fast becoming a lesser worry and hopefully a beat up that has run it's course.

Locally the weather maps contain more orange and red than ever before, but the resulting outcomes are really no different.

I watched as poor Melbourne was to cop 'a months worth of rain in one day'. The forecasters stood outside reporting in a light rain, pictures of the usual suspects (like a notorious south Melbourne underpass) claimed more victims as it once again flooded.

Mind you, it was doing this regularly when I was living down there in the eighties. Stupid drivers who think their cars are waterproof get a nasty shock when they stop, it will always make for good headlines, but is simply not relevant. I see no difference in flooding patterns or pictures presented, other than blocked drains (lack of maintenance) and changed drainage ability (usually by new builds in the area).

Is anyone else witnessing this continual bombardment of orange and red, that turns out to be a fizzle? I guess the unpredictable-ness of weather is hard to bring into line with the expected fear porn that precedes it.

The science around our coral reef (the Great Barrier Reef), is showing record growth despite the same continued promises of die off, the mention of this doesn't make the news.

Dr Peter Ridd tells us about the fairy tale of reef statistics. What the world is being told and the media hype using the reef as proof of climate change.
The reality is that growth is the highest it has been in the last six years and equal to any of the previous 35 years.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eCr5UrGsMt8

Dr Ridd has been studying the reef since 1984 and provides a comprehensive take on reef health. Well worth watching, and a reminder that not all scientists agree with climate fear.

The push to tax us into oblivion and enact permanent controls over us, just to fix a statistical manipulation of facts, is beginning to falter, as the local visuals we

see with our own eyes contradict predictions, and in the broader picture, science once again starts to reassert itself with some sensible commentators coming forward. We need to share this material when we find it, to ensure others in our communities can find some relief from the stress of mainstream media presentations.

Lying with statistics is still lying, and the truth will set you free! ***

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.