A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 37 | 25th September 2026

IN THIS ISSUE

Rumours of a Collapse, or Just More Fear Porn for Manipulation?
By Neville Archibald

Last week in discussing the purpose of government we should have come to the conclusion that it was there to deal with the problems we face as a state community, as a Nation. This does not mean riding roughshod over the desires of those communities or attempting to change to fit us into a vision that someone other than we (the people) have. Identifying the 'philosophy' of the nation and deriving policy to implement or continue it, is their prime concern. The mechanics of achieving it are only of a concern if they do not fit the overall philosophy or 'culture'.

The dreams of a Nation, a people, are the sum of the dreams of the individual. An individual within a nation should be free to pursue their own desires within that grouping as long as they do not interfere with the expected rights of others. While this may sound complex, it is really based on the basic Christian principles that our system of living developed out of. It is the fabric that weaves through our Australian values, whether you like to recognise it or not. It is an inescapable conclusion if you assess these values side by side.

Our Government will soon be tested, and we will see whose interests they pander to. I know many will say they are already serving a different master. The extent of this betrayal is limited by what they believe they can get away with and still continue to have a hope of re-election. Many of them do realise that their jobs are on the line if they fail us, or are seen to have failed – these are the ones we should be concentrating on (if we cannot put acceptable candidates in ourselves).

There is talk all over the internet and in social media of the coming collapse of civilization. A meltdown of the financial markets. Many reasons are quoted as being the root causes, but the one root cause that rules them all is never mentioned – the failed money system we operate under.

We have the war in Iran, a fuel crisis, the flow on food crisis, waring factions within communities and uncontrolled immigration (and I've probably missed a few) breathing down our collective necks, but the stem of these branches of collapse, is strictly monetary. Meanwhile the Banking Industry is still making record profits hand over fist. Debt, both personal and National continues to climb and Government budget, makes a joke of the definition of the word. How is it that those who lend and those who spend our money can both continue on without taking any responsibility for their actions.

The banks, who supposedly calculate risk and ability to pay back, never seem to find a limit, as long as they profit. The ones that manoeuvre the loans to 'Australia limited' are content with the $1 trillion debt ($1.8 trillion if you take into account all public debt, federal, State and local). This state of affairs means so little that we, along with the USA with it's some $40 trillion debt and every other country in similar circumstances can never repay without total world collapse. Is this what we are seeing now, in those rumours of collapse? To whom are we all beholden and how has it come to this point?

I cannot believe that this fraud has continued for so long without the majority waking up to it. The very absurdity of some entity now owning virtually the entire world, all for 'lending a means of exchange' so that we may go about our business of living, is the biggest con in the history of the world.

With all this in mind, and the 'coming collapse' supposedly imminent, what solution will be proffered? Remember, the people proffering a solution will be the same ones who have been conducting the con for all these years, ask yourself, what will change?

If the controlling powers using finance against us now have their way, the collapse will not be as bad as the media version is predicting. They will not want to reduce us to complete poverty and disarray, that would upset the luxury lifestyles they lead. They have already cemented the basic control principles by convincing us that the complicated explanations of finance are not to be questioned with any real intelligence. No, they will wish to further capture our ability to prosper, despite their interference, and turn it even further under their control.

A combination of a digital currency, managed in detail, along with complete surveillance, (CBDC's) will usher in a new era of control to ensure nothing changes and no one can question why we are poor amidst the possibility of plenty. Ownership of money and the means to live will be even more firmly entrenched in International hands and responsible to no one nation or people. We will have completely lost control!

Who should be in control of finance has been a common political debate, often made in times of structuring a new form of government. If we are to move away from our current system and into an age of re-structuring, we had better be ready to listen to the words already used but somehow corrupted before being properly entrenched.

In the USA, *"History records that the money changers have used every form of abuse, intrigue, deceit, and violent means possible to maintain their control over governments by controlling money and it's issuance."* — **James Madison** (founding father and fourth president)
and:

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a monied aristocracy that has set the government at defiance. The issuing power (of money) should be taken away from the banks and restored to the people to whom it properly belongs." — **Thomas Jefferson** (founding father and third president)

Both of these men and many others like them, began the American dream understanding these dangers. Sadly the loss of control continued to the point that many American people do not realise the control of the federal reserve is largely in private (banking) hands.

This next quote was written in 1966, but it is a picture of what we have today, is it not?

> *"The powers of financial capitalism had another far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. This system was to be controlled in a feudalistic fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert, by secret agreements arrived at in frequent meetings and conferences. The apex of the systems was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the worlds central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank...sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury loans, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence the level of economic activity in the country, and to influence co-operative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world."*
>
> Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time.*

Jefferson and Hamilton (yes the same Hamilton who has had a resurgence of popularity recently with a stage play glorifying him) were at odds in creating a central banking system. Why this is important is the key to understanding how we have arrived at the point we are at now!
To quote from: ***https://www.federalreservehistory.org/essays/before-the-fed***

"Jefferson, on the other hand, saw a different economic future for the new republic. He put more faith in an agriculture-based economy of yeoman farmers. He saw the benefits of large cities in terms of the culture and sophistication they engendered, but viewed them as fountains of corruption as well. He also considered industrial growth and the concentration of economic power in institutions such as banks as potential threats to liberty. Banks were particularly problematic for Jefferson since they encouraged speculation rather than making their money from honest labor, and he believed they tended to concentrate power in near monopolies."

Hamilton; *"In particular, he was impressed with the Bank of England".*

"The California Institute of Technology historian John Brewer suggests that Britain's development from a peripheral player in Europe to one at the center of world affairs owed more to its bankers and bureaucrats than to its generals and soldiers. In his book The Sinews of Power, he wrote, "Victory in battle relied in the first instance upon an adequate supply of men and munitions, which, in turn, depended upon sufficient money and proper organization." Those commitments were met "thanks to a radical increase in taxation, the development of public deficit finance (a national debt) on an unprecedented scale, and the growth of sizable public administration devoted to organizing the fiscal and military activities of the state." (Brewers comments presented as a summary of Hamilton's beliefs)

The opposing ideals of these two founding fathers, would clash over financial policy and end up being the major driver of debt finance going forward. If you look at the comments by Jefferson, you will see the worries he had regarding corruption, speculation, loss of liberties and monopoly control, have now become reality today! Hamilton's agreement with debt finance and all that it entails, has become the ruling force, thus the un-payable debts we have all incurred.
You may be asking about Australia's involvement in finance, is it any different?
I use the argument between Jefferson and Hamilton as it illustrates clearly in a few words the opposing ideals. We could similarly go to King O'Malley and his opponents, re: the Commonwealth bank. (please note the existing 'Commonwealth Bank' is similar in name only, and has little resemblance of the original one.)
See: ***https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Amos%20DJ%20-%20Commonwealth%20Bank.pdf***

"In 1908 O'Malley presented to parliament a detailed plan for the creation of a national bank of deposit, issue, exchange and reserve, and in the same year at the third Federal conference of the A.L.P. succeeded in transferring creation of a 'Commonwealth Bank' to the fighting platform. Despite this, O'Malley knew that many party members were lukewarm and he devoted the next two years to educating them. Partly because of his bad relations with Prime Minister Fisher

and W. M. Hughes, O'Malley was not elected by caucus to the ministry in 1908. Fisher and Hughes were not convinced of the need for a national bank before the government was defeated in June 1909. But party support was growing for a competing bank which would smash the 'Money Power'."

"His campaign for a national bank, backed by a 'torpedo brigade' of nineteen members of caucus, ended on 15 November 1911 when Fisher introduced a bill to establish a 'National Bank' to carry on general banking business in the same way as any commercial bank. This was not O'Malley's idea of a Commonwealth Bank and he was bitterly disappointed. As established, it was, without doubt, a Fisher bank, but it may be claimed that O'Malley was the spiritual father of the later Commonwealth and Reserve banks." **https://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/omalley-king-7907**

This Bank operated successfully under the Governorship of Denison Miller (later Sir), from 1913 until 1924, funding many projects and the first world war.

"When, during an interview in 1921, Sir Denison Miller was asked if he, through the Commonwealth Bank, had financed Australia during the war for £350,000,000, he replied: "Such was the case; and I could have financed the country for a further like sum had the war continued." Again, asked if that amount was available for productive purposes in times of peace, he answered in the affirmative." (*Australia's Government Bank*, p. 275, by L. C. Jauncey, Ph.D. See also Treasurer Spender's speech in *Hansard,* 21 Sept., 1939).
https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Amos%20DJ%20-%20Commonwealth%20Bank.pdf

We would later see even this Commonwealth Bank further emasculated and no longer capable of being anything like O'Malley originally envisioned. The Bruce-Page Government (Nationalist-Country coalition) would be the one to do this in 1924. This example of a peoples bank proving it is capable of financing a Nation, and then being sold out, gives us hope that it can be done again, public willing.

Betty Luks wrote this excellent summary some time ago, but it fits in with the American issues about banking, it could be said to be a parallel of what has occurred in many countries who at one time had 'peoples' banks, rather than 'Bankers' banks.

Jack Lang wrote of the ruling elite of the time in "The Great Bust: The Depression of the Thirties". Under the heading of "Decay of Democracy" he wrote:

"The Bruce-Page government introduced into this country the idea that the best form of government for a Conservative party was one in which the machinery was handed over to a multitude of Boards. These suited the philosophy and outlook of Prime Minister Stanley Melbourne Bruce … he had the idea that the right people to run the government of the country were business leaders and experts."

"Bruce," wrote Lang, "could see no point in the Gettysburg Address, in which Lincoln had defined Democracy. He didn't really believe that the people were fit to govern themselves. (These) were his kind of people, bankers, men of commerce, lawyers, accountants – they were the ideal managers. Bruce was one of the first exponents of the Managerial State."Eric Butler also recorded historical events of that time in "Enemy Within the Empire":

"Since 1924, the Commonwealth Bank has been under the direct domination of overseas interests. Prior to that time it was used to some extent on behalf of the Australian people. Until 1923 it was controlled by a Governor, Sir Denison Miller. The bank's outstanding act was to refuse to sacrifice the Australian people in 1920 at the instigation of Montagu Norman and his international banking friends... The private bankers in this country started to restrict the nation's credit supplies and depression threatened...Sir Denison Miller foiled this move by using the Commonwealth Bank to issue £23,000,000 between June and December of 1920. This was a threat to the private banks, who then curtailed their deflation policy..."

"In 1924 the Bruce-Page administration took the first step in making the Commonwealth Bank a Central Bank, controlled by the Bank of England and the Bank of International Settlements. This was in line with Mr. Norman's policy of a chain of central banks throughout the world."

As to former PM Stanley Melbourne Bruce, Eric wrote:

"Soon after the emasculation of the Commonwealth Bank, Mr. Bruce left for London, where he wined and dined with his financial friends. I have no hesitation in saying that no man has betrayed his own nation more to International Financial interests than "Australia's Noblest Son"; his record on behalf of the financiers since 1924 should be familiar to every loyal Australian...To make the Money Power supreme, Mr. Bruce got the Financial Agreement incorporated as part of the Constitution. This Agreement paved the way for the formation of the Loan Council to control all government borrowings."

Jack Lang noted:

"Few Australians who entered their local polling booth on 17th November 1928 to record their verdicts on the record of the Bruce-Page Government realised that they were also closing the chapter of real self-government for their State Parliaments. They didn't realise that when they placed a simple cross against the word YES on the separate ballot paper to insert Clause 105A into the Constitution, they were sacrificing the sovereign powers of the States..."
https://www.blog.alor.org/prediction-in-1941-the-gradual-end-of-democracy-in-europe-by-betty-luks?tmpl=component&print=1&format=print

So you should be able to see the steps that were taken in both America and Australia that changed the concept of a peoples bank to that bankers bank that Quigley mentioned in 1966. Go back and re read that quote now, it will make even more sense.

Since this time, control over National finance has steadily gone from the people via their government to the profit driven banks who are only becoming bigger and more unaccountable. A monopoly of credit, as Douglas puts it, rules over us all now, and a carefully crafted digital format, presented as a solution to our woes – is on the way.

AI and Hacking

Yet another breach of digital security has occurred. Medicare and at least three other government websites/databases have been accessed. So much for the secure digital world we are continually promised. The timing on this admission, taking some weeks from the breach to report to the minister, means data taken could be well used before any action was taken to stop it. In the days of instant gratification, tap and go, and everything at your fingertips, it is refreshing to know that bureaucratic lag is still analog (or is it?).

Those whose information was stolen may not know and may not feel it immediately. A continued harvesting of your data, wherever it comes from is another means of control that many simply do not believe is real or see as crucial. Advertising relies on accurate data about consumers to ensure it reaches the targeted audience; political manipulations are no different, census and supposedly 'safe' data combined can direct a Nation just as easily. The biggest hurdle in using this data has always been the sheer volume to be collated and analysed. With AI and surveillance centres (data centres) and well written algorithms, this is now possible, we can be sold nearly anything (lie).

Further reading on this and what the future of manipulation (the present too) looks like: *Weapons of Math Destruction,* Cathy O'Neil.
https://www.penguin.com.au/books/weapons-of-math-destruction-9780141985411

I'll leave you with a letter from an early League publication, *The New Times* of June 7, 1935.

THE HON. A. A. DUNSTAN, M.L.A.,
Premier of Victoria

Dear Mr. Dunstan,

There are very few people in Victoria who have not followed with sympathy your gallant fight in the Star Chamber at Canberra. There was, from the start, apart from the technique of the financial agreement, little hope that you would effect much in competition with New South Wales. For Mr. Lang, in spite of the childish prattle of our financier-controlled press, is still the person whom our masters most fear in Australian politics, and so, no matter what the cost, no stone will be left unturned to show New South Wales that U.A.P. means prosperity.

However, you had your measure of victory. But what was the victory, Mr. Dunstan? For what were you fighting, except to increase our debt and our interest bill to the bankers? What a world we live in, that you should be hailed as a hero for bringing us home an extra million of debt beyond what the bankers had prepared for us. Have you ever thought about this question of debt? Figures recently published estimated the world's debts (all bearing interest) as follows:

A .D.	**£**
1500........................	80 millions
1600........................	200 millions
1700........................	300 millions
1800........................	1,600 millions
1900	80,000 millions
1929........................	140,000 millions

Compared with these figures, an extra million or two for us may seem neither here nor there. But where is it all going to end? Every extra million of loans means that the bankers, even at present low rates of interest, demand a toll from us of about £35,000 a year forever. That toll must be raised from extra taxation, from the blood and sweat of a crucified people.

And it is all so futile, all so unnecessary. The money which has proceeded from past loans has all been withdrawn, all been cancelled. Only the debts—and the interest—remain. Does not this suggest to you that there is a chronic shortage of money in the community, and that it should be the prerogative, not of the bankers, but of the nation, to issue sufficient money to enable its own goods to be sold? Does it not suggest to you that this loan business is the greatest ramp in history?

—*THE NEW TIMES* .

Does the size of the debt truly portray the nature of the country? Where does it come from and what does it really represent? I suggest it is a fictional concept that belongs more in the world of false accountancy and misrepresentation, than it does the real world around us. Compare the numbers in this letter and the trillions now, when does the concept of the absurd kick in? ***

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