A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 26 **10th July 2026**

IN THIS ISSUE

Thought for the Week:

"When King and People understand each other past a doubt, It takes a foe and more than a foe to knock that country out; For the one will do what the other requires as soon as the need is shown; And hand in hand they can make a stand which neither could make alone! It is not wealth, nor talk, nor trade, nor schools, nor even the Vote, Will save your land when the enemy's hand is tightening round your throat. But a King and a People who thoroughly trust each other in all that is done Can sleep on their bed without any dread - for the world will leave 'em alone!" From *Together,* by Rudyard Kipling, 1885-1926.

Yet Another Level of Tax? By Neville Archibald

We have a number of entities taxing us in Australia. We start at a local level, with the councils; rates, fees and levies (forced on council by the state in many cases – fire levy). Then comes State government with their taxes and finally Federal taxes.

It now appears that the UN, who are probably feeling the impact of the reduction in contributions from the USA (thanks to Trump's decisions not to waste any more of his citizens money supporting dubious causes) and now need to find an income not connected to voluntary contributions.

The UN is supported by its member states by assessed contributions based on a number of factors. Over and above that, voluntary contributions are made, these are discretionary to the government (of that state) of the day. With the USA cutting these voluntary contributions back, and a number of member states with mounting arrears in payments, the UN could be said to be 'cash trapped'.

It is largely due to this that the global tax discussions have come into view of the general public. These 'global tax policies' have been under discussion for years and only now have hit the spotlight because of this (my thanks to Trump – whether intentional or not). The latest news from the UN, in a recap from the fourth session of negotiations, 17 March 2026, shows that they have scoped out the core elements and moved on to more detailed options. The standout point for me is the section operating behind closed doors.

'*The session highlighted a stark contrast in global tax rulemaking. While countries negotiated openly and transparently at the United Nations, a number of governments had moved in parallel behind the closed doors of the OECD to agree a 'side-by-side' arrangement exempting US multinationals from elements of the global minimum tax.*'

'*A review by the Tax Justice Network found that the report relies on a model so deeply flawed that 'the results are meaningless at best, if not deliberate distortions to serve a lobbying agenda."*

https://taxjustice.net/press/un-tax-convention-advances-toward-zero-draft-as-closed-door-oecd-deal-casts-long-shadow/

There is much more negotiation to go and I dare say things will change around as it goes; however, the tentacles of the coming feudal-like system, run by corporations (who actively interfere with national government operation by that same 'lobbying for concession') is now being seen in the 'global sphere' as well.

For a starter, our government is still OUR government and should not be influenced by forces from outside (especially the UN whose majority of member countries are not democratic).

While the UN has this to say:

'*Democracy is one of the universal and indivisible core values and principles of the United Nations. It is based on the freely expressed will of people and closely linked to the rule of law and exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms.*'

https://unis.unvienna.org/pdf/Democracy_UN_2008.pdf

The member nations, those who vote on core policy, are in the majority, non-democratic or not considered to be 'free' countries. If the larger portion of these members are potentially corrupt when it comes to allowing 'lobbying' to interfere with their decisions (and we can see that in so-called free countries too), then there really is not a free voice overall.

The push for 'fairer tax' re the UN and the linking of this 'fair' concept to the reasons for instituting it, gives rise to a lot of discussion around human rights. This makes for impressive reading with fine sounding rhetoric; but the pedigree of those speaking, to me, leaves much to be desired – especially considering that focus on excepting corporations.

The US war of independence was fought around the concept of, 'no taxation without representation'. This idea of responsible and controllable national governments is for the individuals of the nation, not for corporate or ultra-national entities to subvert.

Unfortunately, this is what is coming to pass, in both National governments and now, it can be seen in the UN as well.

The IMO (International Maritime Organization) is among those negotiating for greenhouse gas pricing measures (carbon tax) to be levied on the highest-polluting vessels. The ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) likewise is looking at a global offsetting scheme. Their opposition to 'taxes' does not preclude 'environmental charges', to me a splitting of hairs over definitions. The end results that will be seen, of course, will be inflation of all those transportation costs, which we ultimately foot the bill for.

It is truly a wonder to ponder on, that successive governments, worldwide, have led us down the path of global trading, often at the expense of our own industries, and virtually forced this 'Shipping dependency' onto us. Now, they are crying about wasted energy and CO^2 pollution as though their still-active policies were not the cause – we are to pay via increased costs! Could it be intentional? Why is it that it never mentioned that: Whoops, we got it wrong with all the offshoring of the things we used to do quite well ourselves! Lima agreement be damned!

I take offence at being called a BOOMER!

What exactly is this term? Boomer? Referring to a particular age grouping, people born between 1946 and 1964 (I just scrape in!) who witnessed, and participated most likely, in a surge in growth. Post war reconstruction and the rapid advancement of technology at this point led to a surge in both beneficial and sadly non beneficial mechanisation of society.

The idea that this group should be held accountable for all the problems of the world, is a ridiculous attempt at dividing us once again. The term coined in the sixties that I would say started all this nonsense, was 'the generation gap'. The idea that 'squares' and 'mods' and other groupings should be at loggerheads, was promulgated by a film industry filled with socialist attitudes. (see: *Red Stars Over Hollywood,* by Myron Fagan. Playright, Director and Producer. Available to listen here: ***https://archive.org/details/lp_red-stars-over-hollywood_myron-coureval-fagan***)

Fagan is not the only person who has noted this propensity for the earliest form of social media to have a definite leaning to the left. A quick search of this subject reveals a long list of authors who have decried the political influence and targeted social change that was introduced as 'avant-garde' or generational rebellion and the angst of youth. Instead of trying to pull us together this exploitation continued and grew into the multifaceted divides we are faced with today; almost any difference can be skewed to divide us.

The gen X, gen Z, Boomer etc classifications abound, putting us all in little boxes (and to borrow a line from Pete Seeger – full of ticky-tacky!). Pointless socially; but perfect for sowing division.

I dislike all these many boxes; the ones we tick to place us in one group or other. Be they political 'left' or 'right', age, gender, or even dress style. We often find that they put us at loggerheads with others due to the words used as descriptions, and instead of figuring it out, we shrug and walk away at best or get angry and write others off as lost causes.

If my time talking to all and sundry has taught me anything, it is that most of those we could list as opposition, still have a great many similarities with which we can agree. The idea that a section of the population that, overall, created a better world for us (the boomers or any other made-up division), are to be held in contempt for their efforts, is not thinking things through clearly. Those who captured and skewed the system for their benefit alone, are a small portion of every generation, and usually remain hidden behind what is seen as success and wealth, or they are not seen at all. Policy drives our direction as a society, and those in charge of that policy are the ones to blame, the policies are the things we must change – and that will take all ages and types working together!

The great race.

It would seem that Australia is leading the way, well almost! Iceland has beaten us by a mere 0.8%. What race is this you ask? Why, Inflation of course!

Iceland stands on the top of the podium at 4.8% while we are a close second at 4.0% (not sure who is third). This is only among the 'advanced economies' mind you.

> '*Australia now has the equal-highest core inflation rate among major developed economies and the second-highest across all advanced economies, behind only Iceland.'* (Source: *Financial Review and Trading Economics).*

So says the Liberal Party of Australia on it's Facebook page.

Spare a thought for poor Venezuela who is tracking somewhere between 387% and 525%, Sudan at 75% and Iran 68.9%. Are we all just one war away from that sort of madness? No amount of investment risk would negate those losses!

This is not a race anyone should be happy to win, but the system of finance we struggle under, ensures we must have some, otherwise it is unemployment that rises. If you are wondering how this minuscule percentage is bad, and you can remember the 80s when it reached 11.35%, take a moment to realise what it really means!

$250 in 1963 is equivalent in purchasing power to about $2,737.93 today, an increase of $2,487.93 over 63 years. The dollar had an average inflation rate of 3.87% per year between 1963 and today, producing a cumulative price increase of 995.17%.

Going backwards, it would take almost one thousand percent increase in your $250 to buy an equivalent amount of goods today.

So if you had an inheritance to invest and hope to add it to your retirement fund (and who wouldn't) by the time you get there and have the time to spend it – you need to ask yourself, what will it really be worth? (It is worse if they are your own hard-earned dollars.)

Thinking about the investment side of things and supposing you don't get whammed by a stock-market crash or other high-risk event, then to break even with a 4.0% inflation rate you need to get at least 4.0% on your investment. Going by the above calculations, the one thing we can be sure of, is that the value you get from savings is only ever that which the 'market' allows you to have. You must spend time and take some risks to keep up with the game. This uncertainty also ensures we drive ourselves to work harder.

Where does this extra interest to keep up or surpass inflation, come from? It begins to get quite technical at this point and this extra money is said to be from loan repayments, bond investments (interest paid by government selling bonds to cover debts, i.e. our taxes), corporation bonds (with that same interest derived from sales to us – thus reflected in the prices we pay) and trusts or managed portfolios and more. Each of these 'earnings' that pay us an interest component for our investment, relies on the ever-growing bubble of productivity. It also cycles back into the taxes and prices we pay, an ever-increasing circle. Not only that but keep in mind, each country is saddled with an ever-growing debt too, this can only last so long before something must even it out. A stock-market crash, a bank bail-out, debt for equity swaps and a multitude of other losses are quite possible, in fact it must happen at some time, it always does.

You might think that it won't happen here. That we are not Venezuela or the Sudan; but these countries show us that the system does not work, the populations of these places pay the price. That we are on the 'winning' side at the moment, and are still struggling, should only help to press home the knowledge that something isn't right.

Why is it that we accept this variation in monetary value? Why do we continue to take part in a game that we must surely see is rigged?

Money is a measuring tool, it must end up equating to the goods and services that are provided and do so in a manner that allows each individual to participate in society. Our tape measures don't vary, our weights and volumes remain the same! Everyone knows where we are with these things - how much of each we must use to get a desired result! Money, which we all must use, remains the only variable, and seems to do so at the whim of those who issue it, rather than as a staple measurement. That it does so, suggests to me that there is a purpose behind this variation, and that purpose becomes clearer the more you look into its use as a control measure.

We enter the great monetary race as soon as we are born. We are subject to the ever-changing rules and the manipulations that go on around it without thinking clearly just why we do so. Those with plenty of it, seem to fare better without actually doing much more than just playing a virtual monopoly game, where real production of tangible items is less of a concern than speculation (or gambling) about who might do well in the future. Playing the market creates winners and losers as we all know, the losers end up being where the buck stops, and that is at our level. It results in jobs gone, price increases, business failures and of course, inflation. The game of finance as it currently stands, is not about advancing the living standards of the whole of humanity, nor is it about what it was originally designed for: ensuring people have the ability to effectively make a demand on the production we are capable of.

We need to think of this demand, as a money vote. We use it to vote for the products and services <u>we</u> want, those items that <u>we</u> decide are useful and suit our outlook on life. If we think the item is exploitive, polluting or just contrary to our beliefs, we can 'vote' for (or buy) something that isn't. In this way <u>we</u> control the direction the world takes.

When money is scarce, we cannot vote as we would wish and must by necessity, vote differently. This scarcity is fictitious in the age we live in, and we are effectively being robbed of our ability to vote for the society we want.
The problem of providing for the material wants of mankind has effectively been solved by the genius of our past achievements. This inheritance belongs to us all and it should be enabling us to achieve a greater level of leisure in which to enjoy it. What does Douglas say?

Money not Wealth or Production:

' ... that money is nothing but an effective demand. It is not wealth, it is not production, and it has no inherent and indissoluble connection with anything whatever except effective demand. That is the first point, and it would be difficult to overrate the importance of a clear grasp of it. It lies at the root of the question as to the true ownership of credit-purchasing-power.'

' The second point is that, so far as we can conceive, the co-operative industrial system cannot exist without a satisfactory form of effective-demand system, and the result of an unsatisfactory money system (that is to say, a money system which fails to function as effective demand to the general satisfaction) is that mankind will be driven back to the distinguishing mark of barbarism, which is individual production.'

(This is something that we are experiencing now as people turn to smaller communities and attempt to become self-sufficient in many ways. The return to a more basic lifestyle, really equates to this concept of individual production, as people opt out of a life under the current 'system'.)

'And the third point, and the point which is perhaps of most immediate importance at the present time, is that the control of the money system means the control of civilised humanity. In other words, so far from money, or its equivalent, being a minor feature of modern economics, it is the very keystone of the structure.'

We are at a point in time now, where we are changing the systems, we live under. Attempts to create a global form of government has never been easier to see. Individual governments the world over, are all following the same path towards restriction of the individual and at the same time increasing debt enough to ensure that we will ask for some alternative to alleviate it. Make no mistake, there is a remedy available, but I am not sure you will like it when it comes.
As Douglas says:

'*We are at the present time unquestionably under the domination of a financial system, which rules us. It rules us in our most basic necessities; the necessity for bed, board and clothes, and the other things that go to make up the standard of living. But we do not want to transfer that domination from, let us say, what we can call the banking, system under another name to something we call the State.*
We have no desire whatever if we will analyse what our objective is, to change one master for a still more powerful master. That is one of the greatest dangers at the present time - that large bodies of people will be carried away by words of which they have not analysed the meaning. ... The opponents in this matter - we will put it on its lowest terms - can either allow the world to be plunged into another great 'delirium tremens', another great World War, or the opponents themselves can take steps to change the system. Now I have myself no doubt as to what is happening at this particular time, and that is that the opponents are endeavouring to change the system and the endeavour is being made to change over from the tyranny of finance to a tyranny of administration.'

'*Whether it be by accident or design, the world is steadily moving over from a financial tyranny which has both the elements of breakdown and has also been* *found out to another tyranny, a tyranny of administration ... the setting up of an entire State which can say, "You shall do so and so". "You shall have such and such rations". "You shall live in such and such a house, you shall work such and such hours". "You shall be taught such and such things". "And any deviation from those laws which we lay down for you will be penalised by either starvation or by all the rigours of the law".'*

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Thoughts%20of%20Douglas.htm

There is an alternative, one that C.H. Douglas proposed and one that returns the concept of money back to being a device to truly measure what we are capable of and distribute this capability to create a future that holds the promise of a better life for the individual. The objective as Douglas saw it was:

> '*... we want to establish a correct relationship between the individual and the group so that the group, and the attributes of the group shall serve the individual and not the Individual be the slave of the group.*'

This concept applies to groups of all sizes, even unto Governments!

Further reading: *Democratising Money,* by Charles Pinwill

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Pinwill%20C%20-%20Democratising%20Money.pdf

> ***'Electing the products of industry.***
> *Just suppose you have a dollar. You might be lucky to have a dollar. And you go down to the Corner Store. And you walk in and you say, for some odd reason, to a perfect stranger, "Can I have a pie and peas, please?". And he goes and gets it. And when he comes back you say, "Got any hot sauce?", and he says, "No, I've got tomato sauce. Would Soy sauce be alright?". He is deferring to you, isn't he? In fact, he is acting like your servant, and treating you like his master, and he's never seen you before in his life! Why is he doing that?*
> *Because you've got a sanction. Because you have a dollar. Because you have ordered a pie. He has been given an order. You could of course have elected to have two sausage rolls instead, or a cup of chips, or some soda squash.*
> *You could have elected any of many things, but you ordered a pie. And industry needs orders, and responds to orders. The money vote is a mechanism to control and direct industry, in the same way that a political vote is a mechanism to control and direct government.*
> *When we use our political vote we can choose, for our sins, to have a Labor representative, or a National, or a Liberal, or perhaps even a Citizens' candidate. Somebody says it is a bit like marriage, you takes your pick, and you pays your price! The price of a pie is $1, and if it's a bad pie, perhaps indigestion.*
> *You see the ballot paper and the money paper are simply mechanisms. Both are sanctions. Real sanctions. And both are abstractions, organised to indicate*

choice. Both are man-made. Neither the political vote nor the money vote grows on trees. The political vote is a mechanism to give orders in politics, and a dollar a mechanism to give orders in industry.
Who owns the political vote? We all get one each, we've decided that. We may change our minds and have something else, or other societies may. But that's our decision.'
'*We know if the Electoral Office created all the political votes, and then decided to keep them, we'd be furious! But we have another entity, the Banks, which are a mechanism to create the money vote, the sanction of economic choice, and they keep them all. Is that a just relationship? Because that is what democracy is about in the end, a just relationship.*'
'*... we can decide that those money votes belong to the people. This is a radical view of course. I use the word "radical" in the orthodox way here, as one which is at variance with the Bank's self interest.*
Often people say, "Well, look. Taking $50 billion dollars away from Bank Assets growth in the next year, isn't that robbing the banks?"
We know that there is going to be something like $3,000 for every living Australian created in the next year. How can those money-votes or dollars belong to the banks? They don't exist. The money that is going to be created in the next year, it doesn't yet exist. Can you own something that doesn't exist? That's impossible. The old money, which was created yesterday, and which somebody now has, that's a very different matter, but let's just look to the future for the moment.
Nobody owns those now uncreated dollar-votes, and the option is open to make a decision in a democracy about who shall own them.'

This booklet, of some 21 pages, is written in a very readable style and is a great beginning to the understanding of the true reason we use money and just who should own it. Since I touched on both of those concepts in the body of *'On Target'* this week, and since a full understanding of what money should be is a crucial aspect of retaining and furthering our freedoms, it should be top of your list to read.

Charles also writes about what Democracy is and the reasons behind our use of it. To achieve a level of fairness for all individuals within our society, we must exercise our democratic rights with both responsibility and a clear outcome in mind. To do anything less is wasting or sabotaging our potential future and giving over control of our lives to others. Only you know what you want!   ***

Unlawful Government Policy: Mandatory Childhood Vaccination It is Destroying Human Health By Judy Wilyman PhD

This document has been put together by Dr. Judy Wilyman PhD (Public Health) and Dr. Phillip Altman PhD (Pharmacology) and we hope that all members of the public will take this evidence to their politicians to obtain the removal of No Jab No Pay/Play policies immediately. Mandatory vaccination policies are not based on medical evidence and they are indisputably a serious risk to human health.

Coercive vaccination in Australian **Social Services** policies (No Jab No Pay/ Play) is *unlawful.* This is because it is not justified in **Health** Law. It is unjustified for four main reasons:

1. Vaccination is not mandated in **Health** Law because it was only a *secondary measure* in the control of infectious diseases globally. It was adopted in Australia, and all other countries, ***after 1950,*** when public health reforms, nutrition and antibiotics, had already removed the *serious risk* of both death and illness, due to all infectious diseases. Only communities with poor public health reforms were at serious risk after 1950. Cases of these diseases still existed but in the majority of cases they were mild or asymptomatic (sub-clinical) with no symptoms) resulting in natural immunity for the individual and herd immunity for the community.

Government Evidence Here:

https://www.vaccinationdecisions.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Judy-Wilymans-PHD-Thesis-Summary-re-named-Informed-Medical-Options-Party-PDF.pdf

2. Coercion in health promotion is against health promotion ethics. This is because it causes mental and physical illness due to stress. Doctor's medical ethical guidelines are being *violated* by the medical regulator, **AHPRA,** because this board is preventing doctors' from giving patients '*informed consent, without coercion, manipulation or pressure*" (AIH Ed 10).

Doctors are being deregistered by AHPRA for providing 'antivaccination material' and this includes discussing the very real risks of vaccination. Genetics means many people are predisposed to illnesses after vaccination and this is destroying many lives.

Is AHPRA a government or a corporate board making profit for its shareholders? The answer is both -AHPRA is a ***government-corporate*** board. ***So, is this lawful and have you been informed?***

3. The government has ***never used*** a true inert placebo to critically and reliably assess vaccine safety in clinical trials for vaccines prior to marketing to the public.

Doctors do not know this. This represents **medical fraud.**

Government Evidence Here:

https://www.vaccines.news/2025-09-13-661-studies-fail-to-prove-vaccine-safety.html

4. All drugs (vaccines are drugs) have adverse effects (AE's) in some individuals due to genetic diversity. In the case of vaccination, the ***government-corporate*** regulator, the **Therapeutic Goods Administrator,** (96% funded by industry), ***has never*** set up an adverse event reporting system in *70+ years* that can reliably detect, assess, and report adverse events likely caused by the vaccines.

This simply requires follow up of the health outcomes of every vaccinated child for 5-10 years. If this data were made available, health professionals could determine the risk benefit of using multiple vaccines in developing infants, without it doctors are assuming safety and ignoring the significant increase in chronic illnesses.

It is not in the interest of the corporate sponsors to report the types and incidence of vaccine adverse events. Pharmaceutical companies have been indemnified from any liability for harm caused by any drug categorised as a 'vaccine'. They would lose sales if the true safety risks become widely known. There is simply no incentive to advise prescribers or the public of the true risks of any vaccine or the combination of vaccines.

In other words, the actual number of deaths or type and frequency of AE's that are occurring in healthy children *after vaccination* have never been determined. The evidence in the population shows a 10-fold increase in chronic illnesses in children, since 1990, and this is a direct *dose-response correlation* to the vaccination program; the strongest evidence scientists have for a causal link. Yet the Australian government has ***never investigated*** this correlation.

This means that the claims of safety of the combined schedule of 15+ vaccines (~45+ doses) is being made on ***undone science:*** *important science that has never been done.* The government is claiming they are safe and 'adverse events are rare' without any data or hard evidence. It is an unmonitored experiment.

Hence, ***mandating*** multiple drugs called 'vaccines' in the healthy population is a ***crime against humanity.***

No parent should be coerced and/or financially penalised to vaccinate their child because no credible evidence exists to show that the ***benefits*** of childhood vaccination outweigh the ***risk*** of developing widely reported chronic illnesses or death. Post-vaccination chronic disease includes neurodevelopmental disorders, autism, autoimmune disease, allergic conditions, asthma, anaphylaxis, learning disability, speech disorder etc. and death.

Not a single childhood vaccine has been properly safety tested in randomised, true placebo controlled, long term clinical trials despite the recognition that childhood neurological problems have skyrocketed in incidence contemporaneously with increasing use of these injections.

Government Evidence Here:
https://x.com/MrJohnJnr/status/2071396176646074581

Childhood vaccines contain known neurotoxins such as mercury and aluminium. No credible risk/benefit analysis has been performed to justify coerced or mandated use of any vaccine.

To date there have been many studies of various design and subject number comparing the overall health of vaccinated vs unvaccinated children, however, all studies consistently support the view that vaccinated children are generally sicker across all health outcomes than unvaccinated children. ***

The above article has been reproduced here with persmission from Dr. Judy Wilyman's Substack, found here: ***https://substack.com/@drjudywilyman***

Documentary - An Inconvenient Study.

The largest study completed over 10 years showing significantly increased risk of chronic illnesses in ***vaccinated*** children. ***https://www.aninconvenientstudy.com/***

"An Inconvenient Study" Explained

This is the largest and best designed of the 13 clinical studies comparing the health of vaxxed vs unvaxxed children. The Henry Ford Hospital (Detroit), studied 18,468 children over ten years and found that *"exposure to vaccination was independently associated with an overall 2.5-fold increase in the likelihood of developing a chronic health condition when compared to children unexposed to vaccination"* (Lamerato L. *et al:* Impact of Childhood Vaccination on Short and Long-Term Chronic Health Outcomes in Children: A Birth Cohort Study).

This is why Australia's Social Services Policies that mandate vaccines are unlawful. They are founded on medical fraud and not supported by Health laws. They must be repealed immediately as they are destroying the genetic fabric of society.

Parents must take action by showing this evidence to their politicians/doctors and by not complying with laws that are a serious risk to public health. Please also sign up and support the doctors at the **Australian Medical Professional Society (AMPS)** ***https://amps.redunion.com.au/*** that are standing up for the patients best interest but are being persecuted by the *corporate-medical regulator,* AHPRA, for abiding by their medical ethical guidelines. ***

Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.
Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

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