



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 61 No. 20

23rd May 2025

IN THIS ISSUE

What's Going On In Victoria? By William Waite	75
Arthur Chresby's 'How To Get What You Want' – An Analysis By Neville Archibald	77
The Ongoing Deindustrialisation of Australia By Arnis Luks	83

What's Going On In Victoria? By William Waite

Protests against the Victorian Government's doubling of the fire services levy rate continued yesterday in Melbourne. ¹ The increased tax tied to land values is ostensibly to help fund the state's emergency services. Evidently, amidst one of the most gruelling tax regimes in the world, many Victorians see the increase as just another government money grab to, as one Victorian said to me, "pay for their *&^% ups."

To find the root of the trouble let's have a look at the state of Victoria's finances.

Until the financially engineered collapse known as the GFC Victorian state debt per person rounded to nothing. The GFC apparently started an inexorable rise until the deadly combination of the Andrews government and the engineered public health emergency commonly referred to as 'the pandemic' sent it skyward. State debt currently sits around \$19,000 per Victorian and is expected to go to \$25,000 within a couple of years.

At 262 days Melbourne had the longest and hardest (stay-at-home orders, business closures, curfews, 5 km travel limits, exercise restrictions, rubber bullets) lockdowns of any city in the world. This literal imprisonment of its population cost a lot of Victorian government debt. More than any other state. The financial hangover from covid is \$31.5 billion dollars of red columns.

After doing the "good debt, bad debt" talk the government describes covid debt:

On the other hand, our COVID debt relates to one-off investments designed to protect Victorians and Victorian businesses throughout the pandemic, and set the state up for recovery on the other side. (...)

As the state's economic position is now sound, now is the time to pay off the debt and the accumulating interest incurred as a direct result of the pandemic. ²

What's it look like on the ground?

This week *The Australian* ran a story about a sandblasting business in Dandenong which has seen a 2300% land tax increase in a decade. The bill has increased from \$8300 to over \$200k. This company has operated at the same site since 1973 and has worked on some of the biggest projects in Melbourne including the MCG, Docklands Stadium, train stations and bridges. Due to the cost increases they're looking at taking on smaller premises where they may not be able to handle the largest steel sections.³

In addition to the aforementioned taxes and fire levy the government has legislated a public health levy and, my favourite, a covid debt levy.

The "one-off investments" to fund the covid response were a disaster for the economy and the people of Victoria whichever way you look at it. Now the banks and institutional investors who knowingly financed the scandal are going to be made whole at the expense of people like our Dandenong sandblasters. Notice how the banks and the government function in unison.

On what planet can the Victorian government's covid response be considered a success such that it should pay interest on the dollar to Blackrock and the Central Bank? It seems to me the final condemnation of an illegitimate financial system.

Ask yourself, in what sense are we moving toward a more prosperous and secure economic future? Cost-of-living is in permacrisis, house prices are so insane that a large percentage of our kids will never own property, tax is off the charts, small and medium enterprises are going to the wall in record numbers. Debt is spiralling at every level, we make nothing here, growth is immigrant driven and the native-born birthrate is below replacement. It's a pattern of decline observable across the Western world and sitting at the center of it all is this lousy debt-based financial system.

We need to overcome our moral confusion about debt. To think through this you could do worse than begin with Douglas' straight forward observation that "Ethically, there is every difference between money created at the stroke of a pen and money acquired as the result of years of effort."

Honestly people how long are we going to take the conventional line on banking before we start to ask what this "fountain pen money" is costing us? Will we just let them manage the dismantling of Western economic life until we have nothing?

1 Darling, A, Rooney K., Morgan, C. 16.05.25. CFA Volunteers Walk off the Job to Protest new fire Tax. *The Age*, Available from: <https://www.theage.com.au/national/victoria/country-firefighters-refuse-to-work-in-protest-against-tax-plan-20250515-p5lznz.html>

2 Victorian Government. May 2023. Covid Debt Repayment Plan. Available from: <https://www.2023.budget.vic.gov.au/covid-debt-repayment-plan>

3 McCaffery, L. 14.05.25. "They can afford to pay": Symes doubles down on land tax. Available from: <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/politics/victorian-budget-breaking-point-of-2300-per-cent-tax-hike/news-story/277f8589d3cd34b0750eb3915321cde8>

Arthur Chresby's 'How To Get What You Want' – An Analysis By Neville Archibald

Back in 1990, A. J. Symonds, wrote a booklet based on an Arthur Chresby's speech from 1976.

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Chresby_A-How_To_Get_What_You_Want.pdf

Chresby was a former Federal MHR who was also a research analyst in Constitutional law. A proud Australian, he was committed to ... *“informing Australians of their electoral rights and obligations in an attempt to maintain the rights of everyday Australians. He maintained that the government and public representatives had as their sole purpose and duty is only to act upon the will of the Australian people, not political factions.”* Wikipedia.

In this booklet, Mr Symonds summarises and transposes the spoken word, into a written form which is easily read and studied. It reveals to us the thinking of a man who was knowledgeable in the ways of power and essentially the “warfare” of government control.

We have been talking about the results of the election and it's aftermath, and the role of independents to reduce the power of the party machine. Prior to this I have concentrated mainly on alternatives to the party rule. Ways of reducing the influence of that system on our representatives, or on removing it altogether. Even I can lose sight of the true objective when trying to find a better way. As a tactician, Chresby was not as concerned about party influence as I have worked myself up to be. We do indeed, sometimes, lose sight of what we want when we are striving to make a change for the better. Here I should quote from this booklet,

“Party politicians, and I underline and emphasise Party, always yield to pressure. Make no mistake about this, or kid yourself otherwise. But at the moment, the major pressure is from above, from the Parties. It is just in misunderstanding this word, pressure, or as Douglas once referred to it as moral suasion, the correct application of moral pressure or moral suasion, is where we are weakest, and where, to that extent, the enemy is the strongest.”

Indeed, the application of pressure from the electorate once every three years, is truly a sad indictment of our concern. Many of us allow the three years to go by before we even comment again. We might say something to others, but even if we meet our representative in the street or at a function, few ever go so far as to inform them of their desires or even hold them to account for their voting patterns. I would suggest that the number of people that knew what was voted on, was as great as the number who knew how they voted: a very small percentage indeed! Those taking the time out to visit their members office, or to go to a function where the Member will be, would also be a minimal number. The movers and shakers of our communities, often the very people we don't trust, are often those who take time to ensure they are heard. We, the meek, by our very inaction, again end up with what we deserve due to lack of effort.

In speaking of pressure brought to bear on our politicians, Chresby points out that the machinery of the party is centralised and ruled from the top down; the most desirous of power finding themselves in a battle to get to the top. Making powerful and often corrupting friends on that journey, ending up either beholden to, or sharing, a lust for that ultimate power over others. The global influences have us beaten in this regard, with wealth and time at their disposal. It is here we often think we are at a loss, but we have a greater power, we are always present at the base of their power, that of denying their re-election. Without our vote, they lose.

We have seen a liberal party, primed for change after their defeat. They are positioning themselves where they believe will get them the most votes; their weakness is in the direction they want to obtain these votes from. They see the labor party as the one to steal votes from; so that they end up with those swinging voters instead. To me that is a very limited view.

In looking at the results of the election on a first preference basis, we see that both major parties are losing ground to a mish-mash of minor parties and independents. What good is stealing from a dwindling number of votes, when the trend appears to be a rejection of the direction both majors are headed for.

The very power brokers at the top that Chresby next mentions (those who influence party direction) are already well aware of the direction they want Australia to head in, and to cede that direction, is the last thing they wish to do. This is why we see the “new” liberal leadership, still pushing the global agenda route, the one that runs parallel to labor’s route. The public is not wanting this; but, the power brokers do, so they create diversions to “win” people over by minor cosmetic change, rather than actual effective policy change. Those that this does not sit well with, will protest, even to the point of leaving the party: see the Nationals split. The powerful heads of the parties do not want the direction to change, they wish to remain in control, they are willing to give up many things, but not that. So Chresby talks of this control by others (the power brokers) and how it is done. How the powerful ensure that they keep control.

“We know that this is done through the machinery or mechanism of Parliament. How does he control the Parliament? Through the machinery and mechanism of what is called the political Party system. He would indeed have the greatest difficulty in the world in trying to persuade over two hundred Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, if they were pure Independents, and not under the duress of dictation of a Party.”

It is here we see the nature of our possibility, that we are greater in number and can cover each and every member in their own electorates if enough pressure is brought to bear by enough people. The original and most important part of keeping them in power, is our vote.

“He would have the greatest difficulty in controlling and persuading such a

conglomerate of different types and mentalities of which our Parliament exists. And so, there can be no argument that the basis of his control, the basis of the implementation of his financial policy and efforts to centralise all power, and destroy the people's control over their member, is through the Party system."

"As a consequence then, we must look at this Party system and its structure and how it works. Now in expressing my opinion on the question of the Party system, I do so, not from the reading of others, but from practical experience. I deliberately went into the Party system, worked my way into the position of a member of State executive, and deliberately worked myself into the position of getting a seat in Parliament. So I was able to see from the inside precisely what happens and how it works."

Party Politicians Always Yield To Pressure

"We have to drive a wedge between the Party and the Member. Now this on the surface, and on broad past experience, seems to be a practically impossible task. This is the thing that is worrying so many of our very good people who have worked so hard over all these years. What then is the answer, and how do we go about it? I said that Party politicians yield to pressure. Therefore, the pressure that we bring to bear has to be greater than the pressure brought to bear by the Party."

"The central core of Douglas' presentation in this particular context, was summed up by him in his Buxton speech in these words: That a Member of Parliament is concerned with two things, and two things only. The first is in holding his seat. The second is how much voting pressure is behind any demands made upon him. And from my own experience, I can verify that to be correct."

The C.H.Douglas speech at Buxton can be found here:

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20The%20Nature%20of%20Democracy.pdf>

Again he also mentions **voting pressure**. A selective campaign, focused on each major issue as it arises must be of greater influence on the member than that of his party. We have seen parties dis-endorse or sideline their own members for failing to toe the line. Have we made capital use of this? Have we congratulated those who stand up for principles or perceived electorate desires? Did we get behind their future campaigns and encourage them to rethink their allegiance, change it to the people first, before the party?

I am reminded of the plight of poor Dan Andrews here, he cannot find a Victorian golf club to accept him as a member. If this method of congratulation applied to every political member, and reflected their observed input while in power, we may well see a more cautious approach to the wielding of that power.

If the fruits of their labours was reciprocated in this fashion, then only a sociopath would be unaffected. Are they not always saying that the pay should be on par with the work done?

We have scattered members of various parties who may well be good candidates to consider, when deciding who to support. There may be “pretend” independents among them, but equally there may be useful known entities that can be worked with. It all depends on the amount of influence that an electorate can wield. It is in this way that very wedge can be driven. Each time a Party stumbles in this way, we must be ready. If they can get what Chresby called, ‘**voting pressure**’ behind them, they will be less likely to swayed by their party, more likely to see how they are being used : something no one appreciates.

In the current liberal party, during it’s reconstruction, we need to focus our attention on the disaffected among them, the reasons for that internal conflict they have. I think there are some who could be persuaded to defect from the party line with enough outside support. Maybe even the labor party has those too. Any reduction in party support from their own members, those that remember a different original idealism, is a beneficial one; one that will tap that wedge in further. Each candidate must be considered on an individual basis, and only by knowing them can this be an effective tool. As with all battles, there are good and bad methods of achieving goals, Chresby speaks of these below:

Five Fundamental Principles of Strategy and Tactics

“I want now to reiterate the five fundamental principles of strategy and tactics.

Action, for without action no decision can be arrived at.

Application of forces superior at time and place of impact.

Economy of effort. You don't use more energy than is essential to achieve the task. You don't use a nuclear device where the use of a slingshot will do the same job.

Retention of initiative. Never engage in any action whatever which you yourself cannot break off anytime you want to, and come back again. Never allow your efforts to be so extended that you have exhausted everything in your means, that you are depleted in physical and mental energy, that you are not able to carry on, because then the enemy has defeated you.

Application to yourself of intelligent obedience or functional discipline. I have often illustrated this by the use of General Wolff's famous words to his troops before the taking of Quebec, “Hold your fire until you see the whites of your enemies' eyes.”

Now I have cut and pasted much from Mr Symonds booklet, and to be fair, the booklet needs to be read in it’s entirety. It is only 28 pages long and contains a lot of thoughtful material. Material that can be put into practice by anyone willing to stand up and push for reform.

Arthur Chresby was a man of insight, whose experience and writing have much to offer us. Like all good tacticians, we need to plan going forward to best achieve the end result we want to see. We can use the very nature of the party system against itself. Very few offer themselves up to blind obedience when there is a better alternative on offer. It is up to us to make that alternative a more attractive one.

HOW TO GET WHAT YOU WANT - Elements of Organisation, Strategy and Tactics.
The transcription of a tape recording made in January, 1976 by ARTHUR A. CHRESBY
https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Chresby_A-How_To_Get_What_You_Want.pdf

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Chresby_A-Your_Will_Be_Done.pdf P. 15

WHAT IS THE LEGAL FUNCTION AND DUTY OF A PARLIAMENTARIAN?

While there are many British and Australian judicial interpretations on precisely what IS the true legal function and duty of a Member of Parliament it will be sufficient, here, to give two such (examples-ed). Heavy print in these two quotations has been added by this writer to stress the points involved. The first is from a British case (for those of legal mind see A.C. 1910, at p. 110) where Lord Shaw of Dumfermline stated, amongst other things:-

"Parliament is summoned by the Sovereign to advise His Majesty freely. By the nature of the case it is implied that coercion, restraint, or money payment, which is the price of voting at the bidding of others, destroys or imperils that function of freedom of advice which is fundamental in the very constitution of Parliament."

The second is from a High Court case ('Horne v Barber' (1920) 27 C.L.R. p. 500):-

"When a man becomes a Member of Parliament, he undertakes high public duties. These duties are inseparable from the position: he cannot retain the honour and divest himself of the duties. One of the duties is that of watching on behalf of the general community the conduct of the Executive, of criticising, and, if necessary, of calling it to account in the constitutional way by censure from his place in Parliament - censure which, if sufficiently supported, means removal from office. That is the whole essence of responsible government, which is the keystone of our political system, and is the main constitutional safeguard the community possesses. The effective discharge of that duty is necessarily left to the Member's conscience and the judgement of his electors, but the law will not sanction or support the creation of any position of a Member of Parliament where his own personal interest may lead him to act prejudicially to the public interest by weakening (to say the least) his sense of obligation of due watchfulness, criticism, and censure of the administration."

(The above judicial decision on the duty and function of a Member of Parliament surely gives rise to the following legal question:-

In debating and voting on strict party lines in his House of the Parliament, is not a Member of the dominant party in serious breach of the law, and in contempt of the Court, for how can a member obey strict party rules and High Court decisions at one and the same time?)

More simply put, these and other interpretations mean:-

(a) **THE SOLE LEGAL FUNCTION** of a Member of Parliament IS TO FREELY ADVISE the Queen in the government of the Country, according to the clearly expressed will of the people, on any matter or thing, i.e., his sole legal function is to legislate.

(b) In legislating, his **SOLE LEGAL DUTY** is that, like a judge entering his court, he shall enter his House of the Parliament, each official Sitting day, and with judge-like dignity and decorum, he shall honestly, impartially, and searchingly examine all matters that properly may be placed before him and, with unbiased judgement, vote according to his conscience and his sense of legal responsibility.

(c) No Member of Parliament has any legal function or duty outside of his House of Parliament, unless that House officially details him otherwise.

(d) It is no legal part of his function or duty to interview Ministers of the Crown or departmental officers for and on behalf of his electors or others.

(e) Such interviewing is purely a social and moral obligation that flows from his public status; obligations which can be, and are, performed by other non-parliamentary public figures without monetary rewards, either by salary or allowances.

(f) There is no constitutional-legal authority for paying Members, out of Crown revenue, for the performance of purely social responsibilities, whether that payment be a parliamentary salary and allowances, or just allowances - State and Federal Parliamentary Allowance Acts notwithstanding.

Of necessity, the following crucial questions must arise out of the aforestated judicial interpretations:-

(a) Who, or what, is it that deliberately prevents back-bench Members of Parliament from faithfully carrying out their sole legal function and duty, as judicially defined?

(b) If it is claimed that legal authority exists then, precisely, what Section of the Constitutions grant constitutional power to pay Members of Parliament salaries, out of Crown revenue, for not faithfully carrying out their judicially defined legal function and legal duty?

(c) Where is the precise Constitutional power to pay allowances, out of Crown revenue, to back-bench Members of Parliament for the performance of judicially defined **PURELY SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS** of interviewing Ministers of the Crown and departmental Officers, for and on behalf of constituents?

(For the legally-minded, it is suggested that the going would be extremely rough, if not impossible, to claim the "implied and incidental powers" of the Constitutions as the authority for such payments.)

More than ninety years of party political control over our seven Australian Parliaments reveal that it is only on very rare occasions that Parliamentary party leaders agree to allow their back-bench Members to have a free, or "conscience", vote. On all other occasions party leaders and party controllers, **DEMAND ABSOLUTE LOYALTY** to the party, and **INSIST** on voting **BEING ON PARTY LINES**.

This raises the further crucial question of whether, under State Criminal Codes and the Commonwealth Crimes Act, Parliamentary party leaders, and controllers, are not severally and individually guilty of deliberately breaching those codes and statutes, i.e., of being guilty of conspiring to prevent back-bench Members of Parliament from fulfilling their judicially defined legal function and duty in their Houses of Parliament?

It also raises the basic question, touched on (previously-ed), of whether or not back-bench Members of Parliament themselves violated their legal duty to the People by freely allowing themselves to be coerced by their leaders and party into not correctly fulfilling their judicially defined legal function and duty and, of a consequence, thereby rendering their Parliamentary Seat vacant by an act of overt or covert conspiracy

The Ongoing Deindustrialisation of Australia By Arnis Luks

Around July last year I travelled to WA. The issue of concern then, was the banning of live sheep exports by the state and federal labor governments. Having this year again travelled to Western Australia, the issue of banning live sheep exports is a *fait accompli*. Another lucrative Australian industry has been shut down.

Jeremy Lee's '*Upon This Mountain*' records the treachery of that then Fraser liberal government in the seventies and eighties, and nineties under Howard aggressively deindustrialising Australia. That labor is continuing on with this policy is no surprise for anyone who pays attention to the dialectic of the uni-party working in tandem.

Little or no noise was heard from the MSM about small business as they struggled to keep going. But the greatest silence of all is/was from the unions (losing permanent jobs and long-term employment) and the Liberal/National coalition membership. It is only a matter of whose turn it has been to 'implement the unpopular policy'. The policy does not change regardless of political party in power.

Malcolm Fraser was the dominant figure in the 1970s, however it is a real question of the dubious circumstances within Parliament, of almost no member lifting a finger to hold the Executive to account for this treachery, of which labor MP Graeme Campbell was alone. Even for the insipid representative, there is the mechanism of 'Question Time' to raise the issue, or using other alternatives, of 'Letters to the Editor', or mainstream media interviews which achieves the same result. It is a question of political will-power. Immersed within the dwarfed-integrity of the representative was silence, especially ongoing silence, as an act of complicity throughout the treachery.

This sordid history of our national surrender of our sovereignty, independence, and self-reliance, is littered with big ideas by little people, supported by a litany of complicit mainstream media, indentured professorships, and membership of board positions attracting lucrative salaries. Little people wishing to build their own personal utopia have only simple desires affecting themselves. The bureaucrat, the transnational industrialists, the political class, given a cupful more power than they should hold, engenders grandiose thoughts affecting many, many others. This glaring issue of Executive treachery requires accountability to bring it back to order.

Banning live sheep exports affects individuals, families, communities and businesses alike. Eyre Peninsula, closer to home, has lost sporting clubs and many social events as their industrial base - like that of rural Western Australia - is wound down. Broad acre farming is requiring bigger and bigger machinery. The fourth Industrial Revolution has displaced man from the industrial processes to allow the few to be 'managers of machines' - doing the work by one man, but, producing the quantity of what 10,000 men from ages past produce, and this, without any mechanism to purchase what the modern machines produce. A similar event occurred several hundred years ago with the clearances, the enclosures, resulting in a tragic 25 percent loss of life during the Irish blight potato famine.

The other crops were still produced but the absentee landlords were not held accountable for a moral answer and so the peasants were left to starve. Those merchant bankers who controlled the then UK Parliament, were more interested in profit than the effects on the little people. This is neoliberalism or libertarianism in thought and action. We are called to pursue a higher purpose - when asked for our shirt to offer our coat also. The Christian unction is not legalistic at all, but moral.

Senator Alex Antic issued a newsletter claiming we – Australia - should opt out of the pandemic 2.0 treaty. This position does not necessarily come from the Liberal party of which he is a member, and also I might add, holds the enviable first-position on the Senate voting ticket. Observing his esteemed position on the voting ticket may reveal 'gas lighting' as a tactic - denying with their mouth what they are doing with their hands. Several in ALOR circles endorsed the coalition for the last election, so you are not alone if you did the same in the hope of a better outcome.

An important point is to realise that the policy espoused by Senator Antic must be reinforced by an active citizenry to wake up the general public that 'he as Senator', and as a spokesman and esteemed position holder for the Liberal party, must 'doubly' be held to account for this statement.

During an election-cycle in the UK several years ago, the then leader of the Conservative party David Cameron committed to a referendum for BREXIT that he, and the party hierarchy, had no intention of upholding. This political game of cat and mouse operates in real-time every day. It is only an active citizenry that can hold this type of historical treachery to account.

The real issue is to get out of the World Health Organisation and all other treaties which diminish our personal and national sovereignty, for which Sen Antic must be commended and the Liberal party pressured-unrelentingly to uphold.

If a businessman made this calibre of statement without any intention of adhering to it, ASIC would immediately draw him before the courts for providing misleading guidance to the market. Yet, our political class came to the profound conclusion under John Howard, that a 'core promise' was above all other election-cycle promises, and so would be adhered to. What humbug.

Our online ALOR PDF library holds three booklets by former MHR Arthur Chresby, which provide some guidance as to 'How To Get What You Want', including a compilation of letters to Governors-General and Governors.

While Senator Antic's integrity is beyond reproach, he is only one man and without an active citizenry coming behind him to support this policy, he will be swamped by his coalition-colleagues and the Parliament. Similar could be said about our monarch, even though he holds a position of high esteem, without the citizenry coming behind him to pursue a policy, he, as our Regal Governors and Governor-General alike, are only one man. At the time of Operation BankWatch, those earlier Eyre Peninsula activists had to be diligently at the wheel to support the 'potential action' of the then South Australian Governor Sir Donald Dunstan. Worth thinking about.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Bankwatch/index.html>

On Target Subscription Postage Details

Mail Postage and Payment Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription Postage Details

Mail Postage and Payment Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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.

On Target Subscription Payment Details

Mail Postage and Payment Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription Payment Details

Mail Postage and Payment Details too
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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.