



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 61 No. 38

26<sup>th</sup> September 2025

IN THIS ISSUE

Preparing The Opposition Members of the Uniparty By Arnis Luks	01
In Other News! Or By Their fruits! By Neville Archibald	02
Infected By Neville Archibald	04

## Preparing The Opposition Members of the Uniparty By Arnis Luks

Andrew Hastie is beginning to set his mark on the Liberal Leadership with at least 3 differing policies from current Leader Sussan Ley – Re-establish Australian-based Manufacturing, Reducing-Immigration, and Abandon Net-Zero. Personally, I have not seen an aspiring politician ‘of any party’ take such a firm stance away from their party policies – without a move for the leadership. Those who agree with him would do well to write to endorse his position – as policies you are prepared to get behind. He must be encouraged if he is to navigate the political storm that will come his way.

The real question to ask of him is whether he will put his future on the line to draw out these policy initiatives. If necessary, will he leave the Liberal Party to pursue these policy initiatives? I doubt it somehow. He is making his move for the leadership of the Liberal Party of Australia – tis all.

### Finance is The Key

Andrew Hastie has no financial policy to date, which is why I take the view of what he says with a grain of salt. He is playing a game of political-deception. Financial policy is a must before a policy of re-industrialisation of Australian Manufacturing can begin. The first tuft of soil to be turned over - won't happen without adequate finance. Wishful thinking won't do it either. Finance is a licence to live. He should know that, but he has neglected to show how his pursuit of policies is to begin - financially.

Taking a look at the last politician, I remember, to have taken an independent stance on policy from their main political party was Graeme Campbell in the 1990's. Establishing the Commonwealth Development Bank was integral to his policy platform – the bank needed to be established to finance the projects.

Andrew Hastie has done nothing of the sort, which shows a lack of foresight on his part. Perhaps a friendly reminder from a helpful contact is in order here:

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Campbell\\_G-Industry\\_policy\\_Directions\\_for\\_growth.htm](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Campbell_G-Industry_policy_Directions_for_growth.htm)

The importance of having a sound financial policy before the first tuft of grass is turned, demonstrates a practical approach to the problem at hand. It is not a matter of businessmen supporting Hastie's thoughts, but finance making the ground ready-for-work. Only a banker can do that – a banker of similar mind to himself. For this we would need to go back to 1911 and Dennison Miller being that banker who placed Australia's interests above those profiteering for the bank.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Amos%20DJ%20-%20Commonwealth%20Bank.pdf>

Legislation to empower the banker must be ready as soon as parliament sits after an election. Like a project-manager, he must think ahead and be at call when it is necessary to act. Saying that Australia needs a car industry, less immigration, and abandon net-zero is a lot easier said than done. Only last year Andrew Hastie was complaining of Liberal policy after the Tasmanian State Election where the Liberals did not succeed. He was making sport of an issue that effects all Australians – excessive amounts of Immigration. Housing prices affect everyone one way or the other – insurances, rates and taxes, or purchase price. Both, in the end affect the rental-costs for housing.

Is Hastie smart enough to prepare the ground for a proper run on these issues, or is he just opportunistic enough to white-ant Susan Ley's Leadership? I think the latter.

### **In Other News! Or By Their fruits! By Neville Archibald**

The reformation of the Liberal party would seem to be on someone's agenda. A few of the less audibly challenged liberal party elect are beginning to hear the grumbles of their constituents. Some, to give them credit, have had this discontent with the current liberal direction for some time.

After the electoral defeat at the last election, the party seemed to get a revamp. The marketing division, I suggest, took on some of the Labor criticisms of poor diversity within the party (read not enough female representation compared to how labor sees themselves - advance a new leader) and a need to strengthen their perceived weakening on the incredibly important global commitments to things like net zero and surveillance via digital identity pursuance.

The revamp seemed to take on a new lease of life, sadly it pushed them into looking more like a new labor-lite party than conservative in any form. This of course deepened the divide that was already there. The result we are now seeing.

Criticism of Susan Ley's leadership is not to be allowed in order to create a firm and united stance going forward. The pushing of Senator Price to the backbench for disagreement on a policy, that should never have been liberal policy in the first place, only served to antagonise the dispute.

The rejection of key concerns brought to light by many rural members has also

caused issues. Thus we are seeing discussion on topics that have been virtually silenced in the media, by lack of difference between the members of the uni-party (lab/lib).

This can only be a welcome opportunity to congratulate and encourage those liberals making a noise. I don't know that I would go so far as to vote for them, they would need to make huge concessions and an abject apology to all, for me to even consider that. Tony Abbott appears to be attempting to do just that in his latest interview, but be warned, when a party is out of office they often say and do things that they have all the appearance of meaning.

The best I can say for this 'upset' is that it provides us with the ability to now discuss these important issues on a wider scale, we should take advantage of it.

....

***Vietnam has shown a global trend is occurring there too. Reports of the suspension of 86 million bank accounts has appeared in print:***

"The State Bank of Vietnam (SBV) has deactivated over 86 million bank accounts. This is part of a national "data-cleansing" campaign to ensure that all active bank accounts are linked to verified, biometrically authenticated identities. 1 day ago"

<https://www.comsuregroup.com/news/the-state-bank-of-vietnam-sbv-has-deactivated-over-86-million-bank-accounts/>

For those who wonder where this push to digital identification is going to, follow the money. It is no longer about online safety or fraud reduction alone. This will have profound impacts on every country that complies with these standards. What you do with your own money is at risk of being fully controlled, it is only one step away from full time monitoring of all that you do.

It is interesting to note that Keir Starmer has also come out with a promise to implement a compulsory digital ID, without which ,you will not be able to work in the UK.

*'Announcing his plans for the new digital IDs, Sir Keir said the scheme would "make it tougher to work illegally in this country, making our borders more secure".'*

*'There will be no requirement for individuals to carry their ID or be asked to produce it, Downing Street said.*

*However, digital ID will be mandatory as a means of proving right to work in the UK by the end of the Parliament, expected to be 2029 at the latest.'*

So, after allowing all the excessive migration for so long, and introducing laws that make it extremely difficult to have any discussion about it, without the threat of penalties, he now has the solution. More control. I wonder what a dictator would do?

Australians please be advised, that he was talking to other people we know at that point too:

'Addressing the Global Progressive Action Conference in London - attended by politicians including Australian Prime Minister Anthony Albanese and Canadian Prime Minister Mark Carney - Sir Keir said it was time to "look ourselves in the

mirror and recognise where we've allowed our parties to shy away from people's concerns". <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cn832y43ql5o>

On the Victorian front, Brett Sutton (our former Chief Health Officer during the COVID regime of the Andrews Government), has finally made a statement. There has been a concerted effort to find out which of the draconian laws were actually instituted under health guidelines (backed by medical science). All to no avail. Now during an interview with Neil Mitchell he has admitted that many of the things we did were 'probably never necessary.' I suggest you read the full article in the link below, taking note of these comments (emphasis added by me).

*'He also admitted that the imposed policies were so harsh, and some so unnecessary, that Australians may never put up with a lockdown again.*

*Maybe we will agree as a society that we never want to do that (lockdown) again,' Professor Sutton said.*

*I'm okay with that. There are other ways to manage stuff.*

*'If we all wore masks and we all got vaccinated and we all kept distances without them being mandated. That's a potential path we can take.'*

<https://www.oversixty.com.au/editorial/never-necessary-covid-health-chiefs-startling-admission-about-pandemic/>

So if we are good little girls and boys and follow directions without question next time ...

## **Infected By Neville Archibald**

We have been infected!

Infected by an insanity of distrust!

For too long our ideals have been subverted.

Subverted by the will to power.

Among our species (homo sapiens) there are individuals who clamour for attention, for wealth, for individual success, with such a thirst that they would deny all others the quenching of theirs. The reason: A misguided belief of scarcity? A lack of moral right and wrong? Limited exposure to what we once termed civics (duties, rights, and activities involved in life, institutions and systems).

Left to our own devices, a majority would treat others as friends or at least as fellow travellers in this world. Given, of course no extremes of scarcity or contrived conflict. But, we are not left to our own devices – are we?

Mankind's story is one of growth and reduction. We see a flourishing of civilization as we learn to work together, as we unlock the secrets of the world to benefit us all. We call this, in some fashion, freedom. It has many connotations :

Freedom from hunger  
Freedom from violence  
Freedom from endless toil  
Freedom from Restriction in it's many forms.

Then you have freedom – of thought, of action, of desire.

We recognise these last ones as almost instinctive, and that they should also be 'moral' ones. Here we immediately come across an issue, for by moral, we mean – of our societies conventions according to it's development. This is so often taken for granted and overlooked, that those who raise it as a question often face criticism for doing so.

The very conventions we pride ourselves on, have root in the Christian concepts of love, of all being equal under God.

Love for your fellow man, love for all gods creatures, and love for his entire creation and all that that implies.

It has served us well. It has created a free society to this point – despite the many corruptions that have occurred alongside it. This has been our philosophy, like it or not! This philosophy must be recognised as the foundation that built it, any deviation from it, will alter and destabilise what we have.

We have seen this destabilising occur every-time greed and corruption has raised its ugly head. We are seeing it now, as others with a different philosophy come to live among us. Not content with the failings of the society they are running from, they ask for our compassion to come and live with us.

Having this Christian background, we are probably too easy going, and we allow them to come and live among us, we are charitable towards them.

These differing philosophies cannot, however, exist side by side without tension and disagreement. A clash is inevitable if neither is going to change. It is here that a further philosophy can be found, and it is fostering and creating this societal divide. This is the philosophy often associated with mankind as god, the humanist view. Or more to the point, specific enlightened humans, who see themselves as the propagators of a better society through philanthropic works and control of various facets of our governing bodies.

In short, a view that leads to dissociation from a divine rule - based on set principles, to create one where - whatever works goes, with morals set by a group of men for the greater good (usually themselves first – for they must be powerful to inflict this greater good on us for our own benefit). A totalitarian structure.

Our vision, as a species, could be placed in many different categories, according to historical determinations. The different cultures that exist alongside each other, albeit on different continents, have done so for centuries. Unless expansion of territory is needed, or at the prompt of a ruler, these have co existed with only occasional clashes.

Our ability to move from place to place easily now, has brought with it an increased mixing. As far as travel or sightseeing is concerned, as long as we are careful to understand and move among these cultures with respect for their differences, all is fine. We can then go home and consider what we found. Closer ties without conflict can occur, for we are not forcing ourselves on others.

Enter the ‘divide and conquer’ philosophy of destabilisation. Destabilisation in order to reconstruct our society in a different form (for that further philosophy).

The players of power long recognise this method, and push ideals that would normally clash with our intuitive reactions to see differences as dangers, to be reflected upon. Instead we are convinced that mixing cultures is good for us, it will bring about a richness and openness to other ideas about life. This has been sold to us as the direction that we should be aiming for.

The clashes that occur will magically sort themselves out, if only we are tolerant. Yet such are the differences, that we cannot, without one side or the other giving ground – to do so would mean a total change in culture for one group or the other.

Each of these groups live under a structure, built to explain or interpret the aims or desires of past leaders or kings. To serve a will to power, using religion or fear of some god to subdue what cannot be done by force alone. A totalitarian idea, whether directed by left or right wing entities does not matter, the end result is the same.

In a multicultural society, all those influencing/contaminating bodies of thought direct our development. The end result will be determined by whoever has the most power over the people they wish to control.

If it is to be ‘we the people’ who control ourselves, then we must be the ones to exert the strongest and broadest power. We must reject all other forms of power over us. To do this we must know how we are being manipulated or controlled. The corruption of the Christian principles for life is the first and largest of these changes being wrought, we must stand firm to this onslaught.

The rise of Christian thought spread throughout the world and took with it a freedom. One that was realised by many as a possible way to exist together in peace. The imposition may have been – at times – warlike and conquering, but the resultant

concepts took root. Loving and caring for others has a truth embodied in it that has reached a certain chord in our lives, in our basic needs. We can envisage our neighbours as helpful and sharing. The concept of family is expanded out into the near, then further reaches.

The local community coming together to build a gathering place, for music, for instruction, for sharing the wealth of things that help a community bond. Then further, to nationhood, so that travel outside of the local community is possible with equal safety and comradeship.

Then the even wider net that was developing, including those outside nations, for reciprocal travel to exotic locales, to learn new things and ways, to broaden our ability to bond with others. To be in a position to help when disaster strikes. This progressive 'care and share' attitude is the very action of building a civilization. The very name we call it by, is a derivation of community thought and of raising up out of barbarism into enlightenment. A betterment of life for the individual wherever they be.

Has the world seen such a raising before? Have citizens of this enlightened period been the drivers? Are they still aware of their responsibility to maintain this civilized state of being?

The answers to these questions are things I've asked myself many times, in many ways.

The first, I believe to be the reason for its success. The spread of an idea that loving your neighbour as yourself, was taken up, was because of its sheer simplicity and obvious benefit.

The compassion needed for us to forgive trespassers of our basic ideals comes from raising our own families – children learn to be good and to treat others as friends instinctively and given proper direction from parents both can see the advantages for peace. This is a world recognised truth in peaceful times and bad.

We associate to get along and to bring about advantage. Safety, abundance and freedom from mere existence is the prize at the end. A flowering of a civilization. To keep it we must be aware of it. To fight for it to continue, we must know what and who we are fighting and the methods of warfare being used.

To combat any of this effectively, takes time, takes research, takes thought and discussion. Not being prepared to take that time out of a busy life, will mean we lose all we have gained over the past centuries. We will once more be slaves in a chaotic world.

It is time to take your part in politics, time to exert your will, with critical thinking, common sense and a respect for our inherited culture.

**The AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS**  
**NATIONAL SEMINAR**

**ADELAIDE 11-12 OCTOBER 2025**

**THE WILL TO POWER**  
**THE WILL TO FREEDOM**

=====

**THE TRADITIONAL CHURCH -**  
**SPEAKING TO POWER**  
delivered by Solicitor R Balzola

**UNCOVERING THE DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT ARCHIVES**  
**OF SIR WALTER MURDOCH**  
delivered by Daniel L. Criddle

**THE DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT SOLUTIONS**  
delivered by Neville Archibald

Bookings via email to :: [heritagebooks@alor.org](mailto:heritagebooks@alor.org) or Mobile 0415527121

**The Cross-Roads - Wednesday Morning Streaming**

Our usual Broadcast / Podcast for Wednesday morning each week will now include streaming through Zoom technology. Should you wish to join us, simply click on the front page link in [alor.org](http://alor.org) - just below the main menu items and before the videos.

While we won't be able to bring you 'live' into the show at the moment, the questions and statements from the chat box can be passed around the team to consider your thoughts.

We look forward to catching up and fielding your interaction across the panelists. This is a new initiative for ALOR, and you are most welcome.

Every Wednesday mornings at 1000 hrs ACST - (UTC + 9.30) via Zoom.

**See you all there!**

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](mailto: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.