



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -*

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.40

October 20th, 1995

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "The essential difference between the conditions of the Nineteenth and the Twentieth Centuries is that service in the former was predominantly that of one human being to another, while that of the later is service by one individual to an organisation. The idea has been subtly indoctrinated that there is something degrading about the former, and something elevating about the latter. *Demon est Deus inversus.*" (The Devil is God upside down.)

— C.H. Douglas in *The Social Creditor*, April 29th, 1950

**PHILLIP ADAMS GOES OVER THE TOP** by Eric D. Butler:

Phillip Adams's torrent of bitter abuse of me in particular and the League of Rights in general, in *The Weekend Australian* of October 14th-15th, must be rated as a classic of its kind. One can only ponder on the significance of an Adams assault surpassing in vitriol anything which Adams has managed in the past. Is it part of an emerging pattern of League bashing, designed to run up until the Federal elections? While I would be surprised to learn that many party politicians are regular readers of Adams, there is no doubt that the type of poison he pours out in his articles and radio programmes helps to create the type of climate in which the politicians are extremely sensitive to any charge that they might be associating with the League. Labor Member Graeme Campbell is one of the few politicians who appear to be immune to the anti-League virus. Adams says it is a pity that K.D. Gott's little hate book, *Voices of Hate*, is out of print, and suggests that if Graeme Campbell had read Gott's work he might not have spoken at a League of Rights function. I have some news for Phillip Adams concerning the work by the man he describes as his "old mate": The League has always had a supply of *Voices of Hate* and has over the years recommended that students of the art of perverting truth should read it. If Phillip Adams cares to send in his \$6.00, he can obtain a copy.

As most League supporters do not waste their time and money on daily newspapers, the great majority will have missed the Adams *Weekend Australian* torrent of abuse, headed TOXIC SLUDGE. Adams opens his piece by stating that while a number of Butlers are listed in *Who's Who in Australia*, there is no mention of Eric D. Butler "the fascist and anti-Semite who poses as a patriot and loyal monarchist. Yet Eric has had more influence on Australian life than all the other Butlers put together. And all of it is bad." That is a most revealing statement, indicating that

Adams and those groups he seeks to please, fear the **influence** of the League of Rights movement.

Adams says that he is "proud to say that Butler and his slimy followers regularly target me in their publications – which are more foul than any imaginable rubbish you could wrap in them. These papers are so toxic that if you put them on the bottom of the budgie's cage they 'kill the budgie'." Following this little delicate gem, Adams complains that hardly a week passes when he doesn't get an "abusive or threatening letter" from a League supporter. Adams does not even use his powerful imagination to concoct an example of the type of letter he complains about. Adams continues, ".. I am loathe to mention Butler's name and that of his loathsome organisation for fear that it will alert disturbed minds of their existence. On the other hand, the widespread ignorance about Butler and his Nazi mates (not neo-Nazi. Nazi) needs to be addressed . . So fools such as Graeme Campbell can have no further excuse."

No further quotes are necessary to indicate that Phillip Adams, the man who bitterly attacks Christianity, has reached a new low in his attack on me and the League of Rights. It is probably his failure to understand the essence of Christianity which has him charging me with the very hatred which oozes from nearly every sentence in his *Weekend Australian* assault. I unreservedly accept that the Law of Love is one of the most explosive and healing forces in human affairs. Apart from his famous meeting with me at a Press Council Conference, from which he clearly still smarts, I have never met with nor had any discourse with Phillip Adams. When his "old mate" Ken Gott was billed to meet me in debate on an ABC rural programme, he failed to appear. Perhaps Phillip Adams can do a little better? Could we not have a debate in one of his *Weekend Australian* columns? Or why not invite me on to one of his radio programmes? But Phillip Adams can always offer the excuse that he might become contaminated with the toxic poisons which he claims poison me.

I suspect the reality is that Phillip Adams is a disturbed man, a type of lost soul who is always fearful that perhaps the League of Rights is espousing some basic truths which are having a growing influence in a society which is obviously disintegrating. In a strange way Phillip Adams is helping to ensure that these truths are publicised.

#### NATIVE TITLE ACT OPENS UP FURTHER DIVISIONS by David Thompson:

The stated reason for Mr. Keating and his administration to press hard for the Native Title legislation passed against the better judgement of the two Green Senators from Western Australian 1993, was the process of reconciliation between Aborigines and non-Aboriginal Australian descendants of the "invaders". But while this may have been the **stated** reason, it is clear that the Native Title Act has only contributed to further friction and alienation between the two "groups".

To confirm this deteriorating situation, hard-line "Aboriginal" interests have now laid claim, under this Act, to most of the Swan and Canning Rivers in Perth, Kings Park overlooking the central business district, and the land on which the Perth international airport is built. As the ABC current affairs programme *Four Corners* indicated recently, **not a single square inch** of land has been granted to 'Aboriginal' groups under this Act as yet. The Act has done nothing for the individual Aborigine who may be suffering disadvantages common to some of his European counterparts, of poverty, illiteracy and unemployment.

The above claims in W.A. have been accepted by the Native Title Tribunal, which means that the

Tribunal must now spend months and millions of dollars to determine the claim's validity, generating increasing resentment between the Nyoongar and Ballaruk Aborigines, and other West Australians. Not only is the Native Title Act enormously divisive, but clearly completely unworkable.

When Premier Richard Court challenged the Commonwealth Act in the High Court, the W.A. press savaged him unmercifully when the case was (predictably) lost. Court was accused of institutionalised racism in using taxpayers funds for such a purpose. But the reverse is the true position. The ability to make special claims upon sensitive public assets is limited to a single racial group – Aborigines. This can only be described as institutionalised racism. As Professor Geoffrey Blainey points out (*The Bulletin*, 17/10/95), "... to cap an official campaign against racial discrimination in 1993 with legislation for two nationwide systems of land tenure, one of them based essentially on race, makes the O.J. Simpson trial almost seem a carnival of honesty ..."

What is generally unrecognised is that the legislation is deeply dividing the Aboriginal people themselves. As Graeme Campbell points out, groups like the Kimberley Land Council are feared by bush Aboriginal settlements as being completely unrepresentative of Aboriginal aspirations, yet are accepted as legitimate spokesmen for Aborigines. The President of W.A.'s Pastoralist & Graziers' Association, Mr. A.P. Boulton, notes: "*The problem started in the Kimberley with blatant Federal sponsorship of the Kimberley Land Council and is following the resources trail through the Pilbara to the Goldfields as new land councils are formed to tap Federal funding, and to take charge of the land claims agenda . . .*

*"Lawyers and former politicians are being funded to side with and to complement the land councils. Those under attack, like pastoralists and miners as well as those Aboriginal claimants who refuse to acknowledge the land councils, are expected to pay their own way. . . ."*

West Australians who remember the legendary Dreamtime serpent, Wagyl, and the claims made in its name on the Swan River in years past, are digging in for another long, divisive and frequently farcical round of public conflict as a result of the Native Title Act. No wonder the Prime Minister wants the Mabo issue **off the political agenda** leading up to the Federal election.

We have limited stocks of *The High Court of Australia in Mabo*, two papers delivered to the Samuel Griffith Society in 1993 by The Hon. Peter Connolly, Q.C., and Mr. S.E.K. Hulme, Q.C., published by the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies Inc. in W.A. Copies are available from League Headquarters: \$10.00 each, or \$12.00 posted. As background for the High Court's "Mabo decision" in 1992, it is highly recommended.

**WHERE REAL POWER LIES:** In the last week Mr. Rupert Murdoch has been able to demonstrate the truth of the suspicion that the day of the media-baron, prepared to use his influence at the head of near-monopolistic press interests, has not departed. At a News Ltd. shareholders meeting, Mr. Murdoch had offered the view that the Australian economy was "terrible" and "a disgrace".

This was a clear rebuke to the present Government on its handling of economic matters in the period before a general election, and the Prime Minister Mr. Keating could have been expected to "go for the jugular" of anyone else who made such a suggestion. But his comments concerning the Murdoch criticism were very muted indeed. Mr. Keating is fully aware of Mr. Murdoch's press power, and having already damaged any chance of the Packer press supporting the A.L.P., Mr. Keating was not taking any chances.

Murdoch indicated that there is some merit in his comments of the economy when, interviewed by Channel Nine on a Sunday programme, he warned that Western countries like Australia must find ways to match the "huge surge of wealth in Asia" if we were to avoid a permanent underclass in "divided, decaying societies". *"We're in danger of getting an underclass of people who don't have hope, who don't try, and certainly we're getting that in America, we're seeing it in Britain, and it's totally destructive,"* he said. Confirming that he is a committed republican, Murdoch stressed that although the republic was quite inevitable, the timing was not important.

If confirmation is required that Mr. Murdoch and his press empire can have a huge impact on entire economies, the conflict over the leadership of Australia's biggest retailer tells a story. In the press last weekend, Mr. Murdoch attacked the Executive Chairman of Coles Myer, Mr. Solomon Lew, accusing him of thuggish and improper behaviour. In attempting to apply pressure to News Ltd. to tone down criticism of Lew, Murdoch has called for Lew's resignation at Coles Myer, joining the Myer and Coles families, as well as huge institutional investors in Coles Myer. So far Mr. Lew has resisted, but now that Murdoch has stepped in, it seems inevitable that Mr. Lew will go.

In recent weeks the Murdoch press, particularly *The Australian*, has practically campaigned for Lew's resignation. Financial columnist Terry McCrann has been scathing about Lew, with considerable justification. McCrann claims that Lew "has a preference for non-disclosure" of personal business matters. *"In view of the nature of the transactions which benefitted him to the tune of \$26 million his preference is understandable – and that he finds my observations unpalatable,"* said McCrann.

In his public slanging match with Mr. Murdoch, Mr. Lew might well recall that the beginning of the end for Alan Bond was Bond's conflict with the British Chairman of Lhonor, Mr. Tiny Rowlands. Rowlands never forgave Bond, and proceeded to destroy Bond's business intentions in the U.K. Bond never recovered. Mr. Murdoch is now at least as powerful as Mr. Rowlands was, given that he monopolises the press, which reports Mr. Lew.

Mr. Murdoch claims that Solomon Lew and his staff implied that unless News Ltd. toned down its criticism of Mr. Lew, Coles would withdraw about \$18 million in advertising from the Murdoch press, and printing business amounting to perhaps \$60 or \$70 million. *The Australian* (16/10/95) claims that Mr. Lew made little effort to deny the substance of Mr. Murdoch's allegations.

It seems clear that Mr. Lew will struggle to survive his debate with Mr. Murdoch. Both John Howard and Paul Keating will be watching the results with interest. Mr. Keating might also be remembering a report carried by the Rockhampton *Morning Bulletin* in November 1976, if he is even aware of it. This report carried Murdoch's comments in New York concerning News Ltd's refusal to support Whitlam in the famous 1975 election, although Murdoch's press had practically campaigned for Whitlam in 1972. The report quotes Murdoch as saying that he had hoped that Gough Whitlam's Labor Government would make Australia a republic. *"They chickened on us. They were just bloody weak. Whitlam was a disaster,"* Murdoch said. Mr. Murdoch was reported by the *Courier-Mail* in October last year as saying that the Australian republic was perhaps 50 years overdue. It would be amazing if Mr. Keating was unaware of such matters. Even John Howard knows where Australian political power resides. Mr. Murdoch is more to be feared than Mr. Keating.

---

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,  
145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.  
Subscription \$30.00 p.a.