



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –*

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.31, No.30

August 11th, 1995

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "The real cost to consumers of cheaper goods will be that they will lose their jobs, get paid less ... (and) face higher taxes to cover the social cost of increased unemployment."  
 – Sir James Goldsmith, now a Member of the European Parliament, on the global free trade dogma.

## THE TOTALITARIANS SHOW THEIR TEETH by Eric D. Butler:

Last week saw the totalitarians of the mass media show their teeth in a massive campaign against The League of Rights and West Australian Labor M.P. Graeme Campbell. An in depth analysis of a most remarkable week in Australian politics must wait until the total picture of what is happening becomes much clearer: for the moment it is possible to say that a strategy in depth is being attempted to destroy, if possible, what is perceived to be the growing influence of the League. A highlight of the strategy was revealed in an editorial in *The Age*, Melbourne, of Wednesday, August 2nd. *The Age*, along with *The Sydney Morning Herald*, belongs to Canadian media mogul Conrad Black. *The Age* is claimed to be one of the most prestigious and financially profitable papers in Australia. In recent times it has emerged as one of the most openly pro-Zionist papers in Australia.

There were two features of the editorial of August 2nd: Graeme Campbell's political influence must be destroyed. As all warnings to Campbell have failed, the Labor Party must withdraw his pre-selection. This is exactly what Mr. Isi Leibler and other Zionist Jewish leaders have been demanding. As for the League of Rights, from whom Graeme Campbell has twice accepted invitations to speak at League Seminars, *The Age* says that it is "by any reckoning a racist and anti-Semitic organisation", and that "all the mainstream parties ought to make it clear to their M.P's. that they should not have any association with the League of Rights, an organisation that is – and deserves to remain – well outside the mainstream of Australian politics". This is exactly what the Zionist Jewish leaders have been saying. Over the years the League of Rights has invited politicians to speak on League platforms, not because of their party label, but because it was felt they might make a contribution on a specific subject. In the early days of the League it was relatively easy to find, for example, a Liberal Party politician who might make a contribution on constitutional issues. As the years went by it became increasingly difficult to find anyone capable of making such a contribution. Mr. Alexander Downer was invited to speak at an Adelaide Seminar, on the Federal Constitution, because of his background.

*The Age* editorial reminds its readers of what happened to the unfortunate, although pathetic, Alexander Downer. Like other sections of the mass media, *The Age* has taken it upon itself to proscribe any

organisation of which it does not approve. Clearly the mass media of this country are running their own party with their own agenda. Needless to say, when National Director David Thompson sent an appropriate letter to *The Age*, this was not published. But *The Age* had one of their senior journalists, Mr. Martin Daly, interview me at length on Thursday, August 3rd. Victorian State Director Terry Rogers was present most of the time, while I taped the complete interview. An analysis of this interview must wait. Not surprisingly, most of the questioning had little to do with basic questions about the League, but about "anti-Semitism" and immigration.

On Saturday, August 5th, an article appeared under the heading, RADICAL RACISM IN A LEAGUE OF ITS OWN. An indication of the general impression Martin Daly was attempting to create was his statement that "I was alleged in Parliament several years ago to have been involved in a plot to assassinate the Prime Minister Mr. Bob Hawke". Martin Daly asked about this incident and appeared to be vague as to whom had made the claim. I pointed out that this absurd nonsense had come from Queensland Labor M.P., Mr. Keith Wright. No one took this allegation seriously, not even Bob Hawke. I mentioned in passing that since making these absurd claims, Wright had finished in prison because of serious criminal charges. I said that Wright's fall gave me no personal pleasure, and that in some ways I was sorry for him.

The Daly article also carried a statement from the Zionist promoted "expert" on the League, David Greason, still busy working away on his promised major work on the League, this to appear next year to coincide with the 50th anniversary of the League. Greason's understanding of the League may be judged by his statement that "The League is basically parasitic. The danger it does to political institutions is far worse than the antics of a few demented skinheads". As the League is not a political party, competing in the party political power business, its real "danger" obviously is in the sphere of education and ideas. As yet not one of the numerous "in depth" articles on the League has attempted to examine its basic training programme, The Social Dynamics Seminar. Those who have been through this Seminar are well aware that the League is encouraging the regeneration of a traditional form of government which grew out of Christianity. A number of distinguished constitutional authorities have throughout this century warned of the subversion of constitutional government by the centralised party political system. One of Graeme Campbell's "sins" is that he has dared to challenge the totalitarianism dominating Australian politics today. As he said in one of his numerous media interviews last week, any political party which cannot tolerate dissent is not going anywhere. *The Age* has openly said it does not like dissent either.

Which brings us to the last and most important part of Martin Daly's *Age* article. He quotes Victor Rebikoff, chairman of the Federation of Ethnic Communities Council of Australia, as saying that "the League is the major reason Australia needs racial vilification legislation", exactly. Last week saw the battle lines more clearly drawn concerning the battle against totalitarianism in Australia. The League is honoured to be labelled as the major target of the totalitarians.

#### THE CAMPBELL AFFAIR AND THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS by David Thompson:

Amid the bluff and bluster that has accompanied the persecution of Labor Member for Kalgoorlie, Mr. Graeme Campbell, the reality is that he has seriously embarrassed the A.L.P. on issues of considerable substance, and there is little the A.L.P. can do about it unless they are prepared to lose the safe seat of Kalgoorlie. The lessons of the Queensland State election may be too fresh in the A.L.P. mind to risk this.

The response in Western Australia to the abuse heaped on Campbell is interesting. All indications are

that he has enormous sympathy for his position, and great grassroots support. This is what concerns the A.L.P. But there are two aspects to support for Campbell.

The first is that he has generated enormous short-term, superficial support for his jibe at the Queensland League Seminar that Keating's greatest contribution to the A.L.P. would be a State funeral. Many voters who detest the arrogance of Keating identify with this tongue-in-cheek comment. Critics of Campbell and the League have attempted to imbue the comment with sinister undertones of assassination, etc., which is clearly ridiculous. They have not seen the video, and for the most part, suffer from an under-developed sense of humour.

The second aspect is that perhaps not enough who support his sentiments about Mr. Keating are fully aware of his position on the issues of substance. In the end, this is what counts, otherwise Campbell may simply go down in history as a rebellious larrikin with a pet hatred of the politically correct. This is not what he is about at all.

One of the few newspaper articles that approached accuracy concerning Campbell was that of Peter Rees, Canberra correspondent for *The Daily Telegraph* (6/8/95). Rees, who must have observed Campbell at close quarters, writes: "*Critics acknowledge that he possesses some intellectual substance. He hates what he regards as political correctness. He is an anti-authoritarian and stridently pro-free speech . . . The issues on which he has opposed the government are legion. The gold tax, immigration, the Mabo legislation, the republic, the racial hatred bill . . .*"

**ATTACKING THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS:** It is clear that it is the issues of substance that Campbell stresses, which is hurting the A.L.P. And any possible co-operation between Campbell and the League of Rights sets the political alarm bells ringing throughout the A.L.P. And not only the A.L.P. The Coalition cannot afford a detailed debate on some of the substantial issues either, because their position is just as weak as the A.L.P's., as Campbell has correctly pointed out.

So when A.L.P. National Secretary, Mr. Gary Grey, announced that the A.L.P. would consider listing the League as a "proscribed" organisation, this was supported by Mr. Fischer of the National Party. Perhaps no clearer indication of the plight of the Coalition Parties is necessary. In one sense, the proposed "proscription" of the League by the A.L.P. is rather embarrassing. For many years we had believed that the League was already on the proscribed list. It was only when Campbell addressed the League's National Seminar in Melbourne in 1993, that it was disclosed that there were no A.L.P. rules that prevented Campbell appearing. If the League is "proscribed" (which means that no A.L.P. members are permitted to support the League, and no M.P. may appear on a League platform) by the A.L.P., then, far from being offended, we assume our rightful place in the relationship.

It is worth noting that the entire issue of Mr. Campbell appearing at the League Seminar in Queensland was raided by the Jewish journal, *The Australian/Israel Review*. It is clear that, having demanded Campbell's expulsion from the A.L.P. on the day of the Seminar, that someone from the *Review* obtained a copy of the League's video, and combed through Campbell's address for something racist, anti-semitic, or "extreme" with which to confront the A.L.P. Nothing of this nature was found, but a joking remark that could be blown out of context was used to demand Campbell's head.

Thus, the Jewish mafia, armed with Campbell's "State funeral" jibe, confronted the Victorian Branch of the A.L.P., and demanded Campbell's expulsion. Keating's co-operation was sought, and he again repeated his almost obligatory description of the League: "*I object to people speaking to racist, anti-semitic organisations like the League of Rights.*" As with the proposal to "proscribe" the League, the

Keating comment says more about Mr. Keating and the A.L.P. than it does about the League. First, it encapsulates the refusal to debate the real issues by employing the political smears of "racist and anti-semitic", hoping that the League will cower away from such charges. Neither the League nor Graeme Campbell have done so.

Second, it confirms the totalitarian nature of both Mr. Keating and the A.L.P.; freedom of speech and association come a poor second to the requirements of political power. It is from this philosophical background that legislation like the Racial Hatred Bill spring.

**WHAT NOW FOR MR. GRAEME CAMPBELL?** While it is true that Campbell's joke concerning a State funeral for the Prime Minister is only being used as an excuse to exert pressure on Campbell, there is also some merit in the underlying thrust of his remark. That is, Mr. Keating has become a liability to the A.L.P. On the day that the press first heaped abuse on Campbell, *The Australian* (2/8/95) headlines announced that *Newspoll* research showed Keating's position weakening yet again.

On the question of political loyalty, Mr. Campbell is quite correct when he places his first loyalty with his own constituents, who have re-elected him with increasing margins since 1983. His second loyalty is to the nation, and loyalty to a political party and its leadership are lower priorities. This, however, is not good enough for the A.L.P. power-brokers. But what is to be done with Campbell? The A.L.P. has three choices. The first is that at the Party Executive meeting on the 24th, they can withdraw Campbell's nomination for Kalgoorlie. As Senator Loosley notes, this could mean giving up Kalgoorlie, as Campbell could win it as an Independent. The second is that they could conceivably expel Campbell from the Party, making him a political martyr, and just increase his chances of winning as an Independent. It is extremely doubtful that the A.L.P. will ignore the lessons of the Queensland election so soon, and willingly surrender Kalgoorlie.

The third option is to do nothing, except 'censure' Campbell — a tap on the wrist — if he will tender an apology to Mr. Keating for the State funeral joke, and agree to observe Party discipline. As a political strategy, Campbell has agreed to apologise to Mr. Keating if Keating will meet him, which would be a major reversal for the Prime Minister. But Campbell has refused to give any undertakings about observing Party discipline. In fact, if anything, the reverse; he would still not support the Racial Hatred Bill. The latter option would certainly not placate the Jewish leadership, which sparked the Campbell debate in the beginning. So the A.L.P. has been neatly placed on the horns of a dilemma by the Jewish lobby.

There is, of course, a fourth option for the A.L.P. It could agree that perhaps Mr. Campbell's objections to A.L.P. policy on immigration, multiculturalism, Mabo and native title, the republic, the global market, etc., do have some substance, and agree to address them. This is so far removed from the bounds of reality to even consider. Campbell has performed a service by drawing attention to the real issues. All political pressure must now be applied to see that such issues are given electoral expression, perhaps in the Senate.