



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —*

Registered By Australia Post — Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol.29, No.3

January 29th, 1993

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:** "State absolutism is the modern danger against which neither representative government nor democracy can defend us..... If we do not bear this in mind we shall be led constantly astray by forms to overlook the substance, to think that right is safer against majorities than against tyrants."

- Lord Acton in 1860

**"TAPES" CONTRIBUTE TO RELENTLESS PRESSURE ON ROYALS** by David Thompson:

In the circumstances surrounding the publication of the highly damaging recordings of what are purported to be conversations involving members of the Royal Family, a number of questions have never been adequately pursued. The first is whether or not the recordings are genuine. This seems almost impossible to answer with confidence, the more so in the light of further information now available.

The second question is the purpose for which the tapes have been used. The answer to this would appear obvious. It has now been established that the alleged 'conversations' took place within a three-week period around Christmas and New Year in 1989. Where has this material been in the intervening three years? The timing of the release of the alleged conversations involving the Prince and Princess of Wales could hardly have been calculated to do more damage to their relationship, and to the monarchy.

The third and perhaps most significant question is who recorded these salacious conversations? It is now known that the "Squidgy" tape that is alleged to include the voice of the Princess of Wales was taped by a 70-year-old retired bank manager and ham radio operator, Cyril Reenan, of Abingdon, Berkshire. But Mr. Reenan himself now has grave reservations about the whole affair, as was reported last weekend (Sunday Telegraph, 24/1/93). Excerpts from this report:

**"A SINISTER CONSPIRACY":** "Information in the 'Squidgy' tape reveals the conversation took place on New Year's Eve. But Cyril Reenan picked it up on January 4th. It is now known that the conversation

was re-broadcast between four and six times.

"I wasn't even at home on New Year's Eve - my wife and I were at her brother's. I know when I heard it, and that was January 4," Mr. Reenan said. 'I think I was set up ... part of a sinister conspiracy.'

"The fact that about 220 million calls would have been made on mobile phones in Britain during that period means the chances of ham operators picking up all three are tiny..." (Emphasis added)

Who, then, has been monitoring the Royals' telephone calls? A former editor of The Times, Lord Rees-Mogg, draws his own conclusions in an article published in The Australian (15/1/93): "When sensational conversations can be leaked, it is natural to suppose that they are selected from a wider group. The tapers cannot have struck "Squidgy" or "Trousers" first time. In early 1989, someone, ... was systematically spying on the Royal Family. That someone subsequently used these taped conversations to damage the reputations of both the Prince and Princess of Wales by leaking them. The people doing the original taping are much more likely to be employees of the State security system than anyone else. If a single newspaper had done it, that paper would presumably have been the sole beneficiary; the editor would not have delayed publication of such a scoop for three years..."

MONARCHY IN JEOPARDY: If it is true that some unknown individual, or group could reach right into the MI5 or MI6 intelligence services, and make use of technical and organisational resources from such sources, the future of the monarchy is indeed at great risk. It is becoming increasingly clear that not only the gutter press, but perhaps even the Princess of Wales herself has been manipulated by sinister forces of unknown magnitude. Who was advising the Princess about what course to take in what could understandably have been a stressful marriage?

As far as the infamous tapes are concerned, there must be great doubt about their authenticity. Returning to Malcolm Holland's Sunday Telegraph report, there appears to be doubt about whether the tapes were edited:

"Mr. Reenan said he was mystified the published version of the tape differed from the version he recorded. He believes the published version of the tapes may have been edited, combining details from a version recorded on New Year's Eve by another amateur eavesdropper, Jane Norgrove.

"'There were large chunks which I knew had not come from my tape,' he said. The 'Camillagate' tape of Prince Charles and Mrs. Parker Bowles also appear to have been re-broadcast a day after it took place."

It would appear that someone with sophisticated equipment has painstakingly recorded, selected, and perhaps edited conversations which are purported to involve Prince Charles and his wife in compromising circumstances. These recordings were then re-broadcast a number of times to ensure that they were picked up, and passed on to the press.

Whatever the authenticity of such tapes, the result has been of such enormous damage to the institution of monarchy at an absolutely critical time. This is no accident. Under such circumstances, it almost becomes irrelevant whether the tapes are genuine or not. The result is the same. And even if such conversations did take place, who among the self-righteous scandal-mongers are in a position to cast the first stone?"

See also: "Prince Charles - Is History Being Repeated?" - Intelligence Survey, January 1993. \$20.00 subscription, G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.

**THE NEW "POLITICALLY CORRECT" LAWYERS** by Eric D. Butler:

The New Testament records that Christ was not over-impressed with lawyers. But under the influence of English Common Law the status of lawyers improved enormously, and from the ranks of the lawyers came the Judges, and in Common Law countries like Australia there emerged a large number of Judges who were a credit to themselves and the traditions they represented. But in recent times a new type of Judge has started to emerge, rejecting the role of interpreting law, but of attempting to dictate what the law should be. There has been a storm of protest against the recent decision by N.S.W. Magistrate Pat O'Shane who not only dismissed a malicious damages charge against five Sydney art students, who openly admitted that they had vandalised a billboard advertising a well-known brand of women's bras, but then delivered a court-room lecture claiming that the real crime had been by the advertisers! Magistrate O'Shane went on to say that she was "disgusted" that a legal system had been used to protect the property of advertisers who had used images which allegedly incited violence against women. No evidence was provided to support this astonishing claim. Those who have read Red Over Black, by top ex-Communist Geoff McDonald, will recall Ms. Pat O'Shane's long Marxist background. Media comments about Magistrate O'Shane's "politically correct" court decision falsely describe her as Australia's first Aboriginal barrister. She is, in fact, half Irish.

But the O'Shane case is relatively minor compared with how the new breed of "politically correct" Judges are dealing with constitutional questions. The late Lionel Murphy was one of the High Court Judges who used the External Powers to argue that Australia now had "international obligations". This development was serious enough. However, in the Mabo case one of the Judges, Justice Brennan, went further stating that not only a new treaty was necessary to extend the powers of the Commonwealth but that this could be done in the absence of a treaty, providing the new matter involved a question of "international concern". In the Mabo case, Mr. Justice Brennan said in essence that he was rejecting existing legal authorities in assessing whether a group of natives owned the land in question. His Honour invented a new law stating that it was essential because of "the expectation of the international community" and "the contemporary values of the Australian people". The term "international community" has become

a type of cliché, never defined. And what about the "contemporary values" of the Australian people? The great majority of Australian people are in favour of a "fair go" for all Australians, including a small minority of their fellow Australians who are of Aboriginal background. But they have never been asked to express an opinion on radical "land rights" demands which in practice would prove disastrous for all Australians.

Australians must face the reality that they are in the midst of a constitutional revolution. Presumably all that is necessary to radically change the structure of Australia is for any group, backed by enough publicity (often paid for by the unknowing taxpayer), to claim that some matter is of "international concern", and they can rely upon the new breed of Judges to invent a new law to take care of the matter.

**BRIEF COMMENT:** It is not surprising that a recent survey of young people, conducted by the Democrats, found that most of those between 15-25 years were "cynical and distrust politicians". Our assessment is that electors generally have become cynical about politicians. Paul Keating is attempting to exploit this cynicism, using Dr. Hewson's changes to Fightback to charge him with being untrustworthy. Dr. Hewson has provided Keating with further ammunition by flatly disputing that there was any evidence to suggest that the Opposition parties were in favour of a 24 hour access to the Sydney airport. But both the National Party leader Mr. Tim Fischer and Opposition spokesman on Tourism, Mr. David Jull, had clearly stated in letters that they favoured lifting the curfew on the Sydney airport. Power is the name of the game for the Party politicians, and they can all be relied upon to bend the truth when they feel it necessary to serve their purposes. Electors should only consider voting for candidates who will state in writing that they favour the introduction of the Swiss concept of the Electors' Veto.

**DARE WE FAIL ON BASIC FUND?** The League's annual basic fund continues to struggle forward. But time is starting to run short. Since our last report a further \$240.00 has been contributed, taking the total to \$38,302.00. The League will not collapse if the target of \$60,000 is not reached. But it would mean that in the most critical time in Australia's history, with the League planning new major offensives to meet the crisis, there would develop a critical chasm. The League's enemies would be delighted and be encouraged to press forward their campaigns of attempted destruction. The majority of our readers have still not responded. We urge them to stand loyally with those who have already given so magnificently. All contributions to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

---

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription \$30 p.a.  
Telephone: (03) 650 9749 Fax: (03) 650 9368