



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.12

April 2nd, 1993

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: ".... the tearing up of our history, the denial of all need of seeking guidance from the past, can lead only to an ever-increasing concentration on material things and beyond that an ever increasing sense of vagueness, confusion and uncertainty in all that concerns our life and our role as a nation in the life of the world."

- John Fathing in Freedom Wears A Crown

BATTLE LINES DRAWN ON MONARCHY VERSUS REPUBLICANISM by Eric D. Butler:

Support by NSW Liberal Premier John Fahey for the Keating push for the establishment of an Australian Republic, made public last weekend at the NSW Liberal Party's Council, with the endorsement of a number of Liberal Party Members and supporters, should come as no surprise to matured observers of Australian politics. The trauma of the Federal Liberal Party defeat on March 13th has brought into the open the depth of the philosophical rot which has been seeping through the Liberal Party in recent years. Revealing that he had written to Prime Minister Paul Keating proposing a convention on the Republic question, Premier Fahey made the revealing statement that it was "inevitable that Australia will become a republic". The deadly "inevitability" theme has been advanced by a number of commentators and editorials throughout Australia. This theme is at bottom a manifestation of acceptance of the traditional Marxist position concerning historical materialism. It is in direct contradiction with the traditional Christian view that while the laws governing the universe cannot be changed, faith and creative initiative can change the course of history. The doctrine of inevitability is basically anti-Christian.

The hopelessness of the Liberal Party's position may be judged by the response of Federal Leader John Hewson to Premier Fahey's statement. While John Hewson stated that he did not think that a Republic was inevitable, he was not prepared "to state a position until it was clear what form of republic was proposed". He did not come out bluntly stating that the Liberal Party supported the concept of a Constitutional

Monarchy as a central feature of the Australian Constitutional system. The truth is that many of the new breed Liberals have no strong feelings about the fundamental importance of the institution of the Constitutional Monarchy, and its role in democratic government. The future of Australia will be determined largely by its constitutional system. That system is rooted in over a thousand years of experience. Destroying that system is not merely a question of academic debate, as Liberals believe, but one which concerns the very life of the nation.

The Australian of March 20th published the findings of a survey conducted by Quadrant Research, confirming what many of us suspected: The overwhelming majority of young Australians know nothing about the Federal Constitution. Republican Professor Donald Horne commented that it was the "complication" of the Australian Constitution which was the problem. The truth is that young Australians, along with large numbers who are not so old, have never been taught about the Constitution at school. Professor Horne has spent much of his academic career criticising a constitution which he has not sought to explain.

Ever since mankind has been grappling with the problem of government, different forms of government have been advocated. But Australia has inherited a system of constitutional government, rooted in British Constitutionalism, which has been admired by non-British authorities and philosophers. Constitutional Monarchy is a central feature of that system of constitutional government. That system is being attacked in every possible way because it is an obstruction to complete totalitarianism. The Federal Liberal Party of Australia is betraying the very soul of Australia by suggesting that Republicanism is "inevitable". But they have served the valuable purpose of demonstrating the depth of the philosophical rot in Australia. As they have nothing of value to contribute to the case in favour of Constitutional Monarchy, they should have the decency to say so, leaving the task to those who are prepared to provide a full-blooded defence of an institution which is part of the warp and woof of traditional Australia.

DAVID IRVING : SLANDERED AND ABUSED by D.Thompson:

I know David Irving, British researcher, World War 2 historian and orator, rather well. His frustration at being denied a visa for Australia, while his critics "pour buckets of slime" over him, is understandably immense. The press have published only a few of the letters to their editors with which he has been peppering them since December last year. He is being abused and slandered, and denied the facility to answer the most bitter charges either in person or even in writing.

The anti-Irving campaign took a new and vicious twist last week, when Irving's representatives in Australia were linked with the League, which was described as a "racist body". This is possibly designed to influence the Federal Court hearing in which Irving is appealing the visa decision.

A series of scathing articles in The West Australian have attempted to establish that, by its "association" with the League, Veritas is a "racist" publisher, and that Irving, therefore, is an odious person. No evidence whatever has been offered for such implications. The League's answer, reproduced below, took the form of a letter to the editor. The allegations against Veritas and the League appeared in the news pages; our answer was buried on page 26. But as Irving points out himself, allegations about League involvement with his proposed tour are completely false, and merely highlight the weakness of the case against him. The relationship between Veritas and the League is simple: Veritas is a publisher (including Irving's works) and the League buys books. Irving's are selling extremely well, now.

ZIONISTS IN DAMAGE CONTROL: The Jewish/Zionist leaders who were so strident in their opposition to Irving receiving an Australian visa have been stung by the general perception of a tough, demanding lobby, and have been trying to minimise the damage this had done to their "image". In a quite poisonous article in The Australian Jewish News (19/3/1993), Mr. Isi Leibler tries to change the issue from one of freedom of speech to charging that Irving is "a leader of international neo-Nazism" and should therefore be barred from Australia. Leibler repeats the obligatory description of the League of Rights as "the foremost racist organisation in the country". Specific allegations are made, attempting to prove that Irving is a dangerous neo-Nazi leader, and would have definitely been disruptive, and threaten harm to the Australian community. Irving's detailed rebuttal of the Leibler charges was devastating - and unpublished.

IRVING'S POSITION: In a press statement dated 24/3/1993, issued by Veritas, Irving makes the following comments upon his position:

"The topic for discussion on my proposed tour was to have been 'freedom of speech', and the media in Australia have taken a fair-handed approach to this issue. However, it seems that on the matter of my conclusions about the extent of the holocaust, drawn from studying masses of historical documents, and archival material, they have been scathing and I wonder what opportunity they have had to read any of my books which deal with the various aspects of the Second World War and the individuals who were responsible for the major decisions.

"The claims that I am a convicted 'neo-Nazi historian' are scurrilous - statements of this nature are subject to libel action. On the matter of my conviction in Germany - it is a crime in that country to question the extent of the holocaust or to utter an opinion - about gas chambers - which expresses doubt. German people are unable to discuss this aspect of their own history.

"My conviction in a Munich Court for 'defaming the memory of the dead' in an opinion which I expressed publicly on April 21, 1990, is not finished. The German court refused to hear fresh evidence and refused to hear our expert witnesses, including Dr. Franciszek Piper, Director of the Auschwitz State Museum in Poland, who has stated that the Auschwitz 'gas chamber' shown to tourists is a 'phony reconstruction'. A further appeal has been lodged, and under German law, the fine and sentence therefore have no force in law until that appeal too has been exhausted."

THE LEAGUE'S RESPONSE: In his article in The West Australian (22/3/93) Mike van Niekerk wrote that the League of Rights was described by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commissioner in 1991 as "undoubtedly the most influential and effective as well as the best-organised and most substantially financed, racist organisation in Australia". This back-handed type of compliment, associated with Veritas, implied that Veritas, too, is a "racist" organisation, which was denied by the Managers. The League's reply, published the following day, was buried deep in the newspaper:

"I wish to take issue with your perjorative description of the Australian League of Rights as "racist" in your article on Veritas Publishing Company and the British historian David Irving (22/3/93).

"I note that your journalist provides no evidence whatsoever for his very broad and highly offensive generalisation. He has obviously been misled by uncritically accepting a derogatory reference to the League in the Human Rights Commission's Report into Racist Violence.

"If Mr. van Niekerk had bothered to check the Report for himself, he would have found that the authors were reluctantly forced to concede that they could find no evidence that the League was involved in 'racist violence' after an exhaustive enquiry over more than a year.

"In fact, the Human Rights Commission made the absurd claim that the influence of the League was "more dangerous" than other "extremist" groups because "it has assumed the mantle of 'respectability' by espousing family values, patriotism and nationalism". This reveals far more about the attitudes of the Human Rights Commissioner than it does about the League of Rights!

"I also object to your shabby implication that Veritas Publishing is somehow a disreputable company because its directors are members of the League of Rights. League members come from a variety of backgrounds, and any attempt to damage their livelihoods on the basis of ideological bias or professional negligence by journalists is contemptible."

Yours sincerely, David Thompson, National Director

"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