



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.29, No.37

September 24th, 1993

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Co-existence on this tightly knit earth should be viewed as an existence not only without wars ... but also without (government) telling us how to live, what to say, what to think, what to know, and what not to know."
- Alexander Solzhenitsyn

DAVID IRVING AND "NATURAL JUSTICE": Unless the Federal Government seeks leave to appeal the Federal Court's pro-David Irving decision, the British historian has won the right to visit Australia on a lecture tour. Irving's Australian representatives state that such a visit is unlikely before March of next year. After a long delay in bringing down its finding the Federal Court unanimously upheld the appeal by David Irving against a decision by Mr. Justice French of the Federal Court in May, when the Judge upheld a decision by the Minister for Immigration, Senator Bolkus, to deny a visa. The original decision had been made by former Immigration Minister Gerry Hand, who has criticised the decision by the full bench of the Federal Court. Hand's statement reveals that, contrary to the view of some that Hand had been reluctant to impose the ban, the former Minister was obviously reacting favourably to the anti-Irving pressure openly applied by the Zionist lobby in Australia.

The essence of the Federal Court's finding was that no evidence had been presented to the Minister to support a conclusion that David Irving was likely to become involved in any activities likely to be disruptive to the Australian community. Mr. Justice Drummond found that David Irving had not been afforded natural justice because the Minister failed to provide him with the opportunity to reply to the allegations made against him. While the Federal Court's decision only concerns the Australian situation, it hopefully will have some influence on the threatened New Zealand ban, recently revealed by

FINAL BOOKINGS FOR NEW TIMES DINNER NOW DUE

Irving, and the Canadian ban. The Zionist lobby has been active in New Zealand, openly calling for the banning of David Irving. In Canada, Mr. Justice Rothstein has dismissed with one line Irving's application for a review of his deportation order: "This application for leave is dismissed." No reasons were given.

While the Australian Federal Court ruling is a major blow to the anti-Irving forces, it can be taken for granted that the Zionist lobby will do everything possible to force the Federal Government to try to keep Irving out of Australia. Professor Colin Tatz, Professor of History at Macquarie University, says "They (the government) should reject him again because of the disruption he causes wherever he goes...". It is David Irving's totalitarian opponents who create disorder. Dr. Jacques Adler, an associate of the Department of History at the Melbourne University, is quoted as saying that if David Irving had a message he should send it to likeminded people. "Holocaust survivors would be offended by Mr. Irving's views." "Holocaust survivors" are not compelled to attend David Irving's lectures. And when David Irving sought to speak to interested Australians via his video film, "The Search for Truth in History", Zionist-promoted demonstrations prevented several planned public showings of the film.

The Melbourne Herald-Sun of September 18th, in a short editorial on the Federal Court's ruling in favour of Irving, states that the Jewish community made a "tactical mistake" in opposing the Irving visit. The editorial points out that "Mr. Irving, a historian, accepts that the Nazis murdered tens of thousands of Jews and other races. But he doubts the reported scale of the killings and the methods used". The Herald-Sun suggests that the "sensible course for Australian Jews now is to ignore him. That way, the man and his views may pass largely unnoticed". But the problem for the Zionist anti-Irving campaigners is how to retreat from the difficult position in which they now find themselves. The campaign in Australia is part of what can only be described as an international conspiracy against David Irving. While David Irving may be over-optimistic about the near-end of the "Holocaust legend", those with a vested interest in it are going to continue as long as possible. The Irving affair is not going to go away.

THE KEATING BALMORAL CIRCUS: The republican tub-thumping and the trading of insults with the British tabloids by the Keating entourage assumes an increasingly desperate air. While it is unpalatable to Australians to see their Prime Minister lampooned by the press of another country, it appears that this suits Mr. Keating quite well, and his wounded response is for the benefit of the image-makers in Australia, where the polls are showing that the chances of Mr. Keating

winning another election - whenever it is held - are becoming microscopic.

There was never any doubt that Keating's audience with the Queen was always a publicity stunt at best, and, at worst, a grubby attempt to manipulate the Australian sovereign, and her inability to give him the royal dressing-down he richly deserves. What could the Queen say to the proposition that her subjects might seek to change their constitutional arrangements? In fact, The Times in London had predicted, almost word for word, what the released statement from Balmoral said about the Queen's response: that the republic is a matter for her Australian people to decide, it is a political decision in which she cannot participate, and that she will act upon the advice of her Ministers in the matter. Australians can only squirm in embarrassment at what the Queen might make of it all.

The Times also published the interesting note that Buckingham Palace officials were most annoyed that the Balmoral meeting was being presented as some kind of "summit" meeting, at which Mr. Keating would be handing the Queen notice to "quit her Australian realm". One of the most significant press reports concerned Prince Charles' part in the Balmoral meeting. Charles, who was present at Balmoral when the Keatings were visiting, requested a full accounting of each of the Keating entourage, including their curriculum vitae, in advance. He is clearly taking an interest in the whole matter, and as the Prince of Wales, has more freedom of movement and expression than the Queen herself.

THE KEATING MANDATE: The most appalling and frustrating aspect of the Keating jaunt to Balmoral is that Keating purports to speak for the majority of Australians on the republican issue. Clearly the British press does not even believe this arrogant posturing. The truth is that Mr. Keating has absolutely no mandate in any form with which to discuss the odious proposal for a republic with even the Palace cat, let alone Her Majesty the Queen. Australians must continue to make this quite clear, not only in the Australian press, but to the British press, and to the Queen and Prince Charles themselves whenever possible.

While Mr. Keating complains that Australians must suffer the British monarchy as Australian Head of State, he behaves increasingly as if he were Australia's Head of State, thus dimming the status of the Governor-General wherever possible. The truth is that as far back as the Imperial Conference of 1926, it was established that Governors-General had the same relationship with their national governments as the King had with the British Government. For all practical purposes,

the Governor-General is the Australian Head of State. As Sir David Smith points out, Mr. Gough Whitlam was the last Prime Minister who sought to have the Queen act as Head of State, when he requested that she reverse Sir John Kerr's termination of his commission. The Palace replied that the Australian Constitution placed all such matters in the hands of the Governor-General.

The British press has also noted Mr. Hayden's comments upon the wisdom of adopting a republic, commenting that Hayden's remarks will not have escaped Royal attention. And the Tabloid Daily Star ran a small story which was a straight report of the accusation by Australian monarchists that Keating's behaviour was treasonous and seditious. Ironically, it is the Star - one of Keating's "gutter press" tabloids - that perhaps best sums up Keating's visit: "He has come to Britain for the sole purpose of feeding his own cheap publicity machine at the Queen's expense."

MISLEADING AUSTRALIAN MEDIA: The strongest of the pro-Monarchists among the Federal Opposition Parties, Mr. John Howard, charged before the Keating visit to the Queen, that the Prime Minister would be prepared to "lie" about the visit in order to advance his Republican cause. John Howard says he would not believe anything said by Paul Keating. But Paul Keating does not need to lie directly when the mass media so blatantly manipulates the truth. For example, the front page of the Herald Sun of September 20th carries the headlines: REPUBLIC 'ACCEPTED' - QUEEN'S YES TO P.M., while The Australian of the same date carries the headline, QUEEN ACCEPTS REPUBLIC, SAYS P.M. It is probably true that the Queen has agreed that she will abide by any decision of the Australian people in favour of a Republic, BUT NO SUCH DECISION HAS BEEN MADE. Australian Royalists in their hundreds of thousands must now make it clear to Her Majesty that Paul Keating has no right to claim to represent the majority of people. Letters might also be sent to Prince Charles at Buckingham Palace, London.

BASIC FUND OFF TO SPLENDID START: Responding magnificently to the challenge facing the League of Rights to continue giving realistic direction and service to a nation in deep crisis, a handful of supporters have already contributed just on \$10,000 to the League's 1993-94 Basic Fund. This has been set at \$60,000. Please send your donation, however large or small, to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, Vic., 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