



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.37

October 4th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "We should not console ourselves by thinking that the barbarians are still a long way off. Some people may let the torch be snatched from their hands, but others stamp it out themselves."

- Alexis de Tocqueville in *Democracy in America*

IS MIDDLE EAST PEACE POSSIBLE? by Eric D. Butler:

President Bill Clinton of the U.S.A. is a captive of the most formidable Zionist Jewish influence in history. There is no secret about this influence, documented in the Zionist Jewish media. Clinton's attempt to initiate a renewed "peace process" following the recent wave of violence between the Israelis and the Palestinians clearly meets with the approval of the Zionist-Jewish strategists, who are unable to ignore the fact that an overwhelming majority of United Nations members have blamed Israel for an outbreak of violence which has resulted in scores of lives being lost, the majority of these Palestinians. As usual with any U.N. vote which condemns the Israelis, the U.S.A. has used its power of veto to prevent any firm action against the Israelis. The Israeli shelling of a U.N. safe haven camp, with a large number of Lebanese refugees being killed, during Israel's last major assault on Southern Lebanon, was strongly condemned by the U.N. after a special investigation had found the Israeli shelling had been deliberate. But once again the U.S.A. refused to endorse the condemnation. Apart from a little wrist-tapping, no American Administration has ever taken a firm stand against Israel from the beginning of the Zionist invasion of Palestine. American Congressmen courageous enough to condemn Israel have been subjected to the type of psycho-political warfare used to force a well known American publisher against fulfilling its contract to publish David Irving's last major biographical work, *Goebbels Diaries*.

It can be predicted with complete certainty that any "peace agreement" brokered by President Clinton will have little long term effect on the Middle East crisis **until the dispossessed Palestinians are granted the right to live in their own State**. While the defiant act by Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu in opening a tunnel close to the third most sacred mosque in the Moslem world, was the catalyst for the latest outburst of violence between the Israelis and the Palestinians, the basic cause has been the growing frustration of the Palestinians as they saw the new Israeli Government renege on even the few modest concessions made by the previous, Rabin, administration. Israeli troops have not been completely withdrawn from the highly sensitive Hebron area, while the Palestinians have watched with dismay as new Jewish settlements have been established on the West Bank. Although Netanyahu said he was committed to the Oslo Accords, the Netanyahu Government has not implemented any of

the promises made to the Palestinians, represented by Yasser Arafat. With a typic display of Talmudic dialectics, Netanyahu has continued to argue that "peace" can be achieved with the Palestinians by doing exactly the opposite of what was originally promised. This has been the story of the Zionist conquest of Palestine from the beginning. As pointed out by the distinguished anti-Zionist Jew Dr. Oscar Levy, the Chosen Race doctrine and the philosophy of Pharissism, have resulted in what he described as "two thousand years of madness".

Douglas Reed traces the history of this "madness" and its effect on international politics, in his great classic, *The Controversy of Zion*.

In recent years a growing number of Israelis have started to express their dismay at the evidence mounted that so far from time healing the Palestinian problem, the situation was going to become progressively worse unless the just demands of the Palestinians were met. The Israeli media has been extremely critical of what it describes as the "macho" policies of Netanyahu. Many of the critics have warned that Netanyahu has plunged not only Israel, but the whole of the Middle East back into a state of open violence with the whole of the Moslem world united in its enmity towards Israel.

Terrorism can never be justified in a civilised society, but unless basic causes of the terrorism are removed, terrorism and acts of violence will breed still further terrorism. Arab memories tend to be long, and right throughout the Moslem world there has developed a view that Israel was established by a treacherous Western world which capitulated to the early terrorist activities of the Zionists. The British were the first victims of this terrorism as they sought to uphold law and order in Palestine. British Foreign Minister Enrie Bevan was abused as an "anti-Semite" because he refused to buckle to Zionist demands. Not surprisingly, some of the younger Palestinians turned to various acts of terrorism in an attempt to bring the plight of the Palestinians to the world. There were initially spectacular hijacks of planes.

Even though awarded the Nobel Peace Award, Yasser Arafat must accept some blame for acts of terrorism. But the West must face the reality that unless Arafat can obtain genuine benefits for the Palestinians, he will be swept aside by those who believe that his strategy in agreeing to a "peace" strategy will never succeed and that more violence is necessary. The Zionist issue not only dominates both the Middle East and the whole of the Moslem world, but all Western nations. President Clinton is painfully aware of the necessity not to offend the Zionist Jewish lobby. "The Holocaust" has been elevated into a new religion to which even Christians must bow before. The British Labor Party has announced that if it wins the next British elections, any criticism of "The Holocaust" will be deemed to be a criminal offence with severe penalties. That the home of the Common Law can be reduced to such a state is a graphic commentary on the influence of Political Zionism in a world which even George Orwell would find hard to come to grips with. Representatives of the Zionist Jewish lobby in Australia have long urged that criticism of Zionist policies should be outlawed. Only the American Constitution continues to offer a degree of genuine freedom in the United States.

The author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, predicted that the "Jewish Question", which is basically a philosophical and religious issue, would dominate the remainder of the 20th century. But he also said that the creation of the State of Israel would have far reaching implicatons for the Jewish people as well as others. Events in Israel are confirming this prediction. What remains of the Free World may yet be grateful to those courageous anti-Zionist Jews in Israel and elsewhere, who have have defied the Zionist terror.

THE IRVING CHALLENGE TO JOHN HOWARD by David Thompson:

Pauline Hanson's maiden speech in the Parliament has set off the most extraordinary chain of events. As an attempt to deal with the issues she raised, the Prime Minister said at the Brisbane Liberal Party function last weekend, that since the election "the pall of censorship on certain issues has been lifted I welcome the fact that people can now talk about certain things without living in fear of being branded as a bigot or as a racist". Enter David Irving, who announced his intention to again apply for a visa to enter Australia in an astute attempt to capitalise on Howard's remarks.

The response to Irving's announced intention has been extraordinary, especially among special interest minority groups, who have the ability to hijack a debate if they wish. The response from some Jewish groups, for example, is little short of hysterical. Michael Kapel, the editor of *Australia/Israel Review*, popped up in several newspapers. His opinion piece for the *Sydney Morning Herald* (26/9/96) began: *"Free speech is one thing. David Irving is another altogether . . ."* Kapel then bends the truth considerably with a litany of half-truths or imagined crimes alleged to have been committed by Irving, concluding that the ban on Irving's visa should remain. He accuses Irving of causing "gratuitous offence" with his writing and "rabble-rousing, vilification and incitement". He overlooks the fact that **none of this occurred** when Irving peacefully visited Australia in 1986 and 1987, to promote his books.

Mr. Mark Leibler of the Ethnic Coalition of Australia is running the "line" that Irving was refused a visa because he has a criminal record, and is therefore "of undesirable character". The Executive Council of Australian Jewry is reported to be maintaining close touch with the Immigration and Multicultural Affairs Department concerning the implementation of the Coalition's proposed \$10 million community "education" programme to eliminate racism. The E.C.A.J. is also lobbying the Minister, Mr. Ruddock, for an early review of the Racial Hatred Act, in order to give the Act more "teeth". It quickly becomes obvious that there is a very clear double standard on the question of free speech. It seems to apply to everyone except those whose views are beyond the realms of civilised discourse, like Irving, or the dreadful League of Rights.

DAVID IRVING RESPONDS: The legend that has built up around Irving is largely a product of the general refusal to publish his own account of events. When that rare chance permits, Irving gives a very good account. *The Age* (27/9/96) carried an article by Irving, which made some telling points, particularly about his "criminal record":

"What the objectors took exception to were some of my opinions as an historian – for example I have stated in public lectures that the 'gas chamber' shown to visitors at the former Auschwitz concentration camp is a fake built after the war.

"I was fined \$30,000 in 1993 for stating this in one lecture in Munich. In modern Germany there is an artificial offence, unknown to criminal law elsewhere in the free world, of 'defaming the memory of the dead'. Ironically, in January 1995, the Polish authorities admitted that the 'gas

chamber' on show to visitors was indeed built in 1948. The reputable French news magazine *L'Express* reported this admission on 20th January 1996 but reputable historians have known it all along. The \$30,000 German fine, however, still stands. Of course it gives me a criminal record, about which Isi Leibler and other Australian critics never tire of gloating to the media . .

"But miracles still do happen. Although the Goebbels book is not even available to U.S. readers, their biggest literary journal, the *New York Review of Books*, has just devoted six tabloid pages to a glowing review written by a leading modern historian, Professor Gordon Craig of Stanford University, who is perhaps coincidentally not a Jew.

"Perhaps John Howard, in deciding my new application, should read what Craig writes: 'Silencing Mr. Irving would be a high price to pay for freedom from the annoyance he causes us. The fact is that he knows more about National Socialism than most professional scholars in his field, and students of the years 1993-45 owe more than they are always willing to admit to his energy as a researcher and to the scope and vigour of his publications'"

WHO WOULD DEBATE IRVING? Victorian Premier Jeff Kennett takes the view that Irving should be permitted a visa, and his views 'dealt with'. Democrat founder, Don Chipp, who is scathing about Irving, writes "Let the bastard in". Chipp believes that Irving offers another opportunity to "educate" another generation of sceptical children about the horrors of the holocaust if he is permitted entry, and professionally demolished. But Chipp overlooks the main factor concerning Irving. Whenever Irving is offered a fair debate, he demonstrates his tremendous grasp of his subject, together with a formidable memory and debating flair. Most of those who have debated Irving have been publicly mauled and professionally humiliated.

THE MYTHS SURROUNDING IRVING: To this day any reference to the Titanic is usually accompanied by the description of the ship as "unsinkable". And yet neither the ship's owners (White Star Line) nor the builders, Harland & Wolff, ever claimed the Titanic to be unsinkable. The myth arose from a 1912 sub-editor's addition to a magazine article about the ship's construction, and has been loosely bandied about ever since, adding a false air of ridicule to the Titanic's designers and builders. Much the same has happened to the British historian, David Irving. It appears to be almost automatic when referring to Irving to describe him as having "denied the holocaust took place", or as an "apologist for Hitler", or as "a neo-Nazi agitator".

The latest round of Irving-bashing repeats all the previous false descriptions of Irving, and adds a new one. In their report of Irving's announcement that he would take Prime Minister Howard at his word that free speech exists in Australia, John Short, Chip Le Grand and Rachael Hawes describe Irving as "**Dr. David Irving**" (*The Australian*, 25/9/96). Who was responsible for this mistake, repeated throughout the report? As an obvious follow-up on the newspaper report, a number of radio news and current affairs items also referred to Irving as "Dr.". Paul Daley repeats the error in *The Sunday Age* report (29/9/96). When was Irving awarded his doctorate? In which particular discipline was it earned, or is it an honorary title?