



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Vol.44, No.9

March 14th, 2008

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

"Freedom to read and freedom to write
They only fear the truth whom the truth shall indict."

– Scotland's poet son, Robert Burns

DR. FREDRICK TOBEN IN COURT – AGAIN by **Betty Luks:** Dr. Fredrick Toben recently appeared before the Federal Court (*The Australian*, 28/2/08) to face a civil contempt of court complaint by Mr. Jeremy Jones, a former president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry. Mr. Jones wants Dr. Toben to remove material presently on his Adelaide Institute website which Mr. Jones refers to as "Holocaust denial". Justice Moore has adjourned the case to a date in April, ahead of a possible hearing in June.

Dr. Toben spent seven months in a German prison for daring to challenge the only legally permitted version, by the German authorities, of 'the Holocaust'.

Mark that carefully fellow Australians: It was not because he committed a crime that Dr. Toben was gaoled. He did not commit a *criminal* act. He did not rob, nor steal, nor commit murder, etc. He dared to disagree with the official version of the 'Holocaust', he dared to publicly express his *opinion* and the German authorities imprisoned him!

It is many years since the Australian League of Rights warned fellow Australians that to allow Race and Religious Vilification legislation to be enacted would lead to legal tyranny. Well, now the chickens are coming home to roost. Who will next be hauled before the HREOC for daring to think and write for himself or herself?

PERSECUTION OF 'HOLOCAUST DENIERS' by **Nigel Jackson:**

To the Editor, *The Australian*, 29/2/08:

History shows us that periodically certain fanaticisms take hold of large numbers of human beings with extraordinary intensity of irrationality. Such is true of the current worldwide persecution of those misleadingly called by their opponents 'Holocaust deniers' and then demonised as such.

Manifestations of this persecution include an Australian Parliament statement against 'Holocaust denial' (as inappropriate a use of parliamentary authority as the recent 'sorry' statement), a UNO call

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *Dr. Fredrick Toben In Court – Again* • *The End Of The West Is In Canada* • *Persecution Of 'Holocaust Deniers'* • *Sorry – Even Blind Freddy Could Have Seen It Coming* • *Example Of A Process But Not Of A Genuine Democracy* • *God, Genetic Engineering And The Nature Of Life* • *The Dogma Of Anti-Racist Biology*

on all member states to prosecute the campaign against 'Holocaust deniers', the gaoling of Ernst Zundel and Germar Rudolf in Germany and the current harassment of Robert Faurisson in France.

This persecution is a wicked affront to the principle of intellectual freedom and Dr Frederick Toben ('Holocaust denier claims conspiracy', 29/2) is one of the latest victims.

Even if some of his allegations about the Federal Court and some of its judges prove to be erroneous, it still remains true that the present legal attempt to silence him is unjust and unwise. Matters of history should be able to be discussed in open public debate and it is not the business of either Parliament or the courts to stifle such debate.

THE END OF THE WEST IS IN CANADA by James Reed: In her own way conservative columnist Janet Albrechtsen has recognised that the end of the West is in Canada ("Too Many Rights Make a Wrong for Freedom of Speech", *The Australian*, 16/1/08, p.12). Canada's Human Rights and Citizenship Committee has greater power than our own Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. According to legal authorities that she sights, the creators of these commissions in the 1960s and 1970s never foresaw that they would expand their jurisdiction and swallow freedom of speech whole. That they did not see this takes some believing in my opinion. Nevertheless, today even publishing excerpts from books readily available from mainstream publishers such as Mark Steyn's "America Alone", which discusses the Muslim threat to the West, can put one in trouble.

Political Correctness Never Dies: It Just Gets More Sinister: And it will happen here too, without, of course fierce opposition. The 'Human Righters' are likewise pushing for more legislation, and a Bill of Wrongs, sorry 'Rights'. And under Rudd we are back to the Keating days of political correctness where one only has to blink off cue to be slammed as a racist.

Those brave souls opposing the 'Sorry' circus were hosed down with the anti-racism fire hose. There have been calls by the Left for removal of the few (mild) conservatives in the media. No divergence from the party line is permitted. The cultural wars are not over: they have yet to begin!

SORRY – EVEN BLIND FREDDY COULD HAVE SEEN IT COMING by James Reed: After the euphoria of the apology to the "Stolen" generation, Rudd's approval rating reached 70 per cent. The punters out there in democracy land loved it; they got into the swing of things. But opinion polls showed that they did not want to pay compensation. Wait – "sorry" means that you were at fault. "Sorry" implies responsibility and responsibility implies compensation. Rudd gagged the publication of legal advice on the implications of the apology because he wanted to enter parliament as PM and as a great white anti-racist. So let us not confuse matters with the consequences of our actions.

Now there is a flood of compensation claims – 1,000 claims in Western Australia and the Northern Territory alone: "Lawsuits Prepared for Stolen", *The Australian*, 21/2/08, p.4). The lawyers have been busy indeed!

Now let all those supporting a "sorry" come forward and pay for it. Will those brave millionaires, crying crocodile tears to prove what humanitarians they are – will they be the first to dig into their pockets? Hell will freeze over first: it is always the public till that must be tickled.

EXAMPLE OF A PROCESS BUT NOT OF A GENUINE DEMOCRACY by Betty Luks: The following is a good example of an organisation that clearly has an undergirding philosophy that is in conflict with its stated aims. It claims to be "an independent, not-for-profit community campaigning group" that wants to "use new technology to empower Australians to have their say on important national issues". But, by some process quite unknown to those it wants to recruit en masse to its campaigns, 'it' first decides what the issues are and what is the policy position to be taken. It is therefore in advance of the Australian electors, as to the issue and policy to be decided upon.

Their claim is that they "receive no political party or government funding, and every campaign [they] run is entirely supported by voluntary donations". Fair enough. But one can hardly call it democratic. If it was genuinely democratic this group would use their technology to give the electors the opportunity to vote on one issue at a time and then convey to the Parliament the results of the surveys. Just as HASCO has impartially been doing for quite some time.

Whomsoever runs this organisation deems it appropriate to determine in advance just what issues should receive their attention on the basis of their own philosophical position.

Look at the following communiqué received from them before Rudd's 'apology': "Our Indigenous colleagues have stressed two factors in the success of this new way forward. First, the supreme importance of cross party support when the PM takes to the Parliament floor. So, if your MP is Liberal, please urge him or her to push the party leadership to support the apology.

Second, the apology was always only meant to be the first step and must be acknowledged as such. So, if your MP is Labor, please support, commend, and thank them – but also remind them that this a starting point and that what is required now is the full and comprehensive response to the Bringing Them Home Report." (Emphasis in original)

Really Mr. Webmaster of GetUp? Where on your voting mechanism is there a spot for me to record my objection - whereby my objection will be made known to 'Parliament'? And who authorised you to choose this particular version of Australian Indigenous history? The 'Stolen Generation'? Many would say the 'Rescued Generation'!

I don't like your version of 'democracy' – in fact, I reject it! I want to have more control over my own affairs than either you or governments want me to have. I suggest you should have mounted a campaign inviting the Rudd government to put the matter to the people in the form of a Referendum. Although the whole matter is so flawed and consists of so many half-truths and downright lies, let's put a theoretical case as to how a referendum could have been conducted.

The ballot paper would include another separate section for those Australians who voted:

'YES' I agree with the proposal to mount an 'apology' and

'Yes' I agree with Compensation Claims being recognised and paid out.

The separate section would go something like this:

"I hereby authorise the Taxation Department to collect the taxes from my pay packet for as long as the 'Sorry' Claims have to be met".

The Ballot Paper should look something like this:

"Do you agree to the Rudd government apologising to what are termed the 'stolen generations'? [Yes] [No]

Do you agree that Compensation Claims should be recognised? [Yes] [No]

If you have voted YES: You have agreed to Compensation Claims being paid out of taxation. To ensure that your specific contributions are collected and acknowledged, please register your Name : Address : Tax File Number and/or Bank Account Number (and any other necessary details).

Your 'Yes' Vote will make you legally responsible to contribute your share of the Taxes necessary to cover the Claims until all paid out."

Saying 'Sorry' makes you morally and legally liable: In the light of James Reed's article just saying 'sorry' should make you liable to pay your share of the taxes! Those who disagree should not be made legally responsible to pay those taxes based on the YES voters' choice. Now, that seems a fairer system to me, and much more 'democratic' than the present system we groan under.

GOD, GENETIC ENGINEERING AND THE NATURE OF LIFE by James Reed: Britain is allowing their mad scientists to create human/animal hybrid-animals for research. This is all a spin-off of stem cell research; all that one has to say is "our team will get a cure for cancer" and, seemingly, 'the team' is free to do what it wants, however mad. One critic said that hybrids would be sub-human slaves, made for the purpose of research: with that I heartily agree.

Barry Commoner in "The Spurious Foundations of Genetic Engineering", *Harpers*, February 2002, pointed out then that advocates of cloning seldom mention that most clones exhibit development failure. Genetic defects are more common than not. The reason for this is that the Human Genome Project is a failure: there are too few genes to account for the complexity of biological form, but genetic engineering is based on the "central dogma" of genetics, that genes determine physical traits. But "if the human gene count is too low to match the number of proteins and the numerous inherited traits that they engender, and if it cannot explain the vast inherited difference between a weed and a person, there must be more to the 'ultimate description of life' than the genes, on their own, can tell us." As I understand it, recent advances in the understanding of 'junk DNA' (*Nature* 447, 14 June 2007), support Commoner's position.

Genetically engineered organisms are potentially dangerous because they have been created on the basis of a flawed genetics. We cannot predict all the consequences of releasing such organisms into nature.

THE DOGMA OF ANTI-RACIST BIOLOGY by Brian Simpson: According to Mark Pagel, professor of evolutionary biology at the University of Reading in England ("Our World is Growing Apart as People Adapt to their Environment," *The Weekend Australian*, 16-17/2/08, p.23) it may be an exaggeration to say, with geneticist Richard Lewontin, that there is no such thing as race, but the truth is not far off.

"The old ideas about race are flawed," he says, as there are "no abrupt genetic boundaries" separating people. He then goes on to say that the Human Genome Project has shown that most people are 99.5 per cent similar. Yet at the most basic building block DNA level, we are 98.5 per cent similar to chimpanzees as well and not much different genetically from blackberries! Surely the genetic dogmas behind this type of reasoning need exposure because they conflict with scientific facts.

Pagel begins his article by citing DNA co-discoverer and Nobel prize-winner James Watson's view that Africans have a lower IQ than Whites and East Asians. Pagel boldly says, "there is no evidence for innate differences in intelligence" – completely ignoring a major debate that has raged for decades on this issue.

Perhaps he would like to confront the evidence presented in Frank Salter's "On Genetic Interests," (Peter Lang, New York, 2003). There is also the work of Michael Hart on the role of IQ differences in human history, explained in his book, "Understanding Human History". Even William Saletan writing from the Left ("Created Equal" at <http://www.slate.com>) has accepted that racial differences in IQ are genetic.

Somehow, *The Australian* hasn't woken up that this debate has already been won and that Pagel's side has lost.