ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: http://www.adelaideinstitute.org

Online
ISSN 1440-9828

April 2014 No 753

WILL AUSTRALIA DITCH THE "HOLOCAUST" LAW – RDA Section 18C?

***Past PM John Howard towed the NWO party line on 28-29 April 1996 – Port Arthur Massacre;**

***Current PM Tony Abbott tows the party line since Saturday 8 March 2014 – Malaysia Airlines Flight MH370.**

MH 370 – A Sinister Tragedy In the Fog of Coincidence?

Some strange parallels with catastrophic consequences

By Matthias Chang, April 1, 2014

While this article is published on April 1, 2014 I hope that all concerned would not take this analysis as an April Fool's Joke but a serious attempt to explore what are the likely scenarios beyond that which have been discussed over the last few weeks.

I have thought long and hard since the publication of my previous two articles posted to my website on the 28th and 29th March, 2014 whether to write this article. I had sleepless nights but realized that this article must be written because the issues which I am addressing deserve public attention and a response from the relevant countries whose technologies are so far superior to Malaysia's that only they can provide adequate answers.

I leave it to you to judge whether this article is a "conspiracy theory" (an oxymoron because any unlawful act committed by two or more persons or entities constitute a conspiracy - this is Criminal Law 101) or a legitimate demand for intelligent answers, for the public is not stupid.

What puzzled me most since the "disappearance" of MH 370 is the deafening silence of the Military establishments of the United States, Thailand, Singapore (and to a lesser extent those countries who are mere observers) who prior and subsequent to the "disappearance" of MH 370 ***were involved up to their eyeballs in the annual military exercises "Cobra Gold" and "Cope Tiger" led by the United States beginning from 11th February and ending 21st March, 2014.***

I am sure when you read the underlined words you were aroused from your usual stressed-out state of mind after a hard day's work. I am equally sure that immediately, you could recall certain past events which I will address in due course.

But, let me first pose a few questions to the geo-political stakeholders who may stand to lose from this tragedy in more ways than one:

Given that the military exercise covers an area where there is heavy civilian air traffic, what precautions were made to avoid any mistakes such as miscommunications, misidentifications of aircrafts from those taking part in the said exercise?

What security protocols were put in place to ensure that no third parties (persons and or entities) would under the cover of the exercises mount hostile operations?

Immediately upon the announcement of the "disappearance" of MH 370 (and the subsequent 5 hours of continuous flight as advanced by the experts in the Investigation Team), were the participating countries' military assets involved in the said military exercises deployed to search for MH 370 which was within the airspace of the designated military exercises?. If not, why not?

It was announced that Malaysia's military personnel sought verification of their identification of an aircraft (which at the material time was not confirmed as MH 370) which was picked up by military radar. Was the verification sought from any of the participating countries' military assets involved in the said military exercises? If so, what were their responses?

MH 370 having "disappeared" for more than three days, did the ongoing military exercises hinder the SAR mission, or did the military assets in place assisted in the SAR mission? If not, why not?

I could continue asking other technical questions that relates to military exercises that involve air and naval assets, but it would not serve the purpose of this article because the above five questions are sufficient to elicit a proper response from the relevant military stakeholders. And since this article is addressed to the

public at large, it would confuse them if highly technical questions are introduced.

It is not a conspiracy theory to suggest (and since the Investigation Team has stated categorically that all scenarios would be explored) that there is a high probability that third parties may well have exploited the situation ***and under the cover and likely confusion, mistakes etc. of the military exercises to execute a diabolical act for a geo-political and or intelligence agenda, that the lives of 239 passengers and crew is but mere collateral damage.***

Why it is not a conspiracy theory?

If your memory serves you right, then it cannot be said that the "disappearance" of MH 370 during a military exercise is a mere coincidence in relation to the 9-11 tragedy. The experts have declared that the so-called hijackers knew of the military exercise on September 11, 2001 and exploited the situation to their advantage. There is no need to revisit the 9-11 tragedy as it is not a matter for debate that there was a military exercise on September 11, 2001.

That this is the preferred Modus Operandi of the evildoers is evident from another tragedy. The blame was laid on some young Muslims boys. But no explanations were given as to how they would know that there would be a terrorist bombing exercise on that fateful day. Of course, I am referring to the horrific bombing in the London Underground on July 7th, 2005. Tell the fairies that it was just coincidence that the bombings took place in exactly the Underground Stations in which the exercise was conducted!

Tell the fairies that it was a coincidence that the leading demolition company had its van parked 50 yards from the bus that exploded in flames on Tavistock Road in London on the same day when bombs devastated several underground stations. I still have the picture of the van in my archives!

MH 370 "disappearance" took place during two major military exercises in Thailand.

NSA can track your phone calls so long as you are using your phone and as long as your phone is switched on, you can also be located. You cannot hide from the intelligence apparatus. This is from Edward Snowden.

An airplane runs on electronics. It has miles of electrical wirings that control and transmit data that enable the plane to fly. So, even if the transponder is disabled and if the plane is still flying as in the case of MH 370, then there would be electrical signals emitting from the plane.

And as long as the plane is flying, its engines will of course be running and signals would be emitted to indicate either the engines are running efficiently or there could be malfunctions, so that the pilot can take remedial actions. In the case of Rolls Royce, engines the HQ monitors all engines while in flight. Go check it out.

Yet, MH 370 "disappeared" without a trace till today. Go figure!

The military assets of the participating countries owe a duty to humanity to come forward and enlighten all of us as to what happened to MH 370.

The families of the passengers and crew of MH 370 deserves better treatment than a wall of silence from these participating countries and their military assets.

I implore the Malaysian government to demand from these countries that we will not accept silence and or some technical fairy tales to explain their failures to locate MH 370.

***Future FastForward* - www.futurefastforward.com**

****

China to take our orders in war games

China has sought to operate under Australian command at upcoming military exercises.

With Philip Wen and Sanghee Liu, April 4, 2014

China's People's Liberation Army has asked to operate under Australian command in the largest international exercises that it has ever joined, smoothing the path for Tony Abbott's most challenging international excursion as Prime Minister.

The breakthrough in military relations follows close co-operation in the search for the Malaysia Airlines flight MH370, which is believed to have disappeared off the coast of Perth with 153 Chinese nationals on board.

And it demonstrates that Beijing has shelved, for now, its frustration at Canberra's deepening military ties with Washington and the fury it vented at Canberra's support for Tokyo late last year.

It is believed to be the first time the PLA would operate under Western command in a military exercise, a senior military officer has told Fairfax.

Leaders in Canberra and Washington are coming to the view that China's muscular advances into its maritime periphery cannot be resolved, or reversed, but only managed. They are particularly concerned that lines of emergency communication and co-operation are far less developed with China than they were with the Soviet Union at the height of the Cold War.

Western military leaders welcomed a PLA decision last year to join humanitarian rescue components of the US-led ''Rim of the Pacific'' maritime exercises, which will see the navies of more than 20 nations converge around Hawaii for warfare drills in July.

And they are likely to welcome the PLA's request - which Fairfax understands was communicated through defence channels last week - to operate in those exercises under the direct command of the Australian navy.

"China has a central role to play in contributing to regional stability," Australia's Defence Minster, David Johnston, told Fairfax, while declining to directly comment on the most recent Chinese overture, which is yet to be fully processed through political channels. US ambassador to Canberra John Berry told Fairfax that the US supported Australian co-operation with China generally because it did not view its own relationship with China as a "zero-sum" contest.

He pointed to the PLA's imminent participation at RIMPAC as a stand-out example of "efforts to foster co-operation and better understanding between our militaries. We seek to work with China on areas of common interest and concern but are prepared to speak out when we have differences," Mr Berry said.

Mr Abbott's tour of Australia's three most important export partners involves a delicate itinerary. On Monday, he is due at an important defence co-operation agreement with Japan's Prime Minister Shinzo Abe before meeting China's President Xi Jinping for dinner the following evening and then departing for South Korea.

In the background, China and Japan have been clashing over disputed territories and accusing each other of failing to learn lessons from past world wars, while Korea struggles to avoid being crushed in the middle. The China-Japan dispute has generated 15 months of tense military encounters in the East China Sea.

Late last year, Mr Abbott broke from precedent to side publicly with Japan by naming it as Australia's "best friend in Asia" and also an "ally". Chinese disquiet broke into open fury when the Abbott government publicly protested at China's surprise declaration of a so-called Air Defence Identification Zone over disputed airspace.

And then the head of the Department of Foreign Affairs' north Asia division, Peter Rowe, said he had "never in 30 years encountered such rudeness" as the public treatment of Foreign Minister Julie Bishop by Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi.
Chinese diplomats further castigated Canberra for failing to protest against Mr Abe's visit to the Yasukuni Shrine in December, which they say was symbolic of resurgent Japanese "militarism". By January, however, high-level talks between Australian and Chinese military leaders had been rescheduled and the diplomatic fury appeared to have evaporated.
In recent weeks Mr Abbott has recalibrated his language, made adroit moves to support Chinese search-and-rescue efforts over MH370 and delivered a comprehensive statement of priorities in Asia.
http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/china-totakeourordersinwargames20140403361k9.html#ixzz2xrN7N46X

Freedom of expression for the rest of us

Ruby Hamad, 03 April 2014

The repeal of section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, which made it unlawful to publish material that offends or insults a person or group on the grounds of race, colour or national or ethnic origin, is good news for people such as Andrew Bolt, after whom these so-called 'Bolt Laws' were named.
Bolt's lawyer in the case in which he was found to have breached Section 18C, has since stated that the changes mean the case would never see the inside of a courtroom. Rather, he writes, those who had been targeted by Bolt would have had to hit back with 'the most powerful weapon of all' — their own free speech.
Of course, unlike Bolt, none of those people have their own daily column and TV show and an audience of millions. For most of us, our exercise of freedom of expression takes the form of public protest and assembly.
How ironic then, that even as Attorney General George Brandis ensures the rights of 'bigots', the rest of us are finding our own rights under threat, as Liberal state governments across the country continue to roll out laws that affect the more marginalised and less privileged among us.
Victoria's new Summary Offences and Sentencing Amendment Bill — better known as the anti-protest law — which recently passed the upper house, significantly expands police 'move-on' powers and, in a blow for anyone who thinks public protest is a vital form of dissent and expression, removes the exemption for political protests.
Police can now issue move on orders (effective for 24 hours) to 'protesters who are blocking access to buildings, obstructing people or traffic, or who are expected to turn violent'.
Those found breaching the order are subject to arrest, and any who receive more than three in a six-month period (or six in 12 months) risk a 12-month jail term. This has led some to claim the laws are a thinly veiled attack on what remains of Victoria's trade unions, for whom public protest remains a key form of activism.
Even Victoria's Attorney General Robert Clark has conceded the laws limit 'an individual's right to move freely within Victoria ... and may, in certain circumstances, limit the rights to freedom of expression, and peaceful assembly and freedom of association'.
Community groups are also worried. The Salvation Army warns that increased move-on powers will 'disproportionately affect marginalised young people, people experiencing homelessness, poverty and mental health issues'. Increased exclusion from public spaces is likely to leave vulnerable people with no place to turn.
They have reason to be concerned. Queensland police saw their move-on powers increase in 2006. That year, a survey by the University of Queensland of 132 homeless people found that 76.5 per cent had been issued a move-on order at least once in the last six months. Some of the respondents stated that the same police officers 'chased' them throughout the day, moving them on from place to place.
In Western Australia move-on directions are used disproportionately against Indigenous Australians. A report (also from 2006) by the Indigenous Law Bulletin went as far as to state that while the law itself was not racist its application certainly was:
Western Australian ('WA') 'move on laws' are used by police as a mechanism for the social control of Aboriginal people. The laws are used to move individuals from well known public places in city areas where Aboriginal people congregate. The laws have become another example of discriminatory policing of an already over-policed Aboriginal population and are further contributing to the huge overrepresentation of Aboriginal people in the WA criminal justice system.
The move-on orders often include the entire Perth CBD, and sometimes include the area where the person lives, essentially confining them to their own home unless they wish to risk arrest for violating the order. Some were arrested and given a criminal record without having committed a criminal offence.
One woman, on her way to an appointment, was arrested for violating a move-on order not far from her home, just one minute before her order expired. Others were arrested five to 20 minutes after being moved on, as they waited for public transportation to take them out of the exclusion zone.
That people can be arrested without committing a crime is a worrying trend. It is also occurring in Queensland, where the controversial anti-association or 'anti-bikie' laws ban three or more members of an outlawed motorcycle club from meeting in public, for whatever reason. The January arrest of five Victorian men as they went out for ice-cream in Queensland led the now-Human Rights Commissioner Tim Wilson to declare that the laws were 'violating the human right of association', and to seek the laws' repeal.
While the Queensland Government maintains the laws target illegal clubs, critics, such as Gabriel Buckley, president of the Liberal Democrats, warn that they are 'so broadly written that they could be used against any group of people'.
NSW hasn't gotten off scott-free either. As part of his laws aimed at curbing alcohol-fuelled violence, Premier Barry O'Farrell (who, to his credit, has criticised the repeal of 18C) has just upped the fine for using offensive language in public from $150 to $500. So,

while privileged Australians can now offend other people in print, us minions would do well to think twice before doing so in public.
So, what's that they were saying about freedom of speech, again?

Ruby Hamad is a Sydney writer and associate editor of progressive feminist website The Scavenger.
http://www.eurekastreet.com.au/article.aspx?aeid=39206#.Uz458vmSzT9

Author explores the 'enemies of science'

Updated Thu 3 Apr 2014, 8:33pm AEDT

Will Storr is an author and journalist who has just written the book, *The Unpersuadables: Adventures With The Enemies Of Science*. As part of his research he spent time with historian David Irving, who was jailed for denying the Holocaust ever happened, and at the centre of a famous libel case over a book that named him as a Holocaust denier.

MARK COLVIN: Sometimes it seems the more science discovers, the more some people are determined to ignore it.

Ever since the 1950s, psychologists have been studying the reasons why people refuse to believe clear evidence when it's put in front of them. It's a field which began with a classic study of a cult that believed aliens were coming to take them away on a certain date, then rationalised things furiously when it didn't happen.

Psychologists use terms like 'cognitive dissonance' and 'confirmation bias' to describe what happens when we refuse to believe what we don't want to believe. And they say we all suffer from confirmation bias to some extent.

The writer Will Storr, who has just written a book in which he travels among some of the really hard cases, has called his book The Unpersuadables: Adventures with the Enemies of Science. I started by asking him about his travels with the notorious Holocaust-denying historian David Irving.

WILL STORR: Well, I mean, I thought it was an extraordinary experience, because, I mean, I actually went undercover for seven days. He does these holidays where he invites people to go on an historical tour of World War II sites. And of course the people who go on these holidays - they cost US$2,500, they're not cheap, and you don't get your flight for that - they're neo-Nazis. They're people who are proper Hitler-worshipping neo-Nazis go on these holidays. And I had to kind of go undercover, really, because they weren't going to let some lefty journalist on the tour in a million years.

So I had to spend a week there, undercover, pretending I was a racist, effectively. But it was an extraordinary experience because, you know, I mean, David Irving himself was interesting enough, but also interesting were the people that were on the tour. And a lot of these people - two of them were Aussies, incidentally - a lot of them had very close relatives who were German.

On the last night there was the screening of the film *Downfall*, which, I'm sure you know, is the last few days of the Hitler bunker; very realistic film about the end of the Second World War and Hitler's death. And one of the guys didn't want to see it because he found it too upsetting because his dad was there in the bunker and it was all too close to him.

And it really felt like these were... these were men who, you know, love their mums and love their dads, and yet they were born into this world which told them that their mums and dads were evil. But for them, their mums and dads weren't evil. They were nice, they were lovely, and yet they were Nazis.

So it felt very much to me like these people were kind of, you know, on this kind of mission of love in a kind of perverse way, you know, against everything that the world had been telling them. They were just determined to believe that the history wasn't true and the Holocaust didn't happen, people say it happened, and the Nazis weren't all bad because that was their mum, that was their dad.

MARK COLVIN: But are you... by saying that these people have their views and can't be changed, and we all have our views that, in many ways, can't be changed, aren't you equating the two?

For instance, I have interviewed lots of people who were either survived the Holocaust themselves, or were relatives of Holocaust survivors. I've read a great deal about the Holocaust. I've seen a lot of the evidence. Is my belief the same as their belief, just the reverse?

WILL STORR: No, because you're not coming at this from this very emotional angle. You don't have this kind of distorting presence in your unconscious, which for them is that they feel horrified by this idea that their dads could be evil. You don't have that in your life. You know, you've approached this from a very normal perspective of being born into a world where history and evidence tells you something that's true. So you believe it. I mean, that's the normal way.

But I think where people get something wrong - and this is where I get back to this idea where people are extremely emotional about it. I mean, you don't wake up every day thinking, "The Holocaust is true, the Holocaust is true, I know it's true!" and go onlining it around to people who tell you any different, whereas these people do.

These people are kind of obsessed with this idea, in that they're the ones that will be in the comment rooms and the chat rooms, arguing with everybody. They're the ones that will be, you know, writing these terrible books about why the Holocaust didn't happen.

You know, and I think that's one of the signs when they're really, when we're really separate from a rational take on something, and that's when we will go out kind of campaigning and trying to rally troops to our causes.

MARK COLVIN: But that's an argument, really, for ordinary individuals to go and just try and dig out as much information and evidence as they can themselves?

WILL STORR: Yeah, absolutely, and I think the main thing is to watch what you're emotional about. You know, our biases are invisible to us. We all sit there in the middle of this world thinking that we're the only clear-sighted person in the world, we're the only one that isn't prejudiced and isn't biased. This is the nature of bias and prejudice that it's invisible to us.

There's that old clich "I'm not a racist, but..." People who say that really believe it. I mean, that's why they believe they're not racist. Of course, it's a joke because we can see that they are. We know what the second half of their sentence is going to be and we're all like that. We all think we're not biased, but bias is completely invisible to us. We don't feel it.

MARK COLVIN: I've seen you argue that the best way to deal with these people is essentially to ignore them, not to give them the oxygen of publicity. Is that your view?

WILL STORR: In the sense that the more you argue with people, the more you push them into their corner, the more resolute you make them. It doesn't work going up to somebody and shouting at them. It's never going to work. It's going to make them more entrenched.

Now, if you want to change people's minds, you need to almost sort of co-opt them into their world view. You need to tell them a kind of story about the world in a new way that they can kind of understand.

If you're, you know, an Australian who is concerned about the Government's policy towards the people coming on the boats, then you need to, you know, rather than going, shouting at them saying, "You're horrific people, we have a duty to look after these poor, desperate people", that's not going to work.

If you want to have any hope of changing their minds, you need to think of an argument that's going to appeal to their emotional causes, maybe about how, you know, the benefit that migrants do to the economy, or I don't know... something that's actually going to appeal to the world as they see it.

MARK COLVIN: But what if you see an issue, for instance, that has grown largely without a lot of vocal opposition, like the anti-vaccination movement, and which ends up actually having huge effects in the real world, because suddenly epidemics start that weren't there before and wouldn't have been without the vaccines? You've got to fight against that somehow, haven't you?

WILL STORR: Oh, absolutely. And this is - and I say this in the book, I mean, you know, where your irrational belief is doing harm, we absolutely must fight it, and I think that's where the law comes in.

MARK COLVIN: Author and journalist Will Storr. His book is called *The Unpersuadables: Adventures with the Enemies of Science*, and the full version of this interview will be on our website.

http://www.abc.net.au/news/20140403/authorexplorestheenemiesofscience/5366046?section=entertainment

***

Fredrick Toben comments:

I just read the transcript of these few minutes of guff **Author explores the 'enemies of science'** and am compelled to offer the following for your consideration:

1. Most of the hardcore Revisionists are scientists, and David Irving is not a Holocaust Revisionist because in 2006 he re-canted his views and now claims 'limited gassings' did take place. He also now distances himself from Revisionists whom he now classifies as Revisionists and hard-core revisionists.

2. Holocaust Revisionists' and their work, such as Arthur Butz, Carlo Mattogno, Jürgen Graf, Thomas Kuess,et al, have not had their research refuted, but they have been personally attacked through legal persecution, and especially in Germany any such work has been criminalised, i.e. banned and its authors imprisoned, e.g. Germar Rudolf and his The Rudolf Report.

3. The 3-decade-old challenge by Professor Robert Faurisson still stands: Show me or draw me the murder weapon-homicidal gas chamber! It has not been done. Why not?

4. This led me in 2006 to conclude that 'The Holocaust has no reality in space and time, only in memory'!

5. There is no free and open discussion on this topic – and even now with the discussion on the RDA Section 18C those who wish to de-criminalise matters Holocaust, then quickly slip into defaming Revisionists. Former Age Editor, Michael Gawenda, is in favour of deleting Section 18C but then says this about me: **In every sense, Toben is a low-life. He is someone who has inflicted pain on Holocaust survivors and their families. He is a racist and an apologist for Hitler and Nazism. He is a virulent anti-Semite. He and his ilk, if there is a hell, will undoubtedly rot there. -** https://www.businessspectator.com.au/article/2014/3/5/politics/hate-not-dirty-word Anyone who has a German background has a right and duty to find out the truth of the matter and ask those difficult questions.

6. A pity that Will Storr merely alludes to this point – it has nothing to do with justifying Nazism but finding out the truth of a matter – and that is liberating from the propaganda and lies told about matters Holocaust. Oddly, now one is made to feel guilty about making such enquiries because it may cause someone hurt feelings.

Submitted for your kind consideration.

Fredrick Toben
toben@toben.biz

[*The Australian* newspaper has been a leader in vigorously debating the RDA Section 18C issue, and it supports the government's proposal to drop the "Holocaust" law because it seeks to align Australian free expression concerns with that of the USA's where only threats of physical violence are legally sanctioned as expressed in the term "moral turpitude" but "hurt feelings" remain unprotected. If insults fly, then there is always expensive defamation action as an option. How the US will cope with the moves by especially Jewish groups to eliminate the First Amendment and introduce "HATE SPEECH" is something that needs watching. The following two articles are

perceptively written, except that the groundwork is laid for the community at large to regard Holocaust questioners as somewhat unbalanced and unreasonable in their argumentation and that need to be ridiculed for NOT believing in the "Holocaust-Shoah" – ed. Adelaide Institute.**]**

Community standards at the heart of rewrite

CHRIS MERRITT, ANALYSIS, THE AUSTRALIAN, MARCH 26, 2014 12:00AM

THERE is only one way of judging the impact of George Brandis's plan for section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act: would it have made any difference to the proceedings against Andrew Bolt?

If these changes had been in force in 2011, Bolt's articles about light-skinned Aborigines would almost certainly have withstood the Federal Court.

He did not incite racial hatred, nor did he cause any fear of physical harm. Even if he had faced these accusations under the rewritten law he would not have been judged from the perspective of those who dragged him to court.

Because this plan replaces section 18C, it will disappoint some who wanted the entire provision abolished. Nor will it satisfy those who preferred no change.

Any complaints need to be seen in context. If implemented, this plan will take the Human Rights Commission out of the business of riding shotgun on good manners and force it to focus on more serious matters to do with race.

It would no longer concern itself with whether people are offended, insulted or even humiliated. Hurt feelings are being replaced by a law that targets more serious matters: the incitement of racial hatred and causing fear of physical harm.

Under this plan, the nanny state will shrink. If community standards are met, nobody will need to fear being hauled before a closed-door session for "conciliation"if they refuse to retract an opinion.

Bigots would have the right to be bigots — but if they cross the line, they would be exposed to the first federal law targeting the incitement of racial hatred.

This new provision has been designed to be easily accessible. A breach will only require the civil standard of proof not the much more difficult criminal standard.

At the heart of these changes is the concept of community standards. Brandis plans to enshrine them as the touchstone of liability in 18C. Because this provision will still restrict free speech, the community needs to be confident those restrictions are in line with mainstream values, not those of self-selected subgroups. The same test should apply in other areas of anti-discrimination law.

Yet the sensible dominance of community standards has been qualified in the RDA plan by an extra carve-out that protects public discussion that does not meet that test if it concerns political, social, cultural, religious, artistic, academic or scientific matter.

The plan would also reform the defences, eliminating the requirements for "reasonableness" and "good faith". This means judges would never again feel obliged to conduct themselves like editors. In the Bolt case, judge Mordecai Bromberg quibbled about Bolt's tone and criticised him for failing to include material that the judge preferred. Brandis has sent the court a message that their efforts are best confined to judging, not journalism.

http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/opinion/communitystandardsattheheartofrewrite/story-e6frg9uf-1226864758245

Community standards form the benchmark

CHRIS MERRITT, THE AUSTRALIAN, APRIL 04, 2014 12:00AM

AFTER intense debate, the community is starting to gain an insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the draft plan for reforming section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act.

The debate is not over, but it has already revealed that this plan is not perfect. The problem is relatively minor when it is compared to the overall effect of the scheme. And it could easily be remedied without damaging the immensely important changes at the heart of what the government is trying to achieve.

The core of the scheme — and the part that should not be compromised — is the decision to make community standards the touchstone of whether speech on the subject of race is unlawful.

Much of the criticism of this scheme has focused on the very wide carve-outs, or exemptions, that mean statements that do not comply with community standards are exempted from liability if they concern politics, social affairs, the arts and some other areas. This is a mistake. The whole point of the change is about elevating the importance of community standards. So why not rely on that test instead of a blunt exemption?

A replacement provision for section 18C that relies on an exemption, instead of community standards, would show just as much disdain for the general community as the scheme it replaces.

Remember, the present test for liability in section 18C explicitly rejects community standards. It relies on an assessment from the perspective of a hypothetical reasonable representative of those claiming they have been wronged.

Almost as important as the shift to community standards is the move away from what are best described as the "hurt feelings" offences — offend, insult and humiliate — and towards a new focus on more serious matters such as inciting racial hatred and causing people to fear for their safety.

Some still believe there is a role for federal law, federal courts and federal bureaucrats in protecting their feelings. They like the idea of close-door sessions before an all-knowing speech commissar at the Australian Human Rights Commission.

But the debate has caused many others to question whether the prevention of hurt feelings was ever an appropriate role for government. This is a philosophical turning point and it is surprising some Coalition backbenchers have failed to grasp the significance of what Brandis is doing.

Nicola Roxon, when she was attorney-general, seriously put forward a plan for the consolidation of federal anti-

discrimination law that would have gone in the opposite direction. Roxon wanted to extend the reach of the nanny state and make it the caretaker for the hurt feelings of every citizen on every subject covered by anti-discrimination law. Remember the plan to use "offend and insult" to veto what people could say to each other?

Some sort of change will probably be made to the draft plan for section 18C. The challenge for Brandis will be to take account of community feedback while protecting the core of this proposal.

http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/opinion/communitystandardsformthebenchmark/story-e6frg9uf-1226873926985

David de Rothschild's World Jewish Congress meeting in Paris

April 2, 2014

The World Jewish Congress (WJC) held its biannaul board of directors meeting in Paris on March 31, 2014.

The Council consists of 49 members, plus the representative of the United States, Ambassador Ira Forman, in charge of the fight against anti-Semitism. It includes two French members, Roger Cukierman (CRIF president and vice-president of the World Jewish Congress) and **David de Rothschild** (President of the Foundation for the Memory of the Shoah and Board member of the World Jewish Congress).

In addition to its members, the Board heard a statement by French economist Jacques Attali.

The Council passed several motions:

- Support for Manuel Valls, the new French Prime Minister, for his action against the anti-Zionist comedian Dieudonné.
- **Fight against anti-Semitism. In particular, approving the British sanctions against the footballer Nicolas Anelka (a friend of Dieudonné), urging the Australian government not to reform the Racial Discrimination Act, and supporting the Greek authorities in their fight against the Golden Dawn party.**
- Situation in Ukraine. The Council called on governments not to exaggerate the situation of Jews in the country and not to use it to challenge the legitimacy of the new government.
- Israel and the peace process. Denunciation of the alleged apartheid character of the state of Israel and the BDS boycott campaign. Call for the recognition of Israel as a Jewish State.
- Argentina-Iran Protocol. Call for the repeal of the Memorandum of Understanding on the investigation into the 1994 bombings in Buenos Aires.
- Hungary. Condemnation of the celebration by the Hungarian authorities of Miklós Horthy, regent of the Kingdom of Hungary during the years between World Wars I and II, and support for the Jewish community in Hungary for their boycott of the Holocaust memorial events.

Finally, the Council adopted the Robin Shepherd report on the evolution of neo-Nazi groups in Europe.

It is to be noted that the World Jewish Congress does not defend Jews, but the interests of the State of Israel. Similarly, it does not oppose Nazis in general, but only those who threaten Israeli interests.

http://www.voltairenet.org/article183129.html

Dear Alan, Dear Peter

April 3, 2014 by J-Wire Staff

The Executive Council of Australian Jewry's executive director Peter Wertheim wrote to famed law expert Alan Dershowitz following the publication in The Australian of an article written by the American dealing with the Australian law and racial vilification....

Dear Alan

Peter Wertheim

I write as one of your many admirers in Australia. I especially enjoyed reading Chutzpah and The case for Israel.

I see from today's *Australian* that you have weighed into the debate currently under way in Australia about our existing Federal law against racial vilification. (We have State racial vilification laws too, but these are not in issue in the current debate).

The Federal laws that are in dispute are the provisions of Part IIA of the Racial Discrimination Act, comprising sections 18B, 18C, 18D, 18E and 18F. These sections were the product of widespread public consultation and debate in the 1990's in response to the recommendations of three major inquiries including *The National Inquiry into Racist Violence* and the *Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody*. The laws were co-authored by the late Ron Castan QC, a giant of the Australian Jewish community and the Australian legal fraternity and a champion of Indigenous Australians and the cause of human rights.

I don't want to burden you here with the technical details of how Part IIA has operated in practice. If you wish to read up on the law and the relevant cases you can begin here. The vast majority of incidents of racial vilification never progress to a formal complaint. Those that do, go through a compulsory process of conciliation in the Australian Human Rights Commission before the complainant can go to court. Only a small number of formal complaints have done so. Our organisation has been the plaintiff in several of those cases (eg Jones v Toben, Jones v Scully) and we have usually been successful. We have successfully resolved many more cases at conciliation or by direct negotiation with publishers.

We have not wasted our time chasing every antisemite and neo-Nazi nobody down a rabbit-hole. But the big operators like ISP's and social media platform providers are worth going after. We were successful in our complaint against Facebook to the Australian Human Rights Commission in 2012. After several rounds of negotiations with their lawyers during the conciliation process they removed hundreds of crudely racist images and comments that appeared on 51 Facebook pages. We would never have been able to get them removed without Part IIA. Facebook ignored the avalanche of complaints from Facebook users for weeks, and only acted once our organisation made a formal complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission under Part IIA.

In the US, similar efforts against Facebook failed. See the attached. Our laws have clearly worked better for the Australian Jewish community against Facebook than the US First Amendment has worked for the American Jewish community.

Part IIA of the Racial Discrimination Act has operated without controversy in Australia since 1995. Hundreds of victims of racial vilification have been able to avail themselves of a legal and peaceful avenue for seeking redress, instead of being forced to suffer in silence or dignify their tormentors with a "debate". The reason for the present controversy is purely political and has nothing to do with principle. In 2011, one of the government's champions in the media was successfully sued under Part IIA because he was found to have racially vilified Aboriginal people. That is the beginning and the end of it. The country is about evenly divided between people who think he deserved what he got (his newspaper was ordered to publish an extract of the court's opinion on the page next to his column) and those who think he was hard done by.

The US is greatly admired in Australia but there are aspects of the American legal and civic culture that very few Australians would wish to see emulated in our country. Here, the right to sue for defamation to defend one's reputation against untrue publications (even if there is no malice) is regarded as sacrosanct.

And the US Second Amendment (the right to bear arms) is viewed by many in Australia as a dangerous anachronism. All of the peak Jewish national bodies in Australia without exception – the ECAJ, AIJAC, ZFA and ADC – and their respective constituent and affiliate organisations, professionals and volunteers who combat antisemitism every day have united in opposition to the government's plans to emasculate Part IIA. **More than two-thirds of the Australian population, according to Australia's largest study on racism, support retention of the existing law.**

Personally, I agree that free speech as a rule is an effective counter to racism. But the law is there to deal with exceptions, not the rule. I doubt that the newspaper that published your piece today would have the courage to publish this reply, because it rebuts their editorial position. I would love to be proven wrong on that point. I am taking the liberty of forwarding them and many others a copy of this email

Warm regards

Peter

p.s. Part IIA provides a civil remedy only for aggrieved individuals and groups , not criminal sanctions. So it is debatable whether "censorship" is the issue here. And there is a long list of free speech defences in section 18D for virtually anything said or done "reasonably and in good faith".

Alan Dershowitz

Dear Peter

Thanks. I deliberately kept my argument at a level of generalization because I'm not familiar with the details of Australian legislation or the specific problems faced by particular communities. On a general level I am confident that I am correct– that answering rather than censoring is the preferable response to bigoted speech. **That strong presumption may be overcome by compelling reasons–such as the unique need to ban holocaust-denial in post war Germany. I leave it to you and your fellow Australians to weigh the costs and benefits of the particular laws currently being debated. Please keep me apprised**

Best

Alan.

***

...and concern from Melbourne

March 31, 2014 by David Marlow

The Jewish Community Council of Victoria (JCCV) is deeply concerned about the Exposure Draft of proposed changes to the Racial Discrimination Act.

Freedom of speech is a very important right but not an absolute right. It is limited for good reason in several areas, such as defamation, libel and sexual discrimination, as well as racial discrimination.

Nina Bassat, President of the JCCV said in response to the exposure draft that, **"hate speech based on race, ethnicity or religion should be deplored and all members of society should be protected from it. Just as freedom of speech should be valued, so**

should the right of people to be part of a free and fair society without suffering the emotional and mental damage caused by hate speech."

Nina Bassat

"We believe that the Racial Discrimination Act (RDA) as it stands has been working well and is effective in creating an environment that supports multiculturalism and a harmonious Victorian community. We also believe that the protections it provides and the avenues it opens to conciliation are critical to a society that can see things from the perspective of the vulnerable and less powerful."

"The current legislation has also been very useful in helping to remove hate speech in the online world. We would not like to see this removed."

"Racial and religious intolerance, vilification, incitement of hatred and intimidation are lines that should not be crossed."

"This is not just a Jewish issue or an Aboriginal issue, but an issue for all members of society. Over the past few months we have been involved with 35 other ethnic, community and faith organisations in issuing statements expressing our concerns about the potential watering down of the RDA."

"We appreciate the support and welcome the statements from Matthew Guy MP, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and David Southwick MP, Member for Caulfield against the watering down of the RDA."

"The JCCV will be evaluating all aspects of the Exposure Draft and we plan to work with the ECAJ on its submission to the Attorney-General, as well as working with other communities to help express our concerns."

[On 2 April 2014 *The Australian* published the following three articles where readers were then invited to comment. Fredrick Töben managed to submit his response to all three but they never appeared – why not? – ed. AI]

Bans on bigotry backfire

ALAN DERSHOWITZ, THE AUSTRALIAN, APRIL 02, 2014 12:00AM

THE first casualty of racist speech is often freedom of speech. When bigots espouse anti-black, anti-Islamic, anti-Jewish, anti-gay or anti-feminist ideas, the initial reaction of many well-intentioned people is to ban such expression.

I have seen this all across the globe, from the US to Europe, Israel and now Australia. This resort to censorship as a short-term response to racist expression does far more harm than good, both to the cause of anti-racism and to the cause of liberty.

By turning those who express racist ideas into criminals, we give their bigoted voice a megaphone. Racists want the government to censor them so they can claim the mantle of free expression. The racist expression escalates from a one-day story to a multi-day story, with the censorship receiving far more attention than the statement itself. Civil liberties organisations defend the right of the racists, thereby creating the strangest of bedfellows, which itself makes a good story for the media. Villains become heroes, and the well intentioned censors become civil liberty's villains. This plays right into the hands of the racist.

I vividly recall an episode in the Chicago suburb of Skokie, Illinois, when a group of ragtag neo-Nazis decided to march through this largely Jewish area — a neighbourhood with many Holocaust survivors — in a deliberate effort to provoke a confrontation. The town of Skokie banned the march, thereby putting the neo-Nazis on the front pages of American newspapers, and on prime-time television. A one-day story turned into a yearlong debate about the limits of free speech. In the process the neo-Nazis were able to spread their hateful message widely.

So those who think they are helping the cause of racial or religious tolerance by banning hate speech are simply wrong as a matter of experience. History has proved that the best answer to bad speech is good speech, that the best answer to falsehood is truth, and that the best answer to hate is brotherhood and sisterhood. The challenge is not to remain silent in the face of bigoted speech but to respond and defeat it in the marketplace of ideas.

Censorship of racist speech is also bad for liberty in general, and especially for freedom of expression. Once a government gets into the business of banning one type of bigoted speech, the circle of censorship inevitably expands. I call this "ism equity". As soon as one ism, say anti-racism, gets to employ the power of the state to stop its enemies, every other ism claims an equal right to employ the power of the state against its enemies.

Some feminists demand restrictions on sexist speech, which can be defined broadly to include pornography, sexist jokes and other genres deemed offensive to some. Jews demand an end to everything deemed to be anti-Semitic, which can include Holocaust denial, demonisation of the nation-state of the Jewish people and anti-Jewish jokes and cartoons. Other groups similarly demand equal treatment. The result is that the circle of civility expands and along with it the circle of censorship. The big loser is the freedom of all to hear and see everything and to judge for ourselves.

When I was a kid, we learned a ditty that went this way: "Sticks and stones can break my bones, but words will never harm me."

Like many other things we learned as kids, this is arrant nonsense. Words can and do harm. Being called a name — whether it be a racist epithet or a more personal insult such as retard, sissy or fatso — can cause serious psychological harm.

Lies, rumours, gossip, slurs, insults and caricatures can be painful. Bullying and verbal taunting can drive vulnerable people to desperate measures, including suicide. The truth can hurt. That's why we learn to be polite — to self-censor. That's why families, schools, groups and other institutions have rules, sometimes explicit, more often implicit, regulating speech. "We just don't say that kind of thing around here" is a common limitation on freedom of expression.

It is a far cry, however, from an informal family understanding to formal government legislation and legally enforceable restrictions on expression. I would never use the kind of epithets listed above, but neither would I want the government to prohibit, under threat of criminal punishment, the use of those words in the open marketplace of ideas.

Freedom of speech isn't free. It's expensive, but it's well worth the cost. Without freedom of expression, democracy is weakened. Democracy can endure the coarsening and painful effects of bigoted speech.

It cannot survive a regime of governmental censorship.

Alan Dershowitz wrote Taking the Stand: My Life in the Law.

***

Fredrick Töben's comment would have been Comment 20

Professor Dershowitz can speak freely about any matter while in the USA because the First Amendment still holds that nation's mindset together, and if it ever crumbles, then that too would be the end of the USA. But there are individuals working on an elimination of this Amendment, and then fall-back on a mindset what Dershowitz has pioneered: splitting free expression into free speech and hate speech, the latter then becoming a criminal matter.

The intention of the Australian government to repeal Section 18C is interesting because this section makes the RDA a "Holocaust law" that prevents anyone from openly investigating the physical facts that make up the official "Holocaust narrative" and that actually gives it legal protection.

If the Section is repealed, then the usual smear words, or "shut-up" words will be used even more often than is now the case, such as: HATER, HOLOCAUST DENIER, ANTISEMITE, RACIST, NAZI, They will be used by individuals who feel threatened by those who have a different view of what happened, for example, to European Jewry during World War Two.

It will be interesting to see how the freedom to investigate historical investigations will progress under a new RDA without Section 18C.

http://www.theaustralian.com.au/nationalaffairs/opinion/bans-on-bigotrybackfire/storye6frgd0x-1226871314008

***

Survivor wary of 'velvet totalitarianism'

RICK MORTON, THE AUSTRALIAN, APRIL 02, 2014 12:00AM

A FEW years after most members of his extended family were exterminated in World War II, John Furedy sat in a classroom as teachers in Hungary, then a part of the Soviet bloc, asked what the children's parents had talked about over the breakfast table.

He was young, seven or eight, but the scars of one regime lingered and he was cautious of revealing too much lest he say something "wrong" or incriminating. His mother, Dusi, had protected him from the worst of it but the memories were searing and the convictions forged from them absolute and well-informed.

"I remember censoring myself and I remember thinking, 'This is not right, I am not free,' " he said from his Sydney home.

A boyhood scepticism of powerful agendas built an unassailable view that speech was better when it was free, even for Holocaust deniers, and led to Professor Furedy this week backing proposed revisions to the Racial Discrimination Act.

The Holocaust survivor came out in support of Attorney-General George Brandis to halt what he calls the creep of "velvet totalitarianism", under which thought and speech are criminalised.

"The best thing my parents ever did for me was take me to Australia in 1949, but I have
watched Australians take their freedoms for granted," he said.

"There has been what I call a velvet totalitarianism creeping in. I call it that because the punishments are less severe but people still try to censor themselves and each other.

"They do it on an unconscious level. There can be no contest of ideas if we go too far down this path."

Professor Furedy, 74, graduated from the University of Sydney in 1963 and eventually settled in Canada, where he worked as a professor of psychology at the University of Toronto and found a case that would test, and ultimately confirm, his views on free speech.

Notorious Holocaust-denier and anti-Semite Ernst Zundel was in the midst of a deportation battle with the Canadian government when Professor Furedy wrote a letter to the National Post newspaper defending his right to free speech. "I have long been disgusted by Zundel's publicly stated, anti-Semitic opinions," he wrote in 2005.

"Nevertheless, as one who has had first-hand experience of ... 'fear societies' in the form of the Nazi and Soviet tyrannies, I have, since 1987, defended, in print, Zundel's right to publicly state his disgusting opinions because I did not want to see a Canadian shift towards the fear end of the free-fear continuum."

The same shift, he says, could happen in Australia and Senator Brandis is right to correct it.

It's a view, he concedes, with which others in the Jewish community have strongly disagreed. The Australian has previously published reports of Holocaust survivors panning the proposed legislation. Ernie Friedlander said that even though he agreed with the principle of free speech he could not support a revision to the act that "removed protections from minorities".

Professor Furedy broke down yesterday as he recalled the distinctive, unpredictable course of fate during World War II that led to many of his extended family being slain while his father was spared.

"I love freedom, but I hate its abusers," he said.

His father and two uncles were sent to different labour camps. The uncles perished somewhere in Ukraine. His father, Bela, survived only because a German colonel's instincts to win the war were greater than his instincts to kill Jews.

"He told my father if you work like a soldier, you'll be fed like a soldier — and he was," he said.

Professor Furedy said free speech wouldn't have saved the Jewish people under Hitler — "there were so many other factors at play" — but was adamant it was the best way to defeat bigotry.

"The only protection against stupid speech is better speech," he said.

"I have a feeling Brandis will water down the proposals, but I think as they are, he is sound. And he was correct to say we have the right to be bigots. Of course we do. And the rest of us will respond to bigots with mockery, ridicule and argument."

He said he did not believe minority groups needed special protections, even where they had to fight back with ideas against a powerful person with a stronger platform.

"The distinction should be made between acts and words,'' he said. "I do not support the boycott, divestment and sanctions campaign because that is an act that has a harmful, tangible effect.

"It is fundamentally anti-Semitic and makes me ashamed to be an alumnus of (Sydney) University."

As a boy hiding in a ghetto in Hungary, Professor Furedy narrowly avoided being picked up and put on a train to Auschwitz himself.

"The regime which replaced that was just as bleak,'' he said. "These things always happen gradually, step by step. We must fight every step."

***

Fredrick Töben's comment would have been Comment 33

My maxim has always been: If you take away my freedom to think and to speak, then you take away my humanity and you commit a crime against humanity. Truth is my defence.

Currently the RDA, Section 18C, protects an individual's hurt feelings without that individual having to be medically assessed, and there is really no defence against such subjective claim. In other words, 18C is actually a "Holocaust Law" modelled on the German law where "defaming the

memory of the dead" arose out of a watered down defamation law. However, in the current RDA there is no provision made to order investigation into the factual matters that have given rise to the alleged hurt feeling - and that is my worry because we should also be free to investigate the truth-content of anything at all, beginning with the official 9/11 conspiracy theory that a group of Arabic-speaking individuals did the job.
Senator Brandis' proposal aligns us with the USA's free expression principles where spoken words are permitted, if they do not incite to physical violence against property or persons, i.e. not committing moral turpitude.
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/nationalaffairs/survivorwaryofvelvettotalitarianism/storyfn59niix1226871541737?utm_source=The%20Australian&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=editorial&net_sub_uid=33105777#social-comments

***

Freedom of speech needs a much better mouthpiece than Mundine

JAMES ALLAN, THE AUSTRALIAN, APRIL 02, 2014 12:00AM

WHAT would you think if I told you that in Australia, one of the world's oldest and most successful democracies, a certain eminent person wanted to keep in place laws that put more limits on what people could say and write — more limits on our speech — than exist in the US or at the national level in Canada?

What would you think if I also mentioned that this eminent person's test of when someone could speak or not speak seemed to depend in large part on when and where this eminent person's "sympathies" ended — as in his sympathy for the argument someone else is making?

In other words, if this person thinks the argument is acceptable, that's OK, but if it goes beyond the extent of what this person's sympathies can bear, well, that's not on. And pushing for that much free speech provokes "deep frustration" in this eminent person.

Apparently his sympathies and his moral antennae vibrate at the perfect frequency for knowing when someone else's speech gets its tone wrong.

Or when it crosses the line (his line) when discussing the melange of issues related to affirmative action benefits based on what is loosely called "race", to whether people ought to be able to self-identify to qualify for those benefits, to whether such benefits ought to exist at all, to whether this sort of self-identifying leads to middle-class capture of such benefits, and more.

What if I told you that this eminent person likes to say that he is in favour of free speech, but then he talks as though it was wholly right that Andrew Bolt was silenced by section 18C and Federal Court judge Mordecai Bromberg's interpretation of those speech-stifling laws?

What would you think of all that? What would you think if I added that this eminent person made these sort of arguments in this paper yesterday?

I suppose, like me, you might be tempted to think it was all an April Fools' Day joke of some sort. Surely no one who thinks about the issue of free speech for more than one minute can really believe that the test of whether others in a free and democratic society ought to be able to say something is to be determined by what I happen to like. Or by what I find simpatico, as it were. Or by the tone of argument that I happen to find offensive or insulting. As though I, by some cosmic fluke, am the pinnacle of four billion years of moral evolution and so it's my sympathies that count. What rot!

Look, this issue of what people can say and when and how is crucially important to us all. A century and a half ago the great liberal philosopher John Stuart Mill made the key point that you do best as a society by letting people speak pretty much as they will unless they are threatening violence (virtually no one supports that), or their speech will have catastrophic consequences (say, when someone wants to publish how to make some new biological weapon).

It is in the cauldron of competing ideas, some of which we know going in will be distasteful and wrongheaded, that truth is most likely to emerge.

A corollary of that is that Mill thought the average Joe was as likely to see through the Holocaust-denying moron or the neo-Nazi nutcase as the sociology professor with four degrees or, yes, as the handful of human rights commissioners on their $320,000 a year salaries.

Experience shows that trusting government bureaucracies and judges to decide who can say what, to rely on their sympathies, is a bad, bad mistake.

The seven million Jews who prefer to live in the US without any hate speech laws at all prove that point every day.

Did you know that the same sort of issue that came up with Bolt came up in the US with now senator Elizabeth Warren and her claim to be one-sixteenth or one-thirty-second Native American and whether that helped her win a job at Harvard?

The debate there was more vigorous than anything here. It seemed in the end that Warren had no Native American lineage at all. We don't know if it helped her get the job. And the voters in Massachusetts elected her anyway. But no one thought about taking anyone to court, regardless of their tone or anything else.

However, what's good for the US goose is not good for us Aussie ganders. Or so says our eminent person, Warren Mundine. His sympathies don't extend that far.

If you think that my tone is dripping with sarcasm in this piece, you're right. Mundine's argument is pathetic. It warrants only derision. Yes, I could have written this piece in a more respectful way that covered the same basic ground. But the truth is that Mundine's position warrants this sarcastic tone.

Sure, I might also have sent my draft along to Bromberg to have him check my tone against his sensibilities, but in a longstanding democracy, one of the world's most successful democracies, I really don't feel like making Bromberg the arbiter of my tone of voice or the de facto editor of this newspaper.

Here's the takeaway point. The Prime Minister has no business taking free speech advice from Mundine.

And if what is really going on behind the scenes in the Liberal Party caucus is a fear of how this may play with some voting blocks, let's get the names out in the open of Liberal MPs who want to object to the Attorney-General's announced repeal of section 18C. These doubters can then see what otherwise Liberal voting people make of their hesitation.

Personally, I wouldn't vote for any Liberal MP who blocked these Brandis reforms. Would you? You can consult your sympathies on this one.

James Allan, is Garrick professor of law, University of Queensland.

***

Fredrick Töben's comment would have been Comment 64

Note that Justice Bromberg's decision rests on my precedent FCA case set in 2002. An appeal would have had to go to the High Court as my 2003 appeal was lost in a Full Court decision of the FCA, and a High Court challenge would have eliminated Section 18C, which then would also have eliminated the precedent set by my 2002 FCA case - and the defenders of the "Holocaust" are not ready to concede that we should be free to investigate the physical evidence that Holocaust believers rely on in their narrative of what "Holocaust" was all about.

Now to Professor Allen's two pet hate objects: "Holocaust-denying moron or the neo-Nazi nutcase". This is interesting because the good professor, too, has his blind spot, which he will defend to the death - the Post-World-War-Two New World Order.

If Senator Brandis is successful in getting the change, will Professor Allen permit me to physically investigate the allegations and claims made by such believers for factual truth content? I dare say he will not because then he, too, may have to revise factual information that he thinks comes from "morons" and "nutcases" and thus needs to be subjected to ridicule and contempt.

We live in interesting times.
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/nationalaffairs/opinion/freedom-of-speech-needs-a-muchbetter-mouthpiece-than-mundine/story-e6frgd0x1226871312041#social-comments

***

Changes to racial vilification laws a 'colossal mistake': Shorten

Steve Lillebuen, March 30, 2014

Opposition leader Bill Shorten says growing fears that Holocaust deniers could avoid prosecution under proposed changes to the racial vilification laws is proof enough the government is making a "colossal mistake". In a Sunday speech in Melbourne to Jewish community leaders, Mr Shorten argued how any watering down of protections under the Racial Discrimination Act would be a giant step backwards. "It sends a dangerous, insidious signal that this issue isn't as serious as it was before," he told the annual meeting of the Zionist Federation of Australia. "There is no place for bigotry, no place for racism, no place for hate speech in modern Australia."

The federal government is proposing to change Section 18C of the act, removing provisions that make it unlawful to "offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate" someone because of their race or ethnicity. Instead, new provisions would make it unlawful to "vilify" or "intimidate" people based on race or ethnicity.

But Mr Shorten said there isn't a better example of how important the current provisions are than the case of Holocaust denier Frederick Toben. In a landmark decision, the Federal Court had found some pages of his website breached the act - where he accused Jews offended by Holocaust denial of having limited intelligence and that the number of Jews killed in World War II had been exaggerated for financial gain. He said it was significant that the Executive Council of Australian Jewry has already determined that the 2003 legal win would be unlikely to succeed in 2014 if the act is changed. "This is proof enough that the government should not be tampering with these protections," Mr Shorten said. "Doesn't this nation have more important challenges than tampering with these protections?"

Senator George Brandis insisted last week that Holocaust denial will remain unlawful. "I can't see how Holocaust denial fails to be racial vilification," he said on Wednesday. But some Jewish leaders disagree and a recent poll found most Australians are against weakening the act.

Mr Shorten urged the Jewish community on Sunday to send a message to the Abbott government about the proposed law changes. "We've got six weeks to change the government's mind on this issue," he said. "This is a colossal mistake and one with potential disastrous consequences."

After the speech, the Zionist Federation of Australia formally called on the government to scrap the proposed changes. In a motion passed on Sunday night, the group labels the proposed changes to racial vilification laws as "deeply flawed" and a risk at giving a green light to the incitement of hatred.

The ZLA motion states that current laws provide a proper balance between free speech and racial vilification, so the government needs to reconsider its position. "It's a very strong message," said newly-elected ZFA president Danny Lamm. "And we'll join with other organisations in conveying to the attorney-general our distress at these changes."

http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/changes-to-racial-vilification-laws-a-colossal-mistake-shorten-20140330-35reg.html#ixzz2xQvgCeje

---

How creative is this photoshop job?

The below left advertisement image is real and the below right a fake