

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the nature of Holocaust denial in Australia. It does so through a study of the beliefs and activities of the three organizations for whom Holocaust denial is a central belief: the Australian League of Rights, the Australian Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and the Adelaide Institute. Their activities, their international ties, and their relationship with the broader racist Right in Australia is considered. The paper concludes by reflecting on the future directions and responses to Holocaust denial.

INTRODUCTION

The nature of Australian Holocaust denial organizations, their activities, and their place in broader far Right circles is different from denial organizations in other countries. This is explained by the dominant role of the Australian League of Rights in far Right politics, the civil liberties origins of the Australian Civil Liberties Union, the lack of sizeable neo-Nazi groups in Australia, and the dominance of anti-Aboriginal and anti-Asian issues on the far Right agenda. In addition, unlike many European countries where denial is explained as a response to their wartime collaboration with the Nazis, this motive does not exist in Australia which fought against the Nazis and her allies.

Although Holocaust denial is a fringe activity in Australia, it has significantly increased over the last two decades with a concomitant growth in collaboration between Australian and overseas Holocaust deniers. This is not just a Jewish concern for Holocaust deniers have become a leading element within the racist Right with whom they share a common worldview. This is because in addition to their antisemitism, Australian Holocaust deniers expound racist and xenophobic policies and views.

All three Australian denial organizations variously engage in a range of methods to negate the uniqueness of the Holocaust and dispute its number of Jewish victims, such as relativism and minimalization. However, they are defined as deniers because they deny there was systematic plan to exterminate European Jewry and they believe the Holocaust is a Zionist “myth” devised for political purposes.

Focusing on the Australian League of Rights, the Australian Civil Liberties Union, and the Adelaide Institute, for whom Holocaust denial is a core part of their *raison d'être*, this paper draws extensively on primary material from these groups and media reports about them to

- Describe the three organizations and their leaders
- Consider their antisemitic conspiracies

- Discuss their operating methods
- Explore their ideological and practical ties to the broader far Right agenda
- Examine their international links, and
- Conclude by assessing responses to them.

ERIC BUTLER AND THE AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Until the 1980s there was only one racist group for whom Holocaust denial was a central belief, the Australian League of Rights (hereafter the League). They challenged the “Holocaust hoax” long before it gained momentum in Europe and North America during the 1970s and, unlike the Australian Civil Liberties Union and Adelaide Institute, rather than copying the ideas and activities of overseas deniers the League developed their own.

Described by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission’s 1991 National Inquiry into Racist Violence as “the most influential and effective, as well as the best organized and most substantially financed, racist organization in Australia,” it was from this position that the League championed Holocaust denial in Australia in the second half of the 20th century.¹ According to historian Hilary Rubenstein, “by the 1950s Holocaust denial was a frequent component of League of Rights propaganda,” a process overseen by Eric Dudley Butler who established the organization in 1946 and led it until his semi-retirement in 1991, a period in which he dominated Australian far-right politics.² His successors David Thompson (1991–1999) and current National Director Betty Luks share his Holocaust denial beliefs.

For the League, while prior to the Holocaust, Hitler was the Jews’ creation, in its aftermath this genocide is explained by Butler as “the myth of the six million”³ a “blatant fabrication” and “a propaganda offensive from start to finish.”⁴ Accordingly, the League deem both the Anne Frank Museum in Amsterdam⁵ and the American Simon Wiesenthal Centre⁶ as institutions not established to memorialize the

¹ Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Racist Violence: Report of National Inquiry into Racist Violence in Australia* (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1991), 200.

² Rubenstein, “Early Manifestations,” 93–109.

³ Andrew A. Campbell, *The Australian League of Rights: A Study in Political Extremism and Subversion* (Collingwood, Victoria: Outback Press, 1978), 42.

⁴ *New Times*, Jan. 1991.

⁵ *On Target*, 18 May 1990.

⁶ *On Target*, 20 July 1990.

dead, but as cynical means to raise funds.⁷ The League's Holocaust denial is an extension of its overtly hostile position to Jews which is explained by two main considerations.

Firstly, the League's ideology is based on the social credit, anti-collectivist, and antisemitic notions developed in the 1930s by discredited British economist C. H. Douglas. He explained the Depression, and his social credit alternative, in terms of real power being vested in the hands of the financiers who were Jews bent on world domination.

Before the Second World War, Butler was an organizer in the Australian chapter of Douglas's Social Credit Movement (SCM) and a contributor to the social credit journal, *New Times*, which in 1935 denied German atrocities against Jews as lies based on Jewish propaganda.⁸ As a SCM leader, Butler blamed international bankers and Jewish financiers for the Depression, claimed the Nazis were maligned, and expressed support for fascism, including the Axis during the Second World War.⁹

Secondly, the League's antisemitism in general, and Holocaust denial in particular, is the result of Butler's theological world view. A one-time member of the Anglican synod, Butler believes "Christian civilisation is being crucified by the policies of the Anti-Christ.... The modern barbarians have long since breached the walls protecting Civilisation; they are now firmly established inside the gates...."¹⁰ In this vein, the League claims that Jesus himself was not Jewish¹¹ and describes Judaism as a "Pharisaic disease choking genuine Christianity"¹² for which it is a "primary adversary."¹³

The "theological" framework which explains the League's Holocaust denial is illustrated in Butler's three-page article "The 'Jewish Holocaust' Threat to Christianity" which illustrates that his denial is motivated by an attempt to exonerate Christian complicity in antisemitism in general and the Holocaust in particular. He writes

If as Zionist propagandists are insisting, the alleged "Holocaust" during the Second World War was the culmination of two thousand years of Christian persecution of the Jewish people, and the roots of "anti-semitism" are to be found in "The New Testament," particularly St Mathews gospel and that Christians

⁷ As documented below, these views lead to ties with leading Holocaust deniers both in Australia and overseas.

⁸ *New Times*, 1 Nov. 1935.

⁹ Campbell, *Australian League of Rights*, 3–4.

¹⁰ *On Target*, 21 Apr. 1995.

¹¹ *Australian Jewish News*, 10 June 1988.

¹² *On Target*, 18 Dec. 1992.

¹³ *New Times*, Feb. 1994

everywhere must accept collective guilt for the systematic gassing of millions of Jews in German concentration camps, it is the duty of Christians to face the far-reaching implications of the “The Holocaust” issue. The first thing that must be said is that the “holocaust” issue is not simply one of history but has become a religious question, one of a faith which ignores any evidence suggesting that the “holocaust” story may be false.¹⁴

Butler contends that the Holocaust is an act of “psychopolitical warfare”¹⁵ which is part of “an on-going strategy designed to reverse the defeat experienced by the Pharisees two thousand years ago.”¹⁶

With an estimated 2000 activists in the League, Holocaust denial would be supported by the organization’s core supporters, although the less active would be attracted to the League for its other political activities, such as social credit policy and lobbying on issues such as the debate about whether Australia should become a Republic.

JOHN BENNETT AND THE AUSTRALIAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

The Australian Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) headed by John Bennett is the second organization established in Australia for which Holocaust denial is a primary objective. The ACLU’s main strategy is to campaign for Holocaust denial as a freedom of speech and civil liberties issue.

Bennett, a retired lawyer in his sixties, claims he used to believe in the Holocaust until he read Arthur Butz’s 1977 book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, recalling “it was if the blinders had been lifted from my eyes.”¹⁷ He asserts, “I believe, as a lawyer, that allegations—especially those which cause offence to an ethnic group, in this case, Germans—should not be made without supporting evidence.”¹⁸

How Bennett came across Butz’s book is unknown, but it led him to get national coverage for denial in 1979 when the *National Times* newspaper published a 13-point memorandum he was preparing to send to academics based on Butz’s thesis and that of other deniers he had read, such as Robert Faurisson and Helmut Diwald.¹⁹ Later that year he made his first trip outside of Australia to attend the first international “Revisionist Convention” in Los Angeles organized by the Californian-based Institute for Historical Review (IHR).²⁰ Bennett banally said of his

¹⁴ *New Times*, May 1995.

¹⁵ *New Times*, Nov. 1989.

¹⁶ *New Times*, Nov. 1989.

¹⁷ Supplement to *Spotlight*, 3 Mar. 1980.

¹⁸ *Your Rights*, (1998).

¹⁹ Rubenstein, “Early Manifestations,” 93.

²⁰ *ADL Facts*, June 1980.

participation, “As a bored public servant I just find it intellectually stimulating.... I’m a detached cynic.... [W]e’re in very short supply in this conformist society.”²¹ His participation in the conference led to increased involvement with the IHR, and his becoming an Editorial Advisory Committee member of IHR’s *Journal of Historical Review*.

Bennett’s embrace of denial led to his 1980 suspension and eventual removal from the Victorian Council of Civil Liberties (VCCL). He had been Honorary Secretary of the VCCL since 1966, but its leadership was concerned that his personal views would be seen as those of the VCCL.²² By 1984 he established the ACLU, a name which has worked to Bennett’s advantage, for while the League are taboo many unsuspecting media and politicians have assumed the ACLU is a bona fide civil liberties organization for whom they have provided a platform.

The ACLU is a small organization run from Bennett’s home,²³ and Holocaust denial appears to be part of his broader world view, with Bennett claiming, for example, that Einstein’s theory of relativity had never been proved.²⁴ However, through his annual and widely available civil liberties guide *Your Rights* described below, the media seek his commentary on freedom of speech issues and other Holocaust deniers take his legal counsel when their freedom of speech is curtailed.

FREDRICK TOBEN AND THE ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

Although the Adelaide Institute is the most recently established of the three Holocaust-denying organizations, its founder and director Fredrick Toben, in his late fifties, is Australia’s best-known Holocaust denier. The Adelaide Institute add to the political work of the League and the legal work of the ACLU by offering a quasi-historical dimension to Holocaust denial, although none of its leaders are trained historians.

Toben came to national attention in April 1999, when he was arrested after presenting Holocaust denial material to a state prosecutor in Germany, where denying the dead is a criminal offence—something Toben was on the record as saying he knew. While his supporters presented him as a “martyr for truth,” it is possible that he wanted to remake himself as Australia’s David Irving.²⁵ After a three-day trial in November 1999, Toben was convicted and sentenced to ten months in

²¹ *The Bulletin*, 18 Sept. 1979.

²² *The Age*, 2 Apr. 1980.

²³ Bennett, letter to *Without Prejudice*, 10 Apr. 1991, claimed 400 members in 1991, although only about 50 attended the organisation’s AGM during this period, *The Age*, 6 Oct. 1990.

²⁴ Radio 3RRR, 7 Dec. 1987.

²⁵ <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org> accessed 13 Nov. 1999.

prison. Having already served seven months in a Mannheim prison while awaiting trial, he was freed after paying 6000 Deutschmarks (AUS \$5000).²⁶ These events, and a finding against him by the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission in 2001 that material on his Internet site breached the 1995 *Racial Hatred Act* by denigrating Jews, have succeeded in placing his case, and thus Holocaust denial, in the public arena in the same way actions against Ernst Zündel did in Canada in the 1980s. Toben has documented his views and experiences in his book, *Fight or Flight: the Personal Face of Revisionism*.

Toben has succeeded in making himself a player in the international denial movement with Willis Carto, for example, describing him as “the pre-eminent Australian holocaust denier.”²⁷ His activities have been reported in varying degrees by Ernst Zündel and the IHR. The Adelaide Institute Internet site is one of six that Bradley Smith’s Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust highlight in their “revisionist archive.”²⁸

Toben arrived in Australia in 1945 with his family from Germany as a one-year-old. After gaining undergraduate degrees from Melbourne University in Australia and Wellington University in New Zealand, he undertook postgraduate studies in Germany, receiving a Ph.D. in philosophy from Stuttgart University. In advancing Holocaust denial he portrays himself, his ideas, and his organization in academic terms. “I wrote my thesis on Karl Popper” he claims, “and I therefore cannot

Accordingly his denial extends beyond the Holocaust, with Toben arguing,

The mind-set of those who believe in the existence of homicidal gas chambers is the same as that of scientists who believe in the HIV equals AIDS hypothesis. It is a deeply totalitarian mind-set which lacks the flexibility and honesty that is the hall- mark of truly civilised people.²⁹

He also disputes that the Greenhouse effect is a proven fact.³⁰

Toben was an employee of the Victorian Department of Education and Training in Melbourne until his dismissal in 1985 on the grounds of incompetence and disobedience, a move he challenged and claims to have won in the courts.³¹ After driving a school bus for four

²⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 Nov. 1999.

²⁷ <http://www.williscarto.com/toben.html> accessed 8 July 2002.

²⁸ wysiwyg://13/http://vho.org/Archive.html accessed 3 July 2002.

²⁹ *Truth Missions*, 2 May 1994.

³⁰ *Horsham Mail-Times*, 7 Nov. 1990.

³¹ http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/travel_diary.html accessed 4 Dec. 1999.

years, he gained relief work in Adelaide where he settled, with the Adelaide Institute being his full-time occupation for several years.

Unemployed, Toben began to move in far Right circles, specifically that of the League, whose 1990 National seminar he addressed on Aboriginal land rights and multiculturalism.³² His involvement with the League, which he described as an organization involved in the self-preservation battle,³³ would have exposed him to their views on Holocaust denial, and subsequently on February 9, 1994 he produced a one-page flyer called *Truth Missions* which was handed to members of Adelaide's Jewish community attending a charity premier of *Schindler's List*. By June 1994, *Truth Missions* was renamed *The Adelaide Institute*, a Holocaust-denying publication which evolved into an organization of the same name and objective, offering conferences, speakers, and the most comprehensive Australian denial Internet site.

Toben modeled the name of his publication and organization on the respected think-tank, the Sydney Institute, believing that such a name would add credibility to his cause. This strategy has been vindicated, with the Adelaide Institute referred to in the media as a think-tank, and with Toben described as a historian, despite having no formal history qualifications.

Unlike the League or the ACLU, the estimated 250 members of the Adelaide Institute are dedicated Holocaust deniers. As with the ACLU, the Adelaide Institute is run inexpensively out of Toben's suburban home, with income generated through membership fees, and some members being in a position to provide extra financial support.³⁴

ANTISEMITISM

All three Australian denial groups strenuously deny any notion of antisemitism, claiming that they are engaged in historical enquiry and open debate. However, a broader analysis demonstrates clear hostility towards Jews. Indeed, this evidence suggests that their Holocaust denial is an extension of their antisemitism. In particular, they subscribe to the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, its modern versions and concomitant belief in inherent Jewish evil and the notion of a Jewish-Communist conspiracy.

³² *New Times*, Nov. 1990.

³³ *The Sunday Age*, 6 Jan. 1991.

³⁴ Adelaide Institute associate Michael Mazur, for instance, pledged to financially assist their international conference described below (*Adelaide Institute*, no. 80 (Oct. 1998)).

The Protocols and Inherent Jewish Evil

Belief in the authenticity of *Protocols* is a logical part of Holocaust denial philosophy, for if the Holocaust did not happen there must be a massive worldwide Jewish conspiracy to perpetuate the fraud. As Dina Porat observed, Holocaust denial is one of the “new variations on the underlying central idea” of Jewish world domination. It depicts the Jews as a sophisticated and powerful world organization, capable of talking the entire world into believing in a hoax which they invented, even though it lacks any factual basis whatsoever. In other words, Jewish domination of the world is so gripping and total, that Jews may in fact carry out any scheme that they care to design; they have the ability to present any lie and make it pass as a tragic truth accepted by millions. The story of the Holocaust as the Jews present it is the best possible proof that the world is indeed in their hands, because this baseless horror story rewards them with money and sympathy; it provides Jews with the victim status which is an excellent starting point for conducting profitable negotiations and making extortionate demands. Denying the Holocaust also implies that Jews have a sick and morbid imagination able to invent gas chambers, mass murders and indescribable tortures—in itself a pinnacle of evil.³⁵

In 1945 the *Protocols* was published in Melbourne for those associated with the social credit movement,³⁶ and in 1946 Butler authored *The International Jew*, an Australian version of the *Protocols*. While conceding in *The International Jew* that the authenticity of the *Protocols* may be disputed, its portrayal of the Jewish plot for global control was clearly endorsed. *The International Jew* included a long list “proving” Jewish power, ranging from Jews being behind violent events such as the Spanish Inquisition to controlling the media and universities in contemporary Australia. Elsewhere, Butler writes that Zionism is the machination of the “Elders of Zion,” a group with whom no compromise is possible.³⁷

The League became the main Australian distributor of the *Protocols*, viewing events through its prism of a global Jewish conspiracy. Butler’s views about Jewish power and scheming, for example, included the claim that Hitler and Mussolini were tools of the Jews,³⁸ who also

³⁵ “Dina Porat, “New Uses of an Old Myth,” in *Demonizing the Other: Antisemitism, Racism and Xenophobia*, edited by Robert S. Wistrich (Chur: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1999), 325.

³⁶ Rodney Goultman, *Journal of Australian Jewish Historical Societies* 11 (1990): 155–59.

³⁷ *New Times*, May 1995.

³⁸ *The West Australian*, 25 Nov. 1995.

orchestrated Saddam Hussein's 1990 invasion of Kuwait and the subsequent Gulf War.³⁹

Bennett has not openly advocated the *Protocols*, but he appears to adhere to its theme, commenting that the fact that the wives of four prime ministers were of Jewish descent "explains many things that are happening here."⁴⁰ His deputies, however, have been more overt.

ACLU vice-president Jonathan Graham regularly refers readers to the *Protocols* in his column in the far Right publication, *The Strategy*, claiming it is "not a forgery but a blueprint which can be seen being put into action..."⁴¹ arguing that the *Protocols* "fit the facts and explains what is happening."⁴² Describing in his columns the "Zionist Occupation Government,"⁴³ he refers readers to Henry Ford's *The International Jew*.⁴⁴

Like Bennett, Toben is not on the record as having spoken about the *Protocols*, but he does speak about "international finance plundering" countries,⁴⁵ and euphemistically refers to "Talmudic Jews," claiming "we see how difficult it is for the Jews to abandon their hate-filled Talmudic tradition."⁴⁶ As with Bennett, it is Toben's deputies who directly espouse the *Protocols* and related claims.

Toben's deputy until November 2000 was the Berlin-born David Brockschmidt, who had an unusual background for a Holocaust denier. His parents were declared Righteous Among the Nations for helping supply trucks to Oscar Schindler during the war, and he spent eleven years working for the British army in the Rhine as a civilian, and two years in Israel from 1977–1979 before settling in Australia.⁴⁷

Brockschmidt describes "the schemes of the International Jews" engaged in "world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstruction of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality."⁴⁸ This is based on his belief in "the cunning and crafty behaviour of powerful Jewish groups in the financial world, in the world media, in global culture, in world

³⁹ *On Target*, 25 Jan. 1991.

⁴⁰ *Free Thought*, 3 May 1987.

⁴¹ *The Strategy*, June 1999.

⁴² *The Strategy*, March 2000.

⁴³ *The Strategy*, February 2001.

⁴⁴ *The Strategy*, March 2001.

⁴⁵ www.adam.com.au/fredadin/travel_diary.html accessed 4 Dec. 1999.

⁴⁶ *Adelaide Institute*, Sept. 1995.

⁴⁷ *Intelligence Survey*, July 1995.

⁴⁸ *Adelaide Institute*, Aug. 1995.

politics and in practically all aspects of life,”⁴⁹ referring to the “anti-Gentile Babylonian Talmud” as “the root of evil.”⁵⁰

In Tasmania, the Adelaide Institute’s Olga Scully has made the distribution of the *Protocols*, together with cartoons portraying ugly hooked-nose Jews sitting on piles of money tricking the world into their conspiracy, a regular part of the Adelaide Institute’s work.⁵¹ When distribution of the *Protocols* led to a hearing before the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission Scully claimed the “truth” of the *Protocols* as her defense.⁵²

Similarly, antisemitic views were expressed by ACLU secretary Geoff Muriden, who in 1997 wrote to Christian clergy on ACLU letterhead stating “the Jews of the present day are the ‘Synagogues of Satan’” and enclosed a Council of Christians and Jews document defaced with the words “Complete sell out of the Gospel to accommodate the AntiChrist Jews.”⁵³ Bennett dissociated the ACLU from the letters and replaced Muriden as Secretary, but he moved sideways to become Toben’s Assistant Director at the Adelaide Institute before returning to the ACLU in mid 2000 as their research officer.⁵⁴

The “Jewish-Communist Conspiracy”

The Australian far Right have long maintained opposition to Communism as a central part of their beliefs. As an anti-Imperial movement, Communism was at odds with the British Empire with which the Right was closely identified, and Communism’s anti-racist agenda meant rights for Aborigines and Asians, and a broad cosmopolitanism. Furthermore, until the collapse of the former Soviet Union, the Communist threat to Australia from Asia was regarded with genuine concern. For the far Right, Communism was seen as a Jewish movement, which Holocaust deniers argued was advanced through the “Holocaust myth.”

As an organisation dedicated to the Empire and the Crown, anti-Communism was a key component of the League’s rationale and in 1943 Father Patrick Gearson, a Melbourne-based professor of theology who became a prominent League supporter, authored *Communism Unmasked* under the pseudonym Jean Patrice. Describing Communism as being “a Jewish movement inspired by Satan and hence diabolically clever,” early

⁴⁹ *Open letter to the leaders of world Jewry*, 20 June 1996, <http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/worldjew.html> accessed 2 Nov. 1998.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Australian Jewish News*, 16 Oct. 1998.

⁵² http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/media_release_olga_scully_01.html

⁵³ *ADC Briefing*, 4 Nov. 1997.

⁵⁴ ACLU Letterhead cited by author.

editions focused on Jewish communist atrocities. Since 1970, it has been published and distributed by the League, and is unequivocal in its denial of the Holocaust.

In 1961, Butler authored *The Red Pattern of World Conquest* in which he identified Communism at all levels of society, from the women's movement to the wool industry. He takes up the idea of the Jewish-Communist conspiracy in several of his books. In *The War Behind the War* (1940), he argued that the avenue through which Jews achieved power since the French Revolution was through socialism.⁵⁵ In the undated *Censored History* he explained that international finance and Communism were linked to an "international power structure" to support a "New World Order." Antisemitism and anti-Communism thus became a complementary focus of League activity.

The Adelaide Institute and the ACLU also adhere to the belief in a direct link between Judaism and Communism. In the words of Brockschmidt, "there is a philosophical and religious link between Talmudic Judaism and Marxism-Leninism."⁵⁶ In the words of Muriden, Bolshevism "was a Jewish creation maintained by Jews, which would make them liable for the murders, tortures and slavery committed in its name."⁵⁷ In this, not only do they deny Jews rights as victims, but they turn them into aggressors. For example, Brockschmidt and Muriden refer to the "Bolshevik-Jewish holocausts,"⁵⁸ Toben speaks of the tsar and his family being executed by "Jewish Bolsheviks,"⁵⁹ and Olga Scully claims both her grandfathers were killed by "Jewish revolutionaries" in Russia.⁶⁰

Family experience such as that which Scully refers to helps explain why individuals subscribe to denial. Explaining how her family fled to Germany from Russia where they were well looked after, Scully says "If I can do a little bit to repay that, then I will because we would have all died if it had not been for them, yet whenever you read about them they are all Nazis who gas 6 million Jews and it's a whole lot of lies."⁶¹ Little is known about Toben's family background, although being of German origin he appears to reflect the motive of deniers, minimizers, and relativists in Germany that want to dissociate the name of Germany from the events of the Second World War. Bennett is not known to be of German origin but he has a strong affiliation to the country, claiming in 1999 to have visited there for 10 of the previous 12 years.⁶²

⁵⁵ Campbell, *Australian League of Rights*, 33.

⁵⁶ *Adelaide Institute*, Aug. 1995.

⁵⁷ *Adelaide Institute*, Aug. 1995.

⁵⁸ *Adelaide Advertiser*, 26 Oct. 1995; *New Times*, Apr. 1995.

⁵⁹ http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/travel_diary.html accessed 4 Dec. 1999.

⁶⁰ *The Australian*, 28 Sept. 2000.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Wimmera Mail Times*, 7 June 1999.

OPERATING METHODS

The Holocaust deniers disseminate their views in a multitude of ways, but irrespective of the methods employed their arguments are repackaged versions of those devised by European and North American deniers. As such, Australian deniers add little to the ideas of their overseas peers and they are highly dependent on them. Their main claims are:

- The six million figure is a myth perpetuated to achieve Zionist goals in Palestine, with Bennett arguing that in 1938 “there were only 6.5 million Jews in Europe”⁶³ and the actual number of Jews to die in the War was about 500,000.⁶⁴
- There is no “proof,” according to Toben, that even those 500,000⁶⁵ were murdered, for there was no policy of extermination. Bennett explains that the 1942 Wannsee Conference, at which the Final Solution was agreed upon, “refers to the evacuation to the East not to extermination.”⁶⁶
- What the victims actually died from, according to Bennett, was disease, most notably typhus.⁶⁷ Toben provides that this explains the presence of Zyklon B, for rather than kill Jews by gassing it was, as Bennett concurs, used to kill the disease that threatened them.⁶⁸ The League says 100,000 died of disease.⁶⁹
- Gassing did not occur, with the Adelaide Institute asserting there were no gas chambers,⁷⁰ and the ACLU stating they were “reconstructed or fabricated” after the war.⁷¹
- The Holocaust was created, according to The League, to justify the formation of the State of Israel.⁷²
- The Germans were victims, not persecutors, in what Toben describes as the “Dresden Holocaust,”⁷³ with a July 1982 letter by Bennett to the University of Melbourne student newspaper *Farrago* stating that the only Holocaust was of a million Germans

⁶³ *Free Thought*, 3 May 1987.

⁶⁴ *Melbourne Times*, 10 Feb. 1982.

⁶⁵ *Adelaide Institute*, 2 July 1994.

⁶⁶ *Your Rights* (1993).

⁶⁷ *Toorak Times*, 16 Mar. 1988.

⁶⁸ *Toorak Times*, 16 Mar. 1988.

⁶⁹ *New Times*, May 1995.

⁷⁰ *Adelaide Institute*, 27 Jan. 1995.

⁷¹ *Your Rights* (1993).

⁷² *On Target*, 3 Nov. 2000.

⁷³ *Adelaide Institute*, 28 Feb. 1995.

and Japanese who died by allied saturation bombings.⁷⁴ This is consistent with Yehuda Bauer's observation that the message of Holocaust denial "is to set the victim and the perpetrator on the same level."⁷⁵

The ways in which these arguments are advanced by the three denial groups reflects their different operating methods.

The League

League Holocaust denial is advanced:

- In their publications, the monthly *New Times Survey*⁷⁶ which offers detailed analysis on current affairs, and the weekly *On Target* with bulletin style information and promotion of upcoming events;
- At regular meetings of their front organizations, such as the Conservative Speakers Club, which are often addressed by Holocaust deniers such as Toben;
- By selling tapes of lectures given at their forums, in addition to sending these for free to public libraries;
- By publishing Holocaust denial books through their publishing arm Veritas, whose authors include David Irving;
- By running Letters to the Editor campaigns; and
- By organizing Australian speaking tours for overseas deniers, such as David Irving, discussed below.

ACLU

The ACLU's main activity is the annual publication of *Your Rights* which is also available online. Available for AUD 4.95 from most local news agencies, the attraction of this booklet is the succinct summation of legal advice on a range of issues from tenancy laws to police questioning, but it also exposes purchasers to Holocaust denial and opposition to non-white immigration and Aboriginal reconciliation.

As noted above, in choosing the name for his organization and publication Bennett hoped its legitimate sounding title would give it access that would otherwise be denied. This deceptive suggestion of being a bona fide civil liberties publication, has secured for *Your Rights* the promotional quotes which appear on its back cover from popular magazines *New Idea*, *Women's Weekly*, *Vogue*, *Simply Living*, and

⁷⁴ *Farrago*, 14 July 1982.

⁷⁵ Yehuda Bauer, "Antisemitism in Western Europe," in *Antisemitism through the Ages*, edited by Shmuel Almog (Oxford: Pergamon, 1988), 384.

⁷⁶ It replaced *Intelligence Survey* and the *New Times* from January 2000.

Cosmopolitan. It was even positively reviewed in the journal of the Victorian Law Institute.⁷⁷ This process has so angered genuine civil libertarians that the South Australian Civil Liberties Council attacked it for being racist and misleading⁷⁸ and the New South Wales Council for Civil Liberties called for it to be supplanted by a genuine book on legal rights.⁷⁹

Despite *Your Rights* being the subject of Federal Court injunction hearings⁸⁰ an anti-Discrimination hearing in New South Wales, and the national bookseller Angus and Robertson removing it from their shelves,⁸¹ it is likely to remain in circulation for the foreseeable future. Thus, a segment of the community which would not otherwise come across denial material is thereby exposed to it.

Purporting to be a civil liberties organization, the ACLU lobbies on legal issues with a racial dimension. For example, Geoff Muriden appeared before the Senates Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee hearing on Racial Vilification in 1995⁸² and Bennett also attended the 1989 National Inquiry into Racial Violence and the 1993 Attorney General's hearing on racial vilification, although there is no evidence their representations influenced outcomes. Of more practical effect is the ACLU drawing on Bennett's legal background to act as a de facto legal advice arm for deniers when their views lead to legal disputes as illustrated below.

Like the League, the ACLU succeeds in getting Letters to the Editor published and its spokesmen appear as commentators on current affairs programs on related issues, such as the debate about regulation of the Internet, a subject of great importance to the far Right as a whole. Like the League they also provide a forum for Holocaust deniers, so when Paul Madigan was dismissed by music radio station 3RRR in 1988 for his on air Holocaust denial, Bennett came out in his defense⁸³ and provided him with a platform by inviting him to address the ACLU's 1990 AGM.⁸⁴ This proved to be an important strategic move as Madigan became active in the Australians Against Further Immigration and One Nation political parties as is described below.

⁷⁷ *Law Institute Journal*, August 1999.

⁷⁸ *Adelaide News*, 28 Feb. 1990.

⁷⁹ *Australian Jewish Times*, 22 Oct. 1987.

⁸⁰ *The Age*, 28 Mar. 1984.

⁸¹ *Australian Jewish News*, 28 May 1993.

⁸² *Australia Israel Review*, 23 Mar.–13 Apr. 1995.

⁸³ *Toorak Sunday Times*, 18 Dec. 1988.

⁸⁴ *Your Rights* (1990).

Adelaide Institute

The main activity of the Adelaide Institute is the publication of their eponymously titled newsletter and its electronic version *Adelaide Institute Online*.

The hard copy publication is a cheap stapled photocopy, usually consisting of articles that have appeared in the press in relation to the Holocaust, articles from Holocaust denying websites and articles about the Adelaide Institute, especially from Jewish sources. By comparison, the Adelaide Institute website, which has always been more comprehensive and impressive, offers an array of articles, many by Toben, and photos of him at Auschwitz standing in a gas chamber pointing to holes where he contends the gas would exit the chamber. However, after a 2003 legal finding forced Toben to remove denial material from his website, it has been replaced with general far Right material and anti-Zionism. Both the legal case and his shift to anti-Zionism are discussed below.

Viewing themselves as historians in the same way that the IHR does, Toben digs into archives to find the “truth” about the Holocaust, and consistent with international denial efforts since the *Leuchter Report*, they also undertake “scientific” research to prove their case. For example, with funding from undisclosed sources, the Adelaide Institute’s Richard Krege, an electronics engineer in his thirties, went to Treblinka in 1999 where he used ground penetrating radar to find that soil under which Jews had been buried was undisturbed, leading him to conclude there were no mass graves there and thus ~~no~~ Treblinka was not a death camp. Indicative of how such “reports” generate media interest the *Canberra Times* in Australia’s capital city and the *Examiner* in Tasmania reported his findings without challenge. The extent to which this Australian denial is used by overseas deniers was seen by Krege’s findings being reported on the Internet by the Holocaust Review Press, the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust, David Irving’s Focal Point, and the IHR.⁸⁵

Like most other racist groups, the Internet has become a primary and indispensable medium for the Adelaide Institute. Toben explains,

The Internet has given individuals the freedom to break free of emotionally mutated and morally truncated thought-patterns. Responsive persons can now follow their inner voice and develop

⁸⁵ *Canberra Times*, 24 Jan. 2002; *The Examiner*, 24 Jan. 2002, <http://www.codoh.org/bbs/messages/2407.html> ; <http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/Treblinka/groundscan.html>; <http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v19/v19n3p20radar.html>, all web sites accessed 7 Aug. 2002.

that inner potential which is waiting for liberation, development and fulfillment.⁸⁶

The Adelaide Institute use the Internet strategically to increase their efficiency and organizational power, for example, by issuing calls for action in real time as they did in the respective trials of Toben and David Irving. With the added advantage of spreading their message far beyond their small fringe constituency, they have actively campaigned against regulation of the Internet, a subject discussed further below.

Toben appears to regard himself as an ambassador at large for Holocaust denial, and it was in this vein that he approached the magistrate in Germany which led to his imprisonment. In Australia, he makes a point of attending Jewish community meetings, often with other Adelaide Institute officials, where when an opportunity arises he stands to ask questions and introduces himself in the process. In April 1998, for example, he joined a tour at Melbourne's Holocaust Museum. According to witnesses he repeatedly challenged the guide, disputing the assertion that smoke came from the crematoria. He also claimed that the railway lines into the Birkenau concentration camp were built after the war. An Auschwitz survivor interjected that he personally saw the smoke billowing from the crematoria, that he personally traveled on those train lines and that he personally lost his entire family in the Holocaust. Toben remained calm throughout the exchange, left his Adelaide Institute business card and departed.⁸⁷

Toben is the main speaker on Holocaust denial on the far Right's speaker circuit, and has played a key role in ensuring that denial has become a central belief to the far Right as whole. Toben is very active writing Letters to the Editor and calling talk back radio, a very popular form of Australian media. As a result of his German trial, Toben has the highest profile of any denier, and is often quoted in the media when denial news stories are generated by his legal cases. Another important feature of the Adelaide Institute's work is to be the main Australian point of contact with overseas deniers with whom Toben maintains close relations, as described below.

TARGETING UNIVERSITIES

Deniers have identified universities as important arenas in which to advance their ideas because making denial an issue of historical debate in academic circles will provide the credibility they seek. Bennett's

⁸⁶ Travel Diary, 17 Apr. 2000, http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/chapter_03/diary_2000.html, accessed 1 May 2000.

⁸⁷ *ADC Briefing*, Sept. 1998.

memorandum noted above, for example, was a prelude to a draft article he intended to send to six European history lecturers in an attempt to engage them in debate.⁸⁸

While the deniers want academic respectability, they are, in fact, hostile toward universities. Toben describes how “history departments at our universities resemble ideological faculties reminiscent of Marxist-Leninist state-run institutions,”⁸⁹ blasting as “cowards” academics who “will be shamed for having remained silent on the Jewish Holocaust issue”⁹⁰ when they know the truth.⁹¹ Although there have been no dedicated university campaigns such as those undertaken by denier Bradley Smith in America, there are four main aspects to the Australian deniers academic campaign.

Firstly, university libraries are contacted to purchase denial books for their holdings, because having these on their shelves provides the book with credibility and equivalence between the work of genuine historians and that of the deniers.

Secondly, historians are engaged in debate about denial. Accordingly, Bennett has written to academics asking for their views on the Holocaust, raising denial issues and suggesting the availability of Holocaust denial material. In 1995, Toben attended the Australasian Association of European Historians conference at the University of New South Wales where he engaged with academics and spoke from the floor, leading German Professor Mommsen to respond “What rubbish you talk.”⁹² This was one of several university encounters where Toben has been disruptive.

In September 1996, Toben and Brockschmidt repeatedly disrupted an Adelaide University continuing education class called *Hitler's Germany: Will History Repeat?* Most attendees lodged formal complaints which led the Director of Continuing Education to issue a written apology. A similar incident arose at the same University in 1994 when Toben and Brockschmidt had a heated confrontation with Holocaust survivor and Jewish community leader Fred Steiner and Holocaust historian Dr. Paul Bartrop when they were guest speakers at a campus meeting organized by a Catholic group.⁹³

Thirdly, they expose students to denial literature. Holocaust denial pamphlets written by Bennett were found in historical reference books at Melbourne and Monash universities in July 1994; Bennett personally

⁸⁸ Rubenstein, “Early Manifestations,” 93.

⁸⁹ <http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/50-brock.html> accessed 2 Nov. 1998.

⁹⁰ *Truth Missions*, 21 Feb. 1994.

⁹¹ *Truth Missions*, 14 Mar. 1994.

⁹² *Adelaide Institute*, Sept. 1995.

⁹³ *Australian Jewish News*, 29 July 1994.

distributed literature in the University of Melbourne Student Union building during the Jewish student's Holocaust Awareness week in April 1998, and he has written letters to student union papers.⁹⁴

Fourthly, they organize Holocaust denial speakers on campus. This was an important part of David Irving's program during his 1986 visit to Australia where he spoke at the Australian National University in Canberra in a lecture arranged and booked by an external non-academic group.⁹⁵ Similarly, Bennett accompanied Irving on a talk at Melbourne University which was given in the corridor because the University refused to provide Irving use of a lecture theatre.⁹⁶

Overall, it appears most academics won't engage with deniers, on the basis that debating the issue with them confers legitimacy on their ideas: only one academic has openly identified with them—Dr. William DeMaria, a lecturer at the School of Social Work and Social Policy at the University of Queensland. However, hoping to expose students who have no personal memory of the Second World War but who will be influential members of the Australian community to their ideas, deniers are likely to continue their university based efforts.

THE INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEAGUE, THE ADELAIDE INSTITUTE, AND THE ACLU

The League, Adelaide Institute and ACLU maintain a close and complementary relationship reflected in the way they regard each other in the most complimentary of terms. The League has portrayed Bennett as "Australia's leading and most influential libertarian,"⁹⁷ while Bennett has praised the League "for its fight against media censorship on issues such as immigration, multiculturalism and finance."⁹⁸ Bennett personally attended the testimonial dinner to mark Butler's semi-retirement, where he praised his "courage and tenacity."⁹⁹ Toben, while denying being a League activist, said he held those who were "in the highest regard" for having "shown a deep concern for the well being of Australia."¹⁰⁰

The three groups rely on each other for audiences. For example, Bennett has addressed several League meetings and written for League

⁹⁴ *Farrago*, 14 July 1982.

⁹⁵ "The Committee of the 30th Anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Uprising, *The Australian*, 26 Mar". 1986.

⁹⁶ *The Age*, 15 Apr. 1986.

⁹⁷ *New Times*, July 1992.

⁹⁸ *New Times*, Nov. 1989.

⁹⁹ *New Times*, July 1992.

¹⁰⁰ Letter to *Adelaide News* which Toben sent to the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission, 23 Dec. 1991.

publications,¹⁰¹ while Toben conducted a national speaking tour for the League on his return from Germany in 2000.¹⁰²

The three organizations similarly rely on each other for mutual promotion. For instance, tapes of Adelaide Institute and ACLU talks to League meetings are distributed by the League, who also promote *Your Rights*.¹⁰³ The Adelaide Institute publishes material by Butler¹⁰⁴ and ACLU vice president Graham Pember refers readers of his *Strategy* column to the League's *On Target*¹⁰⁵ and recommends that readers contact the League to purchase "controversial books on Zionist political terrorism."¹⁰⁶ The three organizations provide other assistance to each other. For example, when the League arranged screenings of a David Irving video after he was denied entry into Australia in 1993, it was Bennett who organized the Melbourne showing,¹⁰⁷ and when the League arranged for Canadian lawyer Doug Collins to visit Adelaide as part of a national speaking tour, the Adelaide Institute was the local contact address.¹⁰⁸

The three organizations also turn to each other when legal and political difficulties arise. When Toben was incarcerated in Germany his deputy David Brockschmidt addressed the League's Adelaide Conservative Speakers Club on the events surrounding Toben's trial.¹⁰⁹ The ACLU set up a defence fund for Toben's German trial which raised \$6000,¹¹⁰ Bennett planned to travel to Germany to advise Toben during his incarceration,¹¹¹ and the League's Nigel Jackson wrote letters to the mainstream press in Toben's defence.¹¹²

Overall, the relationship between the three organizations is necessary because they provide each other with practical and moral support and a core constituency and rationale that they would otherwise be denied.

¹⁰¹ *New Times*, 1989.

¹⁰² *On Target*, 14 Jan. 2000.

¹⁰³ *On Target*, 2 Apr. 1984.

¹⁰⁴ *Adelaide Institute*, 2 Oct. 1994.

¹⁰⁵ *The Strategy*, Mar. 1999.

¹⁰⁶ *The Strategy*, Apr. 1999.

¹⁰⁷ *The Age*, 20 May 1993.

¹⁰⁸ *Adelaide Institute*, Dec. 1995.

¹⁰⁹ *On Target*, 28 May 1999.

¹¹⁰ *Wimmera Mail-Times*, 14 May 1999.

¹¹¹ *Wimmera Mail Times*, 7 June 1999.

¹¹² *On Target*, 27 Oct. 2000.

INTERNATIONAL LINKS

Australia is both an importer and exporter of Holocaust denial, a fact which reflects the international nature of Holocaust denial.

Through the Crown Commonwealth League of Rights, an organization Butler established in 1972 and subsequently chaired,¹¹³ Butler was able to directly disseminate his denial internationally, to New Zealand in particular but also to the UK and Canada. Indeed, in a 1986 court case about a Canadian teacher's alleged antisemitism in the classroom, the defendant cited Butler's *Censored History* (1978) in his defense.¹¹⁴ Today, League activist Nigel Jackson writes for the neo-Nazi British National Party publication *Spearhead*,¹¹⁵ and Toben is active with his international peers in spreading denial to new countries, as was seen in Russia where he joined American and European deniers in participating in the first Revisionist conference in Moscow in 2001.

While Australians have exported denial, the importation into the country of overseas denial has been fundamental to the development of denial in Australia. With limited resources in Australia the overseas deniers add a dimension that makes the work of the Australian deniers more viable as they regularly publish and refer to the work of their overseas peers. The League has gotten denial mainstream media coverage by inviting to Australia speakers who attract media attention. This includes the 1988 speaking tour of Dr. Robert Countess of Alabama, an editorial advisory board member of the IHR,¹¹⁶ and the 1991 visit of the Canadian lawyer Douglas Christie who represents Holocaust deniers such as Ernst Zündel. This served as the basis for ongoing support, evident in Christie's contribution to League supporter Nigel Jackson's book, *The Case for David Irving*.

The clearest illustration of the local use of overseas deniers was during the first Australian Revisionists Conference when the biggest gathering of Holocaust deniers in Australia took place in August 1998 in Adelaide. There were four speakers from overseas, including Butz from America and Jürgen Graf from Switzerland who delivered two talks, including the keynote address where he denied that one and a half million people had been killed at Majdanek and denied that the gas chambers were homicidal. Sixteen deniers participated by video or phone, including Robert Faurrison, Mark Weber, Ahmed Rami, Ernst Zündel, and Charles Weber.¹¹⁷

¹¹³ Michael Moore, *The Right Road* (Oxford University Press Australia, 1995), 66.

¹¹⁴ *The Age*, 12 Feb. 1986.

¹¹⁵ See, for example, *Spearhead*, No.,325 (Mar. 1996).

¹¹⁶ *Australia Israel Review*, 1–14 Sept. 1988.

¹¹⁷ www.adelaideinstitute.org/newsletters/news80.html and

The relationship between Australian and overseas deniers is mutually beneficial. That the overseas deniers are relied on by the Australian deniers increases the former's sense of relevance, purpose, and effect. Organizations such as the IHR are able to cite their participation in Australian activities as they present themselves as an international organization. Similarly, the relationship Australian deniers have with their overseas peers makes them feel that however marginal they are locally, they are relevant internationally. As an IHR report about the 1998 Adelaide conference stated, "For some time now, Australia has been one of the most dynamic battlefields in the worldwide struggle against the historical blackout. And at the forefront of the battle there is the Adelaide Institute."¹¹⁸

Both Toben and Bennett regularly attend IHR conferences, but the more active of the two through these networks is Toben, who has extensive contacts with deniers across the globe. His European contacts are well documented in his travel diary of a 1998 trip to Europe which was devoted to meeting deniers, visiting concentration camps, including Auschwitz, and delving into archives where his findings reaffirmed his beliefs. In London he met Germar Rudolf where they discussed the involvement of *Adelaide Institute Online* in an English language publication Rudolf is planning, and he stayed with Rudolf on the farm of British National party leader Nick Griffin. In Poland he met with Tomasz Gabis, editor of the magazine *Stancyk* which features denial; in Vienna he spent time with Emil Lachout, apparently an engineer who has "proved" there were no gas chambers; and in France he visited Robert Faurisson at his home. Details of contacts with others were not fully disclosed, such as "Dr. D" and his interpreter "Dr. S" in Kiev.¹¹⁹

In addition to reinforcing Toben's world view and providing him with information to disseminate in Australia there is a practical dimension to these contacts. This was seen in Ludwig Bock who had personally been convicted for Holocaust denial,¹²⁰ representing Toben during his German trial, with German supporter Eric Rossler paying the fine the German court imposed on Toben.¹²¹

Overall, Holocaust denial in Australia can only be understood in its global context, a factor which will influence its future direction. With Toben attending the American Free Press/Barnes Review Fourth Annual Conference in Washington D.C. in 2003 this international aspect remains current.

www.adelaideinstitute.org/newsletters/news81.html, accessed 13/7/2000.

¹¹⁸ ihr.org/ihr/v17/v17n6p-6.html accessed 26 June 2000.

¹¹⁹ www.adam.com.au/fredadin/travel_diary.html accessed 4 Dec. 1999.

¹²⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 Nov. 1999.

¹²¹ *Adelaide Advertiser*, 16 Nov. 1999.

ISRAEL, ZIONISM, THE MIDDLE EASTERN CONNECTION,
AND THE LEFT

A central thesis of denial is that the Holocaust “hoax” was created to justify the formation of and ongoing support for the State of Israel. Bennett, for example, identified two main reasons for his denial. “The first is that the State of Israel and various Jews have obtained something like about eighty billion dollars in compensation, and the second motivation [is]...that were the Holocaust to be shown to be a hoax, the number one weapon in Israel’s propaganda armoury disappears, and it’s because it’s the number one propaganda weapon that we get so much of the Holocaust on television.”¹²² This rationale has led the denial movement to win many adherents in the Middle East and there are increasing links between Australian deniers and Middle Eastern regimes and groups which support denial.

The Libyan regime of Colonel Gaddafi was active in Australia, particularly during the 1970s and 1980s. Bennett wrote an article for the first edition of the pro-Libyan magazine *The Green March* in 1986,¹²³ and in 1988 he reportedly traveled to Libya as part of a delegation to sit on a “tribunal” to “judge” the U.S. bombing of Libya.¹²⁴ Elsewhere, the ACLU’s Graham Pember refers readers of his *Strategy* column to Radio Islam, providing an extremist Islamic source of denial for Australians to access.

When Toben held his 1998 international denial conference in Adelaide, the United Arab Emirates Ambassador to Australia attended.¹²⁵ In December 1999, Toben spent three weeks in Iran¹²⁶ where he lectured on denial to university students¹²⁷ and was interviewed by the *Tehran Times*, which described him as a “German researcher residing in Australia.”¹²⁸ Since then he has been interviewed from Australia by the Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting television about the Pope’s 2000 visit to Jerusalem where he said “the Jewish politicians are using the Holocaust and the six million dead figure as a justification for suppressing the Palestinians and for claiming that Jerusalem is their undivided capital.”¹²⁹ Clearly this is a mutually beneficial relationship, with Toben enjoying the sense of relevance this provides and the Iranians benefiting from using a Western figure to reinforce their views.

¹²² Quoted in Rubenstein, “Early Manifestations,” 94.

¹²³ *The Green March*, Feb.–Mar. 1986.

¹²⁴ *Bulletin*, 25 Apr. 1989.

¹²⁵ *Weekend Australian*, 24 Oct. 1998.

¹²⁶ *Australian Jewish News*, 10 Dec. 1999.

¹²⁷ *Australian Jewish News*, 4 May 2001.

¹²⁸ *Tehran Times*, 8 Dec. 1999.

¹²⁹ *Adelaide Institute*, nos. 106 and 107.

Toben was also scheduled to speak at the Holocaust denial conference in Lebanon in March 2001 which was cancelled by the Lebanese Government. This would have brought him into contact with Hizbullah and the most influential of racist figures such as the late William Pierce. With Olga Scully also scheduled to attend the conference, this reflects how the Adelaide Institute is a vehicle for its members to participate in international Holocaust denial forums which they would otherwise be unlikely to do so.¹³⁰

Toben responded to the Lebanon conference's cancellation saying

Do not blame the Jewish-Zionists; blame the Cowards who bend. The cancellation of the proposed Beirut 'Zionism and Revisionism' conference does not illustrate how powerful the Jewish Zionists are. It illustrates how cowardly those are who yielded to the Zionist pressure.¹³¹

These are views that would clearly be shared by organizations such as Hizbullah and individuals such as Pierce.

Middle Eastern issues, or more specifically anti-Zionism, have taken an increasingly prominent place in Toben's activities. After the Australian High Court ordered him to remove denial material from his Internet site as is discussed below, the site is largely dedicated to the Palestinian cause which provides a basis for indirect denial. For example, in August 2003 Toben and his Adelaide Institute colleague Mohammed Hegazi attended a conference in Iran on the Palestinian Intifada where Toben was one of the speakers. The Adelaide Institute website included photos of Toben wearing a black and white keffiyah, next to women in traditional Islamic dress as he described how they questioned the Holocaust. In other photos Toben and Hegazi appeared next to two Palestinians who had witnessed that "Zionist 'Holocaust'" and they stood in front of a recreated Palestinian home demolished by the Israeli army at Tehran University with the caption "A demolished home symbolizes the actual ethnic cleansing of Palestinians from their own homes: millions of Germans suffered this fate at the end of World War Two, carried out by the same Axis of Evil that supports aggression against and oppresses the Palestinians." Other references to denial through the Palestinian issue included excerpts on the Adelaide Institute website of what Toben described as the Palestinians equivalent to the story of Anne Frank.¹³²

Australian collaboration over Holocaust denial with Middle Eastern regimes and organizations is consistent with trends

¹³⁰ *Australian Jewish News*, 18 May 2001.

¹³¹ *Australian Jewish News*, 30 Mar. 2001.

¹³² www.adelaideinstitute.org, accessed 17 Aug. 2003.

internationally. Ties to those involved in Middle Eastern denial has the potential to introduce more extreme forms of antisemitism into Australia. The late IHR founder David McCalden claimed Arab sources provided initial financial support for the IHR,¹³³ and with their common anti-Zionist and antisemitic agenda, Arab sources could be a source of funds for otherwise underresourced deniers in Australia.

Ultimately, several deniers, such as Jurgen Graf, have made Iran their home¹³⁴ and Toben has suggested that he may follow their lead. He said in relation to Federal Court action arising from the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission finding against him, that he “would apply for political refugee status in Iran if and when his condition of stay in Australia becomes insecure.”¹³⁵ In the interim, Toben remains active in the broad Middle Eastern anti-Zionist crusade, claiming to have traveled to Jordan during the 2003 war in Iraq in an attempt to offer himself as a human shield, telling an audience “The tragedy in Iraq deflects from the Palestinian tragedy, and peace will only come to the Middle East with the dismantling of the Zionist, apartheid, racist state of Israel.”¹³⁶

The increasing prevalence of Holocaust denial in the Arab world has the potential to increase support for Holocaust denial in Australia from within the Islamic and Arabic communities as has occurred in Europe and North America. Incidents of this nature have occurred in Australia in the past.¹³⁷ This could lead to alliances between Islamic extremists and the traditional far Right, a practice which is evident in Europe and North America. In addition, with denial often related to extreme and open forms of antisemitism in the Middle East these ties may increase the extremist nature of denial amongst groups as the League, ACLU, and Adelaide Institute in Australia. Moreover, as Islam in South East Asia is influenced by the extremist Islamic groups from the Middle East there may be a growth of denial in this region in which Australian deniers could play a role. Indeed on his way to Iran for the conference on the Intifada in August 2003, Toben stopped in Malaysia where he gave a lecture to the history class of Professor A. B. Kopanski at the International Islamic University in Malaysia.¹³⁸

Holocaust denial is also likely to appear in the Australian Islamic/Arabic community in relation to attacks against Israel. For

¹³³ Kate Taylor, ed., *Holocaust Denial: The David Irving Trial and International Revisionism* (London: Searchlight Educational Trust, 2000), 94.

¹³⁴ Abraham Cooper and Harold Brackman, “The Fight Against Holocaust Denial,” *Midstream* (April 2001).

¹³⁵ *Australian Jewish News*, 18 May 2001.

¹³⁶ *ADC Online* 5, no. 2 (Aug. 2003).

¹³⁷ Jeremy Jones, “Holocaust Revisionism in Australia,” *Without Prejudice* (Dec. 1991): 53.

¹³⁸ www.adelaideinstitute.org accessed 17 Aug. 2003.

example, in October 2000 as the Al-Aqsa “Intifada” erupted, the Australian Muslim News published on its front page a statement from the president of the Supreme Islamic Council of New South Wales, Gabr Elgafi, which stated that the Council

deplores the Israeli Government and its army for the atrocity and the barbaric behaviour in the State of Palestine. We the Muslims of New South Wales urge the Australian Government and the Prime Minister to demonstrate their disgust and disapproval of the events in Palestine and the Israeli territories. We find ironical that the victims of the so called holocaust have had a lapse of memory.¹³⁹

The Middle Eastern dimension adds another potential source of support for deniers from the hard Left where anti-Zionism plays a central role. In her pioneering 1986 study, *The Holocaust Denial*, Gill Seidel observed how for anti-Zionists such as Lenni Brenner, author of *Zionism in the Age of Dictators*, Zionism and Nazism are congruent, a view shared by many Marxists and Left anarchists.¹⁴⁰ More recently, Norman Finkelstein’s view of “the Holocaust Industry” reflects his own anti-Zionism, with his thesis that Jews have created the Holocaust industry to forge Israeli power, a core argument of deniers.

Anti-Zionism, particularly amongst elites and on the Left, has been identified as a new form of antisemitism with implications for Holocaust denial.¹⁴¹ Evidence of the Israeli-Nazi equivalence in left-wing circles has been widely seen since the outbreak of Israel-Palestinian fighting in September 2000 with pro-Palestinian demonstrators across the world, including Australia, carrying banners equating the Israeli Flag with the Nazi swastika.¹⁴² In 2003, as controversy raged about Israel’s security fence, the Sydney *Morning Herald* broadsheet published a cartoon which equated the West Bank with the Warsaw Ghetto, through two walls.¹⁴³

In the book, *A New Antisemitism?*, which explored the relationship between anti-Zionism and antisemitism, Peter Pulzer observed,

When every civilian death is a war crime that concept loses its significance, when every expulsion from a village is genocide we

¹³⁹ *Australian Muslim News* (Oct. 2000): 1.

¹⁴⁰ Gill Seidel, *Holocaust Denial: Antisemitism, Racism & the New Right* (Leeds: Beyond the Pale Collective, 1986), 86, 91.

¹⁴¹ Paul Ignanski and Baryy Kosmin, eds., *A New Anti-Semitism? Debating Judeophobia in 21st-Century Britain* (London: Profile Books/Institute for Jewish Policy Research, 2003).

¹⁴² For broader analysis of post-September 2000 antisemitism in relation to Israel-Palestinian fighting see Danny Ben-Moshe, “The Impact of the Al-Aqsa ‘Intifada’ On Israel-Diaspora Relations,” *Israel Studies Forum* vol. 14, no. 3 (2004).

¹⁴³ See editorial, *Australian Jewish News*, 22 Aug. 2003.

no longer know how to recognize genocide. When Auschwitz is everywhere it is nowhere, when every military occupation is a holocaust the real Holocaust becomes blurred and then erased from memory. Which is no doubt the intention of those who are convinced that in order to mobilize sympathy for Palestinians it is necessary to neutralize any sympathy that people may feel for Jews, whether in Israel or the Diaspora, because only thereby can Israel be denied its *raison d'être*.¹⁴⁴

In the same book critic Howard Jacobson argues that the constant comparison of Israel with the Nazis despite the absence of comparative characteristics is because the anti-Zionist Left have “had enough” of the Holocaust and want to expunge it from memory.¹⁴⁵

Hatred for Israel on the Left, which involves breaking down the taboo of the Holocaust, could thus fuel Holocaust relativism and lead to direct collaboration between anti-Zionists and Holocaust deniers as has occurred in Europe. Indeed, in 2003 the left-wing Melbourne Underground Film Festival in Australia offered screenings on the Israeli occupation from “a Palestinian perspective” together with the screening of films by Irving and Faurisson. This was a clear sign that the relationship between the Holocaust relativism and denial and left-wing anti-Zionism. The potential for denial to be accepted in other left-wing frameworks is also seen by the support provided to David Irving by left-wing new age magazines such as *Nexus* described below.

It should be remembered that the origins of denial lie on the far Left with Paul Rassinier, whose works are published by the Paris-based Left anarchist publishing house La Vielle Taupe, which also published Faurisson and *The Myth of Auschwitz* by German Wilhelm Stäglich. With reports of denial on Trotsky Internet forums¹⁴⁶ and the hardening of an antisemitic anti-Zionism by the far Left this could develop as the next major area of Holocaust denial.

DAVID IRVING

Any discussion about Holocaust denial in Australia would be incomplete without considering David Irving. While obviously not an Australian denier, he has done more than anyone else to make Holocaust denial an issue of public debate in Australia. Australian denial organizations were centrally involved in this process, with Irving acting as a vehicle to

¹⁴⁴ Ignaski and Kosmin, *A New Antisemitism?*, 95.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 110.

¹⁴⁶ http://www.columbia.edu/~Inp3/mydocs/jewish/holocaust_denial.htm, accessed 4 July 2002.

promote their agenda. Irving's high profile in Australia preceded his 2000 defamation case against Penguin books and Deborah Lipstadt and is largely a result of controversy regarding Jewish communal calls for him to be denied a visa in 1992–1993, which in the context of freedom of speech generated much debate.

Irving first visited Australia in March 1986 on a national tour organized by Veritas to promote his book *Uprising*. League leader Butler and Irving appeared to have a close relationship, with Butler hosting him in his home during this visit,¹⁴⁷ while overseas, Butler has chaired meetings for Irving, such as that held in Winnipeg in 1987.¹⁴⁸ Because of his relatively high profile Irving attracted extensive, much of it uncritical, media interest during his visit, far more than the local deniers could generate for themselves.

After Irving failed to find a British publisher for *Churchill's War*, Veritas published the book¹⁴⁹ and organized a 1987 tour of Australia for Irving to promote the book. During this visit he gave the keynote address at the League's Annual Conference,¹⁵⁰ and there were several controversial incidents particularly at universities, where the student union of the University of West Australia cancelled a talk after they became aware of his views,¹⁵¹ and at Sydney University a talk was cancelled for fear of violent disturbances.¹⁵²

The Australian Jewish community became increasingly concerned at the profile Irving was giving to denial and as reports emerged in 1992 that he would be visiting again, the Jewish community began to lobby for him to be denied an entry visa.¹⁵³ In 1993 Irving received a letter from the Government informing him that he was being denied a visa based on concern that "the effect your presence in Australia will have within the community" and "that your proposed visit...would have been disruptive to the Australian community."¹⁵⁴

Thus began a cycle of visa applications and appeals that continues to the present. Irving appealed the 1993 decision, for which Veritas established the David Irving Legal Aid Defence Fund,¹⁵⁵ but when the decision to deny Irving a visa was upheld by the Federal court he

¹⁴⁷ *The Bulletin*, 13 May 86.

¹⁴⁸ *On Target*, 30 Nov. 1990.

¹⁴⁹ Taylor, *Holocaust Denial: The David Irving Trial*, 14.

¹⁵⁰ *On Target*, 4 Sept. 1987.

¹⁵¹ *The West Australian*, 10 Mar. 1986.

¹⁵² *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 Mar. 1986.

¹⁵³ *The Age*, 2 Dec. 1992.

¹⁵⁴ *The Australian*, 19 Feb. 1993.

¹⁵⁵ *Intelligence Survey*, May 1993.

described Labor Prime Minister Paul Keating as “the last bastion of Bolshevik bigotry.”¹⁵⁶

While denied personal entry, Irving produced a video especially for an Australian audience, “The Search for Truth in History,” with the local deniers responsible for its promotion. Newspaper advertisements promoting the video listed Muriden and the ACLU’s contact details¹⁵⁷ and in a program organized by Veritas and Bennett, the video was scheduled to be shown nationally but most talks were cancelled because of protests. However, this whole process made denial an almost daily news item, much of it with interviews with Irving from the UK and America.¹⁵⁸

In addition to the media benefits, Irving’s case gave Australian deniers a cause to rally around. Nigel Jackson, for example, authored his book, *The Case for David Irving*, with long accounts of Irving’s “elegant and profoundly researched texts.”¹⁵⁹ This sense of purpose that Irving provided was also evident during his 2001 libel trial in London, when regular reports from Irving’s web site were republished in League publications. Readers were referred to Irving’s website.¹⁶⁰

Irving received practical benefit from this Australian support, 288 donations were received from Australia, ranging from \$10–\$2000, in the leadup to his trial.¹⁶¹ During his trial, Irving was assisted in preparing information for his cross examination by Australian public servant Michael Mills; Irving acknowledged his assistance in his case, given the limited time he had to prepare. This demonstrates that an Australian such as Mills who has no impact on the debate about the Holocaust in Australia, can play a more significant role when connected to prominent overseas deniers.¹⁶² Following the court’s decision against Irving, the ACLU planned to provide financial assistance for his appeal.¹⁶³

Indicative of the way the Internet has broadened the reach of deniers and is the means through which non-Australian deniers can reach an Australian audience, Irving’s Internet site provides a section for purchases with Australian credit cards.¹⁶⁴ While the Internet does not provide the range of coverage of mainstream media, it is the means by which Irving interacts with Australians despite the denial of a visa, with

¹⁵⁶ *The Age*, 14 May 1993.

¹⁵⁷ *The Age*, 19 June 1993.

¹⁵⁸ *The Age*, 20 May 1993.

¹⁵⁹ Nigel Jackson, *The Case for David Irving: The Selective Censorship of History and Free Speech* (West Australia: Veritas, 1994).

¹⁶⁰ *On Target*, 23 Apr. 2000.

¹⁶¹ *The Weekend Australian*, 15–16 Apr. 2000.

¹⁶² *Generation*, May 2000.

¹⁶³ According to columnist Jill Singer, *Herald Sun*, 14 Apr. 2000.

¹⁶⁴ <http://www.fpp.co.uk/orderforms/orderformAustral.html> accessed 17 July 2002.

individuals with no public record of denial writing to the letters page on his website.¹⁶⁵

The broader implications of Irving's denial of entry into Australia was evident in the matter being raised during his case against Lipstadt.¹⁶⁶ He remains determined to enter Australia; the three denial groups are eager to offer their assistance and use his services. However, his most recent application, lodged in August 2001, is unlikely to be viewed favorably, given the loss of his 2001 libel case and the fact that he now owes the Australian government \$35,000 in legal fees arising from appeals against previous decisions to deny him entry.¹⁶⁷

Irving, however, seems destined to remain the most high profile player in the Australian Holocaust denial saga. This was seen in 2003 when his film *The Search for Truth in History* was scheduled to be played at the Melbourne Underground Film Festival, to be followed by a live telephone hook up with him. The screening and hook up failed to happen following the controversy its scheduling generated, including legal action described below.

Overall, Irving maintains a mutually beneficial and close relationship with Australian Holocaust deniers. The ACLU and League promote his books, which are available at their meetings,¹⁶⁸ while Toben lauds Irving as "one of the few historians to have their moral and intellectual integrity intact."¹⁶⁹ Irving has returned the favors by issuing a statement in support of Toben during his legal difficulties in Australia.¹⁷⁰

Holocaust denial has not had the same level of impact in Australia as it has overseas, and one reason for this is the absence of a figure such as Irving who had a reputation as a historian before being identified as a denier. By lending himself to the Australian deniers he has been able to assist their campaign and they have remained committed to him despite his loss against Lipstadt, with Toben and Scully, for example, attending his 2001 Revisionist Conference in America.¹⁷¹ However, for the wider Australian community the loss of credibility as a result of Irving's legal loss in London means that Australian deniers have lost their main entry into mainstream debate.

¹⁶⁵ See, for example <http://www.fpp.co.uk/Letters/Rightwing/Knight241101.html> accessed 3 July 2002.

¹⁶⁶ D. D. Guttenplan, *The Holocaust On Trial* (London: Granta Books, 2002), 206.

¹⁶⁷ *Australian Jewish News*, 25 Jan. 2002.

¹⁶⁸ *ACLU newsletter*, no. 110 (April 1996).

¹⁶⁹ *Adelaide Institute*, June 1995.

¹⁷⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 Apr. 1999.

¹⁷¹ Simon Wiesenthal Centre, Los Angeles to Danny Ben Moshe, Melbourne, 14 May 2002.

WHITE SUPREMACY, THE FAR RIGHT, AND THE ANTI-ASIAN
AND ANTI-ABORIGINAL AGENDA

As a movement seeking to facilitate the rehabilitation of Nazism, Holocaust denial reflects a broader far Right white supremacist agenda. A lecture by Geoff Muriden, for example, is promoted by the League as “Is there a threat to the survival of the White Race? Is ‘Racism’ being used as a social weapon against Anglo-Saxon-Celts in Australia (and against the white races overseas, for that matter)?”¹⁷² In his lecture he warned that white man’s “survival is at stake” as “a mongrelised racial conglomerate appears.”¹⁷³

It follows that the Holocaust deniers share common ideological and political beliefs with the broader racist Right. Thus, the ACLU supports the standard far Right policy of Citizens Initiated Referenda,¹⁷⁴ a voting system which, although not racist per se, is standard far Right policy in Australia. Elsewhere, Toben indicates his openness to the Port Arthur conspiracy which is for the Australian far Right what the Waco conspiracy is for the American far Right.¹⁷⁵ The Port Arthur conspiracy contends that the 1996 shooting spree by a deranged gunman in Tasmania was supported by the government as a pretext to disarm the Australian population as the “New World Order” powers dictated.

Like the broader racist Right, Holocaust deniers also oppose the environmental movement, a strong lobby group in Australia, which is seen as being elitist and progressive, although they do so on the same “scientific” grounds that they challenge the Holocaust. Toben disputes that the green house effect is a proven fact,¹⁷⁶ with the Adelaide Institute exposing the “green house myth” by explaining how scientists “developed it” to “generate controversy to ensure their continued employment”; politicians “need to be seen to be doing something to keep the ‘green’ vote to ensure their continued employment,” and the media report on it because they “need to stir up controversy to ensure their continued employment.”¹⁷⁷

The broader racist Right’s unifying and defining belief is the “New World Order” conspiracy, about which Toben asks “Are we going to support the New World Order?”¹⁷⁸ In the tradition and spirit of the *Protocols*, Jews are held to be at the center of the “New World Order”

¹⁷² *On Target*, 17 Feb. 1995.

¹⁷³ *New Times*, Apr. 1995.

¹⁷⁴ *Your Rights* (1991).

¹⁷⁵ Toben Travel Diary, 9 Apr. 2000, http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/chapter_03/diary_2000.html accessed 1 May 2000.

¹⁷⁶ *Horsham Mail-Times*, 7 Nov. 1990.

¹⁷⁷ *Adelaide Institute*, June 2000.

¹⁷⁸ *Adelaide Institute*, May 1996.

which in the Australian context is manifest in Asian immigration and Aboriginal reconciliation. With Toben commenting how “The Holocaust dogma attacks western-Nordic culture”¹⁷⁹ opposition to Asian immigration and Aboriginal reconciliation forms a major plank of the denier’s activity and is a logical consequence of their white supremacist world view. As Toben told the League National seminar in 1990, “For me, the [Aboriginal] landrights issue is, obviously, the other side of the multicultural coin. Both issues are fracturing the unity and strength of our country.”¹⁸⁰

Opposition to Asian immigration and multiculturalism is thus an important sub-section of the Holocaust deniers’ agenda. Muriden says it “threatens peace and harmony”¹⁸¹ and Toben claims its supporters deny the existence of a host Australia culture.¹⁸² Bennett calls for an “increased percentage of white immigrants to Australia”¹⁸³ and a “return to the policy of predominantly European immigration.”¹⁸⁴ Elsewhere, Olga Scully asserts that foreigners are overwhelming “white people’s” gene pool, stating “I’ve been to Sydney and Melbourne, I know what it’s like in many suburbs, there’s just millions of them.”¹⁸⁵

In pursuing this agenda the deniers, like the broader racist Right, engage in racist stereotyping and scapegoating. Bennett links Asian immigration to unemployment,¹⁸⁶ as he speaks of “the Asian invasion” which has to be stopped,¹⁸⁷ with *Your Rights* arguing that some leaders of the “multicultural industry... seem to have greater loyalty to their country of origin than to Australia.”¹⁸⁸

For the most part, as with the Holocaust, the deniers endeavor to shroud their opposition to non-white immigration and multiculturalism in informed, freedom of speech terms, but as with the Holocaust they occasionally lapse into outright vilification. Referring to the artwork of Jesus, “Pissing on Christianity,” Muriden suggests a response of “Moses in excrement, Mohammed in porkland and Krishna in Puss.” He warned that in response to such a move Muslims would issue a fatwa and “the Hindus would kidnap the artist, bring him to the holy city of Benares at the Ganges river—and before they drown him in the holy river, they

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ *New Times*, Nov. 1990.

¹⁸¹ *The Strategy*, Mar. 1996.

¹⁸² *Wimmera Mail-Times*, 31 Oct. 1990.

¹⁸³ *News Weekly*, 5 Aug. 1981.

¹⁸⁴ *The Age*, 23 Mar. 1984.

¹⁸⁵ *Australian Jewish News*, 9 June 2000.

¹⁸⁶ *On Target*, 10 Sept. 1982.

¹⁸⁷ *The Australian*, 28 Feb. 1984.

¹⁸⁸ *Your Rights* 2000, p. 102.

would skin him and castrate him. If the artist were a female, she would be cooked in boiling oil and then given to stray dogs for dinner.”¹⁸⁹

While Holocaust denial is specifically about Jews, it is indicative of a broader reconstruction of history in which events that do not suit the deniers’ white supremacist agenda can be rewritten. In the Australian context this leads deniers to revise Aboriginal history as part of their opposition to reconciliation. As Toben put it, “the mind-set that attempts to stop us from exploring the factual historical truth-content of the Jewish-Nazi Holocaust is similar to the mind-set that claims to have the Aborigines’ interests at heart.”¹⁹⁰

In this context Toben asserts about Australia’s indigenous population, “that Australia’s Aborigines originally came from southern India—thereby short-circuiting the silly story that their origin lies on some 40,000 year-dream-time mythology.”¹⁹¹ These views on Aboriginal history are directly related to the deniers’ contemporary political agenda,¹⁹² with Toben believing that “the land rights issue was carving up Australia into a number of different tribalistic homelands, i.e. creating ethnic Apartheid on the Australian continent.”¹⁹³ Land rights, acknowledging traditional ownership of the Indigenous population of the land they were dispossessed from by the colonial settlers, is a major item in the demand of the indigenous population to receive recognition and reconciliation and is a major issue in Australian politics.

Bennett similarly claims that the extent of the atrocities committed against the indigenous population is “often exaggerated for political reasons,” with this “exaggerated version” referred to by the media in order to “promote particular interests.”¹⁹⁴ He acknowledges some threats to Aboriginal civil liberties, but ignores high rates of mortality, unemployment and imprisonment, and is of the view that “the extent of the threat to the civil liberties of Aborigines and of discrimination against them is overstated.”¹⁹⁵ The distortion and lies evident in the deniers’ deliberation on Jews is also applied to Aborigines, with Muriden, for example, repeating the myths about Aboriginal cannibalism which he says is “factually correct” rather than “politically incorrect.”¹⁹⁶

The scaremongering directed at Asians is also applied to Aborigines, with Toben claiming Aboriginal land rights threaten “our

¹⁸⁹ <http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/news69.html>

¹⁹⁰ <http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/ayer.html> accessed 20 Jan. 2000.

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² A prominent political issue in Australia is addressing the genocide and dispossession of Australia’s indigenous population by colonial settlers.

¹⁹³ *New Times*, Nov. 1990.

¹⁹⁴ *Your Rights* (2000): 103.

¹⁹⁵ *Your Rights* (1998).

¹⁹⁶ *Exposure* (June–July 1997).

national unity and national well-being”¹⁹⁷ and Muriden describing for the ACLU the 1982 Mabo historic judgment which recognized that Australia was not *terra nullus*—an unpopulated country at the time of white settlement—as a “Black Australia policy.”¹⁹⁸

It is because of these shared beliefs that the deniers maintain close ties to organized racist groups as they promote each other and provide an outlet for their respective ideas.

THE BROADER RACIST RIGHT: HOLOCAUST DENIAL AND TIES TO THE LEAGUE, ADELAIDE INSTITUTE, AND ACLU

Part of the significance of Holocaust denial is that it represents a broader white supremacist agenda. As Nigel Jackson put it,

Our ‘democracy’ is a fraud; our parliaments have ceased to be truly representative; and behind-the-scenes money rules the day, in alliance with thin-gruel ideology and personal corruption. As a result, Australia has forfeited sovereignty over its own affairs; the people are confused, dispirited and increasingly angry; and massive and unnecessary unemployment pollutes the polity. I am at present one of those one million myself. In order to achieve a political renaissance, we need new ideas and a new understanding of the recent history of Europe (Of the last few centuries, especially). David Irving is merely the most publicised of many great writers whose labours have been making possible this necessary reassessment.¹⁹⁹

This world view and the deniers broad racist agenda provides a basis for working relations with a range of far Right groups for whom Holocaust denial is a unifying belief. These include:

Neo-Nazis

Unlike Europe and Northern America, neo-Nazis in Australia are small groups on the fringe of the Australian far Right, but they are in contact with the Holocaust denying organizations and have espoused Holocaust denial.

Prior to his embrace of Holocaust denial, Bennett’s only known reference to neo-Nazis was in 1971 when he sought to preserve the free speech of the Australian National Socialists.²⁰⁰ Once he embraced denial

¹⁹⁷ *New Times*, Nov. 1990.

¹⁹⁸ *New Times*, Apr. 1995.

¹⁹⁹ Jackson, *The Case for David Irving*, 60.

²⁰⁰ *The Age*, 13 Feb. 1971.

such contacts became more direct. His address to the second conference of the IHR appeared in *Perseverance*, the publication of the West Australian National Socialists and an article on immigration from *Your Rights* was republished with permission in *The Nationalist*, the monthly journal of the Australian Nationalist Movement.²⁰¹

For his part, Toben in 1990 “welcomed” an eighteen-year sentence for crimes including arson and assault by Jack Van Tongeren,²⁰² leader of the neo-Nazi Australian Nationalists Movement, but in 1998 he referred to him as a “political prisoner” whose greetings were read out at the Adelaide Institute international conference.²⁰³ In May 2000, Toben gave Van Tongeren a forum in the Adelaide Institute newsletter to explain how he had phoned Toben and the Adelaide Institute called on people to campaign for his release.²⁰⁴ Another group Toben publishes on his Internet site is the otherwise unknown Fascist Party of Australia.²⁰⁵

The main skinhead organization in Australia, National Action, has also espoused Holocaust denial. In 1988, they left abusive literature which included Holocaust denial at a parish of the progressive Uniting Church,²⁰⁶ and during a 1994 screening of *Schindler's List* in Adelaide, National Action members stood outside the cinema telling patrons the Holocaust did not happen.²⁰⁷ When National Action leader Michael Brander took a local newspaper to court for defamation in 1999 after being described as racist, his claim was dismissed, in part because of the organization's Holocaust denial and failure to condemn principles espoused by the Third Reich.²⁰⁸ Brander, who is from Adelaide, has attended a League meeting at which Toben and other Adelaide Institute associates were present, reflecting the common circles in which deniers and other far Right figures mix.²⁰⁹

New Age

In many instances Australian racist groups take their ideological lead from overseas racist groups whose ideas they import into Australia. However, one area where Australia provides the lead in racist thought and activity is New Age racism based on ideas relating to the Thule Society and lost civilizations. Unlike other fringe far Right groups, New Age racists, with their focus on UFOs, lost civilizations, and alternative

²⁰¹ *The Nationalist*, Mar. 1986.

²⁰² Toben to B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission, 2 Nov. 1990.

²⁰³ Adelaide Institute On Line newsletter, no 80.

²⁰⁴ *Adelaide Institute*, No. 108.

²⁰⁵ *Adelaide Institute*, June 2000.

²⁰⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 Aug. 1988.

²⁰⁷ *Australian Jewish News*, 15 Apr. 1994.

²⁰⁸ *The West Australian*, 20 Jan. 1999.

²⁰⁹ Conservative Speakers Club, Adelaide, 24 Jan. 2000.

health, and operating through their widely available glossy magazines *Nexus*, *New Dawn*, and *Hard Evidence*, attract a far-wider audience than most on the racist Right.

Melbourne-based *New Dawn* is headed by Robert Pash, who was associated with Libyan activities in Australia in the 1980s. It peddles the Holocaust denial conspiracy that Hitler was a victim of a powerful satanic force,²¹⁰ with Pash declaring after a 1983 visit to Libya, “the Libyans agree with me that one million not six million Jews were killed by the Nazis.”²¹¹ John Bennett has had material from *Your Rights* published in *New Dawn*.²¹²

Queensland-based *Nexus* magazine is the most successful of the three new age racist magazines with international sales in the tens of thousands across North America and Europe. With Editor Duncan Roads “open-minded” about the Holocaust,²¹³ *Nexus* embrace David Irving as “one of the western world’s most acclaimed and respected researchers,” stating that “his research is impeccable, and none dare challenge him on it.” In a review of his book *Hitler’s War* they say “If you ever wanted an unbiased history of World War II, Hitler’s War is a must-read book,” and a review of Irving’s video *The Search for Truth in History* concludes that “It is high time to publicly debate some of the points raised in this video.”²¹⁴

In an article in *Exposure* (as *Hard Evidence* used to be known), Peter Myers—who has also had articles published on the Adelaide Institute website arguing that the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are true—said “Hitler would not have had the level of support he did, if he had not also done some beneficial things.” Once again, the link between Holocaust denial and white supremacy is provided, with Myers adding about Australia’s White Australia discriminatory policy which up until 1972 allowed for white immigration only, “even though the sins of the white colonists are obvious, their critics stand upon the edifice they built: the roads, bridges, cities, universities, farms, airports, communication systems etc.”²¹⁵ This is indicative of the way these magazines can promote Holocaust denial to sectors of the population who would not otherwise be exposed to Holocaust denial, as is also seen by *Your Rights* being positively reviewed in *Exposure*.²¹⁶

²¹⁰ *New Dawn*, Issue 41.

²¹¹ *Willesee Show*, Channel 9, 22 May 1987.

²¹² *New Dawn*, Mar.–Apr. 1993.

²¹³ *New Statesman and Society*, 23 June 1995, 20.

²¹⁴ *Nexus*, Aug.–Sept. 1993.

²¹⁵ *Exposure* 5, no. 4 (Oct.–Nov. 1998).

²¹⁶ *Exposure* 7, no. 1 (Mar.–Apr. 2000).

Christian Identity

Although Christian Identity groups are not as significant in Australia as they are in America, like their American peers they subscribe to Holocaust denial. The head of the Victorian State division of the oldest Australian Identity group, the British Israel World Federation, Vic Propoach, said that the Holocaust has been “completely blown out of proportion” with “only” a few hundred thousand Jews dying, mostly of diseases,²¹⁷ while the organization’s Sydney bookroom sells Holocaust denial literature such as Arthur Butz’s *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*.

Christian Identity Ministries (CIM) is a more militant and secretive organization based in far-North Queensland and they too espouse denial, for example by selling tapes of Canadian denier Ernst Zündel. Promotion of this denial material in their newsletter states “Jewish maths: take 3.7 million...subtract 6 million dead, and the answer comes to over 4 million ‘survivors’ who are claiming ‘repatriations!’”²¹⁸ With CIM literature claiming there were no gas chambers at Auschwitz and that “the explosive *Leuchter Report* was correct,”²¹⁹ denial is a core CIM belief. This was reflected in the statements of two members of the local government in the New South Wales town of Coffs Harbour who were found in 1999 to be CIM members. Then councillor Bob Burton said, “I think you’ll find a lot of people killed were actually Poles” and then Mayor John Smith similarly said in 1999, “I don’t think there were that many of them around,”²²⁰ saying “six million? I think that is exaggerated?”²²¹ Media reports about Burton’s and Smith’s beliefs raised concern that they would use their local government positions to advance their CI and Holocaust denial agenda.

It follows that CIM support the entry into Australia of David Irving, with their publication commenting “I’m sure David Irving won’t mind being with the sheep on the right, when Christ separates the sheep from the goats.... I’ll bet the Christian churches couldn’t get an anti-Christ Rabbi banned from entering the country!”²²²

In addition to Identity groups being Holocaust deniers, some leaders of Holocaust denial groups are believers in Identity. Olga Scully, for example, distributes cartoons which refer to Anglo-Saxons as the lost tribes.²²³ Geoff Muriden rhetorically asked in a 1994 CIM article “were the Jews of Christ’s day also of the tribe of Judah?” before replying “No!

²¹⁷ *The Age*, 3 June 1999.

²¹⁸ *Christian Identity Ministries* (Sept. 1996).

²¹⁹ Untitled pamphlet, 1992.

²²⁰ *The Age*, 21 July 1999.

²²¹ *The Age*, 23 July 1999.

²²² Christian Identity Ministries Literature List, dated 1 January 1992.

²²³ As seen by author.

Were they of the god of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? No!” before concluding, “most people would identify the pseudo-Israelites or ‘synagogue of Satan’ of Christ’s day with modern Jews, when they are, in fact, modern Pharisees.”²²⁴ In his work for the Adelaide Institute and ACLU Muriden promotes Christian Identity. For example, he has referred attendees of a League of Rights meeting to the homepage of a Sydney-based Christian Identity group, the Covenant Vision Ministry (CVM),²²⁵ and his articles, including those in the Adelaide Institute Newsletter, have promoted Christian Identity Ministry books.²²⁶

The relationship that leaders of the three Holocaust-denying groups, such as Muriden, have with the broader racist Right helps raise the profile of denial amongst competing agenda items on the racist Right. These relationships also provide for mutual self-promotion and collaboration on issues of mutual concern, with CVM head and *Strategy* columnist Pastor Frank Dowsett, for example, saying he received a “recommendation” from the Adelaide Institute in response to attempts to curtail the problem of hate on the Internet.²²⁷

The Strategy is the main generalist far Right publication which endorses Christian Identity, and Muriden is a regular contributor. ACLU vice-president and *Strategy* columnist Jonathan Graham uses his column to discuss denial, referring readers to the *Leuchter Report*, Butz’s *Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, and a number of Holocaust-denying web sites, including David Irving’s and the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust.²²⁸ Once again, this enables the deniers to extend their message to the broader racist Right, with *Strategy* editor Ray Platt having personal contact with both Bennett and Butler.

AAFI

Opposition to Asian immigration and multiculturalism is a major issue for the racist Right and for much of the 1990s this was championed by Australians Against Further Immigration (AAFI).

AAFI had no policies on Jewish issues, but indicative of the way antisemitism was part of their xenophobic world view, AAFI election candidate Paul Madigan, who described how “All Italians are thieves,”²²⁹ spoke of a “Japanese invasion,”²³⁰ and accused Aborigines of “reverse

²²⁴ Christian Identity Ministries flier, undated 1994.

²²⁵ MEA tape of Muriden talk, 7 Sept. 1998.

²²⁶ *Adelaide Institute*, July 1995.

²²⁷ *Special Report*, no.1.

²²⁸ *The Strategy*, Mar. 2000.

²²⁹ Radio 3RRR, 25 May 1988.

²³⁰ Radio 3RRR, 30 May 1988.

racism,”²³¹ claimed that figures of Holocaust victims have been “changed” upward to six million.²³²

Although Holocaust denial was not AAFI policy, the party courted deniers as part of their campaigning, for example, speaking regularly at League meetings. As AAFI turned to deniers for promotion, with AAFI spokesman Dennis McCormack, for example, having an article published in the 1994 edition of *Your Rights*, they developed an increasingly close relationship to the deniers. This led Muriden to endorse AAFI in his *Strategy* column as the party to support in the 1996 Federal election, helping make deniers influential players in Australian far Right politics.²³³

Grahame Campbell and Australia First

Grahame Campbell was a maverick Labor MP expelled from the party in 1995 because of his ties to far Right groups, specifically AAFI and the League, but also because of his opposition to his party’s policy on multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation.

On leaving Labor he established the nationalist Australia First party with which deniers were involved from the outset, with John Bennett and Eric Butler amongst the 350 people who attended the launch in January 1996.²³⁴ Marginalized in the mainstream, Campbell turned to the fringe for endorsement, leading him to get Muriden’s support during the 1996 Federal election where Campbell worked in cooperation with AAFI.²³⁵ Active in the party from the outset the far Right, including deniers, became Campbell’s constituents, evident by his addressing the ACLU in 1996 on “Freedom of speech and the right to dissent,”²³⁶ by being his foot soldiers, with the League providing practical support such as letter boxing election flyers, and Toben highlighted what he perceived to be Campbell’s admirable position on Aboriginal affairs.²³⁷ Eventually Campbell joined the One Nation Party where he is now a leading figure likely to be a lead candidate seeking election to the West Australian state parliament or Federal parliament.

By being in a position to assist Campbell, the deniers appeared to influence him. Thus, while in 1993 he said there was “overwhelming evidence” about the extent of the Holocaust,²³⁸ when challenged about

²³¹ Radio 3RRR, May 16 1988.

²³² *Australian Financial Review*, 17 Aug. 1998.

²³³ *The Strategy*, Mar. 1996.

²³⁴ *Australia Israel Review*, 1 Feb.– 14 Feb. 1996.

²³⁵ *The Strategy*, Mar. 1996.

²³⁶ *ACLU Newsletter*, May 1996.

²³⁷ <http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/ayer.html> accessed 20 Jan. 2000.

²³⁸ *Australian Jewish News*, 8 Oct. 1993.

his League ties in 2000, Campbell parroted the League line of Hitler being a tool of the Jews, citing as evidence the fact that the Holocaust was an event that led to the establishment of the State of Israel and arguing “What about Stalin? You people never talk about Stalin and his crimes.”²³⁹

One Nation

One Nation was the far Right populist party established in 1997 and in the 1998 Federal election they gained over a million votes, replacing the Democrats on the left and the National Party on the right as the third largest party in terms of votes. Campaigning on the basis of opposition to Asian immigration, multiculturalism, and Aboriginal reconciliation, although One Nation leader Pauline Hanson had no record of personal involvement in far Right groups, her party attracted extensive far Right support.²⁴⁰

Although Jews did not feature on the One Nation agenda, like the broader racist Right the deniers lent their support to One Nation on the basis of the party’s anti-Asian, anti-multicultural, and anti-Aboriginal position and general worldview. As Toben said “If anyone says I support Pauline Hanson, it’s because in our work at the Adelaide Institute we focus on the national and international conflict, and Pauline Hanson, in my view, focuses on how to get the family back in order,”²⁴¹ highlighting what he perceived to be her admirable position on Aboriginal affairs.²⁴²

The League identified with Hanson, with Butler stating that the League agreed with her “views and policies.”²⁴³ The League encouraged their activists to support her,²⁴⁴ while their outlets sold One Nation literature. The ACLU published enthusiastic statements in Hanson’s defence,²⁴⁵ with Bennett claiming there was a campaign against her by commentators “many of whom doubtless see themselves as part of some sort of cultural and intellectual elite.”²⁴⁶

Hanson said she could not stop far Right groups, including Holocaust deniers, from expressing support for her party. However, she did not object to this support which resulted in the deniers becoming a legitimate part of One Nation’s constituency. For example, in March

²³⁹ Campbell, in a conversation with Prof. Andrew Markus at Chinese Heritage of Australia Federation Conference Melbourne, 1 July 2000.

²⁴⁰ Danny Ben-Moshe, “One Nation and the Australian Far Right,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 35, no. 3 (2001).

²⁴¹ *The Australian*, 9 Mar. 2001.

²⁴² <http://www.adam.com.au/fredadin/ayer.html> accessed 20 Jan. 2000.

²⁴³ *On Target*, 17 Jan. 1997.

²⁴⁴ *ADC Briefing* 1, no. 2.

²⁴⁵ *Your Rights* (1997).

²⁴⁶ *New Times*, June 1997.

2001 Toben attended a meeting Hanson addressed where he gave her support from the floor.²⁴⁷ Although she later said she did not know in advance of Toben's views, she did not reject them when she was told who Toben was.²⁴⁸ Indeed, when asked about far Right links as a whole, Hanson said she "couldn't care less."²⁴⁹ Deniers were the beneficiaries of such an attitude as they were able, through their involvement in One Nation, to enter the mainstream political process. Indeed, former AAFI candidate and Holocaust denier Paul Madigan was nominated as a One Nation candidate only to avoid preselection after the media reported his Holocaust denial views.²⁵⁰

Overall, what One Nation illustrated was not that Holocaust deniers could win mass support, but that it was a school of thought deemed acceptable by the broader populist Right. As such they have access to and can potentially influence far Right parliamentary representatives. Although One Nation has lost its original momentum and party founder Pauline Hanson is no longer a member of parliament, the vice-president of their West Australian power base elected in 2002, Edward Joseph Wall, has acted both for David Irving in his attempts to gain entry into Australia and for Toben while he was imprisoned in Germany and he openly identifies with the League.²⁵¹

Scott Balson

Scott Balson is the former One Nation webmaster who ran his own far Right Internet news daily, *National News of the Day*, for several years, ceasing publication in 2000. Its long list of Internet links, which included Jewish organizations, also included the Adelaide Institute²⁵² and David Irving's home page.²⁵³

While not a Holocaust denier himself, Balson provided deniers with a forum for their views, further illustrating how denial is viewed as legitimate on the far Right. Contributions included letters such as that from "Arthur H" titled "Anne Franks' diaries not so frank?"²⁵⁴ and "Renata." She prefaced her remarks with the disclaimer "to criticize Jews does not automatically mean you are anti-Jewish. Not all Moslims are 'cruel, vindictive and sly.' No more than all Jews are money-hungry, world-destroying vipers," before stating "But alas, many are." Renata

²⁴⁷ *The Australian*, 9 Mar. 2001.

²⁴⁸ *The Australian*, 9 Mar. 2001.

²⁴⁹ *The Australian*, 26 Oct. 2001.

²⁵⁰ *Australian Financial Review*, 17 Aug. 1998.

²⁵¹ *ADC Online*, Feb. 2002.

²⁵² @NOTD, 15 Feb. 2000.

²⁵³ @NOTD, 15 Mar. 2000.

²⁵⁴ <http://anotnews.tripod.com> 17 Feb. 2000.

then listed Jews being behind the Russian Revolution, Mussolini, and Hitler, before stating “there were actually less than ONE million Jews murdered in concentration camps.” The relationship between this Holocaust denial and contemporary antisemitism is seen with Renata continuing “It is well known that Jews, in some way or other, are behind most of the world’s troubles mainly because they want to take total control. If you don’t believe me, read ‘The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion,’ or read about the Illuminati, find out more about the Rockefellers, Rothschilds, etc.”²⁵⁵

The extent to which denial forms an important part of the “New World Order” conspiracy is reflected in an anonymous, unsourced article on Balson’s site which, critical of the detention of deniers in Germany, “suggests a coordinated international campaign on the part of the so-called ‘Western democracies’ to use the political and judicial system imposed upon Germany after 1945 as a basis for a system of ‘international law’ designed specifically to serve the purposes of the New World Order by transcending existing national constitutions and curtailing nationalist activities.”²⁵⁶

With a far Right figure such as Balson establishing this site and with deniers contributing to it, Balson provided deniers with a forum they may have otherwise been denied and in the process exposed others readers of his daily who are sympathetic to the Right to denial which they may not otherwise have been exposed to. This is a pattern of activity that is likely to be repeated on the many other burgeoning far Right Internet sites.

Denial and the Far Right: Conclusion

The public support garnered by parties such as AAFI, Australia First, and One Nation is generally of a populist nature concerned with the practical consequences of Asian immigration and Aboriginal land rights rather than the plans of elusive Jewish bankers. Indeed, as has been noted, Holocaust denial was not a policy for these parties.

There is growing evidence of tolerance of denial, legitimized in populist circles. By having access to populist far Right figures, such as Campbell above, suggests that deniers are able to influence them. This was seen in the case of John Pasquarelli, a one-time One Nation adviser with no known Holocaust denial views. However, he knew Bennett personally, took on the position of ACLU secretary and when pressed about his views on the Holocaust publicly defended Holocaust denial not with any apparent detailed knowledge of the subject but because of

²⁵⁵ @NOTD, 23 Sept. 1999.

²⁵⁶ @NOTD, 22 Feb. 2000.

his association with Bennett.²⁵⁷ While denial may not be the populist far Right's central belief, as the case of AAFI, Campbell, and Pasquarelli shows, it is undeniably close to its surface.

Furthermore, Holocaust deniers are sufficiently connected to the broader far Right and they use these links effectively to advance their cause. It is the far Right's tolerance of Holocaust denial that provides the deniers with a base to increase their support. For example, the militia magazine *Lock Stock and Barrel* does not directly espouse Holocaust denial, but it does carry advertisements from Olga Scully.²⁵⁸

For the hard core racist groups, as long as Jews remain central to the New World Order conspiracy, Holocaust denial remains an inevitable belief, especially because it fits into the New World Order conspiracy and because denial groups promote it in far Right circles. For example, E. Nowak, editor of a compilation articles about the Port Arthur conspiracy, *Port Arthur: The Mysteries of the Massacres*, has expressed views about how Jews established "a New World Order with a One World Government"²⁵⁹ and has cast doubt on the authenticity of the Holocaust.²⁶⁰

RESPONDING TO HOLOCAUST DENIAL: MORAL, LEGAL, AND EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

Australia has no constitutional right to freedom of speech as exists in America, but deniers benefit from the generally held view which regards freedom of speech as an integral part of Australia's democratic process and culture. Thus in the case of David Irving, although there was bipartisan support to deny him entry, the overwhelming majority of media commentary, while objecting to Irving's views and recognizing that he was racist, believed he should be granted entry on freedom of speech grounds. This sentiment was also reflected in a 1994 survey in which 81% of respondents believed that Holocaust denial should be protected and allowed under freedom of speech.²⁶¹

Media reports and survey findings do not of course mean that the journalists and survey respondents condone denial. However, it makes it more difficult to persuade the public when the Jewish communal position is that Holocaust denial should not be debated because doing so confers legitimacy on it. Indeed, it is the public position of freedom of speech that led the Jewish community to stop lobbying for Irving to be

²⁵⁷ Radio 3AW, 24 Aug. 2000.

²⁵⁸ *Lock Stock and Barrel*, no. 27.

²⁵⁹ *Bendigo Advertiser*, 23 Apr. 1991.

²⁶⁰ *La Trobe Valley Express*, 12 Apr. 1993.

²⁶¹ *The Age*, 20 July 1994.

denied an entry visa. Cognizant of the resonance of the freedom of speech argument, deniers will portray themselves as its champions, and this will remain a key part of their strategy. In this freedom of speech debate two facts must be understood.

First, underlying the deniers freedom of speech arguments are the stereotypes and Jewish conspiracy notions. As Jackson argued, “the ban itself [on Irving] has certainly been implemented by a craven and self-seeking government (and supported by an opposition of equal weakness) at the behest of the semi-secret establishment, internationalist in scope, whose power lies in the current financial system based upon usury, and whose ranks assuredly contain a very significant proportion of super-rich Jews.”²⁶² This is something bona fide free speech advocates, such as Electronic Frontiers Australia who support the free speech of deniers, need to be aware of.

Second, denial generates antisemitism, so protecting the denier’s freedom of speech must be balanced with protecting the denier’s Jewish targets. Denial can lead to overt antisemitism, such as that seen in 1999 when Toben was arrested in Germany for his denial activities and the Melbourne Holocaust Museum was graffitied with the slogan “Free Fredrick Toben and “Six million lies.”²⁶³ It can also put Holocaust survivors, of which Australia has the highest per capita number anywhere outside of Israel, on the defensive. It is what Nadine Fresco, a French authority on Holocaust denial, describes as the “double liquidation,” denying not only the dead but also the living.²⁶⁴ As the late Holocaust survivor and Australian Jewish academic Frank Knopfelmacher observed, with more than half of Australian Jewry made up of survivors, escapees, or their descendants, revisionists put their “Social legitimacy and reputation in question.”²⁶⁵

Despite freedom of speech concerns, unlike in America there is no First Amendment, but there are legal limitations on hate speech to which the Jewish community has recourse, primarily the 1995 Racial Hatred Act. This prohibits racially offensive or abusive behavior, covering public acts “reasonably likely in all the circumstances to offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate that person or group.”

The Executive Council of Australian Jewry (ECAJ) took action against both Toben and Scully under the act with the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC). In 2001, HREOC ordered Toben to remove material from his Internet site which breached the act

²⁶² Jackson, *The Case for David Irving*, 61.

²⁶³ *Australian Jewish News*, 14 May 1999.

²⁶⁴ Nadine Fresco, in *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory*, edited by Geoffrey Hartman (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 191.

²⁶⁵ Quoted in Jones, “Holocaust Revisionism in Australia,” 52.

by denigrating Jews, and to apologize to ECAJ,²⁶⁶ while Scully was similarly ordered to apologize for her literature which was found to “offend, insult, humiliate and intimidate Jewish persons who received the material or who became aware of the campaign.”²⁶⁷

However, for Toben and Scully the process reinforced their world view, with both stating they would ignore the findings. Toben, who walked out in protest of the proceedings,²⁶⁸ said “I shall do nothing. I cannot, because I consider the proceedings to have been immoral because truth was not a defence,”²⁶⁹ with Scully declaring “I’m ignoring it (the finding). I’m not taking any notice of it.”²⁷⁰

Both Toben and Scully could respond in this way because HREOC cannot enforce their decisions, however, the ECAJ took the cases to the Federal Court for enforcement. Toben and Scully used the process to repeat their position, with Toben expressing concern over the “make-up of the Federal Court” noting that Justices Alan Goldberg and Marcus Einfeld were Jewish, saying he would ask the judge hearing his case if he was a Zionist, indicating how the deniers antisemitism clashes with the rule of law.²⁷¹

Toben responded to the pending case by switching to an overseas Internet Service provider, but in a 2002 landmark ruling, the Federal Court found the 1995 Racial Hatred Act applied to the Internet and ordered Toben to remove material from his Internet site. The Federal Court ruled that he would be in contempt of court if he refused to do so, making him accountable under Australian law even if the material is hosted in another jurisdiction. This is an important precedent in relation to online racism in Australia and may also influence similar deliberations by courts overseas. The Federal Court decision against Toben, which was upheld following an appeal, was also of particular importance because it found Holocaust denial breached the Racial Hatred Act objectively, rather than being subjective to the feelings of the complainant. Scully was also found to breach the act with the risk that if she continued to distribute her material she would be in contempt of

²⁶⁶ *Herald-Sun*, 5 Apr. 2001.

²⁶⁷ *The Examiner*, 27 Sept. 2000.

²⁶⁸ *The Age*, 3 Nov. 1998.

²⁶⁹ *The Age*, 11 Oct. 2000.

²⁷⁰ *The Australian*, 28 Sept. 2000.

²⁷¹ *Australian Jewish News*, 6 Apr. 2001. Similarly, while Holocaust denial was given a major blow by David Irving’s loss of his libel trial in London in 2000, it has served to reinforce the deniers worldview. On behalf of the Adelaide Institute, Muriden wrote, “The judge’s decision against Irving represents a serious challenge to freedom of enquiry about the events of WWII, including the Holocaust and is another sign of the creeping growth of authoritarian control of historical thought. He who controls the past controls the future.” @NOTD, 12 Apr. 2000.

court. Toben has removed offending material and the threat of being in contempt of court should he add denial material to his Internet site remains. As is noted above, in the absence of being able to espouse denial directly, Toben does so indirectly through his focus on the Palestinian issue.

These cases demonstrate the value in racial vilification legislation in confronting Holocaust denial, but there are undoubtedly risks in the legal process. In Tasmania where the Scully case was heard, it led to front page coverage in the press. Moreover, with cases taking a long time before they are heard by HREOC and then enforced by the Federal Court (the Toben and Scully cases took six years), there is still scope for deniers to propagate their material, sometime with the advantage of the publicity that goes with a legal challenge. With Scully being declared bankrupt, the Jewish organizational plaintiffs may be unable to recover their costs.²⁷² Ultimately, if Toben moved overseas it would be hard to enforce any decision handed down by an Australian Court but his legal liability would probably prevent his return to Australia.

Moreover, despite the important precedent of the High Court decision against Toben the ability of the judiciary to identify the antisemitic nature of denial remains a moot point. When, for example, the Jewish Community Council of Victoria sought an interim injunction to prevent the screening of Irving's film at the Melbourne Underground Film Festival, the judge said it may be offensive to some members of the Jewish community but it did not constitute racial vilification under the Victorian Racial and Religious Tolerance Act. He found the film to be "quite bland" despite references such "traditional enemies" and "dining out on the Holocaust." Reflecting the importance of freedom of speech in Australia, the judge said he made the ruling to uphold "the right of all Victorian to engage in robust discussion."²⁷³

Legal responses to Internet regulation will prove pivotal in the future of Holocaust denial in Australia and indeed internationally. With Toben noting that "the Internet gives us global access that would normally not be available,"²⁷⁴ the League, the ACLU, and the Adelaide Institute have campaigned heavily on this issue with the latter, for example, lobbying the Internet Industry Association in 1998 not to include a ban of racist sites in their voluntary code of ethics. Further acts of this nature can be expected, which places an onus on Internet Service Providers to demonstrate corporate social responsibility in these matters.

In terms of Holocaust denial on the Internet, the work of Australian deniers will also be affected by the situation overseas. In his

²⁷² *Australian Jewish News*, 8 Nov. 2002.

²⁷³ *The Age*, 8 July 2003.

²⁷⁴ *The Age*, 13 Nov. 1999.

German trial, for instance, Toben was acquitted of charges of defaming the memory of the dead on the Internet because the offending information was installed outside the German jurisdiction. However, an appeal to the German Supreme Court found he could be tried as the material could be downloaded in Germany. This has global implications for Internet regulation, but its practical effect means that Toben is unlikely to return to Germany. This indicates that the future prospects of Holocaust denial in Australia will be directly affected by global responses to it.

Denial in Australia will also be effected by developments in the denial movement overseas. For example, the reduced funding that the IHR has compared to the past will effect the activities it can offer in Australia and the support it can offer figures such as Toben.

In terms of responding to Holocaust denial, the Jewish community runs extensive Holocaust educational programs while in both government and private high schools, Holocaust literature such as the *Diary of Anne Frank* is widely read. However, educational authorities, both Jewish and general, will need to consider as part of these efforts the development of specific educational programs aimed at addressing the issue of Holocaust denial. This will be increasingly important as survivors of the Holocaust, who speak to thousands of schoolchildren each year, pass away.

In considering educational initiatives there is a dilemma about whether they should be specifically directed at denial itself or focused on educating about the Holocaust, based on the rationale that educating about deniers just attracts attention to them. The reality is that education about denial is happening, for example the New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies include it in their Holocaust educational material in Australia and the International School for Holocaust Studies at Yad Vashem have produced a guide on denial for teachers.²⁷⁵ In future years, further resources and intellectual capital will need to be invested in developing appropriate educational resources that balance pointing out the danger of denial without bringing unwarranted attention to it.

One option that balances the two schools of thought is to ensure that Holocaust studies are taught in such a way that Holocaust education addresses the issues raised by denial without addressing denial itself. This means, for instance, teaching how the *Endlösung der Judenfrage*—the “Final Solution of the Jewish Question”—was undertaken in a secretive manner because the Nazis recognized how different it was. This leads to a study of the euphemisms that were accordingly employed, such as gas

²⁷⁵ Ephraim Kaye, *Desecrators of Memory: Confronting Holocaust Denial* (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1997).

chambers and crematoria known as *Spezialeinrichtungen* (special installations) or *Bade-anstalten* (bath houses), with the killing described as *Sonderbehandlung* (special treatment).

Unfortunately the pedagogic agenda will in part be set by the deniers with the *Leuchter Report*, for example, making it necessary to teach that it takes less gas to kill humans than delouse clothes. It needs to be taught that the Nazis tried to destroy all evidence, and to explain how and why gas chambers were reconstructed after the war. Jewish involvement in Communism in Russia may also need to be explained in the context of the antisemitic Tsarist regime that some Jews wished to see overthrown. Not least, it needs to be taught that research into the Holocaust is ongoing.

An indication of the potential for Holocaust denial was provided by the best selling and award winning 1994 book, *The Hand That Signed the Paper*, which demonstrated that some of Australia's leading literary figures and intellectuals were willing to embrace and defend a book whose central thesis, while not denying the Holocaust, found a justification for it.²⁷⁶ This "justification" of Jewish-Bolshevik persecution of Ukrainians is an argument held in common with the Holocaust deniers. Little surprise that all three Holocaust denying organisations enthusiastically embraced the book. Although *The Hand That Signed the Paper* is a work of fiction and as such is distinct from the embrace of overt denial, this experience suggests that a time may arise when literary figures similarly defend a work of Holocaust denial in principle. Indeed, in February 2000, the Victorian Minister for the Arts, Mary Delahunty, in a hypothetical discussion said she would hope to "have the courage" to put public money into a play based on the work of David Irving.²⁷⁷

While Holocaust denial in Australia will be influenced by events overseas, certain factors influencing the local movement are acute to Australia, foremost of which is the distance from the areas where the Holocaust took place. This can have a dual and potentially contradictory effect. While deniers could seek to exploit this comparative lack of immediacy about the Holocaust, unlike European deniers whose countries experienced losses at the hand of the Allies, the Australian deniers have fewer potential supporters interested in the relativizing of events of the Second World.

²⁷⁶ Helen Demidenko/Davrrville, *The Hand That Signed The Paper* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1994).

²⁷⁷ Arts Today, ABC Radio National, 16 Feb. 2000. When criticized for this, she said Holocaust revisionism was outside the boundaries of what is acceptable and therefore would not be publicly supported. Mary Delahunty to B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission, Inc., 21 Feb. 2000.

While it is easy to dismiss Holocaust deniers as extremists, in the context of freedom of speech and the passage of time since the Holocaust, the advantages of the Internet and international support, the potential exists for them to establish that there is an alternative history to the Holocaust. Although the 1994 survey found that 93% of Australians said the Holocaust certainly happened, there are signs that the deniers have succeeded in making people think there is a legitimate alternative point of view on the Holocaust, with seven out of ten respondents to the survey saying they had heard the claim being contested.²⁷⁸ That this has entered the mainstream was evident in January 2000 when Melbourne's *Herald-Sun* tabloid had a phone poll at the time of the Irving-Lipstadt trial asking "Do you agree with historian David Irving's view of the Holocaust?"²⁷⁹

Acceptance of denial's core thesis is not limited to the racist fringe. The Chief Historical Examiners for the High School certificate in one state and a school history teacher in another have reportedly said, when referring to revisionism, that there is an alternative point of view.²⁸⁰ A danger lies in the appeal of relativism to Western liberalism as was seen in Norman Finkelstein's 2000 book, *The Holocaust Industry*. Furthermore, as Yehuda Bauer observed, there has been a tendency throughout history of people to deny life-threatening events because they threaten our sense of security.²⁸¹

Wherever Holocaust denial occurs and whatever form it takes it will continue to employ the discredited methods it has employed to date, namely: inventing information and presenting it as fact; quoting information again and again until it is no longer checked and is accepted as fact; and focusing on single claims to disprove the whole. As time from original claims and sources lapses and the Holocaust survivors themselves pass away, second and third generation survivors will have a role in countering this trend.²⁸²

Ultimately, the success of denial will depend on the success of the broader far Right. The One Nation experience, where party leader Pauline Hanson accepted the support and involvement of all three denial groups demonstrates that with denial accepted by the far Right it would benefit from the far Right's political success. While the rehabilitation of

²⁷⁸ *The Age*, 20 July 1994.

²⁷⁹ *Herald-Sun*, 14 Jan. 2000. To the Herald-Sun's credit they did not publish the results and apologized to the Holocaust Museum for running the poll.

²⁸⁰ As told to author by author by Avraham Biderman, award winning author of a Holocaust autobiography, *The World of My Past*.

²⁸¹ Avraham Biderman, *The World of My Past* (Milson's Point, NSW, Australia and London: Vintage, 1998), 40.

²⁸² Referring to the children and grandchildren of survivors as such is a term that deniers contest, but it is a widely accepted and, in the authors view, appropriate term.

Nazism that Holocaust denial represents has little direct resonance in Australia, whose soldiers fought against the Nazis, its anti-Asian and anti-Aboriginal white supremacist agenda has broader appeal in a country with a history of official racial discrimination in the White Australia policy.

With people prepared to invest in denial as seen by Australian contributions to the legal proceedings of Irving and Toben, with the Internet as a medium, a culture where denial is seen not as racial vilification but freedom of speech and with the passing away of Holocaust deniers, the prospects exist for Australia's Holocaust deniers to build on the progress they have made over the last two decades. While hard core deniers number around two dozen, scores are known to attend their meetings, hundreds are sympathizers, and they reach thousands through their mailing lists.

The nature of denial is such that constant vigilance of its activities is required, but in this context it is important that Jewish groups are selective about which manifestations of denial they respond to and the way in which they do so. Not every case can be fought and cases must be fought in a way that denies the deniers the publicity they seek and affects public perceptions about freedom of speech in relation to Holocaust denial. Jewish groups must also be vigilant to the emergence of denial outside of far Right circles, particularly amongst the Left as part of their anti-Israel campaign.

While the impact of the deniers on the mainstream is limited and they have neither the profile or effect of their overseas peers, their activities and supporters have increased significantly since the 1960s and 1970s when, with the exception of the League, denial was espoused by two lone operators.²⁸³ Legal losses suffered by Toben and Scully in Australia and Irving in London are major setbacks to denial in Australia, but its future will depend on legal and educational responses and the Jewish community's ability to convey the fact that Holocaust denial with its broad white supremacist agenda is not just a Jewish concern.

²⁸³ De Wykeham de Louth and H. F. Brus, described in Rubenstein, "Early Manifestations."