

THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Vol. 47, No. 8

AUGUST 1983

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

UNWRAPPING THE RIDDLE OF RUSSIA'S RULERS

As every student of Communism knows, it is impossible to discuss the history of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, and the subsequent history of the Soviet Union, without reference to the Jewish Question. Just as many completely misread the role of Hitler in furthering the strategy of International Zionism, so there are those who accept at face value Zionist inspired propaganda, which pictures the Soviet as now being anti-Jewish. Masters of the art of disinformation, the Soviet is currently promoting a new book, *The Class Essence of Zionism*, which, while holding that Israel has a right to exist as a sovereign state, also refers to Jewish monopolists and bankers seeking to dominate the world. It would be instructive to have the views of the Rothschilds and other Jewish financial supporters of the Soviet!

The following in-depth article by South African writer, Mr. Ivor Benson, in the June issue of his journal, *Behind the News* (Box 1564, Krugersdorp, South Africa, 1740).

NEW YORK — An estimated 180,000 people marched through New York City to a rally on Sunday accusing the Soviet Union of persecuting Jews and restricting their emigration.

News item, 24th May 1983

Who rules in the Soviet Union?

It is a question over which Western conservatives continue to be somewhat confused and divided: Do the Jews in the Soviet Union still have their hands on the levers of power? Or have they been shouldered out of the way by representatives of the Russian majority, the real Russians?

No one doubts that the Bolshevik Revolution was a Jewish exercise, as were the Marxist revolutions about the same time in Germany and Hungary. The facts were clearly stated in 1922 by Winston Churchill, then Secretary for War and Air in the British Government, who had at his service the entire investigative resources of his government's Military Intelligence and diplomatic corps; and the picture he then presented is relevant to any assessment of the global revolutionary situation today:

• This movement among the Jews is not new. From the days of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia) Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxemburg (Germany) and Emma Goldman (United States), this worldwide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognisable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the Nineteenth Century, and now, at last, this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of this enormous empire.

(Winston Churchill, end of quote).

Churchill was not exaggerating, for official Bolshevik statements in 1920 showed that 545 members of the chief ruling bodies included 447 Jews, and even as late as 1933 the American Jewish journal *Opinion* was able to report that one-third of an estimated Jewish population of 3,000,000 were Soviet officials. In White Russia 61 percent of all officials were Jews, most of them, we may be sure, in the higher echelon of government.

Douglas Reed, the London *Times* correspondent who accompanied British Foreign Minister Anthony Eden on a visit to Moscow in 1935, wrote: "The censorship department, and that means the whole machine for controlling the game

and muzzling the foreign press, was entirely staffed by Jews, and this was a thing that puzzled me more than anything else in Moscow".

It was at this time also, however, that, as Reed put it, "Jewish heads became fewer among the row that dotted the Kremlin wall" on those rare occasions when the Russian masses were allowed to get a glimpse of their leaders. And it was between 1935 and 1938 that the world was treated to the spectacle of several great show trials which resulted in the elimination of "old guard" Bolshevik leaders, many of them Jews. *¹

THE DISPOSSESSED

Did this mean that already in the mid 1930s the Soviet Union's Jews were in the process of being dispossessed of the enormous power they acquired at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution?

Not so, said Russian émigré A. Stolypine in 1937. The substitution of Russians and others for Jews on the highest rungs of the official ladder, he said, was only a tactical move, for the Jews still held in their hands the principal levers of control *through terror*, these including the concentration and slave labour camps, prisons and secret police. They also controlled the entire news distribution system and censorship, and the system of political commissars through which the armed forces were kept under terrorist discipline.

Solzhenitsyn has avoided direct reference to the role of the Jews in the Soviet Union, but in *The Gulag Archipelago Two* he has printed photographs of six of the great concentration camp bosses, all Jews, including one Naftaly Frenkel, one-time Black Sea timber millionaire, who is said to have been the architect of the entire slave labour system, designed to destroy all those prisoners from whom no more labour could be squeezed. And the Germans who fought on the eastern front could testify that "political commissars" who fell into their hands were almost invariably Jews.

The fact of Jewish predominance in the Soviet Union for some years after the Bolshevik Revolution can now be accepted as an indisputable fact of history. If, therefore, it is now argued that the tables have been turned and that the real Russians are back in power, an important question calls for an answer: At what moment, or over what period of time, did this happen? Plus other questions, like: What were the signs that it was happening?

For, surely, if the events in St. Petersburg in 1917 which enabled "this band of extra-ordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of the world" to become "undisputed masters of this enormous empire" could be described as "ten days which shook the world", then, surely,

their dispossession would be a correspondingly momentous happening!

In the West one of the leading proponents of the idea that the Jews in the Soviet Union have lost top-dog position is Wilmot Robertson who, in the latest and updated edition of his book *The Dispossessed Majority*, writes: "Today the Soviet Union's ruling clique is once again composed almost entirely of Slavs, with a strong emphasis on Great Russians. As for the Soviet Jews, they eventually became the target of an official anti-Zionist and quasi-official anti-Semitic campaign — a turn of events which constituted a supreme act of ingratitude towards Marx and other prime movers of Soviet communism".

This reversal of fortune for the Jews, he explains, can be traced to the fact that during the last war, "At the height of the German attack, when Russia was on the verge of collapse, the Russian majority came back into favour, since it was called upon to do most of the fighting".

Wilmot Robertson expands on this theme in his book *Ventilations*, in which he remarks that the present Kremlin leadership could do no better in its efforts to rebut accusations of anti-Semitism than "trot out an obscure deputy premier Dimschitz". What he evidently did not know is that this "obscure deputy premier", Dymshits, *² was and still is the Kremlin's economic "czar" who, with Lazar Kaganovich, has helped to maintain an unbroken line of Jewish control over the Soviet Union's economic existence ever since the Bolshevik Revolution, the big boss with whom Western bankers and businessmen have to deal.

"My conclusions are admittedly based on thin evidence", says Robertson, adding: "I doubt, however, if there is a firmer foundation for the theory that Russia is still part of a Jewish-directed international communist conspiracy".

We must agree with Robertson that if real power in the Soviet Union was restored to the real Russians this could only have happened during World War II or immediately thereafter, since no plausible case can be made out for it having happened earlier.

It can be counted among the indisputable facts of history that during most of the war years virtually all power was concentrated in the hands of Generalissimo Stalin, who was not a Jew, although said to have had a Jewish wife. But then, neither was Stalin a "majority" Russian, being Georgian, a representative of one of the minority ethnic groups which the Jews drew into the Bolshevik Revolution and with which they tried to mask the Jewish character of their operation.

It is also indisputably true, as Robertson remarks, that when Russia was on the verge of collapse the Russian majority "came back into favour" since only they could supply the military might needed to halt the German onslaught.

Technically, therefore, there can be no doubt that there did come a time when the party hierarchy, almost numb with fright as Hitler's forces come knocking at Moscow's gates, willingly surrendered its power to a gentile, knowing that as head of the armed forces he was being given an opportunity of establishing a personal power base quite independent of them and the party.

Looking at the confused picture immediately after the end of World War II, Churchill is said to have described the Soviet Union as "a riddle, wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma".

What we want to know is whether the all-powerful Stalin ceased to operate as an agent of the Jewish revolutionary forces, which he had served for more than 20 years as Lenin's successor in the Kremlin.

We can find some sort of answer to that question in history's account of what happened within that huge slice of Europe that fell into the Soviet sphere of influence as a result of the Yalta Agreement. Did we here see any halting of the march of that "worldwide conspiracy" described by Churchill?

Here is how Douglas Reed answers that question in his book *The Controversy of Zion*:

- In communised Poland the United States Ambassador, Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, saw and recorded the prevalence of Jews, many of them alien, in the key posts of terrorism . . .
- To communise Hungary, the terrorists of 1919 Matyas Rakosi (born Roth in Yugoslavia) returned as premier in 1945 and on this occasion had the Red Army to keep him in that office. Eight years later (1953) the Associated Press reported, "90 per cent of the high officials in the Hungarian Communist regime are Jews, including Premier Matyas Rakosi". The *London Times* in that year said Mr. Rakosi's cabinet was "predominantly Jewish" . . .
- Of communised Czechoslovakia, the *London New Statesman* (a trustworthy authority in such questions) wrote seven years after the war's end: "In Czechoslovakia, as elsewhere in Central and South-Eastern Europe, both the party intellectuals and the key men in the secret police are largely Jewish in origin" . . .
- Of Rumania the *New York Herald Tribune* reported in 1953 eight years after the war's end: "Rumania, together with Hungary, has probably the greatest number of Jews in its administration". In Rumania the terror raged under Anna Pauker, a Jewess, whose father, a rabbi, and brother were in Israel . . .
- In communised East Germany the reign of terror was presided over by one Frau Hilde Benjamin, who was first made vice-president of the Supreme Court there and then Minister of Justice. "Red Hilde" is frequently described as a Jewess in the press . . . The *Johannesburg Zionist Record* in 1950 reported, "The Supreme Judge in the Eastern sector of Berlin is a Jew and so are several senior judges in the provinces outside Berlin. In the press, too, as well as in the theatres, quite a considerable number of Jews have been given responsible positions" . . .

(Douglas Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*)

All this happened while Stalin was undisputed *supremo* in the Kremlin; hence, no matter how much power he now held in his own right, no matter how independent of the party machine, he did continue to promote the purposes of an international revolutionary movement of which the real Russians, as Churchill, and later Solzhenitsyn, remarked, had always been the major victims.

'DECEPTION OF NATIONS'

What is needed is a brief and simple narrative capable of gathering up a mass of seemingly contradictory evidence — the arrest of the Kremlin doctors, most of them Jewish, when Stalin believed that attempts were being made to assassinate him; the continued existence of innumerable millionaire Jewish "capitalists" and a vast network of Jewish-owned industrial and commercial enterprise; *² many signs towards the end of Stalin's life of "an official anti-Zionist and quasi-official anti-Semitic campaign"; freedom for Jews — denied to all other minority groups — to quit the Soviet Union in great numbers, most of them to find their way to the United States of America; the Soviet role in the setting up of the state of Israel and as first major supplier of arms to that state; the uninterrupted flow of Western finance, technology, wheat and other forms of assistance to the Soviet Union, all of it unthinkable without Western Jewish approval; the considerable involvement of Jews in pro-Soviet subversive activity in the United States, including the theft and transfer of atomic bomb secrets; etc.

And to cap it all, a massive campaign of de-Stalinisation after the dictator's death.

The world may have to wait a long time for a "brief and simple narrative" capable of absorbing all the apparent contradictions, but it is possible in the meantime to explain some of them.

There is good reason to believe that there always was a felt need to prevent a revolutionary movement with global ambitions from being too clearly identified as Jewish, and it was for this reason that the choice fell on Stalin as the

successor of Lenin, who if not himself a Jew was at least married to a Jewess, with whom he is said to have conversed at home in Yiddish.

The disappointment of the hopes of the obviously Jewish Trotsky gave rise to a good deal of tension inside the Jewish hierarchy, which only worked itself out in the mid-1930s with the elimination of leading members of the "old guard" who had become unhappy about Stalin's increasing power.

The pragmatists prevailed, convinced of the need to relieve international socialism of the handicap of an almost exclusively Jewish image, but aware, too, of the risks involved.

This would explain the replacement of Jewish heads where they would be most conspicuous to all the world — on the Kremlin wall in ceremonial occasions — while themselves retaining, as Stolypine says, all the instruments of *rule by terror* and all avenues of access to the minds of the people — not to mention continued undivided control of the country's economic existence.

A certain amount of overt "anti-Semitism" that could be publicised abroad is not inconsistent with this interpretation.

'THE JEWISH PARADOX'

There was, too, nothing genuinely "anti-Semitic" about the "official anti-Zionism", for there always was a certain antagonism of ideas on this subject within the Jewish community inside Russia since long before the Bolshevik Revolution, as Chaim Weizmann has explained in his autobiography *Trial and Error*. *3

Therefore, a mass anti-Soviet demonstration in New York, as reported in May, 1983, does not necessarily mean what it seemed to mean: it does not necessarily mean, as Mayor Edward Koch put it, that "today the Soviet system still maintains a stranglehold on the lives of its citizens but nowhere does the hand of oppression grip tighter than at the throats of the Soviet Jews".

It is perhaps significant that the only forms of "oppression" mentioned in press reports of this rally were the clamp put on Jewish emigration and the detention of a few academics.

And very few of the 180,000 who are said to have attended the rally may have suspected that it might be the stranglehold of their own leaders they most of all have to fear, both inside and outside the Soviet Union.

The Zionist-Communist nexus can be explained in a few words: For Jews, a homogeneous Zionist or *National Socialism*; for others, a heterogeneous *international socialism* that the Jews will control — two areas of endeavour which outside the USSR frequently overlap.

It is reasonable to suppose that after the war's end the party hierarchy found itself wrestling with the problem of how to deprive Stalin of the enormous personal power he had acquired, now supported by his generals; and it is reasonable to suppose that Stalin, in his efforts to cling onto that power found Jews in the forefront of those now bent on cutting him down to size; hence more phenomena that could be interpreted as "anti-Semitism" and persecution.

This interpretation is consistent with what happened after Stalin's death. None of those who followed him in the top position appears to have had any power in his own right.

The atmosphere that prevailed in the Kremlin as Stalin's struggle to cling onto his power manifested itself increasingly as a struggle against his Jewish comrades is reflected in the "notes for a journal" left by Maxim Litvinov, former Foreign Minister, by now relieved of his job and his country residence. *4

There can be a big difference between what can be known or reasonably believed and what can be *proved*.

Those who know as much as Wilmot Robertson about the

situation in the United States are convinced that in that country the "majority", the real Americans who opened up the country — sometimes described as the "White Anglo-Saxon Protestants" or WASPS — no longer possess the power they once had, hence the title of his excellent book, *The Dispossessed Majority*. Yet there are millions of people in America, many of them otherwise well educated, who have come to no such understanding.

Therefore, Robertson should have been warned not to attach too much importance to certain signs that, as he put it, "the Soviet Union's ruling clique is once again composed almost entirely of Slavs". If the same reasoning is valid for the United States it must follow that the WASP "majority" is as firmly entrenched there as ever it was, with an unbroken succession of majority representatives in the White House and no signs of minority *predominance* in the administration, the judiciary included — over-representation, perhaps, but not predominance that would put the minority clearly on top.

We cannot hope to be able to form any clear and coherent opinion about what is happening at the highest levels of power in either the United States or the Soviet Union, or anywhere else in the Western world for that matter, *unless we can bring into our investigation a great deal of accumulated knowledge of a special kind*. This knowledge has to do with Power, what forms it takes and how it can be exercised; for this is an arcane science, or rather a combination of art and science, a subject which Western universities evidently consider too dangerous to handle.

It is possible to be reasonably sure of an opinion that cannot be proved because it is possible to accumulate in the computer of the memory and to analyse and synthesize particles of knowledge of quantity and kind language cannot communicate. Just about everything that has happened since the Bolshevik Revolution, both inside and outside the Soviet Union, has some light to throw on a question of the greatest imaginable importance: Whose now is that power we know as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

All this information, or as much of it as any individual can collect and comprehend, can be summed up with the statement that there are no firm grounds for the belief that the Russian people have freed themselves from those who held them by the hair of their heads and have continued ever since to live out the pattern of Marxist-Leninist totalitarianism at home and in close co-operation with their former oppressors both at home and abroad.

Western investigators have no vested interest in believing that the international conspirators described by Winston Churchill still lord it in that vast empire; on the contrary, they would like to be able to believe that the nation of Tolstoy, Gogol, Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Chekov, Turgenev, Tschai-kovsky, Borodin, Solzhenitsyn, etc., has managed to take the control of its destiny back into its own hands.

They have a right to rest on the assumption that *there has been no change* inside the USSR, leaving where it belongs the whole onus of proving the contrary.

This article is an abridged version of a chapter in a book being published abroad, soon to be available.

NOTES: *1 A lively eyewitness account of the 1938 trials is given by Fitzroy Maclean in *Eastern Approaches*. See also, Litvinov's *Notes for a Journal*. *2 Konstantin Sunis, *USSR, the Land of Kleptocracy* (See *Behind the News*, August, 1981, 'Underground Millionaires of the USSR'). *3 In *Behind the Scene*, Douglas Reed summarises and analyses Chaim Weizmann's autobiography. *4 Maxim Litvinov, *Notes for a Journal*.

It pains us that the West heedlessly confuses the words 'Russian' and 'Russia' with 'Soviet' and 'USSR' . . . It is a thoughtless blunder to consider the Russians the 'ruling nationality' in the USSR. The Russians were the recipients, under Lenin, of the first crushing blow.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn,
'Assessment for 1980'.

The Results of Bonking Control

THE SEVENTH CHAPTER FROM

The Monopoly of Credit

By C. H. Douglas

(1937 Revised and Enlarged Edition)

Perhaps the major difficulty, which confronts the student of large-scale organisation, is to decide to what extent it is practicable to question principles, which have been regarded as axiomatic. While there has been continuous conflict of opinion in regard to forms of government, the necessity for government of some kind has not in responsible quarters seriously been questioned. Yet on the face of it, government, in the sense in which it is commonly understood, can easily be put upon its defence, and has in fact throughout history been continuously upon its defence. There is essentially no difference between the principles of modern government and those of the most oppressive of the tyrannies of history. The mechanism is different, the results on the whole may be considerably more satisfactory, but in each case the essential consist in an infringement upon personal liberty.

It would be anachronistic to inject into the consideration of this situation any question of what are called human rights. Perhaps the clearest fact, which emerges from the present flux in the world of ideas and of action, is that the human individual has no rights except those, which he can sustain. It does not however, seem to require much consideration to admit that the general interest is well served by the elimination of certain courses of action on the part of the individual, murder being perhaps an instance. But having arrived at this point, we have by no means disposed of the fundamental problem. What is it, which causes murder, and do we deal most satisfactorily with the problem of murder by the imposition of severe penalties upon the murderer, or on the other hand by concentrating the whole forces of society to remove any incentive to murder? Or, to put the matter another way, is murder a form of mental aberration, or is it a reaction from an environment, which can be changed?

As a practical problem there is probably no clear answer to this dilemma in the present stage of human progress. It is arguable that we could eliminate murder if we could with sufficient rapidity modify the predisposing causes to murder, which are involved in a defective economic and social system, and at the same time remove the mental complexes, which have been produced by those defects. But it cannot be done by a stroke of the pen, or by any action. Governmental or otherwise, which is in the range of practical politics, and it is probably accurate to say that the most rapid progress is possible by a modification of environment accompanied by a decreasing, but not too rapidly decreasing, system of control. If the problem could be kept upon the plane of pure reason, it would still be a large problem, but it would be simplicity itself in comparison with the practical problem, which confronts the world at the present time. Each one of the factors is itself the battlefield of warring interests. Governmental systems seem to have a life of their own, with all the determination of the living organism to maintain its existence. The decay of doctrinal religion has to a large extent deprived humanity of any clear objective, attainable or otherwise, and it would appear that indirect progress, or the solution of the problems of life from day to day in the light of experience, is for the moment the only solid ground upon which to build.

At first sight this situation seems to lend powerful sup-

port to a policy of what in fact promises to be a world dictatorship. To those who have no practical experience of large organisations, which is in essence the position of Bankers, there is an attractive logic about a world planned and controlled like a machine. But, in fact, society does not work like a machine, but like a living organism. Any works manager will testify that the surest and shortest method of bringing about what is called labour trouble, is to endeavour to organise his factory as though the difference between the tools and the men in it were merely a difference of degree. At the beginning of the European War in 1914, collectivism, which is clearly allied to this idea of a machine-organised world, was almost as prevalent amongst the executive and administrative grades of industry as amongst the manual workers. Four years of organisation under war conditions, which brought into being collectivist mechanism to an extent otherwise impossible, disillusioned both the worker and the technician, not so much as to the soundness of the theory regarded as a means of attaining maximum production, as in regard to its extreme social unattractiveness.

Italy and Russia have, since the European War, had their own special forms of collectivist organisation, which it would be absurd to denounce as having failed from the purely materialistic point of view. It would be equally untrue to suggest that in either of them is there any approach to general satisfaction with the type of civilisation to which they tend, and still less ground for supposing that the extension of the policy for which they both appear to stand, in the direction of a world state organised on the philosophy of the subservience of the individual to the organisation, would be likely to meet with any more general approbation. Without going too deeply into this aspect of the problem, it seems safe to suggest that the supposition that individuals can be regarded as units in the Census figures and catered for on this basis is a fundamental mistake not merely in ethics but in Works Management.

Only a cursory acquaintance with history is requisite to appreciate the fact that the major conflict of human existence is concerned with what we are accustomed to call liberty. Physical existence upon this planet requires the provision either by the individual himself, or by organised society, of bed, board, and clothes, and the maintenance and continuation of existence is the strongest force in human politics. There has never been a period of history in which this individual determination to live and to insure the continuance of human life, has not been conditioned, not so much by physical facts, as by human action itself. The cave man probably found his chief difficulty less in the lack of game or in his peculiar housing problem arising from a shortage of eligible caves, than in the fact that his neighbour, instead of exploring new territory and finding an additional cave, preferred to take measures to expel him from the sites already developed. Not, I think, so much because he liked fighting, as for lack of ability to conceive of the existence of enough caves. Fundamentally there is little difference discernible in the outlook of man upon the situation to-day.

The world is obsessed, or possessed, by a scarcity complex. While at the date of writing (1936) Great

Britain is preparing for another war, she still has a million unemployed, farms going out of cultivation and agricultural products being destroyed because they cannot be sold, publicists still inform us on one hand that the situation is due to over-production, and on the other hand that sacrifices must be made by everyone, that we must all work harder, consume less, and produce more. Yet no economic training is necessary to assess the meaning of the existing situation. On the one hand we have an enormous and increasing capacity to produce the goods and services which are the *primary* objective of civilisation and which probably form the material basis on which alone a cultural superstructure can be reared. On the other hand we have an immense population not only unable to obtain from the shops, which are so anxious to sell, those goods which they are unable to buy, but are, by the miscalled unemployment problem, prevented from producing still further goods. Ordinary common sense alone seems to be required to recognise that only one thing stands between this practically unlimited capacity to produce, and what is in fact a definitely limited capacity to consume, and that is the money system, the bottle-neck which separates production and consumption.

Now the evidence is clear enough that this bottleneck actually operates in fact to an extent exceeding that in which any control of economic process has operated before. He would, I think, be a bold protagonist of the existing financial system who would contend that the results are meeting with general approbation. Just to the extent that the conditions in the world have improved in the past few years, and it must be admitted that this extent is quite limited, this improvement has been obtained by forcibly depriving those persons who, by adherence to the rules of the financial system, had acquired sufficient purchasing power to release them from the pressure of the control, for the partial benefit of those not so fortunate. In passing it may be noted how the power of taxation has grown into a form of oppression beside which the modest efforts of the robber barons of the Middle Ages must appear crude. While the system is fundamentally based upon a theory of rewards and punishments, modern financial methods, in conjunction with the taxation system would appear to suggest that the acquisition of the reward is proper ground for the imposition of punishment in the form of taxation, which will distribute the reward amongst those who have not worked for it. I have very little doubt that in this we are witnessing not merely the decay of the financial system, but of the whole theory of rewards and punishments as applied to economics.

However this may be, the perfecting of the financial system of control outlined in the previous chapter has been contemporaneous with a rising wave of discontent and disillusionment, and it is obvious enough that competent financial policy as operated by those in present control of the financial system aims not so much at removing this discontent, as at removing all mechanism by which it could be made effective. That is the objective of the disarmament propaganda in its various forms. So that we seem to be in possession of a certain amount of preliminary evidence which would weigh against this centralised control of finance. A further examination I am afraid, only strengthens this view.

Mention has been made of the outstanding prosperity in a material sense, which was experienced by the population of the United States during the period 1921-1929. No serious effort has been made to deny the fact that this period was terminated by the action of the Federal Reserve

Banking System, partly by the raising of rates for call money to a fantastic figure, and partly by the calling in of loans irrespective of the interest rates offered. So far as any excuse is put forward for the action taken, it is that worse consequences than did in fact ensue would have been the result of further delay. Viewed in the light of subsequent effects it seems difficult to understand in what way this could have been true. Apart altogether from this, however, the course pursued strengthens the impression which is produced by an examination of the lesser financial crises which have been a feature of the twentieth century, that there is something in the banking system and its operation, which produces a constitutional inability to look at the industrial system as anything other than the basis of a financial system. To the banker, the satisfactory conditions of industry at any time are those which make the banking system work most smoothly. If it cannot be made to work smoothly, it must be made to work, even though in the process every other interest is sacrificed.

Only the exercise of a child-like faith, which the present generation seems unlikely to supply, would secure agreement with the proposition that a system which has produced undesirable results in cumulative measure as its power increases, would produce better results if its power became absolute. While grave criticism of the personnel of the banking system and its prostitution to politics of a peculiarly vicious character is becoming daily more common and seems in many cases to be justified, it is evident that the world is becoming daily less willing to trust *any* personnel with a system at once so powerful, irresponsible, and convulsive in its operation.

While, as previously suggested, it is the reverse of true to accuse *Financiers* of planning or desiring war, the financial *System*, of which they are the defenders, is, beyond question, the chief cause of international friction. Since, as we have seen, no nation can buy its own production, a struggle for markets in which to dispose of the surplus is inevitable. The translation of this commercial struggle into a military contest is merely a question of time and opportunity.

SOCIAL CREDIT TRAINING COURSE

It has become increasingly clear over the years, that the author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, was right when he said that the crisis afflicting Civilisation could only be resolved if there was a minority who knew what to do and how to do it. As the crisis deepens, it is more essential than ever that more people equip themselves to be effective Social Engineers, capable of advising and assisting their fellows. The first step towards becoming an effective Social Engineer is to master the basic Social Credit Training Course, which can be done by correspondence under a panel of competent tutors. There are eight lectures in the Course, and each lecture has questions requiring written answers. Students may do the course at their own pace, although in order to obtain the best results it is desirable that the course be completed in a reasonable period of time, preferably in no more than three months.

The charge for the course is \$10, which covers the cost of the notes, questions and postage. The tutors provide their time free of charge. At present New Zealand students are making use of the Australian panel of tutors. Applicants should write to G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, enclosing \$10.

HOLOCAUST REVISIONISM FOR BEGINNERS

by David McCalden

The recent case of the hoax of the "Hitler Diaries" has had at least one positive result: Increasing numbers of people are starting to question what has passed for history. For many years there were only a few professional writers prepared to risk their careers by suggesting that much of the written history concerning the events which led up the Second World War, and what happened during and after that war, was misleading. But in recent years there has emerged a growing stream of revisionist history, which challenges the authenticity of stories like the gassing of six million Jews. Even occasional references to revisionist history can be seen in the general media, even if in a sneeringly patronising style.

Well-known revisionist writer David McCalden provides an excellent introduction to holocaust revisionism in the following question and answer article:

What exactly is meant by "Holocaust Revisionism"?

The word "revisionism" has been used throughout this century, at least, to describe those who have dissented from orthodox dogma. There have been Communist Revisionists who were condemned by Stalin. There have been Zionist Revisionists led by Jabotinsky. Now, in the 1980s we have Holocaust Revisionists: those who disagree with the widely accepted belief that six million, or some other number, of Jews were exterminated in gas chambers by the Nazis as part of an extermination programme.

In what respects do the Revisionists disagree with this theory?

Fundamentally, in three respects. First, the Revisionists argue that six million Jews did not die in the war; the true number must be less than one million. Second, the Revisionists argue that there were no gas chambers, so the number of Jews exterminated in gas chambers was precisely zero. Third, the Revisionists maintain that there is no solid evidence that the Nazis ever had an extermination programme *per se*.

Who are the Revisionists?

The leading Revisionist academics right now are Dr. Arthur R. Butz, associate professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences at Northwestern University in Chicago; and Dr. Robert Faurisson, former professor of Literature at the University of Lyon-2 in France.

How come neither of these are historians? What right do they have to pontificate on areas outside their field?

The sorry truth is that these academics have had to venture into the historical arena because of the default of the regular historians. When one brave German historian, Helmut Diwald, challenged the Holocaust orthodoxy in a book published in West Germany, the publishers withdrew the book from circulation and had the offending pages altered. When British historian David Irving expressed some skepticism of the slightest kind in one of his books, again the publishers tried to alter his findings. There have been calls for the dismissal and/or censure of academics in the United States for daring to associate themselves with the Institute for Historical Review, an organisation which leads the field in Holocaust Revisionism. Clearly, the market in ideas in this area is not a free one. Whatever happened to the much-lauded right to dissent?

Are the opposing academics all historians then?

Although almost every modern historian pays lip service to the Holocaust dogma, not one of the leading Holocaust authors is a historian. Raul Hilberg teaches political science. Gerald Reitlinger was an art dealer. Lucy Dawidowicz teaches "Holocaust Studies" at a private Jewish medical school. These opponents of Revisionism are termed Exterminationists, because they believe in the theory of extermination. Very few history texts deal at any great length with the Holocaust precisely because there is so little evidence to go on. Historians are accustomed to having reams of first-hand documents on which to base their findings. In the case of the Holocaust, there is very little, and so the timid historians usually leave out any mention of it altogether. That way they can play it safe.

Let's get down to basics and deal with some basic, practical facts and figures. Do the Revisionists deny that Jews were persecuted and herded into Nazi concentration camps?

No. Nazi Germany was an anti-Semitic regime. Jews were discriminated against and were rounded up and interned in

concentration camps.

Do the Revisionists support this policy? Are they Nazis?

It is not the business of Revisionists to pass moralising judgments on historical events. Neither do Revisionists pass judgment on Roosevelt's rounding up of American citizens who happened to be of Japanese extraction, and herding them into concentration camps on the West Coast. Revisionists come in all political shades.

What about all the photographs from the camps, of piles of naked bodies being bulldozed into pits? Of human skeletons wandering aimlessly around?

No one denies that the camps were horrible places — both for the inmates and for the staff. Toward the end of the war, conditions in the camps deteriorated very rapidly due to Allied bombing of the rail and road distribution networks. Germany was deliberately starved into submission by Allied bombing and blockades. Many thousands of Germans also starved to death, or succumbed to disease. The horrible pictures one sees are not of victims of gassing; they are of victims of hunger and typhus. According to the legend, the victims were driven into the gas chambers straight off the trains, so therefore the bodies would have been in fairly good shape. The pictures are primarily from camps where even many Exterminationists admit there were no gas chamber installations.

But surely we are told that all the camps had gas chambers? Weren't they called "extermination camps"?

This is a widely held popular view, but even a superficial study of the Exterminationist literature reveals that nowadays they divide the camps into two types: concentration camps (in the west), and extermination camps (in the east). By a curious coincidence, all the extermination camps are located in what is now Communist-governed territory. Over the years since the end of the war, the Exterminationists themselves have gradually had to revise their dogma, on account of ready public access to the Western camps. For example, in 1945 American Congressmen were taken on a tour of the Dachau "gas chamber" and were told that many thousands of Jews had died there. Now the Exterminationists agree that no Jews were gassed at Dachau. Similarly, several Germans were

"RED OYER BLACK"

By Geoff McDonald

A former Communist leader documents the long-term Communist strategy behind the mounting Aboriginal "land rights" campaign. The author tells of what he learned in the secret Communist training school at Minto, N.S.W.

The hard-hitting preface is by Mr. Bruce Ruxton, outspoken President of the Victorian Returned Servicemen's League.

Recently launched in Brisbane by Queensland Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen, this book is sending shock waves throughout those minorities who endorse the Al Grassby concept of fragmenting Australia through a multi-racial programme.

\$6.00 posted from all League of Rights addresses.

executed after the war for operating "gas chambers" at several camps in West Germany. Today, the Holocaust experts admit that there were no gas chambers at those camps. The Revisionists now ask: what is the difference in quality between the evidence for gassings at these Western camps (now admitted to be bogus) and the evidence for gassings at the Eastern camps (still maintained as genuine)? Why is Western evidence dismissed as bogus while Communist evidence is retained as genuine?

But what about Zyklon B? Wasn't it found in the camps?

Zyklon B was most certainly found in the camps. Zyklon B was a very common pesticide used to delouse the lice-ridden clothes of incoming prisoners. Ironically, it was only when this fumigation process broke down that the lice were able to spread typhus throughout certain camps. If more Zyklon B had been used, more Jewish lives would have been saved.

What about the gas chambers? Surely one can see them displayed at the camps?

Various installations have been misrepresented as having been "gas chambers". At Dachau, for example, at least two places were represented as being deadly gas chambers. The first was an ordinary communal shower bath. The second was a fumigation closet for the delousing of clothes. Today at Dachau a sign on the shower bath claims that it is a "gas chamber, which was never used". The fumigation closets are correctly labelled as such, even though a U.S. Army report by the OSS in 1945 claimed that these were mini-gas chambers. At Auschwitz there is now a room on display that was first used as a basement mortuary for the deceased from the hospital next door. Later in the war it was used as an air-raid shelter. Today the Communists claim it was a gas chamber. Any superficial study of the Dachau and Auschwitz "gas chamber" would show that they could not have been used for extermination because they are not airtight. The room at Auschwitz has even had rough holes knocked in the ceiling to "prove" that this was where the gas pellets were dropped.

What about the ovens? Surely they prove that the Nazis exterminated people.

The perfectly ordinary crematorium facilities at the camps were just the same as those at any German city mortuary. People died in the camps from natural causes, disease, judicial executions and (later) hunger. Cremation is the most hygienic method of corpse disposal. It is used throughout the Western world today.

Didn't the Nuremberg trials prove that the Holocaust happened?

The Nuremberg trials were a show of strength of victor over vanquished. The Germans were put on trial for doing the same things, which the Allies had been doing, and continued to do in occupied Germany. The Germans were even charged with committing the Katyn massacre of Polish officers while the Soviets, who had really committed this crime, were sitting in judgment. Hardly any of the "evidence" admitted at Nuremberg would stand up in court today.

Such as?

Such as documents with no proof of source. Such as affidavits from dead people like Certstein. Such as grossly leading questions to witnesses like Rudolf Hoss. Such as "lampshades" and "soap" exhibited by the Soviets.

How else were the trials biased?

The defendants were not allowed to cross-examine witnesses (only their court-appointed lawyers could do this). The defence was not allowed proper access to documentary exhibits. The defence counsels were not allowed to exhibit Allied documents as proof of identical Allied "crimes". Potential defence witnesses were arrested. Potential defence documents were kept from defence lawyers. Throughout, the defence lawyers were treated as naughty children. The defendants' guilt was already determined in advance.

Didn't the Nazis themselves confess to their crimes?

None of the Nuremberg defendants knew anything at all about "gassings" or extermination. The only top Nazi leader

who would have known the exact details of what went on in the camps was Himmler, who conveniently "committed suicide" while in British custody, with his body being secretly buried in a wood. Albert Speer most likely knew that the allegations were bogus because he was in charge of War Production, and many factories used camp labour. But Steer felt that to challenge this cornerstone of the Allies' theory would have been to risk greater punishment for "lack of contrition". His humble approach paid off in the form of a prison sentence instead of the gallows.

But surely some Nazis confessed?

Yes, they did. The principal confession used in Holocaust literature is that of Rudolf Hoss, a commandant of Auschwitz. He appeared as a witness at the Nuremberg trials, and his "evidence" consisted of assenting to an English-language affidavit he had signed earlier. There is no evidence that Hoss understood English. His affidavit in many respects contradicts his later testimony and written confessions conducted by the Communist Poles. Much of his testimony also flies in the face of science, and in the face of the reality of the Auschwitz "gas chamber" on display today. There is evidence that Hoss was tortured; even Exterminationists describe his psychological status as "schizoid apathy".

Isn't there proof of 'an extermination programme in Hitler's

Mein Kampf

Mein Kampf is certainly anti-Semitic. But nowhere does Hitler advocate the killing of Jews. Instead, he recommends their removal from Western Europe and resettlement in Palestine or wherever. This policy was curiously in harmony with that of the Zionists.

Surely some written order has been found proving Hitler authorised the extermination programme?

No such order has been found.

What about all the eyewitnesses? What about all the survivors?

This is probably the most difficult area of all to explain in the short space available. It will have to suffice to say that very little

ANNUAL DINNER AND SEMINAR

The 1983 National Weekend starts with the Annual New Times Dinner on Friday, September 30, followed by the National Seminar on Saturday, October 1, and the National Action Seminar on Sunday, October 2.

Readers should make every endeavour to participate in what is the highlight of the year. The National Secretariat of the League will, as usual, start their annual convention in the morning of Friday, September 30. The New Times Dinner, to be held as usual at The Victoria, Little Collins Street. The charge will be \$16 per person and no bookings will be accepted unless accompanied by the \$16. Guests should indicate if they want a fish or a vegetarian Dinner. Also if they have friends with whom they wish to be seated.

The organisers of the Dinner reserve the right to decline dinner applications.

The National Seminar will almost certainly concern itself with one of the major national issues confronting the nation, the constitutional battle.

The Action Seminar on the Sunday will be a feast of action reports and projects. Dinner will be provided at a nominal charge.

As usual, interstate and country readers desiring to avail themselves of private hospitality, are requested to forward their request at the earliest opportunity.

All bookings and enquiries concerning the National Weekend should be directed to G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.

of the eyewitnesses' testimony would stand up under cross-examination. Many survivors appear to be suffering from a kind of "group fantasy", where they imagine themselves witnesses to all kinds of horrific deeds. Many "survivors" at war crimes trials have wanted a place in the history books for themselves, and society holds back from questioning their testimony too closely for fear of offending their sensitivities. Several Exterminationists, such as Gerald Reitlinger, Hannah Arendt and Gitta Sereny, have admitted that much "survivor testimony" has been bogus. Even in the United States, witnesses from Israel and elsewhere came forward to testify against Frank Walus, whom they claimed was a camp guard. After losing his case, Walus's attorneys discovered new documentation, which incontrovertibly proved his innocence. Therefore the witnesses knowingly or unknowingly committed perjury. Many of them were flown in from Israel and seemed to have been rehearsed. Several of the published memoirs of survivors contain scenes, which are pharmacologically impossible, particularly in connection with corpse disposal.

In the National Archives, aren't there plans for gas chambers and orders for exterminations?

There are plans, invoices and orders for: Zyklon B, crematoria, deportations, judicial executions and anti-Semitic laws. One can even find documents showing the cost of the dog food for Auschwitz. But no one has ever turned up any documentation for gas chambers or programmed extermination. The blueprints for Auschwitz show the "gas chamber" as a mortuary.

The Exterminationists like to pretend that the Germans used code words for their operations, like "special treatment" for exterminations. But even at the Nuremberg trials it was shown that "special treatment" could mean special privileges like extra food rations for VIP prisoners.

What then was the true nature of the camps?

They performed a dual function. They were simultaneously internment camps for Jews and others who were considered a threat to national security, and also labour centres where factories or agricultural projects could be established to take advantage of the ready labour supply. Auschwitz was the biggest, with a galaxy of industrial factories employing both interned labour and voluntary workers from all across Europe. The volunteers outnumbered the internees. The factories included a hydrogenation plant for turning coal into synthetic oil, and a Buna rubber works for making artificial rubber. There were coalmines and botany stations. Most of the other camps in Poland had ancillary agricultural and lumber projects. Obviously, with all able-bodied Germans away fighting the war, the authorities needed to use every single available body for labour. It simply would not have made sense to exterminate able-bodied labour.

A NEW DEFINITION OF "ANTI-SEMITISM"

As demonstrated by Dr. Alfred Lilienthal and other Jewish writers, the most telling criticism of Political Zionism and the policies of the State of Israel, has come from anti-Zionist Jews.

In his great classic, *The Controversy of Zion*, which the Zionists have countered by pretending it doesn't exist, Douglas Reed shows how Political Zionism emerged at a time when increasing numbers of Jews were being assimilated in the countries of residence. They were joining what might be termed the mainstream of history. Political Zionist smear merchants have used some of their most diabolical terror tactics against anti-Zionist Jews.

C.H. Douglas predicted that by establishing the Zionist State of Israel, the Zionists would produce an open debate on the "Jewish Question". That debate is taking place with Israel's holocaust policies coming under increasing criticism from Israelis and Jews around the world.

Any regular reader of Zionist literature can note the growing concern about the rising criticism of the policies of Israel. Masters of what has been graphically described as Talmudic dialectics, the Zionist propagandists have now decided that all manifestations of anti-Zionism must be smeared as "anti-Semitism", this smear to be used against Jews as well as non-Jews.

The Australian Jewish News of May 20 carries a major article by Mr. Leon Wieseltier, a senior editor of *New Republic*, in response to a series of questions put by The Institute of Jewish Affairs in London, one question being, "Are we now experiencing entirely new forms of anti-Semitism, which comes from the extreme Left as well as from the Right, and are expressed in the form of 'anti-Zionism'?"

Mr. Wieseltier argues that "anti-Zionism" is anti-Semitism in theory and in practice. It is anti-Semitism in theory for the following reason. The unit of historical legitimacy in the modern world is the nation. According to the principles of modern politics, every nation has a right to a State.

"The converse, too, has consequences: whoever has no right to a State is not a nation. Anti-Zionism is the denial of a Jewish right to a State. It is, therefore, a denial of the Jewish status as a nation. And this, in turn, is a denial of the historical legitimacy of the Jews."

Mr. Wieseltier neglects to point out that the Zionist claim to nationhood is uniquely different from all other forms of nationhood, with Jews claiming that they both have the right to live amongst other nations, making decisions concerning the policies of those nations, while at the same time having a prior allegiance to the State of Israel. It is this Zionist demand for a dual loyalty which is unacceptable to anti-Zionist Jews like Dr. Lilienthal, who insist that they are loyal citizens of the countries in which they reside, practising their own religion.

Wieselthier claims "The Jews are Jews before they are anybody else. They have their own right to live in Israel..." Obviously the Palestinians, who were expelled by force and terror from the country in which they and their forbears had lived for two thousand years, have no right to continue living in their own country.

Wieselthier concludes with the charge that "The Jew is the victim of anti-Semitism, not its cause . . . Anti-Semitism cannot be cured. It can only be fought. And it has been demonstrated many times that Jews are the only people who can be counted upon to fight it". In simple English, all other peoples in the world are out of step except one "chosen" group, whose leaders claim that because they are "chosen", they are always right. A study of history reveals that Jewish leaders have always insisted on the rank and file of Jews being separate from the nations in which they live. This insistence upon a type of ghetto for the Jews, a nation within a nation, has over the centuries helped to produce conflict between Jews and their host nations.

The reality is that Zionists require what they term anti-Semitism in an endeavour to use the rank and file of Jews for purposes they do not understand. Jews who attempt to break with the Zionist Messianic concept are to be abused as "anti-Semites" along with non-Jews. Those who see this as a form of madness are correct. The future of the world depends upon a freeing of minds from all concepts of "chosen" groups and the philosophy of collectivism.

SOCIALISM

"I am absolutely of the same opinion as our scientist Oriov, the same Oriov who has been in a prison camp for many years. He published an article just before his arrest in which he shows that any socialism, even the softest form, the most 'democratic' form, socialism, if it is consequential, if it moves forward, if it doesn't stray to one side or another, but follows its own inner logical, will inevitably become communism."

—Alexander Solzhenitsyn

NEW TIMES—AUGUST 1983