

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 57, No. 1.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No.VBHI001.

JANUARY 1993.

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

## "FULL EMPLOYMENT" OR SELF-EMPLOYMENT?

by Eric D. Butler

A major feature of a disintegrating civilisation is the existence of millions of people who are officially listed as being unemployed. Approximately one million Australians are now described as unemployed. The general view, as promoted by orthodox economists and those who blindly follow their lead, is that unemployment is a major problem, which must be solved in order to overcome depressed economic conditions. Politicians like Australian Prime Minister Paul Keating feel that if unemployment figures fall their chances of political survival are improved. But it is starting to dawn on a growing number of people that, in the absence of a major Third World War, "full employment" is no longer remotely possible. The dynamic of the technological revolution is such that adequate production for all is possible without the services of the millions now described as unemployed.

As C.H. Douglas pointed out, a problem correctly stated is already half solved. There must not be a confusion between means and ends, if the primary purpose of an economic system is to provide "full employment", then surely the best way to achieve this objective is to emulate the spirit of the early Luddites by dispensing with all existing technology and ordering scientists and engineers to stop developing any more! But, of course, this is impossible. The reality is that the millions not engaged in the production system at present are not desperately trying, in the case of the young, to join the system, or in the case of their elders, to re-join the system, because they feel that still greater increases in production are required, but because they want to obtain a substantially greater financial income than they are receiving from social welfare. They have, along with all other members of the community, been taught from their earliest years, that they must do some kind of work in order to obtain money. In sheer desperation, some try to steal money from someone else.

### A "CHARACTER" OF THE PAST

One of the many "characters" the writer met during the Great Depression of the 'thirties, was a boot maker and repairer in a major Victorian country town. Fred Rush was of Cockney background from England, a man of small stature who had managed to survive the murderous trench warfare of the First World War. He made no pretence of being any type of an intellectual. But he was a man of great commonsense. At the back of his shop he always ensured that he had a large supply of wood to be chopped. The development of chain saws was yet to come. Fred Rush had many of Australia's large army of constantly-moving unemployed calling in, all asking the same question, "Could you provide me with any work?" often prefacing the question with "I am trying to earn a few bob to send back to my wife in Melbourne."

Fred Rush's stock reply was, "You are quite sure it is work

*you are looking for?"* Upon being eagerly assured that that was what was being asked for, the enquirer was taken out the back and introduced to the axe, always in excellent condition, and the pile of wood. "There you are, mate, all yours!" Some time later the man would re-enter the shop and announce that he had finished the heap of wood, and wait expectantly for a response from Fred Rush, who would continue repairing a pair of boots. After a moment of silence, the woodcutter would

### OUR POLICY

**To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, and to a society in which every individual enjoys inalienable rights, derived from God, not from the State.**

**To defend the Free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government**

**To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.**

**To oppose all forms of monopoly, whether described as public or private.**

**To encourage electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.**

**To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting natural (God's) Law, against policies of rape and waste.**

**To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the people of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.**

raise the question of how much he was to be paid. Fred Rush would respond with a well-feigned expression of surprise: "What are you getting at, mate? You didn't ask me for money, you asked me if I could give you any work, which I have!" Before the woodcutter could become indignant and aggressive, Fred Rush, who was basically a generous man, would say, "Of course, I will give you some money, but before I do so, sit down here in front of my blackboard while I describe the difference between money and work, and how money is created by the banking system."

Fred Rush, ex-British Tommy, provided large numbers with a glimpse of reality, which they would never have obtained from a certified economist! He pointed out that if people asked the wrong questions, they could not solve their problems, and would always get the wrong answers.

## A MORAL ISSUE

Basically, the much-discussed economic problem is a moral issue. If the true purpose of production is consumption, and if a diminishing minority of people operating an economic system based upon both a capital and a cultural heritage, can easily produce an abundance of required consumer goods, there is no *physical* reason why the abundance should not be readily made available to all members of a society. In all modern communities, money, a man-evolved system of symbols, is the mechanism by which individuals obtain access to what has been produced. It is elementary that if the technological revolution could be taken to its ultimate conclusion, with only a handful of people engaged in supervising the production system, then most people would be left without any financial incomes, and thus be unable to buy what was being produced. Rather than face the reality of a situation which makes it possible to provide the basic requirements of genuine independence for all, those with the power insist that no one should gain access to even a portion of the abundance without being employed. In other words, ready access to abundance is denied purely on *moral* grounds. In essence, the common view of both the supporters of the centrally planned economy, and the "monetarists", whose god is something called the "free market", is that no one is entitled to a financial income without being employed; no one can be trusted with complete economic freedom. The concept of the *Leisure State* is repudiated in spite of the fact that the greatest explosion of human creativity in the history of the human race, during the great Greek civilisation, was the result of a complete Leisure State with an educational system designed to prepare the individual for living in such a State. Today's educational system is designed to train sufficient technical barbarians.

All attempts to sustain an economic system based upon the goal of providing as much employment as possible require programmes designed to keep centralising power, the ultimate objective being some type of a World State. But every attempt to reach such an objective must result in more of the social disintegration now a major feature of the world scene. The basic issue concerning employment is not employment as such, it is whether the individual cannot be trusted with freedom and must, therefore, be employed under central direction, generally on activities, which are both economically and environmentally destructive, or whether the individual should be placed in a position where he can engage in self-employment. In a realistic sense, self-employment results in the individual

working harder or being much more active, than when forced to engage in activities which can be seen to be both useless and soul-destroying. A government bureaucrat filling in forms to ascertain how many others are also filling in forms is officially designated as being "fully employed"!

## EMPLOYMENT REALITIES

In Australia at present, less than 40 percent of the *total* population is currently "employed", with approximately only 5 percent being engaged in agriculture, including forestry. A growing proportion of what is termed "employment" is non-productive, such as all those engaged in finance, including insurance, legal and administrative activities, which derive from the unnecessary complexities of the financial system, - particularly the taxation system - which even accountants find difficult to understand. Like every other developed nation, Australia is attempting to run harder on a disaster road. Salvation depends upon sufficient Australians grasping that the nation has no future as an independent sovereign nation while it continues on the present road. Changing the label of governments while adhering to current policies will make no difference to the end result. What is required is, for a start, a *change of direction*, with a re-orientation of the economic system, and financial policy being directed towards achieving this re-orientation.

The desperate plight of the Australian rural scene should be one of top priority. The massive debt burden should be eased immediately, with *long-term, low-interest credit* made available for a programme of re-generation, including re-forestation and other conservation measures. Every Australian farmer knows that increased employment of a constructive nature could become available under such a policy. Rural towns and rural industries would start to revive.

Next to the rural scene, the question of adequate housing for the Australian people would be given immediate attention. Long-term, low-interest finance for housing would result in an upsurge of building activities, these in turn having a far-reaching effect on a number of other industries. Employment directed towards serving genuine consumer requirements would automatically follow.

## THE FIRST STEPS TOWARDS THE LEISURE AGE

But more than this is needed to prevent growing social disorders; unless adequate changes are made to the economy to take note of the natural energy of youth, currently misdirected in all types of violent disorders and protests because of the lack of constructive employment in a production system which no longer requires the services of the total adult population. The first and most important step would be to make earlier retirement possible *without financial penalty*. Large numbers would leave the work place at an earlier age, say, for a start, 55, if offered an adequate pension, protected against inflation. Large numbers of those retiring would offer their services in a voluntary capacity to numerous community activities. Such a policy, which could be introduced on an experimental basis for a start, with the lower ranks in industry becoming increasingly available to the younger members of society. Social friction could start to diminish as scope increased for individuals to engage in the type of employment in which they felt genuinely

interested.

A sick society does not recover overnight. But the adoption of the type of programme indicated would start to see the process of re-generation work through the nation, lifting morale and a confidence in the future. Progressively the totalitarian programme growing from the "full employment" dogma would be replaced with the concept of self-employment

in a free society. Educational programmes would, like those of the early Greeks, be progressively adapted to preparing the young to take their place in a new type of society.

No nation is better equipped than Australia to lead the world into that new Golden Age which is physically possible.

But this requires that type of vision without which a nation perishes.

---

## PRINCE CHARLES AND THE FRENCH PEASANTS

Prince Charles has once again brought down the wrath of the internationalists upon his head. In his recent address in France he has, at least indirectly, supported the cause of the French peasants who have been stoutly resisting demands that they should go out of existence in the name of something called "greater efficiency". The Charles address was devoted to something far more important than "efficiency"; he was concerned about the threat to the charms of traditional French rural culture. But the Prince has also been concerned about the destruction of traditional English village life. There is a general consistency in his addresses, irrespective of the subject, because of his firm philosophical views. While his well-known views on organic farming have been sneered at as being "unscientific", the reality is that, slowly but surely, there has been a marked change of emphasis concerning the lavish use of pesticides and chemical sprays in an attempt to grow crops and plants. There is a growing stress among scientists that there is such a thing as a balance in nature, and that control of many diseases requires that efforts be made to establish that balance. The truth is that the Prince of Wales is both modern and traditional.

One photo from France shows a French peasant sitting at his front gate with a placard, which reads, "*If I die, how can France live?*" Exactly! A rural community not only produces food, textiles and wines; it is the repository of the value system of a nation. Anyone who has been to France knows that there is a special charm about the French rural scene. There is no such charm about a gigantic American monolithic corporate farm, which exists primarily to make financial profits for shareholders who never see the farm. Industrial-type farming strikes at the very roots of traditional rural civilisation, as still exists not only in France but in other parts of Europe. So far from being "romantic nonsense", a charge levelled against Prince Charles, it can be demonstrated that so far from being uneconomic, small-scale European farmers who supplement their farm incomes by part-time work in local villages and towns, are a major stabilising influence in society. There are cultural, environmental and other aspects of small-scale European farms, which cannot be measured in cold figures. Not surprisingly, the French rural population voted overwhelming "*NON*" in the French referendum concerning the proposals to create a Federated Western Europe.

It is interesting that in their resistance to the cosmopolitan internationalists, the French peasants have been joined by small-scale farmers from all over the world, including Japan, where the Japanese farmers have strongly resisted the pressure to become bigger and more "efficient". Australia's farming representatives are making a major mistake by believing that the Australian farmers will benefit from the General Agreement

on Trade and Tariffs. The major purpose of the GATT programme is to benefit the American-based multinationals. The get big or get out philosophy has taken the Australian rural community in the wrong direction. It has been a social disaster, stripping the rural areas of people and centralising populations into over-swollen human ant heaps.

What Australia needs for national survival is more farms, not less, and more smaller towns. It is a pity that those who claim to be representing the best interests of Australia's farmers do not echo the sentiments of the French peasants, who are demonstrating their determination to resist a programme of destruction. If Australian farming can only survive by destroying the French peasantry, such a survival possesses the seeds of greater disasters for Australia in the future. All civilisation starts from the ground up, and the salvation of Australia requires the regeneration and expansion of Australia's rural communities.

Perhaps Prince Charles could be persuaded to turn his attention to the Australian rural scene in the same way that he has spoken out on the French rural situation!

### ERIC BUTLER'S QUEENSLAND VISIT

Advisory National Director of The League of Rights, Mr. Eric Butler, will make the traditional Australia Day weekend visit to Southern Queensland, attending the all-day seminar for actionists in Toowoomba on Sunday, January 31. The Seminar will start at 9.30 a.m., with a short Divine Service. The venue is the DPI Conference Centre, Tor Street, Toowoomba. Tea and coffee provided, but the actionists should bring a basket lunch. Eric Butler will provide an update of the developing national and international crisis. There will be a number of reports, including one from Mr. Jeremy Lee of *Freedom Potentials*. In view of the general situation, all supporters are urged to make every effort to be present.

On Tuesday, February 2, Eric Butler will address the Brisbane Conservative Speakers' Club. This will be another special address by one of Australia's most distinguished commentators. There will be a hard hitting challenge:

***"Can Australia Get Up Off Its Knees?"***

# ZIONIST CAMPAIGN TO PREVENT AUSTRALIAN VISIT BY BRITISH HISTORIAN

The Zionist movement has blatantly called upon the Australian Keating government to deny British historian David Irving a visa to visit Australia this year. Former Australian Prime Minister, Bob Hawke has joined in the chorus calling for Irving's exclusion. Zionist pressure was responsible for the recent exclusion of David Irving from Canada. False allegations have been made that he has been excluded from Germany, Austria and Italy. In spite of the fact that David Irving has made two previous visits to Australia without violating any laws, it is now charged that Irving might violate Australia's race laws if permitted to come to lecture and to promote his books.

Irving's major "crime" is, of course, that as a reputable historian, as witnessed by the number of books he has authored, most of these published by well-known firms like Macmillans, he has felt obliged to say that he has reached the conclusion that the holocaust story concerning the gassing of Jews, is not true. Irving says that there is little doubt that tens of thousands of Jews were, along with many others, liquidated in various ways during the war.

Well-known writer and poet, Mr. Nigel Jackson, complained in a letter to *The Age*, Melbourne, of December 11 that the attempt to prevent Irving coming to Australia was a "barefaced call for censorship", concluding his letter by saying that "every Australian citizen who cares for intellectual freedom should actively oppose this effort to stop Mr. Irving's 1983 lecture tour."

Mr. Jackson's letter promoted an immediate reply from well-known Zionist leader, Mr. Isi Leibler, president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, who in a letter in *The Age* of December 12, provided a breathtaking example of Orwellian double-speak and Zionist dialectics. The essence of Mr. Leibler's letter was that the proposed Irving visit was of itself a threat to freedom in Australia! He described Irving as a "beerhall rabble rouser" who was an "apologist for Hitler". A study of Irving's major work, *Hitler's War*, does not confirm Leibler's charge. Irving, generally regarded even by some of his critics, as one of the world's greatest authorities on documents relating to the Second World War, merely says that in all his numerous researches, he has not found one document relating to the mass gassing of Jews.

David Irving responded to the Leibler letter immediately, faxing his communication. We are informed by Irving's representatives in Australia that *The Age* confirmed that they had received David Irving's letter, sent from the USA, where presumably he is not threatening the free society, but that the letter would not be published. So much for the free speech Mr. Isi Leibler is so concerned about! In his communication to *The Age*, David Irving included a copy of a letter he had sent to *The Australian Jewish News* on September 29. Not surprisingly, this was not published. The following is the text of this letter, which speaks for itself:

**To: Reader's Letter, "Australian Jewish News", London, September 29, 1992.**

**"Dear Sir, - On September 25 the Australian Jewish News published an article referring to my renewed visit next year to Australia. Australians are of course familiar with me from my several appearances on Jana Wendt's television programme and hundreds of thousands of people have purchased my books. Your description of me as a man who states that the Holocaust was a hoax will puzzle many people, and I feel it important to set the record straight - if only to help you avoid the kind of legal actions now facing British newspapers who have made the mistake of calling**

**me in print a "Hitler apologist", a "Holocaust denier" and even "the man who authenticated the Adolf Hitler diaries." (I exposed them, too, as fakes).**

**"My views are simple: after thirty years working in archives of German documents, including those in Moscow, I have found not one wartime document referring to "gas chambers". Furthermore, there is no reference to any gassings in the daily top-secret reports from the commandant of Auschwitz, Rudolf Hoess, to his superiors in Berlin, which we British decoded at Bletchley Park during 1942 and 1943. Furthermore, there is no significant trace of cyanide residues (ferric ferrocyanide) in the fabric of the buildings identified by popular Holocaust mythology as "gas chambers" at the Auschwitz site; both forensic tests published by "revisionists" and clandestine tests conducted by the present Auschwitz authorities in 1989, have established this fact beyond doubt. Those same authorities now admit that the gas chambers they display to tourists are postwar fakes, like the "execution wall". The eyewitness evidence does not, in the circumstances, reflect well on the eyewitnesses.**

**"That having been said, let me make it plain that I have also found in the archives abundant evidence that mass shootings took place in Russia and the Baltic states, with perhaps as many as 100,000 Jews and others perishing in this way from 1941 to 1943.**

**"Clearly there is the substance for a compelling public debate - though this is not the topic of my forthcoming visit. If the organised Jewish community tries to suppress such a debate, whether by violence, or window-smashing, or blackmail (methods they have employed in Britain and North America), they will only increase anti-Semitism, which I utterly deplore.**

**"Incidentally, it is incorrect to state, as your article does, that I am banned from Germany, Austria, Italy, and South Africa; I spoke to a large audience in Germany only last week, and I shall spend two months in South Africa before visiting Australia.**

**"You are requested to publish the above as a Reader's letter. Yours sincerely, (signed) David Irving."**

## "HAS CHRISTIANITY FAILED?"

There has been widespread favourable reaction to Mr. Eric Butler's December address to the Melbourne Conservative Speakers' Club. While back copies of *The New Times* containing the address can be provided (\$1 per copy posted), a slightly expanded version of the address will be published in booklet form.

## **NATIONAL DIVIDENDS - THE CHRISTIAN ALTERNATIVE TO NATIONAL DEBT**

**(Notes on National Dividend by Jean McPherson)**

(1) Dividends to be based on money repaid to lending institutions, which use our community's assets, or credits, as surety. Such money being the only true barometer of economic growth, and sound judgment by lending officials.

(2) Dispersements to be paid on a "weight for age" scale, with the "Age" of migrants to start from the date of nationalisation.

(3) Dividends **MUST** be absolutely tax and means test **FREE**, otherwise the whole point of the exercise is lost. Interest and capital have been paid by the collective consumer public in their support of the borrower.

(4) Dividends to replace Unemployment benefit, Auststudy, Job search allowances etc., and other bureaucratically and environmentally expensive schemes, designed to put the wages of the machine and computer where they are needed and useful, into the wallets of people. Machines cannot buy or use food, housing, clothing, cars, fridges or televisions, but they cost money, which must go into prices, and the people they displace must have some of them at least. All must be sold

(5) With the aid of the tax file no., it should be a relatively simple procedure to immediately transfer repaid capital to a Community Account instead of just crossing it off the books as is done now. This would create an Investment fund, in the growth and health of which, every person and loyal organisation in the country would have a visible vested interest.

### **SUPPORTING SUGGESTIONS**

(1) P.A.Y.E. be abolished. It is expensive, in terms of real wealth, to collect, and must be obtained from customers, and so go into Prices.

(2) A campaign to educate the public on the difference between real wealth and book entries is essential. The Satanic myth that every thing we have, and are, and can become is the property of the state, and taxable, is "the root of all evil". Everybody knows that following the "October Crash" there was not one iota of difference in the **REAL WEALTH** in the world, but a vast rearrangement of who controlled its use and flow.

### **ANTICIPATED EFFECTS**

(1) Democratic diversification of the flow of credit, with each person taking responsibility for his/her small portion. "Remember it's **OUR** money". The resultant broadening of the concept of what constitutes "a job", including the most important job of all, service one to another (largely priced out of modern life by a combination of taxation with bureaucratic and union restrictions on "the milk of human kindness"). Wasn't it the Greatest Leader of all time who washed the feet of His Party members? Relieved of the immediate necessity to access a minimum income, each will be free to exercise his/her creativity, desire to support research, enjoy further education, or simply to serve. A few would inevitably bludge.

(2) Every responsible, sane person from the humblest employee to the most powerful company director would have a common interest in doing the job in the best and most efficient way possible, with a visible reward for excellence. It might take a while to reorient some Union officials and manufacturers, who think built-in obsolescence is necessary for survival, but more intelligent members of society would soon convince them that excellence brings it's own reward.

The bureaucracy of the World Socialist State has served its time, and is now top-heavy and counter productive. Recently I, (a 70-year-old woman), did in one afternoon with a pick and spade, a job, for which a contractor with a Bobcat wanted \$400. High tech machinery, tax loaded labour and bureaucracy are no longer economically viable. Makes you think, doesn't it? Somebody, sometime, will have to institute some such system, because it reflects the **REALITY** that God's grace is free and available to us all. "**The rain falls on the Just and the Unjust**". Somebody will put in place a democratic mechanism, which releases the most creative force in the world, individual initiative, and personal responsibility for its use. **COULD THIS SOMEBODY BE YOU? WHAT A MEMORIAL!**

## **GENUINE ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY**

**"The essential nature of a satisfactory modern co-operative State may be broadly expressed as consisting of a functionally aristocratic hierarchy of producers accredited by, and serving, a democracy of consumers. The business of producers is to produce; to take orders, not to give them; and the business of the public, as consumers, is not only to give orders, but to see that they are obeyed as to results, and to remove unsuitable or wilfully recalcitrant persons from the aristocracy of production to the democracy of consumption.**

**"No peace will ever settle on the distracted earth until this matter has been fought to a finish, and it rests with the intelligence of those who are from time to time in a position to guide popular movements, whether a mere remnant of civilisation will achieve the Golden Age awaiting the settlement, or whether a decisive verdict is close at hand"**

C.H. Douglas in *Credit Power and Democracy*. (1920)

## **BASIC FUND REACHES HALF OF TARGET**

With the steady flow of smaller donations over the holiday period, the League of Rights' 1992-93 Basic Fund has reached half of the target set, \$60,000. Some of the support has been most inspirational and is deeply appreciated by those manning the front lines in the battle to preserve and strengthen traditional Australia. Even under present desperate economic conditions, we have little doubt that those readers who have not yet contributed to the Basic Fund will not fail those who have taken the fund to the half-way mark. All contributions to Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001. In order to minimise expenses, receipts are only sent upon request.

## A WARNING TO ALL LEAGUE SUPPORTERS

Several League supporters have confided that they have contributed funds to an organisation soliciting funds by telephone. Under the influence of a North American-based movement, the Citizens' Electoral Council of Australia has now established itself in Melbourne and has embarked upon a high-pressure fund-raising campaign via telephone. When originally the concept of citizens' electoral councils was developed in different parts of Australia, with one major objective being the implementation of the Citizens' Initiative and Referendum (CIR), League of Rights supporters willingly participated. This was an extension of the original League concept of electors' associations, with all political candidates being invited to meet electors before elections, to be questioned and asked for written "contracts". Other initiatives were also experimented with, all designed to bring government under the control of the electors. All this was in keeping with the Social Credit philosophy that governments belong to the electors.

However, before long several veteran League supporters warned that a foreign influence was starting to exert itself in the CEC movement. One feature of this influence was support for a Republican form of government and criticism of the Monarchy. This influence became increasingly strong, with direct and indirect attacks on the League of Rights. In the current issue of *The New Citizen*, philosophical differences between the League and the CEC movement, which no longer promotes CIR as a major objective, are made clear. We, of course, have no objections to this. But at least one telephone canvasser, in asking a League supporter for financial support, said that the League was doing good work and there was no cleavage between the CEC and the League. This is dishonest.

We do not propose at this time to examine in any detail the North American movement backing the CEC. But we do have a responsibility to warn people that if they feel obliged to donate, they are supporting a movement fundamentally different from the League. Soliciting for funds over the phone has become a highly sophisticated art in the USA over many years. The recipient of such calls is flattered to know that he or she is an integral part of the "freedom movement". It is readily agreed that the nation is in deep peril and that strong action is needed. The caller is certain that he can count on the loyal support of the recipient, and starts by asking for a large sum of money to be pledged or sent immediately. In the USA those phoned are invited to provide their bankcard number over the phone. When the initial response is that the amount being sought is beyond the recipient's capacity, a reduced sum is nominated. The technique is to create a feeling of guilt that we must not "let the side down", etc. A complete refusal sometimes ends with abuse. In many cases, the operation has a destabilising effect, which it may well be designed to create.

We are well aware that the CEC movement is drawing attention to debt and other problems. But patriotic Australians are not likely to contribute to a movement, which does not create the impression that it is dealing with the major issues confronting mankind. Quite frankly, we believe that the new CEC movement has a hidden agenda, which will become clearer as events unfold. Well might several people ask the obvious question, *"Why does an American-based movement, allegedly concerned about the problems of mankind, find it necessary to concentrate upon the Australian scene when there are even worse problems in the USA?"*

Time will answer that question.

## YELTSIN THREATENED BY IMF STRATEGY

President Yeltsin of Russia has been fighting for his political life because of the deep-seated and growing opposition to the type of "reforms" he has been attempting to impose in Russia. The key figure in the programme has been Harvard economist Jeffrey Sachs, strong devotee of the "free market" economy advocated by the International Monetary Fund. The IMF insists that credits from the West will only be made available to the former Communist states if they accept the type of "shock therapy" recommended by the IMF "experts". To date the IMF policy has failed to produce the projected results in Poland, to which the IMF planners respond by saying that the policy has not as yet been pursued vigorously enough and needs more time.

But Yeltsin faces increasing domestic resistance, headed by those who oppose a policy, which, if implemented, would completely destroy Russia's industrial base, and turn the naturally wealthy country into a type of quarry serving Western industry. The human suffering would be as great as that imposed by Stalin in his massive industrialisation programme. The economic rationalists everywhere tend to overlook completely the human factor. The Major Conservative government in the United Kingdom made this type of mistake when they decided on a massive close-down of British coal mines, throwing 30,000 miners on to the dole lines. Fortunately, enough Conservative Members made it clear that they were not prepared to tolerate this type of "solution" to the United Kingdom's problems.

Economic rationalist, Dr. John Hewson, trained by the IMF, seeks to "re-structure" Australian industry without any consideration of other factors. For this reason, although the Keating Labor Government presides over one million unemployed, it appears that it might be re-elected at the coming Federal elections. Such an event will not, of course, prevent Australia from being pushed further down the internationalist road, with the further destruction of Australian industries.

It appears that the Russians might conceivably resist the One World programme. But how much further must Australians be pushed before they start to insist that enough is enough?

Turbulent times are ahead everywhere.

---

## THE IMPOVERISHMENT OF CIVILISATION

"Financial stringency is narrowing and impoverishing the whole of our civilisation. It is also vulgarising and cheapening it. . . .

"I began this book by asking why, in the midst of an ever-growing abundance of goods, mankind should be engaged in an increasingly strenuous struggle for a living; and I have since answered it pretty fully. The competition is not for goods, but for a share of the limited amount of work necessary to produce them, in order to obtain a share of the limited amount of money available to buy them. This is equally true of the industrial capitalist and of the labourer. Just as the labourer must hunt desperately for work the industrialist must hunt desperately for markets. As every chairman of every board of directors is constantly saying, 'Our problem, gentlemen, is a

*selling problem*'; and, as he ought to add, 'it is a problem, not because people don't want our goods, but because they haven't the money to pay for them.' Hence we get the plague of advertisements that defiles our streets and landscapes, the swarm of salesmen that add their commissions to the price of nearly everything we buy, and the pestilential nuisance of seedy canvassers cadging for orders from door to door. Every industry is forced to grab, by hook or by crook, as much as it can of the inadequate purchasing power of the people, so that Peter can gain customers only at the expense of Paul, motors and gramophones can be bought only by doing without coats and wardrobes, and the *'Daily Blather'* can only 'progress' by squeezing the *'Daily Blither'* out of existence.

"In such an atmosphere, true civilisation cannot survive. Unselfishness, urbanity, gentleness, modesty, are qualities that unfit a person for a struggle for existence, and the possessors of them go to the wall. To live at all one must be selfish, unscrupulous and pushing. *'Pep'*, *'Go'*, and similar commercial virtues are the only ones that will, in the current abominable phraseology, *'get you on'*. 'Aggressiveness' is esteemed a good

quality, and its cultivation is taught in those damnable 'schools of salesmanship' . . . The existence of thousands of men and women trained to admire this sort of thing is a much worse portent than that of a handful of grasping millionaires; for it is on the ordinary man and woman that the course of the race's evolution depends. Quite needlessly we are resuscitating the characteristics of the ape and the tiger, which Tennyson urged us to let die.

"But it is not only the kindlier characteristics that handicap the business employee. Manliness and independence of spirit may easily cost a man his job and throw him penniless on the street, while the servile tuft hunter sticks to his stool and breeds his kind. How often have we heard it said, 'I agree with such-and-such a cause, but I daren't support it or I'd lose my job'. Thus we are softened in the wrong way as we are toughened in the wrong way. Amidst all the security and abundance of civilisation, we are dominated by fear and hunger, the motives of the jungle."

Eimar O'Duffy, well-known Irish writer and Social Crediter in  
*"Life and Money"*

## CRIMINAL PROSECUTION OF HOLOCAUST DENIAL

by Doug Christie, in a statement issued by The Canadian Free Speech League

Within minutes of the release of the Supreme Court of Canada's decision overturning the conviction of Ernst Zundel and striking down the "false news" law, representatives of Canadian Jewish organisations appeared before television cameras with dire predictions that they would make sure that Zundel would be charged under the "hate" provisions of the Criminal Code if he continued with his Holocaust denial activities. There is nothing new in the demand of the Jewish organisations that "Holocaust denial" be prosecuted as "hate" under the criminal law. In a letter published in the *Globe and Mail* on January 22, 1992, David Matas, Senior Counsel for the League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada, called for the prosecution of Malcolm Ross for "Holocaust denial". Wrote Matas: **"The Holocaust was the murder of six million Jews, including two million children. Holocaust denial is a second murder of those same six million. First their lives were extinguished; then their deaths. A person who denies the Holocaust becomes part of the crime of the Holocaust itself."**

But before Crown authorities commit themselves to any further criminal charges against Zundel or anyone else because they are allegedly "Holocaust deniers", they should ask two important questions - what is the "Holocaust" and what will constitute "denial"?

Will someone be a "Holocaust denier" because he does not believe that the six million Jews referred to by David Matas died during World War II? Certainly, the six million figure was cited by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg. It found that **"the policy pursued (by the Nazis) resulted in the killing of six million Jews of which four million were killed in the extermination institutions."** Yet if that is so, then several of the most prominent Holocaust historians would be subject to criminal prosecution. Professor Raul Hilberg, the author of *The Destruction of the European Jews* doesn't believe that six million Jews died. He puts the total at 5.1 million. Gerald Reitlinger, the author of *The Final Solution*, didn't believe in the six million either. He estimated the figure to be a high of 4.6 million and admitted that the figure was conjectural due to lack of reliable information.

Will someone be a "Holocaust denier" if he says that the Nazis didn't use Jewish fat to make soap? The International Military Tribunal, which had all the evidence before it to be able to decide whether this allegation was true or not (including actual bars of soap), held in its judgment of October

1, 1946 that **"in some instances attempts were made to utilise the fat from the bodies of the victims in the commercial manufacture of soap"**. Then, in 1990, Israeli historians at Yad Vashem (Israel's Holocaust Remembrance Authority) admitted that the soap story wasn't true. **"Historians have concluded that soap was not made from human fat. When so many people deny the Holocaust ever happened, why give them something to use against the truth?"** - said Shmuel Krakowski of Yad Vashem. (*Globe and Mail*, April 25, 1990).

Will someone be a "Holocaust denier" if he says that the meeting of Nazi bureaucrats at Wannsee on January 20, 1942, was not a meeting for the purpose of coordinating the systematic mass murder of Europe's Jews? Gunther Plaut of Holy Blossom Temple in Toronto recently wrote on the fiftieth anniversary of this meeting that it was **"a conference, surely the most macabre in recorded history . . . calmly discussing a task. Rounding up millions of men, women and children"** - who were ultimately murdered in "extermination camps". If Plaut is right, then Israeli Holocaust historian Yehuda Bauer must be wrong and a "Holocaust denier" to boot. With people like Plaut probably in mind, Bauer was quoted as saying at a recent London conference: **"The public still repeats, time after time, the silly story that at Wannsee the extermination of the Jews was arrived at."** In Bauer's opinion, Wannsee was a meeting, but **"hardly a conference"** and **"little of what was said there was executed in detail."** (*Canadian Jewish News*, Jan 30, 1992).

Will someone be a "Holocaust denier" if he says that there was no policy to exterminate the Jews because no Hitler order for such a policy exists? Once upon a time the answer would have been "yes". In 1961, for example, Raul Hilberg wrote in his book, *The Destruction of the European Jews* that there were two Hitler orders for the destruction of Europe's Jews, the first given in the spring of 1941 and the second shortly thereafter. But by 1985 and the publication of his second, revised edition, Hilberg was not so sure. In a review of Hilberg's revised edition, historian Christopher Browning wrote: **"In the new edition, all references in the text to a Hitler decision or Hitler order for the 'Final Solution' have been systematically excised. Buried at the bottom of a single footnote stands the solitary reference: 'Chronology and circumstances point to a Hitler decision before the summer ended.' In the new edition, decisions were not**

**made and orders were not given."** (*The Revised Hilberg*", *Simon Weisenthal Annual*, Vol. 3 (1986), p.294).

The controversy over the lack of a written Hitler order has fractured Holocaust historians into the "internationalists" and the "functionalists"; the former believing there was a premeditated plan with Hitler at the top, and the latter believing that Nazi Jewish policy evolved at lower levels in response to circumstances. But the point is, they cannot show either a plan or an order, notwithstanding the capture of literally tons of German documents after the war. This was admitted by Hilberg at Zundel's trial.

So what will constitute "Holocaust denial"? Surely, if one claimed that most people at Auschwitz died from disease and not systematic extermination in gas chambers, this would be cause for prosecution? But perhaps not. Jewish historian, Arno J. Mayer, of Princeton University in his 1988 book *Why Did The Heaven's Not Darken?: The "Final Solution" in History*, writes at page 365: "... **from 1942 to 1945, certainly at Auschwitz, but probably overall, more Jews were killed by so-called 'natural' causes than by 'unnatural' ones.**"

Even the number of people who died at Auschwitz, the main alleged extermination centre, is not clear-cut. For 45 years after World War II, the monument at Auschwitz read: **"Four Million People Suffered and Died Here at the Hands of the Nazi Murderers Between the Years 1940 and 1945."** During a visit to the camp in the June of 1979, Pope John Paul II stood before this monument and blessed the 4 million victims. Would it be "Holocaust denial" to deny these four million deaths? Not today. In 1990, the Auschwitz Museum removed the words from the stone monument, admitting that the 4 million figure was grossly exaggerated. The toll has been tentatively put at 1.1 million, but the release by the Soviet Union in 1990 of the Auschwitz death register books has complicated matters further. They show a death toll in the camp during the war of approximately 74,000 people. Arno Mayer admits these are open questions. At page 366 of his book he states: "... **many questions remain open . . . All in all, how many bodies were cremated in Auschwitz? How many died there all told? What was the national, religious, and ethnic breakdown in this commonwealth of victims? How many of them were condemned to die a 'natural' death and how many were deliberately slaughtered? And what was the proportion of Jews among those murdered in cold blood - among these gassed? We have simply no answers to these questions at this time.**"

How about the denial that "gas chambers" existed? Here too, Mayer makes a startling statement at page 362 of his book: **"Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable."** Mayer believes there is no question that gas chambers did exist at Auschwitz, but points out that **"(m)ost of what is known is based on the depositions of Nazi officials and executioners at postwar trials and on the memory of survivors and bystanders. This testimony must be screened carefully, since it can be influenced by subjective factors of great complexity."** One example of this might be the evidence of Rudolf Hoess, one of the three commandants of Auschwitz. At Nuremberg, the International Military Tribunal quoted from Hoess' evidence at length in its judgment to support its findings of extermination. But today, with the publication of the book *Legions of Death* by Rupert Butler (Hamly Paperbacks, Great Britain, 1983), it is now known that Hoess was beaten almost to death prior to making the statements relied upon by the Nuremberg Tribunal. His wife and children were threatened with the firing squad and with deportation to Siberia. In Canada today, Hoess' statement would not be admissible in any court of law. He claimed that an extermination camp called "Wolzek" existed; it is now known there was no such camp. He claimed 2,500,000 people were exterminated in Auschwitz and that a further 500,000

died of disease; today, no historian can uphold these figures. It is obvious that Hoess was willing to say anything, sign anything and do anything to stop the torture and to try to save himself and his family.

Mayer also calls for **"excavations at the killing sites and in their immediate environs..."** to determine more about the gas chambers. Two such forensic studies have now been made. The first was conducted in 1988 by execution equipment consultant, Fed A Leuchter, Jr., of Boston, Massachusetts. Leuchter was commissioned by Zundel during his 1988 "false news" trial to examine Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek to determine if the places alleged to have been gas chambers could in fact have been used as such. Leuchter's conclusion, based on examination of the alleged gas chambers and the analysis of samples taken from the walls and floors, was that the sites could not have been used and were not used as homicidal gas chambers. Analysis of the samples taken from the walls of the alleged gas chambers showed either no or extremely small traces (1.1 to 7.9 mg/kg) of cyanide, the chief component of Zyklon B, the insecticide allegedly used by the Nazis to murder the victims. A forensic examination and subsequent report commissioned by the Auschwitz Museum has confirmed Leuchter's findings that minimal or no traces of cyanide can be found in the sites alleged to have been gas chambers. The significance of this is evident when forensic examination of disinfection facilities at Auschwitz where Zyklon B was used to delouse mattresses and clothing, showed massive traces of cyanide (1050 mg/kg) in the walls and floor. The Auschwitz Museum still maintains that the sites were used as gas chambers, but obviously the results of these forensic reports has thrown the issue open to further investigation. In fact, further examinations are being planned by Polish authorities. A third study of the problem was made this year by the Austrian engineer Walter Luftl. Luftl called the alleged mass extermination of Jews in gas chambers "technically impossible". Luftl is not a right-wing fanatic. He is the president of Austria's Chamber of Engineers and a respected expert witness in court cases.

So what will constitute "Holocaust denial"? Those who so vehemently advocate criminal prosecution of "Holocaust deniers" seem to be living still in the world of 1946 where the Nuremberg Tribunal has just given its judgment concerning what happened to the Jews during World War II. But the findings of the Nuremberg Tribunal can no longer be assumed to be valid today. Because it relied upon such questionable evidence as that of Rudolf Hoess, more and more of its basic findings are being debunked

The courts of Canada are not the place to resolve historical debates. Why should the taxpayers of Canada in these recessionary times be handed yet another massive bill in the millions of dollars to finance historical debates in criminal courtrooms because some special interest group doesn't like someone's opinion? Whether it is politically correct or not, there is a growing controversy over what happened to the Jews during World War II. Let this matter be resolved as all other historical controversies are resolved: with free and open inquiry and debate in our journals, newspapers and classrooms. *This statement shows clearly why there must be free discussion of what happened to the Jews during World War II. Don't let Jewish special interest groups take away our right to free inquiry. Write, phone or fax to the Attorney General of Ontario Howard Hampton and protest any further charges or harassment of Ernst Zundel!*

*The Hon. Howard Hampton,  
Attorney General of Ontario,  
720 Bay St., 11th Floor,  
Toronto, Ontario M5G 2K1  
FAX: 416-326-4016;  
Tel: 416-326-2220 or 416-326-4000*