

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 57, No. 3.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001

MARCH 1993.

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

DAVID IRVING AND "THE HOLOCAUST"

by Eric D. Butler

In their desperate attempt to prevent British historian David Irving from visiting Australia, Zionist leaders like Mr. Isi Leibler have opened a Pandora's box with a "fall out" which is going to have far-reaching international implications. In Australia David Irving has become known to hundreds of thousands who had never previously heard of him. But much more significant is the open discussion of the incredible power of Zionist manipulators who, claiming to speak on behalf of a relatively small Jewish community in Australia, have been responsible for all the major political parties agreeing, before the recent Federal Elections, that David Irving should be banned from Australia. Prominent press columnists have openly referred to the Zionist power, one even saying that the parties were "terrified" of it. A new chapter in history is being opened.

While the events associated with the establishment of the State of Israel resulted in considerable open discussion concerning the obvious enormous power of organised International Jewry, as commented on by C.H. Douglas, the Zionist strategists developed a major weapon to at least mute any criticism of the alleged gassing to death of six million Jews. With the aid of Zionists or sympathisers inside the Hollywood movie industry, a stream of films emerged all devoted to the theme of brainwashing tens of millions of people into accepting uncritically what eventually has become known as "The Holocaust". What clearly is one of the greatest hoaxes in history has been progressively embellished. Generally overlooked is that the promotion of this hoax took some time to develop. For example, famous Holocaust survivor and Zionist propagandist Eisie Wiesel, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, makes no reference whatever to gassing at Auschwitz in his first book - set for study in many schools - describing his alleged experiences at this Polish centre. Weisel did demonstrate his powerful imagination with his description of Jewish blood spurting from the pits in which Jews had allegedly been buried. He "discovered" the gas chambers later and promptly got aboard the Holocaust bandwagon.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN WARFARE

Weisel was one of those who said that all Christians, everywhere, not only in Germany, were responsible for what happened at Auschwitz. There is no doubt that the massive Zionist psychopolitical warfare campaign was highly successful. Even the Roman Catholics were forced on to the defensive by the campaign to slander Pope Pius XII as a Christian leader who by his silence aided and abetted the Holocaust. The Pope had been silent for the simple reason that he knew nothing about any Holocaust. Such an horrendous event would have been brought to his attention by his Polish Priests. There is no reference to any Holocaust in any of the books of the major Second World War leaders, including Churchill and Eisenhower. It was after the Second World War that the German people were exposed to the full impact of the Holocaust myth with such a deep guilt complex being developed that the West German Government made it unlawful for anyone even to question the Holocaust. It was elevated to being an article of such faith that it was blasphemous even to raise doubts about it. David Irving was convicted by a German court for publicly stating that, as an historian, he had come to the conclusion that the Holocaust, as generally depicted, was a hoax.

Although a number of writers had, over the years, challenged the Holocaust story, the first major critical work

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.

being *The Hoax Of The Twentieth Century*, by Professor Arthur Butz, a major turning point came with the presentation of scientific proof at the Zundel trial in Toronto, Canada, in April, 1988, that no mass gassings could have taken place at Auschwitz. The scientific proof was provided by an American expert on American execution prisons, Fred Leuchter, who says that before he undertook the assignment to go to Poland, he had accepted the story of the mass gassings. Confronted with irrefutable scientific evidence, David Irving, who previously had maintained an open mind on the subject, although insisting that he had never come across any documentary evidence to support the story about the "Final Solution", said that he found the Leuchter report "shattering". Further research, including Soviet records, has convinced him that Auschwitz was a gigantic fraud.

While the Zionist propaganda machine was able to slow down the impact of the growing scepticism about the Holocaust, the entry of David Irving into the controversy was one of those unrehearsed events of history which posed a major threat to the whole Zionist strategy. It could be charged that Irving was not a "trained historian", and much else, but he had a long record of major works published by well-known publishing houses in both the United Kingdom and the United States. He had exposed the hoax of the alleged Hitler Diaries, originally endorsed by establishment historian Trevor Roper. And the Zionist leaders were shocked when even the Murdoch press had to turn to Irving on the Goebbels Diaries. His next major work, scheduled for publication later this year, and commissioned by Macmillans, is on the Goebbels Diaries. It is now obvious that an international Zionist campaign is being waged against Irving. Australia could prove the major test for the Zionist strategy. Already Irving has scored some major points through radio and TV interviews, and massive coverage in the print media. Irving's Australian representatives state that even if Irving fails in his first appeal to the Federal Court against the ban on his entrance, he has already prepared videotape, which will be shown right throughout Australia. Zionist propaganda has guaranteed record attendances and major sales for Irving's books!

ZIONISTS OVERPLAY HAND

There is little doubt that the Zionist propagandists have overplayed their hand, and made a major strategic mistake, the biggest since the end of the Second World War. Some of the more rational and perceptive members of the Australian Jewish community have seen the danger signs with some criticism of the tactics of Isi Leibler and his colleagues. In a defensive article in *The Australian Jewish News* of March 19, Leibler attempts to justify the anti-Irving strategy, claiming that the Government - the Zionist leader creates the impression that he speaks for the Government — has not sought to censor Irving's books or views, but has kept him out as an undesirable leader of some international neo-Nazi movement.

Leibler argues that Irving's "despicable canards about the Holocaust are freely available in bookshops, and on radio and television", to which Irving has responded, "I have never written a book about the 'Holocaust', nor broadcast on radio or TV about it." David Irving corrects Leibler's other false statements, including the one that "A British ITV documentary programme *This Week* devoted an entire program to his (Irving's) links with neo-Nazi groups". Mr. Isi Leibler has a lot of explaining to do, and I anticipate that more revelations concerning the Zionist anti-Irving campaign will appear in the coming court hearings. And even those Federal Party politicians with notoriously thick hides, and an outstanding capacity to bend the truth, as demonstrated during the recent Federal Elections, may be embarrassed by coming revelations.

A REVELATION

It was significant that the German Court hearing David Irving's appeal against the fine for having stated in a public address that he did not believe the Holocaust story, refused to allow him to call evidence from Dr. Franciszek Piper, Senior Curator and Director of Archives at Auschwitz. In a video taped interview with American Jewish revisionist David Cole, late last year, Piper admits that the main alleged extermination chamber at Auschwitz, shown to all tourists, has been 'reconstructed'. Piper's confused answers to the searching questions of David Cole are a revelation and completely torpedo the Zionist presentation of the Holocaust. But by sheer weight of international propaganda, the Zionists may have been able to minimise the damage of the David Cole video taped interview. However, the Irving factor has completely changed the situation with Australia being moved to the front of a struggle that has scanned nearly two thousand years. "*The Truth shall make ye free,*" said Christ. Irving is serving the cause of Truth, which is why the spiritual descendants of the Pharisees cry out, "*Crucify Him.*"

LAST CALL FOR BASIC FUND

The League of Rights' Basic Fund now stands at approximately \$5,000 short of its objective of \$60,000. The Federal Election results have highlighted the fact that the regeneration of traditional Australia requires the knowledge of the League of Rights. The League has already embarked upon a programme of education in depth. A professionally produced and updated presentation of the Social Dynamics School is now ready for use. Eric Butler's eight-lecture Social Credit introductory Social Credit Training Course has been updated and will also be available shortly.

Professional assistance is being obtained for the presentation of heritage material — history, the constitutional Monarchy, the Federal Constitution, and associated issues, suitable for schools and for general use. With a large number of readers still to contribute, we anticipate that before the deadline for the conclusion of the Basic Fund Appeal, there will be a surplus. This will be allocated to a special fund being established for the financing of heritage educational material. We trust that all last minute contributors to the Basic Fund do so immediately. Send to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

PLAN NOW FOR NATIONAL WEEKEND

The National Weekend is the major highlight of the League of Rights' year. Those attending partake in a rich and growing national heritage. With events moving the League still more closely to the centre of the emerging Australian drama, the National Weekend starts with the *New Times* Dinner, open only to proven supporters and their relatives, followed by the Annual National Seminar on the Saturday and the National Action Seminar on the Sunday. The *New Times* Dinner is on Friday, October 1st. Supporters wishing to attend and to avail themselves of any private hospitality, are urged to book as early as possible. Details concerning speakers at the *New Times* Dinner and the subject of the National Seminar will be published as soon as possible.

Arrangements for the best-discounted airfares can be made for interstate visitors. But, again, forward planning is essential.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE BIBLICAL LITERALIST

by Edward Rock, Chairman, Christian Alternative Movement.

"Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned". But what of the zealot who with the puritanical zeal of Saul of Tarsus pursues those who challenge the ground on which he stands?

Mr. Ian Hodge, publisher of *Christian Economics*, subtitled *Foundation for the Advancement of Christian Studies*, has appointed himself as the final authority on what constitutes Christian Economics, which he argues has its foundations in the Old Testament and the old covenant, and that there is no conflict between the old and the new. In that capacity he finds himself in direct conflict with Social Credit and, as will be seen later, the Apostle Paul, whose roots are firmly planted in the new covenant found in the teachings of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. His opposition to Social Credit is total, and having appointed himself a holy crusader against what he perceives as gross inerrancy, in his latest effort to correct that inerrancy he has delivered himself of a four-part serial entitled *The Theology of Social Credit*. Some indication of the depth of feeling Mr. Hodge has regarding Social Credit can be gauged by the following quotes from his articles:

"Social Crediters don't have an interpretive approach to the Bible.

" . . . Don't understand the relationship between the Old and New Testaments . . . have a defective view of the Bible and its teaching on salvation . . . having denied the commandments of God . . . denied so much of the New Testament teaching by pitting the words of St. Paul against the words of Jesus, Social Crediters come up with a new concept of evil . . . Underlying the defective view of Scripture espoused by Social Crediters is a defective view of God . . . They are not only incompetent economists, they are inept theologians . . . Social Crediters . . . are keen to establish the idea that there is such a thing as a free lunch, in contrast to the long held belief by many that all economic goods and services (apart from raw materials and labour) are created by someone's effort . . . Social Crediters have never demonstrated the accuracy of the claim that we have somehow solved the "production problem."

There is much, much more, and if any Social Creditor would like to know how infinitely sinful and wayward they are they only need to write to Mr. Hodge at P.O. Box 241, Engadine, N.S.W. 2233, and I am sure he will send the complete text. However, Mr. Hodge's *coup de grace* is his charge that the greatest and most unforgivable crime committed by Social Crediters amounts to saying the Bible is not the word of God. Those accused of this crime are expected to cringe into abject submission before their accuser's eyes, begging forgiveness for what must surely be the greatest error of all.

THE POWER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Let us immediately give Mr. Hodge the satisfaction he demands. The Bible is a text. God is God. To argue that we cannot worship God without a text is to limit God, and amounts to dethroning God in favour of a text. It is also a false judgment against those who come to a knowledge and worship of God without the aid of a written text. It is a denial of the freedom God gives to each individual to come to know Him through the power of the Holy Spirit. If we are to judge people on their level of understanding of the first and last word of the bible to decide their relationship with God, who shall be appointed the judges? Mr. Hodge and the self-appointed Sanhedrin? Was it not this attitude, which brought the Pharisees into conflict with Christ? Here was a people who crossed every "t" and dotted every "i" of scripture and sought to inflict their interpretation on every fellow citizen demanding obedience accompanied by a force of intimidation so fierce that the phrase, "for fear of the Jews" became a common expression in New Testament writing. What is Mr. Hodge going to do with those whose faith and belief in God has been sustained with

very little, or perhaps even no understanding of the bible? Consign them to the fires of perdition along with the Social Crediters?

The world has been afforded in recent times empirical evidence of the truth that knowledge and worship of God is not dependent upon a written text in the miracle of Russia where faith in God has been sustained without the aid of the bible with a far greater vitality than in the West where there is no shortage of bibles. There is no doubt that Russian people are hungry for the spiritual sustenance the bible affords, but the Word of God is God, and they were sustained by God, not a text. John, the most loved Apostle and disciple of Christ, makes so clear the correct position in the first verse of his Gospel in a teaching, which is so basic, and so simple one wonders how it escapes the attention of Mr. Hodge and his fellow bible literalists. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John makes it clear that God is the Word, not a written text. To elevate a text to a position of indispensability is to limit the supreme authority of God and a denial of the first commandment. *Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.* Jesus Christ did not equate scripture with God; he confirmed the validity of the first commandment although changing the text and substituting his own emphasis, improving on the original which is the right attitude towards all written texts. Thus Jesus took liberties with scripture! When asked which was the greatest commandment in the law, He replied, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two laws hang all the law and the prophets." (Matthew 22:37-40). Unless the first commandment is obeyed the second cannot be. To elevate scripture to the same place of authority as God is to disobey the first commandment and leads those who do so to propose social policies, which are a denial of the second commandment. This is the trap Mr. Hodge has fallen into and is basic to his violent disagreement with Social Credit.

SCRIPTURE NOT FINAL AUTHORITY

If Christ had believed a written text was all that was necessary to preserve His authority He would have made this clear. The fact beyond dispute, however, is at no time did Christ appoint scripture as His final authority, so perfect in its content to make disputation impossible. He knew what men did with such texts and repeatedly pointed to how His own authority was ignored or distorted by those self-appointed authorities. He, in one famous instance took the liberty to omit from the original text a statement, which goes to the heart of

the conflict between the old and the new covenants; the issue being whether God is a God of vengeance. In Luke 4:18 & 19, where the first public act of Christ's ministry is recorded, He went into the synagogue and read as follows from Isaiah 61:1 and part of verse 2:

"The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised. To preach the acceptable year of the Lord."

From that last verse, Christ deliberately omitted the words *"And the day of vengeance of our God."*

According to the bible literalist those words were inspired by God and should not have been omitted, but God's Son, God Himself, deliberately chose to delete them. He treated the written text as something inferior to His own authority, that the written text was not infallible but subject to correction. No doubt He was aware of the truth in the utterance in the book of the prophet Ezekiel that pointed to how scripture has been used to impute statements to God He never uttered. *"And her prophets have daubed them with untempered mortar, seeing vanity, and divining lies unto them, saying, Thus said the Lord God, when I the Lord hath not spoken."* (Ezekiel 22:28) (my emphasis). It is of some significance that the social and financial policies espoused by Mr. Hodge are based upon the premise that the evil of man warrants continuous judgment and punishment, i.e. *the vengeance of God*. The Social Credit position is that Jesus Christ disputes that judgment as being not of His Father, and that Christ came to offer man complete and everlasting release from the law on which that vengeance was based.

GOD THE ONLY AUTHORITY

The truth is that God's authority can only be maintained by the living God. Christ's promise to the disciples was that He would leave them the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Trinity. Thus God Himself remains the only authority Christians can look to. The bible itself is the most precious of all Christian texts, but the Holy Spirit is the final authority because, as Jesus made it so clear, there was to be ongoing revelation, and the Holy Spirit would be the source of that revelation *But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.* (John 14:26). No mention here of an infallible written text, just God speaking as God, telling the disciples that God would always be their authority, their source of learning in all things.

Mr. Hodge tries to put Social Crediters at variance with both Christ and Paul, but when Paul wrote that *"all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness"* (2 Timothy 3:16), he was only too aware of the limitations of a written text, as he made clear in his letter to the Corinthians

"For as much as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.

And such trust have we to Christ to God-ward:

Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God;

Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit, for the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life". (2 Corinthians 3,3,6).

If a written text is not the final authority, what is written is open to interpretation by the power of the Holy Spirit. Paul

again makes this quite clear as he goes on to speak of the old testament in relation to Moses and the Israelites, of whom he said, *". . . not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished:*

But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which vail is done away in Christ.

But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away.

Now the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty, (ibid verses 13 to 17) (all emphasis by writer).

Paul, the former Pharisee, knew only too well how adulation of the written text of the old testament resulted in the blinding of the mind, and this blindness could only be removed by the *ministers of the new testament*. But in case such ministers also fell into the same error of worshipping the written word of the New Testament he added a warning, *not of the letter, which killeth, but of the spirit, for the spirit giveth life.*

Douglas emphasised this great difference between the new and old testaments to which the biblical literalist in Mr. Hodge took great exception. When Paul said *the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life*, he was speaking of the spirit of anti-Christ warring against the spirit of Christ.

CONTINUOUS REVELATION

To be guided by the Holy Spirit is to be open to continuous revelation built on what has already been revealed. To be subject to the written word is to be subject to the last word written. Did God first reveal himself in the first words of Genesis, and draw down the curtain with the last words of The Revelation? Did Christ come to destroy the law or fulfill it? Is that fulfilment the continuing ministry of Christ through the Holy Spirit? Why has the Christian revelation all but dried up? Surely the mind of God is inexhaustible? Can puny man learn all there is to be known about God, His Creation, and His role in that creation from a written text? Should not the disciples of Christ so know the mind of God that they shout from the pinnacles of the Church steeples against any text that dares to limit new revelations that come from the mind of God?

It becomes apparent on studying Mr. Hodge that what really agitates him is that Social Credit poses a revelation from the Holy Spirit not acceptable to those of a similar school to his own. To Mr. Hodge and his associates the written word is ultimate reality, and stops short there. To the Social Crediter ultimate reality lies beyond what is seen and read, to the unseen. Social Credit faith is *". . . the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen."* (Hebrews 11:1). The great Christian poet William Blake put the matter a little differently but with a poet's discernment when he wrote the lines: *"They ever must believe a lie, Who see with, not through, the eye."*

Mr. Hodge is a disciple of the Americans Dr. Gary North and Professor Rousas Rushdoony, who in their search for a biblical alternative to today's commercial and financial chaos endorse the role of gold as the superior means of exchange in the ordering of a restored financial system. Mr. Hodge is also a devout advocate of the anti-heap philosophy of Full Employment as against the Christian alternative of Full Creativity. Mr. Hodge decries the God-given policy of national self sufficiency ensuring the maximum utilisation of resources God provides close to hand, which can, and does, lead to establishing pockets of increasing leisure. Therefore in his pursuit of the work ethic he advocates the breaking down of

national economic sovereignty in favour of increased international trade to replace commodities we can produce in our own back yard. To quote him, *Man's purpose and duty is to work. That is the ongoing cultural task that he has. The Bible nowhere argues that once a certain level of productivity is found man must cease from work . . . They (the politicians) may even do sensible things like removing tariff protection, import restrictions, and permit more competitors in previously protected industries.* (Part 4 T.T.S.C.) Thus Mr. Hodge, maybe without realising it, falls into line with those concerned to destroy every form of sovereignty other than one supreme New World Order in which Mammon rules over God. Individuals and individual nations exercising true sovereignty, enjoy that freedom which comes from God. How can any individual calling himself a Christian fail to see the co-relation between big finance, big government and the destruction of individual freedom as part of the destruction of Christian civilisation? Is this blindness a by-product of stunted understanding resulting from obsession with the word that killeth?

THE PINWILL-NORTH DIALOGUE

The Christian social creditor, Chas Pinwill, entered into a dialogue with Mr. Hodge's mentor, Dr. Gary North, in which he demonstrated that not only North's Christian theology but his Christian Economics was of such a poor spiritual quality as to embarrass the good doctor and send him scurrying for cover. Dr. North broke off the dialogue when it became apparent that the "systematic thinking", to use a term employed by Mr. Hodge, of Chas Pinwill was too much for him. The full text of the dialogue between Mr. Pinwill and Dr. North can be found in the Veritas publication, *THE NORTH-SOUTH DIALOGUE*, a book which the Christian world, and Christian bookshops have yet to discover, but its potency is undoubted, and like a delayed time bomb is quietly ticking away. The time will undoubtedly come when its explosive qualities will one day upend those liberals who dominate the Christian establishment which has reduced the gospel of Christ to a grovelling appeasement of secular domination*.

In *The Theology of Social Credit* Mr. Hodge demonstrates commendable discretion regarding *The North-South Dialogue*, he fails to give it a mention. Evidently realising his limitations he decided where Dr. North had failed he was unlikely to succeed and it would be better to build a case against Social Credit based on the infallibility of the Bible. As already noted he did so without consulting one of the main contributors to the Bible, the Apostle Paul, who would be aghast at the idolisation of the written word exhibited by Mr. Hodge and those who have failed to discern the spirit of the Word. Far from exposing deficiencies in the theology of Social Credit, Mr. Hodge has exposed his own deficiencies.

The theology of Social Credit to this writer is very simple and quite basic. It is steeped in the acceptance of the Trinitarian nature of God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. A trinitarianism which Douglas traced right through the development of Christian constitutionalism, whose objective was to make government, finance, and all institutions the servants of the individual. It is a subject, which leads inevitably to the correct functioning of all mechanisms affecting the liberty of the individual. But it is a subject, which is a closed book to the biblical literalist because the limitation of *the word that killeth* does not spell out the details. It is left to those who discern the *spirit that giveth life* to reveal the mind of God, and the pattern, but not the details man must follow.

THREE BASIC CREEDS

The three basic creeds of the Christian faith, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and especially the Athanasian Creed,

are foundational to the trinitarianism inherent in Social Credit. One wonders whether these creeds are acceptable to the biblical literalist; after all they are not literal extracts from the bible. The revelation, which flows out of the acceptance of those creeds, and is so fundamental, is that God created each individual as a unique entity with a unique relationship with Himself, and the whole objective of a Social Creditor is to preserve that relationship. Therefore Social Crediters pursue policies, which are designed to ensure each individual has the maximum access to God, and to challenge policies, which block that access. Therefore Social Crediters are concerned with the fullest possible freedom for each individual, and most importantly a freedom, which is unique to each individual in their unique relationship with God. In the pursuit of that freedom Social Crediters seek to ensure that all man-made institutions, money, government, industry, and culture are the abject servants of the individual, functioning to leave completely unblocked the free access to God. That is all God asks of any Christian, to free other individuals from any force which blocks free and unfettered access to Him. From that point individuals who become the recipients of that freedom must choose whether they will enter into that Perfect Freedom. That freedom cannot be imposed by written text, priesthood, by law, by government, or any form of pressure. It can only be accepted it cannot be earned. The task of Christians is to provide ground, which is fertile for acceptance.

In Social Credit it is the practical application of God's gift of unearned grace, which so disturbs Mr. Hodge. There is faith, and there is doubting faith as Thomas so clearly demonstrated. Christians in faith believe that the greatest unearned gift given us by God the Father was the birth, life, death and resurrection of His Son to effect the salvation of the world. They have no difficulty with that unearned act of grace. Why then cannot they extend to the same God the credit of believing that accompanying that priceless gift there are other gifts they cannot earn? Gifts, which are a continuing revelation of God's love for us. Is it because they have a doubting faith? In their doubt they revert to becoming slaves to Mammon.

If there was ever a clearer teaching than that given by Christ on the impossibility of serving both God and Mammon it is that teaching which Mr. Hodge so trenchantly misrepresents in Matthew 6:24, 34. In this teaching Christ completely dismisses Full Employment as a policy endorsed by God simply because it cuts right across God's own policy of unearned grace. It is appropriate that Christ begins that teaching with the words, *"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."* Christ goes on to not only completely dismiss the claims of employment and work as a means of glorifying God, but he also shows them to be a barrier to that complete access which he exhorts us to pursue in the words *"Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."*

Mr. Hodge fails the first test of faith when he says, *Man's purpose and duty is to work . . . Social Crediters are keen to establish the idea that there is such a thing as a free lunch in contrast to the long held belief by many that all economic goods and services (apart from raw materials and labour) are created by someone's effort.*

That 'someone's effort' is God's. Does Mr. Hodge wish to put a meter on the unlimited power poured out freely without charge given us by the sun, or a similar meter on the rain, which falls on the just, and the unjust? Should Christ, when He was feeding the five thousand have had a cash register merrily ringing to record his reward for effort? Was Christ remiss in that He did not check the bona fides of those

receiving His unearned gifts before bestowing them not only without cost, but without discrimination? Even that commandment which is often quoted by the Christian postulates for maintaining Full Employment, "*Six days shall thou labour*", often misses the intention of the operative phrase which comes immediately after, "*and do all that thou has to do*". All that 'has to be done' can be achieved in a fraction of time with little or no effort under modern technology, which if fully released from the shackles imposed by unregenerate man would make work a non-event. Christian Economics has a duty to spell out what Christ so clearly spelt out two thousand years ago in his parable of the Master who went into the market place and hired servants to work in his vineyard, hiring some to work a whole day, and others to work for an hour or less, but paying each one the same to the horror of apologists for full employment. Mr. Hodge and his associates cannot see what the Social Crediter clearly sees, the work was immaterial, the provision of each one's need was what mattered and the Master, (Christ) supplied that need without any thought of the work 'involved. But Mr. Hodge says no, "by the sweat of your brow thou shalt eat bread." Limited by the written word he joins the ranks of those who do not give a fig for the real Word.

Thus Social Crediters can see more clearly than others the Christ purpose in production, consumption, and finance, and their subjection along with the role of government to ensuring the maximum freedom from external restraints imposed on individuals.

REAL FAITH

Real faith is a simple acceptance. It does not need a hermeneutic (science of infallible interpretation of the bible) or an exegesis (extracting that hermeneutic) demanding years of theological study. That simple faith has led Social Crediters to an understanding of the greatness and the depth of God's love for man, and that all sin except that which denies access to the gift of the Holy Spirit can be forgiven. We are grateful to the bible for heightening our understanding; we use it constructively to the glory of God and the furtherance of His Kingdom. We believe that through his faithful servants the victory Christ claimed over the world is assured. We are not trembling in fear about the outcome. We invite all those with the mind of Christ to join with us in claiming that victory. Mr. Hodge is most welcome.

HISTORIC INTERVIEW ON THE HOLOCAUST

Late last year American Jewish student of "The Holocaust". David Cole did extensive first hand research on the alleged mass gassing of Jews at Auschwitz during the Second World War. A major part of his research was a video taped interview with Dr. Franciszek Piper, Director of the Auschwitz State Museum, in which Piper reveals that Auschwitz was reconstructed after the war. David Cole's explosive taped interview will be available in Australia in the near future. The following is the concluding part of the text of David Cole's commentary and interview:

We return now to our job of trying to decide between the two alternate views of the reconstructed gas chamber. Is it a fake or a faithful reconstruction?

One very important question is this: Can we trust the Soviets to have faithfully reconstructed the gas chamber? Since there is no wartime proof of there ever having been four holes in the ceiling, or of any gas chamber usage, we literally have to take the Soviets and Poles at their word that they simply returned the four holes to where they had originally been and reconstructed instead of fabricated the gas chamber.

If we're going to try to establish Soviet intent, we need to look at precedent there is concerning Soviet truthfulness regarding the Holocaust story.

Do the Soviets have a history of fabricating Holocaust evidence or using deception to support the concept? Well, as we've already shown, the Soviets quite brazenly exaggerated the figures of dead at Auschwitz by at least four times.

But was this simply a well-intentioned error on their part? We are told in the Auschwitz guidebook and also by other sources that the reason it was so difficult to ascertain the number of victims at Auschwitz was because the Nazis had destroyed the appropriate records.

This concept was also repeated to me by Dr. Piper.

COLE: Who initially came up with the figure of four million people dying at Auschwitz?

PIPER: (In effect, the Germans had the records.)

But, in fact, the Auschwitz camp death records were held by the Soviets, not released until 1989. These documents were not destroyed by the Nazis. I think we can assume that, during all those years, the Soviets were handing out their exaggerated

death figures, they knew they had these books in their possession.

We can also look at discredited charges made by the Soviets and supported by the other allies at the Nuremberg Trial. The Soviets claimed there were steam chambers for killing inmates at the Treblinka camp in Poland. Now, of course, that claim has been quietly dropped.

Also dropped are the claims of "electro-chambers".

Most interestingly, we have the Soviets at Nuremberg claiming that it was the Nazis, not the Soviets, who murdered thousands of Polish officers in the infamous Katyn Forest massacre. These days, of course, the Soviets have admitted that they are the ones responsible and most legitimate historians knew this all along.

But, at Nuremberg, the Soviets claimed that the Nazis bribed and threatened people to falsely blame the Soviets.

Continued Page 7

"THE MONEY GAME"

"THE PEOPLE VERSUS THE BANKS"

Jeremy Lee has done it again, with a 4-part (all on one video cassette) mini series in which he unveils the dimensions of global debt; the history of international money control; the struggle in Australia; and uncovers the truth behind the question, What is Money? Brilliant lecturer and researcher, Jeremy Lee, makes another outstanding contribution to the defence of Australia. Available from all League addresses: \$32.50 posted.

The now discredited atrocity stories of Nazi-created shrunken heads and human skin lampshades were also exhibited as fact. And in an almost inconceivable charge, it was claimed that the Nazis exterminated Jews with an atomic bomb.

Also presented as fact was the story the Nazis made soap from the bodies of Jews. Let's examine this one a little more closely. Now the Soviets actually submitted supposed Jewish soap at the Nuremberg Trials. But, today, Holocaust scholars like Raul Hilberg, Yehudi Bauer and Deborah Lipstadt agree that these accusations are groundless.

Let's be more specific here. Simon Wiesenthal, perhaps one of the most recognizable names in the Holocaust arena, wrote in 1946 in a series of articles for an Austrian Jewish paper, about boxes of Jewish soap. On the boxes were the initials "R.I.F." (pure Jewish fat).

These boxes were destined for the Waffen S.S. The wrapping paper revealed with complete cynical objectivity, that the soap was manufactured from Jewish bodies. The civilized world may not believe the joy with which the Nazis and their women and the general government thought of this soap.

In each piece of soap they saw a Jew who had been magically put there and had thus been prevented from growing into a second Freud, Ehrlich or Einstein.

How very fiendish! It's not hard to imagine such devilish behavior after decades of seeing two-dimensional Nazi villains in movies and on TV.

The soap story has also been immortalized in William Shirer's best-selling *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* as well as in countless other Holocaust articles, books and even school textbooks.

But can we speak with such certainty about this incredible atrocity? Nowadays, those designated as Holocaust "experts" are as firm as Wiesenthal and Shirer regarding the soap story, except that they say it isn't true.

In 1981, Professor of Modern Jewish History and Holocaust expert Deborah Lipstadt wrote in a letter to the *Los Angeles Times* that "the fact is, the Nazis never used the bodies of Jews, or for that matter, anyone else, for the production of soap. The soap rumor was prevalent both during and after the war. It may have had its origin in the cadaver factory atrocity story that came out of World War I. The soap rumor was thoroughly investigated after the war and proved to be untrue".

Now that's pretty clear!

And Shuel Krikowski, Director of Archives of Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust Center, confirmed in a *Chicago Tribune* article titled, *A Holocaust Belief Cleared Up* that historians have concluded that soap was not made from human fat.

Now I have a few reasonable questions: First, has anyone told Simon Wiesenthal that he's wrong? Secondly, if there was no soap made from Jews, then that means the Nuremberg soap and the testimony about human soap at Nuremberg is wrong. Third, Deborah Lipstadt speaks of a thorough investigation of the soap story and Shuel Krikowski speaks of historians having concluded that the soap story is wrong.

By speaking of a thorough investigation and a consensus by historians, Lipstadt and Krikowski are able to drop the soap story while at the same time affirming their faith in the soundness of Establishment Holocaust history.

But is that faith appropriate? Not only was the soap story not thoroughly investigated and refuted after the war, but even today there is no consensus among historians and experts concerning the soap story.

As recently as 1991 *Village Voice* columnist Nat Hentoff was still talking about having seen Jewish soap with his own eyes. And Dr. Piper? Well, he still supports the discredited soap story.

PIPER: There were such attempts of these (making inmates into) soap in the other concentration camps.

COLE: So that was where it was done?

PIPER: There were made such attempts.

As you can see, the Holocaust experts prove themselves hypocrites when they tell you there is no need to question the Holocaust story, that it has already been proven beyond question.

And here I don't mean to suggest that the soap story is the only thing the experts are not in unison about. Far more importantly, even though they present a united front in support of the gas chamber concept, many of them realize there is little documentation for it.

Which brings us to the real myth of the Holocaust. The myth's that the existence and use of homicidal gas chambers is well documented. In fact, the thing that really got me interested in this subject in the first place was the lack of documentation for gas chambers presented in the standard Holocaust work and the contradictions and guesswork inherent in the evidence that was presented.

Several times now we've mentioned the book by Jean-Claude Pressac. This book was published in 1989 by the famed Nazi-hunting duo, the Klarsfelds, and heralded as the final refutation of Holocaust revisionism. In his book, Pressac offers this damning condemnation of what has passed for Holocaust traditional historians.

Pressac says that his book "demonstrates the complete bankruptcy of traditional history, a history based for the most part on testimonies, assembled according to the mood of the moment, truncated to fit an arbitrary truth and sprinkled with a few German documents of uneven value and without any connection with one another".

Also in 1989, Jewish Princeton professor and refugee from Hitler's Europe, Arno Mayer, wrote in his Holocaust book *Why Did The Heavens Not Darken?*, that "sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable".

Mayer also wrote that more Jews died in Auschwitz of natural causes than by gassings or shootings. And his book angered other Holocaust experts who called it everything from "dangerous and ugly" to "a perversion of the Holocaust".

My point is, when the experts tell you there is no room for debate about the gas chamber story, they are hiding the fact that they debate each other about it frequently. Often-times, the reason for reluctance to answer hard questions about the gas chambers comes from the fact that the experts secretly realize that the gas chambers are simply not well documented, and that much of the documentation we have has already been discredited.

Indeed, the spectre of fraudulent Holocaust evidence from the Soviets has reared its head in more current events like the prosecution of Ukrainian-American John Demanjuk whose incredibly flawed war crimes conviction was based, in part, on faulty Soviet evidence.

And speaking of fraudulent evidence, some Holocaust experts seem to have difficulty explaining the difference between what's fraudulent and what's real.

We return briefly to Jean-Claude Pressac's book on Auschwitz, a book meant to refute the revisionists. Here he shows us a picture of a gas-tight door from a de-lousing room, which he claims the Soviets falsely represented to be from a homicidal gas chamber. Yet, several pages later, he shows us a door, which he claims is a genuine homicidal gas chamber door because of the metal hemispherical grid protecting the peephole.

Pressac offers this door as a proof that homicidal gassings occurred. But there's just one unanswered question. How does Pressac know that this door, too, isn't a Soviet put-on?

If we admit that the Soviets went around misrepresenting and reconstructing things how can we tell the difference between what's real and what's not? In the case of that supposedly genuine door with a metal grid over the peephole, I asked Dr. Piper if I could see it for myself.

COLE: In Pressac's book, he has a picture of a gas-tight door with a metal grid around the peephole. Is that still around any place? Does it still exist?

PIPER: It is in one of the rooms in Crematorium One.

COLE: Crematorium One?

PIPER: Yes, Crematorium One.

COLE: Is it possible for me to see that?

PIPER: You may go to see it (through a window).

COLE: Through the window?

PIPER: Through the window.

Well, guess what. After the interview we went to the director's office and got the keys and explored every room in Crematorium One, and no homicidal gas chamber door with a metal grid over the peephole. No one knew where it went. I guess it simply vanished, like magic.

So, in answer to our question about precedent regarding Soviet trustworthiness, I think we've established that we can't really accept anything on faith because evidence, certified as real one year might be considered fake the next.

Evidence you are told is genuine can, in fact, be a so-called "reconstruction". And if the Holocaust experts themselves can't agree on what's real and what's not, then surely they proved themselves hypocrites when they insist homicidal gassings cannot be questioned.

With all this talk about Soviet deception, I think it's necessary to put this matter in its proper historical perspective. You see, we live in a time now when the old Soviet Union has fallen apart and it's now okay for both liberals and conservatives, as well as everybody else, to speak ill of the dear, departed communist state.

But it was not always that way during World War II, the Soviets were more than just a military ally; their anti-Nazi propaganda was readily accepted by the other allies because it served all of their purposes.

It has to be understood that Russia's communists and Germany's fascists had had a log-running propaganda battle, both before the Hitler-Stalin Non-Aggression Pact and, of course, after, with the outbreak of war.

Both Stalin and Hitler were men capable of and quite adept at propaganda. Yet the vestiges of our acceptance of Soviet propaganda still linger to this day. For example, when we see an anti-communist German poster, we most likely immediately dismiss it as paranoid Nazi anti-communist propaganda.

Yet are we so conditioned to accept a similar Soviet work as paranoid, anti-fascist propaganda? The point is, we have a hard time realizing that Stalin's anti-German propaganda was just as virulent as Hitler's anti-Soviet propaganda and that, as the victors, the Soviets got to commit their propaganda to the history books as fact.

Yet all charges and counter-charges made during World War II must be re-examined with the 20-20 hindsight we now have. The knowledge of Stalin's despotism and the KGB's history of misinformation and deception and this re-examination must include the charges of genocide made against the Nazis, especially considering that for Auschwitz, as well as the other camps in Poland, Maidanek, Belzec, Chelmno, Treblinka and Sobibor, we've had to rely on the Soviets for most of our information. If the Soviets exaggerated the number of dead at Auschwitz, who's to say they didn't also do it at the other camps?

Why would they exaggerate Auschwitz by four times and then be brutally honest about Treblinka? However, lest I appear to be unfair, our own army and propaganda department did not sit idly by and let the Soviets have all the atrocity propaganda fun.

After the war, it was claimed at the Dachau camp that people were gassed. In fact, the army produced several propaganda films supporting that notion.

ARMY FILM NARRATOR: Hanging in orderly rows were the clothes of prisoners that had been suffocated in a lethal gas chamber. They had been persuaded to remove their clothing under the pretext of taking a shower for which towels and soap were provided.

Yet now it is no longer claimed that anyone ever died in a Dachau gas chamber. This is a clear case of wartime propaganda. It should also be added, in fairness, that it was the British who obtained by torture the confession of Rudolf Hoess, Commandant of Auschwitz, before turning him over to the Soviets and Poles. This has been confirmed in a book published in 1983, titled *Legions of Death*, which contains the recollections of British Sergeant Bernard Clark who brags about torturing Hoess to get a confession out of him, and of threatening his family.

Which brings us back to Auschwitz. It was here behind the building we've talked so much about, the supposed gas chamber, that Hoess was hanged for running an extermination camp.

But can we say now that was a just sentence, with the main evidence being obtained by torture and a reconstructed air raid shelter?

Perhaps you will answer that the sentence was a just one since Hoess did run an internment camp where people did indeed die in high numbers from disease and malnutrition. Yet if you consider internment of citizens based on their race a crime worthy of hanging, then what should have been done with the American soldiers who ran our internment camps in the United States for Japanese-Americans?

And if you consider running a camp with such a high loss of life a crime punishable by death, what should have been done with General Eisenhower and his soldiers who ran post-World War II prison camps where anywhere from several hundred thousand to over a million Germans died from disease and malnutrition.

Camps that prompted Lieutenant Ernest Fisher, of the 101st Airborne Division and former Senior Historian of the United States Army to remark in the recent book, *Other Losses*, that starting in April, 1945, the United States Army and the French Army casually annihilated about one million men, most of them in American camps.

Eisenhower's hatred, passed through the lens of a compliant military bureaucracy, produced the horror of death camps unequalled by anything in American military history, an enormous war crime.

Clearly, the only thing that separates Auschwitz from what the Allies did is the concept of exterminations, of genocide, of homicidal gas chambers. If you remove the exterminations from the Auschwitz equation, you are left with a tragedy, yes, but not a unique tragedy - a war crime that was duplicated by the Allies during World War II.

So our question regarding the authenticity of the Auschwitz main camp gas chamber takes on an added importance. Was it a real gas chamber or a simple air-raid shelter, re-done to look like one?

And if we haven't reached a definite answer to that question in this short video, at least, hopefully, I've shown that it is a legitimate question to ask. And although there might not be any easy answers, one thing is for certain: this issue is far from over.