

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 57, No. 6

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001

JUNE 1993.

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

TRADE RIVALRIES MASK ECONOMIC REALITIES

by Eric D. Butler

In one sense, the present plight of the world might be compared with the Mad Hatter's Tea Party in *"Alice in Wonderland"*. Like the characters in that delightful fantasy, the political and other figures on the present world stage utter the most incredible nonsense, but attempt to make it all sound so normal. Poor Alice was bemused by it all, as well she might be. The Queen's call for *"Faster! Faster!"* reminds one of Confucius' statement: *"It's no use running harder if on the wrong road"*. While the Mad Hatter might feel perfectly at home in the present world, the reality is that the madness is being exploited in an attempt to solve the world's problems by a conscious programme of centralisation everywhere. *"Bigger will be better"* is a reflection of the dominant philosophy throughout the world of International Finance.

A quick glance at a selection of current newspapers reveals that the developed nations of the world, faced with growing internal problems, one being unemployment which refuses to go away, are all in complete agreement about one thing: they must force their way into other nation's markets in order to solve their domestic problems. A headline in *The Australian* states that PM ENTERS AVIATION WAR WITH US. What is this "war" about? Prime Minister Keating charges that the American based North West airline is by its flights through Japan to Australia interfering with Australia's tourist policy. That policy, insists Mr. Keating, is essential to help sustain the Australian economy. But what do tourists of any kind bring to Australia? The short answer is: *money*. Which means that if tourists were to cease coming to Australia, then Australians would not be able to make full use of their own vast resources and production system. The simple-minded might react to the situation by asking, *"If we are short of sufficient money to buy our own production, then why don't we create sufficient instead of relying upon tourism?"*

A GROWING CONFLICT

The aviation conflict between Australia and the USA, with the USA banning some of the flights by the Australian based QANTAS into the USA is but part of a bigger and erupting conflict concerning trade. Australian farmers, misled by the same type of "experts" advising the government, have discovered that in spite of all their pleading in Washington, they are faced with the reality that the Clinton administration is determined to try to solve America's domestic problems by demanding greater access to foreign markets. The American policy of subsidies is to be used to export into what Australians have felt were their traditional markets. The Chinese have bluntly said that if the Americans can provide them with grains at a lower price than the Australians, then they will be taking American production.

The tempo of the growing trade war between the USA and Japan has been increased, with the Clinton government

virtually ordering the Japanese to open up their domestic markets to American exports. But with no sign of any serious improvement in the depressed Japanese economy, the Japanese government is finding it politically difficult to grant the American demands. While it appears that the American policy makers have had a short-term victory in forcing the new French government to sacrifice some French farmers by permitting increased American oil seeds into France, this can only increase the long-term problems for the French. There is growing conflict between the EC and the USA on a number of

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.

economic issues, all of which is fuelling the growing anti-American feeling throughout Western Europe.

OMINOUS THREATS

One ominous headline concerning the growing Japanese-American trade conflict, which has already brought the Australian Keating government onto the side of the Japanese, reads "JAPAN DRAWS ITS SWORDS ON AMERICAN TRADE PUSH". Trade wars invariably lead to military conflicts, a truth which Australians could learn at their peril if their governments persist in aligning themselves with Japan against the USA. And there is the growing problem with the Chinese Communist government, now riding a growing boom economy, sustained to a considerable extent by favourable treatment by the USA, which, like other developed nations, sees the Chinese giants as one outlet for their domestic problems. Chinese "ethnic cleansing" in Tibet along with violations of basic human rights, is conveniently overlooked in an attempt to ensure there is no interruption to exports into China. Overlooked too, is the fact that they may be engaged in creating yet another Frankenstein to threaten the world scene.

As persistently pointed out in this journal, with events increasingly confirming our warnings, no nation can escape

domestic and external conflict while tied to a financial policy which ignores the fact that under conventional financial rules, no developed economy distributes sufficient purchasing power to buy its own production. The policy of "full employment" conflicts with economic realities such as the constant striving to use increasing technology to replace human labour. It is now becoming clearer that "full employment" in the conventional sense is never going to be achieved again in any developed economy. Not unless, of course, the current madness sweeping the world leads to another major world war. But such a war would merely hasten the further breakup of civilisation.

The world is now faced with a stark choice: either reform the finance-economic system, making it subservient to true human needs and aspirations, or experience a catastrophic disaster of hellish proportions. Perhaps it would help at this critical time if adults took to reading "*Alice in Wonderland*". Perhaps Lewis Carrol was using fantasy to shed a little light on reality. And having digested "*Alice in Wonderland*" it would be helpful to pass on to another delightful, but illuminating fairy story, "*The Emperor's New Clothes*". It was a child who saw the reality masked by the collective madness which had everyone seeing the Emperor's new clothes when in fact he was stark naked. We were told a long time ago that we should become as little children.

DOUGLAS ON DEMOCRACY

"I suggest that it was not of the essence of a myth that it should be 'true'. Yet I think and hope that there is a real difference between a 'true' myth and a 'political' myth, and that the test of this difference is simply whether belief in it is self-sustaining, or whether it requires organised maintenance. And there are many instances of the myth, which was, once approximately true, but no longer corresponds to fact, and yet is kept in circulation by a conscious effort of organisation because of its usefulness to the organisers. *The identification of democracy with parliamentary suffrage is such a myth.*(emphasis added).

"Originally, and quite possibly until the passing of the Reform Bill, it had a factual basis. Voting as a mechanism for deciding action, arose from the eminently sensible idea if God was on the side of the largest number, instead of proving it by bloody battles, you would receive the same result by counting noses. It will be noticed that the argument is not on a high intellectual level, and assumes that each voter would, in the last resort, have the same length of spear, or throw the same weight of rock.

"In the so-called democratic countries ballot box suffrage is nearly universal, and the more nearly universal it is, the more we are driven to ponder on the nature of God who, as indicated by this process, is on the side of the big battalions. The fact, of course, is that a parliamentary vote gives no effective control, and the more widespread the vote, the less the control."

From *Programme for the Third World War* (1943)

In his classic work, *The Passing of Parliament* (1952) Professor (later Judge) G.W. Keeton expanded upon what Douglas said about the enlargement of the franchise. In the chapter "The Transformation of Parliament", Keeton wrote: "**The history of modern political society is in large measure the history of the struggle of the ordinary citizen to exercise some influence upon government - and of his repeated failures to achieve that modest ambition. . . . it must be conceded that the term "democracy" as used to describe Western political society, has practically nothing in common with Greek democracy, and that it bears little resemblance to philosophic exposition of the meaning of the term. From the beginning of the nineteenth century it has been assumed that political democracy is synonymous with the exercise of the vote by the adult population, male and (later) female. Hence the successive extensions of the**

franchise during the nineteenth century. These, however, have necessarily involved the increasing insignificance of the individual elector. Since individual votes are so numerous that they are almost valueless, and it is only in the mass that they achieve significance, each extension of the franchise has increased the power of the major political parties. They have effectively driven out independent representation and have destroyed smaller parties, and they exercise a predominant influence in the selection of candidates."

Although the first Reform Bill added only less than half a million new voters to the British electoral roll, these mainly from the emerging commercial and manufacturing middle classes, the Duke of Wellington was right when he warned the Reform Bill was merely the first stage of a flood which would eventually submerge the Constitution. Once it was agreed that the counting of heads, irrespective of what is in them, is the basis of policy making, it becomes obvious that a second Chamber is an obstacle to what is termed "progress". Thus in Britain the progressive weakening of the House of Lords.

Keeton writes, "**After the first Reform Bill, the member for a time enjoyed more independence of thought and action than he had done before, or has done since. The number of electors was small, they belonged to the politically mature middle class, and they were immune from susceptibility to corruption"**.

Douglas suggested in *Realistic Constitutionalism*, that genuine democracy required that all governments be subservient to the Common Law, which should be revitalised.

"THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH IN HISTORY"

The League of Rights is actively promoting this David Irving video, and has obtained a supply from his Australian representatives. It is \$35 posted from all League addresses. We are informed that profits from the sale of videos will be used to help finance his legal expenses as he battles against the Australian government.

THE WIDER IMPLICATIONS OF THE DAVID IRVING DRAMA

By Nigel Jackson

Addressing the Melbourne Conservative Speakers Club, a division of The Australian League of Rights, on June 7, well-known literary figure, Mr. Nigel Jackson, presented a most impressive assessment of the David Irving affair. We are publishing the first part of an outstanding example of the scholarship for which Nigel Jackson has become increasingly known. The full text of his address will subsequently be published in booklet form:

Let me begin by quoting some sentences about the British wartime leaders Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill:

"Chamberlain... had offered the only way of preserving what was left of British power; if 1945 represented 'victory', it was, as Chamberlain had foreseen, for the Soviets and the Americans.

To write about 1940 and Churchill meant going back to explain how the man of 1940 had been created. . . . He had become an iconic Prime Minister, but he was never an icon in real life; indeed, no one can be that. It became a matter of getting the icon off the shelf and of trying to discern the lineaments of the living man."

Now you might be imagining that this passage has been taken from David Irving's first volume of *Churchill's War*, which was published by Veritas in Australia in 1987; but, in fact, it comes from page 2 of the introduction of John Charmley's *Churchill: the End of Glory*, published by Hodder and Stoughton in Britain in 1993.

The news about Charmley's revisionist study of Churchill broke in *The Age* and *The Australian* on January 5, 1993. To those of us who had supported Irving's book in 1987 against the barrage of unfair attacks launched upon it by writers such as Robert Manne (a Jew), Michael Danby (a Jew) and Gerard Henderson (a columnist who seems always to be adopting a pro-Zionist line in relevant controversies), Charmley's book sounded like a latter-day justification of the iconoclastic Irving approach.

Our hopes were raised by the report in *The Australian*, reprinted from *The Times*, which stated **"In a review for *The Times*, historian and former trade minister Mr. Alan Clark said the book was probably the most important revisionist text to be published since the war"**.

This seemed to suggest clearly that both adverse criticism of Churchill and the writing of revisionist history were now intellectually acceptable in the best circles in Britain.

It is true that that same report in *The Australian* began with five paragraphs conveying disagreement with Charmley's thesis by Martin Gilbert, who was correctly designated as **"the official biographer of Winston Churchill"** but whose Jewishness was discreetly not mentioned. There is reason to suspect that Dr. Gilbert might be described as the official hagiographer of Churchill and that it is highly significant to find a Jewish intellectual in this position (and not just a coincidence).

Dr. Gilbert has certainly received some extraordinary assistance with his labours that have resulted in a formidable multi-volume life of the so-called "great man". In the introduction to *Churchill's War* Irving revealed in 1987 that not only were the Churchill Papers to remain closed until ten years after Dr. Gilbert had completed his study (by stipulation of the Churchill family trust) but that **"important collections of official documents outside Churchill's archives have been**

effectively sealed."

"For example, the letters that passed between Churchill as Prime Minister and His Majesty King George VI, surely the most official of records, are being held at Windsor Castle at the exclusive disposition of Dr. Gilbert. In consequence, researchers acting without the warrant of the Churchill family are obliged to carry their enquiries into the four corners of the world. To me that looks like an obvious misuse of royal power and I wonder why it should have been the case.

On January 6 I was thus emboldened to send letters to the editors of *The Australian* and *The Age*, for it was known that the Australian Government was meditating on whether or not to grant Irving a visa for his proposed lecture tour beginning in March, and it seemed right to draw public attention to the support for Irving that Charmley's book seemed to provide. Neither letter was published and neither newspaper allowed that connection between the two writers to be made public during those critical weeks.

Later in January I purchased a copy of Issue No. 79 of *The Weekly Telegraph*, the digest of news from the previous week's issues of Britain's premier conservative daily newspaper, *The Daily Telegraph*, and which is now sold in Australia. This issue, I found, devoted three whole pages to the Charmley book and responses to it. What astounded me was that, even in this prestigious newspaper and even in such extended coverage, there was not a single word about Irving's earlier sensational book attacking Churchill and thus no indication of the extent to which Charmley agreed or disagreed with his most controversial predecessor's approach.

The mystery was compounded by a two-page coverage of Charmley's book and the controversy it had roused up offered to Australian readers in the January 30 edition of *News Weekly*, the fortnightly magazine published by Mr. B.A. Santamaria's National Civic Council; for, again, there was a complete absence of reference to Irving - despite the fact that aware Australians were awaiting the decision on Irving's visa application which was then imminent.

On February 6 and 7 *The Australian* devoted almost two pages of its "Weekend Review" to *Churchill: the End of Glory* and its author. Charmley, readers were told, **"expects to be unpopular among fellow historians, historians being what they are"**. Once again, however, not a word about Irving or his earlier attack on Churchill was to be found.

A month and a half later, on April 24, *The Age* published a review of Charmley's book by Robert Manne. After referring to Alan Clark's above-quoted words in his review in *The Times*, Manne endeavoured to diminish their importance by claiming **"Charmley's vast book is actually more complex and less noxious than Clark's review suggests"**. Manne ended his review with a nasty throw away paragraph in which Irving was at last at least mentioned:

"Charmley may not be, in this book, a revisionist in the David Irving mould, fabricating an alternative proto-fascist history of Europe. He is, however, very much a revisionist in the mould of his impish mentor, A.J.P. Taylor, playing with issues where real seriousness is required."

Manne is an Australian intellectual with considerable achievements to his credit and has proved a brilliant editor of the nation's leading cultural periodical, *Quadrant*. However, it must be added that his opposition to the revisionist historians is so intense that, while he will publish attacks on them, he will not even publish letters responding to these attacks; but he has opposed in *Quadrant* the ban on Irving.

Four days later, on April 28, I took delivery of the copy of Charmley's book I had ordered and was bitterly disappointed to find not a single reference to Irving in the index. I put it aside to be read in due course. And this is where the story begins to become exciting.

About two weeks later I was asked to give this address on this topic. Now, since I believe that the two saddest facts about all the controversy over Irving are that it deprives him of valuable writing time and that it almost never refers in detail to his elegant and profoundly researched texts, I began my preparations by re-reading the first nine chapters of *Churchill's War*, concluding with that critical revelation about how Churchill was saved on March 28, 1938 from debts which had forced him to place his beloved home, Chartwell, on the market:

"Bracken's South African friend Sir Henry Strakosch, the gold-mining millionaire and chairman of Union Corporation Ltd., agreed to pay off Churchill's debts. Strakosch was a Jew born in Moravia, Czechoslovakia. Chartwell was withdrawn from the market, and Churchill campaigned on.

Irving, by the way, was not the first to reveal this; it appears that both Churchill and Martin Gilbert had already made some references to it; but in Irving's book it is treated much more prominently. I then decided that I would study Charmley's account of Churchill's career up to that point in time.

Almost immediately I went to Chapter 28 of *Churchill: the End of Glory*, since it is entitled "Searching for Allies" and I wanted to discover what Charmley had to write about Churchill's Jewish allies. I came to page 315 and read the following:

"By the end of July Churchill's search for allies was enjoying a great measure of success. The members of the defence deputation were senior Conservatives, and if the leaders of the opposition parties refused to join it, then 'The Focus' group provided an alternative forum where Churchill could garner support from the left. On 24 July (1936) Churchill had invited some of its members to luncheon at his flat in Morpeth Mansions. With funding of twenty-five thousand pounds, courtesy of Sir Robert Waley-Cohen, the Chairman of British Shell and an ardent Zionist, already promised, and with more in the pipeline, 'The Focus' was to act as its name suggested; by producing research papers and holding large meetings, it was to bring the German menace before the British people."

Then I dutifully looked up footnote 51 and was astounded to read the following statement under it on page 675:

"D. Irving *Churchill's War* Vol. 1, pp. 59-61. "

It is perhaps necessary to say that Mr. Irving is cited only when his sources have been checked and seem

reliable. It should not be necessary to say such things, as Mr. Irving's sources, unlike the conclusions which he draws from them, are usually sound, but such is the hatred (and that is not too strong a word) which Mr. Irving arouses, that it is necessary for a biographer taking a non-hagiographical view of Churchill to do so. The current author admires Mr. Irving's assiduity, energy and courage, even if he differs from him in his conclusions.

So there it is! There is a comment on Irving's work in Charmley's book, and it is extremely favourable, despite its reservation about conclusions; but, by placing it under a footnote, Charmley (or his publisher) was able to avoid signaling its presence in his index.

The significance of that statement is considerable. Irving is a historian who has worked outside the academic world, so that some of his opponents have pusillanimously decreed that he ought to be described merely as a "historical writer". However Charmley is a professional academic historian with appropriate position in a university and publication record to match; and he is also a young contemporary. Not only has he praised Irving for assiduity, energy, reliability of sources and the high virtue of courage; he has also dared to define the characteristic attitude of many of Irving's critics as "hatred", turning against them the very word they so often recklessly and improperly hurl at Irving and his supporters. Although acting with notable discretion, Charmley has thrown down a gauntlet with unmistakable determination and deserves high praise for having done so.

Further examination of *Churchill: the End of Glory* showed that on page 706 Irving's book is listed under "**Biographies/Studies of Churchill**", a section which, Charmley explains, includes "**only the most useful**" of these, in view of the large number published. Another commendation of Irving! And in another part of Charmley's very extensive bibliography there is listed on page 715 *Breach of Security* (1968), which Irving edited.

Of course I felt disappointed that Charmley had specified disagreement with Irving's "conclusions" without, as it seemed, defining and justifying that disagreement; but this disappointment did not last long. For on page 677 I found that footnotes 40 and 41 also referred to *Churchill's War* and they directed my attention to pages 336 and 337 of Charmley's text, where I discovered that he articulates some important disagreements with Irving quite clearly - but not nearly as successfully as he believes. I shall now quote extensively from these pages, making appropriate comments where needed. Charmley is dealing with the drama associated with Churchill's placing of Chartwell on the market:

". . . the sudden appearance of a fairy godfather. Sir Henry Strakosch was a South African financier of great wealth and influence, and as such it was hardly surprising that he was an acquaintance of the ubiquitous Bracken. What might be considered more surprising was his agreeing to take over Churchill's losses for three years. It was an act of tremendous generosity, which enabled Chartwell to be taken off the market; but was it more than that?

On 7 April the Government's Foreign Affairs Committee met to discuss Czechoslovakia . . . During the discussions at the meeting, Lady Astor, the American-born M.P. for Plymouth and a devoted Chamberlainite, said to one M.P. who was clearly advocating a British commitment to Czechoslovakia, which might involve Britain in war, 'You must be a bloody Jew to say a thing like that'.

. . . Yet precisely the same charge has, at least by innuendo, been labelled against Churchill himself. Strakosch, we are told as though it were significant, was a Moravian Jew, and 'Focus' was certainly bank-rolled by wealthy Jews who were, not unnaturally, concerned at the fate of their co-religionists in Germany. So was Churchill a 'hired help' for a Jewish lobby, which, regarding Jewish interests as superior to those of the British Empire, was determined to embroil that Empire in a war on their behalf?

Charmley's discussion has been directed squarely against Irving's *Churchill's War* at this point and I believe that Irving should have been mentioned in the text and thus had his name in the index for those pages. It was Irving who revealed Sir Henry Strakosch's ethnic background and who called Chapter 6 of *Churchill's War* "The Hired Help".

It should be noted that Irving does not, of course, claim that Churchill was a Jew, but he does describe him, directly and without innuendo, as a 'hired help'. That phrase itself, however, can be interpreted in more than one way. Charmley continues his discussion as follows:

"Such is the sensitivity about anti-Semitism since the revelations from the Nazi death camps that even to ask such a question is to risk the grave imputation of racial prejudice. But people have such prejudices and they were a great deal more willing to express them openly before 1945. Beaverbrook certainly believed that 'the Jews may drive us into war', and he was far from the only one; it was, and has remained, a central tenet of the argument of Sir Oswald Mosley and his fascists that it was the Jews who, through their influence in the British press and elsewhere, pushed against Chamberlain's attempts for a *rapprochement* with Germany, thus making war more, rather than less, likely."

It is a pity that Charmley did not point out the fatal vagueness of the ambiguous term 'racial prejudice' and explains that there is nothing immoral in having previously formed judgments on issues of race. It is regrettable that he did not stress the importance of resisting slanderous or libelous attacks under such banners and of refusing to distort one's analyses of historical persons and events through fear of such attacks. It is even more regrettable that Charmley did not refer his readers to Chapter 18 of Sir Oswald Mosley's autobiography *My Life* (Nelson, UK, 1968), where that still much misunderstood man explains clearly (page 339) that his 1934 Albert Hall speech addressing a Jewish interest in fostering war with Germany "had nothing whatever to do with anti-Semitism" and that he was concerned solely with the "main passion" of his life, "the prevention of war".

Charmley then went on to expound a thoroughly unsatisfactory response to Irving's position in *Churchill's War*:

"Churchill was certainly involved with the Zionist movement, but only on the periphery (indeed he refused to lead a delegation on the Palestine issue to Chamberlain in early 1938), and he was certainly associated with Jewish organisations which did take the view that the British Empire and its resources would serve their purposes well. But Churchill's search for allies had also brought in the Russian ambassador, Maisky, pacifists and crypto-Communists from the left of the British political spectrum, trades unionists, feminists, and the weird and wonderful of all descriptions, as well as many ordinary men and

women who, for reasons similar and dissimilar to his own, felt that Britain ought to pursue a stronger line in Europe. But unless we take the view that the communists, pacifists, etc., etc., were all part of this great Jewish conspiracy, then this line of argument begins to look threadbare, for we should have to allege that Churchill was a Communist sympathiser, or maybe a closet pacifist - and at the latter the mind will take no more."

Charmley ignores Irving's implication on page 191 of *Churchill's War* that Maisky was also Jewish ("A decade later he would barely escape the same dictator's anti-Jewish purge"). More importantly, Charmley's argumentation about all the other fellow travellers with Churchill and the Zionists entirely misses the point that none of these people put up the tens of thousands of pounds that saved Chartwell, kept Churchill in politics and gave "The Focus" teeth. It is reasonable to recall the adage that he who pays the piper calls the tune. The presence of all sorts of other dancers does not alter that fact. Nor is there any reason whatsoever to insist on any knowing involvement of these other dancers in a "great Jewish conspiracy" which, by its nature, if it existed, would only have been known to the select number of Jewish individuals participating in it. Such elementary illogicality in Charmley's discourse strongly suggests that, for all his courage in engaging in revisionist history, an instinct for survival has kept him from going beyond a certain distance, quite possibly without his being conscious of this. And a worse error is to follow as the rest of his discussion, which I now quote, reveals:

Churchill's association with the Jewish lobby was on the same terms as his association with Citrine, Dalton or Philip Noel-Baker - those who were against Hitler were his allies, and he was not going to ask too many questions about their motives or ultimate objectives. It was a line he was to pursue until February 1945, when he finally began to realise that a mutual hatred of Hitler did not amount to a community of views on anything else; but by then it was all a little late. Strakosch had been feeding Churchill masses of information about German rearmament since 1935, and he shared with him a view that Hitler's ambitions were of the Napoleonic kind. He had looked to Churchill to champion his ideas, and he was only too willing to bail him out financially to enable him to continue to do so. Those with a taste for more sinister and lurid interpretations may indulge it, but no one would argue that Churchill only opposed Hitler because he was receiving cash for it; that opposition was, as we have seen, part of his general vision of British history."

If no one argues that Churchill opposed Hitler purely for financial gain, then why bother to raise the idea at all? Unfortunately, Charmley has clearly implied that was Irving's thesis. Such an implication flies entirely in the face of Irving's position as stated in the introduction to *Churchill's War*, which runs as follows:

. . . this book's early chapters are overhung by the enormity of his financial deficit during his years in the political wilderness. . . . This financial quandary might seem of only vestigial importance, but in following chapters comes the suggestion that he proceeded to sell his soul to a syndicate of politicians and financiers called "The Focus", a group which continued to fete and finance him until the outbreak of war. . . He remained

unerringly convinced that he was protecting his country and its Empire from its greatest enemy. Yet in reality he had allied himself with that Empire's profoundest enemies, and presided over its dissolution."

In short, Churchill was not in any way a conscious renegade, let alone a mere gobbler up of bribes. More importantly, Charmley again misses the vital point that a man may still be a 'hired help' even if he considers himself his nation's chief defender. Without Jewish financial help, Churchill's political career would have collapsed in 1938, in which case European history might thence have taken a very different direction, quite probably to the greater benefit of Britain, her Empire and the world as a whole.

Irving emerges from this analysis as the subtler of the two historians in this very sensitive context. It must be noted that he is a man with an excellent sense of irony. He called Chapter 9 of *Churchill's War* "**The Grand Alliance**". This might seem at first glance to refer to the "**solemn treaty of mutual defence organised by Britain and France**" which Churchill was calling for in 1938 under that name. The structure of the whole chapter, ending with the account of how Sir Henry Strakosch saved Churchill, indicates, however, that Irving considers the Jewish alliance with Churchill as the factor of prime significance.

And that, presumably, was why Doubleday in the USA and Macmillan in the UK refused to publish *Churchill's War*, despite the assurance that it would have enjoyed colossal sales. Utilising a great deal more data than Charmley refers to, Irving draws aside the curtains of propaganda to reveal that the political affairs of nations are in this age often controlled by a semi-clandestine force of Jewish influence, made powerful by enormous financial resources, and that even the greatest national heroes may turn out to have been no better than gullible tools for the destruction of their nations.

Let me turn now to a recent essay of Irving's entitled *The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers*. This was delivered as an address at the eleventh conference of the Institute for Historical Review in America in October 1992 and later published in Volume 13 Number 2 of the *Journal of Historical Review* dated March/April 1993. Before analysing this essay and its significance, I want, by way of introduction, to refer to an editorial in the British journal *The Economist* on February 1, 1992 and headed "**Unnerving**". This poisonous little piece of commentary is a splendid example of the obscurantist hedge that has been placed around Irving and his achievements by journalists throughout the English-speaking world and also in other European nations. The anonymous editorialist began as follows:

To be hoodwinked once is unfortunate; to be hoodwinked twice looks like carelessness. Nonetheless, when David Irving claimed to have discovered in Adolf Eichmann's memoirs evidence directly linking Hitler to the extermination of the Jews, one British paper, *The Observer*, made it the centrepiece of its front page. Mr. Irving, a historian not unsympathetic to the Fuhrer, had previously been taken in by the notorious Hitler diaries..."

Well, that was one blunder by the editorialist that was so obvious that the journal had to publish a subsequent letter by Irving pointing out the truth of the matter, which is that it was he himself who had exploded the myth of the "Hitler diaries" at a Hamburg press conference on April 25, 1983.

The editorialist then went on to expound his theory of the second way in which Irving had allowed himself to be hoodwinked:

"Doubts about the "find" emerged quickly. Within

a few days, a senior archivist at Koblenz told an American scholar, off the record, that the story would be dead within a week. That same evening, a copy of Eichmann's memoirs - *Ich, Adolf Eichmann: Ein historischer Zeugenbericht* - turned up on a shelf in the library at Hebrew Union College, in Cincinnati. It contained 550 pages, had been published by Druffel, a well-known right-wing German publishing house, in 1980, and bore a remarkable likeness to the material Mr. Irving said he had recently acquired. A further check disclosed nearly 40 copies of the book in other American libraries."

This second claim is as spurious as the first, as Irving's own account shows.

Those of us who are determined to defend Irving the man and his achievements, and not just his right to express his views, should always base our cases, whether they be brief or extensive, on the texts themselves, which for us are Irving's books and essays. That is the ground, which we will insist on making the site of the battle and on which we will win the battle. By contrast, the whole tactic of Irving's Jewish enemies and their lickspittle lackeys in the media is to avoid that ground like the plague. Hence my choice, on this occasion of Irving's 1992 IHR Conference address, which, among other things, refutes that second claim by the editorialist in *The Economist*.

The first aspect of this address, which is notable, is its style or manner. It is buoyant, cheerful, jaunty; it has a tone of light mockery that reminds me of the satire of John Dryden, the great English poet whom T.S. Eliot named "the master of contempt". In Melbourne on 25 July 1992 the *Herald-Sun* newspaper published a gossip piece about Irving headed "**Chauvinism lives on with David Irving**". The writers, Vikki Orvice and Paul Harris, were seeking to locate Irving in a world of male chauvinism and Hitler memorabilia, being quite unable (I suspect) to recognise leg pulling and depth of sentiment, respectively, in the two contexts. Their ploy rather backfired when they quoted Irving's lady friend, Miss Bente Hogh, whose beauty was made plain in an accompanying photograph. Here are the three relevant paragraphs:

"Irving is, well, "different", the stunningly attractive Bente said in a recent interview. "I like him because of that I like people who are different, who are a little eccentric. "He is smart, and has a good sense of humour. It would have been easy for him to give up his beliefs, to stop writing and speaking out, but he hasn't. I respect him for that.

"Around the house, he does more than I do. I iron his shirts and he complains and then ends up doing them again himself. As for his views on women, I take them with a pinch of salt"

In contrast to the picture sedulously pollocked up (if I can put it that way, recalling the waste of Australian money on "Blue Poles") by malevolent journalists and Jewish academics of Irving as the miserable, sado-masochistic, pettifogging, bitter-souled, sour-faced subverter of great men and true history - Robert Manne in the November 1987 issue of *Quadrant* likened him to one of Shakespeare's most treacherous and detestable characters, Iago in *Othello*; and two *Quadrant* editors, Peter Coleman and Roger Sandell, refused to publish an article in reply by me which tore that despicable comparison to shreds - in contrast to the pseudo-Irving, about whom a pseudo-biography could now be written, the real man has a lightness of heart and a fine sense of fun; and it all comes through in this address to the IHR Conference.

The other fact to note about Irving's characteristic style, both in his essays and his books, is its freedom from the dispiriting ponderousness of current academic writing. John Charmley's prose, for example, is heavy and colourless to encounter after the cavalier narration of *Churchill's War*. This populist style is not to be dismissed as that of an intellectual mercenary or charlatan. Rather, we may recall a paragraph from the introduction to P.D. Ouspensky's epochal philosophical study *Tertium Organum* published in Britain in the early 1920's. The Great Russian thinker, about whom Colin Wilson has just published a new biography, wrote:

"It is no merit in an author to invent new words, or to use old words in new meanings which have nothing in common with the accepted ones - to create, in other words, a special terminology. I have always considered that it is necessary to write in the language which men commonly speak."

Those grudging commentators who like to damn Irving with faint praise by paying tribute to his powers of research while vaguely denigrating his conclusions ought to include the gift of lively and entertaining narration with his gift for finding treasures among the archives or in the hands of private persons in many nations. Reading Irving is enjoyable; and that is another reason why his political enemies so fear his works.

Irving began his IHR Conference address by giving some background to his association with the British newspaper *The Sunday Times* in the publications of extracts from the Goebbels diaries. He described the way in which, after it came under intense Jewish pressure, that newspaper endeavoured to shift the blame on to him, defaming its own contributor and the man who had first given them the chance of the publishing scoop involved. The Jewish pressure, which began with a campaign to deface *Sunday Times* posters advertising the scoop, was directed squarely at the paper's employment of Irving. Commented Irving:

"They themselves (*The Sunday Times*) admitted this pressure, not only from the English community but the American Jewish community as well, because *The Sunday Times* is particularly vulnerable. Much of their finance comes from their American banking system, and much of the advertising in Britain is dependent on this particular community. The community left Andrew Neil, the editor, with no doubt at all of their displeasure. He told me at the height of this crisis that he had never been through such a nightmare in his life."

Irving explained that it had taken him two years to learn to read the exceptionally difficult handwriting used by Goebbels, only two other figures in the world having achieved a similar competence. It seems not to have mattered to his Jewish antagonists that such arduous labours deserved the kind of financial reward *The Sunday Times* was offering him. In war, magnanimity often vanishes.

Irving went on to give a graphic description of the kind of vicious campaigns mounted against him by the Zionists:

"Around the West End where I live you'll find every parking meter, every lamp-post, every traffic standard, every traffic light have got stickers on them saying 'Smash David Irving', 'Stop Irving', or 'Irving Speaks, Rostock Burns'. Behind 'this is a group that calls itself. . . . the Committee Against Fascism in Europe, which *The Daily Express* tells me is in fact a front for the Mossad. They've gone around putting up these stickers all over the West End of London advertising mass-meetings outside my home, and very kindly giving my address."

The current Jewish leadership in Australia has run a strong

line, using very tenuous evidence, that Irving was banned from Australia because of his record of advocating political violence. Yet there has been almost no mention in the Australian media of the violence directed against Irving and his books, including the organised smashing of bookshop windows in Britain.

VALE BILL O'DONNELL

It is with deep regret that we record the recent passing of yet another veteran "*New Times*" supporter, Mr. Bill O'Donnell of Coonabarabran, N.S.W., after a long illness.

Bill O'Donnell was one of those rare spirits, which the Social Credit movement produced. Many a bank manager, economist and politician learned that they had completely misread a man they thought was some type of a simpleton who could not possibly know anything about the mechanics of banking. With the use of the principles of double-entry bookkeeping, Bill O'Donnell was in his element proving beyond all argument how the banking system created new money in the form of bank credit. He was a born teacher in his field. A product of the Victorian Mallee of the thirties, which was a tough environment, Bill O'Donnell in latter years became a sleeper cutter in northern New South Wales, continuing to work in the bush long after most men had retired. Right up until the time he reluctantly became hospitalised, Bill O'Donnell maintained a type of almost boyish enthusiasm about his main interest in life, apart from his family. He was widely respected and made no enemies. He sought for a period to inject some financial realism into the Country Party, and also stood as an Independent candidate for Federal parliament. He was always all optimist, a reflection of his Christian faith. For many years he was a staunch supporter, along with his wife Edna, of the Australian League of Rights, helping to organise meetings in Coonabarabran. Bill O'Donnell was representative of the traditional Australian countryman, simple, without guile, direct, loyal and dedicated to fundamental principles.

We extend our deepest sympathy to his widow Edna, to his son Charles and to his grandchildren.

- E.D.B.

PLAN NOW FOR THE NATIONAL WEEKEND

Far-reaching developments are taking place in a crisis-torn world, of which Australia is part. This year's League National Weekend will see a realistic examination, and assessment, and an appropriate strategy, concerning the national crisis. League supporters, old and new, must make every endeavour to be present. The Weekend starts on Friday, October 1st, and finishes on Sunday, October 3rd. Limited private accommodation available. Early bookings appreciated.

THE PAIN OF A NEW IDEA

It has been said that man is a slow learner, often clinging to beliefs, which have been proved false. This is a reality, which Social Crediters must face. The generally accepted "experts" in many fields have, over the centuries, been quick to condemn new ideas, which challenge what they have been supporting. False pride is a major factor. There is also the fear of being economically disadvantaged. In a letter from London to their agents in New York, at a time when modern banking was being introduced into the USA, the Rothschilds made the revealing comment that **"The few who can understand the system will either be so interested in its profits, or so dependent on its favours, that there will be no opposition from that class, while, on the other hand, that great body of people, mentally incapable of comprehending the tremendous advantage that capital derives from the system, will bear its burden without complaint and, perhaps, without even suspecting that the system is inimical to their own interests."**

There was a time when it was generally believed that the world was flat, and up until comparatively recently there was actually a flat earth society. Although Galileo was probably not the first to believe that the earth was not orbited by the sun, as generally accepted, his proof that the earth orbited the sun brought him into sharp conflict with many, including the Christian Church.

Napoleon is credited with the statement that an army marches on its stomach. Nutrition has played a more important role in the history of man than is generally realised. It certainly was one of the major factors in the development of the British Empire. Australians and New Zealanders owe their beginnings to the epic voyages of discovery by Captain Cook. There is no doubt that Cook was a brilliant seaman, but his long journeys were only possible because he was not menaced by the dreaded scurvy, which it is estimated killed over one million British sailors between 1600 and 1800. The navies of all the European nations were cursed with the problem of scurvy.

The medical experts of the day were baffled by the disease, searching for bacteria, viruses or toxins, which it was felt might be lurking in the dark holds of sea-going vessels. But the answer had been known for hundreds of years. In 1530 the famous French explorer Jacques Cartier had his ships frozen in the St. Lawrence River. A quarter of the ships' crews were struck down by scurvy, some so badly that they were not expected to survive. Friendly Indians took pity on the French and provided them with an instant cure, derived from the bark and needles of the white pine. Cartier returned to France reporting that he had found a cure for scurvy. But the claim was treated as a huge joke by the French medical experts. The suggestion that simple Indians had discovered a cure, which had eluded all European medical authorities, was absurd!

Today, of course, it is known that scurvy is the result of a lack of Vitamin C. The bark and needles of the Canadian white pine are rich in Vitamin C, as are citrus fruits. It was 200

years after Cartier's experience that John Lind, a young surgeon in the British navy, demonstrated that the use of citrus fruits prevented scurvy among sailors. But it was nearly another 50 years later before Lind's recommendation was generally recognised by British naval authorities, with limejuice a major feature of naval rations. Thus originated the description of British sailors as "limeys". Cook was one of the first to grasp the importance of limes to maintain the health of his sailors on long voyages.

THE DEBT SCURVY

The cure for the debt scurvy has been known ever since C.H. Douglas started to publicise his discoveries about the modern finance-economic system at the end of the First World War. Events continue to baffle the certified economists who cannot bring themselves to admit that they have been wrong for so long and that the "untrained" Douglas could be right. But eventually the courage and persistence of those who have grasped the Douglas revelation will bear truth. Dr. Harvey was disgraced as a physician because he dared to state that the blood was pumped by the heart and actually moved through the arteries. Dr. Harvey was denounced as a charlatan by his colleagues. Ignay Semmelweis was forced from his Vienna hospital post because he insisted that his maternity staff constantly wash their hands. Such a practice is, of course, commonplace in all hospitals today.

Recently the Australian media carried the exciting news that medical science had made a major discovery concerning the nation's biggest killer: heart disease. Medical science had allegedly discovered that the use of Vitamin E both prevented heart disease and was essential for cure. Television audiences were given an outline of just what Vitamin E therapy did for the human arteries. But the medical "experts" responsible for the "discovery" did not point out that the beneficial effects of Vitamin E have been known for at least half a century, that the Shute Institute in Canada had been reporting beneficial results from Dr. Shute's recommendations concerning Vitamin E therapy over many years. One of the pioneers of popularising Vitamin therapy in Australia was Social Credit pioneer C. Barclay Smith. The late Lady Phyllis Cilento was a pioneer of Vitamin therapy at a time when her medical colleagues scoffed at her teachings.

As C.H. Douglas pointed out, most people are not moved so much by explanations as by the impact of events. Well might those who have, thanks to Douglas, obtained at least a glimpse of reality, ask, "How long, O Lord, how long?" before the scales fall away from the eyes of those who remain blind to the realities around them. But Social Crediters must continue to live with faith. Their mission is to carry through the prevailing storms, which have wrecked much of Western Christian civilisation, that knowledge essential for eventual regeneration. They carry a great responsibility on their shoulders.

INSIDE AUSCHWITZ

In a fascinating video film made late last year, young Jewish American David Cole takes the viewer through the infamous German concentration camp at Auschwitz, Poland, as he asks searching questions of the increasingly confused English-speaking guide allocated to give him a personal tour. The young guide eventually suggests that perhaps the only person capable of answering his questions is the curator at Auschwitz, Dr. F. Piper, who reluctantly agrees to a video taped interview, and makes the revealing admission

that the so-called gas extermination chamber - shown by Cole on his video tape - was actually reconstructed after the Second World War. And there are other revelations. The Australian League of Rights has now obtained exclusive rights of distribution for the David Cole video in both Australia and New Zealand. It can be supplied by all League addresses for \$25 posted. But we must warn that as yet the tape can only be shown privately. It has not been classified for public viewing.