

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 58, No. 5.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication PP481667 100259

MAY, 1994.

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

IRVING AGAIN DENIED AUSTRALIAN VISA

by David Thompson

The Australian Minister for Immigration has again denied a visa to the British historian, David Irving, after the full bench of the Federal Court ordered the Minister to reconsider his previous decision to ban Irving in February 1993. The Court ruled in September that Irving was denied 'natural justice' by the Minister's earlier decision, and that he was entitled to answer the allegations against him, which were brought by the Jewish lobby in Australia.

In his latest decision, Mr. Bolkus, Minister for Immigration, relied upon the view that Irving was not "of good character". It is also clear that Irving's deportation from Canada in November 1992, and his conviction in Germany for "slander concomitant with the disparagement of the memory of the dead" counted heavily against him. Irving was deported from Canada because he was prevented from meeting a voluntary departure deadline. If the full story of this event is ever publicly revealed, including high-level tampering with United States immigration computers, the Canadian deportation must be dismissed as a gross manipulation of bureaucratic indifference. Obtaining hard evidence of this, however, is a lengthy and expensive process.

SOPHISTICATED INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN

Following Irving's German conviction, a German Court ruled in a later case that dissenting views on "the holocaust" were not necessarily disparagement of the dead. It appears that Irving is free to again challenge the Minister's decision in the Australian Courts, if he is prepared to risk substantial costs in doing so.

It is now quite clear that David Irving is the target of a highly sophisticated international campaign to have him silenced. His exhaustive historical research on events during the Second World War, and his own construction on those events, have generated powerful enemies around the globe. In particular, Irving's views concerning "the holocaust" have counted heavily against him, being exaggerated and misrepresented by the press. It is widely conceded that it was the influence of the powerful Jewish lobby in Australia that resulted in Irving being banned. The editorial of one newspaper, *The Newcastle Herald* (21/5/93) included the comment: "Mr. Irving (is) a target for the world's Jews. They have attempted to have him barred from expressing his views. In some countries, including Australia, they have succeeded..."

IRVING MISREPRESENTED

The debate concerning Irving has centred on two matters.

The first concerns freedom of speech: is Irving entitled to express his views? Initially the Jewish lobby argued that barring Irving from Australia had nothing to do with free speech; indeed were his books not available? Rather it was a case of Irving's presence being likely to incite public disorder.

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, either described as public or private.

To encourage all 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.

However, when Irving's video, *The Search for Truth in History*, was to be publicly screened, Jewish groups objected strongly. The editorial quoted above said: "*The reaction of some of Mr. Irving's opponents to proposed screenings this week of a video in which he expounds his views suggests that they would have been the more disruptive force . . .*"

The second matter concerns Irving's own views, particularly of "the holocaust". These and other views of Irvings have been exaggerated and misrepresented in reports concerning him. Repeating each others' mistakes, journalists who had obviously never read Irving described him as an *apologist for Hitler*, and that he *has written several books on the subject* of the holocaust. Some libelous statements were the subject of four court actions brought by Irving, with which he did not proceed because of prohibitive costs. These statements still stand on the public record.

IRVING'S OWN WORDS

In January 1994, Irving was invited by the entry branch of the Australian Immigration Department, to respond to twenty damaging allegations made against him. In an affidavit in response, he sets out his own views, which we place on the public record:

"I accept that many of my historical findings have been controversial. When the *Hitler Diaries* were being heralded by the press as a substantial find, I was able to prove, as a result of my research in West Germany as early as December 1982, that they were fakes. In Australia, students from the Universities of NSW and Western Australia, as I understand it, are penalised for citing my *Hitler's War*, but in the University of Wollongong, students are disciplined if they don't.

"Until the middle of the 1980s my books attracted critical acclaim internationally, further my books were handled by major international publishers . . .

"In the middle of the 1980s during the course of my research for my book, *Hitler's War*, I began to question the traditional view that Hitler Had ordered prisoners gassed in specially constructed gas chambers in the Auschwitz and other concentration camps in Poland during the Second World War.

THE LEUCHTER REPORT

"My attention was further attracted to this in 1988 when I read a court exhibit entitled *The Leuchter Report* which was written by one Frederick Leuchter, an American professional prison consultant specialising in the design and fabrication of execution hardware in prisons throughout the United States of America.

The Leuchter Report dealt with forensic tests which had been carried out on the "gas chambers" at sites in Poland, namely Auschwitz, Birkenau, Majdanek, and which revealed, among other forensic findings, that there were no significant traces of any cyanide compounds in the walls and other fabric of the alleged "gas chambers". This was clearly inconsistent with the suggestion that these facilities had been used as gas chambers during the Second World War. Further, Mr. Leuchter concluded that the nature of the construction of the facilities themselves was indicative that they could never have been used as gas chambers.

THE MOSCOW DEATH-BOOKS

"During the course of my research I looked further into this matter and made many other historical findings casting doubt upon the existence of homicidal gas chambers. Some of these findings were:-

(a) The official British Historian, Professor Sir Frank Hinsley,

reports that the cipher radio traffic from Auschwitz to Berlin during the war was monitored by the British secret Service and that although comprehensive statistics of all deaths occurring at Auschwitz were relayed to Berlin, including many thousands caused by typhoid epidemics, there was no mention of any deaths by gassings;

(b) Historians including myself have recently had privileged access to the Moscow State Archives. These contain the comprehensive S.S. Blueprints on the construction of Auschwitz and statistical documentation on its inmates and death records. Among that documentation, although meticulous in its detail no historian has discovered any explicit evidence of gassings at Auschwitz. The death certificates of Auschwitz are all in bound volumes. There are 46 bound volumes . . . listing sixty six thousand dead. They are not complete; there are some volumes missing for some of the years, from 1941 to 1944, but by and large, they are there. We can say from these certificates, there were probably 100,000 deaths all told, mostly from diseases like typhoid.

(c) Apart from survivor testimony of arguable prohibitive value, evidence of gassing at Auschwitz was given to the Nuremburg War Crimes Tribunal by the Russians who liberated the camp, but the new Russian regime has now conceded that their predecessors consistently produced perjured and fabricated evidence to the War Crimes Tribunal to support their political agenda at the time . . .

CAMPAIGN OF VILIFICATION

"I considered that in the interests of historical truth that the above matters were subjects calling for wide ranging public debate. The consequence of this, however, was that having advanced my hypothesis, I was subject to, and continue to be subject to, a campaign of blatantly false misrepresentation of my views, vilification, smears, and persistent attacks upon my personal and professional reputation.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from the "treatment" of David Irving. Powerful global forces fear that the legend of the Jewish "holocaust" is being undermined by Irving. If this, the greatest taboo in modern journalism, is shattered, then "the holocaust" can no longer be invoked as a ritual incantation to sear the conscience of anyone who dares to disagree with Jewish or Zionist leaders about anything. It would appear that every measure is being taken to destroy David Irving.

Hilaire Belloc

"Belloc was not the last of those who know it is well to have roots; but he was the last to have roots and to grow roots and to grow from roots and that you cannot live in a state of society (which means you cannot live the life of man at all) unless a sufficient number of the people about you are doing the same, and for the same reason."

- *Frederick Wilhelmsen in a review of Hilaire Belloc: No Alienated Man, in the June 1954 issue of The Fig Tree.*

"A NEW BRITANNIA IN THE SOUTHERN SEAS"

by Eric D. Butler

A striking vision of how Australia could lead the whole British world back to its common roots.

Price: \$4.00 posted from all Australian League of Rights' book services.

THE PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY

The following article by Mr. John Mitchell appeared in the June, 1954, issue of the Douglas Social Credit Quarterly Review, *The Fig Tree*:

The problem of individual liberty is one, which from different approaches is the special concern of many sects, groups, movements and unattached individuals. From the different approaches it is considered wholly or mainly as an aspect of the spiritual, the constitutional, the economic or the financial. There may be a sixth factor - the psychological, in which I include morale, which is a special aspect of each and all of these approaches, and which might be a meeting ground for an alliance of forces working along all approaches.

There is much in Mr. Charles Morgan's book, *Liberties Of The Mind*, which is of great assistance in considering morale as a political problem in the battle for liberty. The culmination of this breakdown of morale in the human mind as a political question is seen by him as "... *the conclusion of the cycle of numerical thinking is always the cretinous stage in which what was once individual judgment becomes a wolfish howling under banalities, and what were once men and women are but a single tongue to lick the hand of a dictator.*" In England we have not yet reached that stage there are many signs that we are drifting towards.

Most of us are familiar with the problem of the relation of the individual to the group in our conception of the organic nature of society as a matter of structural principle. But society today has departed far from those principles, and out of its departure has come a mental problem of far-reaching and grave proportions. This is a question of morale, of psychological resistance to the independent acceptance of ideas. Mr. Morgan indicates its nature:

"It followed that as numerical thinking affected man's regard of their fellow-men so it affected their estimate of opinion. Opinion began, as it were, to clot and value attached to the fact of its being clotted. As a head of quicksilver is drawn into a great pool of it, so independent judgment has a tendency to identify itself with the general."

"And again . . . 'they were preparing the way for that kind of mass-mental-conformity which today, even among people who believe themselves to be free, is so widespread that it is scarcely noticed'."

We are familiar with C.H. Douglas's definition of liberty *"as really a simple thing, the ability to choose or refuse one thing at a time"*. Perhaps we have taken too much for granted the "ability" as a legal, economic or financial power. But there is also the power of judgment, and it is only a free mind wherein judgment is exercised.

"It is necessarily hard", says Mr. Morgan, *"for any man to know when he is surrendering a part of the liberties of his mind. He can recognise restraint upon his actions or upon that expression of opinion which is itself an action, but there is for him no self-criticism more difficult than that within the house of his mind, in which he believes himself to move freely, certain rooms are locked on which he has surrendered the keys. But the difficulty of recognising this in himself may be lessened if looking into the minds of his forebears he says 'this is the thing that happened to them as a consequence of certain pressures they endured. May it not be happening to me, upon whom like pressures fall with an increasing intensity?'"*

There is this curious problem in nature: the time puzzle, posed in the problem of which comes first, the egg or the hen. The overt liberties, the liberties of action, are dependent for exercise in the liberties of the mind, which provide the ability. But the liberties of the mind, themselves, become hostages when the overt liberties are surrendered.

Overt liberties have been and are being surrendered. through action in the financial, the economic, and the legal and political fields. Action in the political field, in the first place, can stop and reverse the process but can only be initiated by an action in the mind of individual persons. It is this liberty of the mind, which is being thwarted, and until it is restored the political action will not follow.

Mr. Morgan is fully conscious that on the plane of thought there is an evil power working to destroy liberty. He may know, but he does not reveal the knowledge that there is a conscious, localisable incarnate power subsidising the Evil. But whether he does or does not know this, or whether it is necessary for him to know it, it is indubitably of vital importance that the question of the liberties of the mind and the liberties of action should be considered as ONE problem. Finally, the battle has to be fought out in the political field, simply because that is where power over policy can be exercised.

Mr. Morgan is conscious of the urgency of that part of the problem which he sees: *"There is overwhelming evidence that the problem of the liberties of the mind has moved out of the hinterland of political philosophy and is today as urgent and practical as the problem of the emancipation of the slaves of the past."*

It was Douglas, I believe, who said: *"Principles are all very well, it is the application of them which is all important."* Recently a dignitary of the Church of England in correspondence wrote *"both friends and foes alike of the Church would have agreed that it is the chief remaining bulwark, in an increasingly totalitarian world, which stands for the value of the individual in the sight of God and man, and therefore stands supremely for freedom."* When he was asked what specific freedoms the Church had defended and what action it had urged its members or the general public to take, he would not answer.

In another book of Mr. Morgan's one of his characters asks in reference to life: *"From what origins - to what ends?"* Individual liberty has no fundamental case as something which has to be fought for unless human personality has a spiritual origin, and therefore the Church has obviously a vital concern for liberty; and what is more important against the dark forces of Evil people will not fight unless they realise that individual liberty is an essential medium through which origin control end. But it is not enough to insist that individual liberty is important, its attainment has to be recognised as a practical problem. And in this matter the Church fails its Origin. One, if not the main reason for this seems to be an inhibition, or pressure on a liberty of the mind which has been brought about by a curious magic of virtue-cum-prohibition which has been allowed to be attached to the meaning of the words "non-political". It is not the confusion of the term with what is sometimes meant "non-party-political". It is more than that. The political has come to be regarded as dangerous ground by all who would not compromise themselves or their cause; and the attitude is both unreasoning and unreasonable. To be "non-political" has become something of a fashion and a convention. An American Evangelist, now in this country, is making a very significant point, which he terms *"The vertical relation with God must go with the horizontal"*. Control over individual action, and therefore over individual liberty, is through the horizontal action of the political today as never before. But when asked for his views on politics, the Evangelist said he

was "non-political". What is really happening is that inspirational thought is being abruptly halted at the practical level where principles are applied; and consequently the Evil forces are being left with a free field in which to apply their principles.

Discussing the common ground between Romanticists and Classicists, Mr. Morgan says that they *"have in common that they both recognise the existence of a ladder of apprehension and of a spiritual element in man. Collective materialists deny these things. For them no ladder extends beyond the mind, for in their view, the mind is only a part of the body, and not as it is for romanticists and classicists, an instrument and vehicle of the spirit."*

Mr. Morgan is aware of the dangers that have come with the extended franchise. If he and others, whose intellect has guided them so far along the road, could be taught to recognise that those who fight for liberty, not only have a sanction in their power to give or withhold a vote, but that in the use of this sanction the integrity of its use is the only element in it of value, we might construct a bridge between those of great competence who are fighting the battle of the liberties of the mind with those who are fighting the battle of the liberties of action. A unification of forces could bring to each an accession of strength far exceeding a mere aggregation of numbers.

Yet, such unification could only be effected if there were brought about a concrete realisation on both sides of the actual potentialities of each other. The activist is prone to belittle the analyst who falls short of concrete proposals, actual remedies; the social analyst to shrink from the scene of experiment, the "busy-mart".

I wonder whether Mr. Morgan has ever asked himself, and if he has not whether I may ask him, publicly, what he thinks of the following concrete proposition:

(1) There are thirty women. Fifteen of these vote for "A" Party, ten for "B" Party, and five think both parties have bad policies and don't vote at all. The "A" Party wins the election and carry out their policy. In consequence, the national income rises 10 percent and the purchasing power drops 20 percent.

Which among the thirty voters are morally responsible for the result? Which are held legally responsible?

(2) If by law the salaries of M.P.s and taxation on those who voted for the party in power varied in inverse proportion to the rise or fall in national income and the purchasing power of money, what would be the effect on the responsibility of the action of M.P.s and on voters? How many voters would vote?

Let us consider the same matter from an opposite point of view:

- (1) If all those who believed in the paramount importance of individual liberty withdrew from voting for any Party, in present circumstances would they not be using their political sanction in the only way that has integrity and responsibility?
- (2) If they then announced to candidates that they would not use their voting sanction until assurances, backed by liability to penalty were given that:
 - (a) Minorities would be given, without penalties *for so doing*, the right to contract out of National Education, National Insurance, National Health and Trade Unions.
 - (b) Minorities would be given the right to obtain, without penalty, pure bread and water.
 - (c) Discriminatory taxation would be abolished, i.e. that all

taxation be paid by direct levy on income.

Then responsibility of voting would become a fact. If voters who have a genuine belief in freedom did this, would they not then be using their vote in the only way that has integrity and responsibility?

It is not I who put these questions to Mr. Morgan. I ask him to put them to himself because an attempt is to be made to put this proposal for unity of action to all who profess the belief which he held concerning the importance of individual liberty and tolerance of and respect for the rights of minorities. It is not suggested that he or they should discontinue their present activities along other lines; but that they should help each other to make these activities effective in some tangible outcome.

ALL PARTIES SUPPORT AMALGAMATIONS IN VICTORIA

Nothing has so dramatically demonstrated that modern governments are a type of elected dictatorship than what has happened in Victoria following the massive rejection of the Cain and Kirner Labor governments. One of the major "reforms" attempted by the Cain government under a Marxist Minister of Local Government, was a drastic statewide amalgamation programme for Municipal government. There was a major electoral backlash with Councils resisting their attempted destruction. Liberal and National Party politicians correctly warned that the amalgamation programme was part of a far-reaching policy to undermine the Federal Constitution. The present Victorian Premier, Mr. Jeff Kennett, was one of the anti-Labor politicians most vociferous in his opposition to compulsory amalgamation.

But a few years later the same Jeff Kennett ruthlessly attempts to achieve amalgamation where the Labor Party failed. Now members of the Labor Party, both Federal and State, have been forced to admit the reality of the situation. Deputy Labor Prime Minister Brian Howe has openly welcomed the Kennett programme, stating that it was "overdue and a welcome initiative". Back bench Victorian Liberal and National Party Members have become highly embarrassed by what is unfolding. But unless subjected to sufficient electoral pressure, they will continue to "sit tight" and hope that they will be saved electorally by the notoriously short memories of the electors.

The Victorian Labor Opposition has been forced into a situation where the best they can suggest is that the elected Council represented be retained for the implementation of an amalgamation programme, which they firmly endorse. In the Provincial City of Geelong, the first area to be amalgamated, with six Councils merged into one, the State government elected Commissioners are being paid \$390 a day to implement the amalgamation programme. Pensioners already paying more for home and domestic help are asking where are the alleged benefits, which would flow from amalgamation.

The basic issue now confronting Victorians is whether they can start to correct the situation at the next State elections. Unless they can, they will continue to suffer under an elected dictatorship.

ECONOMISTS ADVOCATING DEBT-FREE CREDITS

During his recent visit to Australia, Professor John Hotson, Professor of Economics at the University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, was given some publicity concerning his views on the urgent necessity for debt-free credits in order to overcome the mounting debt problem. He was even interviewed by Phillip Adams twice on his ABC radio programme. Adams sounded like someone who had suddenly made some amazing discovery concerning the creation of credit. Well-known broadcaster Terry Lane also did an in-depth interview with Professor Hotson on his views.

The Social Credit viewpoint was put forward at a Sydney conference of a variety of groups, predominantly those concerned about the environment. Professor Hotson said publicly that C.H. Douglas has been right and also agreed at an Adelaide meeting that the present economic situation justified the payment of a minimum wage to all.

The essence of what Professor Hotson is saying, is that the debt question is now so explosive that unless corrective steps are taken to start eliminating debt, major economic disasters are inevitable. While we would not completely agree with Professor Hotson's suggestion of creating new debt-free credits for Local Government, at least he and a group of Economic Professors, mainly in the U.S.A., are admitting that orthodox finance-economics has failed, and that civilisation is faced with growing disasters.

What is known as the Sovereignty Movement lists a number of American Economic Professors and a number of tax bodies, which support the Sovereignty Proposal for the necessity for interest-free loans to local authorities.

The following is a statement concerning the Sovereignty Movement:

SOVEREIGNTY - AN ECONOMIC SOLUTION

Economics isn't a science. Sadly, it is an art form. Everyone can interpret, as he or she wants. Chemistry is a science and economics should be, but isn't. Five economists will give you six answers to a problem.

So which plan should be followed? Which economists believed? It's easy. The plan that has the most COMMON SENSE.

The Sovereignty Plan asks, is it COMMON SENSE:

- to agree that the present system doesn't work?
- to use loans, not grants (except for special emergencies)?
- to build capital projects, not for day-to-day expenses?
- to pay for the projects once instead of three times?
- to not add to the federal debt?
- to have the proposal generate much needed jobs, in the good paying fields of manufacturing and construction?
- to not have *any* "pork barrel" in the plan?
- to do this once, check the results before repeating the programme again?
- to have safeguards that prevent inflation?
- to use the best player on the team (government authority to create money) instead of letting him remain on the bench while it's late in the game and we are losing?
- to increase federal tax revenues (due to more people working) without increasing tax *rates*?
- to reduce money going out the back door in unemployment and welfare benefits?

to have local government, the government that generally governs best, implement the plan, set the high standards of excellence so that the federal government could duplicate that for federal project standards?

Are more reasons needed?

We note that at least twelve American Economic Professors are listed as supporters of the Sovereignty concept, along with several senior bankers. If it becomes generally accepted that debt-free credits can be created for public authorities such as Local Government, the stage could be set for the extension of the Social Credit concept of extending debt-free credits direct to individuals. A start can be made by adequate pensions for those taking early retirement from a production system which does not require everyone's services, and by the payment of family allowances on a scale which would make it possible for all mothers who wish to, to spend full time with their young families, and looking after their homes.

Douglas predicted that events would be the major factor in forcing a change in finance-economic policies of disaster. But it requires sufficient trained Social Crediters to ensure that desperate people do not jump out of the fire into the frying pan.

"LIBERTY IS THE GOD IN MAN"

"Generally, the moral substance of liberty is this: that man is not meant merely to receive good laws, good food, or good conditions, like a tree in a garden, but is meant to take a certain princely pleasure in selecting and shaping, like a gardener. Perhaps this is the meaning of the trade of Adam. And the best popular words for rendering the real idea of liberty are those, which speak of man as a creator. We use the word "make" about most of the things in which freedom is essential, as a country walk or a friendship or a love affair. When a man "makes his way through a wood", he has really created; he has built a road like the Romans. When a man "makes a friend", he makes a man. And in the third case we talk of man "making love" as if he were (as indeed he is)

creating new masses and colours of that flaming material - an awful form of manufacture.

"In its primarily spiritual sense, liberty is the god in man, or, if you like the word, the artist. In its secondary political sense liberty is the living influence of the citizen on the State in the direction of moulding or deflecting it. Men are the only creatures that evidently possess it. On the one hand, the eagle has no liberty: he only has loneliness. On the other hand, ants, bees and beavers exhibit the highest miracle of the State influencing the citizen, but no perceptible trace of the citizen influencing the State".

G.K. Chesterton.

THE QUESTION OF WORK

The basic requirements of life are food, clothing and shelter. Work is the expenditure of energy to produce these requirements. Work for work's sake is a form of insanity, elevating means into ends. Premier Jeff Kennett of Victoria and his fellow totalitarians is concerned about Victorians having too many public holidays. During the thirteenth century in England, when basic productive power was man and his animals, there was a four-day working week and 152 holidays (these were "holy" days). These were the days of "Merrie England", during which after providing for the basic requirements of life, there was sufficient surplus production power to build the great Cathedrals and the Guildhalls. Art and literature flourished. There was no national debt.

But in spite of the industrial and technological revolutions which have made it possible for a very small percentage of a total population to produce adequate supplies of food, clothing and housing, along with a flood of labour-saving devices, the politicians and their "expert advisers" call for greater "growth" in a vain attempt to create "full employment". There are several aspects of a problem, which Social Crediters have long grappled with. There is a deep philosophical problem concerning the question of freedom. At bottom some people do not believe in freedom; you "cannot trust people". Numbered amongst these are those who call themselves Christians, who have rejected Christ's message about the Truth He revealed being the road to freedom.

There is also the problem of language, with the term "work" meaning different things to different people. Social Crediters are often charged with being opposed to work because they advocate a dividend system, which would make freedom a reality. Biologists have pointed out that the first thing any healthy organisation does when lacking it is to provide itself with a store of surplus energy. It then looks for means of expending that energy. Nature knows only one way of achieving this end, by work of some kind. Trees grow in accordance with their nature; they engage in work, using energy to grow in accordance with their nature; they engage in work, using energy to transform one form of energy into another form. All animals engage in work. They have simple objectives. But because of his more complex objectives, man is under a greater necessity to work than other creatures.

The cat does not require work to be "found" for it. Neither does the human being. It is not a question of work or idleness. The basic question is whether man is to be free to make genuine choices concerning activities directed towards his own ends, or activities forced upon him by external compulsion. "Full employment" is a policy of forced labour under central direction. This means slavery, irrespective of how it is described.

Writing in *Social Credit*, Douglas said: ". . . there are two separate and distinct inducements to what is called employment. The first inducement is involved in the necessity under which humanity labours to provide itself with bed, board, clothes and such so-called luxuries as are effective in setting free individual energies. That is an elementary necessity imposed by the natural conditions of our existence, and it is a primary necessity, in the sense that until it is met we are not free to devote our attention to other matters . . . It is incontestable that the most efficient method of dealing with this primary necessity so far evolved is by co-operative methods such as have been incorporated in the industrial system of the past hundred years or so. But the second necessity under which men and women labour, *after the primary necessity has been*

met, can broadly be described as satisfaction of the artistic instincts; which can be further analyzed and defined as the incorporation in material form of ideals conceived in the mind."

FORGOTTEN ROOTS

" . . . one cannot live in capital forever. A tradition, however firmly rooted, if it is never watered, though it dies hard, yet in the end it dies. And today a great number - perhaps the majority - the men and women who handle our affairs, write our books and our newspapers, carry out research, present our plays and our films, speak from our platforms and pulpits - yes, and who educate our young people, and have never, even in a lingering traditional memory, undergone the scholastic discipline. Less and less do the children who come to be educated bring any of that tradition with them. We have lost the tools of learning - the axe and the wedge, the hammer and the saw, the chisel and the plane - that were so adaptable to all tasks. Instead of them, we have merely a set of complicated jibs, each of which will do but one task and no more, and in using which eye and hand receives no training, so that no man ever sees the work as a whole or looks to the end of the work.

"What use is it to pile task on task and prolong the days of labour, if at the close the chief objective is left unattained? It is not the fault of the teachers - they work only too hard already. The combined folly of a civilisation that has forgotten its own roots is forcing them to shore up the tottering weight of an educational structure that is built upon sand. They are doing for their pupils the work, which the people themselves ought to do. For the sole true end of education is simply this; to teach them how to learn for themselves; and whatever instruction fails to do this is effort spent in vain."

- Dorothy L. Sayers in *"The Lost Tools of Learning."*

INSTITUTE OF HISTORICAL REVIEW

Several readers have contacted us alarmed by a report that the American-based Institute of Historical Review, which publishes a high quality quarterly, and promotes discussion on what has come to be known generally as historical revisionism, has been infiltrated and subverted by Zionists.

Our investigations reveal no evidence to support this claim, which appears to have originated with an American publication, which unfortunately often publishes sensational stories with a minimum of factual content. We are satisfied that the current staff of the Institute of Historical Review attempts to maintain a high standard of scholarship.

THE BENEFITS OF LESS GOVERNMENT

"In dealing with the State, we ought to remember that its constitutions are not original; they are not superior to the citizen.

"This is the history of governments - one man does something which is to bind another. A man who cannot be acquainted with me taxes me; looking from afar at me, ordains what part of my labour shall go to this or that whimsical end. not as I, but as he happens to fancy. Behold the consequence. Of all debts men are least willing to pay are taxes. What a satire is this on government! Hence the less government we have the better, the fewer laws, and the less confined power."

- Emerica.

" SCHINDLER'S LIST"

Australia's Federal National Party leader, Mr. Tim Fischer, is not always "politically correct". Mr. Fischer said that it was "ironic" that at the time of the Oscar award for Spielberg's film *Schindler's List*, Israelis were killing and wounding school children in Southern Lebanon, far from Israel's borders. Zionist leader Isi Leibler exploded on Australian national television with a personal attack on Fischer, charging that his mouth had moved more quickly than his brain. Leibler made no attempt to answer the point Tim Fischer was making. And, when the Malaysian government decided to ban *Schindler's List*, Zionist spokesmen quickly shouted about "censorship". These are the same people who called for the banning of British historian, David Irving, and then promoted attempts to prevent the showing of Irving's video, *The Search for Truth in History*. The Malaysian view was that *Schindler's List* was a propaganda film, promoting sympathy for the Jews and tarnishing the image of the Germans.

Australian novelist Thomas Kenneally, whose book - originally known as *Schindler's Ark* - was the basis of Spielberg's film, originally worked on the film script, but for some unexplained reason was dropped from the project. When Kenneally had his book re-published by Simon and Schuster under the title *Schindler's List*, there was the following disclaimer: This book is a work of fiction. Names, characters, places and incidents are either products of the author's imagination or are used fictitiously. Any resemblance to actual events, locale or persons, living or dead, is entirely coincidental."

Kenneally's frank admission that he had written a work of fiction raises the question of how factual is Spielberg's film based on this work?

Unpublicised is a revealing letter to Spielberg by David Brockschmidt, whose father helped both Schindler and the Jews. Brockschmidt's role has been acknowledged by both Israeli and German leaders. In his letter to Spielberg, David

Brockschmidt said that his film was "a bad film. It does not heal but it traumatizes and neutralises the viewers' brains. It also brings out aggression and hate in the Jewish Gentile communities the world over. This film will not decrease racism and anti-Semitism. It will intensify it." But the creation of hate is a major feature of Zionist propaganda. As Jewish spokesmen have said time and time, the creation of "anti-Semitism" is essential for control of the rank and file of Jews. The well-known American Jewish scholar, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, brings this out in his classic work, *The Zionist Connection*.

In concluding his letter, David Brockschmidt writes, "I suggest, dear Steven, it is now about time to make a film about the Gentile Holocaust mainly committed and run by Zionist Bolsheviks in Eastern Europe and Russia between 1917 and 1953, the year of Stalin's death. May I further suggest that you call this film, if you are going to make it, *Trotsky's and Kaganovich's List*." As far as is known, Spielberg has not responded to David Brockschmidt's letter. No Jewish film producer is likely to produce a film showing that the Bolshevik revolution was a Jewish revolution, as revealed by Winston Churchill in one of his braver moments, referring to "this world-wide conspiracy." But this was shortly after the First World War and before Churchill got into the financial difficulties, which were subsequently exploited against him, forcing him to accept policies with which he basically disagreed

History is full of examples of man's inhumanity to man, but true history will reveal that the madman Hitler was a Boy Scout compared with the Bolshevik monsters responsible for the mass murders they committed against the peoples they controlled. If Spielberg is looking for material for another holocaust film, he could consult the books of those who recorded the liquidation of the Kulaks under the collectivisation programme imposed by Stalin's Jewish brother-in-law, Kaganovich.

U.N. RESOLUTION AGAINST" ANTI-SEMITISM"

A resolution by the UN Human Rights Commission condemning "anti-Semitism", which is rated as being "racist", raises a number of questions. Judging by press reports, no precise definition of either "anti-Semitism" or "racism" is given. But the UN Commission, to which increasing numbers of the peoples of the world are being urged to appeal if they feel they are being discriminated against, makes the interesting comment that "racism, racial discrimination, anti-Semitism xenophobia and related intolerance, as well as acts of racial violence, persist and are even growing in magnitude, continually assuming new forms."

It is a reality of life that right around the world there is growing friction and violence. Ever since the "wicked" European colonial powers withdrew from Africa, there has been constant killing as a result of tribal differences. Blacks are killing blacks in South Africa. What does the UN Commission propose to do to stop the mass killing throughout the whole of Africa? Send in more "peace-keeping forces", like the one so disastrously used in Somalia?

It is interesting that the Turkish government, along with the USA, helped to sponsor the UN resolution. The division between Greece and Turkey in Cyprus continues indefinitely, while the long-suffering Kurds, promised their independence during the First World War, are in constant violent conflict

with the Turkish government.

The break up of the Soviet Union has seen an eruption of violence as the different ethnic and cultural groups strive for independence. Even the Ukraine, which proclaimed its independence after the break up of the Soviet Union, is now threatened with disintegration. As Federal Labor Member Graeme Campbell points out, there is as much racial conflict in Asia as in any other part of the world.

It is a natural law of life that every form of life discriminates in favour of itself. Otherwise it does not survive. The old saying that "*birds of a feather flock together*" reflects reality. Violence arises when central planners attempt to force different groups and different cultures to try to live together. Harmony in human societies is only achieved when there is the maximum of decentralisation, with different ethnic and cultural groups running their own affairs and not interfering in the affairs of other groups.

Chief Buthelezi of the Zulu people has sought the creation of a South African federation with the Zulus having the maximum of independence in their own traditional homelands. But it has long been obvious that Mandela, the centralist, strongly backed by the Marxists in the African National Congress, is the chosen instrument of the internationalists who have long planned to bring South Africa into their New World

AUSTRALIA THREATENED WITH ANTI-VILIFICATION LEGISLATION

Anyone who doubts that Jewish groups are the major driving force behind anti-vilification legislation everywhere should read the Zionist press. In quoting the "Zionist press" we are being factual in that Jewish communities and their organisations are dominated by Zionists. Anti-Zionists like Dr. Alfred Lilienthal in the U.S.A., have been driven out of Jewish communities.

Zionist domination of Jewish communities rapidly expanded after the First World War, during which war the infamous Balfour Agreement was signed, setting the road which led to the establishment of the State of Israel at the end of the Second World War. While denouncing all forms of discrimination, Zionist leaders have practised it relentlessly in their attempts to preserve Jewish communities as a type of collective battering ram against what they see as a danger to their policies.

The Australian Jewish News of March 25 carries a report concerning an address by Victorian attorney general Mrs. Wade, to the National Council of Jewish Women. Mrs. Wade announced that, in spite of re-election promises, the Kennett government did not now propose to introduce anti-vilification legislation, the reason being that the Federal government had promised to introduce such legislation in the near future. "It's better for governments not to be duplicating what other governments are doing", said Mrs. Wade.

The Jewish News recalls that as Shadow Attorney General Mrs. Wade, before the October 1992 State Elections had assured the Jewish Community Council of Victoria President Mr. Joe Gersch, that the legislation would go ahead, even if amended from the Labor government's proposed bill. This assurance was repeated after the Liberal Party had been elected.

After Mrs. Wade had spoken, a past president, and currently vice-president of the Council of Jewish Women, Mrs. Maltina Malnek, commented that it was not important which government introduced anti-vilification legislation. "We probably would prefer both", Mrs. Malnek said. "We would rather have overkill than underkill on this issue. I'm making this a plea, Mrs. Wade."

The Jewish News reported that when Jewish Community leaders were approached concerning Mrs. Wade's statement, they reacted with "caution". Mr. Leon Bloom said that if there were any lack in Federal legislation, Jewish leaders "would try to get state legislation introduced."

Mr. Isi Leibler said he believed that Federal legislation would be introduced "in the near future" and that he was aware of the State government's attitude. "We are all watching the position and anticipate there will be some progress. I believe the (federal) legislation will be introduced soon and I hope it will have teeth and contain criminal sanctions."

Mr. Mark Leibler is quoted as saying he had no reason to doubt that federal legislation would be introduced. He said, "While there are no guarantees, we do believe that the legislation introduced will include criminal sanctions."

For over a thousand years, the Christian based Common Law system has protected the rights of the individual. One of

the most basic of those rights is freedom of speech. But the Zionist campaigners have their own definition of free speech - this meaning freedom to speak about any subject, which is not vetoed by the Zionists. In Germany and France it is judged to be a criminal offence to cast even doubt on the authenticity of the "Jewish Holocaust" legend. Zionists make it clear that any criticism of current immigration policies should be regarded as an offence. Certain books could be regarded as offensive under the proposed anti-vilification legislation and banned, as has happened in Canada.

The Zionists have been the driving force behind the campaign to ban British historian David Irving from visiting Australia. The fact that they also attempted to veto the showing of David Irving's video, *The Search for Truth in History*, is further evidence of their totalitarian intentions. The Anti-vilification legislation is the greatest threat to genuine freedom ever experienced in Australia.

THE EROSION OF PRIVATE RIGHTS

"The whole conception of the orbit and enforceability of a private right differs fundamentally today from what it meant sixty or seventy years ago. A private right may, without exaggeration, be defined as an area of personal freedom, which exists only so long as it does not impede the development of a social policy by a public organ. When it does, compulsory powers of acquisition or of personal direction, coupled with departmental legislation and adjudication will effectively compass its destruction. It is only very exceptionally today that the hunted citizen can escape from the comprehensive meshes of this spider's web into the somewhat Olympian calm of the ordinary courts - and when it does it is frequently to be told that, however regrettable it may be, the court has no power to interfere with the inexorable advance of departmental policy.

"Behind this constitutional conflict between law and administration it is evident that there exists a still more fundamental problem. The days of individualism have ended, for the time being at any rate. Everywhere, to a greater or lesser degree, the collectivist state is triumphant. There are, it is clear, many possible forms of collectivism, but they all use certain clearly recognisable techniques to develop their policies. We are all aware which way the tide is running. How far do we wish it to run? Do we wish to batter down the few remaining barriers between the executive and the citizen? Are we really satisfied that official policy is necessarily a satisfactory substitute for private right? The consideration of these questions passes far beyond the province of the constitutional lawyer; beyond, indeed, the province of the jurist or the political scientist. Nevertheless, it will only be when these fundamental questions have been answered that we will be able to define the purpose, function and order of administrative law and administrative justice in the modern state."

The Twilight of The Common Law,
by Professor G.W. Keeton, in the April 1949 issue of
The Nineteenth Century.