

THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" - John 8:31

VOL. 63, No. 10.

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

OCTOBER 1999.

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

FUNDING AUSTRALIA'S DEFENCE-NEEDS

By Jeremy Lee

One thing about a war; it forces cold reality into the hothouse world of academic theorists, particularly economists.

They look round the mad, Alice-in-Wonderland world they've created to find that the resources they've always assumed were there all the time have been squandered and dissipated.

With an average annual tax-levy, at all government levels, of about \$10,000 for every man, woman and child in Australia, every area of government funding is stretched to the limit, with crises in such areas as health and education.

The host of small efficient industries that thronged industrial Australia in times past, capable of providing our Defence Forces with the arms and equipment needed is no longer there. We depend on importing our defence equipment on the never-never.

A smug and complacent Treasurer, who has stretched Australia to the limit in order to provide the Government with an IMF-required surplus and a 'kitty' to soften the blow of the approaching GST with some compensatory tax-cuts is now, like Old Mother Hubbard, finding that the cupboard is bare.

The recent Logcon 99 Defence Support Conference in Canberra uncovered some home truths:

"... The prominent strategic defence expert, Professor Paul Dibb, called for a 3 per cent increase of Australia's \$11 billion defence budget over the next decade. This would lift spending to about \$15 billion a year.

Addressing the Logcon 99 . . . conference in Canberra, Professor Dibb said Australia's defence Budget was so inadequate it could not fund even the Australian Defence force's peacetime operations . . .

For over a decade now we have had a defence budget that has been stuck at zero nominal growth and that has been effectively eroded by increases in wages and operating costs. The end result for all the Australian people to see has been just how few combat resources we have when it comes to a major peace enforcement operation in East Timor . . ." (Aust Financial Review, 13/10/99)

One is forced to ask whether, even if adequate money was made available, Australia has a diverse enough range of manufacturing and engineering industries to meet the needs of a realistic, combat-ready defence force? We've pawned, bankrupted or driven overseas a great many of the industries we once had.

It is now imperative that Australia takes its own defence very seriously indeed.

During both World War I and II our funding requirements centred round our own, people-owned Commonwealth Bank In

1914, only a few months after its foundation, the Commonwealth Bank was able to provide \$700 million to war requirements at an interest rate of less than one percent - on which the Bank made a profit. It funded pools for agricultural production that could not be exported.

In World War II the outbreak of war resulted in a quadrupling of the volume of money, so that the whole economy was put on a wartime footing. The technical name for this vast expansion of necessary credit was a "budget deficit".

OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

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) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

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

That is now forbidden under IMF rules. We have voluntarily submitted to international shackles, which preclude the use of Australia's credit.

The result is that we have sent a small detachment of superbly trained troops into action without the resources they need.

Our politicians, while enthusiastic about the East Timor deployment, are not prepared at this stage to make financially possible the full back-up and expansion Australian troops need and deserve.

There is no doubt that Indonesia will be aware just how stretched our military action is. They will understand that the more protracted the engagement is, the greater will be our defence dislocation.

If we are to support Australian troops to the maximum, the

most effective step we can take is to demand the release of sufficient Australian credit, no matter how outraged the IMF may be, to provide as quickly as possible the equipment, resources and relief to ensure their success.

This means informing enough Australians so that they confront their federal politicians to grasp the "nettle" of Australia's credit mechanism.

During World War II, 735,000 Australians listed in the armed forces, out of a population of 7 million. Australia armed, fed and equipped this in service.

We now appear incapable of maintaining for any length of time a contingent of 4,500 troops in East Timor. Such a situation needs to be reversed very quickly - and we may not have as much time as we think.

REDUNDANT AT 45?

By David Thomson

The following article, by Professor Thomson of the School of history, philosophy and politics at Massey University in New Zealand, appeared in the *New Zealand Herald*, August 5, 1999:

Paid work past about age 45 is vanishing fast. This change of the past 20 years has been huge and relentless, touches all levels of society, spreads right across the developed world and shows few signs of halting, let alone reversing.

And if present trends continue, then within a decade a third of all New Zealand men by their later 40s will be "retired" (without significant prospects of getting paid work again) and half of them by their mid-50s. Even fewer women will have substantial paid work - perhaps 40 percent at their mid 50s.

Consider just how deeply we are already into this "post-work world". Until the late 1970s, 96 in every 100 men had full-time paid work from their 20s to their early 50s: only then did employment fall off.

Using data from the population census, in which full-time work is 20 or more hours a week, we find that by 1996 the proportion of men in full-time work was below 80 percent at every age - 77 per cent for those in their later 40s, 65 per cent in their later 50s and 40 per cent in their early 60s. Only a few per cent more had some part-time work.

"DECLINE OF WORK"

Moreover, each successive birth cohort now begins paid work (and earning) later in life, reaches its employment peak at a lower and earlier point and sees its work fall off sooner and faster than for any predecessors.

For those born in the early 1950s, for instance, full-time employment peaked at 90 per cent in their later 20s and was down to 75 per cent in their early 40s.

Among Maori and Pacific Islanders it is all happening sooner and faster still. Where 96 per cent of Maori men had full-time work at age 40 in the 1960s and 1970s, just 65 per cent do so now.

Among women the trends are different - yet similar. Through the past half-century, growing fractions in their 20s, 30s and 40s have had paid work. But that historical rise has ended, with a peak at 60 per cent full-time employment around age 45, and after that employment is now falling steeply.

Nearly 60 per cent of the women born in the 1930s had full-time paid work at age 45, but just 35 per cent of the same group had it at age 55. That fall-off around age 45 is evident for every other cohort too, without exception.

The nature and quality of the shrinking work are changing also. More and more of it after age 45 is self-employment, much of it uncertain, insecure and low paying.

Twenty years ago 75 per cent of men aged 50 to 54, for example, received wages or salary for 20 or more hours a week and 20 per cent were self-employed.

By 1996, just 50 per cent had wages or salary for 20 or more hours, and 27 per cent were self-employed. The rest included some part-timers, but most were simply without work.

LESS SECURITY

Wages and salaries often now come in smaller amounts and with less security and continuity or "perks" than they did 20 and more years ago. The decline in "work" and its rewards is greater than the simple figures might hint.

None of this is peculiar to New Zealand, and it likely points to a permanent, historic shift in modern capitalist economies.

International studies suggest the important explanations for the trends are not poor health (today's middle-aged are healthier than ever), mandatory retirement laws (most people finish work long before any compulsory retirement age), state pension age (again, most "retire" long before reaching this), or employment in the public or private sector (both drop older workers equally readily).

More expected - and unwelcome perhaps - is that overall economic performance matters little either. Booming and stumbling economies alike have for 20 years been shedding their mature employees, as "jobless growth" policy takes hold.

Several key forces are at work. First is automation, or the computer revolution, which helps to do away with many routine procedures or lets them move to cheaper places and people.

Secondly, the blind drive of global capital for short-term "efficiencies", which leads to retaining as few staff as possible and as young, pliant, insecure and cheap as is possible. For many,

it leads to an unpleasant, pressured workplace, which we want to leave when we can.

Thirdly, the disappearance of much manufacturing from developed economies and with it large numbers of better-paying jobs once dominated by the middle-aged.

Fourthly comes attitudes, or the (questionable) belief that older workers are more expensive, slower, less enterprising, adaptable or retrainable than younger ones.

Fifthly, and easy to overlook, is life-style choice, or a rising "culture of leisure" - the expectation among the middle-aged of an extended period free of work while still physically vigorous.

INTENSIFYING

All this is likely to intensify in the next few years, for the middle-aged are the fastest growing segments of the population. In 1996 there were 750,000 New Zealanders aged 45 to 64. By 2011, just a dozen years away, there will be about 1.1 million.

The implications are enormous - for individuals, families, workplaces, public services, personal and collective retirement savings, taxes to support an aging population and much more.

Yet ordinary citizens and policy-makers alike remain in denial about the changes facing us. We blame individuals for their joblessness in mid-life, and urge them to retrain as if jobs will be there for all who do so.

We press everyone to save for retirement, with vague threats about the shrinking of national superannuation in future, and with advertising campaigns built unthinkingly around the assumption that full and unbroken employment will last until age 65.

We muse on raising retirement pension age next century to 70 or beyond, as though this will somehow make jobs available and so "solve" the problems of an aging population. And we kid ourselves that economic growth will deliver full jobs for all.

DIFFICULT MATTERS

It will not happen: large-scale, later-life joblessness is here to stay, and it is time to debate some difficult matters.

Do we care if some people past 45 have jobs (are "job rich") and most do not (are "job poor")? If we don't, then how are we to find income for the many without earnings? Or won't we bother?

If we do care, then how might we bring about a different sharing or work so that older workers stay on? Through "elder-friendly workplaces," part-time work, job-sharing, flexible hours to allow for parenting duties, more holiday breaks, extra retraining budgets?

Through subsidies for employers who take on those past 45 - or regulations enforcing it anyway?

Or to take a different tack, can we afford to have those past 45 out of work?

What of the enormous lost taxes or support payments needed at the same time as the numbers over age 65 mushroom? And if we cannot afford it all, how far are we willing to go in forcing individuals to say on longer or find some other work if pushed out?

By denying them welfare benefits at all before 65, perhaps, or by changing the law and removing our rights to take out private occupational pensions before 65 or 70?

Perhaps we could be more visionary and abandon the idea that work for pay is normal and good and proper, welcome the release from the drudgery of it all, embrace a working life totaling 25 years or less and enrich personal and community lives through the resources and time thus freed?

None of this suggests easy options. But they are beginning to be confronted and debated elsewhere in the developed world. It is time we addressed them, too.

MONEY FOR NOTHING

A British farmer has been fined for failing to harvest crops that nobody wants.

The European Union's ridiculous agricultural policies - which promote the spread of chemical monoculture farming and regularly produce vast food surpluses - were thrown into sharp relief last month when a British farmer, who earns £15,000 a year to grow a crop that nobody wants, was fined for not harvesting it.

For several years, the EU has paid Richard Goldsworthy to produce 100 tons of linseed fibre flax, which he is then ordered to destroy. This year, Goldsworthy decided to save himself the £1,300 cost of harvesting the crop by ploughing it in.

When the EU inspectors discovered the deed, he was taken to court, charged with obtaining his subsidy by deceit. The judge, who described the case as "scarcely believable", fined him £1,500.

Goldsworthy, of Kilgetty, west Wales, is eligible for a one hundred per cent EU subsidy for his 72 acres of flax. In previous years, he had been ordered to destroy the crop because the 350-mile trip to a reprocessing plant in East Anglia was said to make it uneconomical.

A Welsh Farmers' Union spokesman commented, "There's got to be something wrong with an agricultural system that encourages people to bin their crops."

The Ecologist, July 1999.

TRADE TREATY TRICKERY

The EU and Mexico have agreed afar-reaching, and potentially disastrous, free trade agreement

The Ecologist, July 1999.

The Global Agreement on Free Trade, Political Partnership and Co-operation was ratified by the European Parliament on 6 May this year without any transparency or popular discussion. This ominous treaty contains many of the central tenets of the notorious Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI).

Controversial measures like the liberalisation and deregulation of agriculture, forestry and intellectual property rights have been endorsed, and multinational corporations have no obligations to ensure set standards for workers' or indigenous peoples' rights.

Neither do investors have to guarantee that they will leave their host country in the same environmental and social condition in which they found it. Instead, the treaty provides companies with increased powers over local governments, which can be held accountable for any actions that are deemed a restriction of 'free' trade.

Very few people have even heard of this new treaty, let alone understand its implications. A coalition of NGOs from both Mexico and Europe have denounced the treaty, and the way it was negotiated.

BREAKTHROUGHS -1

In what promises to be a sensational legal milestone, an action starting in London's High Courts is due to commence on January 11, 2000. Controversial historian David Irving is suing American Professor Deborah Lipstadt for alleged lies about him in her book *Denying The Holocaust*

Irving has written: "Of course I don't sue people for criticising my opinions. What my critics ignore is that Lipstadt or Sereny accused me, among other things, of being a neo-Nazi, of speaking in public of 'our Fuhrer', of destroying or stealing the Goebbels plates from the Moscow archives, of cheating on a colleague, of distorting and manipulating translations and documents, and of working hand in glove with the Hamas, Hizballah terrorists, and Louis Farrakhan. Nothing to do with historical opinions."

On June 26, 1999, *The New York Times* published this report from London as a curtain raiser on its coverage of David Irving's lawsuit against Lipstadt:

LONDON, JULY 25 - Can a writer who thinks the Holocaust was a hoax still be a great historian?

THE British writer David Irving's books have been praised by some of the most eminent scholars in his field. The military historian John Keegan, who says Irving "knows more than anyone alive about the German side of the Second World War," considers his work "indispensable to anyone seeking to understand the war in the round" Gordon Craig, a leading scholar of German history at Stanford University, also calls Irving's work "indispensable." He adds, "I always learn something from him."

Yet in Deborah Lipstadt, author of *Denying the Holocaust*, Irving is a propagandist - "one of the most dangerous spokespersons for Holocaust denial" - and not a historian at all. It is a statement that has prompted Irving to sue her for libel in Britain. He readily admits that he has said "there were never any gas chambers at Auschwitz," but insists he is not a Holocaust denier because his comments "are true."

The case, which goes to trial here early next year does more than raise the issue of free speech and test the even-handedness of British libel laws: it poses disturbing questions about the practice of history.

There is some irony in Irving's legal action. In 1996, St. Martin's Press, under public pressure, cancelled a contract with Irving for his book, *Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich*. His defenders assailed St. Martin's, arguing they were trying to muzzle his views. The Goebbels biography never did find an American publisher, but a London edition, brought out by Irving's own imprint, prompted Craig to declare: "Silencing Mr. Irving would be a high price to pay for freedom from the annoyance he causes us. The fact is that he knows more about National Socialism than most professional scholars in his field."

In a six-page essay in *The New York Review of Books*, Craig noted Irvin's claims that the Holocaust never took place, and that Auschwitz was merely a "a labour camp with an unfortunately high death rate." Though "such obtuse and quickly discredited views" may be "offensive to large numbers of people," Craig argued, Irving's work is "the best study we have of the German side of the Second World War," and "we dare not" disregard his views.

Yet is it contradictory to describe Irving, as the writer Christopher Hitchens has as "not just a Fascist historian" but also "a great historian of Fascism"?

Irving's claim to historical seriousness rests largely, in Craig's phrase on "his energy as a researcher." An indefatigable documents man. Irving spent years poring over Nazi archives,

rooting out long lost diaries and private correspondence and presenting his findings in vivid, readable narratives aimed at conveying World War II from the German point of view.

That effort has earned praise from many historians who are at pains to distinguish between the historian and the work. Eric Hobsbawm, the British Marxist historian, declared that Irving's politics were irrelevant.

"Most historians are politically engaged one way or another," he said. Asked if he felt awkward about resorting to the courts to silence his critics: "You judge what they do not by political intent, but by whether they produce work based on evidence."

Mark Mazower, a historian at Princeton University, pointed out that "if you restrict yourself to works produced in conditions of freedom, by writers with whom we can feel intellectually akin," you would be ruling out a lot of history. The real question, said Mazower, author of *Dark Continent: Europe's 20th Century*, "is how you treat such material. "After all, even the

Nazi historians produced some useful information."

A similar observation could be heard from Raul Hilberg, author of the classic *Destruction of the European Jews*. "I have quoted Eichmann references that come from a neo-Nazi publishing

house," he told Hitchens in an article that appeared in *Vanity Fair* during the St. Martin's controversy. "I am not for taboos."

By the same token, these scholars recognise that it is absurd to expect historians to operate in a sanitised, value-free environment. Michael Geyer, professor of contemporary European history at the University of Chicago, said that Irving values are responsible for the ultimately debilitating flaws in his work.

Geyer, who specialises in military history, argues that Irving's very success in "understanding the Nazi generals as they were" brings its own pitfalls. First, there is the problem of consistency. "If you want to stay within the purview of the Nazis, you have to reconstruct what they did," Geyer explained in a telephone interview. "You can't just ignore some of what they did because it doesn't fit your point of view. Irving shuts down sources that do not suit his point of view."

What's more, said Geyer, Irving "does not keep all the actors in the picture." In his fascination with the Nazis, he overlooks the humanity of their victims. A good historian, said Geyer, needs empathy as well as intelligence.

David Cannadine, director of London's Institute for Historical Research, has also criticised Irving's "double standard on evidence." Reviewing the first volume of Irving's 1988 book, *Churchill's War*, he accused Irving of "demanding absolute

Irving replied, "It may be unfortunate for Prof. Lipstadt that she is the one who finds herself dragged out of the line and shot."

documentary proof to convict the Germans (as when he sought to show that Hitler was not responsible for the Holocaust), while relying on circumstantial evidence to condemn the British (as in his account of the Allied bombing of Dresden.)"

Hilberg is well aware of the pressure to conform to an approved Holocaust narrative. His own work has been attacked in some quarters for the minimal role he allots to Jewish resistance. But while Hilberg defends Irving's right to publish, he distinguishes living's writing from "legitimate controversy."

"I believe in the freedom not to be responsible," Hilberg has said "but that doesn't mean I endorse it."

There are he said in a telephone interview, numerous continuing disputes among Holocaust scholars. For example, some say Hitler always intended to murder the Jews, while others say he did so partly in response to the fortunes of war. "Exact numbers, resistance - there are still disagreements," Hilberg said. "But to ignore evidence that points to certain conclusions - to claim there were no gas chambers at Auschwitz for killing people! That is not a legitimate controversy."

To Hilberg, Irving's record as a collector of facts is beside the point: "You can create an illusion that is totally misleading by leaving things out even though everything you say is true."

Irving himself insists he is not a historian of the Holocaust. I regard myself principally as a biographer of top Nazis (and others)," he communicated electronically from his house in Key West, Fla. Asked for his response to some recent scholarship setting out the mechanism of Hitler's Final Solution, Irving replied: "Haven't read it. It's not my patch."

Still, he distributes a widely discredited book purporting to disprove the existence of the gas chambers. And he insists that while Nazi memoirs may be taken essentially at face value, the testimony of Holocaust survivors is relatively worthless.

"Eyewitness testimony," he said in a speech last year at Washington State University "is really a matter for psychiatric evaluation."

It is sentiments like these that prompted Ms. Lipstadt to warn historians and journalists away from Irving's works. That warning, Irving said, led to his troubles with St. Martin's - and to his decision to sue.

To get to court in the United States, a public figure like Irving would have to show that Ms. Lipstadt had acted "in reckless disregard" of the truth. But British libel law is different. Here, "the burden of proof is on the defendant," said Anthony Julius, Ms. Lipstadt's lawyer. "We have to prove that what she said was true."

"I feel like I'm living an 'Alice in wonderland,'" Ms. Lipstadt said in a telephone interview. "It's absolutely backwards."

Asked if he felt awkward about resorting to the courts to silence critics after he had been the cause of a free-speech campaign, Irving replied, "It may be unfortunate for Professor Lipstadt that she is the one who finds herself dragged out of the line and shot."

So is David Irving a historian? The question is "a little artificial," said Mazower, the *"Dark Continent"* author. "On whom do we bestow the hallowed title of historian?"

In Germany, where Holocaust denial is a crime, Irving has been convicted and fined for his views. But Britain, like the United States, has no such law. In her book, Ms. Lipstadt advised against using courts to suppress even those who would deny the existence of the gas chambers. "Legal restraints," she wrote, "transform the deniers into martyrs on the altars of free speech."

It will be up to a British judge to decide whether that label fits either side in this case.

BREAKTHROUGHS-2

On April 20th and 21st, 1988, Mr. Fred Leuchter, an engineer from Boston, Massachusetts, gave evidence at the trial of Mr. Ernst Zundel in Toronto, Canada.

Zundel's first trial, in 1985, in which he was convicted of distributing false material liable to cause a mischief, had been overturned by the Ontario Court of Appeal in January 1987 because of grave errors in law. The retrial resulted in Zundel's acquittal.

The substance of the charges against Zundel concerned his claim that much of the history concerning the Holocaust during World War II had been falsified.

The first trial in Canada had been sensational; producing much new evidence, and throwing doubt on previously accepted claims.

Mr. Leuchter had been commissioned to fly to Poland in February 1988 to examine the alleged gas chambers in Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, and determine if they could have been used for their stated purpose.

After detailed examination and the collection of numerous samples for subsequent forensic examination, Leuchter's written conclusions, in a 192-page report that subsequently gained a wide circulation, was that none of the so-called gas chambers had, or could have, been used for that purpose.

Leuchter was one of the foremost specialists in the design and fabrication of execution hardware in prisons throughout the United States. He had just completed the design of a gas chamber at the Missouri State Penitentiary at Jefferson City.

On reading the Leuchter Report David Irving, the famous British historian, said on April 22, 1988, during his testimony at the same trial in Toronto that it was a shattering document which would become essential for any future historian writing about the Second World War.

Fred Leuchter was subsequently subjected to a programme of character assassination and victimisation, which pursued him for many years; although the scientific evidence he had produced, was never seriously challenged.

A film has recently been released on the Fred Leuchter affair. The following description of its release in Toronto at the International Film Festival appeared on the Website irimland@cts.com on September 20, 1999. The author is Ingrid A Rimland:

ZGRAM -WHERE TRUTH IS DESTINY

Good morning from the Zundelsite. I came home yesterday way past midnight and am still shaking off the jet lag, but I want to tell you with a quiver in my heart that what I saw two days ago in Toronto in the beautifully restored Elgin Theatre will change the course of Revisionism.

And I mean globally.

I am speaking, of course, of the long anticipated Fred Leuchter documentary by Errol Morris, famed producer of award-winning films and documentaries, titled *"Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred Leuchter."*

I don't think I need to introduce Fred Leuchter to this list. Newcomers can find his story on the Zundelsite and elsewhere. The Errol Morris documentary portrays a tragic figure, depicting what it costs, and what it takes, to speak a politically incorrect truth today - especially if you rattle the cage of the most powerfully connected Lobby the world has ever seen.

It is a touching portrait.

Yesterday I edited a 24-page Ernst Zundel review of this film, which will be shipped in the Zundel-Haus October Power Letter and, eventually, I hope, in several Zgrams. There will be many more reviews. In fact, I predict that there will be so many reviews of this film that we will have a spectacular kaleidoscope eventually of both rave and poisonous reviews.

For now, I will say this: In spite of the inclusions of the usual shrill, poisonous "racists", "anti-semitic history falsifiers" accusations, this film will open the eyes of millions and make the Holocaust debatable at colleges and in a million homes. If ever a film was destined to become a cult film, this one is going to be it!

So this Zgram is not a review. Before long, this film will play on wide screen in theatres in Canada and America - and people can go, see and judge this extraordinary documentary for themselves. What I want to talk about today is the reaction of an audience to this story.

The premiere I attended with Ernst and several Toronto-based Zundel supporters played Saturday, September 18 a little after noon in downtown Toronto. We had advance tickets and could easily bypass the long queue that formed outside on the sidewalk. I must say that I was slightly apprehensive going to attend this premiere. I thought that we might have to face the usual -- the heckling, howling, obscene ARA-type Jewish Defense League "Stosstruppen" of the traditional Holocaust orthodoxy-enforcing crowd.

But nothing of the sort.

The audience were young people - about 18-23 years of age, most of them neatly dressed, intelligent-looking, of quiet and courteous deportment.

Not even on the sidewalk was there the usual shuffling and horsing around. They simply stood, talking softly in pairs or groups, and waited patiently in line. When we approached, they stepped aside and quietly let us pass. Some clearly recognised Ernst and waved shyly or nodded. The vast majority was white - in contrast to the passer-by on the sidewalk who were of every colour, shape and nationality and wore the "downtown" look.

Remember that Ernst Zundel is Villain Numero Uno - not just in Toronto but throughout the length and width of Canada. The invectives poured over this man for the past ten, fifteen years have never seen anything like it! It has simply been buckets and buckets of slime! Whole industries of "hate Zundel" have grown themselves on his back. Remember also that we were attending Toronto's International Film Festival, which offered a selection of

some 300 films in a couple of weeks, a dozen or so of which played that same afternoon in different rooms in that vast theatre. These young people could have gone and taken in some traditional sleaze, which had been favourably reviewed by the Toronto mainstream media. Why had they come - to see a documentary that had been written about in all three major Canadian papers as being a "quirky" film about despicable "Holocaust Denial" featuring some "nerdy" technician who went to Auschwitz to chisel off some rocks - and claim that the Jews weren't gassed?

We went into the theatre and sat down. It filled to about two-thirds - I would guess there were about 500-600 people. There was a sprinkling of young Jews and perhaps five or six people of colour. The rest were "our people." Young. White. And quietly curious.

I will not describe the film itself except to say that it is a masterpiece of cinematography telling an engaging - one might say incredible - story of how Fred Leuchter went to Auschwitz in 1988 in a cloak-and-dagger expedition behind the Iron Curtain, what he did there, what he found and what he did not find - and what happened to him afterwards because of his report and testimony during the 1988 Zundel trial.

I want to talk about this documentary from a public relation point of view - what will it mean to us?

Above all, I wanted to watch the audience reaction to this film.

The first part caused a few snickers and uneasy laughs - because, let's face it, Fred Leuchter isn't exactly Adonis. His job is an odd one, and the lines he delivers are often unintentionally funny, even though he doesn't mean them to be funny. After all, he is an execution equipment expert working in a trade that must strike anyone as strange - and there he is, insisting all along that his intention is to make sure people will be executed, painlessly and, thanks to him, with dignity.

The documentary starts out by introducing Leuchter as a youngster, playing inside US prisons where his father worked as a guard, and shows him as an adult tinkering with gallows, repairing electric chairs and such - for a living! It gives his mundane background. It shows a geeky kind of guy - and, as the film develops, he kind of grows on you.

But then, about one-third into the movie, the screen goes suddenly black. Pitch black. And then appear the words in white Helvetica fonts: "The Trial of Ernst Zundel in Toronto."

At that, the snickering and giggling audience simply hushed. It went so quiet that you could hear a feather drop. And it stayed hushed for the rest of the film. The mood change was sudden -and stark There was not a single catcall or whistle.

The next thing that happened quite simply took my breath away. In blazing full colours, filling the entire silver screen, was our booklet of all booklets: *"Did Six Million Really Die?"*

This is "the" booklet that started it all - way back in 1981 when Sabina Citron thought that she could pull the rug from under Mr. Zundel by taking away his mailing privileges. This booklet is the one that's on the Zundelsite. This is the publication that still has us before the odious, abusive Canadian Human Rights Tribunal - almost two decades later!

And not a single sound out of the audience! Silence.

Next scene shows footage from the 1988 Great Holocaust trial - Ernst Zundel being hoisted onto the shoulders of his friends, unfurling a banner that reads: "The Holocau\$ is a Hoax!" - surrounded by supporters that carry signs such as "The

Holocaust is a racket" and "The Holocaust is Hate against Germans" etc. That image, too, remained frozen on that screen for what seemed an eternity.

And in that theatre in Toronto, still absolute, almost stunned silence! It almost was as if these people saw a ghost!

The story that unravels from then on can only be described as an artistic dance around a modern day enigma. Fred Leuchter gets to have his say. David Irving tells how he became convinced the Holocaust was fake, thanks to the Leuchter Report. Ernst skillfully torpedoed some authentic Zundel zingers - the one I loved the most is where he says, piercing the audience with his laser stare and looking just as presidential as can be: "Germans will not go down in history as genocidal maniacs! We. Will. Not!"

Man! What a documentary!

We could not have wished for anything more! This film is the opening salvo of what is going to become escalating Holocaust debate - the forensic substance is now on the table! We did not even dream that such a film was possible in 1999 and few of us thought so much suggestive, in-your-face imagery and sound bites would get past the censors.

And speaking of censors - there are, of course, in this film, too, the expected politically correct insertions. How else to market this movie? After all Errol Morris is Jewish - and had to find a way to sell his film without being Leuchterised

In this film, there are three authentic Holohuggers:

There is Professor Roth, who testified under oath in 1988 in a courtroom in Toronto that there was no Zyklon B in the brick and mortar pieces Fred brought back from Auschwitz. Incredibly and shamefully, he does a switcheroo. He says - and now get this! That "had he known where the samples came from", the test results would have been different. Well, we believe him. Sure, why not? After a decade of thinking it over, he has had Leuchter's experience to look back on - as an example of what happens to those who are unwilling to prostitute science. A man has got to eat.

There is the shrill Shelly Shapiro, professional Holocaustian, who hounded Fred Leuchter inside and outside the courts in Massachusetts, who warns the audience not to be deceived: Fred is a "racist" and a "white supremacist" who is up to no good!

Then there is Van Pelt, an academic from Canada, who wrote a book about Auschwitz that pleased the Lobby mightily,

as oily and as unctuous as any small-town minister, who oinks about the "sacredness" of Auschwitz, the "holy ground" defiled by the chiseling Leuchter. There is lots of theology and falsification of German language documents, but there is nothing new. Does he think he is the Pope - defending holy relics?

And that's just about it. The genuflecting done! The rest? You be the judge. The world will be the judge about this documentary. I think it is a masterpiece.

The end of the film shows Fred Leuchter, destroyed by the Holocaust Lobby - without a job, a family, evicted from a motel for non-payment after having been stiffed by a shady employer, walking the highway a non-person. Fred walks away a modern anti-hero, but not before he stated clearly that he is an American who believes in the merits of Freedom of Speech - and who believes that Mr. Zundel is entitled to have his say his way. The audience knows that what they saw was just one simple, honest man who paid the price for showing that he had a spine - for sticking up for truth. Throughout the film, Fred Leuchter never recants. The audience is treated to a rare sight in our days - an American who cannot be bought.

I feel a shiver moving up my spine as I am telling you that, when this movie ended, right there in the theatre in downtown Toronto, 500-plus young people stood in unison as if by command and gave this documentary, this story, this courageous producer, this moving, incredible drama A GENUINE STANDING OVATION.

And then, still silent and with thoughtful faces, they slowly filed out of the theatre into the bright Toronto sunshine. No one - not a single one! - hassled or insulted Ernst who stood there next to me surrounded by his friends. Ingrid

Thought for the Day:

"What, then, might be the next chapter, the next step in the evolution of evil, if not Holocaust denial, a new demonically artful level of evil whose proponents find an ingenious way to murder the dead all over again?"

(Ron Rosenbaum, author of *"Explaining Hitler"* in a review tellingly titled "Errol Morris and the Tricky Art of Refuting Holocaust Denial" published in *The New York Observer*, September 13, 1999, page 27).

Information about Ingrid Rimland's historical trilogy, *"Lebensraum!"*, seized at the Canadian border for being "politically incorrect", may be found at: <http://www.lebensraum.org/ir.html>

SUSAN GEORGE HITS OUT ON WORLD DEBT

By Edmund Doogue

Dr. Susan George's books have made a huge contribution to the growing understanding of the debt crisis. The following article, by Edmund Doogue, appeared in *Ecumenical News International* earlier this year:

GENEVA: "Twenty per cent of humanity has 85 per cent of the wealth, while [at the other end of the economic scale] another twenty per cent owns only 1.3 or 1.4 per cent," one of the world's leading campaigners for reform of the global economy, Dr. Susan George, declared June 9.

Speaking at a press conference in the Ecumenical Center in Geneva, held to launch a statement by the World Council of Churches (WCC) which is urging a meeting of world leaders in Cologne, Germany, on June 18-19 to undertake radical reforms

of the global economy, George delivered a damning condemnation of the leaders of the world's richest countries. She attacked in particular the international community's failure to resolve the problem of huge debts owed to the rich countries by the poorest nations.

"No human catastrophe is enough to move political will," said George, who is associate director of the Transnational Institute in Amsterdam, and president of the Observatoire de la Mondialisation, in Paris. "The words *debt crisis* were first used

in 1982, It's not a crisis, it's a chronic illness, with political reasons behind it."

According to a 1997 UN report, "the debt of the 41 highly indebted poor countries now totals \$215 billion, up from \$183 billion in 1990, and \$5 billion in 1980."

The indebtedness of the poorest countries was, she added, a form of slavery exercised by rich Western countries to keep poor countries "under the thumb of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund" Indebtedness, she said, was a far more efficient form of enslavement than colonialism.

Susan George yesterday described the G8 leaders as "incapable of running a pizza stand". She called on churches to examine with a highly critical eye any decisions on debt at the G8 summit. "Read the fine print," she said, adding that many similar meetings in recent years had produced resolutions, which initially seemed generous towards poor nations but were not so generous when details were examined.

Among other demands, the World Council of Churches'

statement, which is based on a resolution of the WCC's eighth assembly, held in Zimbabwe last December, calls on the G8 nations to:

- Cancel the debts of the poorest countries to enable them to enter the new millenium with a fresh start.
- Substantially reduce the debts of the middle-income countries within the same time frame.
- Introduce a new, independent and transparent arbitration process for negotiating and agreeing upon international debt cancellation.

The WCC statement also calls for measures to ensure that corrupt leaders in poor countries are prevented from using debt relief to line their own pockets. While the indebtedness of the poor countries was a *scandal*, it was just a symptom of other problems. The present economic system favours corruption, and there is a direct link between corruption and indebtedness."

Many African delegates to the WCC's assembly last December had stressed that corruption must be halted.

WORK AND PAY - POINTS TO PONDER

By "Fitter ant Turner"

USA, JANUARY 1912:

"The Massachusetts Legislature has now lowered the work week from 56 to 54 hours for women and children. "

The struggle for humane working conditions the world over, has been littered with bloody battles, hardships and tears. By the 1960s, production in Australia was at an all-time high, with working hours, conditions and wages at a level, which boded well for the future.

AUGUST 1999 (*Herald Sun*):

A report that the Productivity Commission (who are they?) has recommended that Australians should continue to work beyond the age of 65, and that retirement dates should be delayed.

At the launch of the report, Governor Sir James Gobbo said it was a concern so few Australians remained in the workforce after 65.

In the *Herald Sun* report, there wasn't any mention of Australian firms and industries going offshore, nor any mention of the future of young Australians getting a job in a shrinking industrial and commercial scene.

Whatever the situation, one must question the reasons why there has been so much change in the work place.

Much has been made of a "level playing field" in trade, with a recent outburst by Mr. Fischer and Mr. Howard that America was not playing the game in relation to our lamb exports.

But a level playing field also includes employment. Enterprise bargaining, employment contracts etc. may be the new jargon and strategy, but who is benefiting? In this new field of employment there is much evidence emerging of increased overtime without pay, an increasing number of workers leaving home and returning in the dark, of sweat-shops amongst immigrants, and much else.

Does it mean that to achieve a level playing field (Asian style), we must return to 1912 conditions? Is the pressure now being applied to work longer, for less pay?

As "bloody-minded" (describing selective opposition) seems to be a favoured term of Mr. Reith, we have a right to know just how "bloody-minded" his objectives for the workplace really are.

2ND SEPTEMBER

The rate of progress in automation, technology and in every other scientific field has been amazing. In many fields of production a machine may operate, non-stop, night and day.

Built-in obsolescence has become a part of a programme designed to sell more. Reports of fantastic patents and inventions being bought by multinationals, and being shelved so that their own sale products are not challenged, has been recorded for many years.

Increased automation of production, one may reason, would be accompanied by better working conditions and less hours worked. But the whole mad emphasis has been far more production, more exports.

The world knows that production is not a problem. The real problem is that the economists and their theories are unwilling (not unable) to reflect economic policies, which would enable the starving people of the world (including Australians) access to what can be produced.

A very simple fact, which seems to escape the intellectuals, is that the purpose of production is consumption. To produce in gross excess of consumption is a rape of raw materials, and wastage.

Perhaps our conservationists may ponder that point - or is it too simplistic?