

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 50. No 10.

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

OCTOBER 1986.

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

"THE DEAFENING SILENCE"

Approximately eight years ago the Very Rev John da Costa, then Dean of what used to be Salisbury, Rhodesia, delivered in the Cathedral of St. Mary and All Saints what remains to this day the most memorable sermon ever delivered on terrorism. The occasion? The memorial service for those who died in the Rhodesia Viscount *Hunyani-VP-WAS*, near Kariba on Sunday September 3, 1978. The viscount, full of holidaymakers returning from Kariba to Salisbury, was shot down by Joshua Nkomo's ZIPRA terrorist forces, using a Soviet-supplied heat-seeking missile. Piling horror on horror, ten of the 48 killed on that occasion survived the initial crash but were then slaughtered on the ground in a staggering display of bestiality. Because that sermon has a haunting relevance to what is happening in South Africa today — mainly to innocent and helpless Blacks "necklaced", murdered and mutilated in the name of ANC "liberation" — we have decided to reprint it in full.

"Clergymen", I am frequently told, "should keep out of politics". I thoroughly agree. For this reason, I will not allow politics to be preached in this Cathedral. Clergy have to be reconcilers. That is no easy job. A Minister of religion who had well-known political views, and allows them to come to the fore, cannot reconcile, but will alienate others and fail in the chief part of his ministry. My own ministry began in Ghana, where Kwame Nkrumah preached: "Seek ye first the political kingdom, and all these things will be added to you." We know what became of him. We are *not* to preach a political kingdom, but the Kingdom of God.

Clergy are usually in the middle, shot at from both sides. It is not an enviable role. Yet times come when it is necessary to speak out, and in direct and forthright terms, like trumpets with unmistakable notes. I believe that this is one such time. Nobody who holds sacred the dignity of human life can be anything but sickened at the events attending the crash of the Viscount *Hunyani*.

Survivors have the greatest call on the sympathy and assistance of every other human being. The horror of the crash was bad enough, but that this should have been compounded by murder of the most savage and treacherous sort, leaves us stunned with disbelief and brings revulsion in the minds of anyone deserving the name "human". This bestiality, worse than anything in recent history, stinks in the nostrils of Heaven.

But are we deafened with the voice of protest from nations, which call themselves "civilised"? We are not! Like men in the story of the Good Samaritan, they "pass by, on the other side." One listens for loud condemnation by Dr. David Owen, himself a medical doctor, trained to extend mercy and help to all in need. One listens, and the silence is deafening. One listens for loud condemnation by the President of the US, himself a man from the Bible-Baptist belt, and again the silence is deafening. One listens for loud condemnation by the Pope, by the Chief Rabbi, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, by all who love the name of God. Again, the silence is deafening.

I do not believe in White supremacy. I do not believe in Black supremacy, either. I do not believe that anyone is better than another, until he has proved himself to be so. I believe that those who govern or seek to govern must prove themselves worthy of the trust that will be placed in them. One looks for real leadership: one finds little in the Western world: how much less in Africa!

Who is to be blamed for this ghastly episode? Like Pontius

Pilate, the world may ask: "What is truth?" What is to be believed? That depends on what your prejudices will allow you to believe, for then no evidence will convince you otherwise. So who is to be blamed? First, those who fired the guns? Who were they? Youths and men who, as likely as not, were until recently in church schools. This is the first terrible fact. Men who went over to the other side were in a few months so indoctrinated that all they had previously learnt was obliterated. How could this happen had they been given a truly Christian education?

Secondly, it is common knowledge that in large parts of the world violence is paraded on TV and cinema screens as entertainment. Films about war, murder, violence, rape, devil-possession and the like are "good box office". Peak viewing time is set aside for murderers from Belfast, Palestine, Europe, Africa and the rest to speak before an audience of tens of millions. Thugs are given full treatment as if deserving of respect. Not so the victims or their relations.

Who else is to be blamed? I am sure that the UN and its Church equivalent, the WCC, both bear blame in this. Each parades a pseudo morality, which, like all half-truths, is more dangerous than the lie direct. *From the safety and comfort of New York and Geneva, high moral attitudes can safely be struck. For us in the sweat, the blood, the suffering, it is somewhat different.*

Who else? The Churches? Oh, yes, I fear so! For too long, too many people have been allowed to call themselves "believers" when they have been nothing of the kind. Those who believe must act. If you believe the car is going to crash, you attempt to get out. If you believe the house is on fire, you try to get help and move things quickly. If you believe a child has drunk poison, you rush him to the doctor. Belief must bring about action. If you believe in God, you **MUST** do something about it! Yet churches, even in our own dangerous times, are more than half empty, all the time. We are surrounded by respectable heathens who equate belief in God with the Western way of life.

There are tens of millions of all races that call themselves believers, who never enter any house of prayer and praise. Many are folk who scream loudest against Communism; yet do not themselves help to defeat these satanic forces, by means of prayer, and praise and religious witness.

Is anyone else to be blamed for this ghastly episode near Kariba? I think so. Politicians throughout the world make opportunistic speeches from time to time. The ghastliness of this ill-fated flight from Kariba will be burned upon our memories for years to come. For others, far from our borders, it is an intellec-

tual matter, not one which affects them deeply. Here is the tragedy! *The especial danger of Marxism is its teaching that human life is cheap, expendable, of less importance than the well-being of the State.*

But there are men who call themselves Christians who have the same contempt of other human beings, and who treat them as being "expendable". Had we, who claim to love God, shown more real love and understanding in the past, more

patience, more trust of others, the Churches would not be vilified as they are today. I have nothing but sympathy with those who are here today and whose grief we share. I have nothing but revulsion for the less than human act of murder, which has so horrified us all. I have nothing but amazement at the silence of so many of the political leaders of the world. I have nothing but sadness that our Churches have failed so badly to practice what we preach. May God forgive us all? AMEN.

EXPLORING REALITY

by GEOFFREY DOBBS in "Home", U.K.

This book * was written when the author was first a curate and later an Anglican vicar, as well as remaining an honorary Professor of Theoretical Physics of Cambridge, and an F.R.S. to boot. It was written to defend the thesis that science and theology have it in common that they are both exploring aspects of reality. This would seem to be an excessively modest claim for theology. Presumably it is made to counter a widespread popular idea that science has debunked theology; that science deals with facts and theology with opinions. Presumably this view of the superior factual basis of science is based upon the experimental method with its observations of the external world, but these observations have to be interpreted, and the interpretation has to be from a point of view. As someone said, always, in interpreting experiments, we wear spectacles behind the eyes.

There's a notorious duck/rabbit picture, which you can see as a rabbit's head or a duck's head, whichever way it strikes you when you happen to look at it. He has used this as an illustration, though, as he points out, physics itself provides far better examples of such ambivalence. There are, for instance, two interpretations of quantum theory, which equally well meet the observed facts. The layman would probably prefer the more commonsensical one. The professional physicists, for the most part, prefer the more elegant and economical interpretation. Move-over, we are told that physics still has two fundamental theories of gravitation, that is, general relativity and conventional quantum theory, which are still imperfectly reconciled. He is concerned, of course, to show that science cannot be an automatic truth-finding machine, but there is a wide range of views concerning the relationship between the idea and the reality outside the human mind.

Dr. Polkinghorne, like most sane people, is a realist: That is, he believes that there is such an external reality, which scientists are investigating. He rejects the idealism, which recognises no reality outside the human mind. ("There's nothing true but thinking makes it so") as well as the positivism that sees science only as concerned with measurable quantities, its function only to harmonise them, again not recognising any external reality, and likewise certain extremists who either hold that science is entirely individualistic — a sort of free-for-all or is determined by social forces. Dr. Polkinghorne certainly believes that elementary particle physics discloses to us an actual reality, but it is a more subtle reality, he thinks, than that of a naive objectivity.

Dr. Johnson kicking a stone to refute Bishop Berkeley won't do, he says. The stone is nearly all empty space and wave-mechanical patterns. That is, according to the understanding of reality given by quantum theory; but why will Dr. Johnson and his stone not do? They represent the experience of reality of the whole of mankind, while physicists' empty space with particles in it represents not even their direct experience but a reality mentally, mathematically, deduced from certain observations by a handful of people — an experience that can be neither shared nor understood by the bulk of mankind even if a few of us read popular accounts. Moreover, it is provided by vastly expensive and complex apparatus, which is necessarily dependent upon some form of centralised power and finance, whether of governments or large corporations; yet, though we have no choice or

understanding or say in it, our lives may be radically changed or threatened or even destroyed by it. If we believe in this sort of reality of the higher physics it is a belief entirely in what we are told, not at all based on experience, so I think the question that arises is not whether Dr. Johnson and his stone will do, but whether the world of nuclear physics will do — to use the cliché with meaning, — at this moment in time.

WHERE AND BY WHOM IS SCIENCE DIRECTED?

I am not suggesting that the nuclear physicists are not exploring reality, or seeking to restrict their freedom to do so under their own power, or indeed the freedom of anybody else, by themselves or in association with others. I am merely asking whether the direction in which politicians and financiers have pointed the exploration of the universe in recent years is the right direction at this stage of development of mankind; right, that is, not for the physicists or the scientists or the politicians or the financiers but for the rest of mankind, many of whom in any case made the thing possible by their work, not for the purpose in question but merely to earn money.

It is well known that the original Manhattan Project, which produced the first atom bomb, was the result of so-called "compartmentalised research" and that not one per cent of those engaged in it knew what they were doing. When they discovered what it was many of them were horrified, and it is absurd to suggest that people in general wanted such a monster hanging over them, let alone the subsequent fusion bomb or H Bomb. This, of course, was a political and military decision taken centrally, but it would have been impossible to take it but for the earlier so-called 'pure' research. What I am trying to say is that science, like all other important human activities, depends upon the individual — not the individual in isolation, but on people in free, voluntary association. If it is directed by central forces of political power or finance, or what are called 'social pressures', it will move in a different direction from that in which it will move if it is left free. Moreover the direction will be narrower and more likely to serve the interests of centralised power. The natural expansion of human knowledge following the dictates of the curiosity of a large number of people is far less likely to lead to extreme or even disastrous results than a canalized direction, which tends to penetrate very far one way and not at all in another, long before the bulk of humanity is ready for it or can resist the narrow, centralised power which so much knowledge brings.

THEOLOGIANS' 'SCIENCE VERSUS SCIENTISTS' THEOLOGY'

When our author leaves his special field of particle physics he naturally enough takes the generally accepted or consensus view of things, such as, for instance, that the theologians of the church were wrong to reject Galileo and the Copernican theory and three centuries later the Darwinian theory of evolution, because these lay properly in the field of science. But in the first case it was not so much the theologians as theologians, but the theologians as the then scientific establishment, which rejected this innovation. After all, the Ptolemaic theory was pre-Christian. It has nothing to do with Christian theology. Where the Church was evidently in error was in swallowing and incorporating the accepted science of the day in its theology.

As for the theory of evolution, the word itself is ambiguous.

uous. There is no doubt that Darwinism wholly removed from reason the idea of creation by instantaneous edict according to a crude and childish interpretation of Genesis. But in blaming a modern, so-called 'creationist' for retaining this as an absurd 'scientific' theory of how things came about, why does no-one also apportion blame to the evolutionists, many of whom confused the theory of evolution by natural selection with a philosophical, in fact really a religious, theory which substituted belief in the impersonal concept of chance for a belief in a personal God?

Now this gave Christians who put their belief in God before anything else very little choice. If they swallowed the idea put about by so many eminent persons, then evolution is the alternative to divine creation; so you have to choose either God and Genesis on one side or evolution and chance on the other.

Of course they were wrong; the choice is a false one; and for the most part they were simple people, and those who put this about included a great many eminent people. Why is it that the rather simple creationists are blamed so much more than their alleged intellectual betters who presented them with this false choice, and why is theology always under such heavy attack when it invades the domain of science, and science under such little attack when it invades the domain of theology? If both science and religion are human approaches to reality, "By their fruits ye shall know them"; but here there is an important difference.

Science necessarily fragments the universe, approaching it piecemeal. It has its tools; the experimental method, deduction and induction, and the specialised symbolism of mathematics, what we call human reasoning, a mode of working of the human brain. The reasoning process has to start somewhere. It has to start with certain assumptions and axioms, necessarily irrational because they are not the produce of reason.

RELIGION IS BASIC TO SCIENCE

Religion, on the other hand, starts at the other end by formulating those basic assumptions, which determine the operation of the human mind, and indeed of the human life, including that mode of thinking known as reasoning.

The idea that there exists something called 'human reason' which with all reasonable men turns out the same result, is, in fact, as unreasonable as to suppose that a computer will always turn out the same result whatever programme is fed into it.

Now the most fundamental of all basic assumptions is a belief in God. This has primacy over all other assumptions, as has its negative, the denial of God. It is absurd to think that the process of reasoning which starts with a belief in God must produce the same result as one which starts with a belief in no God. Neither can we expect a belief in one sort of God to produce the same sort of reasoning and feeling and lifestyle as a belief in another sort of God; — say a belief in a pantheon of divinities, to produce the same result as a belief in a single unitary God; or a belief in a single unitary God, a monopolist of the universe, to produce the same result as a belief in a Trinitarian God, a Trinity comprising a diversity of Persons united by love in one godhead.

It is, I am convinced, no accident that modern science, with its binding back to the reality of the created world, arose from Christendom. There are origins of science among the Greeks and among the Arabs, the Chinese, all with different fundamental beliefs, but none has, so to speak, 'taken off and become so immensely fruitful, whether for good or evil, as that science which arose in Europe which at the time was the centre of Christendom.

Though I can agree with Dr. Polkinghorne as far as he goes in trying to rehabilitate theology and at least put it on a par with science in that it deals with reality, I don't think he goes nearly far enough. Theology or, rather, religion in the broadest sense including atheistic ideologies, determines the nature of science and the direction in which it is directed, whether individually or centrally. Most scientists, and many theologians too, nowadays shy away from this glimpse of the obvious, especially those who, having abandoned Christianity and perhaps all of the organised and established world religions, imagine that they have none

themselves. They start from nowhere in no direction and imagine themselves as impartially following the facts wherever they lead. Such a position is a delusion. We cannot get outside ourselves into some sort of a non-situate limbo. Whoever we are, and wherever we are, we start from there.

For centuries now the Church has known and taught that only God is absolute. Everything else, including ourselves, is contingent upon Him. Only in this century has science discovered that the observer enters into everything, and we are the observers. The reality, which we encounter, is the reality relevant to us. Even our own reality of God is only that reality which we can grasp; and since we cannot know the ultimate, the absolute, the infinite, it follows, I think, that any grasp we have of it must be revealed to us. We cannot attain to it by reasoning because it is the starting point of reasoning, but, once started, the ordinary processes of reason and experience can operate to confirm it, and that is one thing that religion does, and not only to confirm but to develop the growth of understanding.

DR POLKINGHORNE'S UNIQUE INSIGHTS

I am well aware that I have not done justice to Dr. Polkinghorne's book, since I have mainly been recording the thoughts which it has stimulated in me, which I hope will be taken as a greater compliment than a fuller précis of his ideas, which would be so much better obtained by reading the book. Dr. Polkinghorne's unique combination of experience, first in advanced mathematical physics and later in theology and practical priesthood, enables him to outline the thinking of the modern physicist in a far more relevant way than the ordinary populariser. It therefore becomes more intelligible to the layman.

He draws a number of interesting parallels, perhaps even parables, from quantum physics, which may provide insights into the analogies of theology, at least for physicists, though he has not much use for those of earlier ages. Dr. Johnson's stone, for instance, or Paley's watch, both of which are quite out of fashion; but I would say that Dr. Johnson's stone is as good a proof of man-related reality — the only reality we can all know — as it ever was. As for Paley's watch, the only thing wrong with the argument is that it is upside down. The watch does not prove the existence of God. It is the existence of God the Creator that proves that the watch was the product of design. If people can be persuaded to believe that the whole universe and everything in it came about by the operation of a highly cerebral mathematical concept called chance, or maybe chance and necessity, naturally enough it is a mere bagatelle for them to believe that such a simple thing as a watch came about by the same process. This is a pretty good example of where human reason can lead when starting with the wrong premises. It is a pure verbal-cerebral thing completely unrelated to anything in real life. Even if the most distinguished physicist claimed that a watch that he had picked up was produced by a random process, I think he would be regarded as insane if he really meant it seriously and persisted in the claim.

Dr. Polkinghorne has shown even more clearly by his deeds than by his words where his priorities lie. For him God is not a product of any process of human reasoning, a mental object, among the other objects in the mental universe. Perhaps in his next book we may hope that he will invite scientists honestly to face and investigate and study their own fundamental beliefs and the direction in which they are leading their science.

***JOHN POLKINGHORNE:** *One World, the Interaction of Science and Theology*; S.P.C.K.; paperback, 4.50. 1986.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND CHRISTIANITY

The last issue of "The New Times", devoted exclusively to answering allegations that Social Credit is anti-Christian, has created widespread interest. Extra copies are available for those who wish to make use of them. Send a small donation to Box 1052J, Melbourne.

'WHAT RIGHTS FOR THE WRONGED?'

Is the media sensationalism surrounding real and alleged war criminals, with the 'naming' of the accused in an atmosphere, which severely prejudices any chance of an impartial trial, conducive to justice?

At the recent trial of Ernst Zundel in Canada, one case of rank injustice and persecution took place. The victim, as far as we know, has never received any redress for the wrongs he has suffered over an incredible period of time. Mr. Ron Gostick, writing an appendix in the recently-published and explosive booklet *"The Unholy Alliance"* by Patrick Walsh, (Heritage Bookshop \$6 posted), recorded:

"... The incident, ... which I want to draw to your attention took place at Mr. Zundel's Toronto trial on February 14, 1985, and involves an American witness by the name of Frank Walus. Following are excerpts from a report in The Toronto Sun of February 15th respecting the previous day's proceedings:

"Earlier in the day, a pint-sized Chicago man wept in describing to court the misery of being falsely accused as a Nazi butcher.

"In 1977 Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal accused Frank Walus, 62, a retired General Motors worker, of killing 'dozens of Jews and dozens of Poles' while an SS three-star general in the German army at Kilce, Poland. "But Walus was innocent. Clearing his name cost him four years, \$120,000 and all his friends. He suffered insults, denigrating publicity, 15 assaults and two heart attacks.

" 'I was never in Poland between 1939 and 1945,' Walus said. 'I was never in the army at all. I was too small and weak, so I was taken to Germany for forced labor on farms at age 17.

"But 11 witnesses at his Chicago trial — seven from

Israel and four American — named him as the killer, he said. "Only his documents from the German tax department, the Red Cross and the German health plan into which he paid during the war saved him from being extradited to Israel, where 'probably they'd hang me,' he said..."

This was perhaps the most revealing and amazing testimony in the whole case. Here we had first-hand testimony on oath of incredible persecution, false witnesses, and a conviction in a kangaroo court — not behind the Iron Curtain, but right in the United States!

Note that Mr. Walus was accused by Simon Wiesenthal and convicted of war crimes in Poland, as a "Three-Star SS General." Yet, at war's end he was only 22 years of age. He must have become a three-star general in his teens! And he had spent the war years not even in Poland but on a German farm, physically unfit for military service. Yet, *eleven* witnesses, including seven from Israel, identified him as guilty of war crimes in Poland!

Who selected and paid to bring seven false witnesses from Israel? And who were the four 'Americans' bearing false witness in the U.S. court? They must have been 'holocaust' victims to be able to identify' Walus. Yet they're still alive and giving false witness forty years later in American courts!

Were these eleven false witnesses ever charged with perjury? Why not? Was the Wiesenthal 'war criminal' outfit ever assessed the court costs and the accused's expenses for bringing him to this phony trial? Why not?

This Walus frame-up right in an American court demonstrates the perverted use that can be made of courts by those groups powerful enough to manipulate through money and fear. This undermining and perversion of our judicial system, together with the mind-washing, psychological campaign carried on through the news media, makes it extremely difficult for a victim of the Wiesenthal gang to find much justice at these 'hate' trials.

"NO MAN COMETH TO THE FATHER BUT BY ME...."

Modern-day syncretism is closely inter-twined with the movement for world government. The "New Age synthesis", with its roots in Theosophy, Ba'hai and Illuminism, offers a new religion for the "age of Aquarius" which presents the great religious figures of the past — Mahommed, Krishna, Buddha, Confucius and others — as a body of teachers, or 'ascended masters', on an equal footing with Jesus. Yet our Lord was adamant there was only one "mediator and advocate" between the individual and Almighty God — Jesus himself.

Much of modern syncretism is evident in the increase of "inter faith" meetings and services. John Cotter's excellent book *"A Study in Syncretism"* (Heritage Bookshop, \$7 posted) gives a graphic history of this phenomenon. The World Council of Churches is heavily involved. The following article, from the *Los Angeles Times* (July 14, 1979) gives an example of how the name of Christ is suppressed for the purposes of this syncretic idea:

CHRISTIANS, JEWS WORKING ON JOINT WORSHIP DETAILS

Interfaith-inclined Christian and Jewish leaders, who have explored most aspects of mutual understanding in relative harmony, are trying to resolve a particularly sticky question — how to conduct inoffensive but enriching joint worship services.

Christians and Jews, both people of "the Book", acknowledging and worshipping the same God, have thus a unique relationship.

One of the most dramatic incidents in their dialogue was a recent daylong symposium sponsored by the National Council

of Churches and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

"The problems inherent in joint worship have not yet been solved," said Rabbi Balfour Brickner.

But those attending the session expressed the hope that some of those problems could be overcome without reducing combined worship to its "lowest common denominator".

"Our parishioners are seeking more than a mere exercise in human relations", said the Rev. William Weiler, director of the NCC office on Christian-Jewish relations. "We are trying to establish guidelines that will make possible meaningful spiritual rewards through joint worship."

A model service prepared for the symposium included recitation of the Ten Commandments and the Apostles' Creed, prayers from each tradition, including the Jewish prayer for the Torah and the Christian Lord's Prayer as well as readings from the Psalms and the New Testament account of the Pentecost.

But symposium participants later agreed in guidelines being finalised jointly for distribution by Reform Judaism and NCC affiliates that prayers "should be addressed to God alone ... and should not be in the name of Jesus or the Trinity."

Using the Lord's Prayer was not advised "not because of the text itself but because of its strong historical identification with the church alone."

Human Rights

"The law cannot itself guarantee human rights. Nor can any government. It is rational and active public opinion that offers the best assurance of progress."

Sir Richard Wild, former New Zealand Chief Justice.

NEW TIMES - OCTOBER 1986.

WARNING ON AUSTRALIAN HUNT FOR 'NAZIS'

The "Nazi hunting" campaign is now fully under way in Australia. The Communists must be delighted with a Zionist campaign whose only result can be to create fear amongst ethnic groups, and to further destabilise Australia. While disassociating ourselves from his comment about "revisionists", Mr. Michael Barnard's article in *"The Age"*, Melbourne, of October 7, is one, which deserves the widest possible circulation.

The hunt for war criminals in Australia is shaping up exactly as feared; innuendo, the first fluttering of trial by media and incrimination of entire ethnic communities.

There is a whiff of mischief in the air. How come, one may ask, the drama and publicity attending the handing to Mr. Hayden in New York of the Wiesenthal Centre's list of 40 suspects when the Australian War Crimes Commissioner, Mr. Menzies had been given access to the same names of alleged Latvian and Lithuanian collaborators several weeks before?

It was no scoop, no shock discovery and certainly no gift to calm, dispassionate and *discreet* inquiry in Australia. No sooner were the first afternoon headlines dry ("40 Nazis here: Hayden gets list" — not much doubt in this, mark you) than television interviewers were grilling a Latvian leader along the lines of "Come on, surely you know *some* Nazis in your community" and the flames were being further fanned by a pointed release from the Wiesenthal Centre of a survivor's long and gruesome account of wartime atrocities against Lithuanian Jews.

As a consequence, the mass of innocent Australian Baits are now suffering the stigma and distress of group libel, which no matter how many Wiesenthal protestations to the contrary, inevitably must arise when ambiguous and unspecified charges are made against unnamed members of a particular community. Australia's Baits are hurt and angry. Their anguish is shared by other targeted ethnic groups, such as the Ukrainians, whose lives during World War II were similarly hostage to savage buffeting between the diabolical tyrannies of Stalin and Hitler.

Even some members of the Jewish community, I believe, will share unease at the manner in which the Wiesenthal Centre handled itself on this occasion. There seemed almost a note of triumphant and incontestable finality in the way the 40 names were ceremoniously handed over, with the promise of up to another 160 to come. The hunt emphatically was on and, yes, the accused were guilty.

It is one thing, historically imperative, to keep alive the memory of the Holocaust, in which the entire Jewish race became the target for extinction. It is quite another to beam the accusing spectre of that genocide, intentionally or not, on to entire ethnic communities whose rising generations would not even have been alive at the time and many of whose contemporaries in the general community would be ill equipped (thanks to the indifferent status of history in our schools) to draw informed conclusions.

I do not question that any substantial and corroborated evidence of major war crime should be tested before a proper tribunal, in public — although at this distance I would argue, the essential value lies in reinforcing the historic record rather than in visiting retribution upon the individual. But extreme caution should be exercised.

Such care has already been thrown to the wind, with potentially disastrous results for communal harmony, through the scatter-gun approach of the Wiesenthal Centre and such exercises as the ABC radio series in April through which Mark Aarons and John Loftus helped plunge Australians into a mish-mash of innuendo and unsubstantiated assertions.

Soon, perhaps, the Baits and others concerned may feel compelled, as a matter of self-preservation, to form their own anti-defamation leagues along the lines of the Jewish precedent.

Certainly the time has come for the Federal Government to think carefully about possible outcomes of the Menzies Commission. One aspect is protection of the innocent.

NEW TIMES - OCTOBER 1986

Based on the number of innocents who have been financially or otherwise ruined in the US because of baseless or unproven allegations of war crimes involvement the Government should be prepared, in the event of public naming, to indemnify any wrongfully accused against costs in proving innocence. Additionally, or alternatively, if the budding hunt develops, it should require prime accusers, such as the Wiesenthal Centre, to deposit in Australia sufficient funds to meet any damages claim by an accused that has suffered cost and harm in clearing his name.

It is no good arguing innocents do not get caught in the net. They do. In the US, for instance, there was the tragic case of the Pole Frank Walus of Chicago who was financially and emotionally ruined by the ordeal of proving himself innocent of charges pursued by the Office of Special Investigation. According to 'Ukraine during World War II: history and its aftermath', edited by Yuri Boshyk, Wiesenthal himself was the accuser.

Walus was found guilty and it took a lawyer's trip to Germany to establish that he had been a forced laborer on a farm at the time he was alleged to have been killing Jews. But by that time Walus was over \$200,000 in debt from legal costs. Even so, Walus was "lucky". Documentary evidence was found to support his story. But in how many instances would that apply?

Again, take the case of Tscherim Soobzokov, 67, of New Jersey, who successfully fought war crimes charges only to be fatally injured by a bomb blast which also injured his wife, four-year-old grandson and a neighbor, or of Elmars Sprogis, 70, also the target of a bomb attack after being exonerated by a US federal appeals court of persecuting Jews in his native Latvia.

The 'Los Angeles Times' this year quoted an FBI spokesman, Lane Bonner, as saying that the militant Jewish Defence League was suspected. This may be dismissed as mere (although damaging) speculation, but so also may be many of the accusations against suspects.

Over the past seven years in the US about 600 "cases" have been dropped for insufficient evidence or other causes, against only 19 instances in which the citizenship of Baltic and Ukrainian immigrants has been revoked.

It should also be noted that the Wiesenthal Centre is quoted as attributing its latest "breakthrough" to the gaining of 'access to computerised immigration data from Eastern Europe'. (*'The Age'* 3 October).

There are excellent reasons to suspect Soviet bloc evidence, not least because Moscow and its satellites have a vested interest in discrediting "traitorous" anti-communist refugee communities — including, of course, Soviet Jews themselves. There is capital to be made in painting them all as fascists and Nazis, and setting Jewish and non-Jewish émigré groups at one another's throats.

Not that all evidence is necessarily faked or all witnesses tainted. But one Soviet official, for whatever reason, has already warned US authorities of Moscow's attempts to deceive, and in at least four cases US judges have rejected Soviet-based testimony entirely or in part as seemingly coerced or invented (*'Los Angeles Times'* 28 April). Federal jurists and defence lawyers have carried the misgiving further.

In time, if any eventual hearings here are likely to proceed to deportation, Australia must face these and many other problems complicated by the haze of years and fading memories. It

is a daunting task. And sad.

Sad it is too that some Jewish Nazi hunters, no doubt encouraged by the obscenity of revisionists who would minimise

the dimensions of the Holocaust, are, in the eagerness of the chase, showing signs of the same lack of empathy and understanding which historically has so shamefully marked the outsider's attitude towards the Jew.

GAS-CHAMBER RHETORIC

The following article is taken from the American Roman Catholic Weekly, "The Wanderer", (June 12, 1986).

by Joseph Sobran

WASHINGTON, D.C. - "The Israelis lied to us. This was no small-time rogue operation. It was much more systematic than that. This was a very expensive operation that they ran. There's no embassy slush fund big enough to cover that sort of thing."

So a Justice Department official told *The Los Angeles Times*, thereby ending the State Department's cover-up of the Jonathan Jay Pollard spy case — a case that may soon be a bigger story than ever. Columnist William Safire calls it "a time bomb".

The sooner the full story is told, the better. I, for one, am tired of being called an anti-Semite for suggesting that Israel is something less than our "reliable ally."

This may be as good a point as any to address the issue of anti-Semitism charges — charges that dog anyone who thinks of criticizing Jewish lobbying groups or Israel. The word "anti-Semite" is more potent than most of the charges of bigotry that are flung around these days. It carries the whiff of Nazism and mass murder. "It means," as a friend of mine puts it, "that you ultimately approve of the gas chambers."

I keep finding, to my cost, that whenever I criticise Israel or Jewish and Zionist organizations (no matter how often I've also defended or praised them), I face a barrage of gas-chamber rhetoric.

Last year, when I defended President Reagan's visit to Bitburg, I got a heavy dose of that rhetoric. One leading rabbi wrote me asking me pointedly whether I was anti-Semitic and accusing me of a "whitewash of the Nazis." Thinking naively that the charge might have been made in good faith, I looked back at the offending column. I'd made no less than four references to Nazi "crimes," "mass murder," "atrocities," and "genocide." A Jewish journalist phoned to insinuate that I (and many other conservatives) have a sneaking sympathy for Nazism. Currently the *Near East Report*, a Zionist propaganda sheet, charges me with "a classic, almost European-style anti-Semitism."

It's demeaning even to answer such charges. One's impulse is to wipe them off one's shoes.

The charges function, of course, as silencing tactics. They

are coupled, sometimes, with overt suggestions that the critic be dropped by the newspapers that carry him, and at other times with backstage attempts to blacklist him. There are other tactics, too. Journalist Nat Hentoff recently uncovered the story of how the American Jewish Committee quietly quashed the televising, in New York and Washington, of a documentary on Palestinians on the West Bank. (Being Jewish himself, Hentoff is fortunately immune to gas-chamber innuendos.)

You might think that being relatively outspoken would at least earn one a certain credit for candour, but you would be dead wrong. I find that the more I say what I really think, the more I'm accused of thinking something else. The more I say what I really want, the more I'm accused of harbouring dark ulterior motives. The more individual my observations — ill-favoured things but my own — the more they are explained away as echoes of Hitler, Fr. Coughlin, or obscure medieval persecutors.

And the more underhanded methods of silencing are often used by people who pose as sentinels over our standards of civil public discourse.

It can't help but have a chilling effect, as they say, on news coverage and discussion. You can think of it as a very mild form of terrorism — not the terrorism that makes people fear for their lives, but a kind that makes an editor say, "I don't need this fight. It's not worth the trouble." In time he will form the habit of steering around touchy subjects without thinking about it. He doesn't want to have to take up all his time proving he's not the sort of fellow who would put Anne Frank in a gas chamber.

The paradox is that a good deal of news coverage is distorted by a power hardly anyone wants to acknowledge being affected by: the power to inflict a humiliating suspicion or even lasting damage to one's reputation and career. It would be interesting to know how many people have bitten their tongues rather than make perfectly fair-minded observations that would expose them to loose charges of anti-Semitism.

If the Israeli spy ring unravels, watch for an escalation of gas-chamber rhetoric. The journalists who try to tell the story will deserve a little credit for courage.

THE CULTURAL CLEAVAGE

“ . . . One of our profoundest thinkers has said, the present world crisis is not so much social or political as cultural. The *hubris* engendered by a period of mounting technological triumphs has begun to affect the minds and the souls of men, for they are unable to resist the idea that scientific fabrication is the only cultural ideal of the present and the future. The suggestion that it is so conveyed by almost everything they see or read about, by all the arts of the press and of advertisement, and, at the highest levels, by the steady advance of technical education at the expense of the humanities. Men are almost compelled to believe this cultural fallacy with their brains, but in their souls they, of course, resent it. Unconsciously, they are in revolt, and seek various remedies, from the psychological insurrection, which was invading literature and the arts between the wars to the vast political conspiracies, which have again terrified the whole world into war. War and revolution are assuming such menacing proportions that fears of the destruction of our modern western civilisation are often

seriously entertained, and are probably justified for, although prolonged violence and devastation may reduce some of our pride of culture, they cannot of themselves correct it. There is no way out of psyche impasse except by the recognition that it is of a psyche nature, and by taking appropriate measures to subordinate man's impulse to fabricate to his capacity to cultivate.”

Philip Mairet in *The New Times*, April 18, 1952

BASIC FUND APPROACHES HALF-WAY OBJECTIVE

There has been a stimulating initial response to the League of Rights Basic Fund appeal for 1986-87, with nearly \$25,000 now contributed. This amount has been contributed by a small minority of League supporters, making it relatively easy for the great majority to contribute the balance. Please rush YOUR support TODAY. The need was never greater. Please note that primarily because of horrendous postal charges, receipts will not be sent unless requested.

IS THE NEW TESTAMENT 'ANTI-SEMITIC'?

Christians, by and large, accept that in the "new covenant" established through the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, and sealed in the sacrament of Holy Communion there is, in St. Paul's words, "neither Jew nor Greek".

Salvation and restoration are available to all who accept this gift in faith.

Implicitly, the most disastrous consequences await those who spurn this offer.

Christ's most scathing condemnation was reserved for those who themselves rejected, and sought to deter others from accepting, the sacrifice and atonement which He alone offered. His condemnation was not based on racial history or characteristics, but solely on individual choice. Nevertheless, the charge of racism is often laid against Christ Jesus. The following article, from *The Australian Jewish News*, (June 20th, 1986) is indicative:

Jesus was "the type of rebel as Meir Kahane, who despised the Jewish establishment and fought it" Rabbi Boruch Zaichyk said on Sunday.

Rabbi Zaichyk (spiritual head, Mizrahi Organisation) was speaking at a 1986 Mizrahi/Yavneh Appeal drawing room meeting at the East St. Kilda home of Eva and Ben Slonim.

"Jesus felt that in order to recreate the Jewish establishment to its pre-eminence of days gone by, it was necessary to get rid of that establishment and to replace it with his own henchmen".

Rabbi Zaichyk said Jesus' rebellious nature could be attributed to his failure to fill a vacancy within the Sanhedrin.

He was rejected because of his lack of knowledge, rather than his rebellious nature, Rabbi Zaichyk said.

"Jesus was born to Jewish parents. It was not an immaculate conception — he was born as you and I."

FALSEHOOD

Rabbi Zaichyk dismissed the resurrection of Jesus as "the biggest lie ever created in the annals of history".

"In Christian theology, the Jew is something less than a human being.

"Whether hatred arose due to pre-conceived ideas that Jews have chosen themselves from amongst the nations of the world, or because Jews were seen as a hard-necked people — whichever way, there is an historical and theological beginning.

"Let us not forget that everything is based upon the New Testament."

THE ASIANISING OF AUSTRALIA

That perceptive commentator on public affairs, Civil Libertarian John Bennett has been drawing attention to the role of the media in conditioning Australians to accept the theme that Australia is a multi-racial society. *The Sun*, Melbourne, a popular style morning newspaper, reputedly has the largest circulation of any morning newspaper in the Southern Hemisphere.

Mr. Bennett recently wrote to *The Sun* as follows:

Dear Sir,

Re. Media Coverage

"The Sun has recently published a series of photographs and stories giving Asians a prominence out of all proportion to the percentage of Asians in the community.

"A story about Carols by Candlelight attended by about 30,000 people has a crowd photograph and a close-up photograph of two children, both of whom were Asian. I assume that the audience was a cross-section of the Australian population and that (according to the Government) at least 95% were non-Asian.

"The opening of the school year was covered in a story with an accompanying photograph of an Asian child. It is not clear why the photographer ignored the great majority of non-Asian school children. It is difficult to believe that the singling

Rabbi Zaichyk said that, in all 102 places that Jews are mentioned in the New Testament, they are mentioned in a derogatory form and mentioned as something less than a human being which the devil has created."

Only one Pope, Pope John XXIII, ever loved the Jewish people, he said.

He called on the Vatican to remove the "hate factor" from the New Testament.

"The Pope has the power to take it out.

"Did our good Pope, when he spoke, in the Rome synagogue, refute these things? I don't think so."

Rabbi Zaichyk called on Jewish leaders to ask the Pope whether the Vatican holds any Jewish treasures from the ancient Holy Temple, and if so, for the Vatican to return them.

NO CHANGE

He accused the Christian world, during the Nazi Holocaust, of "sitting in their vestments of hypocrisy and not saying a word — including the Pope, who sat on top of them".

"Let not one Jew for one moment fool himself that he is more acceptable to Christians in the emancipated world of the twentieth century".

Rabbi Zaichyk said there had been a "new Christian theology" since the creation of Israel in 1948.

This theology encouraged Jews to migrate to Israel, after which the second coming of Jesus was predicted to occur, he said.

"Instead of the stick of 2000 years, they have put out the carrot.

"The Jew then becomes so excited about it that he begins to fall for the new opening.

"We have already learnt the meaning of the words of the New Testament, and as long as hate will be embellished in those writings and as long as every child of Christian faith learns that the Jew killed their God, anti-Semitism will be alive and well in every part of the world," Rabbi Zaichyk said.

The best response to this threat was to "be strong in the ways of Judaism" in order to gain the respect of the Christian, he said.

Rabbi Zaichyk said "a very small number" of Christian leaders had defended Jews.

"To those, we will always be thankful, but we will not be fooled again and again.

"We're not asking for love, but just that the hate factor be taken out" of Christian theology.

Rabbi Zaichyk said Jews should be happy only when Christianity "backs up the smile with concrete action".

"Until then, remember that anti-Semitism is alive," he said.

out of an Asian student for this photo was an "accident" any more than the singling out of two Asian children at the Carols by Candlelight was an accident.

"A story about the danger of children swimming in pools was accompanied by a photograph of two children, one Asian and one white. A front-page story about a wet day in Melbourne showed two people, both Asians, in the rain.

"A front page story about an Asian marrying a white Australian included a photograph with the caption "she's an Aussie now". I cannot recall any other front-page story about foreign-born non-Asians marrying Australians with a similar photograph and caption.

"Since Asians are still only about 3% of the population it is not clear why they are given so much prominence. Is there a policy to give Asians a high profile in news stories about events in which all Australians participate to encourage Australians to believe that a high percentage of Asians in the population is inevitable?

"The Sun has also given a disproportionate coverage to Asian communal affairs as compared with the coverage of the communal affairs of other ethnic groups. I can document this if you wish.

Yours faithfully,"

UNFOLDING DRAMA IN SOUTH AFRICA

The following examination of the South African crisis comes from the pen of the well-known South African journalist and author, Mr. Ivor Benson, in the February issue of his "Behind the News" (Available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, England CO 10 6TD).

The news, which the world gets about South Africa, much of it coming from South Africa, represents falsehood of extraordinary magnitude and complexity.

The facts supplied are frequently true; the confusion arises from gross misrepresentation of them. The reasoning, too, is often faultless, but proceeding step by step from spurious premises.

Nevertheless, the news about South Africa, including that supplied by South Africa's own newspapers, serves the purpose for which it is intended by the tiny minority of power-wielders who know exactly what is going on and are never for a moment confused or deceived. It is news that incites and promotes revolution in South Africa in such a way that the vast majority of the peoples of the West have not the faintest idea what is happening.

What makes the situation even more confusing is the fact that there are enough secondary motives at work to obscure the ones that really matter, the ones which make things happen the way they do and keep the revolution undeviatingly on course.

Before trying to dispel the fog with a simple total picture of the present undeclared war against South Africa, let us bring the story up to date with some of the latest items of news.

* The African National Congress (ANC), which is frankly Communist oriented and supported, decided last month at a conference at Lusaka, Zambia, to "mobilise its military resources and take its action into every party of South Africa".

Landmines and other explosive weapons, which had been used in recent weeks, were described as "the opening shots in the new-armed phase".

It is common knowledge that all the "military resources" which have hitherto been used against South Africa are of Communist origin, and the Communist countries have also supplied the terrorist training the Rhodesian pattern reproduced exactly.

But, who is Oliver Tambo, the leader of the ANC who delivered these threats to a representative of South Africa's Argus press? He is one of the ANC leaders whom Mr. Harry Oppenheimer, South Africa's capitalist czar, recently met at some secret hideout in Zambia.

Meanwhile, Desmond Tutu, Bishop of Johannesburg and general secretary of the South African Council of Churches (SACC, a branch of the World Council of Churches), has been on a triumphal visit to the United States, holding press conferences, starred in television programmes and received by Vice-President Bush.

And what has Bishop Tutu been telling the Americans? It was now possible, he told the *Washington Post*, that militant Black leaders would concentrate on what he called "soft targets" like buses carrying White schoolchildren. Other "soft targets" mentioned by this "holy man" were the homes of the Whites where domestic servants could put poison in the tea. Perish the thought that Bishop Tutu would want to incite Blacks to such fiendish forms of militant action, but he must know his own people well enough to know that they are highly susceptible to suggestion and are hardly likely to quibble over the difference between a prediction and a suggestion.

And the English-language papers in South Africa, ever mindful of the will of the mining financiers who own them, including those who were recently in close conclave with Communist Oliver Tambo, these papers would not want to give their full support to the ANC by splashing the Lusaka threats on their front pages, would they? - or would they? And the last thing they would want to do, surely, is to feed into the minds of the Black

militants the idea that the bombing of school buses and the poisoning of their White employers would be regarded abroad as "understandable" and, in the circumstances, even inevitable!

From which it follows, of course, that the owners of those newspapers and their editors must be innocently unaware of the fact that the publicity they have been giving to the ANC and to Bishop Tutu, threats and predictions included, meets all the requirements of those who are bent on drawing all Southern Africa into the same Marxist sink-hole.

A strange purblindness — not so? Yet blindness that does not allow them, even by accident, to deviate one degree from a course that happens to suit the revolutionaries and put heart into the terrorists!

* Other things have been happening in the United States. Under pressure to abandon his policy of so-called "constructive engagement" - an alternative to all-out economic and political warfare - President Reagan has agreed to the setting up of a "bipartisan advisory committee" on South Africa, consisting of eight Whites and four Blacks. This committee, at its first session, so we are told, "was guided by American experts through South African history", and will later travel to South Africa to gather evidence and information.

What does all this mean? Answer: Nothing more than just another generator of more and more news and pictures, to be added to the present surplus generated by politicians, public entertainers, and professional activists of the kind who parade daily in front of South African embassies and consulates.

'CONFUSION IS A WEAPON'

* What else has been happening? A Swiss "debt mediator", one Dr. Fritz Leutwiller, has been on a visit to South Africa to discuss with President P.W. Botha and others debts, which South Africa suddenly and unexpectedly finds itself unable to pay. Bad housekeeping? - Not at all, for most of that which is now owed was neither spent nor borrowed. How so? The black magic involved in that misfortune is not readily explained. What happened was that currency manipulations, by cutting the exchange value of the rand without any warning, trebled the debt repayment burden. What we need to know, and what the newspapers will not tell us, is that this attack on the rand was just another part of the undeclared war against South Africa.

So, what does it all mean? The information about South Africa, and interpretations thereof, can be compared with a tip-truck load of jigsaw puzzle pieces; if all spread out these imaginary jigsaw pieces would need a table the size of a football field. What we would not know, if we were crazy enough to try to put these pieces together to form a single picture — like the pieces of news about South Africa — is that they cannot be made to fit together, for they are a mixture of pieces from innumerable different jigsaw puzzles.

Tutu alone is a scrambled jigsaw puzzle in which no two parts ever fit exactly. Bishop Tutu is quite sure that President Reagan does not understand what is happening in South Africa; he, therefore, undertook, while in Washington, to "uncloud the President's vision". But are we so sure that Bishop Tutu's mind does not also need to be "unclouded"? And if we cannot be sure that President Reagan has not been able to put together all the pieces of the South African jigsaw puzzle, with so many experts to help and advise him, who else can hope to be able to do it?

* Another recent visitor to the United States was Mr. Ian Smith, former Prime Minister of Rhodesia and now leader of the opposition Conservative Alliance Party in the Zimbabwean parliament. This man has been at the centre of political developments in Southern Africa ever since 1963 when he took over as Prime Minister from Winston Field, so he ought to know what has been going on — not so?

NATIONAL WEEKEND REPORT
IN NEXT ISSUE

Printed and Published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne, Victoria 3000